

"INDOCTRINATIONS," "SURVEY AND CURRICULUM
SCIENCE," AND "TRANSITIONAL PHILOSOPHY":

A THREE-STAGE REASSESSMENT OF

FRANKLIN BOBBITT

By

FREDERICK M. SMILEY

Bachelor of Arts
Chico State University
Chico, California
1966

Master of Arts in Education
Master of Arts
Master of Arts
Master of Arts
Chapman University
Orange, California
1973, 1975, 1982

Doctor of Philosophy in Education
University of Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California
1982

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION:
December, 1992

Thesis
1992D
Sb41i

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

C O P Y R I G H T

by

Frederick M. Smiley

December, 1992

"INDOCTRINATIONS," "SURVEY AND CURRICULUM
SCIENCE," AND "TRANSITIONAL PHILOSOPHY":
A THREE-STAGE REASSESSMENT OF
FRANKLIN BOBBITT

Thesis Approved:

Russell Olson

Thesis Advisor

Richard P. Battiger

David Yellen

Kenneth H. Clair

Thomas C. Collins

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Russell Dobson, my advisor and mentor, for his encouragement, support, and counsel throughout my graduate program, but especially with this project. My thanks I also give to my committee members Dr. Richard Batteiger, Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, and Dr. David Yellin for their advice, help, and editing.

To my Mother and Father, Claire Leone DeChesne Smiley and Lester Boomer Smiley, I dedicate this dissertation. They bestowed on me the wonder of new thoughts, the blessing of diligent work, and the joy of education. Their nurture, love, and faith I have always revered and respected; with this document I humbly acknowledge their contributions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	1
U.S. Curricular History Eras	9
"The Puritan Platform" (1620-1749).	9
"The Reluctant Rebellion" (1750-1859)	15
"The Lever Age" (1860-1904)	19
John Franklin Bobbitt Overview	30
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	41
Historical Curriculum Texts.	42
<u>The Transformation of the School--</u> <u>Progressivism in American Education</u> <u>1876-1957</u>	42
<u>Education and the Cult of Efficiency,</u> <u>A Study of the Social Forces That</u> <u>Have Shaped the Administration of the</u> <u>Public Schools.</u>	46
<u>Curriculum Principles and Social</u> <u>Trends</u>	50
<u>The One Best System, A History of</u> <u>American Urban Education.</u>	54
<u>History of Education and Culture in</u> <u>America</u>	58
<u>The Struggle for the American</u> <u>Curriculum 1893-1958.</u>	62
<u>Curriculum--Perspective, Paradigm, and</u> <u>Possibility</u>	69
<u>A History of School Curriculum.</u>	73
Other Studies Consulted.	79
A Study of Mechanism in Education	80
The Educational Ideas of John Franklin Bobbitt.	83
The Shaping of a Field of Specialization, Curriculum Making: A Critical Study of Selected Writings of Charles and Frank McMurry, Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, Harold Rugg, Hollis Caswell, and John Dewey.	84
"Franklin Bobbitt and the 'Science' of Curriculum Making"	86

Chapter	Page
"Shifting Visions of the Curriculum: Notes on the Aging of Franklin Bobbitt"	88
"The Scientific Curriculum-Making Theory as a Conservative-Progressive Reform in an age of Progressivism 1914-1926"	90
Ralph W. Tyler's Principles of Curriculum Instruction and Evaluation: Past Influences and Present Effects. .	91
Comments	92
 III. BOBBITT'S STAGE I--"INDOCTRINATIONS".	 96
Overview	96
Publications	99
<u>A First Book of English</u> (1904).	99
"The Growth of Philippine Children" (1909a)	107
"Practical Eugenics" (1909b).	111
"A City School as a Music and Musical Center" (1911a)	121
"The Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School" (1911b)	126
"The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912)	131
"Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City-School Systems" (1913a).	138
"Literature in the Elementary Curriculum" (1913b)	145
"High School Costs" (1915a)	149
Stage I Summary.	153
 IV. BOBBITT'S STAGE II--"SURVEY AND CURRICULUM SCIENCE"	 155
Overview	155
Publications	157
"The School Survey: Finding Standards of Current Practice With Which to Measure One's own Schools" (1914a). .	157
"The South Bend Public Schools: A Survey by the Department of Education at the University of Chicago" (1914b)	158
"The San Antonio Public School System" (1915b).	159
<u>What the Schools Teach and Might Teach</u> (1915c).	174

Chapter	Page
"Report of the School Survey of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver" (1916)	180
"The Curriculum Situation, Survey of the St. Louis Public Schools" (1917a)	188
"Summary of the Literature in Scientific Method in the Field of Curriculum-Making" (1917b)	192
"The Plan of Measuring Educational Efficiency in Bay City" (1918a)	197
"The Building Principle in the Surveys" (1918b)	201
<u>The Curriculum</u> (1918c)	206
"Reading in the Elementary Schools of Indianapolis v. the Reading Materials" (1919a)	220
"Supervisory Leadership on the Part of the High-School Principal" (1919b)	224
"The Objectives of Secondary Education" (1920a)	227
"Mistakes Often Made by Principals-- Part I" (1920b)	231
"Mistakes Often Made by Principals-- Part II" (1920c)	234
"A Significant Tendency in Curriculum Making" (1921a)	237
"The Actual Objectives of the Present-Day High School" (1921b)	241
"Objectives of Physical Education" (1921c)	245
"Curriculum Making in L.A." (1922a)	249
"Educational Objectives" (1922b)	249
"The Technique of Curriculum Making in Arithmetic" (1924a)	255
"The New Technique of Curriculum Making" (1924b)	257
"Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher Training Institutions" (1924c)	259
"What Understanding of Human Society Should Education Develop?" (1924d)	262
"Functions of the High School Principal in Curriculum-Making" (1924e)	266
<u>How to Make a Curriculum</u> (1924f)	271
Stage II Summary	290
 V. BOBBITT'S STAGE III--"TRANSITIONAL PHILOSOPHY".	 295
Overview	295
Publications	298

Chapter	Page
"The Trend in the Curriculum" (1924g)	298
"Individualizing the Curriculum" (1925a)	301
"Education as a Social Process" (1925b)	306
"Difficulties to be Met in Local Curriculum-Making" (1925c)	309
Discovering the Objectives of Health Education" (1925d)	314
<u>Curriculum Investigations</u> (1926a)	316
"Orientation of the Curriculum Maker" (1926b)	320
"Character Building in the New Curriculum" (1926c)	338
"Educational Science and Supervision" (1928)	342
"Rebuilding the Curriculum in Line With its True Function" (1929)	346
"The Relation Between Content and Method" (1931)	350
"Social Values of the Junior High School Curriculum" (1933)	353
"The Basic Curriculum of Source-Thinkers--A Proposal" (1934a)	358
"Questionable Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies" (1934b)	359
"Trend of the Activity Curriculum" (1934c)	363
"Advancing Toward the Activity Curriculum" (1935a)	367
"General Education in the High School" (1935b)	370
"The Modern Curriculum" (1935c)	373
"The Kindergarten" (1937a)	377
"A Correlated Curriculum Evaluated" {Book Review} (1937b)	378
<u>Curriculum of Modern Education</u> (1941)	380
"The Postwar Curriculum: The Functional vs. The Academic Plan" (1945)	423
"The Unique Work of Porter Sargent" {Book Review} (1946a)	429
"Foreign Service Effects" (1946b)	431
"Education or Catastrophe" (1946c)	436
"The Latest Educational Utopia" (1946d)	440
"Harvard Reaffirms the Academic Tradition" (1946e)	441
"The Educational Policies Commission Banishes Science" (1946f)	446

Chapter	Page
"Letter(s)" (1954)	447
Stage III and Final Summary.	449
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	465

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Curriculum definitions function between two major bookends. At one end, curriculum acts as a specific course of study for a specific time. At the other, it is everything a student experiences under schools' auspices. In between, curriculum definitions range from pure content, a set of performance objectives, or even a series of courses (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, p. 236). As Peter Oliva (1988) says, curriculum can be analogous to a blind man's elephant or Yeti (p. 4). Differing conjectures, opinions, and theories abound, but no one has produced a composite photograph or standardized proof concerning same. To understand curriculum, then, the first step must be to understand the curriculum writer.

To understand the curriculum writer, it is necessary to understand the writer's culture and values, that person's incitations, and how that individual affects any young people served. This study demonstrates how John Franklin Bobbitt arrived at his curricular constructions via his personal and professional influences. This study reviews Bobbitt's legacy to U.S. public school students, and his ultimate place in American curricular history.

Bobbitt, the father of and first curriculum professor in the United States, made his two-pointed curriculum stance very clear (Kliebard, 1986, pp. 120-122). Curriculum for Bobbitt was either a set of directed (home) or undirected (school) experiences that allowed the student to reach specific progress points, or it was the directed (behavioral) objectives that helped "train" the student to obtain the "good life" (emphasis added). This dissertation (first person and third narrator will interchange hereafter) explores in depth Bobbitt's publications, reassess what Bobbitt wrote about curriculum, how he came to his beliefs, and how he progressed through his articles, surveys, and books during his three-decade professorship at the University of Chicago. Bobbitt's work influenced, directly or indirectly, such figures as Ralph Tyler, Benjamin Bloom, and John Goodlad (cf. Eisner, 1967, pp. 42-44, for more information). This dissertation contends that Bobbitt and his work represent a major "scientific" (emphasis added) curriculum force. Many essentialists today, I contend, hold very Bobbitt-like curriculum and curriculum constructionist views.

To understand Bobbitt, readers need to understand his contemporary educational setting. The United States has a relatively short history as a nation and U.S. curriculum study has an even shorter history. Charles Eliot's definition of curriculum, one that promotes elitist college

study via the 1893 Committee of Ten, provided Bobbitt with a backdrop and basis for curricular revision (Hawkins, 1972, pp. 233-239). In one sense, Bobbitt's refutation of Eliot's work not only provides a significant milestone in U.S. educational history, but also gives Bobbitt an important place in our public school curricular annals, a contention in this study.

This study begins with an introduction and retrospective of the American public school system in which Bobbitt becomes first a student, next a public school teacher, then a professor, all under the umbrella of his curriculum writing. This dissertation breaks that educational history into three periods: (a) "The Puritan Platform," (1620-1749), which emphasizes our religious heritage; (b) "The Reluctant Rebellion," (1750-1859) which details our political heritage; and, (c) "The Lever Age," (1860-1904), which emphasizes our mercantile heritage. The first date (1620) marks the Plymouth settlement; the latter date (1904) marks the first Bobbitt publication, A First Book in English. Between both dates lies most important U.S. public school curriculum history.

Franklin Bobbitt, a product of a pious religious household, diligent in his studies and work, affected by the Industrial Revolution--its work ethic and titans--became a good example of not only a member of the Doctrine of the (Calvinistic, religious) Elect, but also the Doctrine of the (Social Darwinistic) Secular Elect (capitals and parentheses

as emphasis). This introduction ends as Bobbitt begins his professional career and becomes an advocate of scientism and essentialism.

The review of related literature focuses on curricular historians that have commented on Bobbitt's work, career, and importance or influence. More than selective, but not comprehensive, this review does not just note the Bobbitt occurrences in various histories. Rather, I went back into each historical curricular text, noted the philosophy and/or point of view of the authors, in their own words or paraphrased, then showed how Bobbitt adds or complements the historians' narrative. Within this review, broken out separately, are articles, monographs, and dissertations that have addressed Bobbitt's writing or people who swayed him, as well as his subsequent impact on other U.S. educators.

Bobbitt's initial period, Stage I--"Indoctrinations," begins with the publication of his English as a Second Language (ESL) text, A First Book in English (1904), and ends with the article, "High School Costs" (1915a). Bobbitt's writing during that time mirrors the influences he had personally from his family's strong religious ties, from the Captains of Industry that surrounded him, as well as from the academic influences he had at the University of Indiana (E. B. and W. L. Bryan) and Clark University (G. S. Hall and W. H. Burnham) (DeWulf, 1962, pp. 71-75). Virtually no one who has studied Bobbitt has scrutinized his early period. That early period is a fount of information

concerning not only Bobbitt's early life, including his early teaching experiences, but it also provides information that sheds new light on his much-studied curriculum texts.

Stage II--"Survey and Curriculum Science" starts with Bobbitt's survey genre, beginning with South Bend, Indiana (1913), and continuing through Los Angeles, California (1922). He later fashioned several more surveys in different states. Those surveys produced the first of Bobbitt's "activities" curriculum. Both surveys and "activities" became focus for his many articles in Stage II, as well as his two major texts (The Curriculum-1918c and How to Make a Curriculum-1924f). Those books mark the end of this stage.

Stage III--"Transitional Philosophy" begins with "The Trend in the Curriculum" (1924g), and includes other articles leading up to his retraction of his prior essentialist position. The National Society for the Study of Education's (NSSE) 26th Annual Yearbook (1926) brought together various curricular (philosophical) factions. Bobbitt's acceptance of child-centered curriculum in that yearbook surprised many. He had long regarded schooling exclusively as preparation for the adult life, as witnessed by his survey genre. Examined also in my third period are the other professional writing Bobbitt did, including works that represent his recidivistic scientism (later called functionalism) apart from his child-centeredness. Last, this dissertation delves into his final text, Curriculum of

Modern Education (1941), and comments on his professional life's work. At his career's conclusion, this text, as well as his other publications, reflect the conservative educational tenets Bobbitt had proposed or completed.

Bobbitt was a curricular leader who reflected the tenor of an age that reacted and resounded from the effects of The Industrial Revolution (Callahan, 1962, pp. 180-181). His essentialist philosophy, I maintain, came about as a result of his religious (pastoral) instructors, secular (big business) titans, and pedagogic (teacher) indoctrinations. His legacy includes the first text titled and solely devoted to curriculum, an activity curriculum made up of his survey and objectives, consulting work to various states' school districts, and his teaching of curriculum at the university level. As mentioned, Ralph Tyler, Benjamin Bloom, and John Goodlad, among others, learn from, modify, or use many of Bobbitt's principles. Many Bobbitt-like ideas and thoughts have contemporary usage and practice. My study concludes that Bobbitt was and is a major education/curriculum figure.

The introduction to this thesis has two distinct purposes. The first indicates the author's missionary approach to his first teaching position in Manila, The Philippines, as well as his zealous curriculum writing/educating at the University of Chicago. Such diligence stemmed from his Puritan culture's influence, generally, and his own family's religious dicta, specifically. My introduction's second purpose traces the

religious, political, and industrial periods of American history, then highlights the resultant change from agrarian to industrial emphases as precursor to Bobbitt's initial writing period. Bobbitt, I theorize, received as much influence from the growing "products, profits, and progress" (emphasis added) motif of American big business, as he did from the Puritan religion that his minister grandfather and father symbolically espoused. For Bobbitt, democracy and democratic education lay within the seemingly disparate parameters of religious zeal and business profits. Further, this dissertation explores the unlikely melding of the religious Doctrine of the Elect to Social Darwinistic Doctrine of the (Secular) Elect. These doctrines became the manifesto of big business, doctrines that also became a pervasive and persuasive part of Bobbitt's pedagogy.

From the vantage point that this introduction produces, the amalgamated Puritan culture and the scientific, industrially-based one, Bobbitt's work divides into three separate stages: "Indoctrinations," "Survey and Curriculum Science," and "Transitional Philosophical." In each of those stages, this dissertation discusses the author's articles and texts using primary sources as singular reference. DeWulf's detailed dissertation (1962) chronicled Bobbitt's life and works. Kliebard (1975) affirmed Bobbitt's apparent philosophical change, circa 1924-1926 (p. 63). Jackson (1975) corroborated that 1924-1926 retraction of Bobbitt's conservative dogma (pp. 131-132).

My academic platform builds from those three scholars' contributions.

Circa 1924-1926, Bobbitt changes his curricular stance. During his pre-Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook writing, highlighted by his various surveys, he advocated education as an adult and adult-living stratagem. His contribution to the 1926 NSSE text exhibits a pronounced child-centered orientation. Although Bobbitt appeared to agree with the educationally progressive and moderate thinkers who openly advocated empowerment, I found that Bobbitt only supported his own renamed scientism (functionalism). He always opposed a purely subject-centered approach expostulated by Charles Eliot and The Committee of Ten. However, his functionalism deemed schools exist for young people and their journey to adulthood. He never wavered from his dictum that pupils' journeys required shaping and conditioning by "men of experience," the term Bobbitt ascribed science-oriented school administrators.

Bobbitt emphasized curriculum via educators, sociologists, and/or other anthropological experts' surveys. Survey-led academia became Bobbitt's conceptual child-centered, activities-oriented school. That resultant schooling, for Bobbitt, mirrored and enhanced his own concept of democracy. Bobbitt's philosophy became his educational "be all" and "end all," one that he never narrowed, negated, or neglected--the summary point of this work's Chapter V. Following now, before the various Bobbitt

textual analyses and my concluding statements, is the aforementioned American curricular history that propelled Bobbitt into public school prominence.

U.S. Curricular History Eras

"The Puritan Platform" (1620-1749)

American democracy stems from Puritan doctrine. Puritanism is a term I use to denote Protestant opposition to the 16th and 17th Century Church of England. It was the religion of choice that many Mayflower occupants shared, whether they were regular passengers, indentured servants, adventurers, or miscreants. Puritanism, heavily reliant on Calvinism, connoted strict Scriptural study, pious living, and a basic distrust of human emotional or carnal excesses (Gutek, 1970, pp. 10-11). Persecuted often in their native England because of their separation from the state church, these original immigrants set out for a new life in America. They also complied with the dictates of the "Mayflower Compact," the transplanted Europeans' first document that represented the spirit of collective and cooperative democracy (Rippa, 1967, pp. 4-14, as well as for a fuller description of middle (parochial) and southern (tutorial) colonies' educational histories). This dissertation details New England history because of its public school legacy. Huddled off the coast of what would be the New England Colonies, Mayflower immigrants prepared for their new home and agreed to give up some individual rights for the group's

cohesiveness. When they disembarked, they equated secular and religious domains. That equation, I contend, did not last long.

Partly fearing the land, partly fearing whatever native conflict they might find, yet having no other recourse, the Anglican dissenters came ashore. What they found and what they did became pivotal for them, for this introduction, and for United States' educational history. The new land provided Puritans with challenges regarding weather, new diseases, and assorted hardships; however, "hostile" (emphasis added) natives were not a threat. Rather, Native Americans provided not only helpful advice on matters ranging from food gathering to land use, but they also provided a friendly atmosphere that supported both cultures' peaceful coexistence (Parkes, 1953, pp. 23-24). In short, the "Indians" (emphasis added) aided, abetted, and otherwise helped the Puritans with any and all matters of surviving and living in the new land.

If the inhabitants provided the Mayflower immigrants physical and spiritual shelter, the hard work that was part of their own Puritan culture provided more than bare sustenance. Prosperity, per se, was new to these people. Few, if any, of the original "boat people" (emphasis added), who boarded the Mayflower and subsequent vessels, expected an easy life or a profitable one. Clinging to the Protestant maxims of hard work, devotion to detail, and parsimonious living, the Puritans practiced their diligence,

drive, and dedication during the six-day work week (Spring, 1990, pp. 25-28). When they completed their secular duties, the immigrants convened at their churches for Sunday worship. Those Sunday services produced penitent, contrite, yet increasingly affluent sinners. They thanked their God that they had survived in the new land, rested on the Sabbath, then returned on the following Monday to their work. Work became more than the original farming and settling. Once the surviving settlers realized that various small businesses and entrepreneurial ventures supported their sundry communities, capitalism thrived. Having Native American allies and neighbors for support and reliance, the European survivors progressed.

Working overtime to clear more land, plant more crops, and/or build up additional turn-key businesses, ranging from animal trapping to supply stores, the Puritans learned a new and important concept--intermingling religious prophets with fiscal profits. Profits became the Puritans' work-ethic (Good, 1962, pp. 12-16). If the immigrants used their collective energies to survive, not only could they survive, but the hardier people could go beyond eking out a living and could become profit-making capitalists. Their religion was the focus for their spiritual life as well as their business and secular orientation. Puritan logic was simple. If God had allowed them to come to their new land, then to live, work, and prosper, He, being omniscient and omnipresent, must want it that way. Businesses and

businessmen used the same logic. If God had not wanted some Puritans to make profits from their ventures, He would have either not let them have profits, or else He would have taken those gains from them (Rippa, 1967, pp. 22-23). Since He did not, the Puritans used their Calvinistic Doctrine of the Elect as a sign that they were the religious elite. Their secular successes became a part of their religion. These melded doctrines, religiously-inspired and secularly-extended, presented the new immigrants with a dilemma. Many had come to America as adventurers, dissidents or outcasts. Within a generation, using their hosts' help to battle the land and elements, they became colonial citizens who produced usable or sellable products or services.

Those citizens set up schools to teach their progeny. Sexism and racism did not have those specific titles during the colonial era; however, the schools, especially higher education, catered only to male clients who were landed gentry. Landed gentry equated to White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants (WASPs). Those privileged few became the educated privileged few, and the educated privileged few have become our "old rich," the unofficial aristocracy--the cultural powerbrokers who today still command the envy, if not the respect, of many citizens (Sellers and May, 1963, pp. 14-15).

"The Puritan Platform" is a term for the colonial and curricular history that begins with the 1620 Pilgrim landing, and extends to 1749, the date that Benjamin

Franklin founded his famous academy (Good, 1956, p. 73). Following "The Puritan Platform" comes "The Reluctant Rebellion," dating 1750 to 1859, and, finally, "The Lever Age," dating from 1860 to Bobbitt's initial writing, A First Book in English (1904). These three periods, and the Social Darwinism that became the Doctrines of the Elect and the Secular Elect, influenced the science/invention-led Industrial Revolution. The two doctrines also became touchstones from which Bobbitt wrote. To study and understand the author and his curricular scientism, readers must comprehend the era in which he wrote, as well as his personal and professional influences.

"The Puritan Platform" witnessed the first group of European immigrants learning to exist, live, and then prosper in their new land. The early New England schools mirrored the needs that the Puritans felt--educational complements that could benefit the colonies. Built upon their Dame School and Latin Grammar School models, the Massachusetts Compulsory School Act (1642) required public schooling for selected students, and the Deluder Satan Act (1647) provided means for offering strengthened literacy skills to more people (Guttek, 1970, p. 12). Subsequent legislation in Dedham, Massachusetts, (1648) assessed property taxes for public schools.

The formation of Franklin's Academy (1749) marked the end of the "Puritan Platform" (Spring, 1990, pp. 22-24). Dame and Latin Grammar Schools had utilized Latin and Greek,

emphasized classical subjects, and promoted vocational skills for wealthy Anglo boys. Franklin's academy utilized English, emphasized practical subjects, and promoted vocational education for more students (Rippa, 1967, pp. 38-43). Additionally, higher education became important for the colonies regarding the training of ministerial, medical, and legal professionals. When Harvard (1636), Yale (1701), and Dartmouth (1769), all securely tied to organized religion, opened their doors, Americans could, for the first time, professionally train young people instead of relying on English and European institutions (Sellers and May, 1963, p. 38). The American "experience" included education as a selectively-important cultural tenet.

Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, speaking for many colonial citizenry, exemplified the glory and beauty of basking in the new American experience. He wrote that becoming an American was the highest joy and the greatest good an immigrant could have: "Here [in America] individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men, whose labours and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world" (Bradley, Beaty, and Long, 1956, p. 142). Regardless of schools and curricula that discriminated against women and minorities and the rigid exclusivity of the professions during "The Puritan Platform," de Crevecoeur's statement suggested that most new immigrants were happy to come to the colonies, work hard, and patiently wait for an even more promising future.

Because they represented so much adversity and persecution from their prior countries, collectively, the new immigrants accepted their respective social status and their place in society. Such attitudes would also fuel the 1776 Revolution.

"The Reluctant Rebellion" (1750-1859)

The second major historical and curricular period preceding Bobbitt's contributions becomes "The Reluctant Rebellion." That rebellion transitions from the "Puritan Platform" to the Industrial Revolution's "Lever Age." During the struggle for colonial independence, many new immigrants came to the colonies. They came in droves. Often escaping from what amounted to great political strife in their native lands, poor living conditions, and general economic depressions, they arrived in this country eager to participate in the growing republican experiment (Callahan, 1962, p. 8). They were only too happy to take the education offered themselves and their families. As the Revolutionary War became first a thought, next a passion, and finally a reality, an abrupt shift occurred in the student role.

Thomas Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia" maintained that the republican experiment required literate voters in order to sustain the government (Bradley, Beatty, and Long, 1956, pp. 270-274). If the citizenry could not vote intelligently, suggested Jefferson, then the experiment would continue only as an experiment; the country would not

grow and prosper. The old Dame and Latin Grammar School concepts, doctrinaire of the "Puritan Platform," could no longer adequately serve students' and the emerging nation's needs. The New England, Latin-based public school instruction, which had prepared ministers, doctors, lawyers, and businessmen, had decreasing applicability as more immigrants arrived. As well, new immigrants participated in growing expansionism--western manifest destiny. The U.S. Constitution contributed to the public education quandary. No direct mention had the Constitution provided for public schools. Only the offerings of each state could support Jefferson's dream of egalitarian education.

Throughout the "Reluctant Rebellion," a change occurred between individual communities and their own curricula, and a growing national curriculum. The 13 original colonies and the expansion that eventually stretched to California represents the basis for that national curriculum. The Morrill Acts of 1762 and 1790 defined higher education needs, but elementary and secondary schools did not find such legislative support (Gwynn and Chase, 1969, p. 12). Only the Kalamazoo Case (1874) provided a federal mandate for free public education (Good, 1962, p. 251). Support for public education became a growing crisis during the "Lever Age," the era I note beginning with the Civil War, indelibly marked with the Industrial Revolution, and accentuated with the 1893 Committee of Ten's work.

Before noting the effects of that U.S. holocaust, I want to mention and include both Charles Darwin's actual scientific theory and work, as well as resultant Social Darwinism. Social Darwinism and Puritanism became an ironic partnership. Irony is an excellent descriptor for the realities of Puritanism and Social Darwinism. Though polarized and apparently antithetical, Calvinistic religion and survivalist science shared much. Two Darwin works, Origin of Species (1859 [reprinted 1900]) and Descent of Man (1871), detailed how more capable and more specialized species proliferate; incapable or non-adaptable species wither and perish. Those two works and Darwin's philosophy do not have the pejoration that Social Darwinism has, any more than the original Calvinism had to expanded Puritanism. Social Darwinism has a much more extended base, more appendages than Darwin's original work that explicated specific species advancement. Darwinism maintained that society was a changing environment where human beings competed with each other in covert and overt struggles.

Social Darwinism's most important struggle, though, was economic survival. Society indirectly benefitted from the increased technology that the strugglers produced, and society directly benefitted from "bottom-line" (emphasis added) profits. The most lionized Social Darwinist was Herbert Spencer, who wrote Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical (1860 [reprinted 1896]),

encased in which was his famous essay, "What Knowledge is of Most Worth?" Rhetorically came the answer, "science." This "God as the Great Clockmaker" insured that science and religion became Deistically melded (cf. Rostow, 1975, pp. 151-157, for a discussion of this topic). American science, I maintain, propelled its citizens in extrinsic-survival struggles on one level. On another, science-like factors such as capitalistic profits propelled the citizens towards intrinsic/economic struggles. Survival on both levels became a by-product of the business and industry motif.

If Darwin and Spencer ushered in the role of science and philosophy for the Social Darwinists, William Graham Sumner, the Yale sociologist, provided education with an accompanying model (Parkes, 1959, p. 489). Sumner suggested that any educational system that did not advocate survival of the fittest must then advocate survival of the ill-fit. Social Darwinism provided an impetus to a whole generation of American Literature chroniclers. Those chroniclers included realists/determinists such as Theodore Dreiser and William Dean Howells, as well as Muckrakers such as Frank Norris and Upton Sinclair. Such social historians described and detailed the misuse and abuse of an industrial age that changed science meant for U.S. citizens to scientism that rewarded entrepreneurs (cf. Cremin, 1961, pp. 366-379, for more information regarding this subject).

The industrialists' philosophy, laissez-faire capitalism, produced burgeoning corporate empires. What

inadvertently the Puritans started with their Doctrine of the Elect, melded into the Doctrine of the Secular Elect (cf. Callahan, 1962, pp. 5-14, for a complete discussion of this topic). Those melded doctrines, as well as the Deistic clock metaphor, equated to the symbolic factory time-clock and whistle of the Industrial Revolution.

"The Lever Age" (1860-1904)

"The Lever Age" was the time span of American history and curricular history beginning with the Civil War, punctuated by the Industrial Revolution, and lasting until the time Bobbitt starts his writing in 1904. Remnants of that era remain to date. The first two eras to which I have focused were fueled by immigrants coming to this country. "The Lever Age" featured a third new citizenry wave. Where the "Puritan Platform" increased its population because of the lure of basic colonial settlements, the "Reluctant Rebellion" witnessed growth that fed the fight for independence. During the "Lever Age," new Titans of Industry actively sought immigrants to feed the various new factories and corporations.

During this last era, major figures, inventions and the country's vast natural resources forever changed the course of American history. When Bobbitt began to teach, write, and do his curricular work, the Industrial Revolution's impact was still very fresh in not only Bobbitt's environment, but also in the minds of the collective

American public. Major industrial magnates and their strict accountability doctrines impressed the young professor at the University of Chicago (Kliebard, 1986, pp. 97-99). Bobbitt, this thesis will demonstrate, reproduced those business titan's watchwords and used their industries' symbols of railroads, factories, and surveys in oral and written addresses, articles, and texts.

Perhaps as much growth, trauma, and tumult accompanied the Industrial Revolution regarding economic and fiscal means in the Nineteenth Century as did the original Colonial Revolution in nationalistic and independence terms in the Eighteenth Century. The 1776 revolution propelled the colonies from the mercantilism and protectorship of England. The Industrial Revolution used economic growth as its own generating power. There was no mother country to fight against or from which to flee. Rather, the Industrial Revolution was a compilation of men, machines, and materials that fomented a national internal struggle. That struggle ultimately accounted for a change from an agrarian-based economy to an industrially-oriented one (Tyack, 1974, pp. 28-29).

Though the Civil War marked the unofficial date the Industrial Revolution began, five men and their inventions figured prominently before that conflict. Samuel Slater, an Englishman, because he was forbidden to take plans for a cotton-spinning machine from Great Britain, memorized its blueprints, and built the first such machine in the U.S. at

Pawtucket, Rhode Island, in 1789 (Hughes, 1970, p. 75). Eli Whitney, better known for his cotton gin invention, became the first person to standardize the parts for making guns in 1793 (Rippa, 1967, pp. 86-87). Francis Lowell traveled to England to study industrial machines. Upon his return, he set up the first completely mechanized business plant, a textile mill in Waltham, Massachusetts, in 1814 (Parkes, 1953, p. 225). Samuel F. B. Morse built and operated the first telegraphy machine in 1844 (Rippa, 1967, p. 92). Though prototypes of railroad engines had been operating since 1830, the first commercial railroad began operation out of Chicago in 1848 (cf. Parkes, 1953, Chapter XIX, "The Growth of Industry," for a more complete discussion of various machines' roles in the Industrial Revolution).

The Civil War proved a terrible carnage of human life. However, it also proved a business boom for the enterprises just listed. As well, the inventions, natural resources, and major figures added to the growing country's technology. The reliance on the railroads for transportation escalated as the Civil War closed. The Transcontinental Railroad began in 1863 and finished at Promontory Point, Utah, in 1869. Other railroads, including the Santa Fe and the Northern, immediately prospered. To provide fuel for new transportation ventures, the coal industry flourished. Bituminous coal mining multiplied ten-fold from 1840 to 1860. Iron became another expanding industry. Far-sighted experts knew that eventually wood-based fuels would not

sustain every industrial application. Iron became the logical substitute. Similarly, oil became industries' fuel used from the Civil War forward. Silver and gold yielded industries' huge short-term runs and profits. Oil dominated the industrial scene, since gasoline propelled the piston engine, and that motor powered new horseless carriages. As westward expansion continued across the plains, the entire landscape became industries' tools, whether for farming the land, raising cattle and sheep, cutting down timber, etc. (cf. Parkes, 1953, pp. 406-414, for a more complete description of how raw materials and inventions affected post Civil War America).

While various inventions and raw materials gave shape and definition to the Industrial Revolution, the Captains of Industry carried out Social Darwinism. Three such men, ameliorated as "Captains of Industry," pejorated as "Robber Barons," represented the most aggressive laissez-faire capitalism. They focused attention on the United States as a major world power. Additionally, John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and J. P. Morgan voiced a philosophy that put hard work, diligence, and parsimony as touchstones that Bobbitt championed throughout his career (Rippa, 1967, pp. 147-150).

John D. Rockefeller, the founder of Standard Oil, became the first Captain of Industry. Like most other Americans, Rockefeller did not inherit his wealth. Rather, born in the U.S. of an herbal elixir peddling, huckster

father and a staid, pious mother, young Rockefeller made his fortune by devoutly eschewing any waste in his first business venture, selling grain and meat to the Union Army before and during the Civil War (Bailyn, Davis, Donald, Thomas, Wiebe, and Wood, 1977, p. 783). Skipping his service obligation, sending proxies to the Civil War in his stead, Rockefeller progressed from selling commodities to selling oil products via the railroads. He emphasized the science of re-manufacturing petrol waste products for even more profits. Later in his career, he transferred some of those profits to educational philanthropy. Shortly before Bobbitt began his professorship there, Rockefeller bequeathed the University of Chicago 35 million dollars.

Andrew Carnegie, like Rockefeller, also came from humble origins. Born in Scotland, he was the son of a loom weaver. The family emigrated to America because Carnegie's father lost his job to early automation (Bailey, 1966, pp. 530-531). Beginning in the Pittsburgh area, young Andrew started his business career working a six-day, twelve-hour-a-day regimen. Also most interested in self-improvement, Carnegie participated on Saturday reading sessions while apprenticing himself to the head of the Penn Railroad, Mr. Thomas Scott (cf. Wall, 1970, pp. 114-126, and 148-150, for more information re Carnegie's early life). Speculating on the future of steel, Carnegie, like Rockefeller, made a fortune buying and selling to meet the demands of the Civil War. He also sent proxies to fight for

him in the actual conflict. Sensitive to criticism concerning his non-participation in the War Between the States, Carnegie sold his steel interests to J. P. Morgan, retired to a more philanthropic life, and gave away more than 350 million dollars to education and charities (Parkes, 1953, p. 407).

J. P. Morgan, the last of the troika reviewed here, was born into U.S. landed-gentry wealth. His father secured a bank associateship for him early in his career as a financier. He and his father acted as financial partners throughout life. Morgan purchased Carnegie's steel interests and formed U.S. Steel in 1901 (Sellers and May, 1963, pp. 280-282). Like the other two robber barons, Morgan also made huge profits on the Civil War. He speculated on several financial ventures during the conflict, and he also paid proxies to go to war for him. Like Rockefeller and Carnegie, Morgan detested waste of any sort, and all three epitomized the "waste not-want not" business theory. They all made money management, product recycling, and efficiency a way of business life.

Charles Darwin had defined the nature of man as selectively adapted. Factory and corporate America quickly seized on the concept that the "fittest survive." The fittest, I suggest, also "deserved" better educations, "deserved" better jobs, and "deserved" management opportunities (emphasis added). Some became the famed Captains of Industry. The drone workers, on the other hand,

often took what education they could, and settled into menial or minor jobs.

As Charles Darwin innocently aided the justification of the division of labor in industrial America, Alfred Binet abetted via testing. Binet developed testing tools and instruments which enabled school personnel and job supervisors to assign courses, curricula, jobs, and professions on the basis of intellectual capacity (Cremin, 1964, pp. 186-187). The history of the Industrial Revolution bridges the "capacity" (emphasis added) work inherent in the scientist Darwin and the social scientist Binet, from the end of the Civil War until the beginning of the Twentieth Century. That the revolution influenced the course of fiscal America cannot be denied. In 1820, manufacturers' inventions and products generated 50 billion dollars; in 1850, 500 billion; and, one decade later, 100 billion dollars (Sellers and May, 1963, p. 202). National earnings and profits grew proportionately.

That the Industrial Revolution influenced the course of American education also cannot be denied. Reports indicate that 34 million immigrants poured into the United States beginning in the Civil War era (1860) and ending with World War I (1918) (Parkes, 1953, pp. 468-470.) The 34 million people, who represented 14 separate language groups, changed the concept of the community school that the Dame and Latin Grammar Schools had embodied. Factory owners and corporate managers did not need workers with intellectual or academic

skills. The rank and file of the industrial army could learn the Frederick Taylor efficiency mode quickly. Factory owners openly boasted how rapidly they could train their piecework helpers (cf. Ostrander, 1964, pp. 254-258, and Hughes, 1970, pp. 110-116, for discussions of Frederick Taylor and the U.S. factory motif). The "hidden industrial curriculum" (emphasis added) required workers to learn machine operation. They must run machines or do repetitive work that demanded efficient work habits, task patterns, and conditioned reflexes. Immigrant workers needed only copy the early Puritan ethics: punctuality, strict adherence to work schedules, and above all, diligence (cf. Hughes, 1970, pp. 99-137, for a complete discussion of these topics).

Public schools and their teachers received new immigrants without benefit of much overt teacher education, and especially without covert ESL knowledge. Often the late nineteenth-century schools simply mirrored the needs of various jobs, factories, or corporations. Many schools worked on learning-by-doing, and most schools regressed to the teaching of concrete elements. Abstract education had no place (Guttek, 1970, pp. 49-58). Often U.S. schools "trained" students for factory work as the Industrial Revolution's true "melting pot" (emphasis added). Large urban schools looked identical to the factories in which their graduates would work. Those schools looked and functioned much differently from their predecessors in the Seventeenth Century. Attendance became mandatory in the

modern school, for the immigrants had to learn the details of industrial discipline. Immigrants, replete with their different speech, customs, and cultures, did not appear as bright nor as acculturated as generational citizenry. Schools and school personnel viewed the new immigrants as Lockian, "foreign" tabula rasa. One historian noted the schools envisioned themselves "total institutions that attempted to influence all aspects of the children's lives and particularly all aspects of their development into adults compatible with the few industrial requirements" (Apple, 1990, p. 88).

Because U.S. public schools grew so fast during the Industrial Revolution, small-community curriculum no longer applied. American schools needed a curricular leader, and Harvard's President, Dr. Charles Eliot, became that director. His National Education Association Committee of Ten redirected the course of secondary education; the Committee of Fifteen did likewise for the elementary school curriculum in 1895 (Kliebard, 1986, pp. 10-15). Eliot's humanism and mental disciplinarian stance maintained that all students could learn all subjects, since schools prepared their charges for life's activities. Teaching for life, he continued, necessitated college instruction. Ironically, he advocated a wide system of electives once the students gained higher education status. However, the bulk of the elementary and secondary students, native and immigrants alike, had to follow a strict regimen. Eliot's

college-elitist regimen provided the first national curricular scope and sequence to the immigrant-dominated public school population.

Bobbitt's work became a reaction to, or agreement with, all Eliot's dogma. He maintained that the purely academic stance Eliot's committee took was traditionalistic in nature and scope. Bobbitt continued a life-long stance against such subject-centered and purely academic-oriented teaching. However, I note Bobbitt's Social Darwinism pervaded his early twentieth-century university training, as well as his Philippine teaching assignment, his graduate training, and his eventual tenure and writing at the University of Chicago. The author's insistence on eliminating educational waste in the curriculum and his emphasis on "scientific education" (emphasis added) recapitulated the whole Industrial Revolution motif. He adhered to the philosophy of the three Captains of Industry chronicled earlier, John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and J. P. Morgan. Bobbitt repeatedly mentioned how his work embellished or anticipated democracy in schools. However, his insistence that "enlightened men of science" (emphasis added) would produce surveys, lessons, and/or curricula for students contradicts democratic tenets and ideals. Captains of Industry saw themselves as "enlightened men of science." As well, they envisioned themselves enlightened business leaders whose innate intelligence, mental strength, and

inherent leadership could shape students and curricula into a pragmatic force to society's collective good.

This thesis will examine the three stages Bobbitt went through: "Indoctrinations," "Survey and Curriculum Science," and "Transitional-Philosophy." Though each stage represented particular development of his scientism-education, never did he completely reject the notion that students channel into the "right" and "correct" directions that Bobbitt's "good life" promised (emphasis added).

Very few critical works have been done on Bobbitt, though five dissertations have added particular information. Patty (1938) chronicled Bobbitt's scientism via relativistic pragmatism, and DeWulf (1962) detailed most of Bobbitt's early influences, as well as much of his published work. Seguel (1964) studied Bobbitt's scientism and curriculum making, though in context with W. W. Charters, John Dewey, and others. Kent (1984) pursued Bobbitt's, W. W. Charters' and David Snedden's non-scientific scientism methodologies, while Stone (1985) indicated Bobbitt's influence on Ralph Tyler. In-depth primary source Bobbitt scholarship does not exist.

I suggest that critical and thorough Bobbitt study should exist; moreover, I also reiterate that in order to do that scholarship, readers and researchers must contend two major factors. The first one is the times from which Bobbitt originated, i.e., the Industrial Revolution. The second influence that readers and scholars need to know and

understand relates to his Puritan religion. The Doctrine of the Elect and the Doctrine of the Secular Elect, the melding of the Calvinistic theology and later lay application, produced the interface that later became Social Darwinism.

Franklin Bobbitt Overview

To understand Bobbitt's curriculum theories, it is necessary to know more about his early personal and religious influences. Bobbitt's grandfather was a minister, and after a mid-career vocational change, so was Bobbitt's father. Born February 16, 1876, in his grandfather's home in Mt. Sterling, Indiana, John Franklin Bobbitt was the first of four children to James and Martha Bobbitt, his school teacher parents (DeWulf, 1962, p. 7). Partly because his mother died when he was eight years old, young Franklin spent much free time with his grandparents, particularly his grandfather. That gentleman, a country preacher for the Christian Church nearby, also doubled as a rural doctor. Accounts indicate that the boy and his grandfather struck up a rich and stimulating relationship, one that included daily communion, intense question and answer conferences, and Sunday preaching sessions. Those sessions never lacked for "a good orthodox text, adorned with classical and Biblical allusions, illustrated with examples from both sacred and popular literature" (DeWulf, 1962, p. 10). Further, Bobbitt and his grandfather enjoyed "lessons from real life, containing food for thought during the coming week, and all

in all instructive, cultural, uplifting, erudite, and doctrinally sound" (DeWulf, 1962, p. 10).

If Bobbitt's early years provided him with an intense and enjoyable theological background, research indicates that his early schooling and his home life were also very God-centered. State Department of Education records indicate that McGuffey Readers were in use in the school Bobbitt attended. Those readers were a compendium of traditional language arts materials; however, they also offered students two unmistakable guidelines: (a) Life is hard, and students must work hard, study hard, and persevere; and, (b) Godliness and the sanctity of the family must endure (conversation with State of Indiana Department of Education, September 22, 1991). Bobbitt grew up in schools that strongly suggested that young people were evil, that they needed training so that they might obey, and that their masters' authority was both important and final (Rippa, 1967, pp. 70-71). One scholar's description of county superintendents' reports indicated Indiana public schools, circa 1880, equated strict religious training and rigid secular discipline (cf. DeWulf, 1962, pp. 10-15, for a full explanation).

If Bobbitt's grandfather provided him with theological nurture, and his early schooling the religious nature, then his regular homelife provided explicit and exacting pious doctrine. Bobbitt's father remarried in 1885 and took a job as an auditor in Leavenworth, Indiana. However, when the

older Bobbitt lost his job in 1889, he fulfilled a long-standing personal and vocational ambition by immediately entering in preacher training at Transylvania College, Lexington, Kentucky. He graduated from there in 1894, and subsequently returned to Corydon, Indiana. Franklin's religious indoctrination with his father was not what it had been with his kindly grandfather. James Bobbitt became a Jonathan Edwards-style minister, one who infused the "fire and brimstone" (emphasis added) type of sermon to his parishioners, and evidently he exerted pressure on his oldest son to become a third-generation man of the cloth. Though young Franklin did participate in all the family devotions, assiduously went to every Sunday service, and participated regularly in Christian youth groups associated with the church, he finally decided that he did not want to become a minister (cf. DeWulf, 1962, pp. 5-20, for a complete discussion of Bobbitt's early religious and personal influences).

DeWulf also notes that Bobbitt learned the concept of self improvement while he was wrestling with his decision of religious service. While Bobbitt's father went to Transylvania College, Franklin stayed with a Mr. Riddle, the Leavenworth High School principal. Riddle reportedly stood for every academic ideal the young man looked up to: diligence, scholarship, and perseverance (DeWulf, 1962, p. 17), and became an important puritanical and pedagogical influence during Bobbitt's adolescence.

What I believe is most important from the pull Bobbitt felt among his grandfather's heritage, his father's new religious zeal, and Riddle's academia, is the discussion of the Doctrine of the Elect, the Doctrine of the Secular Elect, and Social Darwinism. Bobbitt began to read and understand the notion that selected Captains of Industry were real heroes to emulate:

From America's vast industrial complex came some of the first stories of the rise of some men from unfavorable circumstances to the position of business baron. As living proof that the "survival of the fittest" philosophy and the Protestant ethic were the world order, those self-made men gave tremendous impetus to the popularization of both doctrines. (DeWulf, 1962, p. 17)

Texts came out chronicling the struggles and successes of average men who had literally clawed and scratched their way to the higher echelons of business and industry. Bobbitt might well have read such stories and well could have been influenced by same.

Bobbitt finished his three-year high school degree in 1893, and took a high school English teaching position in Corydon, Indiana, while finishing his full four-year degree (conversations September 11, 1990, with Department of Special Collections staff, University of Chicago). Interestingly enough, he became disenchanted with his job's dogmatic teaching requirements, which included emphasis on

student memorization and pure textbook lecture. Hobson (1942) records Bobbitt's frustrations with six-hour recitation days, continual and procedural reviews, and tests written from the State Department of Education in Indianapolis: "The whole process [for Bobbitt] seemed utterly artificial, mechanical, and alien to the total human situation in which it was made to go on" (p. 14). Bobbitt, throughout his career, eschewed the purely academic approach, which he found too superficial and too mechanical for teaching students. Reading John Locke's Some Thoughts Concerning Education (1693, [reprinted 1964]) and Herbert Spencer's Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical (1860) came as a natural part of his penchant for self improvement. He no longer pursued evening and weekend group reading projects as he had done early in his boyhood. Reading Locke's thoughts on what he would later call the "good life," as well as entertaining Spencer's Social Darwinism, injected young Bobbitt with the verve, enthusiasm, and drive necessary for him to go on to college, get his degrees, and become a professor (DeWulf, 1962, p. 27). Often Bobbitt said that he wanted the "good life" for K-12 students. He felt U.S. democracy needed informed, productive people, yet he advocated shaping its students with Puritan doctrines he had learned.

Early in his career, Bobbitt felt that education was lost on young people, that the real benefit education could bring was for adult life. One important point made in this

dissertation is that Bobbitt apparently changed from his early-career scientism to a more child-centered philosophy. His change, however, included the provision that child-centered curriculum came from "men of enlightenment." Rather than have curriculum dependent on survey makers such as himself, he envisioned and urged sociologists or anthropologists to do the vital surveys which would facilitate curriculum writing and implementation. Throughout his life and work, Bobbitt felt that youngsters needed shaping and molding for them to become "right thinking" adults. Though he seemingly recanted his essentialist position between 1924-1926, Bobbitt, never approached Dewey-like, child-centered curriculum status. This dissertation demonstrates that Bobbitt returned to, and became a patriarch of, essentialism--renamed functionalism --after his 1924-1926 retraction.

The remainder of this preface demonstrates how Bobbitt approached his University of Indiana college days, as well as the academic influences that he encountered there. It concludes as he takes his first job in Manila, The Philippines.

Having quit his Indiana job at Corydon High School because that institution subscribed to a purely Latin Grammar School approach, Bobbitt next took a job at Ohio Valley Normal College in 1896 (DeWulf, 1962, pp. 26-27). He also took courses in pedagogy there, and continued his self-help regimen by joining additional Christian Endeavor and

Lyceum sessions. Accounts suggest that Bobbitt was always quiet, studious, and very attuned to self-help texts and literary societies (DeWulf, 1962, pp. 27-29). Evidently in the summer of 1897, Bobbitt had the option of continuing at Ohio Valley Normal College, beginning theological study at Butler University, or enrolling at the University of Indiana (conversation September, 4, 1990, with records clerks at the University of Indiana). He chose the latter, declared a philosophy major, and began a course of study in education that would last half a century.

Diligence to academic tasks as well as hard work and perseverance exemplified Bobbitt's behavior at Indiana University. He finished his bachelor's degree in two and one-half years. Two professors impressed and influenced Bobbitt at Indiana University, both with the same surname: (William Lowe) Bryan and (Elmer Burritt) Bryan.

The former was a strict lecturer who personified the edicts of both The Bible and McGuffey's Readers: frugality, honesty, and rigid morality (DeWulf, 1962, pp. 33-34). W. L. Bryan was also a firm believer in the blend of Darwin as a scientist, Aristotle as a scientist/physician, Leonardo as a scientist, engineer, and artist, and Goethe as a scientist, writer, and poet. W. L. Bryan hoped that science would pervade the schools with the proper training of administrators (confer Dewulf, 1962, pp. 35-37, and Bryan, 1898, pp. v, vi, and pp. 277-297, for more information). The four-step method that Bryan advocated resounds in

Bobbitt's early surveys. He summed up his work succinctly: "Inside the school are the children; outside are the sciences of help; at the door stands the schoolmaster" (Bryan, 1895, pp. 414-415). Additionally, Bryan stressed vocations, job seeking, and the work life.

However, the other Bryan, E. B. Bryan, influenced Bobbitt's college days even more than W. L. Bryan: "It appears that no other member of Indiana's faculty had more immediate as well as long range personal influence over Franklin Bobbitt than Elmer B. Bryan (DeWulf, 1962, p. 41). E. B. Bryan wrote two most important texts: The Basis of Practical Teaching (1905) and Fundamental Facts for the Teacher (1911). From the former, Bryan suggested a child-centered approach. Bryan (1905) noted how the child enters the classroom: "An individual is capable of three things,-- he can be impressed; he can reflect, reorganize, reconstruct; and he can express" (p. 33). E. B. Bryan also suggested that the greatest impediment in student learning is either the teacher talking too much or demonstrating too much "scattered teaching" of irrelevant materials. What should happen in schools is that the students learn how to think, concludes Bryan (1905, pp. 38-39). Unfortunately, Bryan also said students must be "trained." "Training" (emphasis added) and thinking, I maintain, are not synonymous. Bobbitt's work often talked little about thinking, but treated training comprehensively.

Another dichotomy that E. B. Bryan bequeathed Bobbitt was Herbartianism study, especially its emphasis on children's natural interests. Bryan (1905) questioned: "There has been a tendency of late toward a 'soft' pedagogy. The cry is, 'Find out what the child likes and let him have it.' The child knows better what he wants and needs than do the parents and teachers" (p. 87). He resolved the question: "The doctrine of spontaneity, of following out the natural interest of the pupil, should play an important role in all phases of education, but it should have most exclusive sway during the first seven or eight years of life" (Bryan, 1905, p. 87). Bobbitt ponders this dilemma during his career, and he concludes that pre-junior high school education should be less stringent. Bryan continued his thoughts to include the students' parents and their heredity. The role of heredity in learning is also a point that Bobbitt contemplates throughout his career.

E. B. Bryan added more heredity commentary in his second text, Fundamental Facts for the Teacher (1911). In that text, he intoned that schools face students who are rich or poor, native or foreign born, and come from professionals or tradespeople. With that student cultural diversity, he noticed that the students all possess common traits. They "do as little as necessary to get what they desire" and when they do get help "the lifted is willing to sit down on the lifter and ride on through life" (Bryan, 1911, p. 81). Bryan's remedies were twofold. The first

remedy was religion: "There is but one hope, and it is found in the abiding ideal, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God'" (Bryan, 1911, p. 60). The second remedy complemented the first--patriotism: "There is hardly a lesson in history that does not lend itself to high ideals of life and conduct with especial reference, of course, to one's obligation to the institutions in the midst of which he lives" (Bryan, 1911, p. 63). E. B. Bryan's model school offered many activities that stimulated students, provided opportunities to understand those activities, and even suggested ways to utilize the activities (Bryan, 1911, p. 111). Bobbitt pays much attention to these dictates, but especially so in his activities curricula.

E. B. Bryan had a most important effect on Bobbitt, though not just because he was first his professor at the University of Indiana. After Bobbitt graduated from Indiana University in 1901, his pedagogy professor, E. B. Bryan, took a position as director of the Manila Normal School. Bobbitt then followed Bryan to The Philippines in order to take his first professional teaching job after the bachelor's degree (cf. Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year 1903) for more information on Bobbitt's Manila position).

Bobbitt approached his first teaching job imbued with two important influences: Puritan Religion and Social Darwinism. The former began in his own home and with his clergyman grandfather. The Indiana public schools promoted

the virtues of diligence, hard work, and strict morality. The latter, Social Darwinism, Bobbitt read and learned in texts by Charles Darwin, John Locke, and Herbert Spencer (DeWulf, 1962, pp. 25-27). The Doctrine of the Elect and The Doctrine of the Secular Elect became unlikely allies as the Industrial Revolution approached the post-Civil War era. Bobbitt understood and read about the famous Captains of Industry, and knew about the growing laissez-faire capitalism his country had grown into and on which the economy revolved. When Bobbitt went to Indiana University, he encountered both Professors Bryan. They were learned men who spoke, taught, and expostulated tenets of organized religion and Social Darwinism. DeWulf's research (1962) demonstrates young Bobbitt was a diligent purveyor of the prescribed lists given him (pp. 10-14). The lists included readings of organized religion, science, and the beauties of the growing country's expansionistic manifest destiny. The three-pronged "Puritan Platform," "Reluctant Rebellion" and "Lever Age," historical eras from 1620 forward in this introduction, detail the amalgamation of religion, science, and corporations. These three symbolic words melded Puritan Religion to Social Darwinism. Bobbitt enters his first professional teaching position in The Philippines, his subsequent graduate school years, and his later professional curriculum writing and publishing career imbued with these two intertwined doctrines.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Before I conducted a specific review of related literature concerning how curricular historians had dealt with John Franklin Bobbitt, I consulted selected American education and history texts. I did so to gain a more general scope of how our country has progressed in its public school instructional development since the original Pilgrim immigrants landed on its shores early in the Seventeenth Century. To analyze our scholastic history, I consulted the following texts, each of which is in the bibliography:

Cubberley, Elwood P. (1934). Public Education in the United States.

Parkes, Henry B. (1953). The United States of America A History.

Pulliam, John D. (1982). History of Education in America.

Rippa, S. Alexander. (1967). Education in a Free Society--An American History.

Spring, Joel. (1986). The American School 1642-1990.

Once I had researched these books, I ferreted out specific curricular histories that related to my study area.

That selected list follows. I have analyzed each text and ascertained how Bobbitt fits or otherwise affects each curricular historian's philosophy or point of view.

Historical Curriculum Texts

The Transformation of the School--Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957

Chronologically, the first text was Lawrence A. Cremin's The Transformation of the School--Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957 (1961). Specific Bobbitt citations first occur in Cremin's Chapter VI: "Scientists, Sentimentalists, and Radicals." Cremin places World War I as the center point of the Progressive Education Movement, and he relates Bobbitt's significance around this movement. The ensuing liberal Progressive movement, Cremin feels, not only defined the conservative doctrine, but also opposed original liberal doctrine. Political Progressivism began in the 1930s and subsequently died after the 1940s. It also produced two important essentialist figureheads: Harold Rugg and Franklin Bobbitt. The "war to end all wars" symbolized the Progressives' hopes, and their hopes were symbolized in John Dewey's, Vocational Education in the Light of the World War (1918), and Arthur Dean's Our Schools in War Time--and After (1918). Cremin indicates both figureheads proposed that war efforts could rechannel towards serving youth. Society agreed, and the pursuit of arts, Freud, and child-centered study became very important

post-1920 educational phenomena. Cremin notes that Bobbitt, important as he was, followed several other important conservatives who shaped preservationist educational doctrine. First, Cremin notes Harold Rugg's works and projects. The latter had studied education, psychology, and sociology after he had pursued civil engineering. Cremin also shows that Rugg's Statistical Methods Applied to Education (1917) emphasized scientific education. However, with The Child-Centered School (1928), written with Ann Schumaker, Rugg took the position that industrial concerns rarely were strictly humanitarian, and Rugg and Shumaker "found their insight in its tie with the historic battle of the artist against the superficiality and commercialism of industrial civilization" (Cremin, 1961, p. 183).

E. L. Thorndike, immediately identified with and utilized the statistical work that Rugg wrote, suggests Cremin. Thorndike's credo was simple and to the point: "Education is concerned with changes in human beings; a change is a difference between two conditions; each of these conditions is known to us only by the products produced-- things made, words spoken, acts performed, and the like" (Cremin, 1961, p. 18).

Cremin suggests Alfred Binet, Theodore Simon, and Alfred Terman followed Thorndike's example. Those three researchers produced theses in testing student mathematics ability (1908), reading ability (1914), and language ability (1916)--what Rugg called an "orgy of tabulation" (Cremin,

1961, p. 186). That orgy not only served the Scale Alpha and Scale Beta tests regarding World War I soldiers' literacy, but higher education as well. Colgate University's President George B. Cutten, the Carnegie Foundation's Henry S. Pritchett, and several Scribner's editors, profited by Rugg and Thorndike's collaboration, notes Cremin. As well, he continues, Social Darwinism claimed intelligence testing as a rationale for social class distinctions. Rugg's "orgy of tabulation" had formed an unholy alliance of the armed services and prestigious higher education institutions.

During this intelligence testing era, the Committee on Economy of Time in Education formulated several significant reports. Dating 1915 forward, those reports put a premium on teaching efficiency, polemic competency, and scientific precision as the watchwords to and for education. Intelligence testing proponents wanted some efficiency measures implemented, be they Thorndike examination formats, or Spencerian formulas to find out what knowledge is of most societal worth. The final report delivered by the Committee in the Eighteenth Yearbook (Part II) gave Eugene R. Smith and Franklin Bobbitt the opportunity to speak. Smith advocated both intelligence and achievement tests in order to develop district goals and student character building. His work relied on student preparedness, teacher ingenuity, hard work on the part of both, and the needs of a scientific

society that must be enhanced, if not preserved, points out Cremin.

Cremin places Bobbitt, in his historical survey, after Smith, and he denotes Bobbitt as inexorably linked with the Committee on Economy of Time. In synchronism with W. W. Charters, Bobbitt, who had worked with the Committee as a time-efficiency expert, published The Curriculum (1918c) and How to Make a Curriculum (1924f). The latter work, Cremin points out, became the "practice" section of the "theory" that the Committee commended. Bobbitt viewed education as simply various preparatory stages for adulthood, and that premise became the raison d'être of essentialism--Watsonian doctrine with broader appeal. Cremin (1961) concludes that Bobbitt used science as "something eminently visible, measurable, and classifiable, something on which he could use all the paraphernalia of quantification" (p. 199).

Cremin's detailed and thorough work accomplishes two purposes. The first describes the Progressive Movement. The second portrays the antithetical essentialist work of Bobbitt. Cremin chronicles and details the U.S. post-Industrial Revolution educational era in The Transformation of the School--Progressivism in American Education 1857-1957. Social Darwinism Cremin portrays clearly. Public schools dominated by "wissenschaft," and higher education concerned with statistical surveys, melded into scientific curricula via Thorndike, Binet, et al. Cremin (1961) maintains:

And in the schools themselves science gave classroom teachers the rules and maxims they needed to make mass education work at the same time it set them apart from the lay public as professional personnel worthy of appropriate status and compensation. (p. 201)

Cremin highlights Bobbitt's two most widely known works, The Curriculum (1918c) and How to Make a Curriculum (1924f).

Both texts, Cremin deduces, link Bobbitt to Social Darwinism.

Education and the Cult of Efficiency, A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools

One very important curriculum text that exposes Social Darwinism and the Industrial Revolution remains Raymond Callahan's Education and the Cult of Efficiency, A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools (1962). Callahan dedicates the text to George Counts, who was one of the first nationally-known educators to uncover the inherent Doctrine of the Secular Elect. Counts exposed the implicit pressure big business and industry exerted on U.S. public school students during the Industrial Revolution. Corporate leaders had viewed elementary and secondary schools as training grounds for their industries, Counts maintained. Using Counts' thesis, Callahan (1962) lists four important factors that allowed such industrial "shaping:" (a) The American public had

relaxed their views on authority; (b) Frederick Taylor's The Principles of Scientific Management (1911) had an immense effect on the railroad industry, and thus could have a parallel effect on schools; (c) The growing business awareness conceived in the Industrial Revolution meant that accountability could extend to school matters; and, (d) Graduate education schools had no polemic and scholastic programs to offset the business model (pp. 1-18).

In summary, Callahan (1962) says that twentieth-century education had become a "tragedy," and "that an anti-intellectual climate, already prevalent, was strengthened" (pp. 245-246). Into the midst of the above four factors, Callahan places Bobbitt. In Chapter IV, "American Educators Apply the Great Panacea," Callahan introduces Bobbitt's "The Supervision of City Schools," from the Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1913a). This work directly mirrors "The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912), a key Bobbitt document. As preface discussion about the Twelfth Yearbook (1913a), Callahan maintains that Bobbitt must share some essentialist stature with Frank Spaulding. Not only does Callahan pursue actual Bobbitt writing that other curricular historians have not considered, he also introduces another essentialist as counterpoint and complement.

Callahan notes that two extremely consequential events occurred in 1913 that curriculum scholars must know. The first of these was the annual meeting of the Department of

Superintendence of the National Education Association (NEA), which Spaulding addressed. The second was the publication of the Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1913a), which Bobbitt addressed. In turn, both orations had influence from the speeches and writing of James P. Munroe and William H. Allen. Monroe, a Bostonian like Spaulding, was known for his industrial-educating. The former had been President of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, Chairman of the Committee on Education of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, and Secretary of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. William H. Allen had not only written a text called Efficient Democracy (1910), but had also written "Next Steps in School Efficiency." Callahan (1962), referring to both "efficiencies," marks Allen as "the apostle of the gospel of efficiency" (p. 63). Because Munroe and Allen had become well-known essentialism advocates, Callahan deduces that Munroe and Allen covertly influenced Spaulding's and Bobbitt's speeches.

Frank Spaulding highlighted the NEA's 1913 Superintendence Conference. His keynote speech there used Frederick Taylor as a reference to the Newton, Massachusetts', public schools work Spaulding had recently accomplished. That work included three facets:

(a) The Measurements and comparison of results between various district schools; (b) The exact time-and-place conditions under which the measurement had been conducted;

and, (c) The Social Darwinistic attitude student "losers" defined as a reality for their complementary "winners" (Callahan, 1962, p. 68). Spaulding had analyzed the Newton Public Schools' various course costs. In addition, Spaulding had noted the importance of Spencer and Thorndike in his own education and work. Callahan reports that Spaulding's NSSE report represents a Newton Public Schools Social Darwinian financial statement.

Callahan's Bobbitt treatment builds naturally from Munroe to Allen to Spaulding. Bobbitt had been chosen to write for the Twelfth Annual National Education Association Yearbook because of his message of academic accountability in "How to Eliminate Waste in Education" (1912). That accountability article had root in the author's "platoon school" in Gary, Indiana. Callahan (1962) explains Bobbitt's "Gary" rationale regarding various test standards:

Teachers would know instantly when students were failing. Principals would know when teachers were inefficient, and they could easily determine how their school compared with other schools, not in a vague, general way, but precisely and absolutely. (p. 82)

Callahan (1962) concludes Bobbitt conceptualized teachers as mechanics who would distribute the curriculum: "Doubtless many educators who had devoted years of study and thought to the aims and purposes of education were surprised to learn that they had misunderstood their function. They were to be mechanics, not philosophers" (p. 84).

Callahan notes that Spaulding reduced education to a cost-accounting venture, whereas Bobbitt denoted schools as scientific experiments that could utilize behavioral theorists such as Thorndike. Callahan views both men as important Social Darwinistic figures; however, he notes Bobbitt as a major post-Industrial Revolution educator. Though he does not review any other works of Bobbitt--none of his books--Callahan places him into the center of essentialist doctrine and notes Bobbitt's complete disregard of any child-centered views. Callahan devotes place and space to Bobbitt's professional importance as a major curricular essentialist.

Curriculum Principles and Social Trends

In Curriculum Principles and Social Trends (1969), J. Minor Gwynn and John B. Chase, Jr., the third historical curricularists I surveyed, also show Bobbitt as an essentialist educator. They do so in context of their "conservatives vs. reformers" platform. Gwynn and Chase do not break out Bobbitt's writings as separate or exemplary scholarship, nor do they dwell on anything more than his most conspicuous or generally-read manuscripts. They begin their work:

Whether the motive was religious, political, or excellence for all, the American school has been expected to provide courses, activities, and experiences in response to the cultural demands and

crises of a rapidly growing and changing society.

(Gwynn and Chase, 1966, pp. 35-36)

They define curriculum as all the experiences that children have under the direction of the school. Both scholars note three major school conflict areas because of the wide interpretation their curriculum definition connotes:

(a) Differences in educational philosophical theory and practice; (b) Students having an equal chance to get an education; and, (c) Schools' relationships with other "social agencies" (Gwynn and Chase, 1966, p. 36).

Gwynn and Chase maintain that wide discrepancies have always existed concerning what schools should do, as well as how they should do it. More specifically, they reduce much conflict inherent in the U.S. to different educational philosophies. On one hand, the authors link Progressivism to its complements and appendages: pragmatism (or experimentalism), reconstructionism, naturalism, and existentialism. On the other hand, Gwynn and Chase link Essentialism (or traditionalism), and its complements: idealism, realism, neo-Thomism, and scholasticism. The authors do not take up the Progressives' case in this chapter; rather, they emphasize the essentialists' doctrines and influence. Within this latter framework, they mention Bobbitt more than titularly in their discussions.

In a large listing of educators and their characteristics, Gwynn and Chase (1966) connote Bobbitt's "Initiative as a self-disciplining activity" (p. 37).

Further, the authors point to Bobbitt's legacy as one that fixed educational values, trained youngsters to adapt to society, and described a set curriculum. In addition, however, Bobbitt, T. H. Briggs, and H. C. Morrison, Gwynn and Chase note, as "revisionistic." The former three had progressivistic leanings in areas of the mind, observable facts, being (reason and intuition), experience-process, and existing-choice (Gwynn and Chase, 1966, p. 41).

Specifically, Gwynn and Chase treat Bobbitt's individual contributions to the curricular field in Chapter VI, "Early Stages of Growth in Curriculum Revision." The authors mention the NEA's Committee on the Economy of Time in Education (1911) as the most important precedent to the essentialists. Gwynn and Chase chronicle E. L. Thorndike's achievement research (1914-1916). Cremin (1961) had noted both the Committee and Thorndike in this context. However, the authors also add J. R. Clark and Harold Rugg's "socially worthwhile" components of algebra, geometry, and arithmetic (1915-1918), and W. W. Charters job analyses (1923-1927) as complements to survey work (1912-1915). Six distinct curriculum writing stages develop from the above pioneers, according to Gwynn and Chase (1966): (1) The aims and objectives stage; (2) The survey movement; (3) The development of the unit; (4) System-wide curriculum revision; (5) Core curriculum; and (6) Higher education modified subject-matter (pp. 142-143).

Bobbitt's contributions develop through the first two items, and Gwynn and Chase cite The Curriculum (1918c) as written proof of aims and objectives and survey work. The Curriculum (1918c) advocated and promoted surveys as the basals of any general course makeup or specific lesson materials. One survey that Gwynn and Chase explore is the Los Angeles work, Bobbitt's most famous and most extensive-- 1,200 teachers participated. They discuss the ten survey items in How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), which ranged from "Social intercommunication" to "Occupational activities." As well, the eight training techniques Bobbitt advocated in his 1924 text, (observe, perform, read, oral reports, draw pictures, repeat or intensify experiences, solve, and generalize), the authors note as precursor to post-1950s "discovery learning."

Gwynn and Chase examine a third Bobbitt piece, "Curriculum Investigations" (1926a), one that advocated the curriculum for "life" and "adult" functioning. That curriculum functioning came from 14 sources, beginning with periodical literature, newspapers, and encyclopedias. Other formats included labor manuals, quality essays, and errors found in letters to the editor (Gwynn and Chase, 1966, pp. 145-146). The authors fuse Bobbitt's "Curriculum Investigations" (1926a) with Harold Harap's The Education of the Consumer (1924), a work that connected people's habits and living standards as lesson materials.

Gwynn and Chase's last Bobbitt references, though oblique, come in Curriculum Principles and Social Trends' Chapter VI, "Early Stages of Growth in Curriculum Revision." In that chapter, the authors amplify his survey movement. No Bobbitt survey references occur during that discussion, although he produced significant surveys in Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, San Antonio, and St. Louis from 1914-1918. Gwynn and chase include Bobbitt's two major works, The Curriculum (1918c) and How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), as sterling examples of essentialism. The authors also mention "Curriculum Investigation" (1926a) as utilitarian methodology of delivering "the Bobbitt curriculum." Their expanded coverage is more than Cremin (1961), though less than Callahan (1962). They do not indicate how important they thought Bobbitt was, who he influenced, his child-centeredness change, or his later works.

The One Best System, A History
of American Urban Education

David B. Tyack's The One Best System, A History of American Urban Education (1974) includes Bobbitt in Part Four of the text, "Centralization and the Corporate Model; Contests for Control of Urban Schools, 1890-1940." To begin that chapter, Tyack (1974) focuses on how, where and why the centralization and the corporate/school model began: "They talked about accountability, about cutting red tape, about organizing coalitions to push educational reform, about the

need to face the realities of class and power in American society (p. 126). The "They" Tyack refers to are business leaders and university/school managers. Collectively "They" advocated the following "science in education" doctrines that Charles Eliot and The Committee of Ten exhorted: (a) Shifting the power of schools to "successful (school board, parentheses mine) men," thus emulating big businesses' boards of directors; (b) Placing a superintendent in charge of schools districts, copying the corporate chairman of the board; and, (c) Separating specific democratic ideals and identifying more with social stratification (Tyack, 1974, pp. 126-127). Because Eliot openly acknowledged the class lines between students, he also perceived four separate layers in society: (a) Upper, that included managers, leaders, and various presidents; (b) Intellectual, which included various inventors, discoverers, and artists; (c) Commercial, that included tradesmen, commercial people, and sellers; and, (d) Fundamental, which included all those who worked for someone else or carried out instructions (Tyack, 1974, p. 129). Tyack notes that this "classing" centralized power in the schools, much as it had done in big and/or corporate businesses.

The power that "They" wanted resulted in the first university-business partnership, one that placed public school superintendents as educator-entrepreneurs. One such person, reports Tyack, was James J. Storrow. Storrow lobbied for and won legislation which ultimately led to the

Boston School Committee. This five-member board became the prototypical board for Eliot's education reform. Joining the Eliot thrust, on behalf of the academic community, was David Snedden. Snedden, the Commissioner of Education in Massachusetts, later became a confidante of Bobbitt and Samuel Dutton, Professor of Administration at Teachers College, Columbia University. The five-member board's joint commentary exemplified the Social Darwinistic ideal:

No one can deny that under existing conditions the very salvation of our cities depends upon the ability of legislatures to enact such provisions as will safeguard the rights of citizens, take the government from ignorant and irresponsible politicians, and place it in the hands of honest and competent experts. (Tyack, 1974, p. 131)

Further, Tyack acknowledges such a salvation plan received support of that day's mass media. Harper's Weekly, The Outlook, and The Critic all supported legislation, school and otherwise, that enabled "competent experts" to take over from "ignorant and incompetent politicians" (Tyack, 1974, p. 131). To aid Eliot's enabling movement further, college presidents joined the fray. Men such as Nicholas Murray Butler (Columbia) and William Rainey Harper (University of Chicago) lent their time, energy, and influence to push the movement forward. Often, Tyack affirms, the positions of college president and big-city superintendent became interchangeable. Public school superintendents wielded

considerable influence and power. One chief college administrator noted: "I am convinced that next in difficulty and in importance to the work of the President of the United States stands that of the superintendent of schools of our great cities" (Tyack, 1974, p. 135). By 1898, the Public Education Association formed a powerful organization that shared the strategies and goals of the Eliot doctrines.

Bobbitt's role in the Eliot plan had two prongs. To begin, his "How to Eliminate Waste in Education" (1912) added fuel to the advocacy of superintendent-led school districts. Bobbitt viewed economic efficiency as school districts' and their superintendents' primary goals. Second, Bobbitt's famous 1916 address to the NASSP, a conference filled with business-education people, enjoyed a warm reception. In that speech, Bobbitt equated stockholders to parents, businesses to schools, managers to teachers, and students to workers. He concluded all businesses, whether industrial, government, or educational, must have the same exacting laws of good management (Tyack, 1974, p. 144). Tyack's chapter conclusion does not include much else about Bobbitt, but it emphasizes how Bobbitt's famous 1916 speech influenced centralization case studies in New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco.

For Tyack, Bobbitt becomes a secondary figure to the Charles Eliot-led Committee of Ten work. Neither Bobbitt's tenets, texts, or projects does Tyack treat. He does treat

Bobbitt's reaction against the academic stance Eliot had prescribed. Bobbitt interpreted the Harvard President as a core-curriculum advocate and textbook purveyor. Rather than follow that fusion, Bobbitt believed his own "activities" curriculum and "survey" techniques were much more applicable for students to achieve the "good life."

History of Education and Culture in America

H. Warren Button and Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., in History of Education and Culture in America (1983) treat Bobbitt in Chapter IX, "Efficiency and Management." However, that chapter is an overlay to the previous one. Chapter VIII, "Progressive Reform," details first the deterministic and Social Darwinistic history that America fostered. Brought on by the Captains of Industry, e.g., John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and J. P. Morgan, the U.S. integrated manifest destiny, the arrival of millions of immigrants, and the laissez-faire profit motive into a growing business culture. Both Herbert Spencer's and Charles Darwin's doctrines symbolized the social version of Alfred Lord Tennyson's famous "red tooth and claw" manifesto. Businessmen justified using people and means to gain financial momentum; however, the bolstering of the academic community was a bonus for the new industrial titans. Button and Provenzo intertwine men like Lester F. Ward and William G. Sumner to represent a new survival-

oriented Darwinian-based academia. They supported both corporate and national survival-of-the-fittest.

Button and Provenzo also detail the social reformers that opposed the combined industrial/academic juggernaut. To begin, they show the settlement house effects of Stanton Coit and Jane Addams. Those two began separate practical education units for needy immigrants. Next came Jacob Riis's work, reported in How the Other Half Lives ([reprinted] 1970). Riis wanted industrial schools for new immigrants. Those schools' curriculum could provide survival help in the new citizen's land, extend voting/literacy programs, and even make available public parks for young people to play. Joseph Mayer Rice's contribution bridged the gap of the educational reformers via his interviewing and observing the conditions in many and varying public schools. More accountability in the schools, freedom from local political control re the school boards, and proper supervision of schools became his watchwords.

Unfortunately, those watchwords were also guidelines for the Charles Eliot-led Committees of Ten (1893) and Fifteen (1895). From those pro-college, elitist manifestos, Button and Provenzo describe new psychology and burgeoning pedagogical factors. Those factors included Herbart (subject matter important; mental faculties not important), G. Stanley Hall (child behavior and development via observation), and John Dewey (a science of education for

youngsters/entities learned by doing). Dewey became the pinnacle of reform of the economically-based, Social Darwinistic and Spencerian dogma. That dogma channelled students' efforts into profit making for the industrial giants of the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries, report Button and Provenzo.

Where Coit, Adams, and Riis wanted actual reformation, Button and Provenzo show another distinctly different change movement. That reform developed during the United States' progression from an agrarian, private enterprise economy into an industrial, corporate variety. They cite Theodore Roosevelt as the bellwether of that power reform: "Bigness was acceptable, although badness demanded strong responsive action by the government" (Button and Provenzo, 1983, p. 215). Cornerstone to educational reform was the aforementioned Eliot plans. Eliot wanted more specific curriculum permutations in the classroom, and, as well, wanted a more business and professional approach taken to school boards' agendas. Well-meaning, though often corrupt, school boards metamorphosed to streamlined, middle-class businessman models. The reformers wanted the schools and the school systems to emulate the business community. Ironically, as the politics that Eliot eschewed disappeared, the politics that replaced it benefitted neither the humanitarian thinker nor the individual student. Control became the politics that many reformers assumed.

One most important "reformer," in Button and Provenzo's terms, was Bobbitt. They quote his "product" and "service" standards:

Definite qualitative and quantitative standards must be determined for the product. . . . Where the material acted upon by the labor processes passes through a number of progressive stages from the new material to the ultimate product, definite quantitative and qualitative standards must be determined for the product at each of these stages. . . . The worker must be kept up to standard qualifications for this kind of work during his entire service. (Button and Provenzo, 1983, p. 79)

The authors use this quote and others similar to point out the importance of Bobbitt's efficiency/reform work. They also credit Raymond Callahan's Education and the Cult of Efficiency (1962) as pioneer to their own study. The words "efficient" and "efficiency" occur frequently in Button and Provenzo's Bobbitt scholarship. Though students might be "efficient" in their study, the real "efficiency" of a school or a school system demanded the use of "scientific" management. Button and Provenzo (1983) observe:

Bobbitt saw school efficiency as a tool, a tool for the scientific management of the schools. In a sense, scientific management of the schools rested upon a kind of school efficiency, but

school efficiency rested upon education measurement. (p. 219)

The efficiency movement in the United States, according to the authors, goes back far into our history and includes debts to Benjamin Franklin, the epitome of American efficiency, Monitorial schools, which had indicated schools were a factory, and Frederick Taylor's productivity model (Button and Provenzo, 1983, pp. 216-217).

From this legacy, suggest the authors, came Bobbitt's work. Efficiency became economy, and economy became "cheap," Button and Provenzo conclude. Bobbitt, they maintain, as Cubberley and others later in the Twentieth Century, became measurement- and efficiency-oriented.

The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958

Herbert M. Kliebard, more than any other curricular historian, details Bobbitt's rise and importance in education in The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958 (1986). In Kliebard's Chapter IV, "Scientific Curriculum-Making and the Rise of Social Efficiency," he discusses Bobbitt's development as a "scientific" educator. As well, Kliebard also chronicles the scientific curriculum movement's precursors.

To the first issue, that of the "precursors," Kliebard begins. He notes industrialism and the new, rising social order engendered a breeding ground for "scientific" change:

It was social efficiency that for the most people, held out the promise of social stability in the face of cries for massive social change, and that doctrine claimed the now potent backing of science in order to insure it. (Kliebard, 1986, p. 89)

The science to which Kliebard speaks was not G. Stanley Hall's natural child development, or even Dewey's student inquiry. "It [science] was a science of exact measurement and precise standards in the interest of maintaining a predictable and orderly world" (Kliebard, 1986, p. 89). The maintenance that Kliebard alludes and fully discusses in his text had a sociological legacy.

That legacy pointed to Edward A. Ross; specifically, his Social Control (1901). Kliebard notes two important elements of Ross besides his influence on other educational sociolinguists such as Bobbitt's associates David Snedden, Ross Finney, and Charles Ellwood. The first element is Ross's allegiance to his own Aryan race, decrying others as tractable (Slavs) or quiescent (Hindoo) (Kliebard, 1986, p. 91). Initially, he advocated social control by means of tightening or controlling family unit direction. In tandem with that family unit, came education, an education that Ross saw as a modern-day religion. That religion/education substituted the teacher for the parent.

Inexorably linked with Ross, continues Kliebard (1986), came the father of scientific management, Frederick Taylor: Besides the direct and explicit social control

that Ross envisioned, the other key ingredient in social efficiency as a curriculum movement was efficiency itself. Here the principal figure was Frederick Winslow Taylor, the so-called father of scientific management. . . . Once the standardization of the techniques of production were achieved, the task of bringing the average worker up to the required level of work could be accomplished. (pp. 94-95)

Tasks could seep into the worker, Kliebard (1986) shows, in Taylor's famous five movement Principles of Scientific Management (1911): To begin, find 10-15 men who perform a task, study their operations and implements, use a stop-watch to detail their exact movements, eliminate all unnecessary "work," and finally, produce an outline of their best efforts for subsequent "teaching" to other workers (pp. 95-96).

Kliebard (1986) points out Bobbitt entered into the efficiency-in-education arenas following the sociological (Ross) and industrial (Taylor) templates: "No one epitomized the new breed of efficiency-minded educators more than John Franklin Bobbitt. In fact, his work represents in microcosm the development of a field of specialization within education, the field of curriculum" (p. 97). That statement alone marks a hallmark in Bobbitt scholarship; no other curricular historian or education chronicler has acclaimed Bobbitt such status.

Bobbitt arrives on the U.S. public school curricular scene in 1909, according to Kliebard. In that year, Bobbitt joined the faculty of the University of Chicago, whose school of education's department head was Charles H. Judd. Judd's psychological scholarship coincided with the scientism of Thorndike, though he rejected Thorndike's "specified associations" that provide general, not merely specific, knowledge. Kliebard (1986) speculates: "Judd himself was a major exponent of the scientific study of education, and he probably saw in the young Bobbitt a kindred spirit" (p. 97). In 1910, Bobbitt advanced from lecturer to instructor, and in 1911 he began to teach Curriculum as a course. In 1912 Bobbitt published "The Elimination of Waste in Education," a treatise that enumerated optimal use of the plant (school), reduced workers to a usable minimum, eliminated excess waste, and "then" (emphasis added) allowed for individual differences. The last item appears contradictory to the first three, yet Bobbitt emphasized that no waste of any sort should trail into schools.

Kliebard also reviews Bobbitt's progress after publication of The Curriculum (1918c). That work professionally addressed "curriculum" for the first time, a word Bobbitt equated with "activities": "The central theory is simple. Human life, however varied, consists in the performance of specific activities. Education that prepares for life is one that prepares definitely and adequately for

these specific activities" (Kliebard, 1986, p. 116). That simplicity, Kliebard notes, was important, because there was no complexity of Dewey's recapitulation work or Hall's culture-epochs theory. Rather, there was an appeal to the specificity regarding Thorndike or Taylor's science. Bobbitt had no interest in the role of school concerning any "greater good," but rather to the "directed experiences" students might attain.

Kliebard's scholarship also uncovers Bobbitt's survey work. In order to find out what directed experiences might enhance and help students, Bobbitt became an accomplished survey taker. Surveys confirmed which previously prepared behavioral objectives lists Bobbitt would use: "The first step in curriculum-making," Kliebard (1986) quotes Bobbitt, "is to decide what specific educational results are to be produced" (p. 121). This legacy, states Kliebard, is the most far-reaching attribute Bobbitt had. Some formats of his surveys and their resultant objectives still exist today.

Kliebard's concluding comments became the germination for my study. In Chapter VII of The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958, Kliebard notes John Dewey's ascent from educational issues to political ones. That ascent signaled the overall scrutiny America should focus into the rights, privileges, and problems U.S. citizens had suffered under capitalistic individualism. No longer was education solely under scrutiny: "When that undercurrent of

discord surfaced, it was to affect the course of curriculum reform in the first half of the Twentieth Century, but in the 1920s, the direction of that curriculum reform was still uncertain" (Kliebard, 1986, p. 181). American curriculum needed unified direction or consolidation. Both came in the form of the National Society for the Study of Education's Twenty-Sixth Yearbook (1926). On one side, stood the scientific curriculum makers such as Franklin Bobbitt and W. W. Charters, while more child-centered "activity" people such as Frederick W. Bonser and William H. Kilpatrick, stood on the other.

More importantly than the two factions, Harold O. Rugg of Teachers College, Columbia, and George S. Counts of the University of Chicago, stood in the middle. Those two men's avowed purpose was to bring the Progressives and the conservatives into some state of harmony via a composite statement. The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook (1926) postulated: "Participation in social life by providing a present life of experiences which increasingly identified the child with the aims of activities derived from analysis of social life as a whole" (Kliebard, 1986, p. 24). Further, "The Committee believes that curriculum-makers should seek on every occasion to develop sympathetic, broad views of the world" (Kliebard, 1986, p. 24). Kliebard suggests that if two people would object to the very child-centered addresses, Charters and Bobbitt would conceivably object the most; however, that was not the case. Charters mildly acquiesced.

In his NSSE statement, he said that curriculum studies should relate to learner's interests. Those interests, he concluded, should come from regulated studies.

However, Bobbitt gave whole-hearted approval (Kliebard, 1986, p. 182). Of all the curriculum researchers I have reviewed, Kliebard was the first to call attention to Bobbitt's literal and absolute change from his prior "scientism" stance. Kliebard (1986) quotes Bobbitt's new stance: "Education is not primarily to prepare for life at some future time. Quite the reverse; it proposes to hold high the current living. . . . Life cannot be 'prepared for.' It can only be lived" (p. 183). This startling resolution sparked my Bobbitt scholarship.

That Bobbitt changed his mind and ameliorated his position in 1926 is an extremely critical point, one that has received little attention. That his early writings were ever so much more inflammatory than the mid-career pieces noted by so many scholars and historians (The Curriculum, 1918c and How to Make a Curriculum 1924f) is even more important. My study does that scholarship, details reasons concerning why the apparent change occurred, and provides documentation of Bobbitt's subsequent change back into his refurbished functionalism.

Curriculum--Perspective, Paradigm,
and Possibility

William H. Schubert's Curriculum--Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility (1986) begins Bobbitt research in Chapter III, "Precedent: Historical Antecedents." Schubert divides all curriculum study into two parts. The first, pre-twentieth-century curriculum history, subdivides into categories "The Ancient World," "Curriculum in Ancient Greece and Rome," "Curriculum in the Christian World," "Curriculum in the Renaissance, Reformation, and Enlightenment," and "Curriculum from the Enlightenment to Twentieth Century." Bobbitt's curriculum study occurs in Schubert's second division, "Curriculum in the Twentieth Century." This second division involves Schubert's experientialist, social behaviorist, or intellectual traditionalist checklist, a checklist and template that superimposes the whole text.

Schubert's research indicates that twentieth-century curriculum study really begins with a retrospective of philosophical and psychological writers and documents during the 1890s. During that ten-year time span, fomented and originated the magnanimous scientific theories of Darwin, Einstein, and Planck. Schubert also mentions the three important psychologists and educators Herbart, Froebel, and Pestalozzi. Last, Schubert treats the three important measurement theories of Francis Galton (England), Alfred Binet (France), and Wilhelm Wundt (Germany). The term

curriculum itself became a concept during this period. However, more than any single man or movement, Schubert continues, Charles Eliot's Committee of Ten and William T. Harris's Committee of Fifteen (1893 and 1895 respectively), came forward. The latter Committee, especially, impacted public education because of its insistence of students' learning. Their learning, however, included only studying, knowing, and using mathematics, biology, art, literature, grammar (including psychology and logic), and history (including sociopolitical theory). Both committees indicated that all students learn the same subjects in the same way. Moreover, the committees furthered Social Darwinism, i.e., they openly advocated college or university attendance as the pinnacle of their liberal arts curriculum. Joining the "anti-progressive," Doctrine of the Secular Elect thought came Lester Frank Ward. Ward supported that meliorism, the doctrine that a science of improvement, could better the human state. Schubert points out that Ward's work complemented the Committees of Ten and Fifteen, and later joined and used the intelligence testing movement. That testing movement, collaborated by Galton, Binet, and Thorndike, aided and justified the pro-Spencerian and pro-Darwinian forces.

Schubert chronicles John Dewey as the single most important contra meliorist. Schubert then describes the Progressive Education Association, an association designed to celebrate and champion Dewey's "My Pedagogic Creed,"

(1897). G. Stanley Hall's child study, Francis W. Parker's child-centeredness, and Charles DeGarmo and Frank and Charles McMurry's Herbartianism, Schubert mentions as Dewey antecedents. Those four scholars projected students as active learners, not passive recipients of conservative education. Schubert portrays George Kerchensteiner (Germany) and Ovide Decroly (Belgium), as European school reformers for the activity and progressive schools' movement. Schubert marks 1918 as "the" curriculum year, both for the subject generally, and Bobbitt's work specifically. That year's first major curricular event, William H. Kilpatrick's "The Project Method," extolled the virtue of students and teachers working together on Dewey-like common purposes and typical life situations. However, the other two 1918 events did not complement Dewey's work; in fact, they opposed it. The National Education Association's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education wrote Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. The seven principles included (1) Health; (2) Command of fundamental processes; (3) Worthy home membership; (4) Vocational preparation; (5) Citizenship; (6) Worthy use of leisure time; and, (7) Development of ethical character (Schubert, 1986, p. 76). Schubert points to them as unified studies, responsive to realities of life. Further, he contends that comprehensive high schools used the principles to meet needs of a growing student population, and he echoes

Cremin's thoughts that most subsequent movements in the field have been only footnotes to the Cardinal Principles.

Schubert notes Bobbitt's The Curriculum (1918c) became the third contribution to curriculum studies in that year, and became the most important document ever written extolling activity analysis. Schubert notes that How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) became a companion piece to The Curriculum (1918c), and that both works represented the zenith of scientific curriculum making. Schubert views scientific curriculum in three steps. The first combined the work of Thorndike's testing and behaviorism. The second dealt with Charles H. Judd, who believed much of Thorndike's science of education, but did not believe in specified associations, "rather in application of principles that provide general, not merely specific, knowledge" (Schubert, 1986, p. 72). The third dealt with Bobbitt. Bobbitt's work began a trend where educational precision was most important. That precision catered to society's immediate needs in post-Industrial Revolution America.

Schubert stresses the essentialists' work and success. Though he does not scrutinize Bobbitt's work, he does study Frederick Bonser's job analyses, as well as David Snedden's sociological contributions. Snedden's curricular objectives addressed the needs of adult life in physical, civic, cultural, and vocational areas. Additionally, W. W. Charters used Bobbitt's How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) to

fashion ideals of upwardly mobile people, and then fitted those ideals into specified curricula.

Schubert places curricular figures into two separate camps. He views the conservatives as social behaviorists, with their adherence to measurement, science, and efficiency. Schubert's experimentalists were polar opposites. They were child-centered, progressive, and solely democratic. Schubert discusses how Boyd Bode wrestled with the vagaries and apparent disparities both camps proffered. More importantly, Harold Rugg asked for and got both warring parties together, and published their accord in the NSSE's 26th Annual Yearbook.

Bobbitt commentary closes abruptly at this point. Schubert chronicles Bobbitt up to the 26th Annual Yearbook, yet he does not pursue what Bobbitt wrote there. At certain points in his text, Schubert says that Bobbitt had significance, though he does not say to what magnitude. None of Bobbitt's other works receive any mention.

A History of School Curriculum

History of the School Curriculum, written in 1990 by Daniel and Laurel Tanner, provides specific background, data, and text concerning Bobbitt. Chapter IV, "Conflicting Currents in Curriculum Thought and Practice," chronicles the child-centered movement of the 1920s. The authors maintain all curriculum makers writing during this period had a dilemma: "At the beginning [of this period,

World War I forward] it all seemed so very simple: The child would be the source for curriculum reconstruction. As such, however, the child provided very little guidance for curriculum builders" (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, p. 149). "Child-centeredness," per se, meant freedom from teacher domination, from strict subject-matter study, and from a priori curriculum construction. The child-centered school heavily favored creative subject matters, as well as with the tools required--pens, paints, and clays. Bobbitt's curriculum theory, the Tanners narrate, followed the child-centered philosophy, and they term this work "Doctrine of Interest." That doctrine also includes Harold Rugg's and Ann Shumaker's works. Earlier in their careers, Rugg and Shumaker had suggested that teachers should plan any curriculum before substantial instruction could take place. The Tanners comment that teachers' interests could make a subject attractive, as Herbart had theorized. However, interest could also connote the subject's desirability or influence, as Dewey had maintained. Boyd H. Bode challenged the former as ephemeral venturing, and sided with Dewey. The Tanners link Bode with both the Activity Movement and the Project Movement.

The Activity Movement, according to the Tanners (1990), interchangeably known as a movement, program, or curriculum, identified the terms "units, unit of work, central theme, and center of interest" (p. 154). The elementary school used this activity motif most often, and the Francis W.

Parker School became its celebrated model. Child-centeredness focused the activity movement's curricula: "The objective was child growth through experience, active experience that was visible to the naked eye," and the pervading question asked whether or not the movement was a curriculum or a method (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, p. 155). The authors conclude that the activity movement became a useful tool for a subject such as social studies, where units of experience could benefit the student. Too often, they also indicate, the experience curriculum depended on students making their own curriculum.

The Project Method, on the other hand, "published a theoretical treatise in which James Kilpatrick identified the 'purposeful act' as the building block for the curriculum and 'child purposing' as the key to learning" (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, p. 157). What Kilpatrick did was to unite the educational psychology of Thorndike's connectionism and stimulus-response bond with Dewey's concept of worthwhile activity. That unification allowed students to employ the five levels of thinking: (1) Define the problem; (2) Identify the components; (3) Formulate a hypothesis; (4) Reason the hypothesis; and, (5) Test the hypothesis (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, pp. 157-158). Kilpatrick addressed a most important problem, i.e., whether or not the project(s) could be teacher chosen or student chosen. The answer, report the Tanners (1990), was preferably a joint venture; but if a choice had to be made

between the two, then the student should propose, plan, execute, and judge (pp. 156-159).

Bobbitt's work and influence follows in "Scientism in Curriculum Making." The Tanners (1990) introduce him with a quote from his 1912 "Elimination of Waste in Education": "Work up the raw material into that finished product for which it is best adapted" (p. 160). Bobbitt's article became the cornerstone for the Tanners' treatment. They maintain that his efficiency-led doctrines equated to the steel industry's scientific management. Post-agrarian United States had become fascinated with "scientific" methods in the business community, and because the growing disparity in several educational psychology and philosophical camps had produced academic confusion, Bobbitt's accountability doctrine found fertile ground. To that end, the Tanners report, Bobbitt expanded his "Waste" motif into a larger piece. That piece, in the 12th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1913a), proposed that education might shape students the same way industry shaped steel rails. The Tanners quote extensively from this document to demonstrate Bobbitt's views of factory-as-school model and benefits of more school productivity.

Bobbitt became lionized for his factory models, as well as for his advocacy of the business community to act as pattern and standard maker. Bobbitt, the authors comment, felt the academic community might be able to judge "how" in

curriculum making; the "what" industry should establish (emphasis added). Industry should make the scientific purpose and needs known via the survey method. While Bobbitt published his work, at least the work that the Tanners consider in their text, industry began using Dewey's thoughts that education and educational movements mirror their larger social whole. Arthur Twining Hadley, the President of Yale, suggested, in Standards of Morality (1907), that the business community should help solve the various social problems inherent in America, an offshoot of the nineteenth-century monitorial movement (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, p. 182).

The Tanners (1990) total Bobbitt's contributions: "Although easily explainable, the importance of Bobbitt's advocacy of a business-led educational system should not be underestimated" (p. 182), and for good reason. Two modern tenets stem from a thorough Bobbitt study:

(a) Business managers have become the paragons for education administrators; and, (b) The education community continues to look to the industrial and commercial world for pedagogical solutions.

More importantly than the two reasons just detailed, though, is a corollary one--"drift and mastery." Lester Ward, according to the Tanners, made it clear that man's intellect could harness his direction. Where Ward believed that higher formats of human welfare could develop, the authors state that Captains of Industry, as well as

particular curriculum people like Bobbitt, could improve social institutions. The Tanners call such control "drift and mastery."

A second major treatment the Tanners accord Bobbitt addresses his reaction to Charles Eliot's Committee on Economy of Time. In 1888, Eliot had delivered an address in which he proposed that school programs be shortened and enriched; however, those two terms' connotation equated to economy and efficiency. The Committee wanted to find out the minimum essentials of the curriculum, and they worked from three bases. First they questioned, as had Spencer, what knowledge is most worthwhile? Second, they postulated that curriculum content should have quantitative rather than qualitative measures. Last, they felt that time spent on a subject had no correlation to results. To comment on these postulates, the Committee on Economy of Time directed their work. Bobbitt, with W. W. Charters, C. C. Peters, and David Snedden, believed and furthered the causes of the Committee on Economy of Time, report the Tanners. To begin, job and task analyses appealed to Bobbitt, as well as to the other men. Bobbitt and Charters felt they could reduce public schools to 20,000-30,000 specific mechanical skills and/or behaviors. Bobbitt believed that his proposed skills curriculum prepared students for school and life simultaneously: "Since educational objectives were activities and activities were learned through performance, activity analysis discovered both the objectives of the

curriculum and the curriculum itself" (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, p. 188).

The text the Tanners believe showed the most about Bobbitt, How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), developed the Committee's theory into practice. In that work, Bobbitt coined the terms "educational engineer" and "educational surveying instruments." He used those phrases in order to facilitate objectives that he and the committee could write in various curricular constructions. In essence, the scientific curriculum that Bobbitt wrote, expressed, and postulated was old Puritan curricula with new authority: the work ethic, survival in the financial world. Significant difference Bobbitt had with Charters regarding behavioral objectives development. Bobbitt maintained that he could determine what people should do by identifying the things they do: "Charters [the sociologist] warned against this and saw activity analysis as a means for implementing previously selected objectives. It was Bobbitt's scheme that prevailed" (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, p. 189). Both men's work completed "atomized" subject matter for both the student and the teacher, as opposed to the Dewey-like doctrine that synthesized curriculum.

Other Studies Consulted

Besides the historical curriculum texts just reviewed, I have consulted other studies. Broken out separately, again by date, the following are smaller studies,

specialized pieces, or doctoral dissertations. I have used them as reference complements, augments to the texts in some cases, updates in others. Using their words or via paraphrase, I demonstrate how they relate Bobbitt's curricular position.

A Study of Mechanism in Education

William L. Patty's 1938 A Study of Mechanism in Education begins this section. Patty's Teacher College, Columbia University, monograph treats the troika Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, and C. C. Peters. Patty takes up the curriculum-making devices that each man made regarding relativistic pragmatism. The author begins with a description of science's development as a discipline. The progression includes Baconian experimentum crucis, the Cartesian mind-body dualism, and Newtonian empiricism. It is with the latter Newtonian science that Patty (1938) places Bobbitt, Charters, and Peters: "The mechanistic mode of interpretation so central to Newtonian science thus comes to characterize this attempt at scientific curriculum-making" (p. 3). As opposed to the authoritarian science that his subjects used, Patty subscribes to relativistic pragmatism.

Patty establishes representative passages or thoughts from each of his subjects. Though he does not make diminutive the work on Peters, Patty contends that scientists entered the educational foray after scientism

originated; however, that is not the case with Bobbitt and Charters. Charters' "efficiency of educational effort and subject matter" became his focus (Patty, 1938, pp. 4-6). Further, society itself became a figurative educational banker, a lender who looked for investments' interests.

Bobbitt, on the other hand, Patty (1938) contends, was someone who "sought to deduce principles of school administration from that system of industrial administration and business management which had acquired the distinction of being called scientific" (p. 9). Patty begins his Bobbitt discussion quoting the Twelfth Annual Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1913a), traces a mini-history of five Bobbitt works that include the Los Angeles survey (1922a and 1922b), one text, How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), and several other post 1922 works. Patty (1938) reads Bobbitt as "instrumentalistic," and suggests: "Similar to Charters, Bobbitt recommends that the outcomes desired from education be defined with extreme specificity and that all possible efficiency be exercised in achieving these outcomes" (p. 10). Because Peters adds more information but no new ideas to what Charters and Bobbitt wrote, the author combines the three men into the scientism movement. Patty (1938) separates scientism into three "notions": "The whole movement [scientism] centers around three notions, all advocated here, i.e., instrumentalistic education, pre-defined specific outcomes, and science" (p. 13).

Patty's text follows a very defined and historically thorough rendition of how scientism pervaded education. Once he has set up the introduction and the presuppositions of scientism, Patty treats the concepts of experience and analysis, further discussions (observation, learning, social change, and activity), and a "master list" of activities Charters, Peters, and Bobbitt gleaned. Patty adds his own thoughts regarding how effective their collective faith in science was. Throughout A Study of Mechanism in Education, Patty provides influences including Herbert Spencer, Charles Darwin, Frederick Taylor, and E. L. Thorndike. In addition, Patty suggests how scientism became part of American culture from the beginning of the Twentieth Century until 1938. The author suggests that he began this work in 1930, and had wanted to put it in print much sooner than he did to aid scholars who wanted and needed background on the scientism movement. However, his comprehensive fact-finding and extensive information-gathering had taken an extra four years.

Patty's text thoroughly treats the philosophies of the three men he studied, Peters, Charters, and Bobbitt. The author's point of view, what he refers to as "relativistic pragmatism" or "critical idealism," superimposes the U.S. public school system with the science ethic.

The Educational Ideas of John Franklin Bobbitt

The second supplemental work is a PhD dissertation. Bernard G. DeWulf wrote The Educational Ideas of John Franklin Bobbitt as part of his graduate work for Washington University's Department of Education in 1962. DeWulf gained access to many of Bobbitt's private papers, correspondences, and various University of Chicago notes and memoranda. DeWulf's thesis presents a very detailed look at the author, especially Chapter II, "Bobbitt's Formative Years: to 1909." Sensitively biographical in nature, especially the aforementioned Chapter II, DeWulf's work becomes an academic Bobbitt narrative. What the work examines, using many of Bobbitt's works as reference, is a three-fold study. First, DeWulf explores the cultural environment within which Bobbitt grew up and worked. Second, the author closely traces his subject's school and college experiences, noting several major figures that appeared prominently during Bobbitt's maturation. Third, DeWulf chronicles Bobbitt's various professional forays, beginning with his first teaching job in Manila, The Philippines, his professorship at the University of Chicago, his articles, books, and surveys, and finally, his role as an emeritus professor.

The work that DeWulf does has benefitted my study immeasurably. In some instances, I have relied on information that this study has provided as extremely important early-life Bobbitt research. In others, I have used some of the information, data, or views as beginning

bases for my own work. Though DeWulf is not very critical of Bobbitt's philosophy or position as an essentialist or leader of the scientism movement, he presents an array of data that other studies have not drawn on or used. Just as Kliebard's notation that Bobbitt had recanted some of his early "education is for the adult life" and replaced it with a child-centered format, DeWulf's uncovering of heretofore unknown personal references has provided me with information that has greatly aided my study, writing, and production.

The Shaping of a Field of Specialization, Curriculum Making: A Critical Study of Selected Writings of Charles and Frank McMurry, Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, Harold Rugg, Hollis Caswell, and John Dewey

In 1964, another dissertation topic appeared that dealt with Bobbitt. Mary Louise Seguel wrote The Shaping of a Field of Specialization, Curriculum Making: A Critical Study of Selected Writings of Charles and Frank McMurry, Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, Harold Rugg, Hollis Caswell, and John Dewey for Teachers College, Columbia University. Seguel (1964) examines each figure listed regarding three areas: (a) How each perceived, reacted to, and affected curriculum study; (b) The specific recommendations or writings of each; and, (c) The effectiveness of each person (Introduction Page). She proposes that Charles and Frank McMurry utilized Herbartian methodologies in elementary

schools, and suggests that Dewey's democratic concepts simultaneously influenced education during the early part of the Twentieth Century. W. W. Charters and Bobbitt, circa 1910, attempted to systematize the analysis of adult activities, she comments. In the 1920s, Harold Rugg pursued the method of curriculum and the foundations of specified subjects such as psychology and sociology. In the 1930s, Hollis Caswell defined the curriculum as a dynamic structure, one that utilized many factors and people to be successful (Seguel, 1964, pp. 92-95).

Seguel's specific Bobbitt scholarship concerns his early influence of Herbert Spencer, E. L. Thorndike, and Charles Eliot. As well, she notes and examines Bobbitt (and Charters) as effective science-in-education theorists. Seguel begins her Bobbitt section during his Philippines assignment. She traces the Gary, Indiana, work where Bobbitt solidified his views on cost-cutting measures such as the platoon system, and began his individualized programs and business-like administration. The author centralizes much of her scholarship from Bobbitt's contributions to the 12th Annual Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1913a). She notes his "factory metaphor," though she feels that readers should translate his "product" as "person" (Seguel, 1964, p. 113). She suggests that his adult focus resulted in his activity analysis methodology. The activity analysis, in turn, reacted to Charles Eliot's subject studies. Seguel believes that Bobbitt forced

curriculum practitioners to think about what students might do with their various courses of studies. To that end, she focuses on The Curriculum (1918c) as a median point in Bobbitt study and philosophy.

"Franklin Bobbitt and the 'Science' of Curriculum Making"

Third in this supplemental section is an article that Eliot Eisner wrote for the Spring, 1967, The School Review: "Franklin Bobbitt and the 'Science' of Curriculum Making." The author theorizes that Progressives John Dewey and William H. Kilpatrick did not have practical significance for many. Eisner suggests that the early Twentieth Century, fresh with the growth, profit, and accountability of the Industrial Revolution, demanded similar measures in education. To that accountability, Eisner (1967) quotes Charles Judd:

While the testing movement and certain other lines of scientific work in education are becoming so highly routinized that they fail at times to stimulate workers to original and constructive efforts, the re-making of the curriculum with its manifold problems and possibilities seems to offer unbounded and inviting opportunities for the exercise of all the genius that educational workers can contribute. (p. 30)

The possibilities and opportunities, Eisner reports, took place with two Bobbitt books: The Curriculum (1918c) and

How to Make a Curriculum (1924f). The former spoke to the differences between work and play, "antecedent" and "objective" performance, and between academic and vocational curriculum. The latter, on the other hand, began with curriculum construction, second, with forming behavioral objectives, and third, with practical suggestions for administrative personnel. Eisner quotes Bobbitt's ten fields of experience that curriculum should address, shows Bobbitt's rationale concerning their hierarchy, and notes his particular or sequential behavioral objectives.

Eisner suggests both The Curriculum (1918c) and How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) were scientific attempts to write curriculum via studying the society and the needs that society has. Bobbitt divided life into separate activities, analyzed each, then set up educational objectives to become competent in same, Eisner maintains. The author here points to consequences that Bobbitt's work engenders:

1. The objectives themselves had to be sequenced and/or put into a hierarchy.
2. Too much emphasis was placed on the objectives.
3. Lack of much attention to the "is-ought" completely ignored any experimentalism.
4. Coordinating the various people who need to participate in the "scientific" objective making required a very special coordinator or curriculum director.

5. Local means worked for local means; however, Bobbitt's curriculum making had no means to focus on state or nation (Eisner, 1967, p. 40).

Eisner concludes Bobbitt influenced Ralph Tyler, Benjamin Bloom, and John Goodlad; therefore, he had curricular importance. The author denies Bobbitt major figure status primarily because his opponents did not put him into extreme disfavor. As well, Bobbitt, comments Eisner, had no curriculum base such as Robert Hutchins "Great Books" or any other reflective societal interfaces.

"Shifting Visions of the Curriculum: Notes on the Aging of Franklin Bobbitt"

The next supplemental work is Philip Jackson's "Shifting Visions of the Curriculum: Notes on the Aging of Franklin Bobbitt," which he wrote for the 50th anniversary of Elementary School Journal in 1975. Jackson, writing on request for this special issue, highlights two untitled articles that Bobbitt had written in 1921 and 1924. Those two works, the bases for Jackson's article, had been the germination of How to Make a Curriculum (1924f). Jackson lists three reasons for his scholarship. First, he admits he knew very little about Bobbitt and wanted to know more. Second, since the articles were more than 50 years old and had become a book, Jackson comments on their historical significance. Third, Jackson (1975) finds the Bobbitt materials reference our current curricular state: "It was

as if Bobbitt, half a century ago, had hacked out the path along which many of us in American education are still traveling" (p. 2). Jackson first notes Bobbitt's vision. Bobbitt looked at the academic approach to schools and noted no vitality towards the child, a continued reverence for subject-centered schools, rote memory lessons, and inability to cope with different types of students. Bobbitt, reports Jackson, saw American education as a contradiction between educational talk and educational practices. To those educational practices, Bobbitt affirmed activities that students might want or need, including health, citizenship, language, leisure and vocation.

Jackson, like Eisner, does not see Bobbitt as a major figure in American curricular circles, but as simply a man who listened to special interest groups. If science and measurement commanded attention, Bobbitt surveyed that need and urged compliance. Jackson does not laud Bobbitt's overall importance as a complete essentialist; in fact, he defers to Kliebard's scholarship. That scholarship noted that Bobbitt changed his mind regarding a more child-centered curriculum from his almost life-long stance of school as an adult activity. Jackson suggests that another scholar might want to read closely Bobbitt's last book, The Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) in order to find out more about the seeming contradiction. This thesis acts on that suggestion.

The Scientific Curriculum-Making Theory as a
Conservative-Progressive Reform in an
Age of Progressivism 1914-1926

The fifth supplemental study belongs to John D. Kent. The Scientific Curriculum-Making Theory as a Conservative-Progressive Reform in an Age of Progressivism 1914-1926 Kent wrote as his dissertation project for Boston University in 1984. Kent's main point questions whether or not the scientism written during the early Twentieth Century actually used acceptable scientific standards. The author reports on other essentialists such as W. W. Charters, David Snedden, et al., but begins his Chapter III with Bobbitt study. Because Bobbitt wrote the first curriculum text, The Curriculum (1918c), Kent accords him respect as the pioneer and leader of that developing field. As do other scholars, including Eisner and Seguel, within the 12th Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education, Bobbitt's contribution, "The Supervision of City Schools" (1913a), became the beginning of Kent's study. He traces Bobbitt's activity curriculum without citing many of the author's articles. However, Kent does explore Bobbitt through the Los Angeles Survey and the resultant 10-item activities research.

Kent concludes that Bobbitt saw science on two levels: (a) The work level; and (b) The play level. Kent (1984) also sees a mellowing in Bobbitt: "By the 1925-1926 period, Bobbitt's writing revealed a greater tendency to

downplay the scientific nature of his curriculum based on the immature state of educational science" (p. 132).

Further, Kent believes that Bobbitt conceptually began to reduce the role of science, believing that science might not be able to supply education with comprehensive answers.

Ralph W. Tyler's Principles of Curriculum

Instruction and Evaluation: Past

Influences and Present Effects

The last supplemental text utilizes Bobbitt as mentor to Ralph Tyler. Marie K. Stone wrote Ralph W. Tyler's Principles of Curriculum Instruction and Evaluation: Past Influences and Present Effects as her PhD dissertation for Loyola (Chicago) University in 1985. The problem Stone addresses encompasses several areas, including the definition of the Tyler Rationale, as well as the various influences that Tyler had. Bobbitt's section in the thesis, as was Kent's, is not lengthy. Stone combines her brief Bobbitt references in company with John Dewey, Charles Judd, George Counts, and W. W. Charters--all University of Chicago faculty.

Stone's study shows Bobbitt as the chief architect of the Efficiency Movement, mentions his major work, The Curriculum (1918c), and concentrates on his activity analysis. Critics, including Herbert Kliebard and James Macdonald, contend that the activity analysis becomes the body of the Tyler Rationale. Stone, citing the NSSE's

Twelfth Annual Yearbook, points to the metaphor of education as industry and How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), a work that shows how to use activity analysis to provide more "plant" helps. Stone acknowledges Tyler's activity analysis influence, but she also notes Tyler had already begun to separate himself from that doctrine by 1930. She spends the remainder of her scholarship time explicating the differences Tyler had with Bobbitt regarding society in the curriculum, use of school personnel, sources of objectives, and even basic educational philosophies. She concludes that Judd influenced Tyler very much, whereas E. L. Thorndike influenced Bobbitt. Therefore, Stone determines that Bobbitt is more a behaviorist and Tyler more of a humanist.

Comments

Bobbitt does not occupy a premier place with most historical chroniclers. Cremin (1961) details the World War I era, one he views as Progressive Education Association Movement-dominated. Within this context, Bobbitt becomes one of several minor, conservative-opposition figures. Gwynn and Chase (1969) compare and contrast "conservatives and reformers" during the early Twentieth Century. Bobbitt, they feel, contributes time, effort, and texts to the "conservative" cause. However, they do not say much more about him than he (Bobbitt) established educational objectives, utilized training doctrines, and originated curriculum as a worthy subject. Tyack (1974) agrees with

Gwynn and Chase (1969). He (Tyack) also gives Bobbitt credit for opposing the Committee of Ten's subject-matter philosophy, but he (Tyack) feels that Charles Eliot had much more impact on U.S. education than Bobbitt. Schubert (1986) focuses his historical study on the year 1918. He describes the Progressives vs. the conservatives academic feud, chronicles the many and influential child-centered proponents, but does not pursue any significant Bobbitt interests. Instead, he suggests Bonser and Snedden, even Charters, as more influential towards essentialism than Bobbitt. Schubert does not even mention any books Bobbitt wrote. Tanner and Tanner (1990) set up a similar "warring faction" motif; however, they promote "activity method vs. the project method" terms. They feature Dewey and Kilpatrick as proponents of the project methodology; Bobbitt and Parker as the proponents of the activity methodology. Bobbitt, the Tanners (1990) agree, was the most important and most influential educator-advocate of the metaphor of school-as-a-business. They list his factory models, survey work, and administration details as Bobbitt's major contributions to the activity work.

Several historians praise and laud Bobbitt. The first chronologically, Callahan, (1962) notes that Social Darwinism has permeated U.S. public schools since its inception. Bobbitt, says Callahan, had mentors: the Robber Barons' fiscal leadership and Frederick Taylor's scientific management. Callahan (1962) describes and emphasizes the

1913 speeches given by Frank Spaulding and Bobbitt, speeches to two different groups, one business, the other superintendents. Both men delivered school accountability-laden addresses that endeared them to businessmen and school-as-a-business educators. Callahan (1962) feels Bobbitt had important impact on his era as an essentialist. Button and Provenzo (1989) agree with Callahan (1962). They include Spencer, Darwin, Eliot, and Binet as precursors to school efficiency modes. Button and Provenzo (1989) suggest that Bobbitt was the most important conservative "reformer." His reformation entailed student, school, and system efficiency.

The most detailed and most comprehensive curricular history, however, is Kliebard's (1986). He offers a total curriculum history of U.S. public schools, replete with literally all major and minor figures. He describes Bobbitt as the chief school "engineer," a scholar and professor who followed the sociology of Ross and the industry of Taylor. Kliebard (1986) not only surveys Bobbitt's significant texts, he (Kliebard) notes Bobbitt's apparent change from essentialism to child-centeredness. Both Eisner (1967) and Jackson (1975) refer to the apparent change, suggest that if there was a softening of Bobbitt's essentialist dogma, more scholarship should be forthcoming.

The dissertations of Patty, Seguel, DeWulf, Kent, and Stone have pursued additional Bobbitt work. Patty (1938) treats Bobbitt's, Peters', and Charters' scientism and

curriculum revisions in relativistic pragmatic terms. DeWulf's work (1962) researches Bobbitt's early personal and professional influences in biographical format, discusses many articles and texts, and assesses Bobbitt's educational and curricular impact. Seguel (1964) investigates Bobbitt's influences from Herbert Spencer, E. L. Thorndike, and Charles Eliot. Kent (1984) questions Bobbitt's, David Snedden's, and W. W. Charters' use of scientism as false "scientific" curriculum making. Stone (1985) explicates the differences between Bobbitt and Ralph Tyler regarding societal curriculum, school personnel, and educational objectives.

To date, however, no researcher has gone through Bobbitt's articles and texts, separated his "stages," and made conclusions regarding his apparent retraction of scientism to child-centeredness. My dissertation divides Bobbitt's work into three stages: "Indoctrinations," "Survey and Curriculum Science," and "Transitional Philosophical." Those stages appear as Chapters III, IV, and V, respectively. Each presents a developmental side of Bobbitt, includes the pertinent publications he achieved, and suggests his influences and educational philosophy. A final summary section discusses the importance of Bobbitt's works via the "stages," and offers a "democratic" (emphasis added) perspective regarding Bobbitt's apparent change and the reasons for that change.

CHAPTER III

BOBBITT'S STAGE I--"INDOCTRINATIONS"

Overview

John Franklin Bobbitt's initial writing period, one I term Stage I--"Indoctrinations," begins with his English as a Second Language (ESL) primer, A First Book in English (1904), progresses to his doctoral thesis, "The Growth of Philippine Children" (1909a), then expands to other articles that represent his first University of Chicago-based work. Those publications intermix Bobbitt's early religious indoctrination and his subsequent adherence to Social Darwinism. Both stances advocate diligence, hard work, and survival of the fittest.

Post "Lever-Age" United States' democracy featured a duality into which Bobbitt gained nurture and learned nature. That "democratic" (emphasis added) dichotomy also provided a dilemma that Bobbitt never completely resolved. "Indoctrinations" is exactly that, his formative and generative publications which reflect his early personal and professional influences. Stage II--"Survey and Curriculum Science" chronicles Bobbitt's mid-career scientism/essentialism-inspired presentations and

publications. Stage III--"Transitional Philosophy" studies his scientism/essentialism-based career's zenith, his apparent retraction of his adult-centered philosophy, and his gradual return to his "activities" dogma.

Studying Bobbitt's early boyhood reveals his steady progress as a diligent student and scholar. Proof of that comes from the influences he had with both his family, especially with his grandfather and father, and augmented by the mentoring he gets from one teacher, Mr. Riddle (cf. DeWulf, 1962, pp. 5-29, for a complete discussion of Bobbitt's early years). As well, Bobbitt's journals and notes throughout his youth show his love of reading, studying, and learning. Bobbitt's scholarship continued as he matured. Listening to family and teachers as a youth, he gained insights through conversations, lectures, and writings. As Bobbitt grew into adulthood, he learned still more from various professional colleagues, and selected, significant businessmen.

Bobbitt's first post-college job was in Manila, The Philippines, in 1901. He took that position after E. B. Bryan, one of his most important higher education role models, took the Manila Normal School superintendency, and offered him work. Unfortunately, because of sudden ill health, Bryan had to leave his post. In his stead, John A. Staunton assumed the Manila leadership (cf. Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year 1903, for more information about Bryan, Staunton, Bobbitt, and the Manila

Normal School). Staunton left little doubt about the combined religious zeal and Social Darwinism he felt the Philippine job entailed:

Each teacher is undoubtedly primarily a "teacher of English," but when he has taught English he has not fulfilled his duty nor the purpose for which he was sent out. . . . Every interest of the United States which is properly the concern of an American citizen becomes a matter which we must not only attend to punctiliously, but must rouse zeal for in others who are now under the same flag. . . . No less than man's highest development in every relation of life, moral as well as intellectual and political, is the goal we have set for ourselves; and we have not caught the spirit with which our country occupies these islands if we have come here without the determination to make these ideals contagious (Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year 1903, Part III, p. 943).

Staunton also issued other warnings and advice. He told the teachers pro forma information concerning English as a Second Language (ESL) texts and lessons, and he gave his staff stern admonitions about challenging the authority of the Catholic Church: "This [education of the Philippine children] can be done solely through obtaining the good will of the padre" (Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year 1903, Part III, p. 947).

Obtaining textbooks became another critical problem.

Inexplicably, Bobbitt had his assignment changed from principal to teacher with no warning; therefore, textbooks and lessons became of paramount importance. The young teacher found that if texts existed, they were archaic and filled with culturally inappropriate materials (Annual Reports of the War Department for the fiscal year 1903, Part III, prefatory notes, n.p.). Because of the dearth of sufficient language texts, Bobbitt wrote his own.

Publications

A First Book in English (1904)

Bobbitt filled the need for a good ESL text when he wrote A First Book in English (1904). He had heeded the advice Staunton and the other administrators advocated in teaching "native" students. That advice included using nouns that were familiar to the students, stressing active verbs, repeating lessons whenever and wherever possible, and illustrating and drawing corollary materials. Bobbitt's text (1904) uses a 10-point language activity guide:

1. Conversing based upon objects, actions, pictures, and stories.
2. Reading of printed and written forms.
3. Copying from books and from dictation.
4. Answering oral questions both aloud and in writing.
5. Answering printed and written questions both orally and in writing.
6. Composing sentences.

7. Completing various exercises involving grammatical forms.

8. Reproducing stories heard.

9. Reproducing stories read.

10. Memorizing stories (p. 3).

This 10-item list provided an outreach to the Philippine students Bobbitt taught. Bobbitt's language and cultural interventions (1904) include vocabulary words associated with the young peoples' homes, farms, gardens, dooryards, barnyards, as well as the Manila settings of sea, weather, and land, among others (p. 4). Bobbitt emphasizes the action in the illustrations, urges the teachers or aides to use same, and create, wherever possible, even more. At the text's conclusion, he accumulated and listed 900 words, which he felt the students needed to know. Bobbitt attempts no cognates, nor does he indicate that he spoke with any students before composing the text. An early lesson follows, indicative of many, if not all, of the others:

Here is a little boy.

His name is Sixto.

His ball is in his hand.

He stands very straight.

His clothes are white and clean.

He is a good boy

Here is a little girl, too.

Her name is Maria.

Her hair and eyes are black.

Her dress is white.

What has she on her feet?

ACTION EXERCISES

This is my eye. This is my head.

This is my nose. This is my hair.

This is my ear. This is my finger.

This is my mouth. This is my arm.

This is my hand. This is my foot.

Note.--Teach names of other parts of the body, also.

(Bobbitt, 1904, p. 7)

Bobbitt lists some 73 lesson items that included "A boy, Manuel, takings his flowers to market," "cat and rat," "mortar, pestle, bolo," "meal fixing-girls," "men threshing rice," and "rainy day scene." The text provides adequate instructional techniques, but despite Bobbitt's good intentions, the text does perpetrate the author's own sexist, decidedly WASP culture. In addition, Bobbitt insists that grammar, following reading and writing, would help the students' composing and phrasing. Regardless that Bobbitt would condemn such a strict academic approach in his mid-career, his Manila work and assignment evidently progressed well (Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year 1903, Part III, pp. 940-960).

After five years on this assignment, Bobbitt returned to graduate school in the United States. Invited by

Professors Lindley and Berstrom, Bobbitt first visited the campus and then accepted a fellowship at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts (DeWulf, 1962, pp. 67-68). Bobbitt began his Clark tenure in the fall of 1907, and he found there a unique graduate school learning atmosphere:

Clark was a university different in important respects from any other that has ever existed in America, if not in the world--in spirit much akin to the German university yet differing from it because of the small student body. It enrolled in all its departments only about fifty full-time students, besides possibly a dozen whose attendance was limited to Saturday classes or special seminars. . . . The student registered by merely giving his name and address to President Hall's secretary. He was not required to select formally a major or minor subject. There was no appraisal of credentials for the purpose of deciding what courses he should take. Lernfreiheit was utterly unrestricted.

(DeWulf, 1962, p. 69)

Where Indiana University prided itself in its traditional and sequential course offerings, Clark University must have been a revelation for Bobbitt. Ironically, Bobbitt's "freedom" rivaled the laissez-faire Charles Eliot gave his Harvard students. That Bobbitt would later so vigorously oppose Eliot's "academic" stance, i.e., teaching all elementary and secondary classes identically and to the same collegiate purpose, is doubly ironic. Both

men believed in their own concept of democracy. Both thought that if students stayed in school long enough, they could eventually participate in real democracy. If they did not, or if the students could not qualify for higher education, then they took the schooling literally and figuratively dictated to them. As a consequence, those same students participated in their democracy at a reduced rate and in subjugated stature.

Bobbitt's academic stature blossomed at Clark, primarily because of the mentoring he received there. Just as the two Professors Bryan had influenced Bobbitt at Indiana University, two other professors swayed him at Clark University. DeWulf noted the first was G. Stanley Hall. Professor Hall acted as Clark's President and department head of psychology. Hall's reputation rested on his erudite demeanor, Darwinian interpretations, and his various insights into problem solving (Spring, 1990, pp. 204-205). The second was William H. Burnham. Professor Burnham, a philosophy scholar, had very definite, outlined, and dogmatic views concerning economy and efficiency in all phases of study, research, and education (DeWulf, 1962, p. 73). Hall's Darwinism and Burnham's efficiency affected Bobbitt's educational philosophy and writing the remainder of his career.

George Stanley Hall's rise to educational prominence occurred for two reasons. The first was that he became the "father of the child study movement" (Kliebard, 1986,

pp. 42-51). The second was his address, response, and criticism of Charles Eliot's dogma that all high school "studies are of equal value when they are pursued for equal periods of time" (Good, 1962, pp. 346-349). Eliot's Committee of Ten's recommendations to the American public claimed that any course in high school should fit the student for college. Similarly, any college course would then "fit" (emphasis added) the student for life. The Committee of Ten advocated a hierarchy regarding college people, i.e., their "elect" status accorded them the chance to take "elective" (emphasis added) curriculum. Eliot himself noted the sorting process:

Thoughtful students of psychology of adolescence will refuse to believe that the American public intends to have its children sorted before their teens into clerks, watchmakers, lithographers, telegraph operators, masons, teamsters, farm laborers, and so forth, and treated differently in their schools according to those prophecies of their appropriate life careers. Who are to make these prophecies?

(Kliebard, 1986, p. 15)

Clark's President Hall did not agree with those prophecies, nor with much else the 1893 Committee advocated. He disagreed that all children should learn the same material in the same way, that courses had equal value if taught equally well, and that "fitting" for college equated to "fitting for life." He intoned: "There is no more wild,

free, vigorous growth of the forest, but everything is in pots or rows like a rococo garden" (Kliebard, 1986, p. 14). Instead, because he had studied Johann Herbart, Hall subscribed to the culture-epochs pedagogy, one that allowed the child in school to retrace the evolutionary paths of his forefathers. Further, Hall believed in an interrelated curriculum, one that had shared, linking parts.

If G. Stanley Hall provided Bobbitt some philosophical direction, then William H. Burnham, Professor of Pedagogy at Clark, offered Bobbitt "economical" instruction, pedantic counsel, and "efficiency" encouragement (DeWulf, 1962, pp. 78-80). Burnham (1903) also subscribed to the "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" doctrine:

[Burnham's foundation] involves the whole physiology and psychology of development in the individual and the history of culture in the race, and its superstructure includes not only all the various forms and systems and methods of education, but the study of the influence of environment in the widest sense. (p. 36)

Burnham espoused a very child-centered philosophy and curriculum, one that not only dealt with the subjects taught and learned, but the essential classroom atmosphere. In one article, Burnham (1901) not only urged U.S. curriculum change from strictly academic perspectives, he also demanded more attention for the students' needs than strict fiscal accountability: "The natural answer to this objection [of money spent for schools] is that any community that will

weight the health of the children against dollars and cents must be the product of a perverted system of education" (p. 870). He debated science-in-education, as opposed to schools' use of the scientific method. Though he did not have any resolute conclusions, he did suggest economy as a factor: "It is, then a problem of special interest to brain-workers to consider how the maximum of intellectual work can be done with the minimum expenditure of energy" (Burnham, 1899, p. 306). Burnham (1899) believed subjects familiar to children would stimulate them to learn more, i.e., to build on their "spontaneous interests": "The emotional prodigality so often seen in our petted children is liable to leave the soul barren of healthy impulses and render ordinary intellectual activity insipid" (p. 313).

Bobbitt obviously listened to Burnham's economy dicta, as well as to selected portions of Hall's Darwinism. From "How to Eliminate Waste in Education" (1912), Bobbitt made U.S. public school economy his essentialism's centerpiece. Burnham (1903) showed how Aristotle gathered 100 or more constitutions of many lands in order to have the principles of an ideal republic displayed (p. 105). He compared the school systems during his era with the Aristotelian governmental gathering, a ten step model that he passed on to Bobbitt and other graduate students: (1) It (the school) should be economical and show no waste; (2) Free from politics; (3) Incorporate efficiency; (4) Be separate from any discrimination of race, sex, or religion;

(5) Demonstrate community needs, wants, and feelings; (6) Be separate from governmental ties; (7) Be as small as possible; (8) Hire competent officers; (9) Employ civil service boards; and, (10) Coordinate power and responsibility (Burnham, 1903, p. 103). Burnham's philosophy began with child-centeredness, yet he believed in and advocated science, the scientific method, and accountability. Bobbitt's writing and thought processes in this text show many of Burnham's dichotomies. As well, Bobbitt demonstrates a bastardized version of Hall's Darwinism following in "The Growth of Philippine Children" (1909a) and "Practical Eugenics" (1909b).

"The Growth of Philippine Children" (1909a)

"The Growth of Philippine Children" (1909a), derived from his dissertation, represents the first published article Bobbitt produces. The work mirrors the missionary zeal that the author received from his grandfather and father's religious training. It also reflects the Social Darwinism that surrounded Bobbitt as he matured. Bobbitt's first work also shows the influence of Professors Bryan at Indiana University, as well as Professors Hall and Burnham of Clark University. W. L. Bryan wrote of his own interest in the "question of successive stages of human development, and the question of the interrelation of human activities and abilities" (DeWulf, 1962, p. 77). Both Hall and Burnham spoke, wrote, and researched genetics-philosophy, a field

integrating pedagogy, philosophy, and psychology. Bobbitt (1909a) wanted to provide the American academic community with some scientific feedback so that United States scholars could benefit:

Child study to date has occupied itself almost exclusively with children of the white races, and anthropology has been concerned with adults. Both of these fields of research have become widely extended, but neither has yet seriously undertaken the study of the children of the various colored races. (p.3)

Bobbitt comments extensively regarding "colored races" in "Practical Eugenics" (1909b).

Few quantitative children's studies had been written before 1909. Bobbitt (1909a) knew this and notes: "If one wishes to obtain exact data with reference to the physical or mental capabilities of the children of any race other than the white, there is scarcely a study to which one can refer with confidence" (p. 3). Bobbitt cites Alex Hrdlicka's work with Indians of the United States and Mexico, as well as some Japanese work as having importance. However, the quantitative studies genre began and proliferated during the early Twentieth Century.

Bobbitt (1909a) had researched the Filipino children before he went to The Philippines: "It is assumed and frequently asserted that the children of the Tropics develop more rapidly and mature earlier than the children of colder lands" (p. 3). Bobbitt states that his research could not

be proved; he could find no concomitant statistics. To aid future studies, though, he proposes to keep records so he can ascertain what instructional stages best fit the Filipinos. His records would include normal growth stages, at what age each manifested itself, and how long each stage continued. His technique and rationale are clear:

In answer to the questions, there were no figures to which to appeal, and one could obtain from the teaching profession any sort of opinion that one might be looking for. The only method of finding out was to measure the children. This was undertaken, and the present study presents certain anthropometric evidence as to the rates and stages of their physical growth. This was naturally the first step to be taken even where the facts aimed at were the stages of mental growth and the age of mental maturity. (Bobbitt, 1909a, p. 4)

Bobbitt encountered a problem of identifying students for this study. To begin, he worked with young people who came from various Manila schools, though some did come from outlying provinces: "About all of the Christian provinces were represented; but the major portion of the students measured were Tagalog, Pampango, Pangasinan, and Ilocano" (Bobbitt, 1909a, p. 4). Additionally, he wanted to measure only those with "malay" blood, though Spanish and Chinese people lived in the archipelago. Bobbitt (1909a) states: "The most that can be said is that they [the students] were

typical Filipinos, fair representatives of the Christian population of the archipelago" (p. 4).

Bobbitt (1909a) wanted his study commensurate with a similar one Smedley had conducted for the Child-Study Laboratory at the University of Chicago in 1899-1900 (p. 4). Bobbitt measured height, span of arms, sitting height, weight, vital capacity, and grips of right and left hands. The only difficulty the author mentions concerned the pupils' ages. He reasons that the tropical climate makes the students forgetful or imprecise, so he asks all 1,180 boys and 438 girls to double check their ages.

Bobbitt's detailed measurements led him to several conclusions. First, the youngsters had three distinct growth stages: (1) Steady growth through childhood; (2) Accelerated growth through puberty (boys at 12-17; girls, 11-14); and, (3) Descending growth through post-puberty stage. Second, girls were equal physically to boys to age 14. During puberty, the girls grew faster than their male counterparts, with some variance in grip and vital capacity. Third, based on his findings, the author maintains his "physiological vs. chronological factors research" should impact future studies. Last, Bobbitt suggests replication of Smedley's and his own work (1909a, pp. 4-6).

In summary, Bobbitt's statistical thesis meets the plan that W. L. Bryan, his major professor at Indiana advocated, G. S. Hall encouraged, and W. H. Burnham supported. The

thesis becomes an instrument for people who approve of his work or want to do similar qualitative research. The study also becomes a tool that Bobbitt utilizes throughout his career as overlay to his survey work, as precursor to his scientism, and as his policy for his later functionalism.

Bobbitt's doctoral thesis, "The Growth of Philippine Children" (1909a), represents the author's first professional writing, albeit into the physical and mental capabilities of non-anglo children. A First Book in English (1904) represents a first practical curricular attempt at teaching those students English. Bobbitt's next work is consummately more pointed--scientifically and philosophically.

"Practical Eugenics" (1909b)

"Practical Eugenics," published in the September, 1909, Pedagogical Seminar, was an address Bobbitt had delivered on child welfare at Clark University, his PhD alma mater, in July of that same year. The article notes the dearth of manuscripts that deal with heredity, as opposed to "plasticity," his word ameliorating those not in the upper classes: "Under the circumstances it is perfectly natural that men should have chosen what seems the easier means of levelling up humanity through their heredity" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 386). The key operatives "plasticity," and "levelling up their heredity" become one focus my dissertation examines. This journal article has remained

virtually ignored throughout Bobbitt research, and I contend it has disturbing importance. "Practical Eugenics"--the title is insidious enough--foretells the author's social engineering tracts, his version of Darwinism gleaned of G. S. Hall, and his intelligence testing venues.

One problem Bobbitt and his contemporaries discussed and debated was how and what to do with less than outstanding public school youngsters. In "Practical Eugenics" (1909b), Bobbitt asserts: "If a child is well-born, if he springs from sound, sane stock, if he possesses high endowment potential in the germ, then the problem of his unfoldment is well-nigh solved long before it is presented" (p. 385). The author continues:

If the child is marred in the original making, if he springs from a worm-eaten stock, if the foundation plan of his being is distorted and confused in heredity before his unfoldment begins, then the problem of healthy normal development is rendered insoluble before it is presented. (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 385)

Bobbitt suggests that the former child, one of high birth, held separate from all evil influences, would assimilate an education easily. The "marred" child however, could not: "Such a child is difficult to protect against adverse influences, and he remains to the end stupidly unresponsive to the delicate growth factors of education" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 385). The author contends this problem has historical precedence:

And yet wherever man has builded [sic] a civilization in his striving to realize his ideal state, in Egypt, or Greece, or Carthage, or Rome, invariably he has met with defeat. . . . There has always been some invisible undermining influence, which he failed to see and to prevent. (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 385)

"Undermining" becomes a tactic for many Social Darwinists.

Bobbitt (1909b) proposes a scientific answer to "undermining": study eugenics, "the newly-arising science which seeks to improve the inborn qualities of our race" (p. 385). Surprisingly racist in tone, the author continues: "Thus we see two sinister processes at work: the upper and better strata of our society are continually dying away; and poorer ones are being added on at the bottom" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 388). Were the rhetoric and racist tone not bad enough, the author adds: "There is a continual drying up of the highest, purest tributaries to the stream of heredity, and a rising flood in the muddy, undesirable streams" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 388). The writer's "clean and impure waters" metaphor previews genetic engineering some two and three decades later--the Germanic outcry for race purification. Bobbitt does not often use metaphors, but the ones he does command attention.

Ironically, regarding both his racial indictment and water metaphor, Bobbitt proposes a scientific restoration --via Luther Burbank. Professor E .B. Bryan had mentioned Burbank in his own lectures. Conceivably, Bobbitt

remembered the references (cf. Bryan, 1905, Chapter V, specifically, p. 58, for more information). Bobbitt (1909b) remarks: "Luther Burbank, in his garden, finds that by carefully selecting the parentage of his plants for a few generations he can transform them into almost anything he wills" (p. 385). This garden reference complements the previous water metaphor in force and tone. Not only can the transformation occur, it can be pretty and utilitarian: "Thus he [Burbank] takes scraggy [*sic*] worthless stocks, and by carefully selecting the parentage, out of them brings new and wondrous creations, both useful and beautiful (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 384). In this metaphorical garden, Bobbitt indicates that schools spend far too much time tending to the "chaff," what he also terms "weeds;" not enough time to "blooming" children (emphasis added). Bobbitt (1909b) reasons that were Burbank to follow suit, botanical chaos would result: "Let one imagine the result if Luther Burbank cherished the weeds of his garden with a more tender solicitude than he bestows upon his fruitful plants" (p. 391).

That this work demonstrates tenets from Charles Darwin's On the Origin of Species (1859), as well as Herbert Spencer's Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical (1860) is obvious. The former's work with "Struggle for Existence" and "Natural Selection" (1859), and the latter's "Liberalism and the Rights of Children" and "What Knowledge Is of Most Worth" (1860), provide real mirror images for the

basis, substance and impact of "Practical Eugenics" (1909b). Equal to these image's impact is that such blatant conservative educational philosophy has received little scholarship attention. I maintain that "Practical Eugenics" (1909b) is Bobbitt's melding of the Calvinistic Doctrine of the Elect and the Social Darwinistic Doctrine of the Secular Elect. Perhaps the statements and doctrines in "Practical Eugenics" (1909b) did not offend people in the early 1900s as they should today. Further research indicates no surprise or negative comments from Bobbitt's peers, and the author offered no amelioration or retraction later in his career. Such comments had Bobbitt and societal approval.

Acceptance, I suggest, connoted reader agreement with the improvement portrayed in the metaphorical garden--they saw themselves as flowers. Bobbitt's article opposes "weeds" in educational, moralistic, and nationalistic terms. Callahan (1962) and Kliebard (1986) have noted Bobbitt's educational applications of scientific principles. They conclude that Bobbitt's successful practicality regarding curricular problems made him the leader of the U.S. education's efficiency movement. Introducing, researching, and explicating Bobbitt's early works sheds a more direct light on his time as well as on his own later and more widely known "efficiency" doctrine such as The Curriculum (1918c) and How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), let alone his other works that have not been as widely read.

Bobbitt's "Practical Eugenics'" (1909b) intent, direction, and philosophy begin with the author's notes on possible "racial deterioration" (p. 389). Besides the obvious worries Bobbitt has for his age, he retraces history for examples and perspective. To begin, he notes during the prehistoric age two important processes existed: "Continual war meant continual thinning of the ranks. The continued existence of the tribe demanded new recruits, large fecundity" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 388). That wholesale battles raged in inter-tribal warfare meant that some warriors fell; however, the essential tribal balance remained unchanged:

And the children of weak parentage, even when brought to maturity under the protection of stronger arms, were naturally first to fall in the struggle before they could mingle their weakness with the currents of heredity. (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 388)

The author reaffirms his water metaphor: "Thus in primal days was the blood of the race kept high and pure, like mountain streams" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 388). Ominous foreshadowing of the latter-day Nazi regime cap his remarks on the prehistoric age:

One may not admire the hard conditions of the savage life of our German forefathers in their Teuton forests; but one must admit that high purity of their blood, their high average sanity, soundness and strength. They were a well-born, well-weeded race. (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 388)

"High purity of their blood" remarks, above, as well as the previous "weeding" phrases have been, and continue to be, mainstay concepts underlying Puritanical and Social Darwinism. Bobbitt, more moderately, echoes these remarks in later publications.

Where the Teutonic statements leave off, Bobbitt carries forward his "Middle Ages" report. He notes society had developed nobles, free men, and serfs. He also contends the first "mischief" began coterminously: "The middle class of freemen were linearly descended from the original savage stock. The best and strongest had specialized themselves upward out of this matrix into the nobility" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 388). Of course, the lower classes had plummeted downward. The problem arose when the upper class, acting out what Bobbitt terms a "selective sponge," recruited the strongest of the middle class, and uplifted some of the lower class to the rank of middle class. Inevitably, when war came, warriors waged battles in order to preserve business interests, and racial deterioration began: "Thus classes of weaklings that never could have survived in the former age, were preserved and permitted to mingle their blood in the common current to the pollution of the whole" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 389). Such is Bobbitt's Darwinism.

Bobbitt's remarks concerning the Twentieth Century mirror what he says about the Prehistoric and the Middle Ages. He suggests that the aristocracy of that latter period had become aristocracies of birth, wealth, learning,

art, and religion. Though stratified into upper, middle, and lower, Bobbitt suggests all classes in all cultures have benefitted from the depth and breadth of education. Bobbitt (1909b) notes education has increased expanses in wealth, economic and geographical freedom, and scientific knowledge for many citizens; however, that expanse has been expensive: "The result has been the survival of grades of weaklings, mental, physical and moral, that in former ages never could have survived" (p. 390).

Using a survival framework he excuses as Luther Burbank-like, Bobbitt describes two children from the slums. He observes the youngsters, one "sound," the other, "stupid," as well as the treatment they get:

Upon the defective we lavish all our care; and when his school days are over, he is solicitously helped to a position of economic independence, where he can bring up a family endowed with his defects. The sound child, however, born in the same environment, we pass by, and let him get on as he can. If he bears fruit, well; if not, well also. It is the weeds that get special protection. (Bobbitt 1909b, p. 391)

Compounding his treatment of the "weeding," Bobbitt (1909b) adds how serious the problem has become in world history:

This cutting off at the top of the best and the adding on at the bottom of the worst and poorest, is at present exhausting the high qualities of our race with

a rapidity never before equaled in the history of the world. (p. 391)

Bobbitt's eugenical reform solution has four tenets.

Tighter standards on marriage licenses begins his eugenical alteration. Bobbitt (1909b) researched a Washington State law that aided his cause, one that required a doctor's signature "certifying that they [the people] are sound and well in both body and mind, and free from serious taints in their heredity" (p. 392). Bobbitt (1909b) intones that the inhibitors listed, tuberculosis, alcoholism, insanity, deafness and blindness, did not go far enough: "The restrictions are entirely too mild yet" (p. 392).

Second, Bobbitt (1909b) also supports the "rise and fall of racial strength" (p. 392). He remarks schools could become disseminators for his practical eugenics reform: "Practical eugenics must therefore widen and deepen our knowledge of heredity and racial changes, and with its knowledge leaven the lump of public opinion" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 392). That public opinion should extend to criminals and misfits.

Third, Bobbitt (1909b) admits minor gains had been made regarding prison and hospitals segregating and sterilizing criminals: "But in general, public opinion is far behind the needs of the situation, and requires much education" (p. 393). He implicitly asks for more such policies and amendments.

Last, Bobbitt advocates the abolition of any public charity agency or system that preserves the weak and thus inhibits racial problem solving. Suggesting that humanity is like a metaphorical river, clean at the top but muddied below, the author proposes several channels. The first includes several important items:

A heavy tax upon bachelors and maids above a certain age; of offering a bonus to the parents of good blood for each child. . . . of [sic] a socialistic conferring of special social and economic privileges upon the highly endowed so as to give them a better chance; of the granting of certificates of high endowment to the highly endowed after strict personal examination, and the encouragement of marriage of highly endowed with highly endowed. (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 393)

The economic sanctions blend into the next category, a eugenic religion "which looks not merely to individual salvation, but to the ultimate good of all future human kind" (Bobbitt, 1909b, p. 393). Bobbitt concludes that such a religion, actually his science, would take much altruism, insight, and perseverance.

"Practical Eugenics" (1909b) melds religion and science. At this stage of his career, Bobbitt defines some personal and professional ideas that couple his taught conservative religion and learned Social Darwinism. He is no longer a student, no longer a neophyte teacher; rather, his words reflect his growing professional career. Though

Bobbitt's eugenics-like thoughts echo on and off throughout his curricular tenure, this article has remained virtually unexplored in Bobbitt scholarship. His next article, which addresses art and music, has none of the impact of "Practical Eugenics" (1909b).

"A City School as a Community Art
and Musical Center" (1911a)

The second journal article Bobbitt wrote was "A City School as a Community Art and Musical Center," published in the Elementary School Journal in November, 1911. This journal, a University of Chicago-based one, accepted Bobbitt's articles throughout his career. Both parties prospered because of the alliance.

The subjects of this 1911 piece, music and art, were curricular areas that Bobbitt never again addressed by themselves. However, noticeably, the just-completed "Practical Eugenics" (1909b), remains a ready reference. He begins: "It appears that a considerable amount of leisure is normal for the human race, whether savage or civilized" (Bobbitt, 1911a, p. 119). Additionally, he explains the industrial metamorphosis the United States had undergone from pre-Civil War days until the beginning of the Twentieth Century. When Bobbitt (1911a) began his professional career, the Industrial Revolution era had superseded the old agrarian order: "This is especially the case during the last few decades, when the burden of heavy labor has been

transferred from human shoulders and placed upon labor-saving machines" (p. 119).

In the new order, believes the author, some citizens need more art and music education than others: "It is the portion of the man's time that is most subject to his own disposition, and it is also probably the portion of his time for which he needs the greatest amount of education unless he happens to be of the managerial class" (Bobbitt, 1911a, p. 119). Bobbitt firmly believed the lower classes simply did not have the training, nature, or time to avail themselves of the fine arts. The "managerial class" did (cf. Larson, 1977, Chapter XI, pp. 190-208, for a full discussion of such "professionalization"). Bobbitt (1911a) submits that moral education equates to beneficial use of free time, and free time might lead to music interests: "Its [music's] power is recognized by both the forces of good and the forces of evil. It is one of the chief attractions both of the church and of the saloon" (p. 120). Music education, he concludes, needs more support.

Bobbitt cites one notable exception to the dearth of cultural activities--the community of Richmond, Indiana. To demonstrate how the city's music system works, the author initiates a continuum. That continuum begins with teaching elementary and junior high young people music theory. Second, Bobbitt writes how the Richmond High School band used its musical training to perform in concert for the city of Richmond. Community members and high school band people

joined together and played "good" (emphasis added) music for the surrounding township. The high school auditorium became the focus for Richmond concerts. Those concerts ranged from the high school orchestra, the high school chorus, to a people's chorus, as well as a people's symphony orchestra. The town-wide system, Bobbitt (1911a) demonstrates, provided a softening agent to more debasing alternatives:

Nothing less will ever be able to offset the attractions of the saloon, the beer-garden, the dance-hall, the low-class music-halls, so called, and other debasing social agencies, all of which use music of some sort as one of their chief sources of attraction (p. 124).

Bobbitt sets up music hierarchies, just as precisely as he has set up social class and student hierarchies.

The attraction he refers becomes music appreciation, a subject Bobbitt extols the remainder of the article, save for the last paragraph. The last paragraph compliments the same community center as a virtuous place where art exhibits might occur. Though the author does not write another article regarding music and art per se, he has a special regard for these disciplines. Later in his career, Bobbitt specifies that curriculum structure could and should become polemic engineering. However, he does not offer that rigidity with music: "The music must be with the spirit not of the pedagogue but of the artist" (Bobbitt, 1911a, p. 124). Bobbitt will spend much time speaking to the use

of free and leisure time in his subsequent works. He will spend even more time writing about scientific curriculum via his surveys.

For most of his career, Bobbitt postulates that his curriculum work extends to, and is solely for, the adult. Academic preparation and entire schools Bobbitt portrays as business-like procedures. Those procedures use industries as models, teachers as lecturers-disseminators of knowledge, and students as receptive learners and bearers of culture. Bobbitt terms this system "apprenticeship."

Though Bobbitt (1911a) spends very little time examining the role of art--95% of "A City School as a Community Art and Musical Center" (1911a) contains music appreciation--he does acknowledge how that subject might be more appropriate from a student-centered format, as opposed to the teacher-dominant one that historians have noted:

An occasional visit to a city art museum is probably of little value in the development of appreciation where the influences are so tenuous and the individual left so passive. One must live with pictures if this spirit is to be transfused with the spirit of art. For this reason the method of using the city is incomparably more effective than the method of placing all the pictures in a separate city art museum to be only occasionally visited by the few, and by most of these to a degree wholly insufficient for the development of any considerable degree of appreciation. (p. 126)

If that explanation was not plain enough, the author reiterates his Richmond art ethic: "Richmond believes that her art should be a thing functional in the lives of her people and not merely a thing to be set apart and occasionally admired" (Bobbitt, 1911a, p. 126). Perhaps Bobbitt begins in this article, at least within the art and music disciplines, to demonstrate less conservative dogma. However, Bobbitt here extols less than core-curriculum coursework--art and music. Later he speaks of the "good life," and he uses that utilitarian concept to denote ways students could use the curriculum and schools to their best advantage. To complete the "good life," Bobbitt would support a liberal or holistic approach to leisure-time activities, of which art and music qualify as proper enhancement.

Bobbitt never completely shook free from the basic core-curricula he had learned, nor the business applications he viewed as so important to job seeking. However, he had participated in reading group and Lyceum activities as a youth (DeWulf, 1962, p. 16). He also knew that the growing populace would have leisure and free-time needs. Therefore, he advocates Richmond, Indiana-like, ones here in "A City School as a Community Art and Musical Center" (1911a). More efficiency-like doctrine follows in his next article, one in which he compares one-room, rural schools to larger, metropolitan institutions.

"The Efficiency of the Consolidated
Rural School" (1911b)

"The Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School," published one month after "A City School as a Community Art and Musical Center" (1911a), provides the Bobbitt scholar with a precursor to his famous "The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912). All three appeared in Elementary School Journal, 1911-1912. Bobbitt subtly begins his article, stating that the primary reason favoring consolidated schools over the smaller site involves economy. The economy theme is one he manifests from his religious and business influences throughout his career, as well as from W. H. Burnham (cf. Burnham, 1899, pp. 306-309, for more information). Bobbitt's 1911b article demonstrates reliance on basic economical principles:

The purpose of this brief sketch is to show the apparent soundness of the argument so frequently used to block the movement for consolidation; and to indicate the way in which it is essentially unsound because of its leaving out of consideration a number of matters which are probably as important as the intellectual content acquired from textbooks in the so-called standard subjects. (p. 175)

Delaware County, Indiana, becomes the study focus, as Richmond, Indiana, had been the focus of "A City School as a Community Art and Musical Center" (1911a). Bobbitt cites six, graded consolidated schools in Delaware County

having four to eight teachers each, vs. 34 one-teacher rural schools--both on a 140 school day year. Though Bobbitt notes that the consolidated schools' students averaged 111.1 days vs. 107.1 for the rurally matched locations, only a 3% average difference, he rationalizes. Acknowledging that a complete breakdown of the statistics showed that rural schools actually had better attendance figures in the early grades, Bobbitt excuses the totals and displays his theory bias. Commenting on statistics that showed attendance in the consolidated schools demonstrated an 8 to 12 percent gain over the rural schools, Bobbitt (1911b) philosophically intones: "If this is the case, this means a double gain in favor of the consolidated school for the grammar grades. This is significant since one's education for adulthood scarcely begins before the seventh grade" (p. 170).

Bobbitt had heard this doctrine from W. E. Bryan and has copied it. Though he makes allowances for art and music in "A City School as a Community Art and Music Center," (1911a), his "education for adults only" doctrine begins in this article. When Bobbitt researched "Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School" (1911b), he found and used another factor other than basic attendance. Both the consolidated and rural schools used a common examination prepared and corrected by the Indiana State Superintendent of Education. The results showed consolidated schools demonstrated a 73.8% pass rate; rural schools, 73.2%. Further, the rural schools showed a 2.6% advantage over

their consolidated matches between 81% and 100% (Bobbitt, 1911b, p. 171). Disregarding the facts, Bobbitt (1911b) defends this conflict: "If more extended studies should arrive at the same results, many of the more substantial claims of the defenders of the movement [for rural schools] would be nullified" (p. 172).

Instead of relying on the data given for his article, Bobbitt (1911b) suggests dicta from a higher authority:

Thus it is urged, for example, in the Report of the Commissioner of Education of Ohio for 1908 that, among other things, consolidation insures a much better average daily attendance, and greatly reduces the cases of tardiness, gives an opportunity for better classification of the schools and grading of pupils; encourages supervision; limits the field of the teacher's work and thus permits better preparation; given few classes to each teacher and longer recitation periods; and secures better teachers. (pp. 172-173)

Bobbitt says this, even though he admits the figures for this article, as well as comparative facts and figures from a "progressive" (rural) and a "conservative" (consolidated) superintendent, prove the exact reverse.

As do many experts who want not to believe facts and figures that run contrary to their inherent and/or expressed beliefs, Bobbitt reasons why the Delaware County experiment had explicit flaws, and why the conversation he had with the two superintendents had implicit flaws. To begin, Bobbitt

(1911b) contends testing factors: "The examinations referred to above are drawn up to meet the needs of ungraded schools and fail to measure many of the most important results secured by graded schools" (p. 174). Paradoxically and conjecturally, he justifies consolidated schools' more effective teaching:

In the latter [consolidated schools] there is 30 to 40 percent more time given to recitation, discussion, shop and field work under the teacher's immediate direction. . . . And yet, the examinations may be so designed that the extra results do not reveal themselves in the percentages received in the textbook subjects. (Bobbitt, 1911b, p. 174)

Either Bobbitt feels that the common examination should be challenged, or else he feels the subjects that the consolidated schools taught should be tested more fully. Just as big businesses progressed with continued growth and prosperity on a mass scale, Bobbitt believes in the fiscal savings that bigger, consolidated schools can deliver. In the next article he writes, "The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912), Bobbitt makes even clearer his bias regarding bigger schools.

Testing procedures, one form of students' accountability, take two divergent paths in Bobbitt's concluding paragraphs in "Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School" (1911b). The author states that consolidated schools can teach many more subjects with a widely

differentiated teaching staff. However, he uses a curious example to prove his point. Suggesting that both consolidated and rural schools should teach science and agriculture as subjects, Bobbitt (1911b) points out:

In order that the teachers have the necessary vocational attitude of mind, there must be a man for the one subject and a woman for the other. While a young lady teacher in an ungraded school might teach textbook agriculture in such a way as to enable her pupils to pass the state examination in proper form, yet the actual results would undoubtedly be far inferior to those secured by a special teacher of agriculture in a consolidated school. The situation would be just reversed in the case of the teaching of household science. (p. 174)

Bobbitt has changed inexplicably from subject matter and testing documents to sexism. How the results he mentions could have any bearing on his research remains a mystery. Saying that agriculture and science have differentiations in theory and practice as a method of criticizing rural schools' superior teaching effectiveness is not logical. Bobbitt approaches a wider area of concern, however, the removal of gainless or profitless school expenditures. His "The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912) uses much of the spirit and intent of "Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School" (1911b). The former article also prefaces much of his mid-career work, the efficiency

dogma that indelibly stamps him a very conservative essentialist.

"The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912)

"The Elimination of Waste in Education" appeared in the February, 1912, edition of Elementary School Journal. It becomes important for two reasons. The first is that this document, and the following "Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City-School Systems" (1913a), highlight Bobbitt's initial period of scientific work and scholarship. That period, "Stage I--Indoctrinations," includes his formative years, college and graduate work, the Philippines assignment, as well as the publication of A First Book in English (1904), "Practical Eugenics (1909b), "A City School as a Community Art and Musical Center" (1911a), and "The Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School" (1911b). Only two smaller articles occur before Bobbitt's second stage. The second reason for the article's importance is that it signals the transition of much of the work that the author does in Stage II--"Survey and Curriculum Science." That middle period begins with the school surveys Bobbitt does for several large, urban school districts, and that survey motif made and set patterns regarding his economic and curricular accountability motif--subject, teacher, and administrator costs for services rendered. The author's business approach and resultant scientism blends into what he terms

"functionalism," the students pursuit of the school-apprenticed "good life." "Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912) portends much in Bobbitt's career.

Where Richmond, Indiana, had been the site of "A City School as a Community Art and Musical Center" (1911a), and Delaware County, Indiana, was the site for the previous "The Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School" (1911b), Gary, Indiana, becomes the site of "The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912). That city is important for more than its geographical location. U.S. Steel Corporation and major railroad facilities dot much of Gary. Its rapid rise in population just before, and especially during the time Bobbitt wrote, witnessed the Industrial Revolution's growth and ferment. Bobbitt (1912) records, even though many students came to Gary schools in 1911-1912, "The [school] population consists for the most part of immigrant foreign laborers, possessing but little taxable property" (p. 259). Additionally, Bobbitt suggests U.S. Steel would contribute no immediate financial help. Any new plant, he explains, enjoyed "undervalued" status in "start-up" years. He blames Indiana's antiquated money distribution policies for the lack of any fiscal equation or stability.

Gary, Indiana, was a prototypical U.S. public education dilemma. Gary, much like schools all over the United States during the early Twentieth Century, faced a burgeoning immigrant flux. Those new citizens, of course, sent their children to school. Cities had a choice: either continue

inferior classroom structures, allow for differentiated days and maximum class sizes, or create a state-of-the art school system with all the academic accouterments and conveniences necessary. Bobbitt acknowledges that logic and the country's good necessitate the latter. In order to have the best possible school plant, Gary must "operate it according to recently developed principles of scientific management so as to get a maximum of service from a school plant and teaching staff of minimum size" (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 260). Bobbitt describes the compatibility between business management practices and schools: "And when the educational engineer appeared and showed how it was possible to introduce similar principles of management into the operation of the school plant, his words fell upon understanding ears" (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 260). They fell on Bobbitt's understanding ears, as well. Gary schools adopted the four-point plan for their schools, and Bobbitt adopted the business philosophy for a whole career.

"The first principle of scientific management is to use all the plant all the available time" (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 260). What Bobbitt means is that any business or industry plant uses its collective facilities to capacity. Using the word "plant" for school, indicative of how he symbolically viewed school, Bobbitt says that plants only operate at 50% of their capacity and that the engineers' job is to make that figure 100%. He asked selected Gary engineers to draw up a school usage plan. Methodically, the

engineers worked up a schedule for eight classes in only four rooms. While one class used the classroom, the other three occupied either the physical education field, workrooms, or laboratories. Classroom activities themselves consisted of "regular" studies. The regular studies entailed mathematics, geography, and language study (reading, writing, spelling, and composition), while the "special" activities consisted of drawing, literature, manual activities, music, nature study, and play--a half day each, with 90 minute periods (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 260).

The narrating educational engineer, who I suspect is Bobbitt, reasons that all work is on a six-hour day, and if six is good, then "more is better." Further, using the Indiana State Superintendent's Bluffton School, a year-round "model," Bobbitt (1912) muses: "That an expensive plant should lie idle during all of Saturday and Sunday while 'street and alley time' is undoing the good work of the schools is a further thorn in the flesh of the clear-sighted educational engineer" (p. 263). Bobbitt demonstrates again his passion for the Calvinistic ("thorn in the flesh") and Social Darwinism ("idle") terms, intertwined terms that flow through his early work often, and resound in these four principles.

"A second principle of scientific management is to reduce the number of workers to a minimum by keeping each at the maximum of his working efficiency" (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 264). Teacher differentiation becomes the watchword for

this second principle. As opposed to the generalists of the old "academic" system, the new one features specialists: "Both regular and special teachers can be experts in their particular fields, requiring no supervisors other than the regular building principals and the city school superintendent" (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 264). The author believes the resulting division of labor will help students and teachers alike, and not undermine their "physical vitality and mental integrity" (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 266). In addition, Bobbitt writes strongly about homework. Students should have much; teachers, none: "Teachers are expected to live like other people, and when their day's work is done to leave it behind them as completely as other 'classes of workers'" (emphasis added) (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 265). Though Bobbitt does want the best for his teacher "class," he sees their job as just that--a job. Their efficiency follows the training module he underscores as the important task of schools.

Reducing workers to a bare minimum precedes the next maxim: "A third principle of efficient management is to eliminate waste" (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 266). In order to avoid the pitfalls of "retardation," (lack of progress) sickness, lack of energy, or "street troubles," the author offers a prescription. The first pitfall, "retardation," might utilize tutoring, Saturday classes, or double scheduling difficult classes. Health problems and lowered vitality find answers by scheduling diseased students in special

classes until they heal. The last, bad peer influence after school, the author answers in two ways. First, he advocates either lengthening the school day, adding more free-time play from the school, or promoting the good use of Saturday time for leisure, sports, and study (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 267). Second, Bobbitt encourages the use of the city's parks and the schools as a positive partnership. He envisions students with free time constructively enjoying the city's parks and other resources. As an addendum, Bobbitt encourages the Gary system to construct a "Boys Town," a voluntary country residential, work, and school center for abused youths. Students could work there for pay and that remuneration could help defray room, board, and schooling expenses.

Last, Bobbitt (1912) addresses the students and the entire Gary, Indiana, school system: "Educate the individual according to his capabilities" (p. 269). The capabilities definition becomes the key:

This [the students' education] requires that the materials of the curriculum be sufficiently various to meet the needs of every class of individuals in the community; and that the course of training and study be sufficiently flexible that the individual can be given just the things that he needs. (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 269)

If the students have open choices for their curriculum and eventual way of life, then strengthening and supplementing the curriculum with "needs" might not have negative

connotations. However, Social Darwinism enters Bobbitt's comments (1912):

If an individual is of the motor type of mind, with his interest lying in the field of manual industry, with neither tastes nor ability for abstract intellection--the type that is prematurely forced out of our schools uneducated and unprepared for his share of the world's work--he can be given a maximum of work in the special activities and a minimum in the academic studies. (pp. 269-270)

On the other hand, if the student has what Bobbitt (1912) defines as an "intellectualistic type of mind" (p. 270), then academia gains emphasis and impetus.

At this article's conclusion, in reference to the necessity for men and women teachers, Bobbitt suggests that masculine and feminine leadership roles warrant study. However, inexplicably, he notes: "Cries of calamity have been arising rather numerously of late on account of the disappearance of men from the profession" (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 271). His response to the implicit question is shocking, though believable, especially in light of his similar words in "Practical Eugenics" (1909b) and "Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School" (1911b):

But as long as school activities consist of little more than academic matters to be poured into the heads of pupils, a task that can usually be better performed and almost always more gladly performed by women teachers,

these Jeremiahs are not likely to accomplish the desired results. (Bobbitt, 1912, p. 271)

Not only does Bobbitt interrupt his own narrative, how to eliminate "waste" in schools, he denigrates the teaching profession. The lay public often had and have misgivings or doubts regarding teachers' efficacy. When a curriculum professor, especially one with the growing visibility of Bobbitt, reduces teaching to women pouring materials into youngsters heads, negative impressions abound. He expands his opinions for his following contribution to the NSSE's Twelfth Yearbook (1913a).

"Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City-School Systems" (1913a)

If "How to Eliminate Waste in Education" (1912) marks a philosophical highlight in Bobbitt's career, "Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City School Systems" (1913a) adds further scientific management markers. It became a chapter within "The Supervision of City Schools," Part I of the NSSE's Twelfth Yearbook (1913). This long and involved piece has two distinct sections. The first, "Introduction," gives the author an opportunity to explain his own education-related precepts, feelings, and involvement. The Second, "Standards," presents a list of eight principles Bobbitt uses to explain or expand "scientific" school management.

The "Introduction" exemplifies Bobbitt's direct and precise writing style. He wastes no time defining administrators' organizational operatives:

They [administrators] must co-ordinate the labors of all so as to attain those ends. They must find the best methods of work, and they must enforce the use of these methods on the part of the workers. They must determine the qualifications necessary for the workers and see that each rises to the standard qualifications, if it is possible; and when impossible, see that he is separated from the organization. (Bobbitt, 1913a, p. 7)

Both workers and their supervisors need training techniques before, during, and after any service, maintains the author.

The use of the word "service" itself explains much.

Bobbitt's service connotes business. As well, business connotes the efficient use of set principles: "The principles appear to be most clearly conceived and to have been most fully and completely worked out by central portions of the industrial and business world" (Bobbitt, 1913a, p. 7). Further, the "central portions" are two specific business ventures, which must lead education's pursuit of accountability: "Certain railroads and manufacturing corporations have gone farther in this direction than government, or philanthropy, or education, or any of the less materialistic institutions" (Bobbitt, 1913a, p. 7). Education, comments Bobbitt (1913a), must learn to learn from industry:

Educational workers can, therefore, perhaps see the nature of some of these principles of supervision rather more clearly from observing their application in other fields of human labor, partly because they have been more completely developed and applied in those fields, and partly because they can be viewed in a more objective and impersonal manner. (p. 7)

Future uses of the principles become just as important as any immediate or short-term gains, implores Bobbitt (1913a):

While some of the matters discussed may therefore be impracticable for actual supervision at present, or in the immediate future, they are presented with a belief that they are highly practical for the investigations that lie just ahead of us, on the basis of which we can bring about such forms of scientific supervision and control in the educational world as already exist within certain other institutions. (p. 9)

Bobbitt suggests that a practical handbook regarding school management should evolve; however, "progressive" school leaders have hindered that progress by their constant and varied "demands" (emphasis added). Nevertheless, Bobbitt (1913a) hopes this document's completion will focus science-in-education planning structures: "I am unable to conceive of any more practical labor that could be undertaken by the educational world than the definite drawing-up of systematic forward-looking plans on which our constructive labors might be based" (p. 10).

Having issued his rationale and plea for educational scientific management, Bobbitt develops his various principles. Principles I and II aim at quantitative and qualitative standards for any product, and the labor that acts on the product. Bobbitt (1913a) equates industrial products and educational ones: "Education is a shaping process as much as the manufacture of steel rails; the personality is to be shaped and fashioned into desirable forms" (p. 12). Though Bobbitt suggests education is tacitly a more sensitive endeavor than business, he promotes school "shaping" as the academic community's most important "process." To illustrate how strongly he feels about the "shaping," Bobbitt (1913a) digresses into a "potato-growing" analogy:

Of potatoes, the average yield in our country per acre over a series of years is ninety-six bushels. . . . One man in Wyoming averaged for his farm over a thousand bushels to the acre. He had set his standard at one thousand and, having a standard to work toward, controlled conditions accordingly and reached it. It was not superior soil or climate; it was having a high standard on the basis of which to adjust and control all the necessary processes. (p. 13)

Bobbitt (1913a) encourages no scientific research regarding his farming metaphor; he just accepts the Wyoming story and tells educators to "control" their "product" (emphasis added): "Man must set up standards and arbitrarily control

conditions even here in order that, with the aid of the growth process, he may secure the full possible product" (p. 13). Bobbitt (1913a) mentions Curtis' mathematical scales and computations as exemplars of the "product" educators could present the teacher, student, and supervisor (pp. 15-40). Finishing Curtis' work, Bobbitt (1913a) challenges teachers to know more about Thorndike and Hillegas' English composition studies (p. 43). Their work, similar to Curtis' example, relies on measurable, scientific teaching strategies.

Bobbitt's Principle III addresses the methods workers might use to shape their product. Disdaining previously used "trial and error" formats, Bobbitt (1913a) advocates administrator control methods: "The new and revolutionary doctrine of scientific management states in no uncertain terms that the management, the supervisory staff, has the largest share of the work in the determination of proper methods" (p. 52). Teachers' responsibilities diminish: "The burden of finding the best methods is too large and too complicated to be laid on the shoulders of the teachers" (Bobbitt, 1913a, p. 52). Bobbitt maintains that administrators specialize in science; teachers, in practice. Using the Harriman Railway as a model, Bobbitt proposes that administrators employ "general educational principles" to find out what students need, then inform teachers to teach their specific coursework. Bobbitt (1913a) comments: "Science [the administrators' various prescriptions] is the

golden guide-star of practice. Without it there is nothing but a blind groping in the unbounded realm of possibilities" (p. 62).

Principle IV concerns the workers' (teachers') qualifications, and Bobbitt summons another business authority. Instead of a railroad, Bobbitt quotes from a bicycle factory efficiency expert who arranged workers' hours, bicycle parts, and workers' "perception time" and "reaction time" to fashion more productivity. Bobbitt suggests that administrators interview various successful teachers to determine their outstanding characteristics. To implement the characteristics' instrument, Bobbitt (1913a) contrives an elaborate "score card" with which to predict teaching "success" (emphasis added). That "score card" includes categories of physical, moral, administrative, dynamic, projected, achieved, and social efficiencies (pp. 68-69). Bobbitt (1913a) justifies such quantification: "Our profession must advance along the same road as that already traversed by the best of the industrial world before we shall be able to place our workers with the same efficiency, justice, and certainty" (p. 70). Factory/school training has become a most important Bobbitt staple. It remains so. Inter-office memos I have gathered between Bobbitt and other University of Chicago faculty and staff indicate that he (Bobbitt) relied on actual businesses to "train" (emphasis added) his teacher candidates the theory and practice of accountability.

Principle V addresses the need for proper training institutions and methods. Bobbitt acknowledges the various certificates and degrees that teachers can obtain, as well as how those certificates' theory and practice can vary. Inexplicably, he refers to a Scottish plan regarding the proper choice their candidates pursue: "The various boards of control consist of men who represent the various educational organizations that are to receive the products of the teachers' training institutions. They are not merely advisory; they are directive" (Bobbitt, 1913a, p. 77). Bobbitt admits that the lack of standards and agreed-upon methods cloud such U.S. boards. However, he relies on individual city-school systems and their administrator-led discussions to pre-determine teachers' qualifications and certifications.

Principle VI maintains that teachers need to achieve professional progress, and their administrators should help them by providing continuing education possibilities. As well, the administrators also provide sufficient incentives, both financial and guidance-leadership types (Bobbitt, 1913a, pp. 79-80). Principle VII complements its predecessor. The administrator, says Bobbitt (1913a), regularly must infuse teachers with information: "The worker [teacher] must be kept supplied with detailed instructions as to the work to be done, the standards to be reached, the methods to be employed, and the appliances to be used" (p. 89). Bobbitt (1913a) issues a "functional"

analogy where various "foremen," using their "planning rooms" and "shops," can "demonstrate" (emphasis added) various teaching strategies for teachers (1913a, pp. 90-91). His rationale is science-motivated: "We have gone into a discussion of the 'functional' method thus fully because it offers so many suggestions for the scientific direction of education" (Bobbitt, 1913a, p. 92).

Principle VIII Bobbitt (1913a) leaves open-ended: "It is a function of the management to discover and to supply the tools and appliances that are the most effective for the work in hand" (p. 95). Bobbitt believes scientific school management should employ business management techniques. Those Frederick Taylor-like techniques require shaping of a product, selling that product, and making a profit (Callahan, 1962, pp. 79-81). With "Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City Schools Systems" (1913a) echoing "How to Avoid Waste in Education" (1912), Bobbitt elevates his status from a regional figure to a national one (Callahan, 1962, pp. 123-125). His scientific management strategies regarding education gain him popularity with business leaders and school administrators.

"Literature in the Elementary Curriculum" (1913b)

"Literature in the Elementary Curriculum," written by Bobbitt in cooperation with A. C. Boyce and M. L. Perkins for the December, 1913, edition of Elementary School

Journal, is an important piece. This article acts as penultimate piece to Stage I--"Indoctrinations," the period that includes Bobbitt's early personal and professional influences, his initial jobs, and his formative publications. "Literature in the Elementary Curriculum" (1913b) also previews Bobbitt's Stage II--"Survey and Curriculum Science." Because "Literature in the Elementary Curriculum" (1913b) uses preliminary thoughts from his survey methodology, the article does foreshadow the four major surveys Bobbitt conducts (South Bend, Indiana, 1914; San Antonio, Texas, 1915; Denver, Colorado, 1916; and, St. Louis, Missouri, 1917). Bobbitt finished the Los Angeles, California, survey in 1922, though I have treated that work separately as a complement to his major texts The Curriculum (1918c) and How to Make a Curriculum (1924f).

The article, "Literature in the Elementary Curriculum," begins rhetorically: "In what school grade should any given piece of literature be read?" (Bobbitt, 1913b, p. 158). The answer returns in the author's utilitarian voice: "Obviously, it ought to be used in that grade where, as shown by practical experience, it works best" (Bobbitt, 1913b, p. 158). Science becomes the means to find the correct matching of literature assignment and grade level. Science also manifests itself in the form of the teachers' actual survey instrument. Bobbitt uses whole cities as references for their "right and correct" curriculum needs.

His premise in "Literature in the Elementary Curriculum" (1913b) reflects his "right and correct" motif.

Since teachers deal with literature daily in their respective classrooms, a wholesale survey of their favorites might help other English teachers find the "right and correct" English texts. The author surveyed 36 school districts in Boston, Cincinnati, Detroit, Minneapolis, New York City, San Francisco, Tacoma, and Washington, DC. From those 36 districts, he got 183 titles from 50 grades, one through eight, recommended four or more times. Bobbitt (1913b) included any work mentioned 20 or more times:

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
1	(Grimms) <u>Fairy Tales</u>	16
2	<u>Hiawatha</u>	27
3	<u>Seven Little Sisters</u>	23
4	<u>Fifty Famous Stories Retold</u>	30
	<u>Robinson Crusoe</u>	29
	(Andersen's) <u>Fairy Tales</u>	28
	<u>Alice in Wonderland</u>	27
	<u>Old Greek Stories</u>	24
	<u>Birds' Christmas Carol</u>	23
	<u>Adventures of a Brownie</u>	21
	(Aesop's) <u>Fables</u>	18
5	<u>Black Beauty</u>	31
	<u>King of the Golden River</u>	30
	<u>Wonder Book</u>	27
	<u>Swiss Family Robinson</u>	23

	<u>Tanglewood Tales</u>	22
	<u>Jungle Books</u>	20
6	<u>Arabian Nights</u>	22
	<u>Hans Brinker</u>	19
7	<u>Tales From Shakespeare</u>	28
	<u>Christmas Carol</u>	25
	<u>Snow-Bound</u>	24
	<u>Miles Standish</u>	23
	<u>Evangeline</u>	23
8	<u>The Man Without a Country</u>	30
	<u>Scott</u>	20

(p. 159)

The article pretends and portends nothing more than the above, i.e., a reading list teachers might use; however, I add two items. First, this list becomes the sum and substance which What the Schools Might Teach (1915c) defines. Bobbitt's first survey work begins with this article, defines city survey work, and later, with more explanation, becomes the above text. Second, Bobbitt reacted strongly against Charles Eliot's academic approach advocating textbook-only learning and recitation.

Ironically, though, more than 70% of the texts that Bobbitt solicited from the teachers in the 36 important and substantial school districts appear on the Committee of Ten's approved-reading list. Bobbitt's surveys that follow in this thesis often ask industry or big business to give education direction. Bobbitt criticized Eliot and lauded

industry, and I attribute this partially to his discovery of and reliance on Frederick Taylor's "scientific management" (cf. Seguel, 1964, p. 112, for a fuller treatment of this subject). Especially does early Stage I of Bobbitt's career find him devoted to Taylor's doctrines that encompassed certainty, accountability, and preciseness. Those doctrines were the paramount factors in the industrial revolution's planning, framework, and ascendancy. The certainty, accountability and preciseness that various literature samples have in this article mirror the status quo place held by the teachers who responded to the survey. The long and involved surveys that follow also reinforce the status quo position of schools-as-factory Bobbitt advocates, as well as the position of "High School Costs" (1915a).

"High School Costs" (1915a)

The last article in Stage I-"Indoctrinations" occurs in October, 1915, in The School Review. Though his first survey, South Bend, Indiana, comes before the actual publication date of "High School Costs," I have included the latter work here to keep the surveys together. The title suggests kinship with "The Elimination of Waste in Education" written just a couple of years before (1912). Both articles share the common bond of efficiency and accountability that the author proclaims throughout most of his career.

Once again, as is the case of most Bobbitt's writing, his style, topic presentation, and tone is precise, direct, and devoid of any frills. He begins: "Accurate cost-accounting lies at the foundation of all successful business management" (Bobbitt, 1915a, p. 505). Bobbitt extols the Industrial Revolution's chief symbol, the railroads, as an educational password. Railroad costs average \$.06 per mile, oil, \$.18 per hundred miles, and the author wonders how educational costs might also be rated:

If English can be had for fifty dollars per thousand student-hours, and that this price represents the norm of practice, then those responsible for high-school management have a standard of adjustment that can be used for measuring the efficiency of their practices.

(Bobbitt, 1915a, p. 506)

Instead of demonstrating more English costs, however, Bobbitt (1915a) surveyed 25 high schools, and showed the cost per 1,000 student hours in the following list:

<u>School</u>	<u>Cost per 1,000 students</u>
University High [no address]	\$169.00
Mishawaka, Ind.	112.00
Elgin, Ill.	100.00
Maple Lake, Minn.	100.00
Granite City, Ill.	88.00
<u>East Chicago, Ind.</u>	82.00
DeKalb, Ill.	74.00
San Antonio, Tex.	69.00

Harvey, Ill.	69.00
Waukegan, Ill.	63.00
South Bend, Ind.	62.00
East Aurora, Ill.	61.00
Rockford, Ill.	59.00
Booneville, Mo.	58.00
Brazil, Ind.	56.00
Leavenworth, Kan.	56.00
Greensburg, Ind.	54.00
Morgan Park, Ill.	53.00
<u>Noblesville, Ind.</u>	52.00
Norfolk, Neb.	42.00
Washington, Mo.	41.00
Bonner Springs, Kan.	38.00
Russell, Kan.	34.00
Junction City, Kan.	33.00
Mt. Carroll, Ill.	30.00 (p. 508)

Bobbitt recalls each school has a reputation for sending its students to college, yet University High spends five times what Mt. Carroll, Illinois, does. Though he does not repudiate the former's extravagance, nor advocate the latter's parsimony, he honors a fiscal "zone of safety" (Bobbitt, 1915a, p. 508). That "zone of safety" encompasses East Chicago, Indiana, through Noblesville, Indiana. Other schools not included in the zone fail their students and Bobbitt's scientific formula. The author's unexplained mathematical formula dictates which schools do an

academically meritorious job and which ones do not. He does not observe or explain any other mitigating factors. If this article accomplishes nothing else, it shows Bobbitt's confidence in mathematical techniques, demonstrates his reliance on factory-like accountability tactics, and previews and forecasts his next genre, the school surveys.

Stage I Summary

All articles in this first stage demonstrate Bobbitt's conservative approach to education. A First Book in Education (1904), the author's ESL text, is dogmatic and sexist. No student dialogue appears; Bobbitt records only teacher and administrator input. As well, "Growth of Philippine Children," (1909a) a dissertation article, is pure science in education. Expected from his graduate professors, this piece measures and calculates selected Philippine children's physical characteristics.

"Practical Eugenics" (1909b) advances Bobbitt's science reliance, as well as his Clark University influences. Bobbitt gleaned selected portions of W. H. Burnham's ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny doctrine and G. S. Hall's Darwinism. Using both influences, Bobbitt dwells on the "well born" and how they must be cultivated. Bobbitt opposes the "marred stock," and suggests thoughtfully watching or "culling" them. "A City School as a Community Art and Musical Center" (1911a) and "Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School" (1911b) address various student achievements in specific Indiana locales, but always in the guise of "savage vs. civilized." Both articles also note the school efficiency mode and method which Bobbitt would build most of his career. "Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problem of City Schools" (1913a) features eight principles Bobbitt set for "efficient" schools. This work (1913a), coupled with "How to Eliminate

Waste in Education" (1912) promote business-like procedures for U.S. public schools. Their acceptance by both school and industrial leaders propel Bobbitt into a national curriculum figure.

"Literature in the Elementary Curriculum" (1913b) provides Bobbitt a chance to survey teachers to find out what books they use, and he does this to recommend the books to others. That more than two-thirds of them had Committee of Ten recommendation, Bobbitt does not discuss. Promoting reading, of course, is excellent; however, promoting the "right" (emphasis added) books, often is not. The survey technique itself, however, becomes an entire genre in his mid-career stage. "The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912) and "High School Costs" (1915a) compare fiscal reporting means with public school pedagogy. Both articles are antecedents to the survey genre that dominates Stage II --"Survey and Curriculum Science."

Bobbitt demonstrates the rigid accountability tenor of his times in Stage I--"Indoctrinations." That accountability in Bobbitt's whole first stage is rife with the two "elect" (emphasis added) doctrines. Those two doctrines Bobbitt struggles with during his entire career: Doctrine of the Elect, and Doctrine of the Secular Elect.

CHAPTER IV

BOBBITT'S STAGE II--"SURVEY AND CURRICULUM SCIENCE"

Overview

The second period that I propose John Franklin Bobbitt went through, which I term "Survey and Curriculum Science," encompasses not only many articles and surveys, but also three texts, beginning with Bobbitt's What the Schools Teach and Might Teach (1915c), including The Curriculum (1918c), and concluding with How to Make A Curriculum (1924f). During this nine-year time span, Bobbitt thinks and writes under two distinct influences. The first reflects his early religious training with his grandfather and father, as well as his relentless, religious diligence to schoolwork as a student and teacher. The second mirrors his academic and philosophic influences, i.e., the Lockian and Darwinian portends of the Industrial Revolution, as well as the professorial weight the Drs. Bryan (Indiana University), and Hall and Burnham (Clark University) manifested.

At the close of this second stage, Bobbitt almost inexplicably changes his essentialistic, scientific curriculum-building in the important National Society for

the Study of Education's Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook (1926a). In that document, as DeWulf (1962), Kliebard (1967, 1975, and 1986), and Jackson (1975) have noted, Bobbitt apparently changed the whole direction that his essentialistic philosophy had followed. His position in the Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook becomes a Dewey-like one. He suddenly maintains that education is not for adult life, as he had so often said prior, but rather for the young, and that curriculum studies should reflect student concerns.

By the time Bobbitt had begun to write in Stage II, "The Essential Curriculum Science," he had returned from his Philippine teaching assignment. He had taken employment at the University of Chicago in 1901, and had begun his professorial ascent. His division chairman, Charles Rugg, was a Thorndike behaviorism advocate, though the former did not completely comply with that philosophy (cf. Tanner and Tanner, 1990, pp. 10-11, and 197-199, for a discussion of this topic). Rugg's influence, as DeWulf notes, included a more behavioristic management style, utilizing methods of the Industrial Revolution "boss" and the stimulus-response "scientist" (emphasis added) (DeWulf, 1962, p. 93). DeWulf also notes Bobbitt's daily regimen, rising at 5:30 in the mornings, performing a full day's work, and retiring early for the next day's routine. His spartan work ethic served as a model for discipline and (academic) detail.

The young Benjamin Franklin-like scholar/professor began to read, study, and mimic Frederick Taylor. Taylor,

of course, had become the paragon of business discipline and economy. Bobbitt championed the business communities, and he accepted and believed that Taylor's writing or any tradesman's agenda was an educational template. Judd's influence did not deter him from supporting Taylor. Beside Taylor's influence, much of Bobbitt's writing during 1915-1924 sprang from his own strong religious training, as well as the Social Darwinism he encountered, his Philippines experiences, and his Clark University training. His publications mirror these societal and intellectual forces.

Publications

"The School Survey: Finding Standards of Current Practice With Which to Measure One's Own Schools" (1914a)

The article, "The School Survey: Finding Standards of Current Practice With Which to Measure One's Own Schools," in the September, 1914, issue of Elementary School Journal, provides philosophical and empirical rationale for Bobbitt's survey genre. Actual surveys Bobbitt conducted in South Bend, Indiana, San Antonio, Texas, Cleveland, Illinois, Denver, Colorado, and St. Louis, Missouri, provide a platform Bobbitt plied well. He used surveys to illustrate that curriculum writers and constructors need to go out into the field, collect data, and report educational research scientifically. Bobbitt had learned the survey technique from Professor W. L. Bryan at Indiana University

(1895, pp. 414-415, and 1938, pp. 11-12), and Professor W. H. Burnham at Clark University (1903, pp. 240-244). Bobbitt used various school data to propel science-in-education philosophy into his essentialist doctrine. That doctrine changed radically when he wrote for the NEA's 1924 Annual Yearbook (Kliebard, 1986, p. 182).

"The South Bend Public Schools: A Survey
by the Department of Education at the
University of Chicago" (1914b)

Early in the South Bend, Indiana, Survey, Bobbitt suggests public school functions range in a hierarchy of literacy, vocational work, citizenship, physical education, and leisure. DeWulf obtained Bobbitt's copy of Spencer's Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical (1860) and found three underlined sections. One follows: "How to live?--that is the essential question for us. . . . In what way to treat the body; in what way to treat the mind" (DeWulf, 1962, p. 159). Another reads: "It must not suffice simply to think that such or such information will be useful in after life, or that this kind of knowledge is more practical than that" (DeWulf, 1962, p. 159). The third sums: "Our first step must obviously be to classify, in the order of their importance, the leading kinds of activity which constitute human life" (DeWulf, 1962, p. 159). Bobbitt inscribed "life's activities" in the margin and added the following: "1. Health, 2. Vocation,

3. Parenthood, 4. Citizenship, and 5. Recreation" (DeWulf, 1962, p. 159). These five headings match well with the South Bend Survey's table of contents, and the extraordinary attention Bobbitt paid to the vocational section. As well, they appear, in modified format, throughout Bobbitt's later publications. DeWulf suggests that this survey and the 1915 San Antonio's message and content emphasized number 2, Vocation.

At two locations, South Bend and San Antonio, following, Bobbitt accentuated one major question: Is the education a school district proposes one that will meet pupil and community needs? Bobbitt did not provide suggestions or answers to that question. However, he found that the educational systems he surveyed, did not, and could not, under the framework at the time of their undertaking, meet his activity-oriented expectations.

"The San Antonio Public School System" (1915b)

Bobbitt began the San Antonio Survey early in 1915 after the South Bend project's completion. The University of Chicago was on a quarter system during this era. Consequently, Professor Bobbitt (1915b) took a spring quarter sabbatical to go to Texas, where he became a "consulting engineer" (p. 1). His directions were simple: "The one thing desired was an increase in the efficiency of the school system; that I was to study the situation in my own way and to make any recommendation that in my judgment

would promote the efficiency of the school" (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 2). Within four weeks, Bobbitt conducted his survey, including classroom visits, interviews, and consultations, and wrote "efficiency" results and recommendations. His survey included 19 of the 29 San Antonio elementary schools and all three high schools.

Sensitive to the survey work and his own writing style, Bobbitt addresses four potential questions. To begin, regarding his own relatively short stay in San Antonio, he comments: "A ship sailing from Galveston for Australia can not arrive in one day, nor even in one week; but because it can not arrive suddenly is no reason why it should not set out" (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 3). Next, he defends his complicated and technical language: "The trouble is that the field of education is itself complicated and difficult; and any language that shows the field truly must show it for what it is" (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 4). To the problem of whether or not there is too much "expert" interpretation, he answers negatively: "The relative few pages given to things involving such large expenditures of time and money and effort are really inadequate for proper community understanding" (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 3). Last, he comments on his reputation for negative reporting: "My method of treatment actually lends color to this objection, since I usually give a small amount of space to point out the gains that have been made and then a fairly large amount of space in pointing out further gains yet to be accomplished"

(Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 5). In sum, Bobbitt (1915b) identifies positive gains he finds in San Antonio, and emphatically concludes:

Much progress has been made; the schools are in a healthy growing condition; in many respects they are fully abreast with the best work going on in any portion of our country. The city will have to be numbered among the cities of the educationally progressive type. (p. 5)

Bobbitt (1915b) believes in his own work, the work of the schools, and improvements that will lead schools, communities, and businesses to democratic good:

Neither the laymen nor the teachers of San Antonio need feel in the slightest chagrined at having the defects, --or I would call them, the needs of further growth,-- pointed out in this report. (p. 6)

Progress in this survey, for Bobbitt, connects the San Antonio schools' "searching self-examination" with personnel "training" (emphasis added).

To train the more than 21,000 students, broken down into 11,461 Americans and Europeans, 8,471 Mexicans, and 2,051 Negroes, with a \$5000.00 per year budget, demands "results," intones Bobbitt (1915b, pp. 7-8). San Antonio, according to Bobbitt, suffered from a vagueness of purpose. To answer that vagueness, the author suggests an educational program "fully rounded" to include the following design:

1. To fit the children and youth for effective performance of the labors of their life's callings.

2. To lay a broad and secure foundation for sound judgement as to the various social, economic, and industrial problems with which one is concerned as a citizen in a democracy.

3. To lay a secure foundation in knowledge and in habits for life-long health and physical vitality.

4. To develop habits of healthy and socially desirable leisure occupations.

5. To give effective training in the means needed for social intercommunication; namely the language or the languages that one actually needs.

6. To train individuals for the activities concerned in the rearing and education of children; or in other words, the functions of parenthood.

7. To train one for his religious activities.

(Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 9)

In order to make these designs come true, Bobbitt (1915b) begins with his soon-to-be familiar schooling concept--young people gain fundamental knowledge from their respective communities:

As one looks at the fields of human vocation, of civic activity, of caring for one's health, one's recreations, etc., it is quite clear that it is through observation and participation on the part of children and youth in the real activities as found in home,

shop, store, club, church, street, etc., that one gets the foundation of all of his training in each of the several fields enumerated. (p. 10)

"Real activities," in which young people participate, allow them to comprehend life's realities, suggests Bobbitt. Once schools know what activities students know or want, the appropriate school personnel can construct respective curricula. Bobbitt (1915b) comments:

The supplementary training by the schools grows more and more necessary, and greater in amount. It cannot be genuine or useful, however, except as it is supplementary to the fundamental training of the world itself, and fitted to the latter as exactly as a house is fitted to its foundation; or as a tree to the roots out of which it grows. (p. 11)

Bobbitt stops short of recommending vocational centers in the public school teaching mainstream. San Antonio students could take what the schools offer--this is the democratic, ethical concept Bobbitt struggles with throughout his entire career. On one hand, he rebels from the purely academic Charles Eliot/Committee of Ten doctrine, where all K-12 students learn all subjects the same way to the same collegiate orientation. On the other, Bobbitt replaces the elitist Eliot doctrine with one that listened and responded to community wishes. Those community wishes, unfortunately, became influenced, often governed, and

sometimes completely dominated by, the Coolidgean dogma that the business of business is business.

Bobbitt frequently reiterates his Fundamental/Preliminary vs. Supplementary/Functional principles. In the final San Antonio report (1915b), he suggests most local educational "inefficiency" had two sources:

1. The supplementary relation of school work to community life in San Antonio had small relation to the courses of study. As a result, there is a considerable quantity of useless and wasteful work. Even when the material is of a kind needed, the failure to build it into the pupil's fundamental experiences, brings much of the teaching to naught. It is feebly learned, loosely held in mind, and quickly forgotten. Also, much needed teaching is left out of fundamental realities.

2. Except for the teaching work of shop, sewing room, kitchen, and commercial department, practically all the work of both elementary and high schools is of the preliminary prefunctional type. The purpose is to give pupils overviews of the general content of history, geography, grammar, physics, etc. This is very necessary, certainly, as part of the work; but the functional half to which this should lead is mostly omitted. The preliminary, too, is over-systematized, over-abstract, too technical, the work too slow and intensive for this stage of progress. In other

words, there is too much time given to preliminary work levels, and not enough for functional training (p. 15).

Bobbitt was not aware that social and political changes, including immigration in San Antonio and the existing minority population there, had influenced the schools. He had separated "Mexicans" and "Negroes" from "Americans" and "Europeans" when he described the San Antonio schools' population. His survey completes his self-fulfilling prophecy that efficient surveys find good in their systems, work for gains, use constructive criticism regarding those gains, and prove their researcher's claims.

His survey (per 1,000 men) listed the manufacturing and mechanical industries as the most prolific (336), followed by trade (226), transportation (129), domestic (120), clerical (69), professional (56), agriculture (32), public service (28), and minerals (4). Bobbitt's similarly conducted women's survey included servants (242), laundresses (215), clothing industry workers (113), sales personnel (71), teachers (54), restaurant workers (54), nurses (40), stenographers (35), bookkeepers (23), housekeepers (14), musicians (14), retail workers (13), telephone operators (12), food services (11), clerks (9), manicurists (6), and workers in the printing industry (5) (1915b, pp. 17-20).

Bobbitt (1915b) strategically places the vocational goal first in the San Antonio Survey, and he rationalizes with a five-pronged "vocational efficiency" description

(p. 21). His efficiency mode corresponds directly to job seeking. First, the student/job aspirant needs to know the "technical sciences" inherent in his labor and how to make practical applications of same. Second, Bobbitt introduces a corporate cooperative-learning mode, maintaining that students must know not only their own work, but also the work of others, becoming better able to identify "good" and "inferior" products. Third, and complementary to the second, workers need to know what their abilities are and the performance management expects from them. The workforce, men and their bosses, intertwine in "a single series of labors" (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 22). Fourth, referring to points two and three, the workers must know their own communities' needs:

Just as the men within a factory need to understand each other as the basis of co-operation, so within society as a whole, the various vocational groups need to recognize the ways in which each group supports the labors of each others group, and thus through effectively serving others most effectively serves itself. (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 23)

Fifth and last, the workers must have high standards.

Bobbitt's single series of labors receives no explicit explanation, neither does the "high standards" phrase, though the Doctrine of the Secular Elect does: "The man who wants little will do little. The man who wants much will do much" (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 24). The San Antonio Survey comes

early in Bobbitt's career, yet it is an important document and statement. Bobbitt's overall high school curricula assessment not only informs the reader evidently how racist/sexist the times were, but also points out the lack of compassion he and others had, especially for women and minority students.

His affirmation of the San Antonio Schools' vocational position for those two groups provides a good illustration of his biases:

In the variety of occupations already introduced in some degree, in the practical quality of the work, and even more in the general spirit and purposes actuating those in charge, the city has taken a very advanced position. (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 26)

That "advanced position" for women included domestic orientations: "For the first of the regular courses, sewing begins in the sixth grade and continues to the end of the high school; cooking is given to all grades beginning with eighth" (Bobbitt 1915b, p. 27). For minority men and women, Social Darwinism tenets apply:

In the vocational and Negro schools it is given in a larger amount of time and begins earlier in the grades. . . . In the vocational and colored schools, sewing and cooking begin as early as the third and fourth grades. At the new Negro high school the city is introducing gardening, poultry raising, horticulture, floriculture, bench work with wood, iron

work, forging, automobile operation and repair, cement construction, sewing, cooking, laundry work, manicuring and hair dressing, and a course in cooking and catering for Negro boys. (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 27)

Bobbitt (1915b) mirrors his age's thoughts regarding progressive womens' and minorities' positions: "Not many of our progressive cities can provide a longer list" (p. 27). Regarding that pre-selected list, he was right. Bobbitt (1915b) identifies three defects the San Antonio school system needs to improve:

1. Arrange the subjects so that they have more utilitarian benefit to the students and industry and/or vocations in general.

2. Prepare more supplemental activities in the classroom itself to complement the fundamental ones they bring to classes.

3. Bring more technical information regarding mathematics, science, drawing, design, etc. to help students prepare for jobs (pp. 27-28).

The author concentrates his San Antonio Survey approach to these three items and how they might fit into academia, not to children:

In a later section we shall point out what history, geography, general reading, civics, etc., ought to be taught by way of taking care of this great national vocational need; and how these subjects now fall short of their high mission because of their dealing so much

of the time with mere erudition and pedantic trivialities. (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 23)

At this stage in Bobbitt's career, I conclude, the "mere erudition and pedantic trivialities" were the Eliot Committee of Ten's dictates. Unfortunately, in their place, Bobbitt proposes an activities curriculum that augmented, supplemented, and propagated the school in a "factory" (emphasis added) metaphor. He advocates schools serve industry as trainers. My research indicates Bobbitt was a quiet, well-meaning man, as well as a diligent professor. He vacillated during his career regarding the place of the student and the mission of the school. Though he experimented and sometimes felt that students' rights and lives should benefit from schooling, he always concluded that authority, dogma, and tradition must prevail over student empowerment.

Democracy occurred, Bobbitt felt, if students studied their lessons, took their place in society, and lived the "good life"--as adults. What Bobbitt construed as democracy meant students listening, learning, and then working for the common good, not schools providing democratic experiences youngsters could discover and emulate. In the San Antonio Survey, for example, he comments:

One of our great captains of industry, testifying before this Commission a few weeks ago said: "I favor the democratization of industry absolutely, and whatever intelligent legislation may be directed to

that end. The industrial worker does not want merely an increase in wages. He wants something more-- something higher." And he will get these things. He should have them. . . . But legislation can not accomplish all this alone. There must be co-operation of the employer, the employed, and the public spirited citizen. (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 23)

The cooperation Bobbitt alludes to comes from citizens and the schools. If the schools do their part, that is, if they diligently "train" (emphasis added) students to take their place in industrial society, industries benefit, as do citizens--fiscally. This democracy, I propose, was the one that Bobbitt recognizes, writes, and (philosophically) constructs throughout his career.

Bobbitt's prescription for any San Antonio improvement is elementary--he wants appropriate jobs for appropriate students. He begins with the academic curriculum already in place, i.e., the disciplines such as English, geography, history, mathematics, and science, placing each in vocational settings. Regarding history, for example, Bobbitt (1915b) says: "No history should be taught except that which can be seen to have a purpose" (p. 141). Once the purpose has been set, the job orientation follows:

The purpose would be to give one an understanding of the things with which men have to do in this present age; commerce, railroads, manufacturing, city-building, sanitation, literature, agriculture, trade unions,

religion, taxation, tuberculosis, insurance, public utilities, quarantine, political states, music, art, political parties, etc. (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 141)

The San Antonio community, he urges, should conduct their own surveys, rather than depend on the present ancient, medieval, and modern European history formats (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 145). He devises a plan measuring how long the average student reads a set amount of pages. The superintendent must discuss and process this plan throughout the community. Conspicuously, teachers would not assist or help with this task: "This is not in criticism of the ability of the teachers. They impress one as distinctly capable. Simply, they are using a wrong plan and lack necessary material helps (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 146). This plan's conclusion portends a more practical education. He indicts the Committee of Ten's outdated contention that college and universities were the highest formats of education: "There is a good deal of medievalism yet in the college field, but I can see no reason why the businessmen of San Antonio should pay their much-needed money for the continued support of college medievalism" (Bobbitt, 1915b, p. 146).

Materials for teaching take primary importance in Bobbitt's hierarchy (1915b), away from the "medievalism":

Let the city economize on buildings, on furniture and material equipment; on abbreviation of the course of study so that children can finish somewhat earlier and

thus the city needs fewer class-rooms [sic] and fewer teachers for a given number of pupils; but let them not economize on the indispensable materials of instruction. (p. 147)

For Bobbitt, materials of instruction represent the practical and indispensable. What he deems even more practical and indispensable are overall fiscal matters. Accountability measures in the San Antonio Survey, as in all his surveys, articles, speeches, and texts become paramount to Bobbitt's educational scheme. For this San Antonio work, the author groups money matters, spending, and efficiency into one entity. Bobbitt quantifies every possible expenditure, and urges the San Antonio people to project fiscally where they want to place their administrative and teaching emphases.

Regarding administration of the whole program, Bobbitt notes three central recommendations. First, the state should bow to the school board and superintendent regarding tools and textbooks. Second, the school board should not give the superintendent full charge regarding the costs of specifics in the curriculum. Last, delegation of many items should begin with the superintendent (Bobbitt, 1915b, pp. 179-181). That person, the superintendent, as well as the entire education hierarchy, have set duties, declares Bobbitt (1915b):

1. The superintendent should be the architect between the owners (the community) and the contractor (the school),

must be able to survey his community and board, and then put his plan into action.

2. The Assistant Superintendent is the chief of the "Bureau of Investigation and Appraisal, thereby putting measurement to the problems of supervision."

3. The Building Principal acts for his school much the way a Superintendent does for a city. Bobbitt again mentions their liberties concerning teaching grammar and handwriting to Mexican and Negro students.

4. The High School Principal oversees the most critical years in education, 13-18, and he "must be a man among men, mingling with all social classes," and he should especially know the life and wants of the teenager, laying out their work, and acting on the various communities' surveys.

5. The Supervisors of Special Subjects, perhaps department chairpersons, should coordinate and make clear the specific disciplines from grade to grade.

6. Teachers do the teaching, but they do so much the same way that a family physician tends the sicknesses and ills that young people manifest.

7. The Business Agent keeps everyone informed of the impersonal standard of judgment and impersonal science in K-12 matters.

8. The Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds needs improvement regarding communication and decisions, else blackboards are too high, color schemes off, etc.

9. Janitors need much technical information so they know elements like "theory and management of ventilation" and controls of various apparatus.

10. The medical department functions from the departments of physical education, but always uses science-like methodology (pp. 181-188).

Bobbitt has a clear vision how the hierarchy works. Administrators, the "men of vision," provide curriculum science. Teachers, like their medical department fellows, follow a hospital-like regimen for their students/patients. Bobbitt, like many education critics to date, uses a hospital metaphor to describe schools. He uses that metaphor again in What the Schools Teach and Might Teach (1915c).

What the Schools Teach and Might Teach (1915c)

Bobbitt's first two surveys, South Bend, Indiana, and San Antonio, Texas, respectively, set several patterns. DeWulf (1962) comments that Bobbitt believed everything that happened in schools began with curriculum writing (p. 238). Bobbitt respected and admired principals and superintendents, and he expected and urged them to formulate and write curriculum. Further, he expected those administrators to become public schools' visionary cornerstones. Students, as patients, and teachers, as doctors, complemented their superior's scientific curriculum writing.

Bobbitt's third survey (Cleveland, Ohio) demonstrates the author's reliance on administrator-led curriculum writing. "The Cleveland School Survey" was sponsored by the Cleveland Foundation. That Foundation, in turn, had influence from the Committee of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association on Economy of Time in Education (DeWulf, 1962, p. 239). This committee maintained that specific criteria determined curriculum:

We are driven to the method of determining minimum essentials on the basis of the best current practices and experimentation which give satisfactory results. Those results are satisfactory which meet adequately the common needs of life in society. (Wilson, et al., 1915, p. 16, in DeWulf, 1962, p. 241)

This position reinforced the earlier National Council of Education's report on Economy of Time in Education survey. Though I could not obtain the actual Cleveland Survey, as well as the other "missing" surveys, I consulted research to present the original document's contents (cf. DeWulf, 1962, pp. 147-156, and 303-304, for a fuller discussion of the survey genre).

In addition, I have quoted from Bobbitt's report What the Schools Teach and Might Teach (1915c). That work is Bobbitt's commentary on, and reaction to, the official Cleveland Survey. Bobbitt began his Cleveland Survey project comparing his fiscal accountability resolution to

elementary school curriculum, mainstay tenets ascribed to by survey. In one activity, for example, reading, Bobbitt compares both Cleveland schools hour-per-year and percent-of-grade-time to 50 other cities. Cleveland totaled 1,710 hours of reading instruction for grades one through eight, as opposed to the 50-city average of 1,280. Cleveland also totaled 25 percent of their total teaching hours to reading, while the 50 other cities averaged 17 percent (Bobbitt, 1915c, pp. 21-22). Bobbitt (1915) also compares the \$600,000.00 Cleveland schools spent on reading to the much more cost effective 50-city average of \$150,000.00 (p. 21).

Bobbitt (1915c), using the aforementioned averages, summarizes four concise, succinct, scientific conclusions:

1. Curtail or limit oral reading, because expressive reading does not suit any useful purpose.
2. Encourage broad, general reading for students.
3. Identify and teach reading materials that have "serious importance" in the students' lives.
4. Practice reading at a specific rate. Bobbitt suggests a third-grade student should read grade-appropriate materials at 20 pages per hour, and that rate should increase to 30-40 pages at the upper elementary school levels (pp. 24-25).

Bobbitt's recommendations for the Cleveland survey's secondary portion complement the elementary accountability and school activities scheduling. Bobbitt's three recommendations (1915c) begin with specific reading texts,

but they also include increased reading speed and learning particular texts:

1. More reading and less analysis. Bobbitt suggests that the senior year's reading should include specific classical texts (A Tale of Two Cities, Macbeth, etc.), and that those texts should have specific and maintained completion schedules.

2. Reading amounts should increase. Bobbitt, using his business sense, suggests that any industrial leader would affirm that school students, like their worker counterparts, accept reading direction that they are given.

3. Text purchasing becomes paramount. Bobbitt argues that buying the right books compares with the factory ideal. At one point in our U.S. history, Bobbitt notes, shoes could be made by hand. However, now that intricate machinery does cobbler work, no craftsman can compete equally with new industry. Bobbitt suggests that efficiency has introduced new tenets to all business formats, and he recommends schools should incorporate such efficiency formats into their regimens (Bobbitt, 1915c, pp. 31-33).

Bobbitt's conclusions regarding the other disciplines follow his business orientation. Spelling, for example, becomes important pragmatically: "The great majority of the population of Cleveland will spell only as they write letters, receipts, and simple memoranda" (Bobbitt, 1915c, p. 38). He notes only specialized clerical industry workers need more and better words for their vocation. Spelling, as

well as all other subjects, Bobbitt suggests, would have more interest and accountability if they had more commercial and adult applicability. Mathematics, Bobbitt (1915c) adds, should have more emphasis: "That everybody should be well grounded in the fundamental operations of arithmetic is so obvious as to require no discussion" (p. 46). He envisions:

Just as the thought involved in physics, astronomy, or engineering needs to be put in mathematical terms in order that it may be used effectively, so must it be with effective vocational, civic, and economic thinking in general. Our chief need is not so much the ability to do calculations as it is the ability to think in figures and the habit of thinking in figures.

Calculations, while indispensable, are incidental to more important matters. (Bobbitt, 1915c, p. 47)

Elementary schools should provide a fundamental basis, of course, but overall emphasis should be on the quantitative aspects of the vocational, economic, and civic subjects. Bobbitt (1915c) quotes the Cleveland arithmetic curricular guide: "The important problem of the seventh and eighth grades is to enable the pupils to understand and deal intelligently with the most important social institutions with which arithmetical processes are associated" (p. 48). Those institutions, he explains, are insurance, tax and revenue, and stocks and bonds.

The remaining subjects, though abbreviated compared to English and mathematics, demonstrate Bobbitt's affinity with

practicality. History and civics, for example, did not have enough time allocated for Bobbitt; he suggests more time and effort for both. Geography, a new subject, Bobbitt sees as too formal. Instead, he wants students to have more comprehension of their place in the physical world. Graphic arts and home economics, partially because of their long history of implementation in the Cleveland schools and their industrial applications, Bobbitt applauds. Science, health, and music had no secondary offerings, while physical education courses had no facilities. To those various injustices, Bobbitt asks for more and better selections. He also chastises the Cleveland schools for not expanding their foreign language departments.

Bobbitt's points of view, his activity curriculum and business accountability (1915b), lead him to the inevitable "activities" (emphasis added) conclusion: "The fundamental social point of view of this discussion of the courses of study of the Cleveland schools is that effective teaching is preparation for adult life through participation in the activities of life" (p. 101). Bobbitt's conclusions call for less mechanical constructions' work, and more extensive emphasis on adult living applications. Those concluding thoughts echo in the Denver Survey.

"Report of the School Survey of School
District Number One in the City and
County of Denver" (1916)

Bobbitt, in "Report of the School Survey of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver" (1916), responds to a question concerning the democratic advisability of giving one visionary, the Denver Superintendent of Schools, curriculum power:

It is not a question of the board of education giving over its powers into the hands of one man who is then to be left irresponsible. It is a question of business-like division of labor. . . . Those who honestly express their fear of one-man power are simply uninformed as to those principles of good management that always are to be observed in large organizations where labors are complicated, specialized and difficult. (p. 106)

Bobbitt's Denver survey becomes an integral part of his survey genre. In this survey, Bobbitt responds to Eliot's Committee of Ten dogma and its influence on education and democracy. The Eliot committee advocated a prescribed public school curriculum and maintained that colleges or universities as the only proper training grounds for the academic elite. The Committee also suggested students attending secondary schools would take the same course load and study the same subject (cf. Hawkins, 1972, pp. 234-239, for a complete discussion of this topic). Bobbitt answers

Eliot's work in a laissez-faire format. He (Bobbitt) promotes an accountability-laden curriculum accentuating commerce and business, generally, and the values of big business and tycoons, specifically. Bobbitt believes the "right" (emphasis added) curriculum for any community or area benefits big business by providing industry trainees. Bobbitt's democracy becomes an ally to the Industrial Revolution's manacled mandates. Those mandates stated that workers figuratively feed the corporations; in return, the corporations literally feed the workers.

The Denver survey also becomes an important piece because of that city's political climate. DeWulf details the power struggle between the school board and the superintendent Carlos Cole circa 1915 (1962, pp. 249-250). The Denver school board had fired 150 teachers and several administrators prior to the academic year 1916, citing their inefficiency as cause. Bobbitt's name had become synonymous with efficiency by this date; hence, the Denver school board asked him to explore the possibilities of discovering more Denver public schools' efficiency.

My study will not deal with the political intrigue, infighting, and controversy regarding the Denver schools at this time (cf. DeWulf, 1962, pp. 249-254, for more information about this conflict). Instead, I will trace Bobbitt's scholarship's two distinct effects. First, his findings caused tumult that remained long after he left the Mile High City in 1916. Second, his efficiency study

received local public spotlight and some national attention. Two factors aided that national recognition. To begin, the word "accountability" had just reached and impressed the American public. Bobbitt's scientism fit business and educational accountability modes. His scientism also spawned behavioral objectivists such as Ralph Tyler, Benjamin Bloom, et al., in subsequent decades (Eisner, 1967, p. 43). Bobbitt's accountability enters educational debates to date. A second factor that aided his national attention was the Denver School Board hiring another important survey figure, Elwood P. Cubberley, to confirm Bobbitt's work.

Bobbitt's preface (1916) to the Denver work underscores his dedication to the accountability links from business and industry to public schools:

The continued prosperity of Denver depends not only upon proper railroad rates, the attraction to the city of industries, good roads, mountain parks, a commerce that reaches all the hinterland, and the countless other elements of material progress. It depends just as much upon the presence within the city of broadly trained men capable of bearing every responsibility and of ceaselessly overcoming every obstacle to progress to prosperity, and to an ever-continuing civic and social welfare. (p. 5)

If that preface was not bold enough, Bobbitt (1916) invokes the city's needs: "The city wants the work done without waste. It wants efficiency with economy" (p. 5). Bobbitt

had talked about efficiency and economy in earlier documents. This survey statement emphasizes efficiency with economy. It will not be the last such statement.

Bobbitt says only two questions need be asked in his Denver survey, or any other survey. First, "Is the recommendation made for the purpose of improving directly or indirectly the quality of the training to be given to the growing men and women of the city" (Bobbitt, 1916, p. 5). Second, after effectiveness, efficiency: "Just how does the proposal promise increased effectiveness in the work of the classrooms?" (Bobbitt, 1916, p. 5). More than 50,000 students attended the Denver schools while Bobbitt gathered data for his survey. He does an interesting balancing act after making his proposals. On one hand, Bobbitt hopes to make the "training" (emphasis added) of the Denver students much more cost-efficient. On the other, he suggests that "vagueness" concerning educational philosophy, proposals, counter-proposals, and the like must stop: "Where the welfare each year of fifty thousand growing men and women is concerned, a city cannot afford to accept vagueness and high-sounding phrases as arguments. The men must be asked to show just how their proposals will improve instruction" (Bobbitt, 1916, pp. 6-7). Bobbitt details the legislative and administrative inspections the city and county of Denver should reflect regarding new educational policies. He suggests the school board translate such policies into action, as well as review continually any specific actions.

Bobbitt speaks to the various school board functions. He addresses the board's legislative agenda: "They need to consider their own limits and goals, then be able to inspect their schools' limits and goals" (Bobbitt, 1916, p. 20). The goals number 39, ranging from what subjects the city and county of Denver has, to questioning whether or not military training might aid the curriculum (Bobbitt, 1916, pp. 21-22). Bobbitt adds a mini-history of the country's national efficiency movement. He cites everyone from carpenters' unions, labor unions in trade schools, colleges, universities, and businessmen's associations. He even includes the Bureau of Education in Washington, DC, as interested observers and combatants in students' proper training (Bobbitt, 1916, pp. 22-23). His charts indicate the need for more administrative leadership. Specifically, Bobbitt notices assistant-superintendents of finance and curriculum as exemplars regarding Denver Public School efficiency and responsibility.

"Administrative Functions" begins with Bobbitt's premise (1916): "The only thing to be aimed at in the work of the schools is the training of the children" (p. 35). School leaders, especially board members, Bobbitt notes, had demonstrated their lack of training theory and practice. That training had included non-definition of roles, lack of updated methods, passive teaching, failure to use all available methods and means, and misuse of school and teaching time (Bobbitt, 1916, pp. 37-38). To eradicate

these deficiencies, Bobbitt (1916) maintains the school board should not fire teachers:

[School board members] by the sound and practicable method of supplying the constructive educational leadership needed for helping all teacher in the service to discover their weak points, and at the same time to discover the means of overcoming them. (p. 38)

Overall school waste, Bobbitt (1916) continues, comes from building principal deficiencies: "The chief waste results from the inefficiency in the instruction in all of the classrooms in the buildings due to the lack of vigorous, stimulating, enlightened leadership on the part of the principals" (p. 39). Bobbitt's "waste" (emphasis added) research evidently embarrassed the board, so they summoned Stanford's Elwood Cubberley to disprove or downplay Bobbitt's attack. Instead, Cubberley's work affirmed Bobbitt's endeavors (DeWulf, 1962, p. 252).

The "Inspectorial Functions" section encompasses the fact-finding that embarrassed the Denver board, exposed their waste, and created Bobbitt's national reputation as an education supervisor and critic. In this section, he notes that the school board should make up a full-year budget, distribute monies evenly for each month, and expand budgeted dollars when returns warrant. He warns that a system of accounting, checking, and efficiency-making must be the board's priority. Using a 1913-1914 fuel costs chart as an example, Bobbitt demonstrates blatant wastes, then lists

school excesses in supplies, repairs, promotions, and instructional costs. Bobbitt never openly blames the board and the school system. Rather, he explains, covertly, efficiency begins by delegating authority to people who can put together fiscal puzzle pieces, and then report those findings to the school board. Instead of such reporting, Bobbitt (1916c) comments: "It is sometimes said that school systems are not managed; that things just happen" (p. 59).

Bobbitt presents a thinly disguised retort to the school board whose members opposed his budgetary recommendations. In his "Replies to Objections Made to Preliminary Recommendations" section, Bobbitt (1916c) presents the following controversies, arguments, and biases:

1. Delegation of responsibilities--Bobbitt, ever correct and proper in his responses, writes that the strength of the board members would be their ability to share their immense responsibilities.

2. Democracy--(I opened the Denver Survey section with this subject, and it is a critical tenet to understand Bobbitt.) Bobbitt bases his democratic interest for students by having them work under the guidance of appropriate "visionaries." He argues that big business and Captains of Industry "democratically" serve the masses well in this capacity.

3. Overly "academic" criticism--Using a myriad of charts and graphs, Bobbitt informs skeptics to check his

scholarship. Denver school board mismanagement had put the Denver school system in fiscal trouble.

4. Lack of patron support--Bobbitt notes 50,000 potential citizens will appreciate his reforms.

5. The school board's "democratic" election did not need an "outsider" to criticize--Bobbitt suggests the superintendent was not an "outsider." Help of any sort, helps, maintains Bobbitt.

6. No material reward for the board--Bobbitt concurs there would be no material rewards for board members.

7. Educators who are not part of Denver should not interfere with what was essentially local business administration--Bobbitt answers that practical means are always welcome. He points out the various charts and graphs as silent but absolute testimony to the problem of "outsiders."

8. The plan was revolutionary--Bobbitt notes that there is nothing revolutionary about fact finding.

9. Board delegation means catering to the superintendent's office--Bobbitt suggests that the board's legislative and inspectorial duties would remain intact.

10. The survey is unnecessary and undesirable interference--Bobbitt adamantly explains that his "outside eye" has provided a virtuous and impartial look at Denver educational expenditures.

11. The plan is difficult--Bobbitt affirms same.

12. The new by-laws are not in accord with the survey--Bobbitt says that by-laws should change to reflect the problems unearthed. Bobbitt concludes that his work came from sound management principles (pp. 126-130).

Bobbitt's management technique means that he affirms and recommends sound business tenets for the Denver problems. Bobbitt's rhetorical style regarding the 12 questions reflects his concise, precise persona. However, politics and "power" (mis)management prevented Bobbitt from completing the survey on his terms. His next project in St. Louis did not have the same political overtones.

"The Curriculum Situation, Survey of the
St. Louis Public Schools" (1917a)

The St. Louis, Missouri, School System needed to pass a bond issue in 1916 to secure \$3,000,000.00 for new school buildings. To convince voters of this need, the St. Louis Public Schools Board of Education secured experts to help them prepare an efficiency report/survey. Chief among the experts was Bobbitt. Unlike the political controversy surrounding Bobbitt's work for the Denver Public Schools, the St. Louis assignment proceeded smoothly. The "Forward" section the St. Louis Board of Education, published in 1917, testifies to a harmonious survey. Begun in May and completed in June, 1916, the board called for and received the reports of 16 education experts. Bobbitt's "The Curriculum Situation" (1917a) treats the elementary school

curriculum. Because there was a paucity of curriculum experts/professors at this time, evidently, Bobbitt indiscriminately accepted elementary and secondary assignments. This St. Louis (elementary) assignment demonstrates Bobbitt's much more subtle writing, unlike the curt Denver style.

Bobbitt's contributions contain gentle recommendations on elementary nature study science, reading, moral education, geography, language and grammar, manual training, and household occupations. Bobbitt (1917a) admits he had not studied details of past St. Louis curricula, and the proposed new curriculum was still in the formative stages:

In this report on the courses of study, therefore, we have considered the newer courses of the various committees. These indicate the best judgments of the school system as to what ought to be done, and as to what will be done just as soon as the courses can be put into operations. (p. 79)

Bobbitt's notes (1917a), ongoing, appear tentative, and he shows reserve in the following:

1. Elementary science (nature study)--Bobbitt noted the survey committee's recommendations on such objectives as interest in nature, perception training, and nature appreciation, but objects to the formulations' limited objectivity. He finds, for example, no mention of applied science, nothing concerning inventions, or the uses of science to benefit labor processes. He recommends an

activity analysis and that teachers learn to analyze those activities. From these surveys, Bobbitt suggests, "objective" measures might aid St. Louis schools' youngsters (pp. 80-84).

2. Reading--Bobbitt judges St. Louis reading efforts as sufficient: "Where observed, the work was of a very healthy character. It was being done for proper purposes, and teachers were using the common-sense methods demanded by those purposes" (pp. 84-85). What he recommends most for the schools is more supplementary texts to aid additional reading, since the school systems had only 8,509 reading sets for more than 2,000 classes (pp. 84-88).

3. Moral education--Bobbitt suggests St. Louis moral education had receded in favor of broader curriculum study within each discipline. Bobbitt agrees with this modern methodology. However, he clarifies that actual moral training implementation in the various disciplines is the next important area St. Louis' schools needs to develop (pp. 89-90).

4. Geography--Bobbitt had favored this discipline in his past surveys. He continues the emphasis here. He commended the survey committee regarding their findings to mix vocational, social and civic understanding, conscious enrichment, and mental discipline. Those three entities equal academic, geographic touchstones. Bobbitt dwells more with geography than almost the other disciplines' total areas. He lists specific themes for specific grades that

include "home geography" (third grade), maps and globes (fourth grade), and a "regulated succession for geography" in the other grades (pp. 91-101).

5. Language and grammar--Bobbitt's next subject on the survey agenda has specific tenets. To begin, he focuses on speaking and writing, not grammar. Second, thought training precedes language training. Third, Bobbitt concentrates on teaching student self-criticism, student model emulation, student opinion, and interaction within varying ability groupings (pp. 102-106). Such comments portend his later student-centered commentary circa 1924-1926.

6. Spelling--Bobbitt emphasizes the use of implemented expansion. He includes a common study list for early grades, use of missed words as review for more mastery, good spelling habits, the Lancasterian tutorial system, and individual study measures (pp. 107-109).

7. Manual Training--Bobbitt wants more student input to suggest various "products" he could make, and more use of factory visits. In addition, Bobbitt wants more formal discipline, vocational guidance, and an appreciation for production as part of the manual training (p. 111). As opposed to the Language and Spelling (numbers 5 and 6 above), Bobbitt harkens to Frederick Taylor regarding "manual training" students.

8. Household occupations--Bobbitt's last objective notes that more work on "Household occupations" continue.

As well, he admonishes St. Louis to complete their survey work (p. 111).

Abruptly, Bobbitt stops the St. Louis survey with the "Household occupations" section. No explanation does he attach regarding why, though his next work, "Summary of the Literature in Scientific Method in the Field of Curriculum Making" (1917b), uses much St. Louis material to explain the entire survey field.

"Summary of the Literature in Scientific
Method in the Field of Curriculum
Making" (1917b)

Bobbitt writes "Summary of the Literature in Scientific Method in the Field of Curriculum Making" for the Elementary School Journal, November, 1917. The piece becomes not only supportive of his St. Louis work, but also a curriculum writing, formulating, and supervising primer for all his survey/curriculum efforts. That primer's four areas include spelling, grammar, mathematics, and social studies (inclusive of history and geography). Not many examples of Bobbitt's scholarship show greater attention to his academic assumptions, philosophies, and details than this journal article.

Bobbitt prefaces his work with the general "scientific" tone and temperament U.S. curriculum experts, as well as students, experienced. He restates curriculum value itself: "In educational work, however, a primordial thing is the

curriculum" (Bobbitt, 1917b, p. 219). Bobbitt (1917b) congratulates the profession on its collective 1912-1917 march away from a curriculum made of "personal opinions, out of some narrow, special, educational philosophy, or merely borrowing courses of study made by others and handed on through the channels of tradition and indolent imitation" (p. 220). Bobbitt (1917b) champions curriculum study as something "not to be made, but rather to be discovered" (p. 220).

Spelling becomes the first discipline Bobbitt chronicles. He relates spelling had much study because of its simplicity and need. The first study he mentions is Six Thousand Common English Words, based on a 6,002 item vocabulary list from newspaper and every-day life use (Bobbitt 1917b, p. 220). The second study is Spelling Vocabularies of Personal and Business Letters (Bobbitt, 1917b, p. 220). That work restricted its readers to epistle writing, though Bobbitt credits the work's scientific impersonal, objective methodology. A third study, The Child and His Spelling, did well for the population of young people it tested (Bobbitt, 1917b, p. 221). It, like the others, failed because of its limited scope. The most comprehensive study is Concrete Investigation of the Material of English Spelling (Bobbitt, 1917b, p. 221). Bobbitt uses this study to survey grades two-through-eight spelling words from a wide academic diversity, and he found 4,532 words necessary for competence.

Bobbitt notes that more work for secondary/high school students should mirror their spelling developmental stages. He approves the latter work and stresses adult life experiences supersede childhood school experiences: "It must be kept in mind that school life and the writing that goes on during this period do not exist for themselves, but as preparation for the activities of adult life" (Bobbitt, 1917b, p. 222). The 4,532 word study impressed Bobbitt (1917b): "Professor Jones' 'heroic' [emphasis added] study is probably the most valuable single one yet made in the field of spelling" (p. 222). However, Bobbitt (1917b) also mentions the spelling "problem" is so great "that it cannot be adequately carried out by any single man, or even any single educational group" (p. 222).

Grammar becomes the next academic agenda Bobbitt surveys. He cites his colleague, W. W. Charters, in A Course of Study in Grammar Based upon the Grammatical Errors of School Children of Kansas City, Missouri (Bobbitt, 1917b, p. 223). Charters' assumptions include that good grammar results from the elimination of oral and written speech errors, and that students master English from essential mimicking. Charters listened to and accumulated 21 types of oral speech errors and 27 types of writing errors (Charters, 1915, pp. 6-9). Since Charters had culled and gleaned speech errors, Bobbitt states the teacher need only find the specific error, and show it to the student for correction. Bobbitt finds fault only in the open-endedness

of Charters' study. In Charters' research, errors found are only the ones students know, whereas Jones' work teaches "all" the basic words a student might need.

The third agenda is mathematics, a subject Bobbitt found especially lacking in his studies and surveys. Bobbitt (1917b) lauds "Current Practices and Standards in Arithmetic", a 1915 text demonstrating 1,600 school superintendents' views of curriculum (p. 225). Bobbitt acknowledges superintendents "know" communities, but questions their familiarity of curriculum surveys. A better and more valid study, suggests Bobbitt, is the two sectioned "A Survey of the Social and Business Use of Arithmetic" (1917). The first section was a questionnaire to businessmen. They voted for more curriculum emphasis in mortgages, checks, and balances; less for such archaic things as troy/weight, longitude, etc. (Bobbitt, 1917b, p. 225). The second section studied actual men and women and their specific job tasks. The result--5,036 problems identified by 1,457 workers. Bobbitt (1917b) observes:

From this illustration, especially, it may appear that scientific curriculum-making aims at a narrow utilitarianism. This, however, is not and cannot be the case. It cannot be scientific except as it looks to all forms of functioning within the world of human affairs. So far as mathematics is found to be a desirable leisure occupation, or a functioning disciplinary occupation, it needs to be considered no

less than when it appears in connection with one's vocational labors. (p. 226)

Bobbitt pleads for vocational education. The country's future, he maintains, rests with young people getting jobs, securing same, and building their futures because of their employment. Curriculum study must follow this lead, resolutely concludes Bobbitt.

Bobbitt's last section in this curriculum making treatise promises much for social studies' programs. He quotes from Professor W. C. Bagley's "The Determination of Minimum Essentials in Elementary Geography and History" (1916). Bagley's study allowed students to get their geographical references from newspapers, periodicals, and other current events (Bobbitt, 1917b, p. 227). Bagley did not suggest his own work as definitive nor even valid--only as a method. Bobbitt enjoyed and recommended it, however. He also recommended two other Bagley studies. The first had listed important dates held by 150 American Historical Association members. The second had noted the most important dates found in 23 American history texts. Bobbitt (1917b) applauds such studies' philosophical merit:

They [the studies] have value; but it must be kept in mind that results reveal the nature of the past, not the needs of the present or of the future. They are historical studies, not forward-looking, practical, curriculum-discovery studies. (p. 229)

Bobbitt's "discovery studies" rely on Bagley's, Jones', and others' research. As well, Bobbitt relies on science as metaphorical authority to achieve efficiency, the subject of his next work.

"The Plan of Measuring Educational Efficiency in Bay City" (1918a)

Bobbitt did not address testing, per se, in any earlier writings. He was not a test designer, and/or a test construction expert; however, because of his stand regarding educational efficiency, certainty, and science, he valued accounting procedures. Those student, teacher, and building testing procedures Bobbitt attends in "The Plan of Measuring Educational Efficiency in Bay City" (1918a).

Bay City, Michigan's Superintendent of Public Schools was Frank A. Gause. Gause had devised, advocated, and validated a two-year testing plan answering Bobbitt's question (1918a): "How can the superintendent of a considerable city know whether the results secured in the different ward buildings are kept up to standard in each of them?" (p. 343). Using words so often associated with him, Bobbitt (1918a) declares that Gause's plan demonstrates "sufficient economy, expeditiousness, and frequency," that even superseded standardized tests (p. 343). Bobbitt believed in standardized tests as an efficient mode--he does not decry the tests themselves. He also believed in cost accountability. Gause's tests gained Bobbitt's favor

because they cost less to administer than the standardized variety. Fiscal efficiency remains in its revered place throughout Bobbitt's work.

Gause's test mixes simplicity, structure, and uniformity. His Grade 6B example, below, measures whole classes, not any particular student:

Arithmetic: A farm is 90 rods long and 60 rods wide.
Find the acres in it. Find the cost at \$60. per acre.
Geography: Make a list of five articles which are
manufactured in Bay City.
Reading: Would you like to work for Scrooge? Why?
(Bobbitt, 1918a, p. 344)

This sampling demonstrates its author's intent. Once a month, Gause's Bay City students wrote a common examination. Though Bobbitt (1918a) questions whether or not all students benefit from those examinations, he concludes:

Now a single carefully chosen question may not be fair for any particular pupil in a class; but if the question is accurately related to the work of the class as a whole, the law of statistical averages enters in.
(p. 345)

The test's premise becomes uniform curriculum within the Bay City area. To maintain the uniformity, individual teachers submitted questions to the superintendent's office they believed represented their teaching goals and practices. At that office, both the superintendent and a special teacher selected test questions that best fit the various grades.

The 6B designation, for example, represented the 6th grade and the "B" students within that 6th grade. All 6B teachers sent in questions, and from those questions came a 6B test. Bobbitt notes two advantages of this service. First, overambitious teachers reveal they are going too fast for the test. Second, "laggards" demonstrate their sluggish teaching inefficiency. Knowing this, Bobbitt (1918a) explains, probably helps teachers to adapt their various styles to the written curriculum analysis (p. 346). Once tests have been taken to the superintendent's office, graded there by the administrator and each "special" teacher, various charts provide the participants efficient feedback.

One chart represents factors of any particular school's combined scores compared to the city's average score in all disciplines. Given these tests occur monthly, Bobbitt (1918a) contends they provide reliability to judge teachers and their respective students: "Superintendents and principals want to find the teachers who are, and those who are not keeping their classes as a whole up to standard" (pp. 344-345).

Another chart represents an honor roll for buildings scoring the highest in a given month's test. Such reporting stimulates the various buildings to do well. Bobbitt hopes low-scoring "offenders" might mimic good teachers in order to increase self motivation. He does not say how. Bobbitt (1918a) emphasizes some very good teachers may "be in a school that never can hope to reach the top in the character

of the results secured" (p. 350). He warns of "lower-quality" students.

Implicitly, however, Bobbitt indicts "lower quality students." Most damning for those "lower quality" students comes a reverse honor roll: "The third type of report sent to each building shows the names of pupils who have failed upon the examination" (Bobbitt, 1918a, p. 350). The terms used to explain the list's efficacy suggest Frederick Taylor's "science": "The sending of this list of names to her [the teacher] enables her to focus her efforts upon the points which have been actually responsible for the losses" (Bobbitt, 1918a, p. 353). Either Gause's tests, Bobbitt's reporting of the examinations, or an amalgamation of both, rationalize this event.

Though Bobbitt maintains Gause's work qualifies as student-oriented, it is certainly not Dewey-like. Displayed on the superintendent's wall, this chart demonstrates how any one teacher compares to other teachers regarding their student's test-taking efficiency. What Bobbitt (1918a) contends is that no Bay City, Michigan, mathematical errors or charting errors exist: "Like the educational measurers of every type, one of his [the superintendent's] major tasks now is the discovery and elimination of shortcomings and defects" (p. 356). Only attacking the problem from other mathematical, statistical, or accountability formats will benefit this plan more, finalizes Bobbitt. His accountability continues as his real agenda. "Standards"

(emphasis added) have been, are, and will continue to be an important Bobbitt standard. The building principal becomes Bobbitt's central focus for any curricular path or growth.

"The Building Principal in
the Surveys" (1918b)

As the article "The Plan of Measuring Educational Efficiency in Bay City" mirrors Bobbitt's interest in testing and measurement, "The Building Principal in the Surveys" (1918b), engages the on-site school administrator. As well, it previews Bobbitt's future "Supervisory Leadership on the Part of the High-School Principal" (1919b), and the detailed "Mistakes Often Made by Principals," Parts I and II," (1920a and 1920b). During 1914-1918, Bobbitt spent much time and effort pursuing the survey process, an effort supported by fellow curriculum scholars W. W. Charters and David Snedden.

As the "Bay City" article implicitly states, the subject areas chosen for study included the traditional arithmetic, grammar, geography, hygiene, history, reading, and spelling. Those subject areas complement Charles Eliot's Committee of Ten recommendations. Bobbitt (1918b) begins: "As is the principal, so is the school, wrote Chancellor Eliot in the report of the New York school survey" (p. 106). In Bobbitt's terms, the functional building principal provides student-teacher guidance in curriculum and testing. The principal also provides

leadership throughout his school. As Bobbitt had stated in "Practical Eugenics" (1909b), and reaffirms (1918b), character had become an important trait for all school personnel--whether students, teachers, or principals: "If he [the principal] is active and efficient, the work of a building will be of a high character; if he is passive, inefficient, or a mere 'odd-job' [a Frederick Taylor term] around the premises, then the work becomes but stagnation or confusion" (p. 106). Though Bobbitt had not elaborated the principal's role in previous survey works, he emphasizes the building administrator's role here:

Our profession has a large assortment of standards to apply in the judgment of buildings, or business management, or the work of the teacher in the classroom; but it seems that we have relatively few clarified ideas as to the nature and place of the principal's work within the system. (Bobbitt, 1918b, pp. 106-107)

Accordingly, Bobbitt (1918b) acknowledges the importance principals play developing, maintaining, and directing school programs, and he formulates 11 categorical functions and duties efficient principals exhibit:

1. The principal--the masculine pronoun Bobbitt always uses--directs the work of the teachers. Drawing from specific surveys, Bobbitt notes the principal's role may range from McMurry's (New York, New York) concept of supervisor and curriculum leader, Cubberley's (Portland,

Oregon) idea of initiator of the whole school system, or his own (San Antonio, Texas) concept as planner and policy maker (pp. 108-109). Whatever model Bobbitt uses, his democracy originates from the autocratic superintendent's authority.

2. The principal sets up his staff's in-service training. Bobbitt contends that in-services connote "long-range" planning for and with the teacher. That planning includes both interpretation or immediate action and long-range impersonal assistance, both of which Bobbitt had referenced in his surveys.

3. The principal acts as an inspector. Bobbitt notes that with perfect science and direction, no inspection would be necessary. Because that perfect state does not exist, Bobbitt says the principal must "note quickly any apparent weaknesses in the procedure. And he will bring the teachers to see clearly both the weaknesses and the nature of the educational science which is dictating something better" (p. 111). Metaphorically, Bobbitt indicates the principal must turn on the light of science for teachers to see. Bobbitt concludes that efficiency is closely linked with promotion, and promotion comes from the efficient scrutiny of principals' rating teachers.

4. Principals act as teacher inspectors. They amass facts, collate and project those facts, then inform the teachers whether or not they have performed to expected standards. Bobbitt says that once facts and directions become clear, the principal conferences "amiss" teachers,

demonstrates methods wished, or has teachers visit and/or observe especially competent colleagues. The administrator does not abdicate his responsibilities, nor is he arbitrary regarding inquiry or decisions. He is, in effect, an "adviser to self-directing teachers" (p. 114).

5. The principal plans for the school system policies. Bobbitt indicates that the principal provides initiative for those under his control--teachers and students: "He [the principal] is only to take orders, not to assist in formulating them" (p. 115). Inexplicably, he adds: "On the contrary, one finds approval of the practice of appointing principals to assist in formulating courses of study, determining standards of achievement" (p. 115). The author mentions such vertical communication and responsibilities, but does not say anything more. After 1926, he would.

6. The principal is the general inspector of the school. This, for Bobbitt, means the principal is a chain-of-command director: "As he inspects procedure and results, he should pass his findings on to those from whom he receives his delegated responsibility" (p. 115). All surveys point to this directorship, Bobbitt contends.

7. The principal is a supervisor. Bobbitt warns: "Most principals have never had any systematic training for supervision. They were trained as teachers and for teaching" (p. 116). Ironically, if teaching does not qualify a person for administration, there is no substance for that role. The alternatives are either an on-the-job

training format or a strict business approach. The surveys do not make this issue any clearer. Therefore, Bobbitt concludes that the complete principal is one "only as he long and carefully and continuously reads the impersonal educational science and interprets it and applies it with clarified judgment to his endless series of educational problems" (p. 118). How he is to do this gets no response from Bobbitt.

8. The principal selects building personnel. Quoting from Cubberley and others, Bobbitt concludes that if the principal does not have the ability to choose his teachers, or can not do so, ultimate "plant" (emphasis added) failure looms.

9. The principal controls material facilities. Bobbitt, in one of his briefest treatments, says: "Equally obvious is the principle that one who is responsible for work should have some proper part in the choice of the tools to be used and the physical conditions under which the work is to be done" (p. 119). He quotes several surveys as proof, but offers no explanatory commentary.

10. The principal selects and places his faculty, then decides tenure and salary. All his surveys indicate how important Bobbitt felt the principal's decisions were regarding who to hire and what to pay them. The Darwinian "survival of the fittest" rationale applies, since Bobbitt indicates "healthy rivalry" for the fittest teachers should abound (p. 121).

11. The principal's labors should have a distribution. In the vaguest and last of Bobbitt's directives, the author suggests establishing a hierarchy of duties, beginning with clerical, connecting with building routine, and ending with technical abilities. Since surveys have not provided solid, directed guidelines, Bobbitt warns that principals' duties might end in trivial functions, and he advocates new supervisory theory to his 11 guidelines (pp. 108-120).

Bobbitt's final words in "The Building Principal in the Surveys" (1918b), that new supervisory theory be constructed, accomplish two things. First, Bobbitt demonstrates his belief in "visionaries" who lead students through their education. Second, the administrator-emphasis becomes a natural transition to his first comprehensive text, The Curriculum (1918c).

The Curriculum (1918c)

Bobbitt's most acclaimed book, The Curriculum (1918c), becomes a professional career summary--to date. This work consolidates what Bobbitt has heretofore written concerning scientific curriculum. It further solidifies his views and makes his philosophy even more pronounced than prior composite journal articles and surveys. No other American curriculum writer to 1918 had written a text exclusively on curriculum, and reviews of his first book demonstrated grateful praise. Predictably, the University of Chicago's periodical, Elementary School Journal, heavily supported

The Curriculum; however, other reviewers also commended it. One professional reader applauded the work's timing: "Intended for an introductory book in teacher-training, it shows the trend of educational thought to anyone interested" (cf. Reely, et al., 14th Annual Cumulation Review of 1918 Books, 1919, p. 51., for more information. Subsequent quotes come from this source). Another critic said The Curriculum was "A new book in a much too little cultivated field," while P. C. Stetson said it was "One of the most significant contributions to education of the year" (p. 51). Survey, however, wavered: "Educators owe a debt to Professor Bobbitt which is not lessened because the book has some of the defects of a pioneer work" (p. 51). Those defects included confusing vocational educational references and nondescript student age levels. The "debt" Survey alluded to was the text's publication, regardless of flaws.

The Curriculum was the first book exclusively treating that subject, just as Bobbitt himself was the first college instructor to teach a course entitled Curriculum (at the University of Chicago). His curriculum, on both counts, of course, prescribed that schools and curriculum writers provide students with directed experiences via specific coursework. Undirected experiences, meanwhile, came from the family, community, church, and business experiences.

In several articles Bobbitt published before The Curriculum (1918c), he contended that well-formulated plan(s) of curriculum needed systematized designs. In

"Summary of the Literature in Scientific Method in the Field of Curriculum Making" (1917b), as well as "The Plan of Measuring Educational Efficiency in Bay City" (1918a), Bobbitt had formulated his educational system plan for the United States--specifically the role that curriculum did and would play.

Following is a concise textual analysis of The Curriculum (1918c), with careful attention to details regarding the preface and inherent theory of the work. Though there is ample measure of Bobbitt's scientific curriculum theory, I maintain that the author wars with himself regarding who benefits from curriculum in a democracy. Bobbitt believed that big business and industrial titans produce the necessary jobs and opportunities that allow a democracy to grow and succeed. However, he maintained students' "liberal" (emphasis added) educations should function without any outside constraints, especially those of the business community. Such a dichotomy led to his controversial, philosophical "reversal" at the 1926 NSSE Conference.

Bobbitt begins his first book showing how curriculum studies and education divide into two realms. First, he looks for "subjective" results of such matters as "the enriched mind, quickened appreciations, refined sensibilities, discipline, culture" (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 1). He also mentions "the ability to live rather than the practical ability to produce" (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 1). The

author insinuates some educators want only "practical action in a practical world," where the successful student "can produce efficiently the labors of his calling" (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 1). From his administrator's perspective, Bobbitt answers the dilemma. Both were right and wrong. How he answers the question is critical. Using the metaphor of a tree that might produce either a flower or fruit, Bobbitt (1918c) suggests: "It [the tree] must produce both or it will not perform its full function" (p. 6). He extends the tree metaphor to an educational plan:

One is experience upon the play-level: the other experience upon the work-level. One is action driven by spontaneous interest: the other, by derived interest. One is the luxuriation of the subjective life which has a clue for objective experience even though one be not conscious of the values at the time. The other looks to the conscious shaping and control of the objective world; but requires for maximum effectiveness the background of subjective life provided by the other. (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 6)

Bobbitt sounds as if he has John Dewey-like or Francis Parker-like leanings. Yet Bobbitt is quick to prioritize. He says the "culture" people are not wrong, that vision widening, actualizing behaviors are good. However, he concludes that practical-minded people must live the majority of their life in the practical world.

Bobbitt spends one full chapter in his preface on his ideal curriculum, "Educational Experience upon the Play-Level." In the preface are justifications for his scientific curriculum making, but also the first justifications for his 1926 philosophical reversal. He begins: "Recent psychology tells us that man has a long period of childhood and youth in order that he may play" (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 8). Bobbitt (1918c) suggests play does not have to produce a specific amount of physical powers, per se, to yield demonstrable skills: "Nature provides instinctive tendency to participate in group-plans, social games, conversation, etc., which develop his social nature, fix his social habits, and cement social solidarity" (p. 8). Put another way, the author implies mental play simply inculcates the human child's mind with information, and "the" basis of "intellectual" (emphasis added) education.

One way Bobbitt understands this is through children's innocent observations. Those observations later become adult active listening. The second way comes via listening to stories and tales that come from events not in students' immediate periphery. Rather, they come from students' imagination and perception. Bobbitt (1918c) speaks to the universality of knowledge in all people--in a word, curiosity (pp. 9-10).

To illustrate this child-centered universal dictate, Bobbitt provides a lengthy aside. On one of his trips to the Orient, probably The Philippines, Bobbitt observed two

young people, first aboard ship and then ashore. Bobbitt (1918c) narrates: "The boys were living. They were not simply memorizing facts. It was all upon the play-level; and yet they were securing the best type of education" (p. 11). Bobbitt could think "liberally" within his own "scientific" confines before lapsing into the "intellectual" (emphasis added) components of specific activities for the social good.

However, following the boys' story, he speculates how the same curiosity he saw in the active imagination could occur in the academic classroom. Via geography, Bobbitt notes that teachers should guide students vicariously through such experiences provided by Peary to the North Pole, Darwin through the South Seas, and John Muir in the Rockies. History provides biographies, narratives, and notebooks where students mentally explore various historical experiences. Harking back to his "Practical Eugenics" mode, however, Bobbitt interjects an unsettling thought.

After explaining how much good the two young voyagers gained from their free experiencing, then noting the possible vicarious good of selected academia, Bobbitt (1918c) comments: "Give 'healthy-minded' [emphasis added] children a full opportunity to indulge in the playful manipulation of toys, tools, machines, appliance, and mechanical principles" (p. 14). He adds:

Give the "unspoiled" [emphasis added] child proper opportunities at these things and he asks no better

fun. He brings to them the same eager intellectual desires to know that inspire the trained scientist who delights in scientific "knowledge for its own sake."

(Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 14)

Speaking to whether or not more "interest" activities could occur in high school than grammar school, Bobbitt (1918c) comments:

Naturally he will explore according to his maturity [always "he"]. Much of this can be accomplished in the elementary schools--more than school people have usually thought possible. . . . The experience is not to be so systemized that the spontaneous play-spirit is destroyed. There is not to be too much teaching. What they crave and need is experience. (p. 15)

The two boys did not have the constraints of any official scientific curriculum, and Bobbitt applauds their own curiosity, yet implores them not to do too much "teaching."

Bobbitt's teaching consisted of his ESL experience in The Philippines after his brief normal school stint. In that first teaching job, he became upset at the unwarranted academic bridles placed on him by his administration, and quit (DeWulf, 1962, pp. 26-27). In his second, he led and fed needful Filipino students English. He did not draw from a rich trove of public school teaching experience.

Regardless of the paucity of his own teaching experiences, Bobbitt felt that the free-time efforts of students are important. However, he also believed in public

schooling's correct time and place, an offshoot of Spencerian dogma of what knowledge is most worth:

There is need of movement, irregularity, caprice, variety, and incessant interplay of all the factors that compose the human spirit. For such are the ways of childhood; and even of youth and adulthood in the hours of their freedom. (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 15)

Bobbitt points out that Boy Scout and Camp-Fire Girl movements help young people utilize their time to find appropriate social activities and physical education. Never does he state that students have the right to participate in their schooling, though he does approve of students' choosing their own particular after-school activities. Any activity, according to Bobbitt, must first be a socially good one. Never does he specify a definition of good. Never does he give an explicit or implicit definition of (free and participational) democracy.

Bobbitt (1918c) becomes much more definitive regarding education when he writes his Chapter III, "Educational Experiences upon the Work-Level":

Although play has its place in the process, education aims at preparation for the serious duties of life: one's calling, the care of one's health, civic cooperations and regulation, bringing up one's children, keeping one's language in good form, etc.
(p. 18)

What Bobbitt (1918c) refers to when he says work is not only vocation, but any "responsible" (emphasis added) activity. To that end, he produces an "A, B, C, D" illustration, following:

<u>Play</u>	<u>Work</u>		
General Exercise of Powers (Usually Pleasurable)	Developmental Results=Power to Think/Feel	Putting One's Powers to Work: (Feeling Element Disregarded)	The Fruits of Labor
A	B	C	D

(p. 19)

Bobbitt says training is the essence of work. It is training that will produce results; more training will produce efficiency. Work (C) happens with or without (B), but can never without (D): "Whether the work-experiences, therefore, look toward subjective or objective fruits, both interests and responsibilities relate to the object; and only in derived form to the subjective" (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 20). Bobbitt subdivides his goals. He questions whether or not vocational education goals, practical citizenship (caring for city shrubs, etc.), hygienic training (food choice, good sleep time), and language training (for job interviews and writing samples), together can "make" schools. He uses the Greek "schole" definition to mean that mastery of grammar school, high school, and college results "is yet a life of leisure" (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 23). Bobbitt had criticized Charles Eliot's Committee of Ten dogma for the exact same position.

Bobbitt (1918c) maintains that the "new curriculum" he offers is not new, but is timely:

The need of work for training has long been understood by the skilled trades. The apprenticeship system trained through experiences of the work-type. The recent agitation for vocational training in public schools is due, not to a new need, but to new conditions. (p. 24)

The "new conditions" he ascribes, the Industrial Revolution and the immigration of so many new peoples, as well as Ross's sociology, and even Spencer's science, lead to the following dictum: "Schools must become sharers in the world's work of every kind by way of finding the only possible training opportunities" (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 27).

Bobbitt (1918c) builds his scientific curriculum on that "training" and several selected bases:

The controlling purposes of education have not been efficiently particularized. We have aimed at a vague culture, an ill-defined discipline, a nebulous harmonious development of the individual, an indefinite moral character-building, an unparticularized social efficiency, or often enough nothing more than escape from a life of work. (p. 31)

"An age of science is demanding exactness and particularity" becomes his *raison d'être*, and the scientific method becomes his gauge for anything from "child-accounting," to grades, or promotion (Bobbitt, 1918c,

p. 41). For Bobbitt, the inherent demands of his own work in this "scientific curriculum" become distinct. Specific activities and their performance prepare the student for life. Life is the key discovery: "However numerous and diverse they [lives] may be for any social class, they can be discovered" (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 42). Social class becomes an egregious curriculum building parameter for Bobbitt. He learned the Elect and Secular Doctrines well.

Bobbitt addresses the Latin word for curriculum, which translates to "race-course" or even the "race itself." Words, claims Bobbitt (1918c), become "a series of things which children and youth must do and experience by way of developing abilities to do the things well that make up the affairs of adult life" (p. 42). Attaining the adult life is the essence of Bobbitt's education.

Affairs of adult life or what life should be, Bobbitt divides into two levels. One level is the experience of community living, those activities that Bobbitt defines as undirected training. The other level is the traditionally directed school studies. The efficient curriculum developer works towards both. As an example of how the curriculum can work, the author points to the grammar-study work that W. W. Charters and Edith Miller wrote in A Course of Study in Grammar based upon the Grammatical Errors of School Children in Kansas City, Missouri (Bobbitt, 1918c, p. 45). That study found via notebook entry and written testing the oral and written errors of the following:

1. Confusion of past tense and past participle	24
2. Failure of verb to agree with its subject in number and person	14
3. Wrong verb	12
4. Double negative	11
5. Syntactical redundance	10
6. Wrong sentence form	5
7. Confusion of adjectives and adverbs	4
8. Subject of verb not in nominative case	4
9. Confusion of demonstrative adjective with personal pronoun	3
10. Predicate nominative not in nominative case	2
11. First personal pronoun standing first in a series	2
12. Wrong form of noun or pronoun	2
13. Confusion of past and present tenses	2
14. Object of verb or preposition not in objective case	1
15. Wrong part of speech due to a similarity of sound	1
16. Incorrect comparison of adjectives	1
17. Failure of pronoun to agree with its antecedent	.3
18. Incorrect use of mood	.3
19. Misplaced modifier	.3

20. Confusion of preposition and conjunction .2

21. Confusion of comparatives and superlatives .1

(Bobbitt, 1918c, pp. 45-46)

Bobbitt's scientific method provides the "cultivated language-atmosphere" where the students could get "unconscious training," as well as the actual teaching of grammar needed for instruction and prevention of errors.

With the academic model, Bobbitt places a vocational one beside it. Bobbitt quotes Ayres (1913), Jones (1914), and Cook and O'Shea (1915), per "Summary of the Literature in Scientific Method in the Field of Curriculum Making" (1917b). In The Curriculum (1918c), Bobbitt advocates finding the major occupations that a city represents, then lists the following occupational report for teacher and student use:

1. A list of tools and machines
2. A list of materials they might need
3. A list of items for general knowledge regarding jobs and processes
4. A list of general math items needed
5. A list of science items
6. Drawing and design needed
7. English needed
8. Hygiene needed
9. Economy facts needed (p. 52).

Bobbitt (1918c) summarizes his curriculum work as follows: "Only as we list the errors and shortcomings of human performance in each of the fields can we know what to include and to emphasize in the directed curriculum of the schools" (p. 52). Too often he addresses his curriculum at what children could not do, not what they could do.

Bobbitt comments on the benefits of reading in Chapter XVIII, "Reading as a Leisure Occupation," suggesting that it should not be something that has to be done simply for academic intents per se. Rather, he suggests teachers foster reading opportunities for their charges:

The qualified teacher is one who loves reading, and who daily uses it in the renewal of his own vision; who has world-outlook, world sympathies, a quickened interest in the varied affairs of mankind; who values experience as a trainer of youth over and above memorization of facts. . . who [sic] knows a better way of managing child-experience than those who say arbitrarily to children that at 9:00 o'clock to-morrow you shall experience thus and so, at 9:30 to-morrow you shall experience such a second thing, at 10:00 to-morrow [sic] your experience shall be of this third type, and who thus mechanically grinds out child-experiences through days and weeks and months of dreary drudgery.

(Bobbitt, 1918c, pp. 242-243)

Bobbitt (1918c) summarizes his liberal reading stance: "So long has our profession taught that we think the only way to

education is to teach. We have not sufficiently known that to live is to educate" (p. 243). Bobbitt (1918c) provides more summary reading comment: "Only recently are we coming to know how to provide the conditions for living. Both have a place; and the main thing is living" (p. 244).

In Bobbitt's advocacy of "the good life," he lauds the role and benefit education can provide. His curriculum theory, as well as his text The Curriculum (1918c), urges students to make education work for them. Work is the key operative. Rather than Dewey's student-orientation, Bobbitt advocates student management. That management meant that "visionaries" teach their students pragmatically. It also meant that students manage their schooling and lessons so that they could benefit from "the good life." Vocational education often is the core of Bobbitt's work. Only with his 1926 NSSE "retraction" does he relent his activities-based scientism. Reading's place in the general curriculum and specific vocational setting become his next article's subject.

"Reading in the Elementary Schools of Indianapolis
V. The Reading Materials" (1919a)

The first article written after The Curriculum (1918c) is "Reading in the Elementary Schools of Indianapolis V. The Reading Materials," May, 1919, in Elementary School Journal. Within this periodical's confines, Bobbitt discusses what the school should provide students for reading experiences

after their successful English mechanics mastery. He complements his words in The Curriculum (1918c), for he answers that the purpose of reading is to expand the pupils' vision of their "narrow immediate environment" (Bobbitt, 1919a, p. 665). He believes vicarious experiences far outweigh the "mere memorizing of abstract facts" (Bobbitt, 1919a, p. 665). Halting short of suggesting "child-centered reading," however, Bobbitt (1919a) maintains the best experiences are ones allowing the student "as fully as he is permitted" to enter into a commitment with his community and his community vocation (p. 666).

This article helps explain the dichotomy Bobbitt faced in experiential reading or learning. He says: "We must participate in industry, in commerce, in war, in religion, and in civic adjustment, right to appreciate these things" (Bobbitt, 1919a, p. 666). In Bobbitt's structural hierarchy, industry and commerce have priority. Later in this article, Bobbitt believes the vicarious experiences students should have must be ones that reconstruct their own "situations." The "situations" mirror the work places-- industry forums, yet also become reading-into-experience formats. He explains:

There are many types of needed reading. We live in a complicated economic world of agriculture, manufacture, commerce, mining, etc. Our Civic problems are nowadays mainly problems of economic adjustment. A full knowledge and appreciation of, and sympathetic

attitudes toward, the various economic groups in our nation seem to be indispensable for the right performance of our various civic functions. The feeling is now growing that this is a matter that should be adequately taken care of by our schools.

(Bobbitt, 1919a, p. 669)

Reading, and by implication, education, should make the student vicariously aware of the world at large, but more importantly, of the student's situation in the community, specifically the working community. Bobbitt (1919a) broadens the scope: "Nothing is quite so potent for developing sympathy and appreciation in this age of growing world-democracy" [than the vicarious joys of reading] (p. 668). Again, Bobbitt's notion of democracy is one connoting free participation in particular jobs or vocations. Quality within the students' minds, portrayed in The Curriculum (1918c), and selected parts of this article, result in an avocational goal, something Bobbitt felt that educated people should do for themselves.

Bobbitt separates reading areas into experiences that will explain or speak to problems of human nature, of problems in health, physical development, and sanitation--even problems in science. What he means by science here, though, is the selected mechanics of applied chemistry and meteorology--manifestations not ordinarily seen. Bobbitt (1919a) explains: "One needs to wander through the wide and rich fields of science and of its applications, through

vicarious reading, rightly to appreciate the science aspects of the world in which he lives" (p. 671). Reading can accomplish the goal of allowing students to know more about their "applied" learning in general.

Immediately, Bobbitt shifts the applied theoretical into the Indianapolis School System's reading lists, and cites four pages and over 100 listings of vicarious experiences that could benefit students. The listings came via Indianapolis teacher-conducted surveys. Bobbitt lauds the surveys, then superimposes a chart that shows how many pages any Indianapolis class reads on the average, as well as the lowest and highest amounts read. What is important here is not so much the surveys and charts, for they are commonplace with his statistical and accountability process.

Bobbitt judges the texts. For example, he says, "No. 46 (Carpenter's Geographical Reader, North America) is altogether too difficult, abstract, and didactic for a fourth-grade class" (Bobbitt, 1919a, p. 672). Just what is "too difficult, abstract, and didactic" he does not explain. Bobbitt offers a series of "historical readings," which he extracted from his own personal reading list. Though he does not coerce, he does urge the Indianapolis district to do their own "focusing and surveying" to find out which texts might be appropriate to their students. Because he could find no lists that had to do with "Industrial Readings" and "Science Readings," he offers 39 books ranging from Mowry's Captains of Industry to the magazine Popular

Mechanics as exemplars of both lists (Bobbitt, 1919a, pp. 687-688). Bobbitt concludes that both industry and science appeal to youngsters because of their literary merit, rather than give students a business and science perspective. Bobbitt's reliance on both science and industry renders his summary statement as wishful thinking, at best. His immediate educational reliance comes from public school administrators.

"Supervisory Leadership on the Part of the High-School Principal" (1919b)

"Supervisory Leadership on the Part of the High-School Principal," written for School Review, December, 1919, is the second article published after The Curriculum (1918c). This article becomes a complement to the earlier "The Building Principal in the Surveys" (1918b), and presage to "Mistakes Often Made by Principals, Parts I and II," (1920a and b). "Supervisory Leadership on the Part of the High-School Principal's" premise asks/surveys high-school administrators what school-related details they would address. Bobbitt then lists the six most important factors, the first of which is that the principal must be a visionary, a person who can see "the big picture" (emphasis added). Again, he reviews that students should not just memorize facts and regurgitate them. Rather, they should be "specialists in mankind and in the affairs of mankind, only secondarily in the means, tools, instrumentalities,

processes, etc., to be used in achieving the ends" (Bobbitt, 1919b, p. 736). That they are passive is not their fault.

The author blames the secondary school teachers and their collective shallow vision. Bobbitt (1919b) judges those instructors as people who view students as "vessels rather than as active agents," and whose "training has simply been one of college 'majors and minors' of esoteric interest" (p. 736). In short, the teachers have not become specialists in mankind. What good administrators must do, suggests Bobbitt (1919b), is become the visionary "ignorant" (emphasis added) students and teachers need:

He [the administrator] needs not merely to keep himself in contact with the community life so as to be able to observe, but he needs actually, as far as he can, to mingle in the multifarious affairs of the community in order that through participation he may effectively take on community attitudes, community valuations, etc. (p. 737)

What Bobbitt (1919b) concludes as a result of this "mingling," however, is that mysteriously the superintendent judges and prescribes public education's final outcomes: "As he [the administrator] comes to see the real objectives of education, the subjects as modified by his more social point of view will naturally fall into their rightful subordinate places as means to the ends in view" (p. 737). Bobbitt does not describe either his methodologies or objectives.

The importance of finding those objectives is critical to interpret Bobbitt's work. The author continues: "He must help them to see" (Bobbitt, 1919b, p. 739). Again, how this might happen does not receive treatment. Bobbitt (1919b), however, extends his democratic ethic theory:

Thus by providing leadership in their [the teachers'] work, but leaving the initiative largely to them, he best discovers where his own efforts as leader are to be placed and the exact nature of those efforts. Under such conditions, there is complete democracy within the organization, and each teacher is permitted to go along so far as he has the ability. (p. 740)

The "ability" reference becomes important. Students use their abilities much the same way Bobbitt suggests teachers use theirs--under direct and "visionary" (emphasis added) supervision.

The remaining directives--three through six--build on the initial two. The third encompasses specific processes to perform with the scope of the objectives. Bobbitt describes a knowledgeable superintendent as one who knows the intricacies of industry in order to serve his students, teachers, and, of course, businesses. Fourth, a superintendent coordinates and organizes whatever measures he has discovered and inaugurated. Fifth, the superintendent delegates specific responsibilities regarding particular objectives dispensation. Bobbitt suggests clerical and teaching duties be subordinate to

superintendents' "business." Sixth, and last, if there is any difficulty, principals must "enforce" responsible performance regarding the objectives' scope and sequence (Bobbitt, 1919b, pp. 734-746). The principal "enforces" by rewarding "good" teachers, directing those that have lesser capabilities, and removing "incapable" or "waste" teachers (emphasis added). As such, the article uses the accountability of "How to Eliminate Waste in Education" (1912). However, in "Supervisory Leadership on the Part of the High-School Principal" (1919b), Bobbitt does not address fiscal overflow or excess, but rather "weeding out" subprofessional people (p. 747), the same spirit found in "Practical Eugenics" (1909b). This article prefaces and augments "Mistakes Often Made by Principals" (Parts I and II, 1920b and 1920c).

"The Objectives of Secondary Education" (1920a)

If Bobbitt's words concerning the duties and responsibilities of the principal in "Supervisory Leadership on the Part of the High-School Principal" (1919b) speak to the need of finding correct objectives, then "The Objectives of Secondary Education," written for the December, 1920, School Review, magnifies Bobbitt's vision of the school-as-industry model. Bobbitt (1920a) does not hint at the corporate modeling he approves; rather, he exhorts it: "In the world of economic production a major secret of success

is predetermination" (p. 738). Further, "The management predetermines with great exactness the nature of the products to be turned out, and in relation to the other factors, the quality of output" (Bobbitt, 1920a, p. 738). By standardizing the product, judging the amount of labor, and setting or altering the conditions of the work, industry determines its own formula. To those business ends, Bobbitt suggests that education needs such standardization--he uses the word particularize--and he writes clearly who is responsible for such educational actions: the administrator. Bobbitt (1920a) also begins a "journey" metaphor to heighten the administrator's role:

We are awakening to the obvious truth that when a long journey is to be taken, one of the most necessary things to know before setting out is the destination. The administrative awakening to the need with definiteness of the goals of public education is coming surprisingly late. (p. 738)

That the problem had been late in coming, Bobbitt remedies in two ways. First, he quotes his colleague David Snedden's need for "particularization":

The great problems of secondary education today are, of course, problems of aim. . . . For, after all, our great fine aims in the secondary education, expressed in tenuous even though aspiring phrases, are in reality only faith aims. (Bobbitt, 1920a, p. 739)

Second, he suggests using the "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education," formulated by the NEA's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. Bobbitt, of course, had been a member of that commission. The objectives of health, fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy leisure use, and ethical character show excellent reform movement toward objectification. However, Bobbitt again points out that any reform can have no practical good unless someone develops those objectives with an itemized statement of the specific habits which condition any recommendation. Bobbitt (1920a) takes the health section, adds 38 specific abilities such as caring for the eyes, protecting one's self, etc., and suggests how the resulting augmentation fits into the larger academic scene:

We are not ready really to formulate the curriculum until we have taken each ability and thus broken it up into its specifics and laid them out before us for our guidance in formulating pupil-experiences. (p. 743)

For Bobbitt (1920a) and his dual utilitarian and democratic ethics, the real good for education must be the "development of each of the specific ingredients which make up the abilities" (p. 743). Those ingredients in this article become 48 refined objectives. The objectives use precursor words repeatedly to help with the "refining process." Bobbitt (1920a) uses the words "desire," "willingness," "habit," "knowledge," "disposition," "faith,"

"understanding," "consistency," "skill," and "confidence" to begin each of the 48 refined objectives (pp. 743-746).

Bobbitt does not stop solely with objectives. He also says that the complete objective pattern could finalize only with the "predetermination" of the objectives under the watchful eye of the curriculum person of record--the building principal or the superintendent: "The objectives actually aimed at within any school system must differ from region to region according to the specific needs of the population" (Bobbitt, 1920a, p. 747). Once established, the objectives generalize into one of nine education areas:

1. Education for general physical efficiency
2. Education for general mental efficiency
3. Education for unspecialized activities of production, distribution, conservation, and consumption
4. Education for a vocation
5. Education for citizenship
6. Education for general social relationships and contacts
7. Education for social intercommunication
8. Education for religious attitudes and activities
9. Education for parental responsibilities

(Bobbitt, 1920a, pp. 748-749)

Bobbitt (1920a) finishes with homage to the behaviorists:

"Look at it [the outcomes] from the point of view of behavioristic psychology" (p. 749). He also warns that

select, forthcoming articles, including one regarding mistakes administrators often make, he will write in behavioristic tone and philosophy.

"Mistakes Often Made by Principals

--Part I" (1920b)

Bobbitt often complements his survey work by indicting those with whom he disagrees. He revered most superintendents and their work; he rarely criticized them. However, because so much daily school work depended on the building principals, Bobbitt writes not only one, but two articles, cautioning and warning principals of their responsibilities, surveying their respective tasks, and listing their "proper" functions. "Mistakes Often Made by Principals--Part I" (1920b) opens with education as a metaphorical long road. Bobbitt (1920b) warns principals to be careful on that road: "It [the road] is obscure and ill-defined in many, even most, of its parts; there are innumerable pitfalls into which he [the principal] may easily stumble; and false trails of many kinds lead off into wrong directions" (p. 337). Bobbitt's various surveys (1920b) indicate the eight misdirected roads principals might encounter:

1. Autocratic rule--Most surveys indicated that principals either did not consult with staffs, or else ignored the teachers. Bobbitt underscores the democratic nature "good" schools and their building principals' adhere:

The principal's direction of the work should be largely the stimulation of teachers to provide detailed plans of work, and the emendation and approval of such plans in conferences with the teachers. Only thus can there be democracy and normal human relationships within the organization. (p. 338)

2. Failure to delegate item lists--Bobbitt ties this directly to autocratic rule, and he castigates principals who do not delegate their power, have no confidence in their staffs, fail to understand school problems, or possess no management plans.

3. Trying to do too much at once--Bobbitt suggests that lacking an efficient management plan often results in the principal "scattering" his efforts. The author's plan to remedy this is predictable--a manual that will tell the administrator how and what to delegate.

4. Lack of interest in the teachers' work--Bobbitt links lack of interest with a similar lack of experimentation, because he believes that much teaching is experimental. Teachers must formulate continually new and distinct teaching plans and ideas; consequently, the principal must be current with their thinking: "The principal who is not constantly in intimate contact with the thinking of the teachers is failing in the highest function of all" (p. 340).

5. Withholding responsibility--Bobbitt detests. In one paragraph, he states: "Strength of any kind is begotten

through the exercise of function" (p. 340). He also indicts teachers who can not take responsibility: "Those [teachers] who cannot [take responsibility] are mental and social incompetents who should be eliminated from the profession" (p. 341). Bobbitt could become acerbic and brusque.

6. The principal who takes too much credit--Bobbitt maintains that a wise administrator gives as much credit to his staff as possible. Bobbitt has good reason for an administrator encouraging a staff's efforts: "To repress them or to inhibit effort by stealing the credit that they have earned is to destroy his own chances for success" (p. 341). Similar to his warning "incompetent" teachers, Bobbitt warns "incompetent" administrators: "The one [principal] who is so petty that he cannot see wherein his own success lies has no place in a position of leadership" (p. 341). Poor administrators doom a school, the author intones.

7. Lack of direct effort--Bobbitt earlier spoke of overextending administrative authority. He warns here that "feeble" leadership fails: "Oftentimes he [the administrator] becomes little more than a mere unskilled, unprofessional, 'odd-job' man [another use of a Frederick Taylor-designed term] engaged in oiling the places in the machinery which have a tendency to creak" (pp. 342-343). Bobbitt blames superintendents for some share of the principals' faults. Speaking of the errors a superintendent can make regarding a principal, Bobbitt says:

"Quite obviously, the shortcomings in the performance of the principal here discussed are oftentimes induced by autocracy and arbitrariness in the offices of the official's superiors" (p. 343). Bobbitt indicates that superintendents err because they are arbitrary in their delegation to the principal, professionally ignorant, intellectually slack, or otherwise timid (pp. 343-344). No mention does Bobbitt make of the superintendent's responsibility to the student--only by inference and delegation to his staff.

8. Frequently policy changes--Bobbitt suggests that the good principal sets a proper school course. Changing policies, which connotes lack of purpose, resolve, and professional direction, concludes the list of administrative resolutions (pp. 338-346). Bobbitt concludes this article by admonishing principals to take their all-important work very seriously, a subject he addresses again immediately.

"Mistakes Often Made by Principals

--Part II" (1920c)

Bobbitt's second article regarding hypothetical principals' errors, appears in Elementary School Journal, January, 1920. "Principals Mistakes, Part II," logically, begins where Part I concluded. Bobbitt's opening lines (1920c) confirm: "Let us continue with an enumeration from the same sources of the principal's errors of an inspectorial character" (p. 419).

9. Lack of inspection time--Bobbitt equates the duties of "direction" and "inspection" as co-equals, something that should be built of "a community of understanding" (p. 420). The community of understanding might be marred only by a haziness of what "keeps the machine running smoothly," poor organizational planning or management, and routine superseding inspection duties (p. 420).

10. Arbitrary building inspections--Bobbitt feels that arbitrary and autocratic rule is not the professional rule of the principal. Rather, "the direction should be that of educational science as this is read by professional people all along the line from superintendent to teachers and pupils" (p. 420). Bobbitt's democratic method requires unified teachers and aligned superintendents for pupils. Individual democratic portends Bobbitt does not mention.

11. Work inspection regarding nondefinite rules/standards--Ill-defined standards need clarification, Bobbitt succinctly says.

12. Inspection regarding fluctuating standards--Bobbitt addresses this problem by having the principal set definite guidelines. However, his telling statement is not about the administrator, but rather the teacher and the nondemocratic system: "Teachers tend naturally to mark time until the administration can decide what it wants" (p. 422). Aimlessness of any sort Bobbitt decried.

13. Inspection with no absolute purpose--If the administrator cannot translate what he says to what the

teachers should do, then any inspection is worthless. As with most other items in this list, students and teachers do not assist or have inspection input.

14. The principals should not fail to report inspections to teachers--Communities can build on common error finding and reporting, comments Bobbitt.

15. Inspection disavows personal bias--Bobbitt melds the "unseen" elements of objectives' writing and reporting. The author speaks of having "clarity and fullness of impersonal scientific thought regarding the nature of the processes that are to be employed and the specific results" (p. 423). Neither Bobbitt mentions further.

16. Gossiping to teachers about other flaws--The "community" under whose auspices Bobbitt says he writes might be the reason to break this rule. If the community would benefit, says Bobbitt, "Possibly in rare cases it [talking about a teacher to another] ought to be consciously used for this purpose" (p. 424). Bobbitt offers no rationale for his reasoning.

17. Spying on teachers--Bobbitt definitely vetoes this activity, though he makes no comment on why the subject even arose.

18. Leadership in terms of organizing supervision--Bobbitt says the man who lets other menial tasks disturb organizing and supervising teachers can do two things: set a certain portion of each day aside for the supervision; or,

study continually educational "ideas." Bobbitt does not mention what those "ideas" are, however.

19. Routine interfering with professional leadership-- Bobbitt mentions the "vision" that a good superintendent must have. He also must act. If he can do neither, Bobbitt suggests seven alternatives: (a) Clarify his vision. (b) Develop a thorough, economic work ethic that allows for his own participation. (c) Carry out the plan. (d) Become a student of means and ends. (e) Prioritize his day so that he involves himself in all major facets of the school plant. (f) Delegate less-important tasks to teachers. (g) Assign other work to janitors and students (pp. 426-427).

20. Various omissions in an "other" category receive attention in this last number. Bobbitt suggests that administrators should strive to learn what mistakes they might make. Once they learn this skill, they can prevent virtually any future communication or situation (pp. 420-427). His next article comments on more student concerns.

"A Significant Tendency in Curriculum Making" (1921a)

As opposed to the previous administrator-directed articles, Bobbitt offers some very student-centered comments in "A Significant Tendency in Curriculum Making," which he writes for Elementary School Journal, April, 1921. His opening statement echoes his customary "science in curriculum" position: "The first step in curriculum-making

is, of course, to decide upon the developmental results that are to be the outcomes of the training" (Bobbitt, 1921a, p. 607). Bobbitt continues two stylistic components in this article, components he repeats in most every article or book he composes. First, he tells readers that "activity analysis" is his *raison d'être*. Second, he uses an easy, concise style, born of years of objective-like lectures and works.

Bobbitt (1921a) recapitulates the vague "aims of education" he has encountered, including "culture, social efficiency, self-realization, etc." (p. 607). However, he narrates, that affective areas ended when particularizing and detailing objectives began. As an example, he cites a Rochester, New York, elementary-school reading program's 27 objectives. The objectives ranged from "Permanent interest in reading newspapers" (1), "Ability to interpret and to make application of things read" (13), to "Habit of handling books with care" (27) (Bobbitt, 1921a, p. 609). Bobbitt notes: "Each of the specific objectives points toward its own special road" (Bobbitt, 1921a, p. 609). Those roads allow teachers to direct their students: "Naturally, they [the teachers] must know children and social processes and professional things in great number and detail in order really to see the road which is so dictated" (Bobbitt, 1921a, p. 609).

However, unlike most all his other articles, Bobbitt also presents three alternatives:

The first was an unnamed "experimental school" in Los Angeles. The differentiation between traditional teacher-led behavior objectives was a plan that enabled students to self-analyze and report when they were ready to progress to another grade. For example, B-3 math youngsters would see the following:

[To know]

1. The forty-five combinations.
2. Addition and subtraction of numbers within thousands, with reduction and carrying.
3. Tables of 2's and 5's to 5 times 10.
4. One-half of even numbers and one-fifth of numbers ending in 5 and 0 within the tables of 2 and 5.
5. Multiplication by 2 and 5 within thousands.
6. Addition and subtraction of United States money. (Bobbitt, 1921a, pp. 610-611)

When the students learn the above, they qualify themselves to progress. The advantages, Bobbitt states, are that both address specific abilities and grade level. The students, to an extent, have some control over what they do, though none concerning the objectives themselves or the subject.

A second alternative is Micheltorena Street School. Bobbitt applauds them. Instead of the usual classifying, grading, and promoting, Micheltorena students work in homogeneous groups. The groups advance when collectively ready. Additionally, within the group, each pupil makes progress through individual instruction, unassigned

teachers, and optional subject work designed for him or her. On occasion, Bobbitt comments favorably on such theory items as Micheltorena's cooperative learning. However, in practice, he remained very loyal to traditional "3-R" teaching applications.

A third "experimental study," in Detroit, builds its coursework to complement student abilities within subject matter:

There must be a greater consideration paid to the needs and natures of the individual child. Children have been proved to differ so radically in their capacities and rates of progress that new forms of classroom procedure are imperative. (Bobbitt, 1921a, p. 614)

Bobbitt (1921a) thus modifies his outlook regarding the nature of students, a change that will have national exposure several years later:

The curriculum is coming to be defined as a series of living experiences on the part of the children which look toward developing within them the specific qualities and abilities. Thus the curriculum is a thing which exists within the children and within them differently according to their natures, capacities, social opportunities, social stimulations, etc.

(p. 614)

He has even more to say about the youngsters; however, their "natures" become his focus:

Different pupils will make different speeds in attaining similar goals. They will cover different amounts of subject matter in the same unit of time. They will utilize different types of activities or experience in attaining similar objectives, according to their original natures, desires, opportunities, social stimulations, etc. (Bobbitt, 1921, p. 614)

Bobbitt forecasts the need to look further into student-oriented schools. His forecast includes ultimate goals of the schools, standards of progress and measurement, administrative leadership and teacher methods, student natures and needs, courses of width and depth, testing in general, texts, and grading (Bobbitt, 1921, pp. 614-615). Bobbitt thus demonstrates an educational epiphany, tinged with his "natures" orientation. He will expand his child-centeredness in the 1926 NSSE Yearbook.

"The Actual Objectives of the Present-Day High School" (1921b)

"The Actual Objectives of the Present-day High School" Bobbitt writes for School Review, April, 1921. In this article, he uses the NEA's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education's "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education" as a template to complement his own scientism. He affirms the seven classes of objectives the Article Commission mentions: 1) vocation, 2) citizenship, 3) health, 4) worthy use of leisure, 5) command of

fundamental processes, 6) worthy home membership, 7) ethical character (Bobbitt, 1921b, p. 256). To question or confirm whether secondary schools had employed the Cardinal Principles' seven classes of objectives, Bobbitt sent out a questionnaire to 51 randomly-selected high schools across the United States. In that questionnaire, he asked their curriculum during the 1920-1921 academic school year.

Bobbitt (1921b) constructs 32 subject/discipline groups:

	Median
1. Occupational subjects (7, 16, 19, 21, 23, 25, 29, 30, 31, and 32)	27.8
2. Occupational subjects open to boys (7, 19, 21, 23, 26, 29, 30, 32)	20.7
3. Occupational subjects open to girls (7, 16, 21, 26, 29, 30, 31)	20.7
4. English	19.8
5. Practical arts--all	13.9
6. Mathematics	13.6
7. Commercial subjects	11.5
8. Social studies (15, 22, 25, 26, 29, 30)	10.7
9. Science, physical and biological	9.7
10. Practical arts open to boys	8.6
11. History (15, 22, 29, 30)	8.1
12. Practical arts open to girls	7.5
13. Modern languages	6.7
14. Latin	6.1

15. Ancient and European History	5.2
16. Household Occupations	5.0
17. Physical training: gymnasium, etc.	3.9
18. French	3.7
19. Shop activities for boys	3.5
20. Spanish	2.9
21. Drawing and design, freehand, etc.	2.9
22. United States history	2.4
23. Mechanical drawing	1.9
24. Music	1.8
25. Civics, social problems, sociology, etc.	1.5
26. Economics	.4
27. Physiology	.1
28. Hygiene and Sanitation	.0
29. Economic geography	.0
30. Economic history	.0
31. Teacher-training classes	.0
32. Agriculture	.0

(p. 258)

Bobbitt's study proves that the high schools he surveyed had not complied with the Cardinal Principles' recommendations.

Per the Commission's report, the vocational studies comprise more than any other subject or area, 28%, though Bobbitt laments that most of it is in pure or simple clerical training and not of the "social type." Bobbitt (1921b) states: "Our most complex and difficult economic or occupational problems are not those of technique but rather

those of social adjustment and control" (p. 263). Control remains very important for Bobbitt.

The second "Cardinal" principle, civic objectives, Bobbitt emphasizes, had not been taught. However, he is more interested in the historical approach to civics that received no attention, as opposed to the subject itself. Bobbitt demands here, as he has done so repeatedly in the past, that schools serve students' practical abilities. Historical teaching approaches, he contends, give students pragmatic knowledge.

The next principle, health objectives, Bobbitt relates to the studies conducted by the Life Extension Institute. He cites the military draft as proof of the average student's "physical invalidity" (Bobbitt, 1921b, p. 266). Only physical education infuses youth, Bobbitt maintains; no "health" studies apply. He declares that lack of health consciousness results from no particularized objectives, poor training, and public schools systems' ignorance.

Bobbitt's leisure studies include English, physical training, drawing and design, and music. However, he makes no decision regarding how much emphasis to place where. Just as he mentions the problems with leisure time activity, he also says that the last objectives of the Cardinal Principles, fundamental processes, home membership, and ethical character, have even more problems. He concludes: "The thing [quantifying and qualifying the Cardinal Principles] is yet impossible because the bases of judgment

have not yet been scientifically established" (Bobbitt, 1921b, p. 272).

Bobbitt's dependence on science causes him to lose sight of many qualitative, general education issues. He uses quantitative methodology and an inherent trust in measurable education. Especially in his Los Angeles Survey, indicative of the others, does Bobbitt display his "science-reliance" (emphasis added). Following, however, in his only treatise on physical education, Bobbitt establishes his strong views on the need for behavioral objectives.

"Objectives of Physical Education" (1921c)

Writing for the May edition of American Physical Education Review, Bobbitt (1921c) addresses the need for more control not only in physical education, but education in general: "The most perplexing problem of general education at present in every department is the problem of the objectives" (p. 229). More specifically, he questions, "What are the specific outcomes of the work which the department should strive and secure?" (Bobbitt, 1921c, p. 229). Moreover, he had special interest with physical education's place in the curriculum. Worthy use of leisure time had been a tenet of the Cardinal Principles, as well as Bobbitt's modification of that Commission's report (cf. National Education Association, 1918, and Bobbitt, 1920a, for more information). Both the NEA Commission and Bobbitt believed that physical exercise in school and

leisure-time activity linked to student and citizen involvement and productivity.

Bobbitt lauds medical and trade schools' curricular efforts. Both feature particular object lessons, emphasize attention to academic or procedural details, and specify sequenced behavioral objectives. U.S. public schools' auxiliary courses such as PE, Bobbitt (1921c) notes, lack all three, but especially need the latter: "This plan of approach [the use of sequenced behavioral objectives] is, however, a new thing for most of our general or non-specialized education" (p. 229). Full participating membership in society hinges on students' assimilation and use of the "general or non-specialized" coursework, according to Bobbitt.

To further the country's need for more and better citizens, Bobbitt initiates a physical education plan. To begin, he makes two baseline inquiries: "What are the physical characteristics of the physically proficient individual?" and "What are the things which one should be able to do by way of developing and maintaining this physical efficiency?" (Bobbitt, 1921c, p. 230). Once he posed those questions, Bobbitt reports that the remainder of the physical education curriculum making becomes facile-- using the trade school as a model, send out "skilled observers" and produce a survey that demonstrates students' PE needs.

Much as he had done in his survey mode, circa 1914 to the present 1921 date, Bobbitt postulates 50 potential physical education "abilities" that might help curricular constructors. Those "abilities" touch the areas of physical stature, participation in games and activities, and hygiene and health care. Following are samples of those "abilities":

1. "Soundness of physique; freedom from structural or functional defect or efficiency; soundness of every tissue, organ and system of organs." Relating to corollary issues of coordination, strength, and vitality, Bobbitt lists 15 other abilities.

16. "Ability and disposition throughout life to engage with pleasure and profit in a varied repertory of games, sports, athletics, dances, outdoor recreations, etc." Bobbitt notes a variety of carryover sports that include competitive events like tennis and golf, as well as noncompetitive exercises such as swimming, skating, hiking, rowing, riding, fencing, folk dancing, fishing, hunting, canoeing, motoring, camping, and other recreations.

30. "Ability to work hard for long periods and still keep physically fit." Under this heading comes the final 32 abilities. This category becomes a receptacle for every body function from abilities to care for eyes, hair, teeth, etc. (33-36), prevention of colds, flu, and diseases (45-48), and even sexual functions (44) (Bobbitt, 1921c, pp. 230-231).

Bobbitt (1921c) points to unnamed statistics that condemn "our national physical invalidity" (p. 232). That invalidity, i.e., the lack of physical culture, manifested itself in a report Bobbitt read from the Society of Directors of Physical Education. The report's aims for American youth included more group participation, personal satisfaction, and stamina. Bobbitt (1921c) charges educators to validate the future of U.S. public school students, as well as the future of the country, by promoting his survey-led physical education curriculum revision:

The writer would be insistent upon one thing only. There is imperative need of the physical education department's drawing up a comprehensive but definite and particularized statement of the objectives at which to aim in education for individual and national physical efficiency. (p. 233)

This article does not stop with Bobbitt's plea for more and better physical education curricula, however. Unique to this article is a "Discussion"/counterpoint section. Dudley B. Reed, M.D., applauds Bobbitt's contention that schools prepare students for citizenship; however, he has reservations regarding a strict behavioral-objectives position: "He [Bobbitt] seems to believe that it is more logical and more likely to lead to success if educators have before them with great exactness the objectives toward which they are working" (Bobbitt, 1921c, p. 233). Dr. Reed suggests that the behavioral approach is far too detailed.

His second criticism has even more impact: "And it does seem to me that he has fallen into the common error of assuming that physical education is entirely concerned with education of the body rather than education by the body" (Bobbitt, 1921c, p. 233). Though Reed's contentions have notice and merit here, the spirit of creating behavioral objectives forges ahead with Bobbitt's survey work in Los Angeles. In that California city, Bobbitt found only support for his scientism.

"Curriculum Making in Los Angeles" (1922a)

"Educational Objectives" (1922b)

Bobbitt continues his surveys with "Curriculum-Making in Los Angeles," published by the University of Chicago in 1922. This work is one-fourth of that genre Bobbitt completed in the 1920s. The others occurred in Wheeling, West Virginia, Toledo, Ohio, and Terre Haute, Indiana--all except the Los Angeles Survey remain unavailable. DeWulf (1962) notes the latter three have been unavailable or were not printed as such, but also writes that the Los Angeles survey represents an acknowledged compendium of the other "lost" works (pp. 304-306). Data indicates that Bobbitt also constructed state surveys for Illinois, Mississippi, and New York, though none exist today (cf. DeWulf, 1962, pp. 295-307, for more information about this subject).

Bobbitt became Los Angeles City School System Assistant Superintendent for the 1922 academic school year. He did so

apparently to devote himself to the task of thinking through his own survey work. The Los Angeles survey itself demonstrates Bobbitt's perseverance to research tasks, as well as his interest in authority-led, community-based curriculum study. As such, "Educational Objectives" (1922b), the complementary piece to "Curriculum Making in Los Angeles" (1922a), is just that. Bobbitt compiled 923 particular objectives to complement the Los Angeles survey work. He labels his objectives in categories of physical efficiency, occupational objectives, efficient citizenship, general social contacts and relationships, leisure occupations, and general mental efficiency (Bobbitt, 1922b, pp. 5-21). The Los Angeles survey itself acts as a fulcrum point. During the time of its writing, Bobbitt "changes" from his dogmatic "administrator-led" curriculum writing to a more "child-centered" (emphasis added) one.

Giving credit to Mrs. Susan M. Dorsey, the Los Angeles Superintendent of Schools, as well as Mr. Arthur Gould and Miss Helen Watson, the two assistant superintendents, Bobbitt begins his research. He surveyed 1,200 Los Angeles teachers and involved several of his own graduate students as research assistants. Bobbitt (1922a) quickly defines the lack of democratic principle under which he will work: "The plan was not designed on the basis of any doctrinaire theory of democracy relative to giving every teacher a voice in the work" (p. 2), let alone any students. Bobbitt's style is direct and concise. His initial premise, "Education aims to

produce results" (Bobbitt, 1922a, p. 4), does not belie the many other articles and books that begin likewise. The Los Angeles work connotes textbook information as a means, not an end, and Bobbitt (1922a) insists that his first survey research task, as usual, is to incorporate a complete list of human abilities and characteristics Los Angeles students need. Procedures for such information and objective gathering took two distinct formats:

1. Bobbitt presented to the Los Angeles staffs and research people a pre-prepared list of objectives that his students at the University of Chicago had gathered, something he advocated as "illustration."

2. Addressing the 1,200 Los Angeles teachers, then, Bobbitt (1922a) asked the following questions concerning the abilities and characteristics their students might have (based on Bobbitt's graduate student lists): (A) Which of the following human characteristics and abilities appear to be generally desirable, and therefore legitimate objectives of education? (B) Which ones are frequently, but not generally, desirable? (C) Which ones are probably undesirable, and therefore not legitimate objectives of education? (D) Which ones are least questionable? (E) Which ones should be amended in statement? (F) What amendment would you suggest? (G) What additional abilities and characteristics here suggested, are also desirable, which should be added to the lists by way of completing

them? (H) Which of the following statements of ability are not clear in meaning? (Bobbitt, 1922a, pp. 5-6).

Further, Bobbitt lists more than 1,000 collective objectives for the students' good, and he stresses 50 as critical for any student's success. The 50 objectives range from "Interest in the things involved: materials, forces, processes, experiences, results," to "Courage in facing and grappling with obstacles" (Bobbitt, 1922a, pp. 35-36).

Bobbitt advocates his usual doctrines: knowledge (12-a, 20-a, 24-a, 42-a, 47-a), the utilitarian ethic (4-a, 5-a, 31-a, 16-a, 38-a, 41-a, and 52-a), and scientific use or inquiry (7-a, 15-a, 19-a, 37-a, 39-a, 44-a, 46-a, and 48-a). With these tenets, however, Bobbitt introduces a new one.

That new one, beginning a young person's self-directedness, includes the following:

1-a. Interest in the things involved.

3-a. Right valuation of the things, processes, results, etc., involved.

9-a. Self direction and self-control in performing all activities involved.

28-a. Disposition to be active in all matters that involve action.

45-a. Openness of mind toward new things, new developments, new inventions, etc. (Bobbitt, 1922a, pp. 30-31).

For Bobbitt, child-centeredness is a relatively new concept. He suggests that the Los Angeles curriculum

people, as well as any others who might read, study, or use this document, should take human characteristics and abilities and "aim at them individually without regard to the usual subjects or departments" (Bobbitt, 1922a, p. 37). Bobbitt encourages new subjects or departments, or at least "distribute them [child-centered ideas] among the present subjects and departments" (1922a, p. 37). Bobbitt has hinted and suggested some Dewey-like phrases and even parts of articles before. However, this piece acts as precursor for the significant change Bobbitt demonstrates in the 1926 NSSE's Yearbook.

The Los Angeles Survey itself, though, also recedes to "scientific" (emphasis added) theory. Bobbitt maintains that effective and scientific surveys use traditional objectives. Those objectives underscore assumptions. 13 such assumptions Bobbitt writes. Number 100, for example, states education is for adults, proposes what adults will need, and aims at different ability levels. Number 109 maintains: "Each child--so far as can be administratively managed--is to be trained according to his individual capacity and needs" (Bobbitt, 1922a, p. 111). Bobbitt's educational philosophy still relies on individual differences, "the good life," and training that bridges the two.

Bobbitt's assumptions regarding students build on what he has written before. Number 130, for example, affirms that only experiences educate. Number 131 alludes to a

"heredity factor" (Bobbitt, 1922a, p. 42). Number 142 refers to a young person's "sense of responsibility" (Bobbitt, 1922a, p. 43). All three remind the reader that Bobbitt clings to his science-in-curriculum motifs most of the time. He mentions, however, in the same context, that curriculum makers should look to the students for "the well-springs of action and effort that can be utilized in prompting to greatest endeavor" (Bobbitt, 1922a, p. 43). He does not explain how the curriculum makers should look, or at what they should look. Bobbitt (1922a) expects curriculum writing diversity will "involve all normal and desirable aspects of one's being" (p. 44).

The conclusion of "Curriculum Making in Los Angeles" (1922a) becomes a myriad of all disciplines, as well as various objectives to achieve those disciplines. It is an objectives parade reminiscent of his earlier surveys. The Los Angeles document's importance, though, is the degree of student-centeredness the author mentions. Though that student-centeredness is not substantial, does not permeate the work, or even gets a thorough explanation, nonetheless, it is there. Bobbitt has begun to intermix that topic with his traditional functional scientism. Arithmetic, an emphatic portion of that scientism, he addresses in his next article.

"The Technique of Curriculum Making
in Arithmetic" (1924a)

Bobbitt addresses mathematics and curriculum in "The Technique of Curriculum Making in Arithmetic" for Elementary School Journal, October, 1924. Noting that this piece "is the second of a series of articles on the techniques of curriculum-making" (Bobbitt, 1924a, p. 127), the author begins. Arithmetic fits well into Bobbitt's functional curriculum, because it could be taught and administered precisely. He separates pure mathematics from "practical affairs," another term for business mathematics. Bobbitt approaches the latter as a common-sense subject that students utilize in three ways. First, he gives an example of reading a newspaper article regarding a star's distance from earth. Second, he shifts to the sports section and how students might figure baseball batting averages. Third, he appeals to the person who wants to solve puzzles, do problems, or just wants to be "intellectually alert" (Bobbitt, 1924a, p. 128). Bobbitt makes a strong case for arithmetic's overall efficacy and practicability.

Bobbitt concludes that mathematics itself is indispensable for all citizens. The only questions he poses are how mathematics can further aid vocational studies, and how many mathematics courses practical living needs. For that practical usage, Bobbitt champions G. M. Wilson's data. Surveying 150 occupations in Iowa, Kansas, and Minnesota, Wilson had discovered mathematics a most important

curriculum and life component. Wilson found that 83% of mathematics applications concerned buying and selling products. Another 11% utilized personal banking, rent, and insurance skills. Wilson also showed that 6% of mathematics applications consisted of time/hours problems, building materials, and gas buying (Bobbitt, 1924a, p. 131). Wilson, Bobbitt notes, specialized in specific problems, not just operational definitions.

Lamenting Wilson's limited vocational usage, Bobbitt promotes H. W. Adams. Adams surveyed 20 publications regarding 16 "activities of the general population" (Bobbitt, 1924a, p. 134). The list included dates, addresses, phone numbers, numerals, roman numerals, money, common fractions, decimals, percentage, ratio, denominate numbers, mathematical terms, graphical representation, mathematical ideas, problems, and higher mathematics (Bobbitt, 1924a, pp. 134-135). Bobbitt notes that Adams found only slight mention of algebra, geometry, and trigonometry. Since such a paucity of evidence about the practical need for algebra existed, Bobbitt abruptly concludes. To facilitate Adams' work, and pursue his own penchant for mathematics, Bobbitt exhorts educators to renew their quantitative curriculum.

"The New Technique of
Curriculum Making" (1924b)

Beginning with "The New Technique of Curriculum Making," in Elementary School Journal, September, 1924, Bobbitt continues his growth as a curriculum writer. He maintains his earlier student-oriented thoughts from "A Significant Tendency in Curriculum Making" (1921a), and "Curriculum Making in Los Angeles" (1922a). To aid his version of student-oriented work, Bobbitt proposes a new curriculum making technique--functionalism. Not exactly utilitarianism, not exactly scientism, Bobbitt's functionalism becomes an extension of his successful activities work. Bobbitt disavows the subject-centered format, as well as his previous stance that education was exclusively for adult living. In "The New Technique of Curriculum Making" (1924b), he announces a life/education process:

Life and education are one process, and never should they diverge. Perhaps we should also mention, since it is a matter of vital concern to the curriculum, that, as we educate, behavior is for its own sake and not more consciously than necessary for the sake of education. The latter is best when it is a by-product, a by-product of life which is lived for its own sake.

(Bobbitt, 1924b, p. 47)

Bobbitt has not forecasted or forewarned the curricular world for such a statement, but it appears. Activity-

analysis still gives him focus, and Bobbitt (1924b) still sees the importance of science-in-education:

The change is coming, too, in an age which is impatient with the primitive methods of guess and whim and the dictation of the special predilections of selfish academic interests. It comes in an age which is demanding that science be placed in control of educational affairs and that scientific methods be employed in formulating the entire program of education, curriculum-making included. (p. 49)

Citing the Los Angeles survey work he participated in earlier (1922a and 1922b), as well as the curriculum work of his compatriot W. W. Charters, Bobbitt advocates major divisions of his nine life's activities: health, citizenship, social, language, leisure occupations, activities for mental health, religious activities, parental activities, and activities in practical arts.

Bobbitt expects possible criticism of his work. He does not answer whether or not "inner" or "outer" activities are more important. Nor does he debate whether people manage their lives badly. He does not discuss the efficacy of a great books approach to learning. Rather, he addresses "normal levels" for all learners: "The analysis is to show what is normal for each of the levels" (Bobbitt, 1924b, p. 54). "Normal" replaces democracy for Bobbitt as he struggles to write child-centered curriculum. Teachers writing curriculum becomes Bobbitt's next focus.

"Discovering and Formulating the Objectives
of Teacher Training Institutions" (1924c)

In October, 1924, Bobbitt pursues where and how teachers get their training to engage his "activity curriculum." He does so in "Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher Training Institutions" for the Journal of Educational Research. To begin, Bobbitt believes that teacher-training schools themselves are vocational institutions. That training includes activity analysis, seeking out particular jobs, and then synthesizing the people's ability who will perform the tasks. To those ends, he quotes Charters' "ideals of the schooling" (Bobbitt, 1924c, p. 188). Bobbitt equates Charters' ideals with abilities to do jobs, and jobs with activity analysis. He urges teacher-training institutes to consider his activity analysis philosophy.

Bobbitt (1924c) makes a six-pronged activity analysis to teacher-training schools/institutions: "Our task is to analyze the educative process as it ought to be; not to find out what teachers are doing, but rather to prove on the basis of carefully assembled evidence, what they ought to be doing" (p. 190). Bobbitt's (1924b) activities follow:

1. Test the student to find out what individual characteristics, the "physical and psychological prognosis he or she has" (p. 190). For Bobbitt's "remedies," [emphasis added] the school becomes a hospital.

2. The teacher forecasts the future place of the

student into the adult world via specific objectives. The author adds, "The teacher is to be high-minded and yet to deal with the truth, not with illusions or delusions" (p. 192), and asks the parents for help in that education.

3. Teachers should treat youngsters as individuals, but they should also have vision regarding where and how students might progress through educational systems.

4. School materials and facilities become the fourth agent. Bobbitt speaks of using "all the materials and facilities, books, playground, home kitchens, etc., and whatever else in the pupil's material environment assists him to a normal functioning of his powers" (p. 193).

5. The fifth directive puts the teacher in the position of a Thorndike-god-like figure who can control the student. Bobbitt says: "The teacher must, therefore, be a master of the influences in the human environment which are to be used and controlled in conditioning the functioning of the pupil's powers" (p. 194). The author confuses himself sometimes, for he also recognizes various influences each student encounters: "It is these varying influences which are to be discovered and utilized in his education" (p. 195). He counteracts that thought: "Here again, therefore, each pupil needs to be treated as an individual, and not as an impersonal unit in a class" (p. 195). Bobbitt struggles with his country's democracy and his own version of democracy, i.e., one in which school youngsters may choose from what a "visionary" sets forth in front of them,

not choose for themselves from their own periphery and perception.

6. The last in this series is proof that Bobbitt does see the greater good of lifting, at least to an extent, the veil and weight of the activities curriculum that would shroud young people. The last of the teacher-training objectives becomes an observer's eye on the growth of the young person. Bobbitt states: "This [the directive here] is to observe continuously the development of the child's power to function in the expected degrees along the different and desired lines" (p. 195).

In closing these six (pp. 190-196), Bobbitt also makes two important remarks. First: "It can never be possible to group children into classes with identical standards" (Bobbitt, 1924c, p. 195). Second: "Each child is to grow into the power to function according to his original nature and his social situation" (Bobbitt, 1924c, p. 195).

Bobbitt mixes his own Doctrine of the Secular Elect and his new vision. That vision emancipated students from Charles Eliot's Committee of Ten's Report. Moreover, Bobbitt (1924c) states the good teacher can realize all educational aspects, and can "know the child thoroughly" (p. 195). Education, he says, "calls for humanness in the cultivation of human beings" (Bobbitt, 1924c, p. 195). Bobbitt remains with his essentialism--functionalism; however, he forges some child-centered thoughts. Such

forging produces his next article, one in which he questions society's role in education.

"What Understanding of Human Society
Should Education Develop?" (1924d)

Bobbitt's "What Understanding of Human Society Should Education Develop?", published in December, 1924, in Elementary School Journal, provides more prefatory information regarding his philosophical change in 1926. In his opening sentence of "What Understanding of Human Society Should Education Develop?", unlike many others describing "scientific" activities, Bobbitt (1924d) notes his country's social changes from the Industrial Revolution forward: "The most numerous and the most difficult problems of the world today are those involved in social adjustment and control" (p. 290). I maintain Bobbitt's refabricated scientism and activity analysis represent public school controlling factors. Both touch social adjustment and manipulation.

If the "right" community, supported by the "right" business, makes the "right" (emphasis added) activity curriculum overtures, the local schools can become a corporation support and feeder system. Bobbitt (1924d) writes: "Class-conscious groups of many kinds are seeking their own ends at the expense of the general welfare" (p. 290). The author chastises such people for their academic and business shortsightedness.

The shortsightedness comes from the division of labors. The machine age had replaced community and small business agendas. Bobbitt (1924d) implores both to come together for the common good: "It is obvious that these groups need to co-operate and to promote the welfare of one another for their own good rather than to seek to overreach or defeat one another" (p. 290). For whatever reasons, Bobbitt looks at the problem as one of simple geography and area. He notes that north, south, east, and west are different, and that farmers and industrialists are also different.

He does not go one step further, however, and indict the big-business ethic, to which he had become an unwitting pawn. Rather, he transfers the problem to a global perspective, and claims that the entire world has become a compendium of encyclopedia-like information and knowledge. The encyclopedia, as analogy, does not provide him with what he wants. His surveying technique, let alone his whole essentialist-science motif, does not serve the needs and wants of students. The difference is that encyclopedias have no ability to make a philosophical statement. Bobbitt does. He gets lost in an argument about the applicability of the 128 articles and the 32 countries. Bobbitt is only comfortable making his own philosophical points; he does not become a critical thinker.

Bobbitt (1924d) does discuss knowledge, the business of education, and his own curricular theory (activity analysis) interactively:

Curriculum-making today is everywhere assuming that life is action and that the business of education is to prepare man for action. Activity-analysis is the basic method of discovering educational objectives. In such analysis we must recognize the fact that this intellectual action on which we here call vision is one of the most incessant of human activities. It is a thing to be cared for through a carefully devised and elaborate educational program. It must result in fullness of normal, healthy knowledge and understanding, and yet it is a thing quite different from that embalmed textbook knowledge which used to be the objective of much of our educational effort.

(p. 292)

Curriculum study, as opposed to the old, fixed textbook methodology, and even the writing of encyclopedias, is not fixed, says Bobbitt (1924d): "It will be, rather, a continuity of viewing directly and indirectly human affairs, groups, relations, and institutions with their multiform activities" (p. 293). The author believes that substituting an activity analysis curriculum for a textbook-laden one will solve the United States' educational dilemma. What he does not comprehend is that activity analysis is as fixed in its adult/administrator-led fabrications as the textbook method was. Bobbitt's concept of American democracy is frayed and flawed. He addresses child-study, as referenced in the last two articles cited, and he continually and

forcefully favors a more democratic-like students' rights platform. However, it is a platform he constructs.

Bobbitt neither thinks through student-centered theory and practice, nor does he show continuity in that philosophy. Perhaps, as he did surveys or wrote articles, the concept of pure democratically-run schools appealed to him. On occasion, he entertains Dewey-like thoughts. Bobbitt lacked the ability, background, and continuity to promote sustained empowerment throughout his career.

In "The New Technique of Curriculum-making" (1924b), Bobbitt struggles with child-centered curriculum planning. In so doing, he replaces usual lessons, plans, etc. for democracy. Moreover, in "Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher-training Institutions" (1924c), he views teacher training, both schools and the procedures, as exclusively vocational endeavors. His writing demonstrates his struggle to understand the "training vs. child-centered" dichotomy. In "What Understanding of Human Society Should Education Develop?" (1924d), Bobbitt addresses America's change from an agrarian base to an industrial one. He does so to understand the tenets of more child-centered work or writing; however, his results prove only that his activity analysis, modified, would benefit students, schools, and society. The prime facilitator for his child-centeredness has been, and continues to be, the right administrator.

"Functions of the High School Principal
in Curriculum Making" (1924e)

Read in context with "The New Technique of Curriculum Making" (1924b), "Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher Training Institutions" (1924c), and "What Understanding of Human Society Should Education Develop?" (1924d), "Functions of the High School Principal in Curriculum Making" (1924e), redefines Bobbitt's reliance on strong public school administrators as the guardians of any child-centeredness. This article appeared in the Eighth Yearbook of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, an association Bobbitt openly admired and supported. Bobbitt's comments followed Claude Brigg's president's address, "The Holding Power of the High School." Brigg's keynote address at the NAASP conference indicated that U.S. public high schools had several interests for educators. To begin, Briggs enumerates particular cost factors for high schools. Second, he takes up the "drop-out problem" high schools encountered from 1890 to 1920. Third, and most important in this Bobbitt study, comes the matter of democracy. Briggs says that American high schools represent the best hope for "the democratic ideal," yet he asks only for more "training" Procedures (Eighth Yearbook of the NASSP, pp. 9-10). Bobbitt's theory of democracy had support.

Though he contends for student-oriented, Dewey-like curriculum writing in his section, which followed Briggs,

Bobbitt advocates (student and school) control-theory, a favorite NASSP creed. Bobbitt begins "Functions of the High School Principal in Curriculum Making" (1924e) with more thinly-veiled Eliot Committee of Ten report criticism: "Not many years ago secondary education was looked upon as the simple process of mastering sixteen units of subject-matter. Education was only information-getting; information-storage" (p. 10). Moreover, Bobbitt (1924e) contends, U.S. public school curriculum reorganization has two major obstacles: "The process [of reorganization] is under way. But it is not rapid. And it has not proceeded far. It has not yet agreed upon a revised theory" (p. 10).

Unable, to date, to formulate any new theory, the author describes resultant education in an abused nature metaphor: "The educational process is fairly described as one of grafting relatively alien things upon the mind under circumstances not favorable to the growth of the grafted matters" (Bobbitt, 1924e, p. 10). Caustically, he indicts "subject matter" high schools: The effects of living four plastic years in an atmosphere provided by high-minded individuals in itself constituted an education of inestimable value" (Bobbitt, 1924e, p. 11).

Instead of the Eliot approach, Bobbitt (1924e) maintains, modern youth need more than the traditional book-oriented curriculum:

Power to live depends not so much upon stored text-book information as upon sense of responsibility, power of

initiative, resourcefulness, industry, doggedness, power of self-direction, social conscience, habits, skills, valuations, attitudes of mind, tastes, wants, ambitions, appreciations, interests, width of vision, powers of judgement, the basic quality of the personality, public spirit, larger group loyalties, sense of justice, hatred of pettiness, hatred of weakness, hatred of falsity, of error, of parasitism, of sentimentality, of greed. (p. 11)

Bobbitt invokes a new order for students and the shaping of the "fibre" of their personality. That "fibre," maintains the author, consists of perseverance, doggedness, strength, endurance in work and play" (Bobbitt, 1924e, p. 12). This Darwinian shaping adds to the information gathering that Bobbitt eschewed. Further, he notes that since students must acquire new abilities, they need new objectives to do so. In order to achieve those objectives, Bobbitt (1924e) has a three-step prescription:

The first step in curriculum making is activity analysis. This is to discover in specific detail all of the activities which right-thinking and right-living men and women actually perform. . . . The second step is to discover the abilities and personal qualities which are necessary for right and consistent performance of the activities. . . . The third step is then to discover what living active experiences will

enable the child and youth to develop those abilities.

(p. 12)

Though Bobbitt (1924e) proclaims these three steps necessary, he has another that is imperative--a "visionary"-administrator:

The leader in the work must be someone who sees education as developing the powers of the man to do, to act, and to live, one who has a broad vision over human life and affairs, one who has a clear vision of the wide range of personal qualities and abilities that function in the well-trained man; one who can unconfusedly see education in its wholeness as the development of these abilities, one who is not a specialist in some partial aspect of education; one who has no special subject-matter axe to grind.

This man is the high-school principal. (p. 13)

The high school principal, not the teacher, department head, or college advisor, becomes Bobbitt's specific curriculum change agent and leader. The former have restrictions of subject matter specialty, textbook orientation, or time.

Bobbitt maintains (1924e) the high school principal, directed by the supervisor/superintendent, qualifies for educational leadership regarding two important functions: "Director of Routine" and "Director of Secondary Education" (p. 14). The former Bobbitt describes as a "lower office." However, the latter, the "higher office," has ten specific functions:

1. To perceive the school's needs.
2. To pass his knowledge on to teachers.
3. To encourage teacher participation in his knowledge--"compel," if necessary.
4. To make teachers aware of "right living" men and women's capabilities.
5. To provide educational objectives' leadership--not the work.
6. To have the teachers discover the correct pupil activities.
7. To assist general educational policies via leadership, though not specific detail work.
8. To maintain teacher work records.
9. To provide "common-sense" approaches to "neutralize the special obsessions of the departmental specialists."
10. To make sure "someone else" performs most of the curriculum work (Bobbitt, 1924e, pp. 15-16).

Abruptly, as sometimes is his style, Bobbitt stops his article. His reformulation of the high-school principal's work, and the elementary principal's as well, since Bobbitt's curriculum work interchanged all K-12 levels, declares two important postulates. First, the principal, per se, becomes a visionary because of his position. He must be a visionary to be a visionary, I suggest, per the Doctrines of the Elect and the Secular Elect. Second, the principal, as stated in number 10 above, must delegate to teachers any classroom work. How the high school or

elementary school principal could do both with no linked plan remains speculation. This piece becomes Bobbitt's prefatory work to his second important textbook, How to Make a Curriculum (1924), published only months later.

How to Make a Curriculum (1924f)

Bobbitt's How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), represents his 1903-1924 professional writings' tour de force. As such, it incorporates his combined personal and professional influences, as well as his curriculum-writing directions. The influences range from his grandfather and father's religious upbringing, his own zealous approach to schoolwork and life, his positive view of big business and its inherent Social Darwinism, his associations with various professors, and especially his own survey/activities curriculum work. Bobbitt's first book, The Curriculum (1918), motivates several other curriculum texts. Those included Frederick Bonser's The Elementary School Curriculum (1922), W. W. Charters' Curriculum Construction (1923), C. A. McMurry's How to Organize the Curriculum (1923), John A. Clement's Curriculum Making in Secondary Schools (1923), Philip W. L. Cox's Curriculum Adjustment in the Secondary School (1925), and Thomas H. Brigg's Curriculum Problems (1926) (DeWulf, 1962, p. 314). These texts' printing and acceptance had proved "activities" curriculum and curriculum study an interest of education professors and scholars, as well the general reading public.

Bobbitt's How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) enjoyed critical acclaim. Not surprisingly, David Snedden came out strongly in favor of the text, and he defined it as "epoch making" (cf. Knight and James, 20th Annual Cumulative Reviews of 1924 Books, 1925, p. 67, for more information. Subsequent quotes, except Boyd Bode's, come from this source). Booklist said: "The volume is a hand-book for the guidance of practical workers" (p. 67). The Boston Transcript offered praise to at least one readership: "It will be studied by superintendents for many a day" (p. 67). Bode, however, openly denounced How to Make a Curriculum (1924f): "Scientific analysis, like patriotism, may be used as a cover for prejudice and as an obstacle to progress" (Bode, 1924, p. 471). Such stinging criticism Bobbitt had not previously heard; Bode's words continue to have major impact.

Bobbitt's second text thus produced both acclaim and discontent. The following How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) textual analysis demonstrates Bobbitt's content and style, and the elements that provoked critical praise and damnation. The style reinforces the progress he had made in child-centered philosophy. Especially does his progress show when compared to earlier works as "Practical Eugenics" (1909b) and "How to Eliminate Waste in Education" (1912). The text uses portions of "The Objectives of Secondary Education" (1920a), "A Significant Tendency in Curriculum Making" (1921a), and the "administrator" pieces (1918b,

1920b, and 1920c). Further, How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) becomes antecedent to his contributions to the NSSE's Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook.

How to Make a Curriculum's "Preliminary Survey" indicates the philosophical flaws that kept Bobbitt from really seeing "Progressive" educational vision. Bobbitt (1924f) begins:

The engineer who plans the construction of a railroad from Omaha to Los Angeles, let us say, begins his work by taking a general over-view of all the region which lies between. . . . Laid out on a map of ordinary scale, it will show in about the position where the road will ultimately be. (p. 1)

Bobbitt did not just chance into the railroad analogy; indeed, he knew and used that symbolism repeatedly. If the railroads represented industrial progress, then Gary, Indiana, the home of U.S. Steel, represented educational management. Bobbitt often cited or utilized Gary's school system as a fitting and just business model. Gary's school system mimicked a business management flowchart and the school utilized many corporate strategies. Bobbitt (1924f) compares the railroad to education:

Within man and in the social world at large there are spiritual mountains, morasses, plains, storm-regions, valleys, through the midst of which man's developmental growth-route must lie. (p. 2)

Bobbitt (1924f) understands the physical and spiritual factors that inhibit curriculum attainment: "And to complicate the matter, the route is not a single line leading to a single goal, but an endlessly complex network of lines leading to a multiplicity of goals" (p. 2). In order to "help" students through this "network of lines," the "educational engineer" must chart the course via the planning of an overview, "a general route" (Bobbitt, 1924f, p. 2). Bobbitt suggests How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) "relates to the preliminary step of laying out the general education routes" (p. 3). He proposes: "The major task of curriculum-making at present is this discovery of the goals in a general way and this planning of the general routes" (Bobbitt, 1924f, p. 5). Railway routes easily fit Bobbitt's plan for educational routes.

Regarding the construction of the objectives, Bobbitt (1924f) takes a step back into his conservative stance of the purpose of education, writing what I consider most meaningful, conservatively-reflective lines before his forthcoming retraction:

Education is primarily for adult life, not for child life. Its fundamental responsibility is to prepare for the fifty years of adulthood, not the twenty years of childhood and youth. (p. 8)

In order to prepare for the 50-year adult life, Bobbitt (1924f) subscribes to his "activity-analysis," i.e., the gamut that curriculum instruction should embrace:

I Language activities; social intercommunication.

II Health activities.

III Citizenship activities.

IV General social activities--meeting and mingling with others.

V Spare-time activities, amusements, recreations.

VI Keeping one's self mentally fit--analogous to the health activities of keeping one's self physically fit.

VII Religious activities.

VIII Parental activities, the upbringing of children, the maintenance of a proper home life.

IX Unspecialized of non-vocational practical activities.

X The Labors of one's calling. (pp. 8-9)

Once the curriculum maker has agreed to the above 10 activities, he must define appropriate major objectives. Any curriculum writing defining those objectives, says Bobbitt (1924f), "will formulate its statement on the basis of its understanding of the realities" (p. 11). Bobbitt produces realities that accompany each section. Following are several:

I. Language Activities; social intercommunication

1. Ability to use language in all ways required for proper and effective participation in the community life.

2. Ability to effectively organize and present orally one's thought to others: (a) In conversations; (b) In recounting one's experiences; (c) In more serious or formal discussions; (d) In oral reports; (e) In giving directions; (f) To an audience.

5. Command over an adequate reading, speaking and writing vocabulary.

12. Ability to read the written or printed expression of others with proper ease, speed, and comprehension.

16. Ability to use maps with ease and understanding.
(Bobbitt, 1924f, pp 11-12)

II. Maintenance of Physical Efficiency

101. Ability to control one's dietary [sic] in such ways as to make one's food contribute in maximum measure to one's physical well being.

103. Ability to utilize muscular exercise as a lifelong means of maintaining a high level of physical vitality.

104. Ability to make one's various mental and emotional states and activities contribute in maximum degree to one's physical functioning.

115. Ability rightly to control the factors involved in the maintenance of body temperatures.

135. Ability to care for the sick,--so far as layman need this ability.

138. Ability within one's occupational field to cooperate effectively in providing wholesome working conditions. (Bobbitt, 1924f, pp. 13-15)

Bobbitt's efficiency here extends from physical education, hygiene, health, and even practical vocational health. His interest in this area demonstrates an early version of "womb-to-tomb" (emphasis added) curriculum interests.

III. Efficient Citizenship

201. Ability to think, feel, act, and react as an efficient, intelligent, sympathetic, and loyal member of the large social group--that group is prior to differentiation and within which social differentiation occurs.

206. Ability to protect one's self from social, economic, and political fallacies, illusions, misrepresentations, petty-mindedness, fragmentary-mindedness, sentimentality, selfish prejudices, and the like, through one's continual reliance upon facts and principles.

211. Disposition of the citizen as consumer to avoid waste. (Bobbitt, 1924f, pp. 15-17)

With these three representations, Bobbitt demonstrates he wants the student to act as a democratic citizen within the large- and small-group structures (206), avoid the pitfalls of the laissez-faire Robber Barons (206), yet also persevere the puritanical-educational need to avoid waste (211). The author's lists themselves interweave and

interchange. Bode's (1924) lists criticism is valid; however, those lists allowed Bobbitt to say much about curriculum writing sans explanation.

IV. General Social Contacts and Relationships

301. Ability and disposition to talk and act in those sympathetic, tactful, and human ways that are both most agreeable and most effective in the conduct of one's relations with one's associates; and conversely, to avoid the many things disagreeable to others.

303. Ability to associate easily and naturally with individuals of diverse ages, interests and specialties.

305. Sincerity, honesty, straightforwardness, truthfulness, fair-dealing, steadfastness, and dependability in one's dealings with others.

307. Ability to discern the unspoken expectations of others. (Bobbitt, 1924f, pp. 104-105)

Again, though the author suggests he wrote these objectives arbitrarily, his choices say much. Section IV, "General Social Contacts and Relationships" might address students. However, more accurately, Bobbitt expresses--albeit inadvertently and unintendedly--a condescending attitude toward students.

Consistently, though not necessarily purposefully, Bobbitt's first objectives, more often than not, reflect his own upbringing and influences. Section IV, "General Social Contacts and Relationships," provides an excellent example.

Bobbitt issues measured, Polonian advice in number 301. He advises students to behave unobtrusively. In number 303, he mentions the advantage of assenting with different people, though not necessarily with different classes. In numbers 301 and 303, Bobbitt directs to the democratic and patriotic ideal American. Bobbitt reinforces the newly formed Boy Scout model of Baden Powell (305), then shifts to the industrial, managerial, ideal (307). The author intends students should do the jobs expected, whether their motivation comes from personal, social, or financial means.

V. Leisure Occupations

401. Ability, disposition, and habit of diversified observation of men, things, and affairs as an enjoyable and fruitful leisure occupation.

404. Ability to utilize the drama, spoken and silent, as a means of enjoyable and fruitful indirect observation of men, things, and affairs.

410. Ability, disposition, and habit of taking up occasionally the systematic study of some new thing; and of exploring untried fields of human experience.

416. Ability to participate in desirable activities of social clubs. (Bobbitt, 1924f, pp. 18-19)

Bobbitt initially notes that watching others is an excellent leisure activity (401). However, he also alludes to the use of motion pictures as a relaxation mode (404), and advocates taking up some new sport or activity to benefit free time

(410). Implicitly, Bobbitt suggests that social class status has some bearing on what the student might choose

(416). Several times he references a balanced approach. As with much of his work, what the balance might be depended on what system students entered or who influenced them.

VI. General Mental Efficiency

501. A proportioned and emotionalized intellectual apprehension, such as one's natural capacities will permit, to the realities which make up the world of man's life:

(a) Man; human nature; diversities of human nature.

(b) Man's activities and affairs in their diverse fields and forms.

(c) Man's institutions.

(d) The territorial or regional groups that make up the local community, the state, the nation, the world.

(e) The specialized or functional groups-- economic, political, religious, and the like--together with their special situations, activities, duties, rights, and relationships.

(f) Man's geographical habitat.

(g) The development of man and of his nature, institutions, manners and customs, specialized groupings, etc., as revealed in biology and history.

(h-t) The worlds of plant life, animal life, chemical phenomena, physical phenomena, geological world, astronomical world, number, quantity, magnitude, sound and music, language and literature, form, color, visual art, inventions and creations, composite forms of woods, hills, streams, and the like, and the world of myth and legend. (Bobbitt, 1924f, pp. 20-21)

Bobbitt suggests that in each field students should awaken interests, tendencies appreciations, and emotional reactions.

502. Ability effectively to perform the mental activities involved in the proper exercise of the many specific functions which one should perform. Bobbitt lists 49 abilities that include interest, watchfulness, delight, resourcefulness, valuation, and emotional serenity in the face of circumstances however trying.

504. Disposition and habit of utilizing one's unspecialized work activities as a means of mental maintenance.

508. Ability to judge one's degree of fitness for the many possible specialized occupations; and for the several levels of proficiency in each. (Bobbitt, 1924f, pp. 24-25) Noting the postures of numbers 502, 504, and 508, I suggest Bobbitt tries to be child-centered in his philosophy, i.e., he probably wanted young people to occupy the center of society. Unfortunately, he also feels that society is made up of many, many individuals, and they need to serve,

augment, or otherwise complement that same society. As much as any other examples, the "serve" and "be served" stance here underlies Bobbitt's "democratic" dilemma (emphasis added).

His stand on mental faculties (502) connotes not only the service, but also the quiet and persevering attitude student/citizens take while partaking or parlaying their societal position. The other component, utilizing that mental efficiency (504), follows. Bobbitt describes his utilitarian mode/work (508). In that pragmatism, Bobbitt often intertwines his activities. The intertwining includes the tenor, times, and influences he learned from his religiously-slanted upbringing, his Bryan-led measurement efficiency at Indiana University, and the Rugg-behaviorism he encountered at the University of Chicago.

VII. Religious Attitudes and Activities

601. A sense of the brotherhood of man. A full sense of membership in the large or total social group. Large-group consciousness. A sense of human interdependency, of community of nature, of origin, of vicissitudes, and of destiny. Tendencies to action and reaction which are inherent in the large-group consciousness.

604. Ability to participate as fully and abundantly as one's "original nature" (emphasis added) will permit in religious and philosophic thought of the type characteristic of man at his best and highest.

605. Ability, habit, and disposition to follow the leadership of the world's Men of Vision. (Bobbitt, 1924f, pp. 25-26)

Bobbitt addresses the "brotherhood of man" relating to large-group and small-group communities (601), but coterminously presents one of his ongoing and ever-present agendas: the Doctrine of the Secular Elite. This Puritan religious doctrine denoted salvation vs. damnation. The secular version (Social Darwinism) stated that some people, via breeding or social status, were "more equal than others" (emphasis added). Protests that the United States was and is a classless society has meant many people refuse, philosophically, to admit this condition. In number 604, Bobbitt's "original nature" apparently refers to Doctrine of the Elect. In number 605, he presents a complementary "World's Men of Vision" treatise. Bobbitt suggests that a dutiful, contrite, and proper Christian follows "Men of Vision." He does not instruct students how to recognize "Men of Vision" from false prophets, however. Whether or not United States' public schools can teach, overtly or covertly, religion has been, and still is, a debated issue. Religion and social control, in the format of controlling visionaries, also has been an issue since the Plymouth, Massachusetts, settlement. The whole visionaries model becomes the crux of the Doctrine of the Elite. Bobbitt struggles with the student-centered curriculum concept, if for no other reason than his visionary religious views.

VIII. Parental Responsibilities

701. The physical qualities necessary for parenthood of desirable type.

702. The mental, moral, and social qualities necessary for parenthood of proper character.

706. Ability to do one's share in cooperatively getting the particularized objectives of the "training" (*italics added*) of their children determined by specialized agencies; particularly the schools. (Bobbitt, 1924f, pp. 26-27)

I chose three items from the list of 18 Bobbitt supplied, and I did so in complement to section VII's "Religious Attitudes and Activities" just discussed. Bobbitt's key curriculum ingredient is activity-analysis. Any activity, derived from objectives ranging from language capability to vocation selection, has community input and impact.

Bobbitt hints at child-centeredness, but it is with such objectives listed in section VIII's "Parental Responsibilities" that he regresses to his renamed scientism (functionalism). Assuming the requirements for parentage begin with the physical (701), Bobbitt continues. Parents must have the proper character regarding mental, moral, and social qualities (702). However, with the third, (706), Bobbitt displays a most grievous logical fallacy. Student/citizens soon enough become parents, and those parents have responsibility to provide their offspring with guidance to allow them education. School administrators, Bobbitt notes, are polemic visionaries. They formulate

educational plans. Bobbitt also states that parents need to assist their visionaries. The parents' duties include selecting objectives for their children's edification, carrying out any assignments their visionaries ask, and assisting their children in homework and school planning.

The problem arises regarding how and what the parents can do. For example, what other goals or objectives would parents select, work, or otherwise feel comfortable with other than the ones they worked under when they were students? When Bobbitt envisions a scientific curriculum, he has good intentions. Reacting to the scholarly and time-honored Committee of Ten's directives that all students should be educated the same way and for the same ambition, college and university-laden goals, Bobbitt disputed. He wanted more diversity. Unfortunately, because he chose scientism, reflective of the Industrial Revolution, i.e., the corporate model as the basis of curriculum instruction, he asks for parental assistance that cannot be anything more than status quo. Having no input in their curriculum as students, the new parents can and will only affirm the business-like curricular decisions that Bobbitt's visionary administrators gave them as students.

IX. Unspecialized Practical Activities

801. Ability to use all common kinds of measuring devices: measure of lengths, area, volume, capacity, weight, time, value, temperature, specific gravity, etc.

803. Ability to make repairs, adjustments and additions to the house and its equipment.

820. An amateur ability to do productive, creative, or interpretative work in the field of the fine arts. (Bobbitt, 1924f, pp. 28-29)

No more dichotomous view of curriculum exists in How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) than in this section. Beginning with the utilitarian interests of "measuring devices" in number 801, the author continues with household repairs and adjustments in number 803. Subsequently, he lists 17 others that address home and family initiatives, ranging from sanitation to proper care of the home's occupants. Then, inexplicably, Bobbitt suggests experiencing the fine arts. Bobbitt's predilection often runs to the Jamesian pragmatic ethic, i.e., what works is good. In this case, Bobbitt's "what" is 99 per cent family life. The other 1 per cent becomes something as unlikely as appreciating the fine arts.

X. Occupational Activities

Because Bobbitt revered the vocational goals and overall good that education could provide, he gives no job listings or career paths available in the various communities. Rather he states:

We cannot here present a list of the occupational abilities. There are hundreds, even thousands of specialized occupations and for each a separate list of abilities must be formulated. For discovering these,

each occupation must be analyzed separately into its activities. We place the general topic here for the sake of completeness. For any individual, the total list of his educational objectives will be those of the foregoing nine lists plus those of the specific occupation which he intends to enter. The nine fields constitute his general training; this last, specialized training. (Bobbitt, 1924f, p. 29)

In order to make these objectives become useful, Bobbitt (1924f) suggests the following:

1. Observation Bobbitt connotes as "sympathetic observation," coercing gently the young person "to do desirable things in desirable ways" (p. 48). The teacher must demonstrate carefully: "Observation supplies the things omitted in instincts. Thus nature has provided for social adaptation" (p. 58). As well, Bobbitt has provided for even more reframed scientism.

2. Performance of function follows observation. Bobbitt believes that the mind grows in patterns, but he also believes that the most important patterns had practical bases. Only in job performance could true function occur. Subject teaching is an impediment to him, so he advocates "living processes," "accessory" or prior experience training, and "normal living" situations to assist school teaching (p. 52).

3. Reading becomes an "instrument of vision" and it

works well with observations in school or at the job site. He does not advocate memorization reading, but rather a format to demonstrate "growth of powers by means of exercise of function" (p. 55).

4. Oral reports flow from reading and are an "instinctive form of language" that should gain nurture especially in the elementary years (p. 56).

5. Pictures aid both reading and processes in work; however, they occur only visually, reveal only outward appearances, deal only in concrete, and do not deal with judgments (pp. 56-57).

6. Prolonging, repeating, and intensifying one's experiences should be a major portion of any education, according to Bobbitt (pp. 57-58).

7. Problem-solving becomes part of the decision-making process. Once decisions have been made, conclusions drawn, or plans perfected, there is nothing else to consider (p. 58).

8. Generalizations come about via demonstrations, field experiences, and social surveys, all leading to "original seeing" (pp. 58-59).

Bobbitt firmly believes that the two most important components of education are foundation and function. The former, "the unfoldment of the powers of the individual without consciousness of the relation of these powers to specific function (such as a child at play)" (Bobbitt, 1924f, p. 36), results from the general education level.

The latter, functional, are conscious, "and the functions are specific and are held before one as the goals of the training" (Bobbitt, 1924f, p. 65). Both, affixed, give the student a job and a general education.

Because functional connotes jobs, maturity, and a good life, Bobbitt (1924f) emphasizes the administrator-led direction a district should follow:

As the teachers plan the details and as the principals plan for the specific needs of their buildings, the superintendent at the same time will independently plan on a still more general level the education which is to be accomplished by the entire organization. He should have definite plans for the labors of every school, every department in the system and for each of the grade levels. He cannot be guide, leader, and coordinator of the professional factors except as he has his educational policies thus clearly defined. . . . In curriculum making, he and his professional staff will thus provide the most general leadership, direction, and coordination. (p. 281)

Based on his L.A. Survey work, How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) resounds "How to Avoid Waste in Education" (1912). The former work represents his surveys and offers only small evidence for the child-centered statements he will state circa 1926.

Stage II Summary

Bobbitt's Stage Two, "Survey and Curriculum Science," encompasses the writing of many articles and several texts. However, this second of three stages, manifests much more than a number of documents. Bobbitt was Professor of Curriculum at the University of Chicago during the entirety of Stage Two, "Survey and Curriculum Science." His position as an elite member of higher education matched his professional writing persona. Where Bobbitt's early Stage One writing incorporated more than a paucity of Doctrine of the Elect and Doctrine of the Secular Elect philosophy, born of Social Darwinism, Stage Two writing mollifies that position.

Researching Stage Two, I found growing and burgeoning progressive references to students' roles in education. Stage One Bobbitt manifested administrator/teacher-dominant education--democracy is passive. Bobbitt's middle period becomes one where he questions his "education is for the adult life" motif. He inquires from the standpoint of administrators (1919b, 1920b, and 1920c), often via his survey methodology (1914a, 1914b, 1915b, 1915c, 1916, 1917a, 1922a and 1922b), and usually regarding various systems (1917b, 1920a, 1921b, 1924a, and 1924b). Absent, however, is any completely student-centered articles. Additionally, he begins to remake his schools' active democratic ethic. That ethic includes using his famed surveys to determine what needs the students might have, as well as welcoming

young peoples' participation with education. Bobbitt produces several precursors to his revelatory child-centered pronouncements for the NSSE's Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook. For example, in "A Significant Tendency in Curriculum Making" (1921a), he produces his essentialism or scientism as templates to child-centered needs. In "Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher-Training Institutions" (1924c), Bobbitt addresses the vocational and educational means for more and better teachers. Further, in "What Understanding of Human Society Should Education Develop?" (1924d), Bobbitt assays differentiations between the earlier U.S. agrarian culture and the burgeoning Industrial Revolution-oriented one.

Because he did do important survey work in Denver, Colorado, (1916), St. Louis, Missouri, 1916, and Los Angeles, California, (1922), Bobbitt had ample opportunity to visit differing United States' geographical areas. Within those differing physical lands, he also had occasion to speak with educators concerning their duties and responsibilities. Bobbitt did not pursue the obvious next step in child-centered philosophy, speak and actively listen to and with students and their parents. Rather, he got business-led "survey" information (emphasis added). His survey conclusions do not prove that he was overly swayed in student/democracy directions; his textbooks do. The Curriculum (1918c) and How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) provide some documentation that Dewey-like concerns came to

Bobbitt's attention. The Curriculum (1918c) produces "play-level" and "work-level" experiences, "culture" and education, "active listening," "learning vs. memorizing," and "the good life" (emphasis added). These key terms do not mean that his first successful book portends of absolute educational democracy. Far from it. However, these words and phrases become part of his established scientism and essentialism.

Similarly, I found a growing trend toward less subject-centered philosophy in How to Make a Curriculum (1924f). This text, like The Curriculum (1918c), demonstrates conservative essentialism. However, reading closely, and especially looking to some future Bobbitt dogma, I found traces of student-centered philosophy. Bobbitt's How to Make a Curriculum (1924f) poses questions of "Efficient Citizenship," "General Social Contacts and Relationships," and "General Mental Efficiency." Those tracts are not staid scientism, though they stem from Bobbitt's early "training" in Social Darwinism and the "school-as-factory" (emphasis added) metaphor he so often used. With his "functional and foundational" components of education in the text's conclusion, Bobbitt establishes a dichotomy that he never resolved. On one hand, functional tenets deal with the practical job-seeking and job-keeping skills Bobbitt revered. However, on the other, the foundational tenets deal with students' individual and personal lives.

I suggest Bobbitt in Stage Two covertly begins considering the total young person. In order to do that, however, Bobbitt always insists on administrator-directed help. His "Administrative Suggestions," for example, minimizes the level of student input for any curriculum. However, the building principal, and especially the superintendent, have the responsibility for the ultimate planning, leadership, and implementation of current and future curriculum programs. Students, Bobbitt believed and contended, could become involved in matters and issues chosen for them. His scientism precluded empowerment.

Bobbitt's writing indicates he was hopelessly trapped in Coolidge academia, what Larson refers to as the "professionalization of corporate capitalism" (cf. 1977, pp. 136-145 for more information about the overt and covert changes of various powers during the last half of the Nineteenth Century and the first half of the Twentieth Century). Bobbitt chose the academic equivalent of the Industrial Revolution's change from a community-based, agrarian economy, to a business-based, industrial one. I believe Bobbitt wanted to embrace a more Dewey- and Kilpatrick-like stance as his era and career grew and prospered. He realized the needs of the students for whom he constructed, enacted, and discerned. However, he also knew and understood the realities of the small businessman and corporate titans who redefined the growing American industrial economy, landscape, and persona.

I will discuss Bobbitt's philosophical change(s) in Stage Three, "Transitional Philosophy." In that third stage, Bobbitt builds to more child-centered point of view, then recedes back to his conservative scientism (to be renamed functionalism). His two shifts become a key component to understanding Bobbitt the scholar, survey practitioner, and curriculum writer.

CHAPTER V

BOBBITT'S STAGE III--"TRANSITIONAL PHILOSOPHY"

Overview

The third and last stage I propose John Franklin Bobbitt went through, "Transitional Philosophy," begins with "The Trend of the Curriculum" (1924), an inclusion in the American Association of School Administration's Second Yearbook. In that work, Bobbitt chides "archaic" U.S. public schools, and he asks for more "individualized" studies. After his 1924 manuscript, he writes "Individualizing the Curriculum" (1925a), a chapter for the NSSE's Twenty-Fourth Annual Yearbook (1925). A third child-centered work, "Difficulties to be met in Local Curriculum Making" (1925c), agreeing with the first two publications in this third Bobbitt stage, act as precursors to the NSSE's Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook. In that text, Bobbitt admits publicly that United States' curriculum should focus on more child-centeredness. Bobbitt seemingly retracts his own scientism in the Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, and, as well, denounces his prior stand that education was only for the adult life. Both "Individualizing the Curriculum" (1925a) and "Difficulties to be Met in Local Curriculum Making" (1925) suggested that individualizing curriculum and

providing cooperative learning modules would aid all students' progress. In addition, they both addressed the need to shun exclusive subject-matter teaching, as well as provide and promote more "democratic" (emphasis added) reforms for American public education. Bobbitt's remarks and quotes to The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook become the zenith of those two 1925 works. His remarks are also this dissertation's pivotal point.

Bobbitt shifts his philosophical position regarding the need for United States' public schools to focus on the child as individual, as opposed to the child as eventual adult. However, a careful reading of many of Bobbitt's subsequent works, until his last recorded one, indicates that he made another reversal. "The Relation Between Content and Method" (1931), for example, shows Bobbitt engaging sociologists to conduct surveys that facilitate his activities curriculum. Rather than furthering any new student-oriented curriculum, Bobbitt will call upon other authorities (sociologists) to add to his own activities/scientism philosophy. Bobbitt adds similar compliments to his own work with "Trend of the Activity Curriculum" (1934c). The "Trend" article is an attack on subject-matter devotees; however, it is really thinly disguised activities promotion. In "The Modern Curriculum" (1935c), Bobbitt reformulates his functional activities work and sets up a five-stage format in readdress. Several other articles Bobbitt writes post-1926 begin child-centered based, yet finish with conservative

dogma, albeit revamped and/or in reworked formats.

"Advancing Toward the Activity Curriculum" (1935a) and "The Postwar Curriculum: The Functional vs. The Academic Plan (1945), for examples, fall into that category. His articles run a gamut of his career's dichotomy between scientism and Progressivism.

Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) establishes a spectrum of Bobbitt's entire curriculum career in one book--his last. That text provides a history, rationale, and explication for the author's thoughts and philosophy.

Careful reading of Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) uncovers vacillation regarding Bobbitt's apparent change from essentialist, to child-centered advocate, and then back to essentialist/functionalist. Conscientious scholarship indicates Bobbitt flexed from one position to the other, ostensibly without recognition or reflection. I suggest he regarded his work so thoroughly and so comprehensively that apparent changes were just that--apparent and apparitional. Following are textual descriptions of Stage III--

"Transitional Philosophy." At the dissertation's conclusion comes a retrospect of all three stages.

Publications

"The Trend of the Curriculum" (1924g)

Concluding his voluminous 1924 publications, Bobbitt writes "Trend of the Curriculum" (1924g) as a chapter to the Second Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators. In this very short, concise article, Bobbitt challenges all educators to use his activity analysis to rid American public schools of any excesses. Bobbitt (1924g) re-establishes his "waste" metaphor (1912):

It is the belief of the writer, who classifies himself as a constructive worker and not an adverse critic, that there is much, very much, waste in education, due to mistaken objectives, artificial and no non-vital procedures, too much carrying of the burden by teachers and not enough by the pupils and parents, waste [sic] academic motion because of a lack of vision of the educational goals and a lack of use of common sense in attaining them, a primitive conception for the nature of the genuinely educated man, the method of prematurity, neglect of the principle of timeliness, the emphasis upon memorizing rather than living experience, and the like. (p. 251)

Bobbitt's remarks to his audience of administrators does lend credence for a modified version of his essentialism. In this text, he states that class loads should be lightened, not teachers' pay: "Quite the reverse, it is

certain that the teacher average [pay] must be lifted quite considerably" (Bobbitt, 1924g, p. 251). Those teachers, he points out, have succeeded with the curriculum given them, a literacy curriculum devoid of citizenship studies:

But in matters of citizenship, we are yet, figuratively speaking, mostly a Nation of unschooled, unpracticed civic illiterates, with a fragmentary training picked up mostly through incidental contacts and desultory reading. (Bobbitt, 1924g, p. 249)

Using the Cardinal Principles Report, as well as his own modified version of that NEA Commission, Bobbitt outlines U.S. public education's failure to address students' needs in the latter civic education, health, leisure time, etc. (cf. National Education Association, 1918, and Bobbitt, 1920a, pp. 740-743, for more information about these objectives).

Bobbitt lists schools' failure to address these objectives. He suggests that elementary schools have made strides in the identification and implementation of the "training," but he also comments that high schools have neglected or glossed over their responsibilities. Bobbitt (1924g) concludes that the U.S. public school system has to face reorganization regarding these needs: "They are not the demands of doctrinaire educationalists. They demand a tremendous reconstruction of the curriculum from kindergarten to the end of college" (p. 249).

Bobbitt (1924g) believes that the "archaic" methods of

classical pedantry has stopped and that the teaching profession wants advance, "a reasonably rapid advance--not too rapid" (p. 250). Ever the conservative, Bobbitt fears too much change and too much innovation. He advocates that students not become walking encyclopedias. Rather, they (the students) must understand and use power: "The end [result of education] is power to live not cold-storage information and non-functioning skills" (Bobbitt, 1924g, p. 250). Further, Bobbitt (1924g) envisions a recipe and a trend:

Of course, it [the recipe] requires teaching, guidance, and supervision. The way our children and youths are to acquire those abilities, habits, attitudes, powers of judgment, and the like, involved in living the community life of today and tomorrow is to live in a way that calls for an exercise on their part of such abilities, habits, and the like. The clear trend of the curriculum is toward living, not memorizing.

(p. 250)

Ultimately, Bobbitt's answer to the problems of public education remains his activities curriculum and fitting those activities to students' lives. He admonishes his administrator-filled audience to advance the cause of student-centered work through his "practical objectives" curriculum. Bobbitt repeats and intensifies these remarks in The NSSE Twenty-Fourth Yearbook (1925a).

"Individualizing the Curriculum" (1925a)

In 1925, the National Society for the Study of Education published The Twenty-Fourth Yearbook. Part II of that tome, Adapting the Schools to Individual Differences, Carleton W. Washburne, directing, included a Bobbitt chapter: "Individualizing the Curriculum." The NSSE's Twenty-Fourth Yearbook succeeded two previous works, The Nineteenth Yearbook, Part II: Classroom Problems in the Education of Gifted Children, and the Twenty-Third Yearbook, Part I: The Education of Gifted Children. The latter two presentations supported the concept that mass education in the U.S. did not have to follow the principles of social promotion with no apparent reference to individual testing differences. The 1925 study, meanwhile, presents varying viewpoints regarding individual differences "in the native capacities" of American elementary and secondary school students (Bobbitt, 1925a, Editor's Preface, n.p.).

Washburne divides testing into two camps. The first represents current classroom practices, i.e., uniform pace, and annual promotion, and advocates either special coaching for slower students or more assignments for gifted ones. A school tracking system occurs when the gifted emerge and the slower simply manage. The second camp recommends individualized learning that allows students to progress at their own rate, yet also promotes cooperative learning so that the groups can foster individual "initiative, originality, and co-operativeness" (Bobbitt, 1925a, p. xi).

Using these experiments as a basis for this text, the following tenets governed the Yearbook's selection process:

1. Ability grouping is only a mitigating step and does not solve fully the problem of adjusting schools to individual differences.

2. Individual work saves time, especially for brighter students.

3. Individual work results in devoting an unusually large amount of instructional time to group and creative activities.

4. Individual instruction using saved time leads to broader and deeper education.

5. Individual promotion decreases retardation and corresponding aging.

6. Individual work increases efficiency in the tool subjects.

7. Individual work does not necessarily cost more than class work.

8. Individual work does not appear to place an undue burden on the teacher.

9. Individual work in the elementary schools results in ability to do efficient high school studies (Bobbitt, 1925a, pp. xi-xii).

Washburne suggests that academic problems might arise from class size, early-age promotion, school organization, supervision, and individual vs. group work.

He (Washburne) summarizes the conclusions and recommendations of The Twenty-Fourth Yearbook:

1. Written curriculum should balance the "essentials," as well as group and creative activities.

2. Essentials should divide into "measurable units."

3. Diagnostic tests must be given.

4. Students must have "self-instructive and self-corrective" lessons so they may formulate and work with what they learn.

5. Individualized grading must occur.

6. Subject or discipline promotions must occur so that students might go on to more challenging and rewarding work.

7. At least 50% of classtime must utilize group activities (Bobbitt, 1925a, p. xii).

Washburne advocates shaping both social and academic activities for students. When that shaping eventuates, Washburne views a promising future: "Out of the accumulated experiences and the heated discussions of the advocates of various forms of individual work will come clearer light and better technique" (Bobbitt, 1925a, p. ix). Complementing this work, A. A. Sutherland, in "Factors Causing Maladjustment of Schools to Individuals," notes "the science of education is nowhere more evident than in the field of individual differences" (Bobbitt, 1925a, p. 1). Sutherland encourages educators and lay people alike to recognize the need for individualization and pupil performance.

With teacher methodology changes, and the growing recognition that pupil methods carry such importance, this yearbook's philosophy makes a distinction between printed subject matter and those useful concepts, ideals, and activities which pupils, as effective future citizens, will employ (Bobbitt, 1925a, p. 19). Regarding what specific needs the schools or teachers might make, Sutherland suggests it might not be "more" (emphasis added) of any one discipline: "The pupil may secure what he needs, when he needs it" (Bobbitt, 1925a, p. 19). The resulting evils, comments Sutherland, include administrators and teachers who do not extend individualization, emphasize retardation (repeating a grade), mortality (dropping completely out of school), class clogging (resultant of repeating students), grade skipping, and the "different" work done by a student in "different" classes (Bobbitt, 1925a, p. 20). Into this individualization mode Bobbitt submits his curriculum philosophy.

Bobbitt's reversal is not a reversal in every regard. I suggest he believed his curricular proposals were all things to all people--the first sentence above, hence, is not oxymoronic. He had developed his activity curriculum based on two fundamental principles: (a) What students bring to their schools; and, (b) Whatever schools affirm, reaffirm, and give students might lead to employment and the "good life." Bobbitt (1925a) commences: "It is my purpose here to present only what appear to be certain facts, or at

least probabilities, as to ways in which the curriculum might be improved through the use of individualized instruction" (p. 224). Not much more could his readers expect, then or now. What Washburne asked for and got was Bobbitt's individualized thinking commentary. What Bobbitt advocates is a recapitulation of his "activity dogma," which, he affirms, is already individualized curriculum.

Bobbitt provides an activity example--a young girl going to school to be "trained" (emphasis added) in home economics. Her duties included cleaning, ordering, and marketing (Bobbitt, 1925a, p. 224). He suggests she will not learn any of them en masse; rather, she will learn them individually. Bobbitt (1925a) labels such activity "conditioning the girl's self-direction," and adds:

We have taken an illustration where it is quite obvious that most of the fundamental training experiences must be individual, and where much of the accessory or preparatory training experiences must also be individual. The illustration, however, is typical of the entire content of functional education in all its aspects. (p. 225)

To support that explanation, he states:

We are coming to believe that one hundred percent of education should be devoted to training individuals to do things. It is not academic mastery of a few academic skills and several bodies of academic information. It is rather a preparation of men and

women to do the numerous things which make up the totality of human life. (Bobbitt, 1925a, pp. 225-226)

Bobbitt views all human activities as individualized. However, he also claims that training for society's collective good becomes public education's most important focus. Bobbitt's concept of democracy focuses on training people for society's needs. His summary regarding any individual planning evidences Social Darwinism again:

The individual plan permits us to lay out a curriculum of general education which is much the same for all pupils, whatever the level of their natural capacity, and then to let the pupils themselves provide the differentiation due to differences in natural capacity.

(Bobbitt, 1925a, p. 230)

Bobbitt leaves no doubt about his placement in individual matters. In his system, the students have natural differentiation: "The pupils are not artificially or arbitrarily differentiated. The efforts of each determine the place of each" (Bobbitt, 1925a, p. 230). More than in any other work, Bobbitt here defines his essentialism and educational democracy. He continues that definition in "Education as a Social Process" (1925b).

"Education as a Social Process" (1925b)

Bobbitt, writing "Education as a Social Process" for School and Society, April, 1925, retraces some of his earlier orthodox educational beliefs, and in doing so, also

lends support and credit to David Snedden. Snedden had become an important educator/sociologist in the early Twentieth Century (Callahan, 1962, p. 211). He advocated vocational education and aided Bobbitt's activities legacy by creating many new objectives. Snedden devised his objectives by using "peths," tiny units, "strands," built around various life functions, and "lotments," work accomplished in one hour (Kliebard, 1986, pp. 111-115). Bobbitt knew and respected Snedden's work, and commended its sociologically-based survey use.

Before addressing Snedden's help, Bobbitt regresses in "Education as a Social Process" (1925b). That regression suggests education actually is man's re-civilizing function. As well, schools sometimes serve only to tie selected extra-curricular experiences together. Bobbitt (1925b) terms language as the "Great School of the Vernacular" (p. 454). Except ministers and certain professionals, Bobbitt (1925b) alleges most education comes about via "general social processes" (p. 455). Regarding democracy, Bobbitt claims any social process comes from civic, political, and economic means. Only because the world has become so complex does Bobbitt (1925b) reason the need for education for all people: "Teachers will assist in keeping the vision of the younger generation fixed upon the good, which are to be imitated; and possibly, in some degree, upon the evils of the bad, which are to be shunned" (p. 456). Bobbitt's

reliance on authority and religion never cease; it only takes a hiatus.

Bobbitt (1925b) admits his authoritarian conservatism: "In this day of inventing new academic procedures, we may be accused of being, not revolutionary, but reactionary, in thus urging a return to old-world fundamentals" (p. 458). He notes life in a monastery is singular; life in the "real" (emphasis added) world is much more social, and further, the changing life in the Twentieth Century poses complex problems. Rather than restructuring his own thinking, Bobbitt seizes the opportunity to bestow some educational responsibility to "visionary" sociologists. Snedden and others, Bobbitt (1925b) proposes, must take over some facets of democratization:

The profession of education, therefore, feels that it has a right to expect of the science of sociology those analyses and those generalizations which will enable it at all times to keep its social and its educational vision true, undistorted and clear. (p. 458)

Bobbitt admits that problems have arisen both in his own culture and age, but he never advocates any empowerment in his work or in his democracy definition. Rather, Bobbitt looks to an outside process--in this case, sociology. The author envisions more than schools-as-metaphorical-factories, but he also lacks ability to oppose his own conservative scientism that advocated factory-like education (cf. "How to Eliminate Waste in Education" (1912), "Summary

of the Literature in Scientific Method in the Field of Curriculum-Making" (1917b), and "The Objectives of Secondary Education (1920a). He intones: "As sociology portrays in detail the good life, it portrays the fundamental process of education" (Bobbitt, 1925b, p. 459). If Bobbitt discarded responsibility for educational thinking, I suggest he did so for one of two reasons. The first reason would be a preference not to consider the issue's seriousness. However, this study shows Bobbitt often had wrestled with conceptual educational democracy. The second reason contends Bobbitt uttered his convictions after living and exercising years of Doctrine of the Secular Elect philosophy, thought, and practice. I maintain Bobbitt found it easier to pass on the charge of deciding democratic constructs to other "properly" (emphasis added) credentialed professionals--in this case sociology (the discipline) and Snedden (the researcher). In his next article, he also passes the democratic constructs to local schools.

"Difficulties to be met in Local Curriculum Making" (1925c)

Bobbitt opens his May, 1925, article noting that the curriculum field needs to adjust to the multi-changing and multi-faceted society in the Twentieth Century. To do this, Bobbitt (1925c) demands administrators react in a democratic way, again emphasizing the notion and belief of the republic's civic responsibilities: "It is the belief of the

writer that this method of procedure is in conformity with good principles of democratic school administration" (p. 653).

Bobbitt (1925c) no longer approves of having curriculum writing done surreptitiously from some central office, nor even from "the pronouncements of the experts in the several fields" (p. 653). Those experts would include Bobbitt himself. It will be momentous that Bobbitt denies his scientism and rigid activities curriculum in NSSE's Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook. However, it is one measure Bobbitt signs that yearbook and affirms more child-centered curriculum. It is quite another measure, however, for him to question the administrative bodies and his own format(s) to implement democratic changes. He sets up a very modern-sounding premise that elucidates any permutations: "The responsibility rests upon each city to educate its own children" (Bobbitt, 1925c, pp. 653-654). In order for communities to serve their children, Bobbitt postulates 12 obstacles and what might be done to remove those educational impediments.

The first two obstacles relate elementary schools' functions and traditions. Bobbitt emphasizes lower schools, historically, had trained students in the "fundamental processes" of reading and writing. He charges schools more responsibilities:

Education has to do with guiding and conditioning the all-sided growth and development of the individual in

his personal qualities, disposition, attitudes, habits, powers of judgment, vision of reality, and competence in discharging all of the responsibilities of efficient adulthood. (Bobbitt 1925c, p. 654)

Education, Bobbitt adds, is at the crossroads of the two responsibilities. Where once "tradition" dispensed information via textbooks, Bobbitt (1925c) admonishes a time "to live as one ought to live" that will add to the students' growth to adulthood (p. 655). Both curriculum makers and teachers had trouble making such a curriculum. The curriculum makers saw such writing as "irrelevant and fantastic." Teachers had few members "to have achieved the necessary intellectual liberation" (Bobbitt, 1925c, p. 655). Bobbitt's thoughts (1925c) are especially important for curriculum writers, teachers, and himself: "They [curriculum writers] do not refuse to take it seriously, they are simply unable to do so" (p. 655). His prophetic words still prove true.

The third, fourth, and fifth obstacles question educational methods or procedures which lead to the "subject-teaching fallacy" (Bobbitt, 1925c, p. 657). Bobbitt lays blame on the traditional base under which both curriculum writers and teachers have labored. He postulates the problem: tradition locks curriculum writers' pens and teachers' instruction. He does not perceive that democracy had reigned in American education since its Puritan beginnings. He also does not perceive the amalgamation of

the Doctrine of the Elect into the secular-academic curriculum. He accuses various indiscriminate targets; however, he ignores the two intertwined "elect" (emphasis added) doctrines.

In both the seventh and eighth obstacles, Bobbitt addresses community. Earlier and often, Bobbitt had championed the business community. In the eighth obstacle, Bobbitt (1925c) acknowledges "home communities" had relinquished many responsibilities to the school: "The community is content, therefore, to have education managed for them and their children in complete isolation from the general community life" (p. 659). No socioeconomic reasons for such abrogation appear.

The ninth obstacle follows immediately, and with it Bobbitt moves his finger-pointing from curriculum writers or teachers to the community itself. He attacks textbooks because their rigid structures had been the center of American education. Bobbitt questions whether or not textbooks should be that hub of schools, in specific, and academia, in general.

Obstacles ten and eleven deal with administration and curriculum committees. In obstacle ten, Bobbitt (1925c) suggests administration easily can distance themselves from communities and their students: "They know the school, but they do not know, in the same detailed way, the community life and the relation of the juvenile generation to the adult generation within this community life" (p. 660).

Bobbitt (1925c) relates his thoughts to John Dewey's child-centered philosophy: "They [the administrators] have specialized in the academic procedures of education but not in the social processes which are even more fundamental in the actual upbringing of children" (p. 660). Bobbitt almost sees the obverse side to his scientific education vision. Sometimes he even moves closer to seeing what happens in growing school systems. He comprehends the wrongs growing bureaucratic democracy effaces. Bobbitt (1925c) applauds specialization, but "it should be specialization in the right growth and development of human beings, which is quite different from the usual type" (p. 661). He misses his chance to focus "the right growth and development."

If administrators miss their chance to work solely with, or at least absolutely for, human beings, then the eleventh obstacle becomes important. Teachers, principals, and other officials often work under trying and fatiguing conditions, and they may not be able to devote themselves exclusively to curricular work. Bobbitt (1925c) accuses their "drift along the easy channels of habit" (p. 661).

The title that Bobbitt (1925c) ascribes his twelfth objection makes its own statement: "Those who are in the position of general professional leadership are, for the most part, primarily directors of routine and only secondarily directors of professional thought and labor" (p. 661). Public school officials have much routine work to do, but they sometimes ignore the most important obstacle,

the interrelationship with the community, says the author.

If Bobbitt lists public school personnel faults, he also distributes teacher-training institutions' shortcomings. He maintains colleges and universities often do not know public schools' goals and objectives: "The professional institutions tend to think of the school in a specialized way and as isolated from the life of the community" (Bobbitt, 1925c, p. 662). Some 65 years later, among others, Goodlad's Teachers for Our Nation's Schools (1990) offers an identical criticism. Bobbitt suggests the specialized curriculum in universities and colleges does not serve many communities. He was right in 1925; Goodlad, similarly, in 1990. Bobbitt's next article treats the specificity of health objectives, just as his "Objectives of Physical Education" (1921c) had specifically addressed PE.

"Discovering the Objectives of Health Education" (1925d)

The last 1925 article Bobbitt writes, "Discovering the Objectives of Health Education," appears in June's Elementary School Journal. That article not only responds generally to the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, but also directly addresses health. Two major influences gave Bobbitt health interests. The first was a committee. The Cardinal Principles' Committee had focused on health and hygiene, and Bobbitt had been a participating member of that 1918 body. The second was one man--Herbert Spencer, the

lionized icon of Social Darwinism, and the author of Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical (1860).

Bobbitt shares Spencer's view that physical well-being becomes a most important educational field.

Bobbitt's "Discovering the Objectives of Health Education" (1925d) is neither very deep or expansive. I hypothesize Bobbitt had written this piece long before its publication date, and I offer several reasons in support. First, the author immediately mounts another scientific-curriculum diatribe, something that he had not done with his other 1921-1924 works. Second, the style reflects Bobbitt's survey-style days, complete with obtuse rhetoric and voluminous tables. In this article, for example, Bobbitt cites "health" (emphasis added) articles from 175 issues of the Chicago Daily Tribune and 140 issues of the Chicago Daily News. Additionally, he selects 56 selected newspaper items and 55 selected textbook items. With all this information, Bobbitt suggests his survey technique could and should fit curriculum agendas or school's responses to proposed agendas.

"Discovering the Objectives of Health Education's" (1925d) style reads very concise and curt. The paragraphs treat and cover the work of W. L. Meyers, who conducted the surveys and did the majority of the research. Bobbitt urges curriculum surveyors use Meyers' findings to forecast future health objectives, yet he abruptly concludes that more

"listing" research must occur before school personnel could use the article's contents. Much more comprehensive is Curriculum Investigations (1926a), a small text melding Bobbitt's survey and activity doctrines.

Curriculum Investigations (1926a)

In 1926, Bobbitt, with Palmer, Nietz, et al., publishes Curriculum Investigations. That text encompasses five major areas: periodical literature, newspapers, encyclopedias, language, and literary digests. This publication mirrors Bobbitt's (1926a) survey and activity work, as witnessed by his opening statement:

Civilization is a system of activities. Whether savage or civilized, man is concerned with matters of food, shelter, physical protection, decoration, travel, communication, social adjustment, social control, play, work, family life, religion, and the like. Primitive man performed his activities in a simple way and on a small scale. Civilization has been a process of inventing and using improved, and usually enlarged, methods of carrying on the activities of life. (p. 2)

Bobbitt also states how these activities fit into his scheme of education.

Disturbing is Bobbitt's attitude about formulating the various activities. He keeps his elitist form intact:

Of the various ability groups, the most significant for all mankind is the leadership group--the most capable

2, 5, or 10 percent that can travel all the road to the highest attainable levels and on whom all the others depend for guidance and, consequently, for their general welfare. Let us discover in the concrete the mature activities and the growth activities of this group, and we shall have the objectives and the curriculum that we would like to employ in the case of all persons. (Bobbitt, 1926a, p. 3)

He says these statements aim at a "life-series of activities" and concludes they are important constructs: "The objectives of education are all the activities which ought to make up the totality of human life from birth to death" (Bobbitt, 1926a, p. 4). He lists four research problems for this study:

1. Bobbitt notes seven levels or divisions of human action, which mirror the Cardinal Principles' list of health, fundamental processes, home membership, vocation, citizenship, leisure, and ethical character. He restates his own "new" positions, which now number ten. He maintains health, citizenship, leisure, and vocation, but now adds or renames communication, general human association, vision, religion, parenthood, and unspecialized practical activities.

2. To the question of how many specific adult activities of "good type" exist, Bobbitt answers, an infinite amount.

3. Bobbitt also gives an "indefinite" answer regarding

what activities should accompany the various levels of development.

4. Bobbitt has a "survey" answer to the last directive. Regarding what the activities should be for children, the author urges investigation of 5,000 major problems (Bobbitt, 1926a, pp. 5-6).

With this preface, the Bobbitt study itself begins, an overt mathematical one that uses the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature as its basis. In that source, dating 1919-1921, Bobbitt finds 46 major topics addressed. Most articles concerned government (9,920), followed by nations and states (9,237), education (4,792), transportation (3,384), intellectual vision (3,289), and mathematics, in 46th place, (89) (Bobbitt, 1926a, pp. 7-9). Besides the obvious delineations of "Education," and "Transportation," Bobbitt also creates interesting categories. "Intellectual Vision," (five on the periodical table) and "Power," (41 on the periodical table) another invention, have no detailed definitions. Bobbitt (1926a) reasons his definitions have efficacy and applicability because of four processes:

1. The topics of largest intrinsic importance will occur most often.

2. What causes irritations becomes important to most people.

3. Topicality appeals to the majority.

4. "Immediate" problems interest people more than "remote" ones (pp. 9-10).

Bobbitt's (1926a) view of humanity, whether or not he ranked periodical literature, recalls his "Practical Eugenics" (1909b) dogma, and his curricular statements in 1915c, 1917a, 1917b, and 1921a:

All other things being equal, the topics of largest intrinsic importance will probably tend to gravitate toward the head of the list. We cannot be entirely sure of this. Because of the general pettiness and immediacy of native human interests, there are reasons to think that the reverse might be the case. (p. 9)

Another statement corroborates his pessimism:

In the aggregate, man seems to prefer to dwell on the little things that make up his existence from hour to hour and is reluctant to dwell on the things that are large and high and intrinsically important. (Bobbitt, 1926a, p. 9)

With these statements, Bobbitt justifies his own survey and activity research. As well, he implicitly peers down on fellow citizens from his professor's podium.

Bobbitt's Curriculum Investigations (1926a) highlights his own surveys and activities philosophy. It also incorporates his graduate students--he had enlisted several into this project--into his democratic ethic. Bobbitt used and advocated The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, and other polemic data banks, as academic fount "source inquiries." He prized that research technique, trained his graduate students to do likewise, and believed that such

inquiry served United States public school students' best interests. This "research" (emphasis added) immediately precedes Bobbitt's capitulation with Harold Rugg in the NSSE's 1926 Annual Yearbook.

"Orientation of the Curriculum Maker"(1926b)

That two warring factions fought over curriculum in the early Twentieth Century is not a secret. Both Dewey's child-centered advocates, and Bobbitt's scientific curriculum devotees, had sufficient reputations, dedicated followings, national influence, and competitive rivalry (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, pp. 199-204). They had jostled privately and publicly for more than a decade. Both factions helped counter and form each others' positions in The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook (1926b). This publication became the pivotal forum within which both sides compromised and tried to settle the national curriculum debate. As well, the 1926 Yearbook becomes the focal point of Bobbitt's retraction of his scientism. The NSSE convocation has become a U.S. public school touchstone. Kliebard (1986) notes:

The general notion that the American curriculum needed a drastic overhaul reached its peak in 1926 when both volumes of the National Society for the Study of Education's Twenty-Sixth Yearbook were devoted to curriculum issues. . . . The announced purpose of the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook was to reach a consensus as to

what would comprise the new curriculum. For a quarter of a century or more, there had been a vigorous drive to replace what was commonly regarded as a curriculum unsuited for the new industrial age and for the new population of students entering both elementary and secondary schools in larger numbers.

(1986, pp. 181-182).

Both Guy Montrose Whipple's "Editor's Preface" and Harold Rugg's "Forward" in the yearbook provide information that helps explain Bobbitt's turning from an essentialist doctrine to a more child-centered one. At the conclusion of this section, I hypothesize why Bobbitt made such an abrupt metastasis, and suggest reasons why that change occurred.

Whipple prefaces the work: "This Yearbook is in several respects among the most ambitious undertakings of the Society" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 1926, p. vi. Hereafter shortened to The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook). Whipple gives Rugg credit as the person having the foresight to gather the disparate factions:

It was felt that the National Society for the Study of Education could perform a real service to the movement for curriculum-revision by directing its contribution to this preliminary problem of method, and particularly by making a special effort to bring together, and so far as possible to unify or to reconcile, the varying and often seemingly divergent or even antagonistic

philosophies of the curriculum that were being espoused by leading authorities or by their adherents in this country. (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. vi)

Rugg, on the other hand, is expansive, dynamic, and effusive regarding America's current educational state: "Synthesis [of curriculum studies] is needed especially because of the gap between school and society, and between curriculum and child growth (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. vii). Rugg recapitulates the Industrial Revolution and pinpoints the onset of the scientific age:

Life on the American continent has moved in two parallel but rarely merging currents. One has been the dynamic rush of land settlement, industry, and politics--exploitive, mercenary, unmeditative. The other--the academic stream of letters, art, and education--has lagged sluggishly behind. (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. vii)

Rugg also notes the divergence that occupied the 26th Annual Yearbook. He suggests that curriculum differentiation is not necessarily a bad omen. Rugg cites scientific curriculum people, subject-matter specialists, and laboratory school personnel, and their respective curriculum agendas. Then he suggests a unifying force or theme could be "hammered out" between the various factions and groups.

The "hammering out" links Bobbitt's own wavering position between scientific and child-centered curriculum.

Instead of taking a pro-laboratory school, a pro-scientific curriculum mode, or a pro-child-centered philosophy, Rugg and Whipple worked all three into a framework (per the 18 fundamental questions on curriculum making):

1. What period of life does schooling primarily contemplate as its end?
2. How can the curriculum prepare for effective participation in adult life?
3. Are the curriculum makers of the schools obliged to formulate a point of view concerning the merits or deficiencies of American civilization?
4. Should the school be regarded as a conscious agency for social improvement?
5. How shall the content of the curriculum be conceived and stated?
6. What is the place and function of subject matter in the education process?
7. What portion of education should be classified as "general" and what portion as "specialized" or "vocational" or purely "optional?" To what extent is general education to run parallel with vocational education and to what extent is the latter to follow on the completion of the former?
8. Is the curriculum to be made in advance?
9. To what extent is the "organization" of the subject matter a matter of pupil-thinking and construction of, or planning by the professional curriculum maker as a result of experimentation?

10. From the point of view of the educator, when has "learning" taken place?

11. To what extent would traits be learned in their "natural" habitat?

12. To what degree should the curriculum provide for individual differences?

13. To what degree is the concept of "minimal essentials" to be used in curriculum construction?

14. What should be the form of organization of the curriculum?

15. What, if any, use shall be made of the spontaneous interests of children?

16. For the determination of what types of material (activities, reading, discussion problems and topics, group projects, etc.) should the curriculum maker analyze the activities in which adults engage?

17. How far shall methods of learning be standardized?

18. Administrative questions of curriculum making:

(a) For what time units shall the curriculum be organized?

(b) For what geographic units shall the curriculum be made?

(The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, pp. 9-10).

Rugg held these eighteen questions as determining curriculum factors. Yet, because of the extensive theory and practice that goes into curriculum, the Yearbook intended no single answer or set of answers. Rugg felt that opening up the debate to major figures and their separate genres would facilitate open discussions:

The danger in publishing the General Statement is clear: namely, that this will be taken as a set of principles to be blindly followed. It should be clear that it is not adoption of these principles that is needed most. No, it is hard thinking about the issues and problems of curriculum-construction that we desire.

(The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 8)

Proceeding with this clarification, Rugg introduced the compromise statement upon which all contributors agreed:

- I. Introductory: The Next Practical Steps in Curriculum Making
- II. Curriculum-Construction in the Light of Both Study of Child Growth and Effective Social Life
- III. Curriculum-Making and the Scientific Study of Society
- IV. The School as a Conscious Agency for Social Improvement
- V. The Curriculum and Social Integration
- VI. Changing Conceptions of Learning and of the Subject Matter of the Curriculum
- VII. The Teacher's Need for an Outline of Desirable Experiences Planned in Advance
- VIII. The Place of the School Subjects in Instruction
- IX. Continuous and Comprehensive Curriculum Study
- X. Measuring the Outcomes of Instruction
- XI. The Role of Teacher-Training Institutions in the Reconstruction of the Curriculum

XII. Problems of Administrative Adjustment in Curriculum Making. (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 11)

This dissertation covers the foundation curriculum syllabus's first four statements, and then demonstrates Bobbitt's reaction to the yearbook's position:

I. "Introductory: The Next Practical Steps in Curriculum Making" has two components. First, all attending members agreed in principle to the Yearbooks' precepts, though they did not have to alter their philosophical stance. Second, the report's principles had applicability for elementary and secondary schools, as well as higher education and collegiate levels (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, pp. 11-12).

II. "Curriculum-Construction in the Light of Both the Study of Child Growth and Effective Social Life" has nine aspects, beginning with the introduction and leading up to a scientific study of education. The report accepts the controversy concerning whether or not educational "ends" should focus on the child's life or the adult's. The membership believes the former had dominance over the latter in U.S. society:

Although a "grown-up" emphasis rightfully has its place, and much more vigorously than has been true in the past, steps to move toward these goals are dictated by children's characteristic interests, needs, capacities for learning, and experiences, as well as by

the larger demands of society. (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 12)

Further, the Yearbook contends curriculum materials and curriculum writing could balance children's needs with inevitable adult needs:

To validate any experience for any particular time, both child interest and social value in the control of behavior should be used as tests. The ultimate test, therefore, of the value an organization of curriculum-materials is the effectiveness of child learning. (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 13)

Social values become an important issue. The yearbook asserts public education had fallen into formalism, which defeats "social life" teaching and learning:

The curriculum can prepare for effective participation in social life by providing a present life of experiences which increasingly identifies the child with the aims and activities derived from analysis of social life as a whole. (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 14)

III. In "Curriculum-Making and the Scientific Study of Society," the report promotes scientific education, yet limits scientism. Curriculum writing includes immediate and "ultimate" objectives, "experimental" child activities, and finding and implementing activities that serve particular grades best (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 14). Rugg's report demands, however, that science not

become the pervasive, encompassing instrument Bobbitt has advocated. Acceptable are "scientific" individual and group processes, including open-forum discussions and excursions (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 14). Science can aid discovering "skills and factual materials," as well as the studies that might lead to "interests and abilities of children at various stages of maturing, even methods of learning" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 15). Science, however, cannot rule and measure education, concludes Rugg's report.

IV. "The School as a Conscious Agency for Social Improvement" complements the scientific study of society, and, as such, finalizes introductory materials from the "foundations." In section IV, the report writers exhort melding child-centered and scientific curricula. Though neither Rugg nor Whipple set up specific terms or formats for both camps, social improvement becomes the curricular goal. Child-centered schools, the report states, are analogous to American and democratic principles as apple pie and the flag are to patriotism--undisputed:

Throughout their school careers, pupils should be given opportunities to think about these problems and institutions, to develop attitudes of understanding and tolerance, and to perfect habits of right conduct and creative self-expression. (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 15)

Agencies such as church or home can not or will not

exert the factors and the education necessary to adequately teach the young. The report says, the school must. The school must also influence a curriculum with sufficient scope, sequence, and practice such that the young can practice "right conduct and creative self-expression" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 15).

Bobbitt (1926b) himself provides the most important link between child-centered and scientific approaches: "The task, however, of discovering appropriate materials of instruction through which to achieve those aims and purposes, is a technical one of great difficulty, demanding special professional preparation" (p. 16). Students must have that "professional preparation" via "appropriate materials" for education to become child-centered. Bobbitt agrees that preparation for the difficult task of teaching social values must not have a casual, scientific approach.

V. "The Curriculum and Social Integration" compares "minimal essentials" and "individual differences," then blurs the contrast between "general" vs. "vocational" education. The emphasis on learners' needs, electives, and time unites Bobbitt's and the child-centered positions (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, pp. 16-17).

VI. "Changing Conceptions of Learning and of the Subject Matter of the Curriculum" complements IV, "Changing Conceptions of Learning and of the Subject Matter of the Curriculum," and VIII, "The Teacher's Need for an Outline of Desirable Experiences Planned in Advance." "Scientific"

planning, arrangement, and teaching have their rightful place. However, the "Foundation Statement" reminds readers the purely "academic" approach the Committee of Ten took. The Committee also addresses teacher attitudes and preparation. In number VII, "The Teacher's Need for an Outline of Desirable Experiences Planned in Advance," the yearbook committee urges teachers to think, plan, and sequence their lessons. If the teachers do so, and use texts and other curricular resources diligently, their students benefit (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, pp. 17-23). Regardless of subject matter chosen or teacher classroom methodology selected, the individual's needs must be paramount:

The chief reason for the criticism of existing subject divisions is that, as now organized [either the subject matter or the traditional scholastic teaching approach] some of the barriers between school subjects [and their respective teaching assignments] hinder true learning, rather than promote it. (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 21)

Whether using a specific scholastic approach or the general "scientific" learning per se, the committee's number IX suggests: "School practice, both past and present, has conceived too generally of curriculum-revision as a task for intermittent administrative reorganization" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 23). Rather than the administrative/top-down, business-community curriculum

motif, a new one should reign:

The Committee believes, on the contrary, that because of the dynamic nature of modern society and of the steady accumulation of truth concerning learning and child growth, school systems and colleges should make provisions for the continuous study, evaluation, and testing of the materials of the school curriculum, and the importation of new materials or the elimination of old kinds whenever this proves trouble justifiable.

(The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 23)

The Committee believes that local districts must revise their curriculum continually. The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook's child-centered emphasis satisfied the Kilpatrick faction, while their using scientific specialists satisfied the Bobbitt group.

X. "Measuring the Outcomes of Instruction," and XI., "The Role of Teacher-Training Institutions in the Reconstruction of the Curriculum," list ways testing factors and instruments, as well as teacher training institutions, can learn to balance child-centered and scientific curricula (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 25).

XII. The last committee section, "Problems of Administrative Adjustment in Curriculum Making," also mirrors the coalition of both warring factions. This section specifies the value of local school teachers meeting and settling curricula relevant for local students, and preparing future meetings as the basis for further

curriculum change (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 26).

That The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook (1926b) expressed, expounded, and produced postulates that mediated the Progressives vs. science-curriculum advocates, says much for Rugg, Whipple, and the NSSE committee. That the disparate factions might agree to its resolutions was not certain. The Progressives, singularly and collectively, praised the effort. The "scientific" curricularists capitulated. W. W. Charters' agreement had reservations: "I have nothing to add by way of elaboration of the combined statement presented by the group. With the pronouncement I am in substantial agreement" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 71). He offers, however, a scientific addendum: "The validity of specific points on which I may differ from my colleagues may well wait until it is settled by scientific techniques" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 71). He does not elaborate on those differences, but his statement demonstrates tacit support for the melding of child-centered and scientific curricula. Later, Charters exhorts: "There are those who hold the position that the curriculum should be based entirely upon study of the needs and interests of the learners. With this position I am unable to concur" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 71). Viewing the NSSE committee's "Statement Position" as one that did not completely favor the Progressives, he

diplomatically concludes: "The conference was a success" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 71).

Bobbitt, in contrast, offers no lukewarm agreement to the "Statement Position." Instead, he grants his wholehearted approval. Kliebard (1986) notes:

By far the most startling of the statements [of The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook] was Bobbitt's.

Inexplicably, he repudiated his earlier central position that education represents a preparation for adult living and declared instead that "Education is not primarily to prepare for life at some future time. Quite the reverse; it purposes to hold high the current living. . . . Life cannot be 'prepared for.' It can only be lived. (p. 183)

Kliebard's notation was and is the impetus under which I undertook this entire study. His scholarship, his detection of Bobbitt's retraction, and his use of The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook were my impetus to document and reassess Bobbitt. To begin this reassessment, I emphasize that Bobbitt, on several occasions, seemingly changed his mind, or at least allowed for different points of view. I suggest his treatises and thoughts on his "elite" (emphasis added) democracy are major components of his apparent shifting.

Writing in Chapter III, "The Orientation of the Curriculum-Maker," Rugg notes: "Professor Bobbitt has expressed his general acquiescence in the General Statement" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 41). Bobbitt

(1926b) restates his position concerning education:

1. Activities are important in education of any sort.
2. In curriculum making, "general education" differs much from "vocational education."
3. Specialized, "efficiency" inquiry and teaching take place with vocational learning.
4. In general, education attempts to lift the human character from what it might have been.
5. A life continuum is important (pp. 42-43).

After stating the "life continuum" section, which recreated his school-must-prepare-for-life motif, Bobbitt (1926b) adds: "Looking to the entire life-continuum for guidance in upholding the activities of the present does not demand that the present be merely a preparation for the future" (p. 43). He adds: "The momentum gained from holding the present high is the preparation for the future" (The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook, 1926b, p. 43). Bobbitt differentiates how school prepares students for life, but finds it hard to explain his scientific control motives. He hedges his thoughts after his earlier shift:

When the central objective of education is nothing other than continuously holding to the activities of high-grade living, and when the specific objectives are none other than these specific activities, then the educative process can be stated in very simple terms: Let child and youth at each age perform the activities which constitute high-grade living for that age. Let

life be full and abundant for its own sake and education is automatically taken care of. (Bobbitt, 1926b, p. 45)

For the committee to think that he does not recognize the essence of child-centered, democratic choice, Bobbitt (1926b) adds:

But over against this simplicity of the educative process, it must be noted that life itself is complex beyond all description. The situations are infinitely diverse and never the same for any two individuals.

(p. 45)

Bobbitt (1926b) acknowledges the child-centered platform on his own terms, using his activity looking glass: "Life is an individual affair" (p. 45). His only difficulty is that he sees student individuality, yet he also wants committee and reader approval that individuals encountering his specific activities curriculum benefit. Wistfully, Bobbitt (1926b) intones: "Each person, it seems, must have his own curriculum" (p. 46). Bobbitt (1926b) adds: "He [the student] may need much assistance, guidance, oversight, and stimulation; and yet it appears that, except for very little children, and largely even for them, one must plan for one's self" (p. 45).

Bobbitt (1926b) proposes his own plan, one that alters democracy as getting the best possible job, to democracy as ultimate responsibility:

We meet here with a problem of enormous complexity

which has yet been discussed but little by the educational profession. It is felt by most individuals that the adult should be entirely free to plan and live his own life so long as he does not override the rights of others; that life should not be planned for him and imposed upon by someone else. There is considerable uncertainty as to where the line would be drawn between activities which are socially harmful and those socially harmless, and there are certain zealous groups at present who appear to deny the principle even of adult freedom. (p. 45)

Bobbitt warred often and long, I suggest, on democracy in education. His war's outcome allowed the business community to dictate which level individuals found comfort. That comfort compromise melded education, freedom and responsibility:

The present writer believes that education should be administered with a view to giving individuals of whatever age the greatest possible amount of individual freedom, so long as this freedom is accompanied by sense of responsibility. (Bobbitt, 1926b, p. 47)

The responsibility connoted fiscal and business measures, as they do to date. Further, Bobbitt (1926b) clarifies the curriculum maker's role:

That curriculum-making is mainly concerned with the making of individual curriculum for the individual boy

or girl, by himself, or herself, as guided by teacher and parents. (p. 47)

Bobbitt rarely uses both masculine and the feminine pronouns, but he does here. He amplifies his remarks with the reference to teacher and parent guides. He explains the awesome responsibility curriculum makers have. Further, he implores them to remember the inherent possibilities school children possess.

Deeply inherent, undoubtedly, is the business community's importance. Bobbitt encourages a child-centered mode regarding the individual curriculum. Regarding the general curriculum, which he understands is The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook's main task, Bobbitt makes inquiry. He supports questions why The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook did not pursue more generalized version studies.

Careful reading concludes, in this important retraction, Bobbitt leaves open the possibility for more scientism--later renamed functionalism. He has confirmed only that he agrees with a child-centered individualized curriculum. He will prove in future remarks his devotion to conservative, generalized curriculum.

Perhaps Bobbitt gained Dewey-like measures from William H. Kilpatrick, an eloquent spokesperson for the child-centered philosophy. However, he also absorbed the strict tenets of authority from his religious upbringing, as well as the "Captains of Industry" from his maturing years. He could not jettison those images. Larson points out the code

of professionalization between the old agrarian and the new capitalistic one in her 1977 The Rise of Professionalism A Sociological Analysis. She suggests that men such as Bobbitt inherently fought the concept of popular democracy, chose the conservative, centralistic nationalism, and supported the "responsible" position of "corporate capitalism" (cf. Larson's Chapter V, "The Rise of Corporate Capitalism and the Consolidation of Professionalism," in The Rise of Professionalism A Sociological Analysis, pp. 53-63, 1977, for a thorough rendition of this subject). Bobbitt wavered in his retraction for reasons undoubtedly he was all too unaware.

"Character Building and the
New Curriculum" (1926c)

Bobbitt writes "Character Building and the New Curriculum" for Religious Education's 1926 issue. As the earlier chapters in this dissertation point out, Bobbitt had received early and fervent religious training by his grandfather and father, both of whom were ministers. In this particular publication, Bobbitt uses his early training, as well as his Social Darwinistic learning to explain his curriculum. Immediately, the author focuses on human behavior, as opposed to administrator guiding or teacher directing, as curriculum aim:

The new curriculum [Bobbitt's proposed activities] exactly reverses these valuations [rote memory]. It

aims at behavior, and the roots of behavior, defining the latter term to include all of the activities, subjective and objective which constitute human living.

(Bobbitt, 1926c, p. 472)

Bobbitt explains in the article that the behavior he refers connotes character building. Though "old," classical studies were indiscriminate in their regiment and intent, Bobbitt's (1926c) new one uses building blocks of students and their Darwinian pursuit of "high grade living":

Education is coming to see that life is not to be prepared for; it is to be lived. . . . It is to be lived thus fully and rightly at each age-level, whether child or youth or adult. The momentum of high-grade living each day tends to continue the same high-grade living in the next day. . . . To live "the good life" as Bertrand Russell phrases it, is to prepare one to continue the good life. Thus preparation for life is a by-product of life itself. (p. 472)

Though the author warns that some students lack "the native ability" to carry out his curriculum challenge, the others must be "shaped" for "good-life" status, and he quantifies his philosophy. The average student spends 12,000 hours progressing from elementary to high school, Bobbitt (1926c) calculates, and that figure represents 2% of the subject's life: "Except in this sense of momentum, it scarcely seems that life can be prepared for. . . . Life exists as a 70-year continuum of activities" (p. 473).

Bobbitt's crusade for his activities does read like a sermon. He has a message and he repeats it often, and just as often, his paragraphs echo his exhortation/homily: "The current activities of high-grade living twenty-four hours a day, and seven days a week are the curriculum" (Bobbitt, 1926c, p. 473). To which, he adds:

Education thus has a double task. On the one hand it is to provide, to condition, and to guide activities of many wholesome kinds at the school. But more important, it is to provide for a continuance of high-grade activity on the part of the individual during all of the hours when he is outside of the school.

(Bobbitt, 1926c, p. 473)

The curriculum writer becomes a "visionary," as Bobbitt (1926c) has noted often before; however, he also becomes a viewer of those most likely to succeed:

The modern curriculum-maker seeks to find the entire range of fruitful activities which ought to make up human existence on each of the age levels. The task is first to find those individuals of each particular age-level who have been most successful in performing the activities desirable for that age-level--and possibly for each ability-level as well. (p. 474)

In order to write curriculum, at this stage in his career, Bobbitt asks sociologists to become academic "visionaries" with their "scientific" questionnaires and survey aids. However, he implicitly enlists the aid of superior students

who will set the norms for his particular behavior objectives: "With these groups before him [the sociological "visionary"] the task is the simple one of listing the activities performed [by Spencerian "achievers," (emphasis added) and noting the character or quality of the performance (Bobbitt, 1926c, p. 474). Bobbitt admits that this process is subjective, but this less than scientific measure fulfills the dictates of the Cardinal Principles for the masses of students. His religious-based rhetoric provides interesting contrast to his Socially Darwinian message: "Let child and youth at each age perform the activities which constitute high-grade living for that age" (Bobbitt, 1926c, p. 475). Even more Biblical imagery follows: "Let life be full and abundant for its own sake and education is automatically taken care of" (Bobbitt, 1926c, p. 475).

Bobbitt's tone changes at the article's conclusion. Rather than the moral, Biblical references, he changes to a more brief, concise tone, one he usually displays. With that more succinct rhetoric, Bobbitt (1926c) poses his democratic/child-centered position he has explicated in the NSSE's Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook:

We meet here with a problem of enormous complexity which has not yet been properly discussed by the educational profession. It is felt by most individuals that the adult should be entirely free to plan and live his own life so long as he does not override the rights

of others and that it should not be planned for him and imposed upon him by someone else. (p. 476)

Bobbitt's (1926c) response demonstrates his answer to the scientism vs. Progressivism debate, and also shows his devotion to religious tenets of pastoral leadership over metaphorical flocks of sheep:

In suggesting the possibility of this freedom, we fully recognize the need of the guidance of children and youths by teachers, parents, nurses, librarians, family pastor, and his own juvenile friends and associates. . . . Thus in that newer curriculum [activities] which is to be but a guided segment of life itself, character education in all of its ramifications is cared for. It comprises the whole of the program. (p. 476)

Bobbitt expands on the responsibilities of "educational science" and the supervision of that science in his next article.

"Educational Science and Supervision" (1928)

Bobbitt left no doubt about his supervision-science duality in "Educational Science and Supervision," a chapter he wrote for the first yearbook for the National Conference on Educational Method. Edited by James Hosis, Educational Supervision, A Report of Current Views, Investigations and Practices, appeared in 1928. Bobbitt (1928) sets his tone

immediately:

In other words, there has been accumulating a large amount of demonstrable information relative to the educational objectives, the educational processes, the practical conditions required for those processes, and the nature of the personality which is to be actualized and shaped by those processes. It is this information which constitutes the fundamental portions of educational science. (p. 237)

Bobbitt indicates that quantitative measures, not qualitative, hold much promise for United States' public school education. He demonstrates how supervision benefits from science. Bobbitt suggests that far too many administrators adhere to arbitrary personnel management. Rather than an arbitrary one, he maintains scientific management allows principals and superintendents to make intelligent, well-regulated decisions. Because the administration can make those cogent decisions, Bobbitt reasons, teachers and students will benefit. To prove his point, Bobbitt (1928) introduces an engineering (science) model that educators might emulate:

When an engineer is called upon to design and construct a bridge across the Mississippi, it is not the board of laymen that employs him which tells him how to formulate his plans and how he shall do his work. He gets his directions from engineering science. (p. 240)

However, Bobbitt (1928) combines the engineering model with

a medical (science) template, one he had used before, and he suggests educators take heed:

When a man employs a physician to treat a sick child, the employer does not tell, and has no right to presume to tell, his professional employee what he is to do or how he is to do it. The physician gets all of his directions from his medical science. (p. 241)

Bobbitt acknowledges that laymen do not respect members of the teaching profession as much as they do doctors or engineers. His plan to gain that respect is simple: to create "educational science." To do this, Bobbitt suggests the key word is "vision." In several articles, Bobbitt has spoken of "men of vision," those ranking supervisors who have the ability to perceive the needs and goals of others. In "Educational Science and Supervision" (1928), the author clarifies how that "vision" occurs. To begin, Bobbitt does not mention vision with students or teachers, because they have to deal with the "realities" of classroom life. However, administrators can and must have "vision."

The superintendent, because of his status, has to have more "vision," suggests Bobbitt (1928):

The primary supervisory task of the superintendent is to quicken and clarify the educational science of his building principals, both elementary and secondary, his special supervisors, and his heads of departments.
(p. 247)

More importantly than the instructions are the ultimate

results: "If he cannot do this, he is not fitted for making educational science the ruling influence" (Bobbitt, 1928, p. 247). Bobbitt does not define the science a superintendent must clarify. However, he adds that any superintendent must be a "disseminator of professional vision" to principals and an "awakener and quickener" to teachers (Bobbitt, 1928, p. 247).

The building principal, in Bobbitt's science and supervision's hierarchy, has several functions. To begin, he "is to enlarge and clarify and quicken the teacher's vision so that he can see for himself what he is to do" (Bobbitt, 1928, p. 246). Using his administrator's vision, he assists the superintendent in clarifying teachers' vision:

He [the building principal] will not see the details of their fields as clearly as they [the teachers]; but he will see the fundamentals of their fields more clearly than they, and he will evaluate them with grater certainty. (Bobbitt, 1928, p. 247)

Bobbitt indicates that the successful principal does not have to instruct teachers too long. Their own "science-vision" frees him "to give any orders that are to be given" (Bobbitt, 1928, p. 247).

Bobbitt's (1928) conclusion recalls a basic religious tenet--faith: "Every supervisor, whether of the special or general type, should, especially at present, cultivate a faith in the dynamic efficacy of educational science"

(p. 248). Bobbitt has united portions of science, supervision, and religion. The administrator, building principal, or superintendent must also "believe": "He [the administrator] needs to believe that those who have light will tend normally and automatically to use that light for their guidance" (Bobbitt, 1928, p. 248). Bobbitt's post-1926 retraction has issued a 1928 version of his Doctrines of the Elect and Secular Elect. His next article redirects his "scientific" doctrine.

"Rebuilding the Curriculum in Line
With its True Function" (1929)

Bobbitt continues his functional curriculum work in "Rebuilding the Curriculum in Line With its True Function" in The Nation's Schools, January, 1929. The article's descriptor could indicate Bobbitt's statements to The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook: "Intelligent unrest marks the attitude of educators toward accepted methods of academic teaching found to be unrelated to the busy world of human living" (Bobbitt, 1929, p. 13). Bobbitt (1929) notes the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education worked hard reviewing high school curriculum, the Commission on the Revision of Elementary Education rethought grade school curricula, and the National Department of Superintendence devoted five years to overall curriculum reformulation (p. 13). These commissions, Bobbitt concludes, collectively did not know what was wrong with

curriculum. They all agreed that the pure Latin Grammar School approach, or the curriculum collaboration of administrators and teachers furtively meeting to construct curriculum quickly, cheated the country and its children.

Bobbitt (1929) indicates a curriculum writer seeking answers equates a "person who is ill and who feels throughout his organism a profound but undefined discomfort" (p. 13). In "Objectives of Physical Education" (1921c), and "Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher-Training Institutions" (1924c), among others, Bobbitt had earlier discussed schools-as-hospitals and students-as-patients. This hospital metaphor complements the ongoing school-as-factory and students-as-workers symbolism. The Holmes and Carnegie reports during the 1980s indicate that "medical," "hospital," or "courtroom" metaphors continue in Bobbitt's "discomfort" discourse (emphasis added).

Bobbitt repeats himself often. In this document, he reiterates that education's answers are not blind algebra, French, and geography prescriptors of Eliot's academic subject teaching. Rather, they should appeal to modern "life" studies:

Preconceptions of what education is and ought to be, which have been establishing themselves during 16,000 hours of sixteen impressionable years, acquire a fixity that is practically permanent. And to that most of us have added years of teaching and supervision that have taken for granted this same academic subject teaching,

unrelated to current human living, as the only possible or desirable kind of education. (Bobbitt, 1929, p. 14) Bobbitt uses all the right Progressive words to put him into child-centered company. He continues by attacking classical syllabi that he finds filled with meaningless details and superfluous minutiae.

For Bobbitt, student-centeredness does not include a true democratic forum. Instead, he offers his term "high grade living," explicated most recently in "Character Building and the New Curriculum" (1926c). Using the familiar activities he spoke of and advocated most of his life, he includes citizenship, vocation, reading, as well as the following: "We are coming to think that education should aim at establishing high grade human behavior for persons of all social classes" (Bobbitt, 1929, p. 14). He stops just short of pure social class interpretation: "This does not mean uniformity of behavior, since differences in native capacity would make this forever impossible, even were it desirable. But in terms of the individual's original nature, there can be wholesome living equally for all" (Bobbitt, 1929, p. 14). Bobbitt (1929) also betrays an inherent belief in the Doctrine of the Secular Elite when he says: "The majority of the population falls seriously short in the quality of its performance, a considerable portion of the people live blunderingly and badly" (p. 14).

As vehicles for this discussion in The Nation's Schools article (1929), Bobbitt uses safety and reading. In safety,

he details how safe living that leads to better community life should motivate curriculum planners. With reading, for example, Bobbitt lists genres all people use and participate--magazines, periodicals, and newspapers. Observing these genres is the key, says Bobbitt (1929): "It is the business of education to take this current faculty of observation in hand and to guide it during childhood and youth" (p. 15). Such observations lead to reading, and in this case, reading "should prepare them [the students] for the life that is being lived" (Bobbitt, 1929, p. 16). Bobbitt has all the sense and sensibility of a child-centered curriculum writer. What he lacks is the sensitivity to know how a democracy works, and an ability to understand children before telling them what they need to know in order to become "educated" (emphasis added).

Just as the Holmes Report of 1986 advocated a teaching hospital approach to education, Bobbitt (1929) suggests that teacher training should follow a definite medical course:

The best method of training a physician, for example, has been to give certain preliminary training within the medical school, and then to give him his fundamental training in the actual care of the sick. (p. 17)

Bobbitt continues his student training advocacy, and, as well, might also have spoken to teacher training institutions. He provides a model to "heal" the sick when

speaking directly to the student through teachers' and administrators' eyes. His missionary zeal is most evident.

"The Relation Between Content and Method" (1931)

Bobbitt in "The Relation Between Content and Method," written for Journal of Educational Psychology, September, 1931, demonstrates further proof and substance concerning his "functional education" beliefs. This is the definition he gives to his post-NSSE Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook retraction that life should be for adults alone and their enjoyment of the mature life. "The Relation Between Content and Method" (1931) concisely states Bobbitt's content and method concerning teaching young people.

The author chronicles, historically, how "subject-matter" teaching had utilized textbooks to produce lessons and tests:

The content of this education has been the textbook subject matter to be learned. The method on the part of the pupil has been simply to concentrate on the materials, with repetition, until it was learned well enough for recitation and examination. (Bobbitt, 1931, p. 3)

Instead of this age-old process, the author recommends education "to bring about current high grade human living on the part of the children and youths" (Bobbitt, 1931, p. 3).

Functional education, contends Bobbitt (1931), almost

openly disregards the word "content," and replaces it with "continuity of behavior" (p. 4). That behavior continuity joins teachers' ability to "condition" the process via necessary opportunities, stimulations, leadership, and guidance: "Teacher method is guiding the life continuity. Pupil method is living the life continuity. To the pupil, life and the educative process are identical. The teacher is a conditioner of this process" (Bobbitt, 1931, p. 5). Bobbitt (1931) recognizes the community and the family must aid children's education:

Long before children ever go to school, the family will have been employing methods, whether good or bad, in conditioning the life continuity, and therefore the education of their children. . . . They will show them what to and how to do it. (p. 5)

Bobbitt (1931) adds how the family and schools should perform their "methods of greatest moment" conditioning duties:

1. To awaken interest in things and in the behavior that relates to those things.
2. To set motives into operation.
3. To awaken a sense of responsibility for behavior that is individually and socially wholesome.
4. To manage and supervise the pupil's behavior as to get it self-planned and self-directed by the pupils with the least possible amount of teacher direction consistent with getting things properly done (p. 7).

Bobbitt's method statement, number 4 above, I suggest, is complex and difficult to probe. Bobbitt speaks of self-planning and self-direction with as little teacher direction as possible. Yet he contrasts that statement by speaking of "things" without definitions and "properly done" without explanation.

If there is an answer to his child-centered vs. subject-centered debate, Bobbitt resolves it via sociology and the sociologist. He hopes for a "changed balance of emphasis in our methodological theory" (Bobbitt, 1931, p. 7). Because the teaching profession itself, and its component troika, administrators, teachers, and parents, have not conceived the outline and manifestations of high-grade human living, sociologists might do it for them:

With the functional education, educational sociology is destined to come into its own. It is a late arrival simply because the older traditional education was, and still is, most oblivious of its social responsibilities and of the sociological setting and substance of the educative process. (Bobbitt, 1931, p. 9)

What Bobbitt envisions while cloaking his words in the sociologists' "wholesome" and "normal" phraseology, is a new science that will explain children for children. Bobbitt occasionally speaks of helping and aiding students' quest for their "good life," yet never asks, works with, or consults them in that process. Bobbitt could listen to Dewey and Kilpatrick, in Kliebard's (1986) words, "be

mesmerized by them," yet never really understand what they said and offered (pp. 159-167). Bobbitt's educational dogma includes process orientation and process understanding. He speaks often of democracy and points to civics-like activities, yet does not address democracy's tenets: empowerment, freedom, and rights. His next article, for example, concerns students; however, he delivered it to an adult, "political" audience.

"Social Values of the Junior High School Curriculum" (1933)

Bobbitt removed himself from overt politics throughout his life. In "Social Value of the Junior High School Curriculum," written for the January, 1933, Social Executives Magazine, he delivers an address to the Ohio State Education Association. That address was, for Bobbitt (1933), an unusually high-profile political arena, warning the uninformed or unenlightened:

In discovering the social function of the public school, a first question must be: What are the serious dangers which threaten the nation as to call for huge expenditures upon education, and for the enforcement by threat of fine, imprisonment, and confiscation of property, if these are not paid? The nature of the dangers will show the kind of education needed.

(p. 179)

He continues: "With some further unbalancing the whole

cooperative enterprise might go down as a great mass of social wreckage" (Bobbitt, 1933, p. 179). He maintains that during his professional tenure United States' curriculum has suffered. Bobbitt notes the years 1930-1933 as the best example of such calamity. Whether or not he meant a general curriculum trend as indicative of the unbalance, or whether he meant the economic depression and the resulting fiscal climate, he does not say. What he does say is the country's populace operates the enterprise, and the citizenry can control their fates via four operatives:

1. Keep themselves abreast of the "high-grade" civilized living.

2. Use the "high-grade" knowledge to seek and demand needs from social agencies.

3. Distribute the good to people's needs, evaluate the benefits, and discard and/or re-evaluate the bad.

4. Reject poor services, refuse patronage of poor agencies, and accentuate the good (Bobbitt, 1933, p. 179).

Proper social control, Bobbitt (1933) suggests, keys his educational theory: "An ignorant population is a prey to exploitation, parasitism, and brigandage" (p. 179).

Again, Bobbitt mentions democracy. He explains democracy as a society of which education is one entity. That society individually and collectively inter-dependes on each other; however, the author warns what will happen if one interest group either prevails or usurps others' abilities and efficacy:

There is a break-up of democracy into militant minority groups, each intent upon exploiting an ignorant society in its own interest. . . . It is obvious that with an unenlightened population, we are headed for social confusion, demoralization, decline, and ultimate collapse of our social machinery. (Bobbitt, 1933, p. 179)

In order to keep this imbalance from happening, Bobbitt clarifies. The first line of defense is education: "It [education] is action for the national welfare. The public school is the first line of the national defense" (Bobbitt, 1933, p. 179). Public schools, from kindergarten and continuing throughout the students' lives, should cultivate an understanding of the agencies that serve them. Bobbitt (1933) explains:

The task of the school is to enlighten all members of the population, relative to all fundamental portions and aspects of the social mechanism and its operation. Its task is to help the young people to see and to understand the nature of the agencies, the character of human needs to be served by them, the standards to be employed in evaluating their services and their costs, their relation to society and to each other, and the needs of each agency if the school is to give proper service. (p. 179)

Bobbitt sounds like a social crusader. He speaks as one who

does not want the students to lose advantage, and, as well, wants them to know how to participate in their democracy.

His analysis of how forces and agencies have or might bring about national curricular imbalance results from his own traditional activities theory. Such activities he calls "functionalisms." By knowing the inefficiency in subject-matter-only curriculum, Bobbitt encourages teachers and administrators to utilize his curriculum plan of consumer activities and citizenship, health care, physical living, family life, bringing up children, work about the home, and vocation through thoughts and practice. His curriculum utilizes understanding, evaluations, attitudes, plans, and decisions. They are essential for Bobbitt's curricular functionalism. Yet he never mentions plans to deliver such thoughts or practices. The practices portion remains a mystery, except for "men of vision" and "sociological specialists" (emphasis added).

Bobbitt again undermines his specificity in his enlightened studies regarding junior high school curriculum. He restates the need for that school "to awaken in all persons an interest in all the fundamental aspects and portions of natural reality" (Bobbitt, 1933, p. 180). The natural realities, he feels, will follow students for the balance of their lives. He also suggests he has no idea how much time, money, and resources to allocate for his enlightenment program. However, he does recommend the following national defense lines:

1. Allocate more time for social studies and science, allowing for individual differences in pupil capability.
2. Conduct surveys to find out specific social studies and science needs students have.
3. Allow social studies and science to become the central part of the junior high school curriculum.
4. Avoid textbook dominance; instead, encourage guidance via "intellectual growth."
5. Have practical science and social studies activities begin at home.
6. Emphasize use of English, higher math, music, etc., as opposed to the "mechanical teaching" of some (Bobbitt, 1933, p. 181).

Bobbitt's emphases allow for what sounds like a balanced theory and practice program. He asks for less "mechanical teaching," less textbook-dominated classrooms, cooperation from homes to support education, and attention to individuals. However, when read closely, at the same time, he advocates science and mathematics, both school and home-supported-basic business and industry aids, and reliance on his own survey methodology framework. Gathered together, these disparate factors become the real "natural realities" Bobbitt projects. His "natural realities" rest in Larson's sociological "dilemma" (cf. "The Historical Matrix of Modern Professions," pp. 2-9, in Larson's The Rise of Professionalism A Sociological Analysis, 1977, for a comprehensive discussion of this dilemma).

"The Basic Curriculum Philosophy of Source-Thinkers--A Proposal" (1934a)

In a short article written for Curriculum Journal, January, 1934, Bobbitt makes a concise plea for educational enlightenment. The enlightenment, Bobbitt (1934a) maintains, as he has throughout his career, encompasses "the several fields of health care, family life, citizenship, vocation, leisure occupations, general human associations and the continuance of the broadly balanced and life-long intellectual living" (p. 4).

The progression through which he views schools' "work" (emphasis added) also is vintage Bobbitt. He promotes "good life" acquisition: "Such a life at every stage of its advance is to be a balanced one and to include every ingredient in proper amount that is normal to the nature, age, and situation of the individual" (Bobbitt, 1934a, p. 1). The author admits that the "good life" is an individual matter; however, education is the most important single device to attain it. The home, he adds, must support the educational institutions: "The chief conditioners, guides, and supervisors of the good life by the children and youths are the families. The family is then the basic, and the chief, educational institution" (Bobbitt, 1934a, p. 1).

Schools concentrate, augment, and complement the basic home "work." Teachers become learning specialists; however, the curriculum still eludes Bobbitt's grasp (1934a): "The details of the curriculum then are to be planned currently

under the guidance of the general principles that properly govern the several fields of human behavior" (p. 3). Sociologists or anthropologists have been the guiding "principals" (emphasis and "principal(s)" added) to this point. Though his intent might have been child-centered, Bobbitt distances himself from Dewey-like status. Bobbitt concludes his "proposal" by joining "enlightenment," "intelligence," and "potential." That joining, the author exclaims, is the reason "the current usual plan and program of intellectual education needs to be fundamentally changed" (Bobbitt, 1934a, pp. 2-4). He neither defines the problems, nor does he give any answers. The "proposal" is a veiled indictment of public school education. His next article indicts the Commission on the Social Studies.

"Questionable Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies" (1934b)

Bobbitt increases his political writing in the 1930s with the publication of "Questionable Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies" for School and Society, August, 1934. Bobbitt had displayed upset with social discontent in "Social Value of the Junior High School Curriculum" (1933). He had also uttered veiled threats at U.S. public education in "The Basic Curriculum of Source-Thinkers--A Proposal" (1934a). He reiterates those positions again:

During the past two or three decades, particularly, the

population has been seriously mismanaging its economic-political affairs and running into difficulties, which have come to a head during the past five years. . . . The custodians of social understanding either have been lacking in their supply of it or there has been inefficiency in distributing it to the populations. (Bobbitt, 1934b, p. 201)

The specific report to which Bobbitt makes allusion is the American Historical Association's "Commission on the Social Studies." That commission indicated the day of individualism and laissez-faire regarding government and the economy had ended and collectivism had begun (Bobbitt, 1934b, p. 203). To say Bobbitt responds vociferously is to say the very least. The only collectivism Bobbitt (1934b) knew consisted of fascist states:

We must therefore assume that they meant those best-known ones: and that the United States, in the judgement of representative of those who best know, moves toward the repressive anti-democratic fascism of Italy and Germany or toward the communism of Russia. (p. 203)

Bobbitt (1934b) remonstrates the commission for its pro-collectivist, anti-democratic stance, especially since their work did not blend scientifically with his:

Democracy in our land has had a long and honorable history. Its measure of success has been such as warrants a full and sympathetic consideration by the

commission rather than the curt dismissal without any attempt at explanation that it receives. The refusal of this authoritative body even to grant democracy a hearing seems to violate principles of scientific accuracy, balance and tolerance which they laud so definitely and justly in their report. (p. 204)

Bobbitt so enthusiastically supports what he believes to be an anti-democratic stance that he almost forgets the substance of the report. He flails at the "frequent lipservice to democracy, when the whole tenor of their report is denial both of its legitimacy and of its desirability" (Bobbitt, 1934b, p. 205). He supports democracy and "scientific accuracy," yet he does not say how his curriculum interact with those two concepts.

In the article's "B" section, which is more ascerbic than "A," Bobbitt actively reproves the commission's academic findings, and he does so with personal, philosophical criticism. Bobbitt here ceases the professor's persona, and assumes the citizen's role. His criticism itself is ironic. For example, Bobbitt notes the commission had responsibility for reformulating the social, political, and moral affairs for the nation's schools. They achieve for Bobbitt (1934b) "how to educate the people in general for a willing and child-like submissiveness to the wise and benevolent few who are to think and plan their affairs for them" (p. 205). He criticizes submissiveness, yet he advocates it for the

American students to whom he wrote scientific curriculum. His democracy worshipped businesses and corporations as societal exemplars. Bobbitt (1934b) states, for instance: "Our public schools were designed to meet the needs of a nation of individuals, each of whom was to be a full-statured, independent and self-reliant free-man in his own right" (p. 205). How he could say this, in light of his business ethic, is difficult to understand.

Bobbitt (1934b) suggests the commission wants to make students "happy children of the all-wise and beneficent state" (p. 205). Removing his first-person base, he defines a United States' credo: "We must educationally aim at indoctrination so as to avoid the necessity of coercion" (Bobbitt, 1934b, p. 206). To illustrate how important his oxymoronic point is, Bobbitt (1934b) reframes the sick-man/hospital metaphor: "The nation is like a very sick man. Only the best doctors are qualified to diagnose, to prescribe and to direct the treatment" (p. 207). He finds the commission lacking qualifications to diagnose or treat the ill man. Though he never specifically excoriates the American Historical Association's Commission, he expands his criticism with a total democracy vs. fascism facade. That assault is different from any other he had written to date.

I believe Bobbitt had conservative political and social views since his childhood. I also think he learned many "liberal" ideas from his associations with Hall, Dewey, Kilpatrick, et al. His 1926 retraction he gave freely, but

perhaps the Muckraking Era as a social touchstone, as well as his own stature as a curriculum professor in a politically conservative era, negated his student-centered views. Larson indicates such a person has "individual and interactional dimensions" (Larson, 1977, p. 244). If the 1926 retraction was Bobbitt's liberal zenith, articles like "Questionable Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies" (1934b) begins and typifies a conservative nadir. His next article does not attack others; rather, it retrenches his own activities dogma.

"Trend of the Activity Curriculum" (1934c)

Bobbitt's "The Trend of the Activity Curriculum," written for Elementary School Journal in December, 1934, issues a statement that is not a simple rendition of his activities curriculum, but rather a series of seven different activities curricula. He suggests that even long-discarded, subject-matter-only curriculum had activity. The activity was drill. Drill, in turn, was the major component of most pre-twentieth century schools. However, since drill-for-drill's sake teaching does not serve modern life, Bobbitt theorizes that one of the seven, or a combination thereof, might better do so. Bobbitt (1934c) notes the real reason for any curriculum organization: "The necessities of administration force schools to systematize the curriculum" (p. 257). Those necessities also allow for over-systematizing or standardizing. Bobbitt (1934c), since

The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook (1926), occasionally states that he wants a democratic, individualized approach for students, and his seven-pronged activities system becomes his methodology:

1. Drilling and the complete drill-oriented approach, still prevalent in rural schools, relies on the "activity" of rote memory/drill of selected subjects.

2. Diversifying the drills and supplementing the texts of the original methodology (number 1 above).

3. Using the framework of numbers 1 and 2 above, the third version uses diverse subjects such as art and music to supplement the 3-R approach.

4. Making good use of individual projects such as club activities, debate and literary work, and the myriad of "extra-curriculum" situations students may choose, is the fourth activity type. By choosing to do them, Bobbitt envisions a vital link from the students, their homes, and their communities' effect instead of the mundane drill memorizing (pp. 258-259 [1-4])

5. Replacing the simple subject matter teaching with a combination of inter-disciplinary studies that feature "concrete projects, units, and integrated enterprises" is the fifth activities curriculum. Any particular unit or project in one discipline may interface another, i.e., a unit in science may be studied with a historical context, in light of its literature base, and might enjoy a socio-political interpretation. Objectives testing still

prevails, not methods, and amounts of information learned and skills attained for "life" venues (p. 259).

6. Utilizing the Progressives' philosophy is the sixth activity curriculum. Bobbitt has acceded to some of their platform, yet he is cautious. Noting the gains "progressive" students make in spontaneity, constructions, and creativity, Bobbitt questions their gains in "objectives," yet he questions their definitions and outcomes:

A major contribution of the Progressives is their rejection of academic skills and information as the immediate objectives of education. This rejection is a step in advance, but it is not enough. The public schools are maintained for a serious purpose. They are expected to secure needful results. We must then have objectives. We must aim at things worth while.

(p. 261)

7. Using Bobbitt's activities curriculum is the last in this list. He melds methods and objectives into activity. He does not aim at subject matter, but at life properly lived. In order to find out what these activities are for any one student, Bobbitt advises educators to work, survey, and report:

The proper task of those who educate is to discover for each individual the seventy-year course of many-sided living that appears best under the circumstances for him and to guide him

through childhood and youth along that course until he is fully launched upon the good life, and able to eager to hold it for himself. (p. 262)

Bobbitt is not objective about his choice of which one will work best. He says that there are two reasons for spending so much time with number 7. First, this is the less familiar of the other six. Second, his work is the only one that "represents both the logical and the practical culmination of the current trend" (Bobbitt, 1934c, p. 264). Bobbitt, however, does not explain "the current trend."

Though Bobbitt (1934c) keeps most any practical format for making number 7 come true, he suggests precedence for his contribution:

Of the seven types of curriculum mentioned, the last-named, as a type, is the oldest of all. Three thousand years ago it was written: "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it." In other words, let us guide the activities of childhood and youth along proper channels in order that they may continue on those same high levels through adulthood. The aim is right living. The method is right living. As a matter of fact, this guidance of activity to the end that one becomes proficient in approved behavior was the method of education for a thousand generations before schools were ever invented. It is the method that has always been used, and the method used today, by enlightened

and careful families in bringing up their children to proper ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving.

(p. 264)

I theorize that once Bobbitt wrote possible curricular activities, as he did these seven, he reverted back to his old conservative scientism, renamed functionalism, via his surveys. Covertly, Bobbitt's dogma creeps into his words. Overtly, yet sporadically, he has begun to use more child-centered terms in that same writing. The collision occurs when Bobbitt speaks of "proper channels" and "right being" (emphasis added). Only by authoritarian-minded schooling and curriculum could Bobbitt exact the proper ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving in his democratic vision. Bobbitt's 1926 retraction has evaporated into his more practical concerns and Larson's "professional" way of life (1977). His next article demonstrates more of his own democratic vision.

"Advancing Toward the Activity Curriculum" (1935a)

With "Advancing Toward the Activity Curriculum" in the January, 1935, Childhood Education, Bobbitt duplicates "The Trend of the Activity Curriculum" (1934c). He rearranges "Advancing Toward the Activity Curriculum's" introduction to feature his child-centered activities approach:

At present this situation [adult life having more importance than child life] is being rapidly changed.

The school is finding its objective in the improvement of the current living of those who are living it. These are infants, children, and youths as well as adults. The schools are discovering that life, when abundant and wholesome, is in itself at every age eminently worthwhile, and that it is the responsibility of education to help all persons, from infancy onward, to a life that is balanced, and fruitful, wholesome and abundant--so far as it can be managed.

(Bobbitt, 1935a, p. 147)

His surface response to child-centered activities is that they are good and necessary; his hidden agendas revolve around the last sentence's words "help" and "manage(d)." Bobbitt wants "the good life" for as many people as possible, if they take the "help" offered to them from schools. The students can receive some good, at least as much as they can "manage," or the schools can "manage." For Bobbitt, all life is an activity, from birth throughout maturity, and the school's responsibility is to help as many people achieve that "good life" (emphasis added) as possible. How to choose the correct activities, however, remains elusive.

Curriculum, according to Bobbitt, has evolved through seven stages. Those stages mirror "The Trend of the Activity Curriculum" (1934c) and "The Modern Curriculum" (1935c):

1. Early (American) schools existed to teach literacy

and textbook facts via memorization and drill.

2. Early curriculum people vitalized the first approach by adding additional readings and texts, thus aiding the methods, but not the objectives.

3. New courses came into the curriculum. Subjects like physical education, home economics, and music aided the original 3-R pieces, but they also used the skills approach.

4. "Extra-curriculum" work using projects or living activities that includes school papers, field-work, and free-play became curriculum's next avenue. As opposed to the semester course approach, this activity work has been effective, though it has also been looked down upon as academically inferior and illegitimate (as opposed to the standard subjects).

5. "Unit" measures have become the next component regarding curriculum construction. Using a "roads" example, Bobbitt points out that units may incorporate everything from arithmetic, reading, physics, chemistry, and various technologies to help the young person learn. The author sees this method especially helpful and useful in the lower grades, but generally abandoned in the upper ones because of adherence to objectives teaching, testing, and accountability.

6. The Progressives have lead the "life" curriculum movement. They rejected "dosing" young people with mere facts, lessons, and drills. However, Bobbitt notes they lacked an overall educational objective.

7. Using life as the objective, Bobbitt affirms his own "good life" curriculum as the newest, brightest, and best home for curriculum studies, what he refers to as "new education" (Bobbitt, 1935a, pp. 148-151).

Bobbitt does not pontificate as he did in the previous "The Trend of the Activity Curriculum" (1934c), but he emphasizes that his work is the first step in planning much-needed active curricula. His work, Bobbitt believes, will become the benchmark of a whole new way of thinking. Allowing that such an effort will be difficult and time-consuming, he suggests his philosophical model needs immediate attention. Bobbitt gains self-assurance and confidence as his career grows. His next article, which focuses on high schools, demonstrates such confidence.

"General Education in the High School" (1935b)

Bobbitt offers guidelines concerning vocational vs. general aspects of the typical United States' high school in "General Education in the High School," in School Review, April, 1935. Bobbitt (1935b) recognizes general education provides for "citizenship, health care, home duties, consumer activities, leisure occupations, language, and the current thought-life" (p. 257). He also recognizes "work" (emphasis added) education. Vocations consume some 40 hours per week, but those hours' outcomes--thought, execution, and proficiency--provide comfort, security, and expenses of the other 130 plus hours, suggests the author.

Bobbitt philosophizes that the 1930s provide a time of transition for United States' high schools. Those institutions educate university aspirants on one hand, and train for simpler callings, on the other. Bobbitt uses facts and figures to prove his contentions. He relies on a survey he had taken, "Frequency With Which Special Curriculums Were Offered in 128 High Schools in 1930-1931" (Bobbitt, 1935b, p. 259). Of the 128 schools, 35.4% featured college preparatory, 23.2% commercial, 16.0% general, 7.9% industrial arts, 7.4% home economics, 4.7% agriculture, 2.9% elementary-school teaching, and 2.5% fine arts (Bobbitt, 1935b, p. 259). Vocational education, admonishes Bobbitt, far surpasses any general education, though schools often represented their general curriculum as vocational.

Further, courses offered in particular subjects proved general education in many schools simply did not exist. Bobbitt (1935b) offers statistics proving most polled schools taught English, history, social studies (citizenship), mathematics, natural science, and physical education (p. 262). He concludes that many schools teach nothing else. No mention could he find of home occupations for boys or girls, health, foreign languages, music, or art. Bobbitt (1935b) demonstrates similar findings in another survey, "Median Number of Year-units Required in 1914 and in 1930 in 54 Selected High Schools" (p. 262). English, history, social studies, mathematics, and natural science

received substantial mention; however, physical training, health and sanitation, practical home activities, leisure occupations except literature, ethical character, and intellectual living received no mention.

Bobbitt (1935b) suggests that twenty years previous, the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education enumerated six critical curriculum factors: health, literacy, worthy home membership, citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character. He suggests many public schools "teach the world of the dead since nobody cares much about it," when they should "prepare citizens for proficiency in dealing with the live and current world" (Bobbitt, 1935b, p. 263). Bobbitt concludes two factors from his research. First, "offending schools" violated the Cardinal Principles. He also wants to include an eighth principle, "General intellectual living" (Bobbitt, 1935b, p. 264). That, too, the wayward schools had not followed. Bobbitt mentions "general intellectual" dictates become much more important than the other pursuits, simply because people need to develop their minds as much as they can or want. Second, the author wonders aloud, just how much English, science, and mathematics studies include his "general intellectual" interests?

Bobbitt's broad inquiries complement several of his previous articles. "Questionable Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies" (1934b) criticizes lack of discipline. "General Education in the High School" (1935b)

promotes vocational education exclusively. "The Modern Curriculum" (1935c) formats a five-stage recommendation for all subjects. Bobbitt returns to more authoritarian-directed, teacher-centered curriculum in these three articles.

"The Modern Curriculum" (1935c)

Bobbitt, in "The Modern Curriculum," written for The Nation's Schools, October, 1935, sets up a five-stage advanced curriculum, grade(s) unspecified. This five-stage work modifies his "Trend of the Activity Curriculum" (1934c), a seven-stage model. He summarizes the former:

1. Subject mastery comes via drills, repetition, and memorization of textbook information.
2. Supplementary and parallel texts widen the methods, but not the objectives, which remain 3-R drill.
3. New courses such as physical education, home economics, music, and other activities Bobbitt offers.
4. Variety in projects, club activities, and athletics receive mention.
5. Special-subject curriculum has been replaced with "experimental composite subjects and integrated units" (Bobbitt, 1935c, p. 21).

Bobbitt refabricates selected Progressive curricula. For him, curriculum represents "the increasing clearness of the nature and value of numerous vital activities as ends and not merely as means" (Bobbitt, 1935c, p. 23). He also says,

simultaneously, the Progressives need an academic "chart and compass" (Bobbitt, 1935c, p. 22). Bobbitt's summary (1935c) of the Progressives is less than flattering: "The world that now blindly ambles toward its destruction needs the guidance of those who know where it should be going" (p. 22). Where "it should be going," Bobbitt suggests, is with his "good life" curriculum. He denotes 22 items in four categories that his curriculum does and will succeed doing for both students and society.

Under "The Emerging Activity Curriculum," the first sub-section, Bobbitt notes education's goal is to live the seven-step "good life" as well as possible, to include physical, social, practical, intellectual or aesthetic, economic, political, and whatever else the individual's life warrants or needs. The individual should receive opportunities based on his own nature, situation, and past experiences that provide information, patterns, guidance, stimulation, and supervision (Bobbitt, 1935c, p. 22). As the individual figuratively awakens, the need for overt education diminishes, maintains Bobbitt.

The second sub-section, "Family is Chief Educator," addresses students' family time before and after school. The most important children's conditioners come from home and family life. The school becomes an auxiliary agency working with and for the family to the goal of the good life, suggests Bobbitt. A specific teacher, school's prime agent, is a "specialist in high-grade human living"

(Bobbitt, 1935c, p. 23), and acts as communicator, counselor, and director of the young person's individual curriculum.

Third in Bobbitt's list comes "Daily Planning of Curriculum Details," parts of which portray experiential learning during the author's era--Whole Language philosophy today. The guiding teacher has textbooks, courses, and a written curriculum. However, Bobbitt (1935c) notes, the teacher must offer concrete, yet "actualizing" coursework:

While there are general guiding principles that enable parents and teachers to foresee in advance the long general course that is normally to be run, yet they cannot foresee or foreknow the specific and concrete details of the course than it be actualized. (p. 23)

Ironically, in this section, one where Bobbitt does assume the mantle and cloak of the conservative person he was and is, he shows a sympathy for public school young people. As well, it is ironic that Maslow will use (self) actualizing as the centerpoint of his hierarchy. Bobbitt (1935c) acknowledges how curriculum materials for the home, the teacher, and the administrator, though loosely-connected pieces often, are most important pieces of a young person's component life:

Most important of all should be the manual changed from year to year, that is placed in the hands of the maturing child and youth, as reference help for his own self-guidance. Only as he learns rightly to live his

own life, as guided by the inner light of his own intelligence, does he become properly educated. (p. 23)

Bobbitt sounds much like Dewey and Kilpatrick when he does not formulate or fabricate his staid scientific curriculum. However, from habit, from lack of experience in child-centered work, or perhaps from the "professional" trap Larson (1977) portrays, Bobbitt always rejoins his science-education.

The last section, "Grafting Method Is Wrong," reiterates Bobbitt's five-step method attack regarding the Committee of Ten's subject-centered position. The subject-centered curriculum, featuring memorization and drill, Bobbitt (1935c) uses as validation for his own activities curriculum:

The deplorable intellectual state of our population is proof, not of inferior natural endowment, but of the misguided character of the attempt merely to hand over to persons a substitute intelligence, made for them by better minds than their own, and which they are to use in lieu of the one that normally should grow out of their own concrete intellectual experiences. (p. 23)

Bobbitt has child-centered insight buried deep in his curriculum. He notices "deplorable" sights in other conservative elitists. His most deplorable and substantial flaw is that he never admits or discusses his own biases.

"The Kindergarten" (1937a)

Bobbitt writes a very short, concise document regarding kindergarten in May, 1937. He publishes it in Childhood Education--the only time he submitted to this journal. Bobbitt addresses both his "good life" doctrine and kindergarten's importance. Describing all students' educations "in scriptural terms, a seventy-year journey" (Bobbitt, 1937, p. 404), the author describes education in a water simile: "Like waters at the sources of rivers, characters during this early period may easily be turned into channels that lie far removed from each other" (Bobbitt, 1937, p. 404). In this article's first page, Bobbitt implicitly warns readers not to squander the kindergarten opportunity.

Bobbitt's second point is uncontestable, and it comes more from the "child-centered" Bobbitt persona than the "essentialist" Bobbitt (emphasis added). Only the four years preceding the kindergarten are more important than the kindergarten years themselves, pleads Bobbitt (1937): "And for the same reasons, the two kindergarten years are undoubtedly more potent for education than any equal subsequent period" (p. 404). Abruptly does the article end with these thoughts to the importance of kindergarten. The editors note that this article is a portion of an address Bobbitt gave to the Froebel Centennial Celebration in Chicago in April, 1937. For the Froebel audience, Bobbitt displays appropriate child-centered, Froebel-like doctrine.

Key to this work, however, is his initial reference--the kindergarten experience portends "the good life." No official activities does he mention; perhaps he feels none appropriate. Once kindergarten graduates begin first grade and following, Bobbitt has more precise recommendations in his next article.

"A Correlated Curriculum
Evaluated" (1937b)

Bobbitt's book review, "A Correlated Curriculum Evaluated," in the May, 1937, English Journal, begins as a critique of English methodology. The review ends reclaiming science as educational template. Bobbitt admires the 61-member National Council of Teachers of English committee striving to improve the "weak portion" of their curriculum. Moreover, Bobbitt (1937b) likes even more their "efficient" and "economical" methodology: "It [the English profession, generally, the committee, specifically] is experimenting, widely and hopefully, on ways of promoting effectiveness and economy of effort by combining the subject matter of the several subjects in some manner and measure" (p. 418). Bobbitt's reliance on those three "E" words has become his educational persona.

He traces the reports' history of academic "fusion," including correlating English with other subjects via "incidental references and isolated projects," English alone, and fusing English and another subject (Bobbitt,

1937b, p. 419). Both the report's committee and Bobbitt believe the latter most effective, especially when world-literature, fine arts, humanities, and European languages become potential, allying subjects.

Bobbitt (1937b) also applauds experts' behavioral objectives, coming from English and an "approved" field: "The result would then be, seemingly, that the correlated result would be entirely organic and not an artificial conjunction of disparate and never entirely fusible things" (p. 419). As well, Bobbitt (1937b) approves of the report's format: "The Report is written by persons who are vitally interested in correlation and who know how to write English" (p. 419). Bobbitt enjoys the report's clear, concise, and balanced presentation. Those adjectives apply to Bobbitt's thoughts, demeanor, and writing. He personifies directness.

For all Bobbitt's positive remarks and thoughts regarding English, he also has severe reservations and "scientific" (emphasis added) recommendations. To begin, Bobbitt suggests that the Report works well within its own assumptions; however, those assumptions are too "English" concentrated. He comments: "They have a departmental bias that has grown up as the essence of the specialization" (Bobbitt, 1937b, p. 420). To aid that over-specialization, Bobbitt (1937b) alliteratively suggests more "re-examination, reorientation, and careful reformulation" (p. 420). His 3-R's aid his 3-E's. Bobbitt's conclusion, once again, retraces his own science-reliance. Whether to

the NCTE committee and Report, or any discipline, school, or business, Bobbitt (1937b) issues a "scientific effectiveness" edict:

This dislocation in the order of investigations is a phenomenon that characterizes the work of all branches and levels of the profession because of the latter's propensity to do the thing which fashion pronounces timely rather than that which scientific effectiveness pronounces needful. (p. 420)

At this stage in his career, Bobbitt disdains any other work than his own functionalism as pejorative "fashion." His final text, Curriculum of Modern Education (1941), fashions Bobbitt's "good life."

Curriculum of Modern Education (1941)

Bobbitt's last book, The Curriculum of Modern Education (1941), is a tour de force of his career, and it is his first publication since the incidental "The Kindergarten" (1937). Bobbitt's prefatory words (1941) suggest a familiar theme: "The good life is the thing that is to be learned, and the pupils learn it by living it. Families, schools, and the general society provide the necessary conditions" (p. vii). Harold Benjamin, the editor, uses the Ephebic oath as an example of what American education should be:

The boys who took the Ephebic oath had learned how to sing the songs of their people, how to cooperate with their fellows in the work of their community, and how

to mark the frontiers of the Athenian state with their enemies. . . . Their curriculum was their life and not a scholastic rite or an academic incantation. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. x)

Not only does Benjamin suggest another "life curriculum," he also explains the Athenians' academic demise:

It was only after the Athenians began to develop subjects to be taught in schools just because the subjects were supposed to have some special magical power in themselves, after the subjects began to be more important than the children who were taught, after schoolmasters began to be teachers of grammar and mathematics instead of teachers of children that Athenian education began to lose its grip and the quality of Athenian life began to decline. (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. xi-xii)

Benjamin affirms Bobbitt's "good-life" work, suggests that the author's long educational tenancy qualifies him to make his statements, and sees Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) as a major contribution to American education.

Book reviews of Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) did not all follow Benjamin's lead. H. E. Nutter agreed with Benjamin's commendation, and suggested the book was an excellent work. Further, he termed it "refreshing" and said it should "strengthen the faith and the courage of all who seek to attack educational problems" (cf. James and Brown, 37th Annual Cumulation Review of 1941 Books, 1942, p. 90 for

more information. Subsequent quotes come from this source).

Nutter comments further:

Individuals and school faculties would do well to study carefully the challenging statements concerning the role of education and, and as a result, think more than twice about their own objectives and procedures (p. 90).

Samuel Everett, reviewing for School Review, the University of Chicago periodical which had supported all Bobbitt's prior work, waxed noncommittal, at best:

It is modern and it is yet not modern. It is sound and yet at certain points not so sound in terms of modern ways of thinking. The emphasis in the Preface and throughout the book on the view that any adequate testing hypothesis--rather than the mere acquisition of book learning is very old and is also at the heart of modern school theory and practice. (pp. 89-90)

Nutter, speaking for a public who did not know Bobbitt's previous works, revered the activity curriculum's concept. As well, perhaps, Everett, had tired of the continual activity dogma. Bobbitt's table of contents (1941) reads as the author's life-long educational history:

- I. The Good Life
- II. Play
- III. Work
- IV. Intellectual Living
- V. The Intellectual Living That Uses Language

- VI. Reading
- VII. Intercommunication
- VIII. Living Knowledge
- IX. The Life of Feeling and Emotion
- X. Instrument and Intercommunication
- XI. Instrument of Accuracy
- XII. The Life of the Body
- XIII. Life Within the Family
- XIV. Education for Citizenship
- XV. Vocation
- XVI. The Vision that Orients and Guides. (p. ix)

I will highlight central portions of Curriculum of Modern Education (1941), note Bobbitt's scholarship, and explicate selected, pertinent sections. "The Good Life," and how to achieve it, becomes Bobbitt's text's focus. What Bobbitt understands as the present human condition begins The Curriculum of Modern Education (1941):

The human organism is enormously plastic. What a person is to be is not predetermined. Let the influences mold him in one way, and he is created a saint; in another, and he is made a worker of iniquity. . . . What he is to become is determined neither by the way the creative processes operate as they mold his delicate organism during the formative years. (p. 3)

The author's use of terms such as "predetermined" and "create," (emphasis added) melds the original Doctrine of

the Elect--God alone does this--and the secular version. That latter doctrine says if human shapers do their job well enough and they get the right clay/humans, they can create. Bobbitt's guidance concept (1941) contends that a young person must receive "good life" counsel early in life (p. 4).

Bobbitt's "beginning" (1941) occurs much before official schooling: Even the way he (the student) lives before his birth has its effect upon all later stages. As he then finds the good life, even during the prenatal months, it is not his own but his parents' knowledge that provides the guidance (p. 4). The "correctly guided" infant can become a successfully school-conditioned person:

During later childhood and early youth, his knowledge is sufficient to enable him to guide his own affairs in an increasing measure, while parents and teachers still do that portion that is yet beyond the powers of his only partially matured understanding. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 4)

Life educates Bobbitt's students, and two important parts of that educational process surface: First, the educational responsibility of the young person is to live as well as possible. Second, "The educative process is what the child or youth does in living the life--the teaching process is whatever his parents and educators do to help him" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 5). This process becomes the apprenticeship, that

time throughout education and life Bobbitt says one is ever-presently practicing in order to gain "right living."

The Good Life areas in Bobbitt's mature years number 18. The first 16, devoted to the 120-140 hours per week of free and leisure time; the last two to the 40 plus hours of vocation:

General:

1. The life of the intellect, or intellectual living, what the author views as the "ceaseless play of the mind," 12-18 hours per day.

2. The "thought-life" guides the intellectual living, what Bobbitt refers to as "directive function of the intellect."

3. The work and play components of "physical living."

4. The "thought-life" that a person uses for physical living and individual needs.

5. The activities, both play and work, for family membership.

6. The "thought-life" that the person uses for family membership.

7. The general society (work and play) components for the individual.

8. The "thought-life" that the person uses for general society inclusion.

9. The "sub-intellectual activities of feeling and emotion" that a person uses in work and play.

10. The "thought-life" a person uses for feeling and emotion.
11. The recreation leisure activities that aid the development of the personality.
12. The "thought-life" processes that a person utilizes to develop recreation activities.
13. The utilization of intellectual tools such as language, math, and other subjects.
14. The "thought-life" that a person develops using intellectual tools.
15. The various "ultimate realities" of religion or philosophy that leads to enlightened intellectual living.
16. The "responsible [the only place "responsible" appears] thought-life," which a person uses to develop religion or philosophy (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 7-8).

The Specialized Portion:

17. The needs and necessities of what one does for a living.
 18. The "thought-life" which the person develops to carry on his vocation (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 8).
- Bobbitt's original list has changed a great deal. Each even-numbered item is an enlightened and added-on facet to his original list. He has added "thought-life" as a developing and maintaining mode for each of the major components.

In order to further "thought-life" factors, Bobbitt recommends only one area of help: science. Bobbitt praises

the factory superintendent who sees himself as the overseer of science management. His underlings, the various managers, plan and direct the workers, and evidently Bobbitt saw this as the school metaphor. His science is very important and he urges school "scientists" to create important curricula: "By science we mean the fullest measure of understanding of the nature of reality in its numerous portions and phases that persons of the clearest discernment have yet been able to attain" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 12). Bobbitt expected to uncover a new or better way to operate schools via this "overseer" science.

Bobbitt (1941) notes that science in and of itself is inert: "It [science] portrays. In itself, it does not direct" (p. 15). The direction does not come from the teacher; rather, from the student:

It is the person using it [science] who decides upon the route to be taken. . . . All direction is in the mind and will of the individual himself. . . . It [science] gives him a freedom that, if he is normal, he will not abuse. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 15)

A more important piece of Bobbitt philosophy does not exist. Instinctively, I believe, he wanted to say the right thing; he simply could not or did not have the "freedom" to go beyond his "elect" (emphasis added) heritage. Students would not elect to make bad decisions of any sort (cf. Dobson and Dobson, Looking at, Talking About, and Living With Children, Reflections on the Process of

Schooling, 1985, for a full discussion of this matter). However, if they surround themselves with his survey techniques, they have had the "right" experts make the "best" (emphasis added) decisions for their development. Little difference appears with this thinking and the traditionalist approach that Bobbitt so openly eschews. On the other hand, Bobbitt suggests if students have too much control, schools have neglected their supervisory duties. He traps himself.

The only discrepancy in Bobbitt's formulation(s) regarding how a student gets his education arises in the "Individuality" section. This section follows "Character Education." There, the author has said that all education is character education, i.e., "Good character is consistency in performing the activities that make up the good life" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 21). However, in the "Individuality" section, Bobbitt stresses no two lives ever run the same course. Persons, he says, come into this world with "different potential powers, capacities, and aptitudes" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 21). He comments further:

Each person in living his life travels a road that neither he nor anyone else has ever traveled before. It has to be discovered as he goes along. An essential part of the traveling is the current discovery of the way. There is zest, since every step is novelty.

(Bobbitt, 1941, p. 22)

Moreover, the school can inhibit, impede, or completely

destroy this zest: "Schooling that tries to predetermine it, and to run it into standard grooves, gets in the way both of life and of education" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 22). Bobbitt, consciously or otherwise, wavers between "free" and "contrived" (emphasis added) education. After stating how important student freedom is, he reiterates his curriculum definition, the course that is run. The curriculum is a 24-hour affair. The family institutes the course; the school applies or supplements 16 factors:

1. Looks at the individual needs of children.
2. Finds out how the child carries on his 24-hour education.
3. Helps carry out curriculum under whatever conditions.
4. Shows errors made or courses not run correctly.
5. Notes the various "enlightenment, condition, stimulation, and guidance" needed to "remedy" what is wrong.
6. Plans varying "exercises" to help young people.
7. Helps students understand "what they ought daily to be thinking and doing in their self-planning and self-guidance."
8. Makes the school a "carefully conditioned and supervised segment of wholesome living."
9. Shows what behaviors are helpful, useful, and "desirable."
10. Assists students in the formulations of their "valuations."

11. Shows pupils various skills.
12. "Stimulates and reinforces" young people's wills.
13. "Shapes the valuations, attitudes, and emotional gradients" of the young people.
14. Assists parents wherever possible.
15. Gives parents help with guidance and supervision of their boys and girls.
16. Helps everyone everywhere in their "life" pursuits (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 23-24).

To all of these, Bobbitt sums, that it is not the achievement, per se, that schools point; rather, it is the "fullness of life" achieved that is the most important factor. Citing Locke again, Bobbitt (1941) also says schools have to fight the "dual guidance," that is, the "lower and cruder feelings and desires, vs. intelligence" (pp. 25-26). Bobbitt says that primitive wants, whether hunger, satiety, love, or hate must direct toward more "intelligent" ways of asceticism. He finishes the first chapter championing the right, privilege, and honor of the factory motif, using Plato's Republic (V, 473) as model:

Where science in the custody of responsible men of thought is the ruler, where the persons who bear the responsibilities have the spirit and power of understanding, and where leadership and wisdom meet in one, man is escaping from the world-old limitations and affliction and is coming to achieve the possibilities of life in the new day that intellect, in the service

of humanity, is bringing to mankind. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 29)

Pointedly, he adds: "Education accepts the primacy of intellect, understanding, science, as the director of its labors" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 29).

Bobbitt explains the philosophy of The Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) in "The Good Life Section." He does so for good reason. That students could achieve "the good life," the whole idea of functionalism, Bobbitt charges as paramount. How students might accomplish that task, the subject of the rest of the text, becomes a Catch-22 situation that Bobbitt pervasively has written in his introduction and first chapter.

Bobbitt charges students with much responsibility for their education. He also wants educators, "the men of understanding," to shape and condition students. In addition to the students' actions and the educators' shaping, Bobbitt asks parents to perform formative conditioning. Since students acknowledgeably spend the majority of time with their own family and community, Bobbitt exhorts the family with initial and ongoing, complementary conditioning and shaping. How the student in Bobbitt's scheme of education can manage "the right life" is difficult to determine. I suggest one explanation is to accept the Doctrine of the Secular Elect. According to that edict, those that are, are; those that are not, are not, and wind up academic and social chaff. Bobbitt either covertly

accepts this doctrine, or he accepts self-actualizing behaviors. He misses entirely the concept of different culture's importance, usage, and respect.

"Play," Chapter II, becomes the cornerstone of Bobbitt's "good life." The author compares animals to humans--both arrive into this world underdeveloped, awkward, and more than a bit helpless. Bobbitt's apprenticeship program builds perceptions in students. They take the form of physical ones that build the body, as well as social ones that build the mind. The aesthetic variety, in addition, offer art, music, and other sensory and emotional uplift. The intellectual perceptions, the most important, provide silent, passive underpinnings regarding Bobbitt's apprenticeship.

Whether it is reading, listening, or seeing, he stresses how an intellectual perception "interpenetrates all the others before it" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 40). Bobbitt's apprentices learn to see the world and become perceivers. Eventually the students enter some vocation and achieve "the right life." He suggests all play be agreeable or satisfying. Further, play must separate itself from work and poor grades. Above all, it must be individually done, though Bobbitt suggests "shaping" to keep very young children from failing (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 37). Puritan that he is, Bobbitt (1941) warns of the inherent danger of letting play get out of hand:

For example, most of the population spends hours each

week in reading, viewing pictures, and listening to presentations of human action that are of varying degrees of obliquity, depravity, and falsity with realizing that as the mind is fed, so does it grow.

(p. 41)

Therefore, that "depraved" behavior, much before the invention of television, they must harness. Bobbitt (1941), the elitist, admonishes:

It is a clear case of "the good is the enemy of the best." Mediocre recreations lay the foundations for mediocre character; only the highest can build the type of personality that reveals itself in the good life.

One cannot have both. For the mediocre to shut out the superior is calamity. (p. 42)

For Bobbitt, the "good" (emphasis added) get better, even in play. Bobbitt's first ingredient, "Play," becomes prototypical of all his "good life" doctrines. If students have altruistic play, they have it; if they do not, they do not.

"Work," Chapter III, complements Chapter II's "Play." Bobbitt uses the examples of a young boy who plays and otherwise watches a craftsman. Bobbitt (1941) suggests the boy may emulate that craftsman: "He [the boy] has the working knowledge necessary for setting out on the task of making one of his own" (p. 43). The observation-in-play activity equates to apprenticeship, and that training elevates to work level. The eighteen "good life"

characteristics, nine objective and nine subjective, constitute its bases. Work Bobbitt (1941) subdivides into nine areas of existence, three of which are most important:

1. Work to maintain physical well-being.
2. Work to maintain family well-being.
3. Work that maintains intellectual well-being

(pp. 45-53).

These three items constitute the inner-manifestations of Bobbitt's "good life." With these three items, he has addressed the self (1 and 3) and the family (2). Since he was so traditional in what he did, and how and what he believed, these ends justified his functionalism's means. Functionalism dominated his democracy during Stage III.

Bobbitt (1941) lists the remaining seven areas of existence:

4. To maintain the social order.
5. To use English correctly and math as a "right" tool and technique.
6. To guide unruly emotions and irrationalities, the primal.
7. To use recreation.
8. To apply philosophy or religion.
9. To choose a vocation (pp. 53-55).

Bobbitt (1941) explains:

In the foregoing, we have enumerated nine classes of work that are indispensable for meeting nine classes of human needs, no one of which can be omitted from the

good life. In each of these nine fields there is the more or less obvious practical doing, which is largely objective in the case of some of them and mostly subjective in the case of others. In a low grade of human living, this practical doing may go on as governed by custom, imitation, habit, wishes, or regimentation by officials. In high-grade living, it is governed by understanding, operating distributively in the individuals themselves. But this understanding is not a gift of man. He has to work and earn it before he can have it. He can have only so much as he earns. (pp. 55-56)

Bobbitt's family life concept recalls his work ethic. He is ambiguous regarding students' freedom and the shaping or controlling he wants:

Parents should remember that life at its best is always one of much error; that perfection in human living is never attained by any person in the longest lifetime; and that the way for a youth to learn to live as best he can in a world of omnipresent error is to be left much to his blunders and self-extrications. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 60)

Parents should parcel what they do to help their offspring:

Of course, in the degree of his immaturity, he [the child] must be protected by parental oversight from injuries so deep as to be irreparable. But let the parents help too much, and their over-solicitude

injures the child or youth. Let them help too little, and their neglect results in injury to him. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 60)

Parentalism must be distributed judiciously. Bobbitt (1941) feels that school, an extension of homes, help best by helping little:

Really in essence, from one valid point of view, the whole function of the school is a weaning function. . . . Even worse than most families, it keeps the young people in leading string long past time when they should be walking for themselves. (p. 61)

Therefore, educational science, the branch of science Bobbitt advocates, works for students--not just benevolent feelings.

An even more devastating remark follows. Because Bobbitt concedes that parents and schools want what is best for their sons and daughters, yet only an acknowledged 5% will go into "the professions" (emphasis added). Other positions such as managers, tradesmen, and farmers do not apply to all students; therefore, Bobbitt (1941) extends schools' responsibility:

It means that society, with the school as its specialized agency, must take in hand this field of work which it has recognized as needful and so thoroughly work out the several factors in obedience to technical and human science that work in every vocation, so far as this can be made possible, is an

inspiring portion of the good life and a potent builder of wholesome personality. Understanding and control of the technical factors of the vocations is already far advanced. (p. 64)

Bobbitt (1941) has become the true secular elitist, and notes even science can not help, or in his word "control" everyone:

The chief obstacle to the organization and beneficent use of the vast amount of human science that we have is man's unwillingness to accept the verdict of science that the world is in its essence a difficult and exacting place, and that effort and hardiness are inescapable. (p. 65)

The original Doctrine of the Elect formed an unholy alliance with the Doctrine of the Secular Elect. That (Secular) Elect, Social Darwinism, had bastardized Darwin's "natural selection" doctrine to suit its social-stratifying purposes. Bobbitt (1941), who demonstrates allegiance to both doctrines, has the perfect condition items for motivating a young person to do desirable work:

1. When he gets rewards.
2. When he has companionship to do the job.
3. When work and plan meld.
4. When it is the "lesser of two evils."
5. When the work regards his peers and community.
6. When he sees the work as value himself, not what someone else says (p. 67).

Within these six, Bobbitt mixes the two "elect" doctrines (1, 3, and 4) to more humane pursuits (2, 5, and 6).

"Intellectual Living," Chapter IV, begins with another comparison of animals and men. Animals, the author points out, see and otherwise develop mental pictures of events, enemies, and food. They do so to prepare to deal with succeeding events: "The inner vision is accumulated seeing, so to speak, ready at any instant to be awakened as active seeing" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 73). Bobbitt (1941) speaks of animals as "reality-thinkers," then shows how primitive man had perceived his every move to live, to become "reality-minded" (pp. 74-76). Reality-mindedness had allowed man to develop language and display emotion, facets which set him apart from the animals. Man had a "multiple-track" mind via senses and perceptions, and especially, his reasoning (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 80). Modern man's dangers, ways of life, and general world situation have increased in complexity, but Bobbitt notes that his (man's) perceptions, opportunities, and knowledge have also correspondingly increased.

The modern student, intones Bobbitt (1941), has the ability to use his memory "to make a sensory impression and an after-impression or inner seeing" (p. 87). That inner seeing occurs with accumulated human experiences, and is given to students via the community, family, and schools. The student's roles are simple:

In developing understanding, the initial task is to

break up the continuum of reality into its elements. The infant begins with the things near at hand. . . . The next stage of learning is to take still smaller lumps of the original continuum, which have not been analyzed, and to resolve them into yet finer divisions. (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 91-93)

The student organizes various particulars, generalizes different ideas, lets the ideas become concepts, and "vitalizes" them according to his own emotional sets.

School programs receive the young people:

For the school to take in hand the elusive, restless, and swiftly moving intellect and to bring it daily and all the time to the ways of a wholesome and fruitful intellectual living is a wholly different kind of task. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 109).

Students require continuous guidance, and Bobbitt formulates a general school plan. The schools should take elements of the "good life" like newspapers, banks, monopolies, symphonies, and sciences, and teach and/or work with them: "When the basic education, mostly out of school, is properly operating, then the school is in position to contribute its due portion" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 111).

Without same, schools have encapsulated handicaps. They can work with radios, zoological gardens, and laboratories as supplements, just as pictures, to which he gives a lot of time and space. However, Bobbitt (1941) suggests other considerations:

Man's life is more a matter of nonpicturable thought, feeling, emotion, and effort than outward things. Many things of the greatest worth are too intangible or too large to be shown in pictures; for example, government, constitution, democracy, law, finance, justice, religion, a nation, a continent, or a million light years. (p. 113)

Bobbitt includes democracy, encapsulated with a variety of other items of "greatest worth."

With Chapter V, as well as the next four chapters, "The Intellectual Living that uses Language," becomes the dominant topic. The materials in Chapters I-IV hinged on language use. Just as a carpenter uses a hammer, Bobbitt (1941) says, citizens use real world tools such as language to forge "portraits" (pp. 115-117). One portrait he offers from his Manila days: "Philippine boys make a light and elastic football by weaving strips of rattan loosely into the form of a hollow sphere about five inches in diameter" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 118). He juxtaposes his portrait with a textbook-styled portrait: "Starting with an non-derivative, a substituent group may enter in either of three positions to form an ortho-compound, a meta-compound, or a para-compound" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 119). Bobbitt shows how lay people may not understand textbook "portraits" or learning for one reason, yet may understand personal examples for other reasons. For reading language to achieve "portrait" success, Bobbitt (1941) lists the following tools:

1. If the person receiving it has the right impressions stored.

2. If the impressions are "true, vivid, and living things."

3. If the receiver has the right impressions in his mind.

4. If the speaker uses words that will build instant recall (p. 121).

Bobbitt (1941) concludes: "Understanding grows only when clear and vivid pictures of the concrete realities are made in the mind" (p. 122). Successful school textbooks must use real and written modes:

1. Reader must have the stored impressions.

2. Impressions must touch vital individual emotions.

3. Sequence in the mind must occur.

4. Text must not go too fast to pass too quickly through mental routes.

5. Repeat imagery must appear.

6. Length must be adequate (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 122-123).

Bobbitt finds many surveyed texts remiss. He chastises history texts that do not adequately portray vivid-pictured history. He also questions propaganda formats that obfuscate truth.

"Reading," Bobbitt's Chapter VI subject (1941), "is one of the ways in which the mind goes everywhere and looks at everything. It is indirect observation" (p. 137). The

magnitude that reading can be fills 32 categories:

1. Man, his nature and behavior.
2. Family life.
3. Local community.
4. Wider community (cities, states, etc.).
5. Social classes.
6. Food.
7. Clothing.
8. Buildings.
9. Fuel.
10. Travel and transportation.
11. Communication.
12. Trade, commerce, finance.
13. Protection of life, liberty, and possessions.
14. Recreation.
15. Art.
16. Education.
17. Religion.
18. Philanthropy.
19. Personal service.
20. Government.
21. Plant world.
22. Animal world.
23. The earth.
24. The solar system.
25. Matter.
26. Electricity.

27. Heat.
28. Light.
29. Sound.
30. Form, place, position, and direction.
31. Magnitude.
32. Time (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 139-140).

To use these 32 items adequately, Bobbitt urges students to concentrate on both the present and the past. Bobbitt (1941) also focuses on geography, history, and natural science as means to viewing "culture selves" (pp. 142-147). He equates "intellectual living," the "apperceptual mass of historical character," and the "foundation of natural science" as the bases of understanding different peoples. That he honors culture so diligently in Chapter VI of Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) is ironic, because he had ignored various immigrants, minorities, and their lifestyles throughout his career.

Student's reading, even immigrant students' reading, according to Bobbitt (1941), should demonstrate truth, which he defines as reality (p. 162). Reading's reality, he continues, begins with easily digested materials in varying amounts in varying grades, and gains shape by home and school impetus. What is most important about this whole section, however, is the interpretations and individual types or readings that young people should do, silent and oral, at school and at home. All people, the author concludes, are born without any "understandings:" "A man

becomes in mind what he has seen and felt" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 175). What better way to understand life, muses Bobbitt (1941), than through the collective men of understanding's eyes?:

A task, then, for every person who has the capacity for understanding is to find the great writings of the world and by reading them let them reconstitute in his mind the magnificent vision of reality achieved by those of heroic intellectual stature. (p. 176)

Those heroes and their realities include (alphabetically) Aristotle, The Bible, Charles Darwin, Charles Dickens, John Locke, Adam Smith, Leo Tolstoy, and other "royal breed of men" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 176). Without notice, Bobbitt has recapitulated much of Charles Eliot's doctrine that he so firmly disavowed. Little difference exists between Eliot's choice of "textbooks" and Bobbitt's choice of "visionary textbooks" (emphasis added). "Men of vision" and their accumulated literature rule Bobbitt's acquisition of "the good life" (emphasis added).

"Intercommunications," Chapter VII, covers the ground of hearing and telling experiences, and sharing that blends the intellect and the social for Bobbitt (1941)--"social vision" (p. 177). The social vision encompasses specific values:

1. The communicator's observations expand in his own area as though seeing via another.

2. The expansion of people's vision who cannot travel or see everything.
3. The person sees others' opinions.
4. Groups progress through individual participations.
5. Relative valuations come from group participations.
6. Responsibility to the group will result in more true statements and less vague superficial speeches.
7. Mental nimbleness with groups keeps the mind sharp.
8. Speakers and listeners utilize "social emotions" of the group process.
9. Vitalization encourages the use of emotion (tone, facial expression, and overall feeling).
10. Pleasure given and received is a very big factor (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 179-181).

The pursuit of truth obfuscates controversy, maintains Bobbitt. Schools can foster both reading and writing programs within schools to augment or fructify intercommunication.

Chapter VIII, "Living Knowledge," gives Bobbitt another chance to amplify his own functionalistic doctrines. He portrays the "academic" (emphasis added) approach of texts, tests, and memory drills as "substitute knowledge." Bobbitt favors "real" (emphasis added) knowledge, which includes businessmen's familiarity with prices, advertising, and profits. Bobbitt (1941) also favors "superseded knowledge and getting fresh information for customers, accounts, and board of directors" (p. 203). Both are true knowledge for

Bobbitt--his lifetime educational pursuit. That lifetime education should gain school aid with as many facts, figures, and experiences that students can use in their perceptions as possible: "Education prepares a person for knowledge, not by mechanically storing it, but by getting him to live in such a way that life itself keeps him fully supplied with knowledge" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 207). If the community, parents, schools, and educators do their respective jobs, United States' public school students will build up to polemic "national understanding."

"Completeness in the chain" was the basis of "The Life of Feeling and Emotion," Chapter IX. Life, per Bobbitt (1941), goes on only if the following chain "works":

Understanding	Valuation	Purpose
NEED	Desire	Effort
Feeling	Attitude	Will

(p. 227)

Bobbitt (1941) notes:

The learning process is a chain of elements. First, there is the need. This awakens in feeling and understanding an awareness of itself. The awareness of need in turn awakens desire for the thing that will meet it. Desire then issues as purpose, and purpose as will. Will discharges in the activity that strives to meet the need. The activity involves interested attention to the varied things, relations, and processes that enter into it. Successful performance awakens [sic] sense of satisfaction with the things

that were involved in the action, and in the achievement of the result which met the need. (p. 227) Bobbitt notes "NEED" begins the educative process. That is what his whole study and book concern: "No official general statement of time that is even semiadequate yet exists" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 229). Any school that develops such a document or list will be the most important school in the United States, claims the author.

Bobbitt develops the subjects that best fit the "good life's" routines in Chapters X and XI: English and mathematics. He begins with vocabulary: "A person gets his tens of thousands of meanings, with their appropriate words, out of the processes of life, or he does not get them at all" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 247). Noting pronunciation, the author says:

The spoken word is a thing with a definite pattern. . . . The pattern exhibited by different social classes within a community vary considerably, and it is distinctly advantageous for persons to acquire the forms used by those who should be the leaders of their thought, namely, the most enlightened social class. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 249)

Bobbitt provides here a blatant, "class-oriented" interpretation. He subsequently mentions spelling:

Let him then carry on his language-life in such a way that he clearly sees the pattern over and over again, and his learning of spelling is

accomplished. . . . Good spelling is a needful accomplishment. A reader's mind is habituated to rightly spelled words, and they instantly awaken their meanings. (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 251-253)

Bobbitt (1941) also mentions the need of (handwriting's) maturity: "The knowledge [of handwriting] operates when it is sufficiently matured. This maturing requires experience and takes time" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 255). As part of this process, he promotes grammar:

He gets his further knowledge of grammar basically, a continuation of the same process, as he hears and reads the more complex forms of sentences until the components of all types have deeply graven themselves into his consciousness and become parts of his mental equipment. If he grows up in an atmosphere of careful speech, and if he reads much, he thus acquires a full knowledge of the substance of grammar. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 258)

Bobbitt knows that grammar is important, but he acknowledges it is a tool for reading:

Reading, however, receives special attention:

For a child to learn to read is simply for him to improve his performance of his activity of keeping watch over reality. The fundamental thing in his reading is this observational process. If it has been going on with vigor and zest, and if it has filled his mind with properly emotionalized and interesting

impressions of the fundamentals of his environment, then learning to read will be easy. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 261)

Youngsters who can not read, according to Bobbitt (1941), are those whose intellectual and emotional experiences have been hurt in "number, range, variety, and vigor" (p. 261). ESL/reading, i.e., how students learn second languages, follows: "To learn any one of them [languages], whether first or second, or tenth, one simply gets impressions multitudinously of its elements and forms, within situations where the language is being actively used for social intercommunications" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 264). Vocabulary acquisition becomes the key to ESL or second language study. Bobbitt advocates "standard" English. Standard English connotes classical English dominates and is official; others are subservient and unofficial.

The second subject of Bobbitt's "good life" is mathematics. To the preceding chapter (language) and the forthcoming one (mathematics) Bobbitt (1941) says: "Man has devised two tools of singular efficacy for the furtherance of his thought. The most remarkable and useful of the two is language; but a close second is mathematics" (p. 266). To the "good life," that being the democratic life that Bobbitt championed, the threat of mathematical preciseness fits. However, the "precise" way he declares its advantages is important:

1. It allows men to scrutinize "finely."

2. It enables man to "deepen" his vision of the world.
 3. It gives him accurate terms, labels, etc.
 4. It gives him an accurate "communication" voice to others.

5. It enables man to speed to complexity.

6. It enables man to do speedily "qualitative concepts."

7. It gives indispensable accuracy to practical problems.

8. It will provide a way to "usher in the beneficent reign of truth" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 266).

In sum, Bobbitt (1941) delineates language as the carrier of "the qualitative vision" and mathematics as the vehicle of the quantitative one (p. 268). It is with this emphasis that Bobbitt demonstrates his lack of person-centeredness, let alone child-centeredness. He states: "The majority ought to have its way," which sounds very domineering, but qualifies it immediately afterward: "Also, it [the majority] ought not be wrong" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 272). He maintains:

Valuations and attitudes are at correspondingly cross purposes. A society in which most persons are honest and capable of intelligent effort is at war within itself. The might of the stronger party, not the understanding of the right, determines what is expected to be right. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 272)

Truth, Bobbitt hopes, will come about because of more

quantitative mathematics needs. These needs, in turn, result from qualitative language and speech. However, it is always preciseness and science he adores--"the accuracy in practical activities" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 274). He believes all students and all society members must first experience, see, and/or otherwise perceive something, then they must use it: "One must first see the object before he can see accuracies in it" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 277). From a curricular scope and sequence standpoint, mathematics' teaching and learning occur when needed: "The mathematical tool, fortunately, is such that all parts of it can be mastered piecemeal as the need for use is approached" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 283).

Bobbitt's perspective in Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) shifts from an academic bent to a Spencerian, physical/personal one. He devotes one chapter (XII) to the body. His thoughts range there from the "foods curriculum," how a person controls his emotionality, to the general curriculum building. "Physical living," for example, entails six levels:

1. The daily life of the body.
2. The daily thought activities that guide the physical ones along right lines.
3. The intellectual living on the work level that ascertains and gradually accumulates applied science of hygiene.
4. The intellectual living on the play level that

concerns itself with matters related to, or involved in, the physical living.

5. The general intellectual living, not specialized as to area, that ranges everywhere and lays the basic foundations of the entire understanding.

6. The emotionalizing element, shaping valuations and attitudes that runs through all of these (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 280-281).

Bobbitt (1941) links the "foods curriculum" to these six, and he has 15 total items, four of which I have selected:

1. He selects food that is balanced according to his individual needs in proteins, fats, carbohydrates, minerals, vitamins, cellulose, and water.

2. He eats at the time and in the manner that best promotes the digestive functions.

3. He holds to the ways sanctioned by science so consistently that they become established as habit.

4. When the temptations of the palate run counter to the counsels of science, he fixes his attention on the decrees of science and follows wherever they may lead without regard to whether they are pleasant or unpleasant (p. 299).

Additional sections include the prevention of infection, physical work, diet, as well as a host of disparate lists.

Another example Bobbitt (1941) cites regards "physical living" and "the individual life":

The proper curriculum of a child or youth cannot be a

ready-made blanket plan of physical living to be imposed upon him. . . . Each individual life is its own curriculum. The problem is simply that of guiding it into right channels. . . . The teacher needs to be so much a master of the science as to be able to apply it to the pupil's nature and situation and therein see what his course could be. (p. 315)

To confound the individual curriculum statements above, Bobbitt (1941) places the teacher into a lofty position: "If the teacher knows the science well enough to do this, then he knows it as well as, or better than, any blanket statement of the curriculum can tell him" (p. 315).

Evidently, if teachers study and achieve enough, they can elevate their importance to "'associate academic' men of enlightenment" (emphasis added). However, their main duty is scientifically to foster student growth. Bobbitt (1941) states: "The infant or small child is a vigorously self-active organism" (p. 316). In order to achieve their "self-active" state, students need teacher-facilitators:

Their [the teachers] thought must rule his [student] action. Yet, they will interfere only in the least amount possible. They will be glad to have the inner propensities rule as long as they direct in the directions that they see to be the right ones. They will interfere only when they see his feelings and desires lead him off in wrong ways. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 317)

Bobbitt (1941) traces how teachers and students can receive help to achieve their self-active organism" alliance--home support:

If parents have been properly educated, this is not adding to their burdens; it is only pointing out the ways their intelligence will naturally operate in any case. If they have not been properly educated during their earlier years and are now unprepared to do these things for their children, the lack, if they so desire, is largely remediable. (p. 319)

Bobbitt does not make the link of the alliance; however, he dangles the components. He has all the ingredients of child-centered education. However, he either does not know, or does not want to make, the closure that would break his functionalism. Students and teachers, he underscores, need "men of enlightenment's" administration and direction.

Chapter XIII deals with "Life Within the Family." The family's role is to shape and condition students before formal education begins. Bobbitt confirms that parents have total responsibility over young children. Initially, parents directly lead all young people's activities. Second, the family indirectly guides their offspring into school, church, and other socializing agencies. To facilitate dispensing the "good life," parents have to live and experience it themselves. Bobbitt calls this "self realization"; Maslow will call it self-actualization. However, Bobbitt forms no pyramid hierarchy. Instead, he

suggests students become chameleons to their elders (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 325).

Bobbitt suggests parents promote physical and social play for their children, as well as the opportunity, place, and motivation for homework. That promotion has important ramifications:

1. Various labors around the house done by family members save money and teaching skills.
2. Doing various unskilled labors allows more specialty to very skilled workers.
3. Students learn resourcefulness by doing "home" work.
4. Doing simple work gives the worker experience to judge other "expert" varieties.
5. Doing various labors prepares the doer to become a better consumer/buyer.
6. The home affords a mini-school; a place to practice and learn various activities.
7. Specialization will occur as a result of general work habits.
8. Work promotes physical health.
9. Home "work" builds good mental health.
- 10-13. Doing chores opens up doors of vocations.
14. Work builds character.
15. Work solidifies the family (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 332-339).

Bobbitt concludes that the school's function should

complement and supplement the home's learning environment. In that way, all society benefits.

If the family contributes guiding work activities to the student, Bobbitt affirms education contributes to citizenship preparation. If the United States exhibits covert, cooperative democracy, then the work force/labor provides overt, cooperative enterprises for its people. Those enterprises include food, clothing, habitations, power sources, travel/transportation, communication, trade, protection, recreation, education, religion, philanthropy, personal service, and social coordination (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 344-345). Likened to a body made up of separate and important organs, Bobbitt alleges a major public school responsibility accords students an appreciation of various job interactions and classifications. He documents the "Great Cooperative Enterprise," but spends more time echoing the Doctrine of the Secular Elect. Into various strata, the author discerns both differing qualities of work and people:

Persons of superior intellect and fine general personality gravitate into those occupations and agencies that require their type and that give their personal qualities a proper chance. Persons of lower intellectual ability and less adequate personality gravitate toward the occupations of which their qualities are fitted. Persons of little intellect and of cruder natures in general gravitate into the simple

and crude occupations that persons of that character are able to carry on. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 354)

Bobbitt, as he began in "Practical Eugenics" (1909b), and continued with "Summary of the Literature in Scientific Method in Field of Curriculum Making" (1917b), his surveys, and "Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher Training Institutions" (1924c), judges everyone, but he does not talk with students--only to them. What he talks to also is the academic cream rising to the educational top; whoever does not get there does not deserve the reward. He declares "men of understanding" or the family unit shape students so that they can achieve and advance. Bobbitt never accounts that only certain parents could provide such leadership. Gray's "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard" reminds readers they might walk on people's graves who never got the chance to develop (Gray, [reprinted] 1963, pp. 62-65); Bobbitt, ironically, witnesses similar "democratic" drama-- he just does not comprehend it.

When Bobbitt (1941) talks about the governmental agencies, how they work, and how they might advance people, he states his private-enterprise-led democracy:

The strong trend of private enterprise today is toward combination of effort by each class of agencies and the elimination of competition among them. . . . The people, then, are forced by the conditions to operate as a body, using their agency of government as the

instrument, to regulate qualities, prices, and conditions of service. (p. 358)

Understanding becomes the key: "A free people can retain its freedom and use its government effectively in its service only as it has the necessary understanding" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 359). He suggests exploitation might hinder understanding. However, instead of pondering the plight of Gray's people, or his own, Bobbitt (1941) volleys a six-pronged consumer-based attack on exploitation, a composite answer that again demonstrates his "business" (emphasis added) approach to life:

1. "Commission the Agencies"--Bobbitt notes: "If persons are living the good life, they are making demand of the right kinds of things and thus giving to each agency the right things to do" (p 361). He believes "enlightened men" ran businesses and they would do what people want: "Out of the lives of the people issues the quality of the social order" (p. 362).

2. "Maintain and Use the Technology"--Business and industry should keep up with their work and help schools. Bobbitt suggests service agencies write texts that explain business tenets and philosophies. Those texts might become part of public schools' curriculum.

3. "Do Much for Themselves"--The family unit must teach young people unspecialized skills and tasks. Schools and businesses can augment that teaching.

4. "Earn the Power to Make Demands"--Bobbitt advocates laissez-faire capitalism.

5. "Evaluate the Offerings"--Bobbitt stipulates quality people need quality goods; simple and crude people need less.

6. "Accept and Reject Offerings"--People do not realize their power, the author concludes. They will not have power if they do not use it (pp. 371-373).

In "Vocation," Chapter XV, Bobbitt describes the specializations constituting the Great Cooperative Enterprise. He labels vocations as technological because they vary according to specialty; sociological, because of their administration. Bobbitt (1941) lists the details for vocation searching, taking, and maintaining:

1. "Laying Foundations for Selection"--Freedom of choice is important for job-hunting, but so are limits: The free man has to operate on limitations of many kinds. . . . His freedom consists in his making his own adjustments to them instead of his being adjusted to them arbitrarily by some caretaker (p. 383). Bobbitt's limitations include personal readiness, regional proximity, and educational cost.

2. "Choosing a Vocation"--Bobbitt suggests this consists of family-to-school preparations.

3. "Laying Foundations for Specialization"--The author warns job seekers to be patient before deciding any specialization. In addition, though, he adds:

For those who can afford it, then, it seems that the years up to eighteen or twenty should in the main be devoted to the growth of the very best possible bodies and mind--that is to say, to general education (p. 385).

He does not mention those who can not afford the luxury of waiting.

4. "The Specialization Education"--Bobbitt means "real" work, where "the elements of responsibility, purpose, thought, emotional satisfaction, and will to effort be genuine" (p. 387). The schools can and will provide more specific curriculum, suggest different methodologies, and provide on-the-job training.

5. "Maintenance of Vocational Proficiency"--A key to living, says the author. He notes: "There are known ways of creating and maintaining emotionalized attitudes and the forcefulness of performance that results there from" (p. 389). However, no explanation follows.

6. "Maintenance of the Foundations"--Bobbitt pleads for more and directed science use. Science, again, is his foundation.

7. "Keeping Prepared for Vocational Shift"--Bobbitt analogizes the horse-drawn cart vs. the motor car as symbolic of progress. His answer concentrates on a first-rate "general" education (vs. the vocational) so students will obtain eclectic learning (pp. 382-390).

To administer the right vocations to the right recipients,

the author maintains the following:

1. A vocational channel related to need.
2. Rewards in proportion to services rendered.
3. Security of income.
4. Working conditions that are conducive to winning.
5. Freedom to earn as much money as one needs.
6. Freedom to earn little if wants are meager.
7. Working conditions that make the earner want to work

(Bobbitt, 1941, p. 391).

Bobbitt (1941) concludes: "Whoever does honest work in any arm of the Great Cooperative Enterprise is engaged in the greatest, the finest, and the most inspiring system of human service that man has ever been able to conceive or to bring forth" (p. 396).

The last chapter, XVI, "The Vision That Orients and Guides," begins: "A person's heredity gives him, not a predetermined character, but only a plastic possibility to be shaped" (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 397). Bobbitt returns often to this theme. From there, the entire chapter recapitulates "good life" policy, pure Doctrine of the Secular Elite. Bobbitt (1941) waxes positive concerning existing job possibilities--"limitless horizons"--in America:

It appears that man's supreme activity is to keep watch, as of a lookout upon a height, over the ranges of whatever exists. The supreme task of education, then, is to help children and youths, and men and women, to a widening and deepening vision over

mankind's swiftly moving affairs and over the magnificent stage on which the great drama is enacted. As they see, the vision abides and grows as living understanding. (p. 398)

The "living understanding," as well as the "good life," of course, is a vision to someone chosen. Purgatory, at best, happens if someone is not chosen. Bobbitt (1941) mentions many horizons and how science widens those vistas, "the Endless Continuum of Existence" (p. 399). The author adds, poetically, a world-family vision:

As a person associates with the members of his family and community, and as he views his interdependencies and organic relationships in a social order that is not only local but nationwide and world-wide, he comes to see himself as a member of a large group--a national, even a world, family. He arrives at a sense of human brotherhood and takes on the attitudes towards all of cooperation, mutual aid, fair dealing, truthfulness, honesty, loyalty, self-restraint, mercy, gentleness, justice. (Bobbitt, 1941, p. 401)

Bobbitt concludes that education allows students to see the world through the eyes of wise men. Those educated students become one of two kinds: Hellenists or Hebraists. The former are Matthew Arnold's men of thought who advocated flexibility of intelligence and testing ideas. The latter recommended religious diligence and single-minded truth seeking (Kermode and Hollander, 1973, pp. 989-990).

Bobbitt's vision is to blend the two for an ameliorated outlook. That outlook has four extremities:

1. Intellectual orientation (right and wrong).
2. Emotional orientation (want or pleasure).
3. Rightness of character or stability.
4. A summit view (resulting from numbers 1-3) (Bobbitt, 1941, pp. 405-406).

Bobbitt's Chapter XVI, blends, and his whole book, references, mankind's potential. Rather than the brutish behavior exhibited by animals, comments Bobbitt, man can ascend. Living life to its highest extent becomes the author's exhortation. Implicitly stated, Bobbitt (1941) believes his articulated activities serve the educational equivalent of that "highest extent" (p. 406). His last major text, Curriculum of Modern Education (1941), is a retrospective, an educational career's tour de force. Bobbitt has passed through his re-acquired activities curriculum, though that work now has acquired individualized addressing. Everett's criticism was and is just: "It [The Curriculum of Modern Education] is modern and yet not modern" (James and Brown, 1941, p. 89).

"The Postwar Curriculum: The Functional vs. The Academic Plan" (1945)

The Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) was Bobbitt's last major work. Until his death in 1956, he wrote retrospective, philosophical pieces. "The Postwar

Curriculum: The Functional vs. The Academic Plan" in School Review, February, 1945, begins his last publications.

Bobbitt (1945) combines two interesting features relating presentation and livelihood of "The Postwar Curriculum: The Functional vs. The Academic Plan": (a) The bogging-down of the "academic" curriculum; and, (b) The "war" curriculum, which had a special brand of "functionalism," akin to his own (p. 77).

Bobbitt reiterates the former "academic" curriculum as one stringently following textbook learning's regimen, teacher dictation, and student coursework. The author connotes regimen with mindless teaching and passive learning. That academic approach encompasses 16 "pre-determining" curricular factors:

1. The subject matter teachers prepare to teach.
2. The method's use.
3. The textbooks available.
4. The curriculum.
5. The tests teachers use.
6. The tests' influence on teaching.
7. The concept of education.
8. The controlling assumptions that teacher educational institutions have.
9. The standards state departments of education employ.
10. The college-entrance demands.
11. The influence of accrediting agencies.
12. The limits of time.

13. The influence money has regarding class, size, teaching materials, and personnel character.

14. The expectations parents and community have.

15. The momentum administrative procedures have.

16. The "unresponsive inertness of institutions that have drifted from their social moorings" (Bobbitt, 1945, p. 77).

Bobbitt chronicles these 16 principles to show the vagaries of the pre-war curriculum, despite the efforts of reformers such as himself. He suggests the war effort gave special meaning to functionalism, his own brand of curricular utilitarianism. That utilitarianism maintains whatever students need to study they should "democratically" (emphasis added) study. Moreover, students should use those disciplines in the real world: "In the efficacious methods developed in army schools, the life of the process has been the vigorous intention to use the things taught and to master them merely as a first step in using them" (Bobbitt, 1945, p. 78). Bobbitt (1945) believes the war effort had demonstrated inadvertently functionalism's most useful dimensions:

Function has been the purpose behind the method, the result, and the test. After the war, when the teaching falls back into the academic atmosphere where "function" is only a word for decorating our discussions, and not an actuality, and where subjects are learned not for use but for possession, then this

powerful war motive can no longer vitalize the process--and when the life of the process is gone, the process stops. (p. 78)

Bobbitt (1945) warns that post-war years will fall back into "the relaxed atmosphere of academic aimlessness" (p. 78). He does not specify the attack on any person, agency, or philosophy, however.

Using the pre-war "aimlessness" and "functional" army-school symbols, Bobbitt (1945) addresses "the functional conception" (p. 80). That "functional conception" builds on the child-centered mandates he has created:

This education of the free pupil for life as a free man is not a thing that can be merely given to him by benevolent persons, by teachers, or by text-books. Only by living the process can he have it. Only by living the whole of it can he have the whole of it. There is wholeness of functioning only when within himself there is the operation of sense of need, of motive, of purpose, of guiding understanding, of anticipation of results, of desires, of intentions, of effort, of satisfactions, and of longing for the repetitional continuity--all going on at once in the doer. (Bobbitt, 1945, p. 80)

Bobbitt has developed his own version of child-centered education.

The curriculum for whom and to whom the author speaks sounds like one in which the pupils not only seek out, but

test. He feels that they "center" the schools and control their destiny; however, this is not the case. As in his other articles that deal with the functional curriculum, the learner has to have help. The help Bobbitt refers to is the survey work he had exhorted many times, as well as the sociological aid collaborated from Snedden, et al. Per "The Relation Between Content and Method" (1931), sociology has become his sole survey alliance and resource:

His environment, then, has to be shaped and tempered to the form appropriate to his stage of maturity. . . . He is to be provided with the conditions of freedom to follow the right ways, but not those of freedom to follow the ways of slackness or of error. (Bobbitt, 1945, p. 80)

Bobbitt's sense of freedom and democracy has a slight totalitarian ring. His students have had their freedom allocated. That freedom extends until a parent, teacher, or administrator finds the students in error. Error(s) must be eradicated. Bobbitt's whole sense of freedom wraps into an insular discipline Larson describes as "modern professionalization" and "standardized expertise" (1977, pp. 136-137). Bobbitt (1945) explicates and cloaks his "functional" education in "responsibility" terms:

We should keep it clear that functional education--as in the vocational area, for example--is the kind that involves the maximum of responsibility on the part of pupils, teacher, and parents. As between "hard" and

"soft," while the functional plan is most satisfying to the pupil after he gets it properly under way, it is the hardest. (pp. 80-81)

Again, Bobbitt falls shy of explaining exactly how freedom operates and succeeds. Instead of detailing the concepts of freedom vs. functionalism, Bobbitt (1945) retreats into Darwin's natural selection:

Of course Nature starts persons out with differing natures and possibilities. But in the powers and performances of civilized persons--in language, vocation, recreation, understanding, and the like--a man's nature, unaided by functioning, carries the individual but a little way. (p. 81)

Bobbitt (1945) complements his "little way" explanation:

"Nature gives him a start and lets him build himself by what he does. He remains 100 percent his own nature; but, equally, he becomes 100 percent the way that nature is shaped" (p. 81). Bobbitt demonstrates Doctrine of the Secular Elect and its resolute, finite shaping. Regarding students' status, nature gets the blame or the credit, depending on how philosophers or readers interpret. From a Puritan sense, if God did not love them enough, then students did not have capacity; if He did, well and good. The shaping and conditioning Bobbitt explains via governmental democracy and religious elect. The "right" (emphasis added) life Bobbitt so frequently refers defines, uses, and maintains control and manipulation. If young

people ascend into society, evidently they were free enough to do so. If they were not and/or did not, then either they were not free enough or they did not get the right shaping. Functionalism, additionally, side-steps student freedom and democracy. Perhaps some people are free and equal, and others are not quite so free and equal.

"The Unique Work of Porter Sargent" (1946a)

Between Two Wars: The Failure of Education, 1920-1940
by Porter Sargent, reviewed for School and Society, January, 1946, served Bobbitt's need to reform academia in United States' public schools. The introduction says much regarding both the writer (Sargent) and reviewer (Bobbitt):

It can be proved that 50 per cent of the program of American education is fraudulent. The customers should be told.

It can be proved that another quarter of the program is largely ineffective. The public needs to know.

It can be proved that there is no escape for the nations of the world from their present troubles, nor from worse ones impending, except by means of an education that lays in human understanding and character the solid foundations of sound constructive effort and advance.

It can be proved that the educational profession is mostly unaware of the basic shortcomings of the

program, and that it is making no serious effort to find out. (Bobbitt, 1946a, p. 68)

Bobbitt openly attacks "academic" public schools, using Sargent's text as a vehicle.

Bobbitt's platform is enigmatic. To begin, of all the texts that he might have examined or reviewed, Bobbitt chose an obscure one. Not only did Sargent privately publish, his book entails wandering and affective views of American private schools circa 1920-1940. Bobbitt (1946a) even comments: "His [Sargent's] books being anthologies, they are better for reference than for consecutive reading" (p. 68). Whatever the other books were, this one was a compendium of criticisms concerning public school ills. Sargent quotes many critics, who offer a multitude of public school allegations, though he himself says little. Bobbitt (1946a) admits: "While he suggests numerous things to be done, and assembles an amazing number of suggestions from others, he makes no attempt to present an ordered program of education" (p. 68). Bobbitt (1946a) might well have commented on his own crusade, for he commends Sargent's "clearing" American public schools' metaphorical wilderness: "He [Sargent] wields with rare vigor a more or less lone axe in that jungle" (p. 68). Bobbitt's contemporaries, notably Charters and Snedden, described him (Bobbitt) similarly.

Much as Bobbitt (1946a) claims students need conditioning in order to pursue freedom, he also recommends this text as something that educational professionals and

interested people need in order to alert them: "Let us then judge the work of Porter Sargent on the basis of his power to awaken those who need awakening and to clear the way for the constructive work that he expects to be done by other persons of different temperaments and ability" (p. 69). Sargent does not say that; Bobbitt does. Such is Bobbitt at this stage in his philosophical career. He, like a lot of older scholars, looks down from his perch and preaches the gospel of what he believes is good, right, and/or just. Bobbitt comments on and fashions his Cooligian democracy. He amplifies those comments in his next article, one that recapitulates his own ESL teaching career.

"Foreign Service Effects" (1946b)

In a more reflective mode regarding his own work, Bobbitt writes "Foreign Service Effects" for Phi Delta Kappan in April, 1946. The author's comments and statements measure his own experiences, thoughts, and reminiscences of his Manila teaching days. Those days formulated the study, work, and writing that became his career's formative foundation.

Bobbitt depicts himself as an academic rebel who took on various opposition, caused untold fervor, and always believed in his cause. If Bobbitt is a rebel, then Dewey, Kilpatrick, et al., are radical terrorists. How Bobbitt develops his own portrait is as interesting and fanciful as the utopian artists painting their verbal propaganda he

reviews in "The Latest Educational Utopia" (1946d). Bobbitt's portrait of himself is something less than a scientific photograph.

Bobbitt retraces his early high school teaching experience in Corydon, Indiana. Corydon had a typical eight-year grammar school--four-year high school plan, and taught traditional subjects in traditional drill-oriented, memory-test fashion:

Had I continued my work in this country, the normal thing would have been to settle down in those comfortable traditional grooves, and to have spent the next forty years in bumbling along with the pleasant academic crowd, seeking never to rock the boat, and to get my share of the plums. (Bobbitt, 1946b, p. 249)

Not only does he mix metaphors, he also romances the time, energy, and democratic vigor he used in preparing for his foreign-service assignment. Bobbitt established a way of teaching that was, for him, quite liberal and student-centered, yet it was also a very oppressive and heavy-handed dictum that only allowed "functional" and "managed" (emphasis added) democracy at specific school sites. If democracy conformed to Bobbitt's ideal of what students might be allowed to share, then he supported it. His version of apprenticeship was complementary. If curriculum makers could surround and/or shape most students with the right materials, lessons, and perceptions, those pupils could enjoy the "good life." Bobbitt's apprenticeship

conjoined the American pragmatic business ethic. His early Manila experiences shaped his later United States' experiences.

Speaking about his Manila students, he says: "In the matter of preparing for literacy, our task was to teach them to read, write, spell and speak a foreign language, namely, English, and not their native Spanish, Tagalog or Visayan" (Bobbitt, 1946b, p. 250). One initial ESL assignment, history, Bobbitt (1946b) rhetorically explains: "What should go into a history, and how should it be written, to make it of vital help to a hitherto exploited and oppressed people, as they prepared themselves for a democratic way of life?" (p. 249). He knew that these students would come to him and the other ESL teachers. He dispensed English; therefore, he was the expert and the mentor. Their need of English was an immense factor. Bobbitt said that arithmetic was different because of the dissimilar systems of weights and measures. He concluded that manual training was different because of the disparate trades, business, and commerce. Then, referencing David P. Barrows, anthropologist and researcher of the Filipinos, Bobbitt (1946b) learned a most important lesson about teaching:

Instead of the normal and usual regimentative way of preventing freedom of thinking on the part of teachers and supervisory officials, he [Barrows] insisted that every worker look with his own eyes to the NEEDS: and then plan and operate accordingly. (p. 250)

What Bobbitt learned changed his thinking, he confesses:

I came for the first time to see the vast advantage of having education directed by a man of understanding whose ideas were not steeped in the paralyzing academic traditions and who consistently took the point of view of the laymen and their need. (Bobbitt, 1946b, p. 250)

It is what he does not see that is the most important factor, however. The "man of understanding/virtue," I suggest, is Bobbitt himself. Perhaps he learned this from Barrows; perhaps he acquired the knowledge by degrees from no one source. In turn, he showed his students lessons and knowledge so they could have a functionally better life. Bobbitt does not say how that better life comes about; no follow-up studies did he do to demonstrate the students' effects and later lives. However, most importantly, he never records speaking directly with the students and/or their families. He is the "man of understanding," the man who is at the center of the academic Doctrine of the Elect. That is one of two indictments. The other is how he shuns or eschews anyone else's philosophy after first saying they had merits.

Regarding his own education and preparation for his Manila experience, Bobbitt (1946b) chastises "tradition" and "regimentation:."

In college, I took most of the courses then given in educational theory; and after returning from the Islands, the further courses required for an advanced

degree; but there was scarcely any liberation from the shackles of tradition in any of them. (p. 250)

Further, he deploras his "shackles":

They [Bobbitt's professors] were devoted mostly to implementing the shackles. Even the so-called "application of scientific method to education" was then, as it has since remained, mostly but a matter of discovering how to increase the intensity of the regimentation in operating the traditional shackled education. (Bobbitt, 1946b, p. 250)

Bobbitt never recognized his own "shackles."

Moreover, Bobbitt exhorts Aristotles' "learning by doing," and credits his own teaching as the reason that he became a "man of understanding." His next statement indicates Bobbitt accorded himself status as a "man of 'ultra' understanding" (emphasis added):

Has that professional liberation been an asset or a liability? The answer is too complicated to explain it in full. At least, it was no hindrance, after five years in the Islands, to re-enter into, and advancement in, the profession on my return to this country. I had my professional degree in two years and went without pause to the University of Chicago, advancing to full professorship in an abbreviated period. (Bobbitt, 1946b, p. 251)

He traced several of his Manila colleagues and found that they had ascended into important jobs also: "And I have

noticed that the subsequent history of many of my Philippine associates followed similar lines" (Bobbitt, 1946b, p. 251). He does not mention how scarce higher education people were then. He does not mention that he got his first (Manila) job because his graduate school mentor, W. B. Bryan, became the Manila director and offered him employment, nor does he mention that he did not teach any more elementary or high school in the United States. His initial year teaching high school in the U.S. and one ESL job qualified as him a "man of understanding" who freed himself from his shackles.

Bobbitt (1946b) sees his post-Manila experiences sans provincialism and "maintaining mental flexibility of continuing mental growth" (p. 263). Bobbitt, honestly and finally, compares himself to John Dewey. A John Dewey, he is not.

"Education or Catastrophe" (1946c)

Bobbitt continues his review and overview regarding America's educational direction in "Education or Catastrophe" for Educational Administration and Supervision, May, 1946. Bobbitt's initial tone is negative (1946c):

In the famous race between education and catastrophe, the state of the world shows that catastrophe has already won over a wide area, and that its never-satiated forces are pushing forward powerfully everywhere toward a culmination in universal desolation and despair. Education has lost the race over the

wrecked and slum portions of the world, and is now losing it over the still unsubmerged regions. (p. 271)

Bobbitt references his assessment on a poll American Magazine conducted in February, 1946. The periodical had contacted recognized education professionals and had asked their opinion of American public schools' welfare. The results showed 6% of the experts indicated United States' schools fared well, 36% said weak, and the balance reported failing and/or substandard marks. Bobbitt (1946c) blames all school levels--elementary, secondary, and even higher education:

The failure of education has been so complete, its present promise is so slight, the race has been so utterly lost, that no national or world plan is now built upon education as its basic foundation. (p. 272)

The author's last statement suggests that the peaceful century from 1815 to 1914 looked to education as the community, regional, and national cornerstones. The post-World War I era manifested power or war as new cornerstones.

Bobbitt has especially stinging criticism for his era's higher education. He awards colleges and universities credit for doing three things well: aiding literacy education, preparing for "work-specialties," and training in the "amateur arts," i.e., music, sports, etc. (Bobbitt, 1946c, p. 273). Bobbitt (1946c) wonders why colleges had ignored his areas of concern, from citizenship, family life, health care, recreations, general human association,

intellectual living, emotional living, religious living, to vocation preparation (p. 273). Five areas especially come under fire from Bobbitt (1946c), areas that he feels schools and colleges lack:

1. Citizenship gains first scrutiny because, Bobbitt states, colleges and universities do not know what good citizenship is. The reason for that is that higher education has not done required survey work that would yield information pertinent to good citizenship. The American Historical Society, the American Political Society, the American Geographical Society, the American Sociological Society, and the NEA could not fathom the question. Bobbitt only questions the money spent, not the fact that real experts could not complete the job.

2. Bobbitt criticizes the lack of understanding colleges provide. He lambastes colleges who "try to stuff juvenile heads with adult verbiage about things dead, things abstract, things remote from the actual world with its turbulent daily march of mankind" (p. 274). In order to provide a more practical approach, Bobbitt advocates an apprenticeship program. He forgets or rationalizes his own University of Chicago lecture-format system.

3. Health education Bobbitt deplors. Using an unspecified Surgeon-General's report, Bobbitt complains that there are virtually no health and fitness programs available for young people while they are in school, or for adults who have completed their education.

4. Free-time activities next come under siege. Bobbitt maintains that leisure time activities display the "triviality, banality and viciousness" of our society, not the "varied and wholesome recreations" (p. 275). Again, the author mentions the lack of partnership schools should have with their children/students.

5. "The fitness of a person for wise and responsible performance" (p. 275) is the last of Bobbitt's criticisms. More important than any single subject or discipline at school, the maintenance of solid family life should be "trained" for, Bobbitt exhorts (pp. 274-277).

After Bobbitt details what schools do not do, he points an accusing finger at the Educational Policies Commission and their The Education of All American Youth. He compares it to Bellamy's phantasmic novel, Looking Backward ([reprinted] 1967). Bobbitt eschews federal aid to education, sees the future as a series of "dream communities" formulated by proponents that are both superficial and frivolous (Bobbitt, 1946c, p. 276). Bobbitt (1946c) summarily condemns Harvard's General Education in a Free Society, especially that institution's reliance on tradition and heritage.

Bobbitt sees no hope except himself and his functionalism. At this latter stage in his career, Bobbitt has begun to criticize several programs and/or institutions, as well as retrospectively regard, respect, and revere his own work, theories, and programs.

"The Latest Educational Utopia" (1946d)

In the "Correspondence" section of the June, 1946, School and Society, Bobbitt writes "The Latest Educational Utopia" as an attack on "The Education of All American Youth." He did so as a favor to the editors of School and Society, who had asked Bobbitt his commentary after reading his previous "Porter Sargent" book review (1946a).

Comparing the mythical communities of Farmville and American City to Plato's Republic begins Bobbitt's scathing criticism. He relegates "The Education of All American Youth" report as sheer fancy. Bobbitt juxtaposes the Education Policies Commission's work to his philosophical "science." First, he denigrates the Commission's work as portraiture, as opposed to "real" photography. The former, the portrait, is "beautifully painted is one of the shrewdest and most convincing types of propaganda" (Bobbitt, 1946d, p. 396). The evangelical zeal and drive elucidated by the Commission's artists remind Bobbitt of other educational artists, such as Sir Thomas More, William Morris, Edward Bellamy, and H. G. Welles. Bobbitt (1946d) judges them as "stirrers of the sociological caldron, pamphleteers in the social advance" (p. 396).

To make transition to his own scientific thoughts, Bobbitt (1946d) concludes: "Artists are specialists in superficial appearances. They can paint the outside of lovely things without any understanding of the structures and functions beneath them" (p. 396). For Bobbitt (1946d),

they are pleasant to read and view, but superfluous for "real work" and "real world views" (p. 397). That "realness," of course, is the "real photography"--science:

The scientist, in contrast, is a specialist in the structures and functions of things. He, too, sees the surface, but as part of the structure as a matter involved in the functioning. He sees a thing inside and out, its genesis, the course of its history, and its aftermath. . . . In comparison, the artist is a blind man. (Bobbitt, 1946d, p. 396)

Bobbitt's answer to artists who portray American educational landscape as utopia is twofold. First, use plain language to tell the readers what occurs. Second, concentrate on propaganda.

Bobbitt wavers in his "The Education of All American Youth" commentary. He is unwilling to see or study what the Education Policies Commission had to say, and unable to project or extrapolate the utopian dream they manifest. Still, Bobbitt finds oblique interest in their message. However, he implores them to portray answers that he will understand and/or accept. Bobbitt lends these artists freedom to express what they have to say, but only if he understands the messages or philosophies. Similar commentary returns in his next article concerning Harvard.

"Harvard Reaffirms the Academic Tradition" (1946e)

Bobbitt's writing style, at his career's conclusion,

remains direct, simple, and straightforward. Though reports, letters, and conversations regarding his personal nature indicate that he was a consummately private and almost timid person, he does not always write passively. Using his last articles, reviews, and correspondences as bases, Bobbitt becomes acerbic. A good example is "Harvard Reaffirms the Academic Tradition" (1946e), which he submits for publication to School Review in June, 1946.

As Bobbitt completes his career, he finds himself as an emeritus professor-philosopher commenting on his age's genres, movements, and philosophies. In this article, he assails Harvard University-sponsored General Education in a Free Society, a work he had cited in the final lines of "Education or Catastrophe" (1946c). To attack the Harvard people, Bobbitt informs his readers that vocational education encompasses both the eight-to-five daytime labor, and, as well, general laymen duties. Though the author mentions many interpretations exist for the former, much work needs to be done for the latter. Bobbitt (1946e) subdivides laymen activities into citizenship, physical living and health care, family life, recreation, amateur arts, association, communication, religion, emotion and understanding (p. 326).

Bobbitt's (1946e) reduces the Harvard report to four areas:

1. Secondary schools should require three year courses

in English and literature, natural science and mathematics, and two in history and social studies.

2. College and university undergraduate education should require two years in each of the three mentioned disciplines.

3. The listed courses are to be set up with materials from a wide-ranging field of different experiences for the young people.

4. The courses should treat effective thinking, communication of that thinking, and deal with relevant judgements, and "value" education (p. 329).

Bobbitt (1946e) does not dismiss the human terms these directives reflect, but he questions why they did not treat his ten-level practicum in general vocational issues:

Without looking to the enormously difficult problems and duties of intellectual living by all laymen in an age when the success or failure of the human experiment is dependent on the laymen's daily headwork, the committee blandly, and seemingly without sense of the difficulty of the problem, unanimously prescribes only a simple dose of academic language about English, the world of nature, and the world of men (p. 330).

Of course, Bobbitt, who prides himself in applied science, can not understand how the Harvard men could ignore his logical answer--apprenticeships in schools so that the students have the correct functional models. The author impugns the report:

"The purpose of all education is to help students to live their own lives," writes the committee with all the wisdom and directness of Quintilian or Montaigne. In that one superb statement, they present the complete refutation of the entire academic program that they recommend. (Bobbitt, 1946e, p. 330)

Bobbitt does not want to, or can not see, any other point of view other than his own accumulated functionalism. He categorizes everyone else, whether the Harvard people here, the Progressives, or classical academicians that would only have students read books repetitively as "merely verbal, academic kinds" (Bobbitt, 1946e, p. 331).

Whatever tasks he starts, or whoever he criticizes, Bobbitt (1946e) eventually returns his rhetoric to his own philosophical position:

For young people rightly to live their own lives during youth is to participate, according to their ages and natures, in the several areas of "normal" [emphasis added] human living. (p. 330)

How they are to go about their "normal" and "human" world is through apprenticeship:

They are to be apprentice members of their families, apprentice members of general society, apprentices in the ways of human association and intercommunication, apprentices in the ways of intellectual and emotional living, and in the other areas. (Bobbitt, 1946e, p. 330)

If students do what he asks in the apprenticeships, then their reward is "right living":

Right living in each area requires that they [the students] see, feel, and understand their needs; that they value and desire the ways of living that are best for them; that they strive honestly and earnestly, so far as can be expected of immaturity, to hold to those ways; and that the wholesome fruits of their striving be satisfying, thus awakening desire for continuance and further improvement. (Bobbitt, 1946e, pp. 330-331)

When students have done all this, then they will have become masters of Bobbitt's functionalism (1946e): "This apprentice living in the several areas may well be called functional education, to distinguish it from the merely verbal, academic kind" (p. 331). This Aristotelian "learning by doing" becomes the ultimate Bobbitt (1946e) education: "No other method of learning rightly to live has ever been discovered. We learn what we do. What we do not do, we do not learn" (p. 331).

Appropriately enough, if this is all there is to learning, then he can and does (literally) dismiss the Harvard people who use methods "patiently and conclusively proved unsound" (Bobbitt, 1946e, p. 332). In this report, he castigates Harvard; his next, an entire commission.

"The Educational Policies Commission
Banishes Science" (1946f)

Bobbitt continues his attack mode with his last article. If he assailed Harvard for their lack of "general" science awareness and applicability, then "The Educational Policies Commission Banishes Science," August, 1946, pointedly admonishes the title body. Continuing his "Latest Educational Utopia" (1946d) vehemence, Bobbitt charges the EPC with heresy--dismissing the scientific discipline and philosophy that Bobbitt had championed his whole life. Science's evolution had produced the industrial way of life Bobbitt had grown up admiring. Science had been the ally of his survey movement, his affinity with tests and measurements, and his whole hope for academic, societal, and cultural progress. To find out that science would not have the attention Bobbitt (1946d) wanted made him angry:

In the face of such clear facts [the obfuscation of science], it is nothing less than monstrous to find the organized sciences of all sorts practically excluded from the curriculum by the distinguished leaders of professional policies. (p. 122)

Bobbitt (1946d) discovers the Educational Policies Commission has drawn public schools a fictional educational picture, instead of a scientific one:

And to find that instead of science as a guide to educators they give forth in this document a modernistic artist's picture of how education operates

in a fictional world with the impossible perfection that can be put into fiction. (p. 122)

He concludes that U.S. schools and society face catastrophe:

The commission clearly rejects the principle that in a world of greatly mismanaged human affairs, only the best possible understanding, namely, science, can provide the only guidance that is good enough.

(Bobbitt, 1946f, p. 123)

Bobbitt has one more attack. He contends that the able professions, doctors, lawyers, etc., rely on science.

Education, Bobbitt warns, will suffer unalterable academic and professional scorn by the commission's actions.

"Letter(s)" (1954)

Bobbitt's last professional writing, a 1954 short-note entry in Changing Times, does not demonstrate any mellowing. Bobbitt examines an un-named Cleveland school during a decade. In 1848, the school got 924 combined points on an examination--cost per pupil, \$10.00. In 1948, that same school, spending \$250.00 per pupil, made only 955 combined points. Bobbitt dutifully suggests the modest 3% gain has not been worth the expenditure--literally and figuratively. The note does not have import just because of the scientific figuring Bobbitt does. What is important is his reliance on "efficiency" (emphasis added), a concept and entity that has remained with the author his entire life. To the point of the duty, plight, and responsibility of the twentieth-

century citizen, Bobbitt (1954) warns:

But in an age when all free citizens should learn to use their heads lest the tyranny of well-meaning political paternalists crush them, education to help people think straight and honestly about their needs and responsibilities is not even 20% efficient.

(p. 48)

Bobbitt, as a retired professor of curriculum science, continues to speak of his honored watchword--efficiency. He has come full circle. He became an efficient son, student, teacher, professor, and scientism/functionalist-oriented spokesman.

Stage III and Final Summary

I have divided John Franklin Bobbitt's career and curriculum writing into three stages. Stage I-- "Indoctrinations," begins with the author's textbook A First Book in English (1904). That primer he used in his Manila, ESL teaching lessons. Following the primer, Bobbitt publishes his doctoral thesis, "The Growth of Philippine Children" (1909a) which documented physical and mental growth patterns of his Filipino students during his Manila assignment. "Practical Eugenics" (1909b) provides evidence of Bobbitt's deep-seated Social Darwinism. Darwinian, survival tenets begin the article, but Bobbitt also includes endorsement that social class distinctions within society foretell U.S. students' educational and professional directions. Somewhat racist in tone, the article forecasts only "scientific" eugenics can curtail the "epidemic" (emphasis added). With "Practical Eugenics" (1909b), I found the germination and amalgamation of Bobbitt's adherence to the puritanical Doctrine of the Elect and the Doctrine of the Secular Elect. Those two doctrines remained with him throughout his career.

The other most important article during Stage I was "The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912). Bobbitt, relying on the religious "waste not-want not" homily and a scientific accountability theme that dominates his early work, establishes a business ethic for schools. Gary, Indiana, the home of U.S. Steel, was the school site for

this article. As well, Bobbitt modeled "The Elimination of Waste in Education" (1912) on an earlier school accountability work, "The Efficiency of the Consolidated Rural School" (1911b). Ignoring facts that indicated the efficacy smaller schools inherently had, Bobbitt recommends "consolidation" to bigger and more comprehensive schools' "efficiency."

Throughout his career, Bobbitt harked back to religious-science economies as most important treatises. "High School Costs" (1915a) concludes Stage I. In this article, Bobbitt reiterates the need for schools' fiscal responsibility; however, he adds an additional component-- school "surveys." Bobbitt participated in more than several big-city school district fact-finding inspections. In those locations, he secured from local businesses and administrators pertinent vocation-oriented information, and gathered data to support his activities curriculum theory. Several other articles Bobbitt wrote between 1913-1915, including a comparison of selected secondary schools and their respective costs of operations, "High School Costs" (1915a), acted as a precursor to his survey-dominated Stage II.

Stage II, "The Essential Curriculum Science," begins with Bobbitt's reliance on survey techniques and products. However, this period also includes two major texts and many articles. It encompasses the brunt of Bobbitt's career work, a career that saw him take and hold professorship at

the University of Chicago until he retired in 1941. His stance as the first professor of curriculum tied closely with his fame as a writer and purveyor of scientism. Scientism became a term for conservative, authoritarian-dominant, job-oriented, scientific-managed curriculum. Beginning with "Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City-School Management" (1913a), Bobbitt began qualitative and quantitative studies aimed at equating the business of industry and the "business" (emphasis added) of schools. Bobbitt had learned survey techniques from W. L. Bryan at Indiana University, and had learned practical Darwinism and scientific motifs from W. H. Burnham at Clark University.

Bobbitt also received much implicit Social Darwinian/Spencerian instruction from such corporate Titans as Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Morgan. With those combined instructors and instructions, Bobbitt conducts fact-finding survey missions to South Bend, Indiana, San Antonio, Texas, Cleveland, Ohio, Denver, Colorado, St. Louis, Missouri, and Los Angeles, California, among others, during Stage II. With these surveys, Bobbitt uses his (religious) diligence, (academic) knowledge, and (eclectic) application to forge his survey genre documents into school/business meld. Repeatedly, the author styles students as academic workers, educators as polemic overseers, and schools themselves as learning factories. Whatever cities he surveyed, he went to the business and industry leaders, sought their job and

position analysis advice, then consulted the schools on their various shortcomings. On several occasions, Bobbitt rated various schools in a district to ascertain which produced the best and most successful employer-ready graduates. Academic efficiency, student preparedness for "good life" employment, and hierarchical literacy, vocation, citizenship and (retirement) leisure became Bobbitt's touchstones, per 1917b, 1918a, and 1918b.

In The Curriculum (1918c), Bobbitt's first major text, he views students as fruit from an academic tree, and the fruits must hold both the subjective or personal tenets, as well as practical ones in order to bloom. With this metaphor, Bobbitt begins a slow, steady ascent into more child-centered-like curriculum doctrine. That ascent culminates in his address to NSSE's The Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook (1926). He never completely escaped from the Spencerian "science is the knowledge most worth" dictate, nor from his cultural, puritanical elect doctrine. However, Bobbitt addresses more compassion for young people that contradicts his prior staid and stolid "Practical Eugenics" (1909b) role in "Literature in the Elementary Curriculum" (1913b).

Activities and the right and proper activities, however, become the template that Bobbitt builds for students. Instead of relying on himself as the survey-taker who might outline the correct activities, Bobbitt welcomes

sociology to aid the search for "the good life," particularly the aid of his colleague David Snedden. Bobbitt assigns the task of uncovering and unearthing the right activities to Snedden and other sociologists' qualitative research, as witnessed by "The Objectives of Secondary Education" (1920a) and "A Significant Tendency in Curriculum Making" (1921a).

How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), Bobbitt's second major text during Stage II, provides substance for his scientism and his emerging Dewey-like child-centered curriculum work. That duality makes him an enigma. He relies on a Cardinal Principals-modified activities list that school districts should engineer for their charges: language, health, and citizenship--general social, spare time, mental, religious, and vocational. Bobbitt, to complement his principals, constructed literally hundreds of objectives, which he called realities. How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), in many respects, is a book of the author's realities. He addresses child-centered education on the activities or realities regarding "men of enlightenment," not the students themselves.

Bobbitt divided education into foundational and functional components. He had empathy for students throughout his writings, especially in Stage II. During that stage, Bobbitt exhibits resentment to the Committee of Ten's insistence on college-bound curricula. He also opposes textbook-only learning, and he disassociates himself

from exclusive rote-memory methodology. In their collective place, however, per How to Make a Curriculum (1924f), Bobbitt replaces Charles Eliot and other "classicists" with his own benevolent dictatorship of "visionaries" (emphasis added). Bobbitt used that latter term as corollary to "men of enlightenment" to indicate administrators or supervisory curriculum personnel who could utilize survey work to the fullest extent "for" (emphasis added) students. With "The New Technique of Curriculum Making" (1924b), "Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher Training Institutions" (1924c), and "What Understanding of Human Society Should Education Develop?" (1924d), Bobbitt showed promise of escaping his scientism dogma and understanding and promoting student-oriented concerns.

In "The New Technique of Curriculum Making" (1924b), Bobbitt initially renounced that education was exclusively for adults. He then states that life should be lived and not just worked. "What Understanding of Human Society Should Education Develop?" (1924d) allows Bobbitt for the first time to publicly discuss the control big business had produced in society in general, and U.S. public schools, in particular. Though far from an indictment on how corporations had usurped power over society, Bobbitt implores big business and communities to join the common good of the country and its young people.

In addition, the author deplored fixed study for students; in its place he asked for divergent "activities."

"Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher Training Institutions" (1924c) produces a six-pronged analysis of teachers-as-facilitator, not the standard teachers-as-lecturers. Though still steeped in his "activities" and "visionary" modes, Bobbitt produces in this article veiled attempts at looking at the student as a person, not an "industrially-packaged product."

Stage III, "Transitional Philosophy," completes Bobbitt's troika of writing divisions. If Stage II, "The Essential Curriculum Science," produced survey-led transition from the author's early conservative "Practical Eugenics" (1909b) mode, Stage III makes another transition. This stage begins with "The Trend of the Curriculum (1924g)". It ends with Bobbitt's fierce, anti-progressive attack in "The Educational Policies Commission Banishes Science" (1946f). The former portends Bobbitt's child-centered curriculum advocacy in the 1926 NSSE Yearbook. The latter reaffirms much of Bobbitt's earlier diatribe that any other academic format except his conservative functionalism had little or no merit.

Between both articles, Bobbitt makes two separate transitions. The first leads to his more liberal, Dewey-like curriculum stance; the second leads back to the author's conservative scientism/functionality. The National Society for the Study of Education's Adapting the Schools to Individual Differences (1925a) and the NSSE's Yearbook provide particular quotes indicating that Bobbitt changed

his "education is for adults" stance to "education is for youth" position. Though he did not keep that child-centered stance for the duration of his career, his dramatic retraction of his life-long functionalism has implications for his career and work, as well as the influence he had on his contemporaries. Just as important, I believe Bobbitt was a major curriculum figure during his tenure in United States' education as a University of Chicago professor, 1908 forward. That he made a significant shift in his dogma and doctrine has far-reaching effects. In Adapting the Schools to Individual Differences (1925a), Bobbitt enters a chapter, "Individualizing the Curriculum" (1925a). This chapter promotes the student as an individual, asks teachers to write lessons commensurate with different abilities, and advocates cooperative learning to maximize peer tutoring. As well, both "Education as a Social Process" (1925b), and "Difficulties to be Met in Local Curriculum Making" (1925c) echo Bobbitt's more child-centered thoughts.

The NSSE's Twenty-Sixth Annual Yearbook brought together the two dominant U.S. curriculum divisions-- Bobbitt's scientism and Dewey's Progressivism. Harold Rugg, the NSSE Chairman, set up an 18-item curriculum platform, one decidedly in favor of Dewey's child-centered position. Bobbitt, surprisingly, enters into and agrees with the platform. He admits that life is not exclusively for adults; rather, it is for children, and children should be accorded respect as individuals.

The remainder of Bobbitt's writing begins with his religious-oriented "Character Building in the New Curriculum" (1926c), and continues with "Rebuilding the Curriculum in Line with its True Function" (1929). That latter document echoes much of the questing Bobbitt demonstrated in the 1926 Yearbook. However, Bobbitt also mentions the need for his activities curriculum as a major component of child-centered philosophy. As well, Bobbitt mentions the need to see U.S. schools as hospitals, places where teachers would treat their students as patients. Bobbitt had mentioned this metaphor before in "Discovering and Formulating the Objectives of Teacher-Training Institutions" (1924c); he will echo it again in "Educational Science and Supervision" (1928), and "Questionable Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies" (1934b). That "medical" thread links much of his *Doctrine of the Elect* and *Doctrine of the Secular Elect* dogma discussed in this dissertation.

I believe Bobbitt sincerely wanted students accorded respect as individuals; however, I also believe he felt his work and thoughts, whether medical or business oriented, to be the epitome of that individualism. That unswerving ability to trust his own judgments, works, and philosophical thoughts was his fatal flaw. Progressivism, child-centeredness, and individualized study were terms Bobbitt agreed with; he agreed on his own efficacy and work more. "Social Values of the Junior High School Curriculum" (1933)

became another link that demonstrated Bobbitt's recidivism to his early career. He has begun in this piece to speak of education stemming the threat to national defense. He revives his "good life" pursuits in "The Basic Curriculum of Source Thinkers--A Proposal" (1934a). In "Trend of the Activity Curriculum" (1934c), the author poses how minor modifications in his activities work could satisfy the Progressives. He echoes that sentiment in "Advancing Toward the Activity Curriculum" (1935a) and "Modern Curriculum" (1935c).

However, it is with the publication of his final book, Curriculum of Modern Education (1941) that Bobbitt puts into perspective what he considered his summary educational philosophy and recommendations. Bobbitt was an honest, sincere scholar and educator. He advocated and pursued his curriculum work diligently. He respected the Progressives' child-centered stand, but he strongly believed in his own activities curriculum. In Curriculum of Modern Education (1941), his last text, Bobbitt blends the two together officially, just as he had been doing in articles throughout Stage III. The Progressives wanted students' needs satisfied; so did Bobbitt. The Progressives wanted democracy and "right thinking" in education; so did Bobbitt. Where they differed is that Bobbitt never lost faith in the authority of "men of enlightenment," or "visionaries," himself included, to produce the choices students could make. Parents at home, and educators at school, maintained

Bobbitt, presented structured and unstructured curriculum pieces students could use to attain "the good life."

Bobbitt talks about free and contrived education in this book; often he intertwined the two. The contrived education he subdivides into home responsibilities (basic education) and school responsibilities (contributory education).

Without completely knowing, I believe, Bobbitt set up a Doctrine of the Secular Elect. Students who had the "right" parents and teachers could choose the "right" educational opportunities (emphasis added). Those who did not, could not break Bobbitt's metaphorical "shackles" (1946b).

Bobbitt's change of philosophical position, from "Practical Eugenics" (1909b) devotee, to scientism and survey-genre advocate, to child-centered promoter, and back to functionalist purveyor might connote vacillation. My dissertation contends Bobbitt easily moved through important professional and philosophical stages.

Stage I--"Indoctrinations," had reflected his early religious training, his diligence to task, and his adherence to business and corporate ethics. Stage II--"Survey and Curriculum Science," viewed the major body of his work and his position as curriculum professor at the University of Chicago. During this era, Bobbitt refined his earlier work, began various surveys, and reacted to the Progressives "child-centered" stances. Stage III--"Transitional Philosophy" proved that Bobbitt had the capability of considering Dewey's diametrical opposite point of view

(Progressivism), accede to it, yet he returned to his previous activities philosophy as an answer and panacea to the questions Dewey and others raised.

Throughout his career, Bobbitt had influences. To begin, his father and grandfather, both ministers, bestowed strict Puritan-Christian values on him, values he never recanted. An early teacher, Mr. Riddle, reinforced Bobbitt's academic diligence. During his undergraduate years at Indiana University, the Drs. Bryan imbued in Bobbitt pedagogy, the disciplines of science and mathematics, the need and use of survey methodology, and the concepts of training. E. B. Bryan offered Bobbitt his first job (ESL in the Philippines). At Clark University, his graduate school, Bobbitt encountered and learned psychology of G. S. Hall, found the nurture of counsel and encouragement, as well as the Darwinian politics of economy vs. waste from W. H. Burnham.

During his University of Chicago tenure, Bobbitt learned Behaviorism from Harold Rugg, his division chairman. In addition, because he shared an adjoining office, William Kilpatrick, the famed liberal educator, also influenced Bobbitt. Bobbitt did not want for influences; he had many. Often, I have found, Bobbitt was especially impressed with the last teacher, professor, or other major figure he encountered. In no small way, those various professional men--there were no women--changed Bobbitt's thinking.

However, each singularly and all collectively, did not

change Bobbitt's core. What I have determined is that Bobbitt associatively and personally learned the Doctrine of the Elect from his grandfather, his father, and his religion. He probably warred with predestination and free will his entire life. That duality accounts for portions of Bobbitt's vacillation concerning students' rights and students' governance. Bobbitt also openly admired the financial titans/gods on earth--the likes of John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and J. P. Morgan. Their Doctrine of the Secular Elect utilized the United States' change from agrarian to an industrial economy.

The Industrial Revolution produced big business and corporations. Both needed trained operators to run various machines and do assigned menial labors. Bobbitt admired the titans' view of U.S. business progress; the titans welcomed an educator who valued their resolute accountability and specific profit motives. More than any other influences, the combined religious and business combination, I maintain, were the chief instigators of Bobbitt's educational philosophy. That philosophy underwent change. One scholar's "professionalization" theory suggests men like Bobbitt warred with "old" agrarian and "new" capitalistic America. I agree, and I suggest Bobbitt chose the "responsible corporate capitalism" (cf. Larson, 1977, pp. 136-158, for a full discussion of this topic).

I have also pursued Kliebard's reference of Bobbitt's abrupt 1926 retraction. Further, I have divided Bobbitt's

works into three stages and demonstrated that each produced a distinct Bobbitt. The early Bobbitt was racist-like, sexist, and advocated eugenics. The mid-career Bobbitt was survey-oriented and approached Dewey's or Kilpatrick's child-centered Progressivism. The mature Bobbitt began with his famous retraction, then receded into his earlier conservative, essentialism. The first professor of curriculum went through three stages. Paradoxically, he did not ever change.

Bobbitt, I propose, is a major curriculum figure. He represents many theorists then and now who say that they are democratically-oriented, child-centered educators. Wanting the best for students and having high expectations of them is commendable. Bobbitt did and exhibited that. Believing in the Doctrines of the Elect and Secular Elect, and thus prejudging students, is not as commendable. Bobbitt did and exhibited that also. No matter how hard he tried, whether it was to enlist science and business to train young people, to encourage more medical law-like models for education to emulate, or whether he wrote more and more proper activities, Bobbitt missed one essential element. He did not talk to students for students. His reliance on various authorities kept him from communicating with the young people he served.

Perhaps whimsically, though certainly accurately, Larson (1987) puts into verse the voice-over Bobbitt into twentieth-century perspective:

To all you stalwart schoolmen
And the factories you run;
To all you frazzled teachers and
The "frills" you've learned to sun;

To the planners and researchers
And their scientific schemes:
"Congratulations! Thank you! You've
Surpassed my wildest dreams!

I applaud your test-tube language
And your number-covered forms,
Your units of performance, your
Standards, and your norms.

I celebrate your objectives, so
Behavioral, so complete.
I love the way your test results
Make knowledge look so neat.

Distar? Workbooks? M.B.O.?
I never had such tools.
I dared not hope technology
Could so control the schools.

I like those curriculum engineers:
Bereiter, Mager, and Popham,
With "Back to the Basics" and ETS.
There's not much left to stop 'em.

Your direct instruction, contracts,
And curriculum in carts;
Your labels and your tracking,
Your Apple data charts--

It's all shown me how much I lacked,
How much I could've used it all,
Those many years ago.

You've scientized the whole shebang!
Efficiency? You employ it.
Just one thing still bothers me:
Why don't the kids enjoy it?

(p. 47).

Bobbitt died in 1956. His status as a U.S. public school curriculum figure, I contend, begins with his legacy of science-inspired, essentialist/functionalist-oriented thoughts, ideas, and beliefs. That legacy continues and is perpetrated by many educators today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, W. W. (1924). The mathematics encountered in the general reading of newspapers and periodicals. Unpublished master's thesis, Department of Education, University of Chicago.
- Allen, W. H. (1910). Efficient democracy. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Company.
- Allen, W. H. (1912, December). Next steps in school efficiency. American School Board Journal, 15.
- Annual reports of the war department for the fiscal year 1903, Part 3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense.
- Antczak, F. J. (1985). Thought and character: The rhetoric of democratic education. Ames, IA: The Iowa State University Press.
- Apple, M. W. (1990). Ideology and curriculum. New York: Routledge.
- Ayres, L. P. (1913). Spelling vocabularies of personal and business letters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bagley, W. C. (1915). The determination of minimum essentials in elementary geography and history, part 1. In Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp 131-146). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.
- Bailey, T. A. (1966). The American pageant: A history of the republic. Boston: D.C. Heath & Company.
- Bailyn, B. Davis, D. B., Donald, D. H., Thomas, J. L., Wiebe, R. H. & Wood, G. S. (1977). The great republic. Boston: Little, Brown, & Company.
- Bellamy, E. (1967). Looking backward 2000-1887. Thomas, J. L., (Ed). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1904). A first book in English. New York: Silver, Burdett and Company.

- Bobbitt, J. F., & Egan, G. R. (1905). A second book in English. New York: Silver, Burdett and Company.
- Bobbitt, J. F., & Bobbitt, S. A. (1906). A first book in English (rev. 2nd ed.). New York: Silver, Burdett and Company.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1909a, June). Growth of Philippine children. The Pedagogical Seminary, 16, 137-168.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1909b, Spring). Practical eugenics. The Pedagogical Seminary, 16, 385-394.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1911a, November). A city school as a community art and musical center. The Elementary School Teacher, 12, 119-126.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1911b, December). The efficiency of the consolidated rural school. The Elementary School Teacher, 12, 169-175.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1912, Fall). The elimination of waste in education. The Elementary School Teacher, 12, 259-271.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1913a). Some general principles of management applied to the problems of city-school systems, Part 1. In The Supervision of City Schools, Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (7-96). Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company.
- Bobbitt, J. F., & Boyce, A. C. (1913b, December). Literature in the elementary curriculum. Elementary School Journal, 14, 158-166.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1914a, September). The school survey: Finding standards of current practice with which to measure one's own schools. Elementary School Journal, 15, 41-54.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1914b, September). The South Bend public schools: A survey by the department of education at the University of Chicago. Superintendent's Report of the School City of South Bend, Indiana. South Bend, Indiana: L. P. Hardy, Co.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1915a, October). High-school costs. The School Review, 23, 505-534.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1915b). The San Antonio public school system. San Antonio, Texas: The San Antonio School Board.

- Bobbitt, J. F. (1915c). What the schools teach and might teach. Cleveland, Ohio: The Survey Committee of the Cleveland Foundation.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1916). Report of the School Survey of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver, Pt. 2. Denver, Colorado: The School Survey Committee.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1917a). The curriculum situation, Survey of the St. Louis Public Schools. St. Louis, Missouri: Board of Education.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1917b, November). Summary of the literature in scientific method in the field of curriculum-making. Elementary School Journal, 18, 219-229.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1918a, January). The plan of measuring efficiency in a bay city. Elementary School Journal, 18, 343-356.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1918b, October). The building principal in the surveys. Elementary School Journal, 19, 106-120.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1918c). The curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1919a, May-June). Reading in the elementary schools of Indianapolis, v. the reading materials. Elementary School Journal, 19, 665-688.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1919b, December). Supervisory leadership on the part of the high-school principal. The School Review, 27, 733-747.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1920a, December). The objectives of secondary education. The School Review, 28, 738-749.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1920b, January). Mistakes often made by principals, Pt. 1. The School Review, XX, 337-347.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1920c, February). Mistakes often made by principals, Pt. 2. The School Review, XX, 419-434.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1921a, April). A significant tendency in curriculum-making. Elementary School Journal, 21, 607-615.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1921b, April). The actual objectives of the present-day high school. The School Review, 29, 256-272.

- Bobbitt, J. F. (1921c, May). Objectives of physical education. American Physical Education Review, 26, 229-234.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1922a). Curriculum-making in Los Angeles. Supplemental Education Monograph No. 20. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1922b). Educational objectives. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Public Schools.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1924a, October). The technique of curriculum-making in arithmetic. Elementary School Journal, 25, 127-143.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1924b, September-October). The new technique of curriculum-making. Elementary School Journal, 25, 45-54, 127-143.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1924c, October). Discovering and formulating the objectives of teacher-training institutions. Journal of Educational Research, 3, 187-196.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1924d, December). What understanding of human society should education develop? Elementary School Journal, 25, 290-301.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1924e). Functions of the high school principal in curriculum-making. Eighth Yearbook of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Washington DC: National Education Association.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1924f). How to make a curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1924g). The trend in the curriculum. In American Association of School Administrators. The Second Yearbook. Washington, DC: Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1925a). Individualizing the curriculum. In Adapting the Schools to Individual Differences. The Twenty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Part 2). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1925b, April). Education as a social process. School and Society, 21, 453-459.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1925c, May). Difficulties to be met in local curriculum-making. Elementary School Journal, 25, 653-663.

- Bobbitt, J. F. (1925d, June). Discovering the objectives of health education. Elementary School Journal, 25, 755-761.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1926a). Curriculum investigations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1926b). Orientation of the curriculum-maker. In G. M. Whipple, (Ed.). The Foundations of Curriculum-Making. Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education, (Part 2). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1926c). Character building in the new curriculum. Religious Education, 21, 472-476.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1928). Educational science and supervision. In J. F. Hosis (Ed.), Educational Supervision, The First Yearbook of the National Conference on Educational Method. New York: Bureau of Publications of Teachers College.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1929, January). Rebuilding the curriculum in line with its true function. Nations Schools, III, 13-16.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1931, September). The relation between content and method. Journal of Educational Sociology, V, 3-10.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1933, January). Social value of the junior high school curriculum. School Executives Magazine, LII, 179-181.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1934a, January). The basic curriculum of source-thinkers--A proposal. Curriculum Journal, V, 1-4.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1934b, August). Questionable recommendations of the commission on the social studies. School and Society, 40, 201-208.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1934c, December). Trend of the activity curriculum. Elementary School Journal, 35, 257-266.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1935a, January). Advancing toward the activity curriculum. Childhood Education, XI, 147-151.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1935b, April). General education in the high school. The School Review, 43, 257-267.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1935c, October). Modern curriculum. The Nations School, XVI, 21-23.

- Bobbitt, J. F. (1937a, May). Kindergarten. Childhood Education, XIII, 404.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1937b, May). A correlated curriculum evaluated. {Review of A Correlated Curriculum: A Report of the Committee on Correlation of the National Council of Teachers of English}. The English Journal, 26, 5, 418-420.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1941). The curriculum of modern education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1945). The postwar curriculum: The functional versus the academic plan. The School Review, 53, 77-84.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1946a, January 26). The unique work of Porter Sargent. {Review of Between Two Wars: The Failure of Education 1920-1940}. School and Society, LXIII, 68-69.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1946b, April). Foreign service effects. Phi Delta Kappan, XXVII, 8, 249-263.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1946c, May). Education or catastrophe. Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXII, 271-277.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1946d, June 1). The latest educational utopia. School and Society, 63, 395-396.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1946e, June). Harvard reaffirms the academic tradition. The School Review, 54, 327-333.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1946f, August). The educational policies commission banishes science. The Scientific Monthly, LXIII, 117-124.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1954, October). Letters. Changing Times, VIII, 47-48.
- Bode, H. (1924, October). Educational administration and supervision {Review of How to Make a Curriculum}. Book Review Digest, X, 89-91.
- Bradley, S., Beatty, R. C., & Long, E. H. (Eds.). (1956). American tradition in literature (Vol. 1). New York: Norton.
- Bryan, E. B. (1905). The basis of practical teaching. New York: Silver Burdett.
- Bryan, E. B. (1911). Fundamental facts for the teacher. New York: Silver Burdett.

- Bryan, W. L. (1895). Science and education. Proceedings and Addresses, National Education Association, 34, 161-165.
- Bryan, W. L. (1895). Child study--systematic and unsystematic. Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, National Educational Association, 34, 412-418.
- Bryan, W. L., and Bryan, C. L. (1898). The republic of Plato with studies for teachers. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Bryan, W. L. (1938). Farewells. Indiana University.
- Burnham, W. H. (1899, March). Economy in intellectual work. Scribner's Magazine, 18, 306-314.
- Burnham, W. H. (1901, June). An ideal schoolhouse. World's Work, 2, 866-871.
- Burnham, W. H. (1903, July). Principles of municipal school administration. Atlantic Monthly, XCII, 105-112.
- Burnham, W. H. (1903, October). Education as a university subject. Educational Review, XXVI, 236-245.
- Button, H. W. & Provenzo, E. F., Jr. (1989). History of education and culture in America. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Butts, R. F. & Cremin, L. A. (1953). A history of education in American culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Charters, W. W. & Miller, E. (1915). A course of study in grammar based upon the grammatical errors of school children of Kansas City, Missouri. Bulletin, Education Series No. 9. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, Columbia
- Charters, W. W. (1917). Minimal essentials in elementary language and grammar, Part 1. In Sixteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 86-110). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.
- Church, H. V. (1924). Eighth yearbook of the national association of secondary principals. Chicago: NASSP.

- Cook, W. A. & O'Shea, M. V. (1914). The child and his spelling. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Cremin, L. A. (1961). The transformation of the school-progressivism in American education 1876-1957. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Cremin, L. A. (1980). American education, the national experience 1783-1876. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Cubberley, Elwood P. (1934). Readings of public education in the United States. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Darwin, C. R. (1859 [reprinted 1900]). Origin of species. New York: Literary Classics.
- Darwin, C. R. (1871). Descent of man. London: J. Murray.
- Dean, A. (1918). Our Schools in war time-and after. New York: Ginn and Company.
- DeWulf, B. G. (1962). The educational ideas of John Franklin Bobbitt (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1962). Dissertation Abstracts International, 24/01, 170.
- Dewey, J. (1897, January). My pedagogical creed. School Journal, LIV, 77-80.
- Dewey, J. (1918). Vocational education in the light of the world war. Chicago, IL: Vocational Education Association of the Middle West.
- Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: Macmillan.
- Dobson, R. & Dobson, J. (1981). The language of schooling. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.
- Dobson, R. L, Dobson, J. E., & Koetting, J. R. (1985). Looking at, talking about, and living with children: Reflections on the process of schooling. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Eisner, E. (1967, Spring). Franklin Bobbitt and the science of curriculum-making. The School Review, 75, 29-47.
- Eldridge, R. C. Six thousand common English words. Privately printed.
- Eliot, C. W. (1909). Educational reform, essays and addresses. New York: The Century Co.

- Frazier, T. R. (Ed.). (1975). The private side of American history-reading in everyday life since 1865. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Good, H. G. (1962). A history of American education. New York: Macmillan.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gray, T. (1963). Gray, poetry and prose. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Gutek, G. (1970). An historical introduction to American education. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Gwynn, J. M. & Chase, J. B. (1969). Curriculum principles and social trends. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Hadley, A. T. (1907). Standards of morality. New York: Macmillan.
- Harap, H. (1924). The education of the consumer. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Hawkins, H. (1972). Between Harvard and America: The educational leadership of Charles W. Eliot. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hobson, C. S. (1943, January). Franklin Bobbitt: pioneer in curriculum making. Curriculum Journal, 14, 14-17.
- Hofstadter, R. (Ed.). (1963). The progressive movement 1990-1915. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hughes, J. (1970). Industrialization and economic history: Theses and conjectures. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Jackson, P. W. (1975). Notes on the aging of Franklin Bobbitt. The Elementary School Journal, 75, 119-133.
- James, M. M., & Brown, D. (Eds.). (1942). 37th annual cumulation review of 1941 books. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company.
- Jefferson, T. (1943). Notes and documents. Cedar Rapids, IA: The Torch Press.
- Jessup, W. A. (1915). Current practices and standards in arithmetic, part 1. In Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 116-130). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

- Jones, W. F. (1914). Concrete investigation of the material of English spelling. Vermillion, SD: University of South Dakota.
- Kent, J. D. (1984). The scientific curriculum-making theory as a conservative-progressive reform in an age of progressivism, 1914-1926 (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44/12-A, 3589.
- Kermode, F. & Hollander, J. (1973). The Oxford anthology of English literature (Vol. II). London: Oxford University Press.
- Kilpatrick, W. H. (1918, September). The project method. Teachers College Record, 19, 319-335.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1967). The curriculum field in retrospect. In Witt, P. F. W. (Ed.). Technology and the Curriculum (pp. 69-84). Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1975). Bureaucracy and curriculum theory. In Pinar, W. (Ed.), Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists (pp. 51-69). Los Angeles: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1986). The struggle for the American curriculum 1893-1958. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Knight, M. A., and James, M. M. (Eds.). (1925). 20th annual cumulation review of 1924 books. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company.
- Knoles, G. H. (Ed.). (1967). The responsibilities of power 1900-1929. New York: The Free Press.
- Larson, M. (1977). The rise of professionalism a sociological analysis. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.
- Larson, R. (1987, May). What Franklin Bobbitt might say if he could only see us now. Educational Leadership, 44, 4, 47.
- Link, A. S. & Catton, W. B. (1955). American epoch a history of the United States since 1900, (Volume I-1900-1920). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Locke, J. (1693 [reprinted 1964]). Some thoughts concerning education [John Locke on education]. Gay, P. (Ed.). New York: Bureau of Public Teacher College.

- National Education Association. (1918). Cardinal principles of secondary education: A report of the commission on the reorganization of secondary education. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Oliva, P. F. (1988). Developing the curriculum. Glenville, IL: Scott Foresman and Company.
- Ostrander, G. M. (1964). A profile history of the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Parkes, H. B. (1953). The United States of America: A history. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Patty, W. L. (1938). A study of mechanism in education, an examination of the curriculum-making devices of Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, and C. C. Peters from the point of view of relativistic pragmatism (Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1938, W1938, 0054.)
- Potter, R. E. (1967). The stream of American education. New York: American Book Company.
- Pulliam, J. D. (1982). History of education in America. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Reely, M. K., Sterling, A., & Rich, P. H. (Eds.) (1919). 14th annual cumulation review of 1918 books. New York: The Wilson Company.
- Regier, C. C. (1932). The era of the muckrakers. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Riis, J. A. (1971). How the other half lives. New York: Dover Books.
- Rippa, S. A. (1988). Education in a free society, an American history. New York: Longman.
- Ross, E. A. (1901). Social control: A survey of the foundations of order. New York: Macmillan.
- Rostow, W. W. (1975). How it all began: Origins of the modern economy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1917). Statistical methods applied to education. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rugg, H. O., & Shumaker, A. (1928). The child-centered school. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Schubert, W. H. (1986). Curriculum: Perspectives, paradigm, and possibility. New York: Macmillan.

- Sears, J. T. & Marshall, J. D. (Eds.). (1990). Teaching and thinking about curriculum, critical inquiries. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Seguel, M. L. (1964). The shaping of a field of specialization, curricular making: A critical study of selected writings of Charles and Frank McMurray, Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, Harold Rugg, Hollis Caswell, and John Dewey (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964). Dissertation Abstracts International, 26/03, 1467.
- Sellers, C. & May, H. (1963). A synopsis of American history. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Shapiro, H. (Ed.). (1968). The muckrakers and American society. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Snedden, D. (1925). Sociological determination of objectives in education. Philadelphia: J. B. Lipincott.
- Spencer, H. (1860 [reprinted 1896]). Education: Intellectual, moral, and physical. New York: Appleton, Century Crofts.
- Spring, J. (1990). The American school 1642-1990. New York: Longman.
- Stevens, E. & Wood, G. H. (1987). Justice, ideology, and education. New York: Random House.
- Stone, M. K. (1985). Ralph W. Tyler's principles of curriculum, instruction and evaluation: Past influences and present effects (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46/01-A, 66.
- Swados, H. (Ed.). (1966). Years of conscience. Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Company.
- Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. (1990). History of the school curriculum. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Taylor, F. W. (1903). The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1918). The measurement of educational products. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Education.
- Tyack, D. V. (1974). The one best system, a history of American urban education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Violas, P. C. (1978). The training of the urban working class, a history of twentieth century American education. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Wall, J. F. (1970). Andrew Carnegie. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Warner, H. L. (Ed.). (1971). Reforming American life in the progressive era. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation.
- Weinber, A. & Weinber, L. (Eds.). (1961). The muckrakers, the era in journalism that moved America to reform--The most significant magazine articles of 1902-1912. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Whipple, G. M. (Ed.). (1926) The foundations and technique of curriculum-construction, Part 1. curriculum-making: past and present. The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.
- Wilson, G. M. (1917). A survey of the social and business use of arithmetic, part 1. In Sixteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 128-142). Bloomington, IL: Public School Press.
- Wilson, H. B., Francis, J. H., Spaulding, F. E., Thompson, F. E., Woodly, O. I., Bobbitt, J. F., & Esmon, V. A. (1915). Minimum essentials in elementary school subjects--standards and current practices. Report of the committee on economy of time in education, part 1. Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 116-130). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Wilz, J. E. (1978). The search for identity--modern American history. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

VITA

Frederick M. Smiley

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: "INDOCTRINATIONS," "SURVEY AND CURRICULUM
SCIENCE," AND "TRANSITIONAL PHILOSOPHY:" A THREE-
STAGE REASSESSMENT OF FRANKLIN BOBBITT

Major Field: Curriculum and Instruction

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Yuba City, California, April
13, 1943, the son of Lester B. and Claire L.
(DeChesne) Smiley.

Education: Graduated from Concordia High School,
Oakland, California, in June, 1966; received
Associate of Arts from Yuba College, Marysville,
California, in June 1963; received Bachelor of
Arts Degree in English from California State
University at Chico, Chico, California, in July,
1966; received Master of Arts Degree in Education
from Chapman College, Orange, California, in May,
1973; received Master of Arts Degree in English
from Chapman College, Orange, California, August,
1978; received Master of Arts Degree in Special
Education from Chapman College, Orange,
California, August, 1982; received Doctor of
Philosophy Degree from University of Santa
Barbara, Santa Barbara, California, January, 1982;
received Doctor of Education Degree from Oklahoma
State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, December,
1992.

Professional Experience: VISTA Volunteer, Burley
Junior High School, June 1977 to June, 1988;
Teacher of English, Coach, and Vice Principal,
McDermitt High School, Instructor of English,
Northern Nevada Community College, McDermitt,
Nevada, September 1978 to July, 1980; Resource
Specialist and Coach, Eagle Mountain High School,
Eagle Mountain, California and Instructor of

English, College of the Desert, Palm Springs, California, September 1981 to July, 1986; Special Education Teacher and Group Leader, Quaezar Corporation, Bridgeport, Connecticut, September 1986 to July, 1987; Teaching Associate in English, Oklahoma State University, September 1987 to July, 1988; Consultant and Trainer, Bilingual Education Multifunctional Resource Center at University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, September 1988 to June, 1990; Graduate Assistant in Curriculum and Instruction, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, August, 1990 to August, 1991; Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, Cameron University, Lawton, Oklahoma, July, 1991 to the present.