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PREFACE

One of the difficulties in doing a study of this kind was the necessity of orienting myself to a different frame of mind as the treatment of each individual was undertaken. It was like shifting gears from high to low and then back to high as I approached the valleys and hills of the thinking of these four individuals as it related to curriculum-making.

Yet the study was personally rewarding for it gave me the unique opportunity of looking at the nature of the curriculum process in a multi-dimensional setting. I have a strong belief that if educators are to be successful in developing adequate and relevant curriculums for today’s educational needs, it will be incumbent upon them to approach the problem by incorporating the thinking and ideas of a number of significant persons whose focuses are different but yet who have something important to say about the nature of the curriculum process.
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INTRODUCTION

Although the interest in the nature of the curriculum has been of educational importance to man since his early civilized years, modern curriculum development, as it is known today, had its origin in the early years of the 20th century, especially during the period under investigation for this study.

Modern curriculum thought grew out of the demands created by an ever-increasingly complex technological and industrial society. By the turn of the century, it was no longer expedient nor popular to develop the curriculum of the school along the traditional "armchair" model as used during the 19th century. The new century demanded a more scientific orientation for the development of curriculum.

It was in the context of a society in transition that Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, Booker T. Washington, and W.E.B. DuBois had their greatest impact on the schools. Basing their educational practices and theorizing on sociological realities, they developed curricula along lines relevant to the needs and problems of a transitional period.
Chapter 1  
OVERVIEW AND STATEMENT  
OF  
PROBLEM  

Booker T. Washington, Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, and W.E.B. DuBois were educators concerned with the nature of a more adequate education for young people. Each saw contradictions in what the public schools, educational institutions, and other social agencies were offering or what was suggested to be offered. Each was dissatisfied with many of the specific training programs offered for young people to help them to meet, adapt to, and understand the problems and develop the skills essential to their adult roles in society. Each of these men, who were contemporaries, had different experiences which molded his educational philosophy. These differing experiences and consequent philosophies clearly shaped the proposals they, in turn, made to alleviate the problems they saw in the training of young people in the schools of their times.

Public education in America, at the turn of the century, was being transformed by the growing complexity, industrialization, and technolization of society. The complexity of society projected its image in other areas of
social relations — the ways man made a living, how he wor-
shipped, the speed of his communication with others. In
the schools themselves, the picture had changed. The
7,000,000 pupils enrolled in the public schools in 1870 in-
creased to 15,500,000 in 1900, the 300 public high schools
of 1860 to over 6,000, and the twelve state normal schools
of 1860 to 175. At the end of the century, there were al-
most 500 colleges, about double the number in 1860. The
traditional subject matter approach to curriculum as taught
in the schools, i.e., knowledge for knowledge's sake, came
under increasing criticism as "non-utilitarian" in a utili-
tarian, technological age. Educational training, it was
thought by some, should lend itself to more practical ends
or to the idea that the useful is the good and that the
determining consideration of the right education should be
the usefulness of its consequences.

The period also was an age of science and the mode of
the day was to apply the method of science to all the ac-
tivities and problems of mankind. Such was the case in
education. So intent were educators on applying the method
of science to educational problems that the period has gen-
erally been referred to as the "Scientific Movement in Ed-
ucation."

The mood of the age is captured somewhat in the ob-
servation by Harold Rugg given below:
"Under the leadership of Thorndike, Judd, Cubberly, Strayer, Terman, Whipple, Freeman, Gray, and others, the quantitative method began to be applied to the solution of educational problems. The fact-finding era was launched; it was the day of the question-blank and the school survey. Learning was being experimentally investigated in the laboratory; 'tests' had entered the classroom. Thorndike had made available the statistical procedure of the British biometricians (1903); standard deviations and coefficients of correlations were in the air. Promotion plans, the elimination and retardation of children, school buildings, the relation of efficiency of instruction to size of class, the measurement of educational products, and the objective investigation of educational processes—all these and other matters of administrative importance were being studied by the new quantitative technique."¹

It was in this general setting that Washington, Charters, Bobbitt, and DuBois emerged as strong educational influences and the need to know the impact they had on American education deserves a thorough analysis both in the historical context in which it evolved and in the parallels it has in the contemporary scene.

The work of the curriculum maker is broad and entails a number of details and concerns. Rugg stated that there are three definite jobs involved in curriculum-making.

1. The determination of fundamental objectives, the great purposes of the curriculum as a whole and of its several departments.

2. The selection of activities and other materials of instruction, choice of content, readings, exercises, excursions, topics for open-forum discussions, manual activities, health and recreational programs.

3. The discovery of the most effective organizations of materials and their experimental placement in the grades of the public schools.¹

Tyler identified four fundamental questions which must be answered in developing any curriculum and plan of instruction. These are:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?

2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?

3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?

4. How can we determine whether those purposes are being attained?²


Franklin Bobbitt defined curriculum-making in terms of the learner performing the activities of some occupation.\(^1\) He termed his process as "activity analysis" which a more detailed comparative account will be made in the present study in relation to the work of Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois.

Washington and DuBois, in terms of the guidelines specified by Rugg, Tyler, and Bobbitt, were curriculum developers. In his program at Tuskegee Institute, Washington attempted to answer the four fundamental queries as posed by Tyler, establish and operate a school based on the curriculum principles specified by Rugg, and, before Bobbitt, sought to achieve his ends through a specification of activities designed to culminate in a predetermined end.

Whereas Washington was concerned with curriculum as an administrator, DuBois viewed curriculum-making from his academic chair at Atlanta University. He brought to the curriculum specialty of education the unique and broad experience of a social scientist. And this background loomed large in his educational outlook for he insisted, throughout his life, with an indomitable persistence of will, that the education of

black people must first seek the complete training of the best of the black populace so that in turn they could lead the black mass to useful and full lives in a highly technological American society which freedom from slavery had so suddenly thrust upon them.

This study juxtaposes the theories of four individual points of view to determine how each contributed to a body of curriculum development knowledge. Also, it intends to analyze the implications of their work with respect to its effectiveness in meeting the needs of public education in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Many thoughtful critics assert that some of the difficulties in developing meaningful curriculum grow out of a lack of historical understanding. In our ignorance of history often we fail to build on what is already known. An historical educational perspective helps to cast many issues regarding curriculum building in a more meaningful context and furnishes insight into current perplexities.

Stated more specifically the problem, then, is: (1) to explicate the nature of curriculum theory and practice in the so-called activity analysis approach as exemplified in the work of W. W. Charters and Franklin Bobbitt, two of the foremost exponents of this approach; (2) to analyze the educational philosophies of Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. DuBois, two black educators who were contemporaries of Char-
ters and Bobbitt; (3) to establish the historical and sociological context in which the four individuals were theorizing; (4) to generate some generalizations which will help explore possible relationships with present day educational problems.

II. **Importance of the Problem**

The justification for the study centers on four substantial concerns. The first concern is with the nature of the curriculum process itself and the individuals who are involved in the process. Some men are "curriculum makers" and some are "experts in making curriculum." The development of this notion along with its corollaries in program development merits attention.

The study also assumes importance in that it proposes to demonstrate both a philosophical basis and a working model of a prototypical curriculum based on that philosophy. The curriculum field today is segmented, in part, because curriculum developers tend to perceive of or to concentrate their efforts on one or two aspects of the curriculum-making process rather than by attempting to build a program by viewing the whole operation. In effect, most contemporary efforts focus on the "micro" aspects in contrast to what might be thought of as "macro" amplification.

Thirdly, earlier curriculum makers were forced by the pioneering nature of the curriculum field to take a "ges-
talt" perspective of the process of curriculum making. The groundwork laid by them provided later curriculum makers with the terminology, concepts, principles, generalizations and a larger conceptual framework from which to arrive at curriculum decisions. This hypothesis in itself is significant for if it holds up under investigation, it provides the historical foundation for the generation of a more adequate conceptual base for current curriculum making.

The study has a fourth dimension in its possible implications for the matter of "black curriculum making." It will probe the thinking of two black educators, at the turn of the century, who participated in curriculum formulation affecting the lives of black children and youth. From the investigation, undoubtedly, will emerge some corollaries for the present emphasis on incorporating the study of the black experience in the curriculum of the public schools.

III. **Methods and Procedures**

The investigation will employ the philosophical-logical mode of inquiry; both analysis and synthesis will be involved. In this sense, it is a "sociology of knowledge" study similar to the classic investigation of C. Wright Mills, who in his retitled dissertation, *Sociology and
Pragmatism,¹ examined not only the origin of certain of Charles Pierce's, William James', and John Dewey's ideas but also explicated the context in which they were generated, i.e., the thinking of certain individuals who were also "at work" at the same period of time.

In addition to the work of C. Wright Mills as a model or guide to the theoretical development of this study, the writer also found quite useful the theory advocated by Glaser and Strauss called, generally, insight and theory development.² According to Glaser and Strauss, "the root sources of all significant theorizing is the sensitive insights of the observer himself."³ These insights can come in the morning or at night, suddenly or with slow dawning. They can be derived directly from theory, one's own or someone else's, or occur without theory. Also, his insights may appear just as fruitfully near the end of a long inquiry as near the outset.

This summation of theory based on insight has some methodological corollaries: 1) the first corollary is that the researcher can get — and cultivate — crucial in-


³Ibid., pp. 251-258.
sights not only during his research, and from his research, but from his own personal experiences prior to or outside it; 2) a related corollary is that such insights need not come from one's own experience but can be taken from others. In this case, the burden is on the researcher to convert these borrowed experiences into his own insights; 3) a third corollary pertains to how fruitful insights can be gotten from existing theory. No researcher can possibly erase from his mind all the theory he knows before he begins his research. An insight, whether borrowed or original, is of no use to the theorist unless he converts it from being simply an anecdote to being an element of theory.

The study is viewed as an initial, heuristic effort. As such, it will be constrained by the traditional limitation that characterizes philosophical-logical inquiry. It is expected to raise fresh questions that must be subjected to more formal empirical testing before large generalizations can be made. The study is, in effect, a demonstration of what sociologists call "middle range" theorizing based on the more familiar mode of theorizing called the "grounded theory" for qualitative research.

IV. Place and Organization of the Study

Historically, very little has been done to show the parallel development of the thinking of black and white ed-
ucators as it relates to curriculum making or curriculum development. The assumption seems to hold that curriculum problems were primarily a concern for white educators and that black educators had little or no imput into the problems related to the development of programs, teaching material, instructional strategies, and other curriculum matters. Therefore, one aspect of this study attempts to show black educators "at work" developing instructional strategies, educational experiences, activities, and materials for the training of black youngsters, and for others who might find something useful in their way of developing educational purposes.

Curriculum making as a special area of study did not come into its own until the 1920's. This study, by also concentrating on the curriculum-making efforts of two well-known pioneers in the field, Franklin Bobbitt and W. W. Charters, provides: (1) a background for an understanding of the historical development of the field of curriculum making; (2) a way of studying the parallel interests of black and white educators as they dealt with problems of a curriculum nature; and (3) an understanding of the social context from which curriculum problems and solutions emerge.

It may be asked why Bobbitt, Charters, Washington, and DuBois were selected for study rather than some other educators. A surface perspective might suggest that these men
are non-parallel in their status as educators and therefore would have different impacts on the problems of education which caught their attention. First of all, the social and political status of the men were not factors in their choice. Neither were they the only educators of significance during this era who had an influence on the educational problems of the time. It would require only a small amount of research to prove this statement.

These men were selected because they had something definite to say about the nature of the curriculum-making process, and what they said provides a basis for a historical study of the educational specialty of curriculum development. What they said about the curriculum influenced the work of other educators.
Chapter 2
FRANKLIN BOBBITT AND THE ACTIVITY ANALYSIS THEORY OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

The first person to be studied from the quartet of selected individuals having interest in curriculum-making during the early years of the twentieth century is John Franklin Bobbitt. The treatment accorded him as outlined in the present study builds around three rather general developments as seen from writings by and about him.

The discussion of the period from 1876 to 1909 points out some significant early experiences which are foundational to his later educational efforts. The second period beginning with 1909 notes Bobbitt launching a new career at the University of Chicago which led to an emphasis on educational administration. During the same time Bobbitt had developed an interest in curriculum development, but this emphasis took second seat to his concern for building a strong foundation for his work in the field of educational administration. By 1917, Bobbitt could finally turn his attention to curriculum theory and curriculum development, an interest which he pursued to the end of his professional career.
I. Biographical Incidents Influencing His Early Thought

Not a great deal is known of the family life of John Franklin Bobbitt. What little is known, however, does lend itself to an understanding of his interest in education and his particular impact on educational development in the first half of the twentieth century.

Born on February 16, 1876, Bobbitt grew up in southern Indiana and attended the public schools of his community. He evidently had entertained quite early in life the notion of becoming a teacher. At the age of 17, after the completion of high school, Bobbitt began his teaching career in the rural schools of southern Indiana remaining there from 1893 to 1902. As was typical of the time, he did not receive his bachelor's degree until after he had taught for some eight years.

One of the first steps Bobbitt took after graduating from the University of Indiana in 1901, which had a bearing on the later development of his thought, was to go as an instructor to the Philippine Normal School in Manila in response to a call for teachers there. During the first few years of the United States' occupation of the Islands after the Spanish American War, American authorities had tried to

---


2 Ibid.
hasten the modernization of the pretechnological culture there which appeared to them to be needlessly primitive and costly in life and suffering.¹

Bobbitt, together with six other Americans who had been teaching and supervising for several years in the Islands, preparing native teachers for the new schools, was chosen to help. Being American, they worked especially hard on establishing the "right kind of schools" which would hasten the acculturation intended. They were asked to draw up an overall elementary school curriculum for the Islands. Referring to this earlier experience several years later, Bobbit recalls:

"It was a virgin field in which we were free to recommend almost anything by way of meeting the needs of the population. We had an opportunity to do a magnificent and original constructive piece......And what did we do? We assembled upon a table in the committee-room copies of the American textbooks in reading, arithmetic, geography, United States history, and the other subjects with which we had been familiar in American schools. We also assembled such American courses of study as we could find; and without being conscious of it, we mobilized our American prejudices and preconceptions as to what an elementary school course ought to be. On the basis of these things, we made out a course of study for the traditional eight elementary grades. We provided the traditional amount of each subject for each grade, distributed them as in American schools, and recommended American textbooks for the work. The thing was not adapted to the conditions within the Islands.

As a matter of fact, we did not try to adapt it to those conditions — though we honestly thought that we were doing the thing needed. Fortunately for the people, the Director of Education was better able to look at essential realities; he cut the course down to six grades, unceremoniously threw out irrelevant materials, and without regard for the time-hallowed sanctities, brought bodily into the course a number of things then far more than now regarded as superficial and plebeian, such as shop-work, cooking, sewing, weaving, rug-making, etc. We were properly horrified.  

The Philippine experience was quite revealing to Bobbit. Never having been confronted with the problem of organizing and developing a curriculum from the ground, Bobbit emerged from the experience with a broader perspective of curriculum-making and with a philosophical basis from which the content and activities of a curriculum derived. Heretofore, Bobbitt never considered socially useful knowledge as an organizing basis for curriculum development. He would develop an interest in curriculum-making later during his professional years.

On his return to the United States in 1907, Bobbitt attended Clark University where he elaborated earlier growth studies he had made on Philippine children. For Bobbitt, whose traditional notions of curriculum content had already

---


2. Ibid., p. 282.

received the shock of contact with sociological reality, the choice of Clark for his graduate work was fortunate. Clark, under its President, G. Stanley Hall, had developed into a center of study and research on the stages by which each child recapitulates the development of the race.¹ The given nature of these stages was seen by the theorists as the pattern by which to select school content and activities.

This approach by the Clark educational staff was a shift from the older view that the child had to adapt himself to the content presented to him. Now, under the new philosophy, content was to be selected primarily as it was useful to the child at his particular stage of development. The graduate work that Bobbitt did at Clark in adapting the course of study to the stages of normal growth in Philippine children brought into harmony his widening vision of the interrelationship of child, society, and the curriculum.²

His first university post was as Instructor in Educational Administration at the University of Chicago in 1909. By 1909, Bobbitt had come a long way in developing a curriculum philosophy. His Philippine experience had awakened

²Ibid. p. 78.
his consciousness to learning, guided by social reality.\textsuperscript{1} The theoretical framework current at Clark opened up new challenges to his mind. Since his work at Chicago begins the second period of his professional life, to this period the attention of the reader is directed.

II. Bobbitt and the Scientific Management Movement 1909–1917

When Bobbitt assumed the post of instructor in educational administration at the University of Chicago, there was no graduate field of educational administration.\textsuperscript{2} He with others, therefore, began to create it, working from the basis of their preparation in other fields. At that time, educational administration was a good choice for a person interested in overall decisions on curriculum.\textsuperscript{3}

It was fortunate for Bobbitt that his first teaching position after completing his doctorate was in educational administration, and educational administration at the University of Chicago. As a new field, educational administration was still viewed from an experimental point of view, and at the University of Chicago Bobbitt was permitted great

\textsuperscript{1}Franklin Bobbitt, \textit{The Curriculum}, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1918, p. 78.


\textsuperscript{3}\textit{Ibid.} pp. 180, 181.
leverage in developing the course of study along lines based on his own educational notions. It appears that the two years after 1909, Bobbitt was attempting to establish a base from which he could develop a model for deriving principles of educational administration.\(^1\) His thinking received a fresh impetus in 1911 from the publication of a book by Frederick Winslow Taylor in 1910 on scientific management in industry.\(^2\) Attention to industrial efficiency was not new, but the wide popular interest in the idea on part of college professors and government officials made Taylor's account of it welcomed. The theory was applied for the first time in 1912 to a university, and the school survey movement, in which Bobbitt participated, was soon launched.\(^3\)

The key to Taylor's theory was that the standards set for the finished product would provide quality control of the whole processing function.\(^4\) Taylor substituted supervision by means of working directions covering the whole process of production from supervision through personal authority. His theory suggested to Bobbitt that the fundamental

---


tasks of management were about the same whether carried on in schools or in factories, and the analogy set Bobbitt to thinking about education as an example of a process to be managed similar to the processes found in industry.¹

At the same time, Bobbitt was attempting to develop a frame of reference for a model of educational administration. He took note of an experiment already two years in operation in nearby Gary, Indiana, under the direction of William Wirt, a former student of Dewey's at Chicago. Wirt had tried to reconstruct the Gary schools according to Dewey's notion of the school as an "embryonic community life, active with types of occupations that reflect the life of the larger society and permeated throughout with the spirit of art, history, and science."²

In so doing, Wirt found himself involved in reworking the school organization and eventually the institutional organization as Dewey had predicted anyone would who tried seriously to work the curriculum.³ Typical of the changes at Gary were the platoon system by which children were freed

²Ibid. p. 79.
³Ibid.
from class recitations and the lockstep of the graded school. Supervision was transformed from a set of orders, percolating down through the system to a relative autonomy of action in each functional part of the school and a coordination of them all through joint planning and attack on problems.¹

At first, Bobbitt saw in Gary an example of what he and his colleagues should have done in the Philippines — use the school as a lever of social progress.² Upon an even closer examination of the Gary plan, he began to think about the school organization itself as a means of carrying out educational purposes. Generally speaking, by 1912, through the influence of Taylor, Bobbitt had found the model for educational administration for which he had been searching since 1909. The logical next step was to make application of this system to his own thinking.

In an article published in February, 1912, entitled, "The Elimination of Waste in Education,"³ Bobbitt made the first extensive and systematic effort to present the Gary

²Ibid. p. 79.
plan as a manifestation of the principles of scientific management in the schools. According to Bobbitt, the schoolmen in Gary had two alternatives in attempting to solve the educational problems of the new, rapidly growing, industrial center that had been created by the United States Steel Corporation.¹

One alternative would be to "build inferior buildings, omit playgrounds, school gardens, laboratories, workrooms, and assembly halls, to employ cheap teachers, to increase the size of classes, to cut down the yearly term to eight months, or to accommodate two shifts of children in the same building each day by doing half-time work." The other alternative was to create a thoroughly modern school plant, equipped with every modern necessity; then to 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.² Since Bobbitt saw in the Gary schools an effort to adapt the principles of scientific management, he concluded that that system had followed the second alternative.

In the "Elimination" article, Bobbitt presented his

²Ibid. p. 262.
version of the principles of scientific management and then
described how each had been applied in the Gary schools.
The principles were stated as follows:

1. A first principle of scientific management is
to use all the plant all the time.

2. 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.

3. A third principle of efficient management is
to eliminate waste.

4. A fourth principle of general scientific man-
agement is: Work up the raw material into
that finished product for which it is best
adapted.¹

The rest of the article is a description of how the
Gary school system adapted the above principles to its sit-
uation.

Almost a year after the publication of his article on
"Elimination of Waste," Bobbitt wrote another article on
scientific management. His work was published in 1913 as
part of the Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the
Study of Education, under the title, "The Supervision of
City Schools."² This society, which included in its mem-

¹Franklin Bobbitt, "The Elimination of Waste in Educa-
tion," Elementary School Teacher, XII  Feb., 1912, p. 262–
268.

²Franklin Bobbitt, "The Supervision of City Schools,"
Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of
Education, Part I, Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
1913, pp. 7–96.
bership most of the leaders in American education, exerted a great influence, chiefly through the publication of its yearbooks which were the most important annual professional publications in the field.¹

Bobbitt, undoubtedly, had been selected to write the yearbook by the committee of the National Society because of the earlier publication. His task in writing the yearbook was to apply the Taylor system to the problem of educational management and supervision.

In his introduction Bobbitt stated his purpose and justified the undertaking on the ground that in all co-operative endeavors, whether in the field of manufacturing, government, philanthropy, or education, the "fundamental tasks of management, direction, and supervision are always about the same."² Then Bobbitt indicated that he had studied Taylor's writing very carefully as he listed the essential tasks of management in all organizations, including the schools, as follows:

"In any organization, the directive and supervisory members must clearly define the ends toward which the organization strives. They must co-ordinate the labors of all so as to attain those ends. They must find the best methods of work, and they must

¹Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962, p. 79.

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. This requires direct or indirect responsibility for the preliminary training of the workers before service and for keeping them up to standard qualifications during service. Directors and supervisors must keep the workers supplied with detailed instructions as to the work to be done, the standards to be reached, the methods to be employed, and the materials and appliances to be used. They must supply the workers with the necessary materials and appliances. They must place incentives before the worker in order to stimulate desirable effort. Whatever the nature or purpose of the organization, if it is an effective one, there are always the directive and supervisory tasks.\footnote{Franklin Bobbitt, "The Supervision of City Schools," Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913, p. 7, 8.}

The substance of the work was divided into seven major sections, each with a statement of the principles to be followed. The first major section was devoted to "standards" and two of his basic principles were:

Principle I - Definite qualitative and quantitative standards must be determined for the product.

Principle II - Where the material that is acted upon by the labor processes passes through a number of progressive stages on its way from the raw material to the ultimate product, definite qualitative and quantitative standards must be determined for the product at each of these stages.\footnote{Ibid. p. 11.}
Bobbitt directed approximately half of his attention to a discussion of the above principles so indicating their importance. Other major sections included treatment of "Methods," "Qualifications of Teachers," "Preliminary Training of Teachers," "Training During Service," "Definiteness of Instructions," "Other Principles." Each of these major sections was followed by a set of principles to be implemented.¹

Bobbitt's interest in educational matters until 1917, as has been indicated, focused around administrative concerns. In the same issue in which he connected scientific management with the Gary Plan, there appeared another article by him dealing with consolidation of rural schools in which he attempted to show the consolidated rural school as more efficient than one-room schools in providing more effective and systematic instruction.²

Late in 1913, he published another article which indicated to some extent, his duel concerns for curriculum con-


tent as well as administration.\textsuperscript{1} One of the devices used
to gather information about various aspects of the total
school setting was the use of the school survey. Bobbitt
conducted several of these surveys among which were the San
Antonio\textsuperscript{2} and Denver\textsuperscript{3} ones. In these surveys, Bobbitt at-
ttempted to show how the training guided by the school
should support the needs of the community. He made an ef-
fort to organize subject areas around social needs developed
in the local surroundings.\textsuperscript{4}

Thus by 1917, Bobbitt moved more and more in the direc-
tion of curriculum development in the larger context as it
was facilitated by the administrative organization of the
school. His Los Angeles study, which appeared in 1924,
marks a definite turning point. The discussion which follows
focuses on his method of curriculum making.

\textsuperscript{1}John Franklin Bobbitt, et. al., "Literature in the
Elementary Curriculum", Elementary School Teacher, Volume 14,
Number 4 (December, 1913), pp. 158-166.

\textsuperscript{2}John F. Bobbitt, The San Antonio Public School System -

\textsuperscript{3}Franklin Bobbitt, General Organization and Management,

\textsuperscript{4}John Dewey, The School and Society, Chicago, Illinois:
University of Chicago Press, 1900, p. 44.
III. Bobbitt's Curriculum Focus and Educational Philosophy
1918-1941

Bobbitt's administrative expertise was a natural foun-
dational preliminary to his later curriculum-making interest. In a sense it was a relatively easy shift. Organizational restructuring necessitates program alterations.1 A major question which should also assist in an understanding of Bobbitt's basic curriculum-making considerations demands atten-
tion: On what basis does Bobbitt evolve his method of curriculum development?

His model of curriculum-making was indeed a very in-
teresting, although a rather mechanical one. Education, in
his thinking, must be viewed in terms of ends or goals. To
Bobbitt, schools were not geared to do everything for those
it served, but it had a responsibility to do something. That
something to Bobbitt was the evolution of an "ideal adult." The curriculum, in his notion, was a series of steps or pro-
cesses along a continuum through which the raw material
(the student) had to pass.2

Bobbitt used as the basis of his curriculum model the
transportation business from the industrial world.3 He took

1Mary Louise Sequel, The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years, New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia Uni-

2Ibid.

3Ibid. pp. 81, 82.
note of what the transportation industry expects of a steel company which services it steel rails. The ultimate product in this case, is a steel rail that meets the specification required by the transportation industry. The steel company bases its work of producing steel rails on the specifications as established by the transportation industry. If the steel company follows specifications, then it was more than likely to make the product required by the requesting party. ¹

Bobbitt thought that industry then provided the school system the analogy needed for the work required of it. The school would compare to the steel company or factory, the child to the raw material, the ideal adult to the finished product, the teacher to an operative, the supervisor to a foreman, and the superintendent to a manager. The curriculum, therefore, could be thought of as whatever processing the raw material (the child) needed to change him into the finished product (the ideal adult). ²

Using the Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Bobbitt explained his analogy calling


it "Some General Principles of Management applied to the
Problems of City-School Systems." He listed eleven prin-
ciples of management, but gave over half his attention, as
noted earlier, to the first two, evidently judging them of
crucial importance. The eleven principles were given spo-
ratically as follows:

Principle I - Definite qualitative and quantita-
tive standards must be determined for the product.

Principle II - Where the material that is acted
upon by the labor processes passes through a num-er of progressive stages on its way from the raw
material to the ultimate product, definite quali-
tative and quantitative standards must be deter-
mimed for the product at each of these stages.

Principle III - Scientific management finds the
methods of procedure which are most efficient for
actual service under actual conditions, and secures
their use on the part of the workers.

Principle IV - Standard qualifications must be de-
termined for the workers.

Principle V - The management must train its work-
ers previous to service in the measure demanded by
its standard qualifications, or it must set up en-
trance requirements of so specific and detailed a
nature as to enforce upon training institutions the
output of a supply of workers possessing the desir-
able qualifications in the degree necessary for en-
trance into service.

Principle VI - The worker must be kept up to stand-
ard qualifications for his kind of work during his
entire service.

Principle VII - The worker 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.
Principle VIII — 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.

Principle IX — Responsibility must be definite and undivided in the case of each task to be performed in the total series of processes.

Principle X — Incentive must be placed before the workers so as to stimulate the output on their part of the optimum product.

Principle XI — In a productive organization, the management must determine the order and sequence of all of the various processes through which the raw material or the partially developed product shall pass, in order to bring about the greatest possible effectiveness and economy; and it must see that the raw material or partially finished product is actually passed on from process to process, from worker to worker, in the manner that is most effective and most economical.¹

It must be remembered that when Bobbitt in talking about the product was really talking about people. As the transportation industry set the specifications for the steel rails, the community, in the case for students, would set the specifications for the ideal adult.

Bobbitt's own summary statement of the curriculum, or the process by which the standard product is produced, is the following:

"To summarize these matters: (1) As a foundation for all scientific direction and supervision of labor in the field of education, we need first to draw up in detail for each social or vocational class of students in our charge, a list of all of the abilities and aspects of personality for training by which the school is responsible. (2) Next we need to determine scales of measurement in terms of which these many different aspects of the personality can be measured. (3) We must determine the amount of training that is socially desirable for each of these different abilities and state these amounts in terms of the scales of measurement. (4) We must have progressive standards of attainment for each stage of advance in the normal development of each ability, in question. When these four sets of things are at hand for each differentiated social or vocational class, then we shall have for the first time a scientific curriculum for education worthy of our present age of science."\(^1\)

Bobbitt's notion of the educational process led him to believe that educational outcomes followed definite laws or principles, and that these could be known through an inquiry or scientific approach. Once known, and in order to make them operative, superintendents, principals, teachers had to cooperate to insure the smooth and effective applications of the principles to educational outcomes.\(^2\)

The time which elapsed between 1913 and his next treatise called The Curriculum, published in 1918, witnessed an

---


\(^2\)Ibid. p. 50.
attempt by Bobbitt to broaden the base of his original notion of the ideal adult and the "scientific curriculum" to achieve that end, to one which took into account the particular culture in which this ideal adult would live.

Bobbitt acknowledged in the introductory section of his book the rapidly changing culture which awaited the emerging adult:

"Since the opening of the 20th century, the evolution of our social order has been proceeding with great and ever-accelerating rapidity. Simple conditions have been growing complex. Small institutions have been growing large. Increased specialization has been multiplying human interdependence and the consequent need of coordinating effort. Democracy is increasing within the Nation; and growing throughout the world. All classes are aspiring to a full human opportunity. Never before have civilization and humanization advanced so swiftly."1

The ideal human being who would live in a culture with both the potential and the problems of modern technological America should be equipped to make the most of this evident social need, Bobbitt contended. Education should develop in the adult the powers and abilities which would enable him to work for social cooperation.2


Bobbitt's ultimate goal, then, of an ideal adult living in a rapidly developing, complex technological society, leads naturally to his method of curriculum formulation.

He treats the matter extensively in his pioneering work on the curriculum. In The Curriculum published in 1918, he opens with a call for curriculum-making along scientific lines. An age of science demanded exactness and particularly in establishing educational objectives.¹

To understand Bobbitt's curriculum-making stance, one must understand something of his educational philosophy. Education, in Bobbitt's ordering, existed on two levels of experience.² One sought the ability to live as an end; the other looked to the ability to produce as an end. Currently, the proponents of these two educational ends were at odds with one another. But in actuality they were both essential to the unfolding of the human potential. Bobbitt recognized the situation by taking note of it in the following manner. "Now, which side is right? Doubtless both are right. It is like asking the question, 'Which shall the tree produce, the flower or the fruit?' It must produce both or it will not

²Ibid. p. 3.
perform its full function. We have here simply to do with two levels of functioning, two levels of educational experience, both of which are essential to fullness of growth, efficiency of actions, and completeness of character.\textsuperscript{1} He described these two levels as the "play-level" and the "work-level."

Having related his basic educational philosophy, Bobbitt was faced with defining the role of the school in performing the functions of education. He does so later in the book by stating that educational experiences must take place where they can be normal and be acknowledged. Frequently this is not done in the schools.\textsuperscript{2} If the school can do the better job of training, then the school should have the responsibility. The training needs to be taken care of where the work can be normal, not where it may be most convenient for teachers.\textsuperscript{3}

The work to be done in organizing an efficient educational program necessitates a technique of curriculum-making along scientific lines. The theory around which the tech-

\textsuperscript{1}Franklin Bobbitt, \textit{The Curriculum}, Chicago: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1918, pp. 5, 6.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid. p. 34.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid. p. 35.
nique of curriculum-making was to be developed, Bobbitt said, 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. However, numerous and diverse they may be for any social class, they can be discovered. These will show the abilities, attitudes, habits, appreciations, and forms of knowledge that men need. These would be the objectives of the curriculum.¹

The above consideration led Bobbitt to define the curriculum in two ways: (1) as the entire range of experiences, both undirected and directed, concerned in unfolding the abilities of the individual. By the undirected, Bobbitt meant that general kind of education one gets by participation in the community life. By directed, he meant the conscious directed training of systematized education. The curriculum is also (2) the series of consciously directed training experiences that the schools used for completing and perfecting the unfoldment.²

When the curriculum is defined, as including both di-


²Ibid. p. 43.
rected and undirected experiences, then its objectives are the total range of human abilities, habits, systems of knowledge, etc., that one should possess.¹ These will be discovered by analytic survey. The curriculum-discoverer will first be an analyst of human nature and of human affairs. His task at this point is not at all concerned with "the studies", - later he will draw up appropriate studies as means, but he will not analyze the tools to be used in a piece of work as a mode of discovering the objectives of that work. His first task rather, in ascertaining the education appropriate for any special class, is to discover the total range of habits, skills, abilities, forms of thought, valuations, ambitions, etc., that its members need for the effective performance of their vocational labors; likewise the total range needed for their civic activities; their health activities; their recreations; their language; their parental, religious, and general social activities. The program of analysis will be no narrow one. It will be wide as life itself. As it thus finds all the things that make up the mosaic of full-formed human life, it discovers the full range of educational objectives.²

²Ibid.
In his first major work, then, on the curriculum, entitled *The Curriculum*, Bobbitt in essence lays down some basic guidelines which those interested in curriculum-making should follow in order to achieve a viable and efficient curriculum. The book can also be looked upon as a realization of his long-time interest in the problem of curriculum development as a mode of restructuring education.

The next major curriculum work by Bobbitt appeared in 1924 and resulted from a plan of approach to curriculum problems as employed in his Los Angeles study which was completed earlier in the same year. The six intervening years had allowed him to give more attention to his preliminary observations developed in 1918.

Generally speaking, Bobbitt does several things in his book, *How to Make a Curriculum*. First, he re-defines or clarifies the end to be sought in curriculum-making. Secondly, he gives an example of a preliminary survey of activities which should comprise a curriculum. Thirdly, he organizes these activities into major fields of human action. Fourth, he analyzes each major field into more specific activities. Fifth, he establishes a set of objectives encompassing the activities of each of the major fields, and finally, sixth, he formulates a list of pupil activities and experiences which entail each of the objectives mentioned.

In line with his previous position, Bobbitt restates
his earlier conviction that the ideal adult life is the end to be sought as an educational outcome. He elaborates on this point by stating that education is primarily for adult life, not for child life. Its fundamental responsibility is to prepare for the fifty years of adulthood, not for the twenty years of childhood and youth.\footnote{Franklin Bobbitt, \textit{How to Make a Curriculum}, Chicago: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924, p. 8.}

Bobbitt wrote \textit{How to Make a Curriculum} for the professional curriculum developer and this fact is evident throughout the work. In doing this he discusses the several tasks, understandings, and responsibilities inherent in the work of a curriculum-maker.

One of the initial responsibilities of the curriculum-maker is to organize the broad range of human experience into major fields. Bobbitt does this but suggests that other categorizations were possible. His major areas, as noted earlier, were:

1. Language activities; social inter-communication.
2. Health activities
3. Citizenship activities
4. General social activities - meeting and mingling with others.
5. Spare-time activities, amusements, recreations.

6. Keeping one's self mentally fit - analogous to the health activities of keeping one's self physically fit.

7. Religious activities.

8. Parental activities; the upbringing of children, the maintenance of a proper home life.

9. Unspecialized or non-vocational practical activities.

10. The labors of one's calling.¹

What Bobbitt does next is to divide and re-divide these major fields into hundreds of specific objectives and then suggest how these could be encompassed in a statement of objectives to be implemented in a curriculum.²

Bobbitt's writings after 1924 reflect a broadening conception of his notions about curriculum development in the overall educational process. His two major textual works, The Curriculum (1918) How to Make a Curriculum (1924), evidenced a noticeable tendency toward a mechanistic approach to the educational process in the sense of the outcomes to be sought. Critics, analyzing Bobbitt's earlier approach,


²Ibid. passim.
were led to disclaim his mechanical inclination to curriculum construction. ¹ To over stress his earlier endeavors, however, is an injustice to Bobbitt and does not take into account the evolving nature of his curriculum theorizing and processing.

The first major indication of his broadening conception of curriculum theorizing came in 1926 with the publication of an article by him in the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. The entire issue gave attention to the problems of the "Foundations and Techniques of Curriculum Construction." Professor Bobbitt's article was entitled, "The Orientation of the Curriculum-Maker."²

This article is more than a summary of his earlier views. Here his focus is on the curriculum-maker himself—his understanding of human life; his perceptions of the learner and society, his formulation of educational objectives and purposes; the quality of thinking which he brings


to the curriculum-making task; the process whereby the ends of education are achieved.

"Education is for the social purpose of elevating the character of human conduct above what it would otherwise be" is his re-statement of what education is all about.¹ This conduct, Bobbitt argues, which is to be elevated in character, is in part child conduct; in part it is the conduct of youth; and in part it is that of mature men and women."² This statement is much different than the statement "education is primarily for adult life, not for child life" made in 1924. The task of education, he continues, is to assist childhood, youth, and adulthood to hold to levels of performance of their activities which are high for the age in question.³ "the all-inclusive objective of education is to hold high at all times and ages the quality of human being."⁴

Another evidence of Bobbitt's evolving curriculum is


²Ibid.

³Ibid. p. 42.

⁴Ibid.
his notion that the curriculum should be so constructed that the individual becomes self-reliant.\textsuperscript{1} To accomplish this end, the curriculum-maker must strive to build a curriculum that focuses its attention on the individual because life in its essence is an individual affair and any educational decision relating to the correct education must of necessity have the individual as its focus.\textsuperscript{2}

These considerations led Bobbitt to conclude that education should be administered with a view to giving individuals of whatever age the greatest possible amount of individual freedom, so long as the freedom is accompanied by a sense of responsibility.\textsuperscript{3} The task of the curriculum-maker is to make the curriculum fit the individual as guided by teacher and parent.\textsuperscript{4}

The curriculum-maker, therefore, in order to do an adequate job, must conceive of curriculum-making in behavioral terms. To Bobbitt, this meant full advantage of the findings resulting from educational science.\textsuperscript{5}

\begin{footnote}
\end{footnote}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{2}Ibid. p. 45.
\item \textsuperscript{3}Ibid. pp. 44-46.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Ibid. pp. 47-51.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Ibid. p. 50.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Thus it might be concluded that Bobbitt's position on curriculum development had evolved considerably since his first major effort in 1918; from one of education for a future goal (ideal adult) to one of education for a living present.

As the capstone of his career, Bobbitt wrote his final major work fifteen years later in 1941. In a sense, it is a philosophical treatise integrating subject matter, in-school and out-of-school experiences around the general concept of the "good life"\(^1\) which he feels should be the ultimate aim of the curriculum.

The lengthy quotation below captures the mood of Bobbitt's final statement about curriculum and also concludes the discussion on Bobbitt:

"Man has been upon the earth, relatively, but a short time. He has found the place a vast surprise to him. But he has been looking it over, trying to discover the natures of things, how they operate, and what he is to do about them all. He is yet greatly perplexed about most of them; but he is rapidly extending his information. It is amazing the number of things his roving mind has been able to discover in the few score generations since he arrived upon earth with no key to anything...He has found numerous things that are good for him - things that he can use for his profit - and numerous others that are hurtful in varying degrees - things that he finds

---

he would best avoid....In the degree in which he discovers the natures and values of things he is enabled to chart his life. By laying out his course with a view to taking advantage at every step of whatever has been proved good, and of avoiding as fully as he can whatever is known to be harmful, he achieves the life that is the best he can compass at this early stage of the human advance. To live such a life at its best seems to be the most remarkable achievement that this world has yet brought forth. It gives to each human being who can find it all of the good that the world at its present stage has to offer. Understanding is a man's guide. He has found that it is only proved knowledge that is reliable enough to show him the natures, relations, possibilities, and values of things. He has further learned that it is the most complete and accurate knowledge that guides him with the greatest degree of certainty and consistency.

The matter of guidance is complicated by the fact that a person finds the life that is best for him only as he finds it from the beginning. Even the way he 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. During infancy and early childhood, as his understanding grows, he can guide himself a little, while his parents do most. 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. By late youth or early adulthood, his own knowledge of the things of his daily concern should have so well rounded itself out as to be a fairly well-matured specimen of mankind's best understanding. In the degree in which this occurs he routes his own course and steers it; parents and teachers stand aside. The operation of his own understanding is an essential portion of his living the good life.\(^1\)

Chapter 3
WERRETT WALLACE CHARTERS: "FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS" – AN EXPANSION OF THE CONCEPT OF ACTIVITY ANALYSIS

Werrett Wallace Charters, like Bobbitt, became interested in curriculum designs relatively early in his professional career. Bobbitt's interest in curriculum grew out of an initial appeal to educational administration and the Deweyan notion that changes in the curriculum design must be preceded by modifications in the administrative structure. Charters' concern with curriculum emerged from a desire to improve the act and method of instruction. Notwithstanding, both men would arrive at comparable modes of developing curriculum models.

Joseph Kirschner divides Charters' work into three periods.¹ His first major organizing idea, the notion that "structure follows function," seems to have greatly influenced his work in the period from 1904 to 1917. By 1917 Charters had added the idea of "job analysis" to that of "structure follows function." Franklin Bobbitt had al-


47
ready employed this device to educational problems, and it appears likely that Charters got the idea from Bobbitt although that fact is not certain. Charters seems to have regarded job analysis as a technique for identifying the substance of structure and function in a given curricular problem. The technique of job analysis largely occupied Charters attention from, roughly, 1917 to 1919, while he was at the University of Illinois.

In the period from 1919 until 1925, he came to realize that job analysis, as a technique, was too limiting to deal with the really important curriculum problems.\(^1\) Job analysis, he thought, however, subtly done, did not appear to touch the larger problems related to a function. He, therefore, coined another concept and operation called "functional analysis." The notion of functional analysis seemed to him a more appropriate device for analyzing complex activities required in an industrial society. Functional analysis was his most comprehensive method for dealing with curriculum problems, and it is the technique for which he is best known.

After 1925, Charters was also occupied with education

---

by radio, but he did not refine the technique of functional analysis any further. The concern in this chapter is to follow the development of his thinking leading to the acceptance of the technique of curriculum construction known as "functional analysis."

I. Biographical Information and Early Career During the Years 1875 to 1909

Whether Charters' method of curriculum formulation was directly influenced by Bobbitt's earlier procedure as outlined in his book, The Curriculum,¹ published in 1918, or by Frederick W. Taylor's book on industrial efficiency published in 1910,² the method of creating curriculum on the basis of specific activities was definitely extended by Charters. Bobbitt and Charters, in the second and third decades of the twentieth century, were leading exponents in the movement to create a scientifically structured curriculum which Charters would label as "functional analysis."

Born in Hartford, Ontario, in Canada, in 1875, he, like Bobbitt, began as a teacher in the rural schools, in Rockford, Ontario, at the early age of eighteen.³ Just out


³Ibid.
of college in 1898, he became principal at the Hamilton Model School in connection with McMasters College in Toronto from where he had also received his AB degree. He left the Hamilton Model School in 1901 and moved on to a Ph.D. in Methods of Teaching History at the University of Chicago, studying under Dewey, whom he acknowledged to have influenced him deeply. Upon completion of his doctorate work in 1903, he became associated with the Minnesota State Normal School in Winona, where he was an instructor in Education and a supervisor of practice teaching. In 1907, he moved on to the University of Missouri becoming Professor of Theory of Teaching and serving as Dean of the School of Education for a part of those years, from 1910 to 1917.  

His stay at the University of Illinois where he had moved in 1917, was comparatively short. The two years here he spent as Professor of Education and as Dean of the School of Education. The next four years, 1919-1923, Charters served as Professor of Education on the faculty of the Carnegie Institute of Technology and as Director of a new experiment called the Research Bureau for Retail Training.

---


At the University of Pittsburgh, where he worked from 1923 to 1925, Charters was part of the time, Dean of the Graduate School and later served as the Director of the Research Bureau for Retail Training which had been established here as well.\textsuperscript{1} By 1925, Charters had returned to the University of Chicago, where, now, he was a colleague of Bobbitt. His professional career ended with a fourteen year stay at The Ohio State University where he served as the Director of the Bureau of Educational Research until 1942, when he became professor emeritus. He did continue working, however, in an unofficial capacity for a number of years afterward. He died in 1952 and was buried in Canada.\textsuperscript{2}

Charters' curriculum focus can be seen in the light of his early experience and background. Unlike Bobbitt, who was oriented around educational supervision and management, Charters was a teacher of teachers and his curriculum focus parallels the teacher's concern with knowledge and content. His concern always was with what would work in practice, a notion gained from studying under Dewey and which would be a guiding principle throughout his professional life.\textsuperscript{3}


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.

An interesting parallel emerges in the careers of Bobbitt and Charters, early in the 1900's, which had an influence on their later curricular formulating. Both Bobbitt's and Charters' curricular concerns developed from an early significant experience. Bobbitt's Philippine encounter, previously noted,\(^1\) in which he was faced with the task of determining an appropriate curriculum for the Philippine Islands, started his interest in curricular problems. Charters' significant experience occurred in 1907, at the beginning of his career at the University of Missouri as a professor of Theory of Teaching. It was here where he came in contact with what he himself later called a "significant laboratory school." Known as the University Elementary School, it had been established there in 1904 by Junius L. Meriam, a former student of Dewey's at Teachers College, Columbia University.\(^2\)

Meriam was attempting to embody in practice Dewey's emphasis on the child. Child activities, such as observation on field trips and excursions, play, stories, both constructive and expressive handwork, together with much


discussion, constituted the curriculum of the University Elementary School. Charters found Meriam's method of selecting and organizing the curriculum thought-provoking, and observation of the school's practice led him to make some rather searching criticisms of Meriam's apparent neglect of content. For example, he wondered whether the improvement of the normal activities of children would, as Meriam contended, best prepare them for adulthood. He felt that the traditional school subjects were being neglected. He questioned whether children didn't need a number of learnings that the free flow of activities in Meriam's school might not happen to provide. Charters' own favorite selection from the ideas of Dewey was the emphasis on the social character of education. If subject matter were created originally to satisfy social needs, as Dewey had suggested, it was surely evident that such needs were continuing. Charters wondered whether there was some subject matter that must be taught to satisfy them.¹

The Meriam experience forced Charters to rethink his understanding of Dewey. Charters once contended that Dewey's philosophy would bear little fruit in the world at large until educators got down and did hard work. One of

the things the world needed, he thought, was educators who could interpret philosophy in a valuable way to people as a whole.

In Charters' attempts to interpret Dewey's philosophy, three meanings were found and used in practical situations. One meaning has been expressed in the idea that "structure follows function." The second is the idea that learning is problem-solving. The third is the idea that learning takes place within a social setting. The first meaning was the one which Charters made explicit in much of his work. The second and third meanings, while often not explicitly stated, were used by Charters in his discussions on such topics as methods of instruction and motivation taken from the area of psychology.¹

As Charters saw it, an organism functions in certain ways as a response to its needs and its environment. The structure of the organism evolves, and in doing so provides the tools that aid it in carrying out its various functions. He first applied this concept to the teaching of history. The title of his doctoral dissertation, "Methods of History Instruction: As Influenced by the Function-

al Phase of Subject Matter," published in 1904, suggests the method he would use with gradual modifications over the next twenty years. In the dissertation, that subject matter called history is seen to be an instrument constructed by individuals for solving problems, i.e., gaining control of specific aspects of the environment.

The events of history, according to Charters, are a series of problems that arise and are solved with the solutions giving rise to further problems. Thus the structure called "history" is developed to aid in the function of problem-solving. For the student, light is thrown on present problems by studying events in history. One could study the problem of telling the truth by reading the history of George Washington or determine what our policy ought to be with regard to say, the Philippines. History, then, is erected as a structure to serve the function of helping to solve problems.¹

Charters' first book, Methods of Teaching, written in 1909 shortly after his acquaintance with Meriam's school shows the influence on his thinking of Dewey's act of thought as expressed in How We Think, and the Herbartians' concern with correlation, motives, and apperception, as

well as their five formal steps of preparation, presentation, comparison, generalization, and application.\textsuperscript{1}

But a more important consideration of \textbf{Methods of Teaching} than the Dewey/Harbartian influence is the fact that in this book Charters sets down, for the first time, his own philosophical notions of education in general and teaching in particular. Speaking of the function of teaching, he states, "The purpose or function of teaching is to assist pupils to appreciate and control the values of life."\textsuperscript{2} The most important term in the definition is "values of life" because all motives for action are based on values. If an orator, for example, wishes his hearers to follow his advice, he must make them feel that what he advises is worth their while; that what he says is true; and that what he asks is good for them. If he fails in this, they will not follow him. Or again, if a salesman desires to sell an article to a customer, he must demonstrate that the article will be useful in gaining something that the customer wants. Otherwise there will be no purchase. The same situation exists with the teacher. If a teacher wishes his pupils to perform an assignment, he, the teacher, must


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid. pp. 9-23.
make them feel that it has some value or it will not be done.¹

What are these values of life to which Charters refers? The range of human values, contends Charters, is as broad as life itself. Hopes, aspirations and ideals, joys and sorrows, business, family and church, are valuable in differing degrees. Avoidance of punishment, approbation of teachers and of associates, arithmetic, history, geography, games, sleds and toys, all, may possess charms for the developing child. Whenever an action is observed, however, some value has prompted it.²

When thinking about society's concern for instruction of its young, the aims of education for the young evolve from what that society considers great human values. Thus Socrates' concerns for universals, or the increasing value of the "individual" which brought on the French Revolution are good examples.

The purpose of teaching was stated to be the assistance given to pupils to aid them in appreciating and controlling the values of life. To appreciate, according to

¹W. W. Charters, Methods of Teaching Chicago: Row, Peterson and Company, ¹⁹⁰⁹, p. ¹⁹.
Charters, means to estimate properly. To appreciate the values of life means to estimate properly the values of life. One function of teaching, as Charters continues, is its business to assist the pupils to value highly the most worthy values and to place less value upon those lower in the scale of worth. Appreciation is of two kinds — intellectual and emotional. A person may know that honesty is a good thing, but he may not feel it in the sense that it becomes a subjective motive for the practice of honesty. The business of teaching is to assist pupils to appreciate in both senses, to have them know the values of life and to have them esteem, prize, and love them.¹

The other aspect of Charters' definition of the function of teaching is the assistance given pupils to control values of life. By this Charters means that if students are to have values of life they must know how to reach their ideals. If the child has a capability for aesthetic enjoyment, he should be shown how to be of social service in the use of that value. If he desires to live a spiritual life, he should be assisted to gain skill to live it.

The assistance to be given pupils by the teacher was

not non-directed assistance. The problem of assisting pupils depends for solution upon two factors. First, it is necessary to determine as carefully as possible (1) the ways in which the child mind acts in securing control, and (2) the subjective values that are resident in children.¹ The more the content of the child's mind and his method of working it are ascertained, the less waste will be necessary in teaching. Second, teachers must know what values are most highly appreciated by society and what methods of control it has worked out through the ages, so that those who instruct pupils can interpret and guide the child, thus making him efficient by having him adopt values and methods of control that the human race is already using.²

As a Herbartian, Charters differed from Charles McMurray who underestimated the usefulness of mediate interest as a means of heightening motivation. Quoting from William James, Charters notes that any object not interesting in itself may become interesting through becoming associated with an object in which interest already exists. The practical situation was precisely the one in which the child felt the strongest need. If a boy did not like arith-


²Ibid., p. 23.
metic but did like horses, Charters felt that the teacher should use the boy's interest in horses to motivate an interest in arithmetic. Thus Charters wove his procedure for selecting and organizing content around the twin themes of socially useful knowledge and child motivation. Speaking of subject matter as a means of satisfying social needs, Charters wrote:

"All subject matter has been created and preserved by the race to satisfy needs and solve problems, and that in the schools such parts of this subject-matter as satisfy the most fundamental needs are taught to pupils. Any unit of subject matter is best presented when the need for whose satisfaction it is preserved is potentially or actually present in the experience of the pupils. To complete a practical description of this conception as applied to teaching, it has been found necessary to discuss the methods of arousing the appropriate needs and the conditions under which they are found present, and to investigate the methods pursued by experience both in satisfying these needs and in securing the maximum degree of such satisfaction."¹

To those who would question the implications of this point of view as it relates to the problem of school discipline and the authority of the teacher, Charters left no doubt where he stood. In answer to the question, "are pupils expected to study subject matter if they do not feel

the need for it?" Charters answers emphatically, "Authority is the buttress of the school; but other motives than that of mere obedience to authority may and should be used. When other motives fail, recourse should be had to obedience, to the study of subject-matter merely because it is prescribed by the school authorities."¹ Charters respected the role of the teacher too much to be caught advocating teacher submission to student uncertainty.

As early as 1909, Charters was asserting elements of the methods of curriculum-making which he was later to formulate in the twenties. For example, he contended that any knowledge which survived in the struggle for intellectual existence has done so because it has continued to meet a recurring human need. This notion of the persistence of need was to be basic to Charters' activity analysis. He was to regard man's current activities as essentially methods of solving persistent needs. In the activity, he was to discern not only the need but the knowledge that had had survival value in the satisfaction of this need.²


In Methods of Teaching, Charters also attributed the structure of an organized subject to the function for which the subject was organized and according to its method of use. As he made this analysis of knowledge and method, he came very close to the point of looking directly at them both as they functioned in adult activities in society.¹

II. Charters' University of Missouri Years, 1907-1917

Charters had been studying with Ella Flagg Young of the University of Chicago when the opportunity was offered to him to come to the University of Missouri.² He accepted the position on the basis that he would have opportunities to test in practice some of the educational theories which he had borrowed from Dewey and others which he had gained from various sources.

During the ten years Charters remained at the University of Missouri, he was able to accomplish several things. Generally speaking, two rather large developments took place which are essential if an understanding of Charters' curriculum formulating methods are to be appreciated. First,


he seemed to have had a strong desire to do something to improve teaching or the instructional process. To do this he undertook to study those aspects of teaching which he felt would bring improvement to instruction. Here he dealt with such areas as psychology, minimum essentials, subject matter, and teaching methods.\textsuperscript{1} Closely related to his concern with improving teaching, Charters also was interested in making the teaching process more efficient. This interest led him into the area of research, an area which appeared to have a growing concern with him, and its implications for efficient instruction. It is from the latter emphasis that he turned his attention toward the actual development of curriculum.\textsuperscript{2}

In the general concern to improve teaching, Charters attempted to find a psychological basis for understanding the learner. Psychology, he felt, would give a scientific account of ways experience operates to secure efficiency in learning. Moreover, it would give him certainty that he was not setting up artificial aims and that he was not using ineffectual methods.

\textsuperscript{1}Joseph Kirschner, Education As Technology: Functional Analysis in the Writings of W. W. Charters, 1904-1925, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1966, p. 44.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 42.
One of the first psychological concepts which he considered was that of motivation. In order to explain the nature of motivation, Charters began with the psychological conception of interest. He distinguished between two types—immediate and mediate.\textsuperscript{1} Interest is immediate if the activity, in which one is concerned, is of value in itself, whereas it is mediate if the activity is used to control some other value. Whether the activity is interesting in itself or not, the important thing for Charters was that interest had an object. On this point he observed, "the activity of the pupil is going somewhere, is directed at some object."\textsuperscript{2} This latter concern proved to be the psychological basis for his analysis of activities in the school to the level of working units.

As important as interest is for efficient teaching, "needs" must also be considered. Needs tend to focus the consciousness of the learner by stressing both his mistakes and failures and problems to be solved. Thus, through the very nature of needs, the pupil is better able to see the use of subject matter.\textsuperscript{3}


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., pp. 150-156.

The difficulties faced in learning a subject matter suggested to Charters a point of attack in improving the efficiency of teaching such subjects as spelling, language, and grammar. Once a problem situation exists, if interest is stimulated, and needs are focused upon, then motivation can be brought to bear to move the learner to action.¹

For Charters, subject matter is formed, when difficulties which cannot be handled by subject matter already formed, are met. Or, in other words, it is created in response to some need.² Thus it is a way of acting as people seek to control values by way of some sort of action.

Subject matter then is of two types, according to Charters. It is a response to problems arising in the past (traditional subject matter), or a relatively new subject created to meet a new problematic situation.³ In either case, once a subject matter is created, Charters would use it in a variety of situations to aid in the solution of future problems.

It has already been indicated that Bobbitt developed concern for curriculum making as it applied to the actual

²Ibid. p. 33.
³Ibid. pp. 33, 34.
administration of the school. Charters, on the other hand, became more and more interested in curriculum formulation as it applied to the improvement of teaching and more particular as he attempted to apply the investigations of research to the teaching process.

Charters' opinions about the researcher's role in matters of theory and practice should be made manifest. According to Charters, to be completely immersed in theoretical matters is too likely to isolate one from practical day-to-day concerns. Therefore, the educational researcher's task ought to be one of trying to make theory operative in practical situations in the schools.

During his first three years at the University of Missouri, Charters attended a number of institutes known as Reading Circles, a type of Chautauqua, very popular during the first decade of the twentieth century. At these institutes, which he attended either as an observer or lecturer, Charters met many teachers and administrators throughout the state of Missouri. Out of these contacts came his early concern with a functional English program. He saw the need for developing the teaching of English with functional concepts in mind.¹

In a 1910 project, Charters was concerned with revising the structure of school spelling courses in order to enable spelling, as a skill, to function effectively in all writing. Specifically, he spoke to the points of spelling efficiency, and individualization. To make more efficient spellers, Charters proposed the setting up of a spelling "hospital" in the classroom. How well one's spelling ability functions in his daily writing is the test of who enters the "hospital." One is admitted if he misspells more than one word per page in his written work. On admittance he spends two hours a week on his individual spelling difficulties, only to be released when his spelling functions accurately in all writings.¹

Other projects indicative of the early interests of Charters in improving teaching were carried out with William P. Evans. For instance, Evans and Charters worked on a course of study calling for a simplified phonetic spelling. The plan was to make use of Noah Webster's idea of making the spelling of English more nearly phonetic and thereby enabling it to function more effectively.²


²Evans was a State Superintendent for the State of Missouri Department of Education with whom Charters exchanged much correspondence between the years 1910 and 1916.
Early in 1916, Charters addressed himself to improvement in methods of teaching agriculture. The problem he saw at this time was that of description and dissemination of efficient methods of teaching. Additional needs were for experimental investigation of effective methods as well as statistical analysis and scientific measurements. To the latter two needs, experimental investigation and statistical analysis and measurement, he had already begun to address himself as early as 1915 in the studies on minimum essentials in language and grammar.

For Charters, the quest for minimum essentials provided another avenue for his trying to improve teaching by striving for a functional curriculum. The structure that he sought, particularly that of English courses, was one that functioned in the lives of the students and the community at large.

In 1915, the National Society for the Study of Education published its yearbook on Minimum Essentials in Elementary School Subjects - Standards and Current Practices. This yearbook and the ones for 1917 and 1918, were essentially developments of an earlier concern for economy of

---


2 Ibid.
time and efficiency in education. The notion appeared in earlier curriculum studies that the curriculum had accumulated considerable dead wood that needed to be chopped out. The various curriculum surveys after the 1890's were concerned with increasing efficiency in education by eliminating the useless and spelling out the minimum essentials needed for social effectiveness.¹

It was in just such an educational milieu that Charters was working around 1915. In language and grammar study, for example, he was concerned with what would actually function in practice. If certain rules being taught in the grades did not function in the student's daily writing jobs, then it was to this point that the educational researcher had to address his work.²

In 1915 Charters published a course of study in grammar based on the errors of school children. For the next two years he collected various studies made in language and grammar. In bringing together the various studies Charters had two purposes: (1) making a descriptive survey of several studies of language errors in 1915 and 1916, and (2)

²Ibid. p. 39.
constructing a grammar curriculum. The idea of focusing on errors was based on the notion that people are more interested in learning rules for the purpose of improving their writing plan than in learning rules for rules' sake. He notes that given the limited amount of time the child is in school the teacher can capitalize on the learning handicaps of the students.¹

Charters' curricular manipulations of language, spelling, and grammar led him to consider a functional English program. In his attempt to create a functional English program, he was to gain considerable insight on other curricular problems.

Charters was interested in three aspects of curriculum study leading to a functional English program. First, a researcher must analyze errors so as to tabulate the elements and arrange them in order of importance. Second, he must designate and evaluate those grammatical elements which will give assistance in reaching the objectives discerned. Third, he must investigate the values and controls that are to be taught to the children. This latter aspect reflects

Charters' conviction that in any curriculum certain values and ideals are to be transmitted to children.¹

Charters' research with a course of study in grammar illustrates his method of attacking curricular problems. In regard to this, one may recall that the theory behind the method is that the learner is motivated to learn to the extent that his needs are brought into the picture. Hence, to build a course of study based on errors being made in that endeavor is to bring the learner and the subject matter together.²

Another area of teaching Charters gave consideration to was that of teaching methods. In his studies of teaching methods he sought to apply two ideas he attributed to Dewey: (1) learning as problem-solving; and, (2) structure follows function. All teaching methods have the transmitting of facts as their objective. He defines these facts as solutions to problems in or out of school which are useful or will be useful in the future in solving problems. He further classified facts into three types: 1) information-


al, 2) attitudinal, and 3) valuational.\textsuperscript{1}

Over a period of time Charters assessed several teaching methods in an effort to find the most efficient means of conveying essential learning. One method which attracted his attention in 1917 was the project method of William H. Kilpatrick.\textsuperscript{2} It was not a new method to him for he and his wife used it in 1911. The method to Charters must involve the solution of a problem and culminate in action in its natural setting. The project method appealed to him because of its efficiency in carrying out the task it sets out to do. The strength lies in its appeal to the interests of the learner and its practicality and function.

Certain limitations, however, obstructed its complete utilization. Teachers may present projects that have interest to them but not to the learner. Projects may involve activities of great or little value for meeting individual or social needs. Often projects require more outside work than in-school work thus placing limits on the guidance from the teacher. Since facts are learned in limited particular project situations, there is a danger that


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid. pp. 44-48.
important life facts may be omitted.

Charters also used the "multi-problem" method which he found circumvented many of the limitations of the project method.\textsuperscript{1} He felt this approach more amenable. For one thing, subject matter lines remained intact providing greater correlation between subjects. Also in the multi-problem method, facts are learned when they are needed, thereby making them more interesting and learnable. The facts learned are actually being used. For example, in studying the geography of the New England states, the teacher might begin with a problem such as: Might New England have developed into a powerful nation? The pupils would respond to this problem by speaking to and researching such queries as: Is New England large enough? Is it self-supporting? Charters further considered this method effective in producing a technique of reasoning in order to solve problems.

Yet, it, too, had certain limitations. Since materials are not systematically organized, there is a need to supplement this method with the systematic treatment of units of subject matter at appropriate times. Unless problems are

selected with great care pupils may fail to learn all the important facts.\(^1\)

It was the "systematic topic method" which provided for Charters the most efficient means of conveyance of learning.\(^2\) Facts were taught in a systematic way and not in response to demands for their immediate use. The dominant advantage of the systematic topic approach was that if facts are wisely selected the topic contains all of the facts that are important and they can be found when they are needed.

Thus, the issue of methods of teaching merge with content of teaching and the effectiveness of teaching. What should be taught as well as how it is to be taught was to occupy Charters' attention for at least the next ten years. The notion that the structure of a given subject matter, that is, its systematic, logical development was an outcome of an agreement reached by many scholars about ways of coping with a particular situation, was to be applied to the technique of functional analysis in curriculum construction.

Charters' accomplishments during his University of


\(^2\)Ibid. p. 50.
Missouri years were numerous. Perhaps the most important one was the discovery of a method of research with which he could function effectively. This method was a technology of education. It was technology in that it involved his applying the notion that "structure follows function" to a number of practical educational matters, such as subject matters to be taught and methods of teaching.

When Charters left the University of Missouri, he had come to understand the problems of uniting theory with practice. He had accepted Dewey's challenge of making theory practical by, among other things, attempting to write a curriculum for Stephens College, a Baptist women's college in Columbia, Missouri. He had been accepted to work on this project because of his own strong affiliation with the Baptist ministry in that area of the country.

Two years after leaving Columbia, Charters worked at the University of Illinois. However, he was not totally happy with his experience partly because David Kinley, the President of the University of Illinois, was not very much interested in professional education. Yet by 1919, Charters had worked out in practice his theory or concept of functional analysis. In his remaining professional life,

---

1 Interview with Ralph Tyler. Tyler was a student and a colleague of Charters at the University of Chicago and The Ohio State University.
he would gain finesse in its use.

III. **Charters Pennsylvania Years, 1919-1925**

For six years Charters remained in Pennsylvania, at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, and then, at the University of Pittsburgh. These years would prove quite productive in his career.

Charters, in 1919, was offered a position to head the training of retail people at the Carnegie Institute. So he went there and eventually became dean of the graduate school. He worked with the faculty in designing a curriculum to educate college people for retail positions.¹ In developing one of the first vocational curriculums, Charters showed how the functions of retail positions could be analyzed to identify the things which the faculty had to do to operationalize a program, and, then, he helped develop a curriculum which would give the learner the skills and understandings to do it. By now he was using his functional technique.

Generally speaking, Charters, by 1919, was using functional analysis to cope with two problems: (1) selection of educational objectives, and (2) the alignment of them

¹Interview with Ralph Tyler. Tyler was a student and a colleague of Charters at the University of Chicago and The Ohio State University.
with activities to be undertaken in a school situation.\textsuperscript{1} Prior to this time, his approach had been to seek minimum essentials within traditional subject matters. These subjects had been analyzed in order to find those aspects that were most useful for the learner's efficient functioning in society.

From around 1919 on, Charters was increasingly interested in applying a technique of analysis to broad aims of education. These included such categories as training teachers and pharmacists, and fostering ideals.\textsuperscript{2} The method of functional analysis was to be used to reduce broad aims to the level of concrete particulars. The assumption Charters was to make was that abstractions, or aims, could be broken down into concrete, behavioral increments that could be learned by the students. By such reductions it was hoped that the series of activities to be performed would lead to understanding and utilization of the abstract aims. Thus the issue of joining theory and practice in education, he thought, would be met.\textsuperscript{3}


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid. p. 82.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid. pp. 82, 83.
A. Procedure and Technique of Curriculum-Making

It may clarify matters to discuss Charters' technique of curriculum construction and give his procedure of curriculum making.

First of all, the technique of curriculum construction, made popular by Charters, known as functional analysis, grew out of the method of job analysis used in industry, first clearly formulated by Frederick Taylor and others as early as 1910, and which, by the early twenties, had become a large-scale undertaking. Speaking candidly on this part of his professional work some years later, he said:

"The building of curricula by the functional analysis method has been carried farther than elsewhere in the field of vocations. On the other hand, the trades are relatively simple in their operations, and are relatively superficial, so far as the theory underlying practice is involved in the use of good methods. In order to be a satisfactory plumber or carpenter, one does not need to have a great mass of so called "fundamental' information on which to base his practice."¹

He indicated also that the technique of job analysis had been given a tremendous boost by the aid of the federal government:

"...the support given to vocational education through the Smith-Hughes Act shows itself in

at least two ways. First, some funds are provided by the Federal Board for research into curriculum-organization; and second, many of the Smith-Hughes officials situated both in Washington and in the outlying states have sufficient leisure and clerical assistance to make it possible for them to work out courses of study on the functional basis."

Although the designations "job analysis" and "functional analysis" were sometimes used interchangeably, Charters preferred the term functional analysis because job analysis, he said, had restricted connotations. Both, however were basically defined the same way.

"The function of job analysis [functional analysis] is to determine what activities are carried on by individuals in the performance of tasks. It is a deliberate and persistent attempt to apply the method of analysis to constellations of activities from the functional point of view."\(^2\)

As a method of curriculum construction it, functional or job analysis, assumes that the function of a curriculum is to provide material for efficient performance, conduct, and behavior.\(^3\)

The method of functional analysis works most easily with simple operations. In simple operations such as mak-


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 214.
ing an apron, cleaning a fish, or sawing a board, the analyst would simply list the duties or performances which are undertaken in carrying through to completion the activity to be analyzed. Charters was careful however not to confuse the terms "duty or performance." There is no line of demarcation, he states, between duties and their performance, because the methods of performing any duty are simply the details constituting a larger activity called the duty.\(^1\)

An example of the analysis of a simple job is that of the position of application clerk in a department store. The duties would be as follows:

1. Meets people who desire to open accounts.
2. Asks them for the information to fill out blank.
3. Writes form letters or telephones for references.
4. Fills out Mercantile Agency blanks.
5. Looks up rating in Dunn's, etc.
6. Files applications temporarily till references come in.
7. Makes notes of references on blanks and hands to Credit Chief, who passes on them.
8. Enters name, address, and number of applications in index.
9. Answers requests from other firms for references.\(^2\)

Using these duties as a basis, Charters would then build a course of study needed to train such a clerk.

---


In complex vocations which involve superior intelligence and skill, such as teaching, where a duty analysis is highly difficult to make, a difficulty analysis may be substituted with practical success. Charters comments on this point by stating:

"Very frequently where it is impossible for the follower of a vocation to list the duties which he is called upon to perform in the pursuance of the vocation, it is comparatively easy for him to list the duties with which he has difficulty, because the duties may become routinized and slip from his memory, while the difficulties are the basis of his attention and thought."¹

Other kinds of analyses were used by Charters and his co-workers. One of these was the trait analysis which, Charters suggested, should accompany an activity analysis.² In building a curriculum it is not sufficient to find out what people have to do and give them instruction in the performance of the duties. Much depends upon traits of personality, such as accuracy, neatness, courtesy, and firmness.


Charters also applied his technique to subject areas. He speaks of analysis of errors and analysis of use. This procedure applies in a course such as grammar. If an attempt to determine what the course of study in grammar should be when based upon use, one gets better results by collecting the observed errors in grammar as a starting-point and then determining what grammar will be necessary to correct the errors. This step can be followed by deciding what laws of grammar are used in practical speech.

Charters listed four methods of making a functional or job analysis:

(1) **Introspection.** - This is the method used by the person who is already familiar with the job whose duties are to be analyzed.

(2) **Interviewing.** - By this method the interviewer asks the individual on the job to give a list of his duties.

(3) **Working on the job.** - The analyst works on the job and carries through the operations himself.

(4) **Questionnaire.** - A written questionnaire is given to the worker. This method was not a good one according to Charters.

---


2. Ibid. pp. 38, 39.
B. Application of Functional Analysis

Once Charters had collected the necessary information from the analysis, he followed a set of procedures which facilitated his curriculum making. Sequel¹ gives a summary account of his procedures and makes comments about each in brackets:

"First, determine the major objectives of education by a study of the life of man in its social setting. [Typical objectives are citizenship, morality, and social efficiency. Those who offer instruction shall determine the objectives after a sagacious and sensitive interpretation.]

"Second, analyze these objectives into ideals and activities and continue the analysis to the level of working units. [Ideals are to be selected by a faculty vote of its members, not lightly nor arbitrarily, but after serious study of social demand. There is room in a democracy for differences of values. Activities are to be derived from objective studies of the physical and mental activities of men in society. These studies must be made scientifically and the conclusions may be shared by all. The analysis must be thorough enough to result in a complete series of small, detailed steps for each activity. The perfect analysis is one which is carried to the point where the student can learn without assistance. If it is put into the form of a book, the ideal text is one which teaches itself. In it the material is so expertly presented that the student understands everything, can follow it through to its end, incorporate it in his experience, and use it in his life of action.]

"Third, arrange these in the order of importance. [Objective measurement is the only reliable means

to be used. Expert opinion may be a useful temporary measure."

"Fourth, raise to positions of higher order in this list those ideals and activities which are high in value for children but low in value for adults. [Examples are dramatization, games, fairy stories, and obedience.]

"Fifth, determine the number of the most important items of the resulting list which can be handled in the time alloted to school education, after deducting those which are better learned outside of school.

"Sixth, collect the best practices of the race in handling these ideals and activities. [Such collections should include empirical studies of adults in action, as well as studies of children's activities.]

"Seventh, arrange the material so obtained in proper instructional order, according to the psychological nature of children. [Items four to seven depend heavily on the collection of empirical evidence.]

From consideration of the research done in the activity analysis, from the statement of objectives to be reached, from concern about the means by which activities were to foster learning, from the arrangement of materials in its proper instructional order, would emerge, according to Charters, the curriculum - the program to be followed.

It is of interest to note at this point how Charters saw

---

the function of the curriculum as it actually operated in carrying on an educational program.

Charters contrasted two points of view concerning the curriculum.¹ From the one point of view, the function of the curriculum is considered to be that of imparting information, while from the other point of view its function is considered to be that of modifying conduct. The first of these may be called the information function, and the other, the conduct function of the curriculum. If the information function is accepted the work of the curriculum is done when the information has been prepared. But if the conduct function is accepted, the curriculum must embrace all the material that is needed up to the point where the student-teacher becomes an efficient teacher in the classroom. Charters, here, makes a specific reference to the curriculum as it relates to teacher-training institutions, but, from all indications, the same understanding would apply in other training areas.²

Charters' "Pennsylvania Years" were good years in terms of personal achievement. He initiated, organized, and directed the Retail Training program at Carnegie Institute

²Ibid. p. 338.
and later directed the Retail Training program at the University of Pittsburgh. He wrote a book, Curriculum Construction, which set down his philosophy concerning curriculum-making and indicated how the technique of functional analysis actually worked. Probably the most significant accomplishment that he was able to see during the years 1919 to 1925 was the convenient application of his method of functional analysis to various learning situations. It was during this period that he gained finesse in applying his technique.

IV. His Final Professional Years, 1925-1942

Charters returned to the University of Chicago in 1925, from where he had earned his PH.D. in 1904. The year before, his chief mentor, Dewey, had departed to Columbia to Teachers College. It was Charles Judd, who headed the Department of Education at the University of Chicago from 1909 until 1938, who was instrumental in bringing Charters to Chicago. Judd had become interested in Charters' work and thought that he might be able to give him some assistance.

While at the University of Chicago, Charters started and carried through to completion the mammoth Commonwealth Teacher Training study which he co-authored with Waples. ¹

Charters had a number of able assistants working on the project among whom was Ralph Tyler. It was also while at Chicago that he started on a project, which continued when he came to the Ohio State University, of helping the school of pharmacy organize its curriculum along functional lines. He got at their functions by analyzing the prescriptions pharmacists filled and obtained their judgments about which functions are important in getting prescriptions properly done and thus identifying some basic principles important for pharmacists.¹

Prior to coming to Ohio State University in 1929 to head the Bureau of Educational Research, Charters wrote another book entitled, The Teaching of Ideals, an area of study which had interested him for a number of years. The problem for which he sought an answer was how does the teacher concern himself with the development of character and personality.² He strongly felt that every teacher had a responsibility in the character development of students. If he applied research and other objective criteria to the study of this area, it would be possible to arrive at a

¹Interview with Ralph Tyler, January 13, 1973. Tyler was a student and a colleague of Charters at the University of Chicago and The Ohio State University.

set of objective measures which would be useful to instructionals goals of developing attitudinal behavior. Charters, however, was not successful in an area beset with relative positions and often contradictory value systems. He would abandon his efforts in teaching ideals.

When Charters came to Ohio State, he continued in a very active role in developing various programs. At Ohio State, he assisted the College of Pharmacy and the Agricultural Extension School in developing their curriculum always in doing so using the technique of functional analysis. He later became interested in radio broadcasting. He retired as professor emeritus in 1942.¹

It was noted in the chapter on Bobbitt that his curriculum focus became more philosophical in Bobbitt's later years. This was perhaps because in the early 1930's, Bobbitt had become rather ill and his active participation in curriculum-making lessened, so that by the early 40's Bobbitt, in his last book, did become philosophical in his attitude toward curriculum development.²

¹Interview with Ralph Tyler, January 13, 1973. Tyler was a student and a colleague of Charters at the University of Chicago and The Ohio State University.

²Ibid.
Charters, on the other hand, rarely became philosophical. He always thought of himself as an engineer. He was much more concerned with getting things to work. He felt that anyone who wanted to talk about theory and didn't take responsibility to put it into practice was an irresponsible person. He wanted to be responsible.

John Franklin Bobbitt and Werrett Wallace Charters concentrated much of their attention in devising a method of curriculum formulation that would aid the educator in creating educational programs that united the elements of theory and practice. These men might correctly be classified as experts in making curriculum.

To what extent did their efforts, if at all, influence the curriculum practices of black educators of this era, particularly Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois? What was the state of curriculum-making in black education? Attention to these matters will now be pursued.
Chapter 4

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON — THE INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION ADVOCATE

A young black recently entered a public library and inquired of the librarian about the man who was called the "Benedict Arnold of the Black race." In his last of a series of studies on Negro history, Leronne Bennett, Jr. began his discussion of the period with the following paragraph:

"When he was not at the White House with President Theodore Roosevelt or at Skibo Castle with Andrew Carnegie, when he was not in Julius Rosenwald's office or on H. H. Rogers' yacht, when he was not advising influential whites on 'the Negro question' or lecturing Negroes on the need for self-help and self-improvement, Booker Taliaferro Washington rose at 6 a.m. and went to his pig pen."¹

Such are the vestigial attitudes and opinions which continue to linger in the minds of many black people after over a half century past the death of Booker T. Washington. Whether this attitude is justified is not the argument of this study. Yet, like Donald J. Calista, another look² into the life and


work of Washington seems reasonable if only for the purpose of determining the origin of the somewhat negative attitudes and opinions surrounding his life. Quoting from the distinguished black historian, John Hope Franklin, "the writing of history reflects the interests, predilections, and even prejudices of a given generation." Calista undertakes a study of the "historical" Washington to determine whether history honestly relates to his time and to determine to what extent Washington's theories and practices have implications for social problems current in the decade of the 1960's. Within the framework of an "open mind", this chapter attempts to analyze B. T. Washington and his educational theories and his related curriculum practices in the educational setting of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Very few writers have looked upon Washington as a curriculum planner. Yet a large part of the work he accomplished in founding a school and organizing an educational program involved the work that curriculum-makers do presently and have done in times past. This chapter then attempts to take "another look" at Washington from a new perspective - from the perspective of one who formulates the educational program of young people, that is, from the point of view of the developer of curriculum.

One notes readily as he analyzes the philosophy, the-
ories, and practices of Washington that his framework was built around the concept of social needs. He held constantly to the belief that the economic progress of the black man in American society was relative to his usefulness in fulfilling an essential need in the community.\footnote{It is interesting to note that Frederick Douglass, the key Negro spokesman prior to 1895 advocated a program and approach for Negro uplift similar to Washington. He commented on one occasion, "Men are not valued in this country or any other country, for what they are; they are valued for what they can do. It is in vain that we talk about being men, if we do not the work of men. We must become valuable to society in other departments of industry than those servile ones from which we are rapidly being excluded. We must show that we can do as well as be; and to this end we must learn trades. When we can build as well as live in houses; when we can make as well as wear shoes; when we can produce as well as consume wheat, corn, and rye — then we shall become valuable to society. Society is a hard-heart affair." Quoted from Leslie H. Fishel, Jr. and Benjamin Quarles. The Black American — A Documentary History. William Morrow and Company, Inc.: New York, 1970, p. 144.}

I. Biographical Events Influencing the Teaching Practices of Booker T. Washington

Booker T. Washington was born a slave on a plantation in Franklin County, Virginia, near a cross-roads post-office called Hale's Ford sometime between 1856 to 1859.\footnote{Booker T. Washington, Up From Slavery, New York: Dell Publishing Company, reprint, 1965, p. 6.} Although he was born in slavery, freedom came while he was still young, so he was not a victim of years of cruelty and bondage as were other slaves born prior to emancipation. He was the child of a Negro slave mother and a white man who took no interest in his Negro son. Washington was born in a plantation cookhouse which had no windows and a dirt floor. As
a child who had but one name, it never occurred to him that he had need of another name until he started to school following the Civil War.\footnote{Basil Matthews, \textit{Booker T. Washington}, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948, pp. 5, 6.}

During the War, his step-father followed the Union armies. When, at the end of the War, all the slaves were freed, the step-father sent for his family to join him where he had found work in the salt mines at Malden, West Virginia. When the Emancipation Proclamation was read by John Burroughs, Washington's master, to the entire slave family, the boy was approximately eight years old. He saw the slaves rejoicing and crying from happiness over their freedom; however, the exhilaration was short lived, for when the slaves realized all the responsibilities associated with freedom, their glee began to wane. Some of the slaves were at a loss as to what to do; many were quite elderly and had already lived their best years and possessed nothing materially. Only freedom was theirs.\footnote{Booker T. Washington, \textit{Up From Slavery}, New York: Dell Publishing Company, reprint, 1965, p. 6.}

In West Virginia, while still a relatively young child, Booker began to work at a salt furnace where his work began at four o'clock in the morning. At night he and his mother struggled to learn the alphabet from a speller that had come
into their possession. When a young man, William Davis, who could read, came to town, all the Negroes pooled their money and paid him to open a school. The classes were crowded with old and young anxious to learn. Young Booker entered the school but remained only a short time because the improvident condition of the family required all potential earners to work. While working in the mines he heard men talking about a school in Virginia called Hampton. He determined in his mind that he was going to attend that school.

Meanwhile, a conflict arose between his desire to continue in the little school in Malden, West Virginia, and his work schedule at the mines. It was during this period that he met Virginia Ruffner, wife of a former Union general who sometime after the War had moved his family from the New England area to settle in West Virginia. The Ruffner woman's stern New England qualities of honesty, thriftiness, and thoroughness in work made a deep impression on the developing mind of the young lad.¹

After a period with the Ruffner family, Washington was able to save a few dollars and having never forgotten his desire to attend Hampton, decided that he had to go. With

the little money he had managed to save together with a few gifts from friends in his community, he began his journey to the school in Virginia. He encountered some bitter experiences on the way but he eventually arrived, well-worn, with exactly fifty cents in his pocket.

Practically penniless and ragged in appearance, he stood before the lady principal, Mary Mackie, and requested permission to enroll in the school. Recalling that experience somewhat later, Washington described himself as looking like "a worthless loafer or tramp," and Mary Mackie, also a Negro, hesitated to admit so unpromising an applicant. Something in his persistency arrested her attention, however, and after detaining him for some hours she said: "Take this broom and sweep the recitation room." "I swept that room," reports the candidate, "three times," and the fidelity exhibited seemed to warrant for him a chance to stay.¹ Thus he passed his "entrance examination."

At Hampton, the still young Washington met Samuel Chapman Armstrong. Armstrong's background lent itself favorably to work among the recently freed black people. A mere summary of Armstrong's career shows that he was born in the

Hawaiian Islands, January 30, 1839, and remained there until coming to Williams College in Massachusetts where he was graduated in 1862. The young man entered the Union army immediately upon graduation, becoming captain in the 125th New York Volunteers in August, 1862. In the Fall of 1863 he took command of the eighth and ninth regiments of United States Negro troops and was mustered out in November, 1865 as Brevet-Brigadier General of Volunteers. In March, 1866, this man was made a sub-commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau with supervision of nine counties in eastern Virginia. Two years later, April, 1868, he founded Hampton Institute for Negro youth. He died May 11, 1893.¹

Armstrong was perhaps the leading exponent of the belief that the Negro could be trained to know and appreciate all the finer elements of modern civilization. His Christian outlook embraced the belief in brotherhood and he sought to effect amicable relations between the races. Aside from being trained to imbibe things purely aesthetic or cultural, he was convinced that the Freedmen's Bureau could succeed in the task of training Negroes to regard manual labor as dignified and ennobling rather than as disgraceful.²

²Ibid. p. 142.
Armstrong was further convinced of the feasibility of industrial training for undeveloped people from being associated with his missionary parents in Hawaii where his father had directed a manual school for the native population. The impact on the mind and the life of Washington that Armstrong had is indicated somewhat by the former's notation in his biographical notes. "One might have removed from Hampton all the buildings, classrooms, teachers, and industries, and given the men and women there the opportunity of coming in daily contact with General Armstrong and that alone would have been a liberal education."  

After graduation from Hampton in 1875, Washington returned home to Malden where he taught as many as fourteen hours a day. On Sundays, he conducted two Sunday schools, one in town and another in the country. He tutored students who were desirous of attending school at Hampton. Many students who had been tutored by him made such outstanding records that General Armstrong invited the young educator to return to Hampton to teach and to supervise a dormitory for American Indians who were coming there to study. 

---


3 Ibid. p. 56.
Washington learned a great deal about the program at Hampton, both as a student and as a member of the staff. What he learned is reflected in his whole educational philosophy and in his administrative practices, especially after he became founder of a school. Washington, like his famous mentor, was oftentimes confronted with the curricular decision of the feasibility and practicability of the inclusion of the classics as an object of the instructional program for the undeveloped black race. Concerning the study of the classics, Washington thought much like his teacher.

"But let us consider the practical question whether the classics should be made an object in our course, or whether, ruling them out, we should teach only the higher English studies. It is the theory of Matthew Arnold that a teacher should develop the special aptitudes; to ignore them is failure; the attempt to cast all minds in one mould is useless. But for one Anglo-African who would, on this theory, need to acquire the ancient languages, there are, I believe, twenty whose best aptitude would find full scope in the study of the mother-tongue and its literature, supposing them to have a taste for language and for the higher pursuits of the human mind...He who has mastered the English, then, has within reach whatever is best in all literature."¹

Armstrong did not discourage the academic subjects but it was readily recognized that the academics was not to be

Hampton's major emphasis. He skirted any demand on him for heavy inclusion of academics into Hampton's course of study by responding judiciously "should any pupil have a rare aptitude for the classics and desire to become a man of letters in the largest sense, it would be our duty to provide special instruction for him or send him where he could receive it. For such the Howard University at Washington offers a broad and high plane of intellectual advantage."\(^1\)

Armstrong, like Washington, remained steadfast to this original conception and purpose of a college for Negroes which was to train selected Negro youths who should go out and teach and lead their people, first by example, by getting land and homes; to give them not a dollar that they could earn for themselves; to teach respect for labor, to replace stupid drudgery with skilled hands, and in this way to build up an industrial system for the sake, not only of self-support and intelligent labor, but also for the sake of character.\(^2\)

Booker T. Washington thus was readied to assume his duties at a school of his own direction. In 1881, at the request of a Negro shoemaker and two white Alabama legislators,


\(^2\)Ibid. p. 99.
General Armstrong sent the young Washington, yet in his early twenties, to Tuskegee, Alabama there to establish a school.

In a delapidated church building with thirty students ranging in age from fifteen to fifty, with Washington as the only teacher, Tuskegee Institute had its beginning. The school had no equipment and the building was in serious need of repair. The roof leaked and when it rained, one student sheltered the teacher with an umbrella while the other students recited.

The Alabama State Legislature voted an annual appropriation of $2,000 for teachers' salaries but it refused to provide for buildings and grounds.\(^1\) The need for these was so acute that Washington and his students decided to raise money, buy land, and build a schoolhouse. They planted the foundation and laid the bricks themselves. Soon, there were a number of faculty members and the student body increased rapidly. Tuskegee continued to grow and by the turn of the century the school became nationally recognized and its founder became America's most noted Negro citizen.\(^2\)

II. The Spirit of the Times and the Issue of Race Between 1870-1915

In order to objectively evaluate Booker T. Washington's


\(^2\)Ibid.
social theories and educational practices, and in particular his curricular concerns, it is necessary to have some idea of the spirit of the times of which as an adult he was a part. The years of his adult life were some of the most difficult years for race relations in the United States. Emancipated only eighteen years before the founding of Tuskegee in 1881, the newly freed men attempted to melt into the American way of life but found the road to social and economic acceptance thwarted by a rising number of whites opposed to their progress. Yet there were some white teachers primarily from the North who were willing to sacrifice their lives and material success by working among the Negroes in the deep South. On the other hand there were also Klansmen who would burn down the schools and run the teachers away. The white hoods and robes of the Klu Klux Klan rode through the night terrorizing Negroes and their white friends as well. Intimidation was most effective after 1870.

The period of the so-called "Black Reconstruction Era" ended with President Rutherford B. Hayes' removal of federal troops from South Carolina and Louisiana. Much of the material gain that Negroes had worked for and acquired was destroyed. Some black people were beaten and others were intimidated for Republican tendencies. Whites organized themselves, patrolled polling places to guarantee fair, peaceful, and Democratic elections. Negroes became fright-
ened, stayed away from the polls and, eventually, the Demo-
crats managed to seize the political power from the hands
of the Republicans and practically eliminate the Negro as
a political power.¹

When it became known that the Republican governments
had been guilty of corruption, the case for "Radical" Re-
construction was lost and the case for the Democrats was
strengthened. Supporters of Radical Reconstruction became
disillusioned and this helped pave the way for white "home
rule" to be restored in the South.

The North began to grow weary of the crusade for the
Negro. Some of the older anti-slavery leaders such as
Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner were willing to crusade
further, but younger politicians took their places and were
more interested in industry in the North and the South
rather than in radical governments in the South. Men of
the character of Hayes, Blaine, Conkling, and Logan became
leaders in the Republican party and their assumption of
political power signaled the increased interest in industrial
profits.²

Decisions by the Supreme Court aided in the defeat of
Reconstruction. John Hope Franklin, in analyzing the judi-

²Ibid. p. 331.
cial climate, noted that in 1875 several indictments under the Enforcement Act of 1870, charged defendants with preventing Negroes from exercising their right to vote in elections. In United States vs. Reese, the Court held that the statue covered more offenses than were punishable under the terms of the Fifteenth Amendment and was, therefore, unconstitutional. In United States vs. Cruickshank, the Court declared that the Fifteenth Amendment guaranteed citizens not the right to vote but only a right not to be discriminated against by the states, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.¹ Neither Negroes nor the "liberal" Republicans could expect much support from a Court that brushed aside the very laws which they had hoped to implement the franchise amendment. So far as the Court was concerned, the South was free to settle its problems as best it could.

After the Democrats came to power in the South, they were desirous of finding ways to eliminate the political strength of Negroes by disfranchising them completely. The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments blocked the efforts to do this, so other methods were used to harass and intimidate the Negroes, thus preventing them from participating

in politics. Polling places were set up far away from Negro communities, and even if some Negroes attempted to reach the polls, they would encounter conditions too difficult to surmount. Sometimes Negroes were given incorrect information as to the location of polling places. In many communities, uniform ballots were not required and stuffing ballot boxes was a common occurrence. At times Negro candidates were nominated by whites for an office in order to divide the vote of the race, while the whites all voted for one of their own race. ¹

During the late 1890's Republican presidents grew very silent on the question of Negro rights. Theodore Roosevelt was a "fence straddler." At times he sought to please Negroes; at other times he sought to please Southern whites. Negroes were pleased when Roosevelt invited Booker T. Washington to the White House for dinner; when he closed the Indianola, Mississippi post office rather than satisfy the white demands that he dismiss the Negro postmistress there; and when he insisted on appointing a Negro as collector of the Port of Charleston even against the wishes of the strong Southern and senatorial opposition. At the same time, he favored the attitudes embraced by the anti-Negro white Re-

publicans. He spoke in favor of Southern traditions and falsely asserted that most lynchings were caused by sexual assaults on white women.¹

The anti-Negro whites made even more progress under Taft than they had under Roosevelt. Taft permitted segregation to be introduced in a few of the federal office buildings. By the election of 1912, Negroes were in the predicament of making a choice between the Democratic candidate, Woodrow Wilson; the Republican candidate, William H. Taft; and the Progressive Party candidate, Theodore Roosevelt.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Southern extremists were influencing public opinion in the North and West more than before; racist books appeared and Northern scholars who dealt with the biological and social sciences gave support to southern racist doctrines. The stereotyped myths about Negroes found champions in both the North and the South.² The thinking of the American public about Negroes was clearly symbolized on the eve of the First World War in the then very popular melodramatic racist movie, "Birth of a Nation" which the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, believed to be an excellent way to teach history.

The injustice of lynching continued to be a sore spot. When Negroes realized that politics was not a beneficial avenue of advancement for them, they turned to the strategies of self-help and racial solidarity. Interest turned to supporting Negro businesses. Negro insurance companies and fraternal orders sprang up. Negro banks were established. The impact of the newer type of business enterprise and the expansion of the Negro entrepreneurial and professional group were evident in the changing nature of the Negro class structure. Ironically, the forces of segregation and discrimination were responsible for a part of the social and professional ascendancy of the Negro.

Such, then, in general, was the spirit of the times. Faced on every side by trying difficulties the Negro sought for a way out of his dilemma. Providing one avenue of approach was a young college administrator and educator. Symbolizing and doing more than anyone else toward popularizing the complex ideas of accommodation, self-help, racial solidarity, acceptance of disfranchisement, economic accumulation, and industrial education was the distinguished Hampton Institute graduate and founder of Tuskegee, Booker T. Washington.

III. The Educational and Social Philosophies of Booker T. Washington and His Curricular Concerns

The educational philosophy and social ideas of Washington are closely integrated and interwoven into a simply and
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"is to get people to see that education in books and in the schoolroom can be articulated into the life and activities of the community surrounding the schoolroom in a way to make the local activities the basis for much of the mental training that is supposed to be furnished by the old traditional and abstract education.\(^1\) The school, to him, was an institution to learn about life and the practical duties associated with it. This philosophy is an outgrowth of Pestalozzian ideas and agrees with the thinking of Dewey, which, of course, was developed somewhat later.

In this connection, then, he relates the "bottom story" which he had occasion to refer to in his many talks, both publicly and privately.\(^2\) A young beginning teacher was having trouble motivating her students to learn various planned activities. She had attempted to gain parental support but to no avail. Washington was invited to the school for purposes of offering suggestions to aid the teacher. The class was involved in an embroidery lesson and was not doing well. Washington was quick to observe that the teacher was teaching the wrong lesson at the wrong time. Rather than teach

---
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embroidering, involve them in something more practical. The teacher then was told to ask her students to count the number of missing buttons on their garments. The count was taken and found to be high. She then told the class to obtain permission of their parents to bring to school the next day all the garments from home which needed buttons sewed on. To the surprise of the teacher, the next day the students brought in a mass of clothing. When the time came for the sewing lesson to begin, her students could hardly wait to apply their button-sewing skills. In addition, the enthusiasm spilled over to the community.¹

Washington also viewed his role as a harmonizer in race relations between blacks and whites. He often criticized prejudiced behavior and seemed particularly proud that he could look upon whites as uncritically as he could blacks as long as they needed his help. His larger role in race relations was to bring the white people particularly of the South into what seemed to him a proper and practical attitude toward the Negro and the latter's efforts to move forward.

Running parallel to his concerns for harmony between the white and black races was the effort to win white ap-

proval of education for the Negro. "Still another thing that I am trying to get the people of the whole country to realize," he revealed, "is that the education of the Negro should be considered not so much as a matter of charity, but as a matter of business that like any other business should be thoroughly studied, organized, and systematized."\(^1\) Here his main criticism was against the manner of the distribution of funds directed to the improvement of education for the Negro. These funds, which came primarily from philanthropic sources, were so spread out that their effectiveness in improving Negro education was almost nil.

The task of solving the problems of Negro uplift and racial harmony between blacks and whites lay to Washington's adoption of industrial education as the primary means of coming to grips with the prevailing situation. The thrust of his educational plan was threefold - the simultaneous development of the hand, the head, and the heart. He commented about the students at Tuskegee:

"They are being taught that mind-training is the logical helpmeet of hand-training, and that both, supplemented and sweetened by heart-training,\(^1\)

make the high-souled, useful, productive, patriotic, law-loving, public-spirited citizen of whom any nation might well be proud."

In a large measure, Washington's work in founding, organizing, and administering Tuskegee indicated in a substantial way his curriculum-making concerns. He cannot be called an idealist in the ordinary meaning of the term. He functioned on the level of realities whether the topic was political or educational. The acceptance of the functional notion of problem-solving is basic to analyzing his educational practices. Thus in a large measure his espousal of industrial education was a natural functioning of his pragmatic way of thinking.

The real purpose of industrial education as conceived by Washington was the adaptation of education to the needs of the pupil and the community. He regarded industrial and agricultural skill and practical knowledge of household arts as important by-products of the school activities. The ultimate aim, however, was the development of manhood and womanhood, through the common tasks of the common day, as well as through the ordinary school activities.

---


Though the primary aim of industrial education was the development of sound habits of hand and head, the economic advantages were not to be overlooked. Washington accepted the notion that no group of people could attain a satisfactory position in life until they were able to make a reasonable contribution to the economic welfare of their community. The moral and civic status was closely related to the economic. He took note that the majority of Negroes were in unskilled occupations and deplored the situation. The Negro bread winners should be prepared to enter the skilled trades and their economic status would be elevated sufficiently to enable the children to attend school and the women to give more time to moral and hygienic development of the home.¹

Yet the exigences of the times forced Washington to make more explicit his espousal of industrial education as the primary means of Negroes achieving acceptance into the larger social order. Often queried by the doubtful blacks on the proper kind of education, he felt compelled to caution them on the dangers of making the wrong implications of industrial education.

"The danger, at present, that most seriously threatens the success of industrial training, is the ill-advised insistence in certain quarters that this form of education should be offered to the exclusion of all other branches of knowledge. If the idea becomes fixed in the minds of the people that industrial education means class education, that it should be offered the Negro because he is a Negro, and that the Negro should be confined to this sort of education, than I fear serious injury will be done the cause of hand-training."

What Washington actually envisioned in his emphasis on industrial education was the creation of a sturdy black middle class composed of artisans, farmers, and craftsmen which would provide the financial support for a professional class and also be the impetus to ultimate progress of the black race in American society. Yet he was ever conscious of the present condition of the Negro race. "While the professional men were indeed necessary," he acquiesced, "and while culture must be kept in mind, the race for the time needed above all else the knowledge and skill which would insure the material necessities of life." 

Fundamental to his industrial program was his belief that the Negro and the South were essential to each other's

---
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mutual regeneration. He commented on the problem.

"Tuskegee emphasizes industrial training for the Negro, not with the thought that the Negro should be confined to industrialism, the plow, or the hoe, but because the undeveloped material resources of the South offer at this time a field peculiarly advantageous to the worker skilled in agriculture and the industries, and here are found the Negro's most inviting opportunities for taking on the rudimentary elements that ultimately make for a permanently progressive civilization." ¹

How did Washington plan to bring to fruition his pro-
gram of social rehabilitation? A partial response would encompass the industrial educational program developed at Tuskegee. Here it was that a program could evolve. Here a place and a plant was available for his experimental man-
ipulation. Here one could gain a measure of his curriculum insights and curriculum engineering ability.

Washington's curriculum-making formulation have been variously defined as project method oriented or life-activ-
ities related.² Each of these methods actively engaged in the student in the learning process through involvement. Yet these approaches have been more associated with the


Deweyan concept of learning rather than Washington even though the latter preceded Dewey by several years.

Being a practical educator, as well as administrator, Washington continuously emphasized that education was a means of knowing how to solve problems and demanded that those problems closest to home should be solved first. Classroom work, therefore, treated thoroughly those industries essential to the smooth functioning of the local community. Yet he was able to see the school as in being for the benefit of the students rather than the benefit of the institution. He held this opinion in light of demands on the institution to become self-supporting.

In his book, *Working With the Hands*, Washington dwelt at length with the problem of correlating theory with practice. Throughout the book he described how various course work was taught. In the subject area cited below a description is made of the instructional procedure for the architectural course.

"The course of architectural drawing covers three years, and aims to give thorough instruction in drawing, building construction and design. In all cases, the general mechanical and artistic training is supplemented by the course of study in the Academic Department. On entering the third year of the architectural course, the student, in addition to his regular work, is given actual practice in office training and general superintendence. The student visits also the trade shops, and is required to attend classes in heating, electrical, lighting, and plumbing. Many of the most satisfactory and imposing buildings of the school were
designed in our architectural department."¹

In the building trades, the students planned the construction of the building, the fully equipping, plumbing, wiring, and all other details essential to making the building functional. With the help of the instructor the students planned the building even in its design stage. This method of instruction could be definitely classified as either project method oriented or life activity related and could provision the Bobbitt approach of activity analysis.

Other descriptions of instructional procedures are given including the training provided for students in electrical engineering.

"The object of the course in electrical engineering is to give the student a foundation upon which he may build along any special line he may choose later. Arc and incandescent lighting is in use at the school, and there is a complete telephone service connecting most of the buildings and offices through a central station. The students learn not only how to install these systems, but to maintain them in the highest state of efficiency. The dynamos and other electrical machinery of a complete powerhouse are in operation for lighting the school buildings and grounds, so that the student finds practical work at every turn in his course."²

The learning process is functional. The student learns
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by actually participating in the analysis and solution of the problem.

Important as the "training of the hands" was in the program of Tuskegee, it yet remained but one phase of what the school intended to teach. Roscoe C. Bruce, director of the Academic Department during Washington's Administration had the responsibility of correlating the industrial work with the "training of the head." The following statement taken from an article he wrote for a book related his inclination for industrial education. He observed:

"The Negro needs industrial training in an eminent degree, because the capacity for continuous labor is a requisite of civilized living; because, indeed, the very first step in social advance must be economic; because the industrial monopoly with which slavery encompassed black men has fallen shattered before the trumpet-blast of white labor and eager competition; and finally, because no instrument of moral education is more effective upon the mass of mankind, than cheerful and intelligent work."

And yet he could not restrict the limits of the program within the bounds of industrial training. Through the course in agriculture he showed how the academic work of the students correlated. Agriculture was considered fundamental to Tuskegee's program for in the overall philosophy of Washington, the black man was to be associated with the

---

soil for several generations to come. Even as a pedestrian as agriculture might seem to be there still were academic concerns involved in the learning of it. "To be sure," Bruce stated, "a flourishing garden may be made and managed by bright-eyed tots just out of the kindergarten, but how can commercial fertilizers be carefully analyzed by a boy who has made no study of general chemistry."¹ The academic study of chemistry, therefore, was essential to the efficient learning of agriculture.

The study of English, another academic concern, served to represent the group of studies that exerted a liberalizing influence upon the student and possessed a cultural rather than a technical value. From oral lessons in language in the lower classes, the students advanced to a modicum of technical grammar in the middle of the course and to the rhetoric of the senior year. An unusually large amount of written composition is insisted upon, the compositions being used not merely to discipline the student in chaste feeling, consecutive thinking, and efficient expression, but also to sharpen his powers of observation and to stimulate him to pick out of his daily experience the elements that are significant.²
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It was one of Washington's teaching practices to encourage the students, in their composition classes, to use those experiences that were relevant to them. One reads, therefore, in many of his books, examples of students' compositions relating their personal experience to the process of making a broom, milking a cow, or hoeing a garden.

Mention should be made of the moral training that was a part of the overall program. This phase was widely known as the "training of the heart." Through the living examples of the teachers much of the moral training was passed on to the students. In addition, Booker T. Washington made it a habit to speak before the student body at the required vespers service on Sunday evenings. His topics varied but tended to be very practical in nature; e.g., he would choose such topics as "Work," "Honesty" or some similar topic.

Washington, then, conceived of his program as an education for life through the training of the hand, the head, and the heart. That he was partially successful is indicated by the fact that when he died in 1915, he left an institution which he—a former slave—had created out of absolutely nothing except the promise of $2,000 a year for teachers salaries from the Alabama State Legislature. He left it with an endowment of approximately two million dollars ($1,945,326), with property worth over a million and a half, with an annual budget of nearly three hundred thousand dollars ($290,245), teaching 38 trades and professions in 15
well-organized departments, with an enrollment of 1,537 regular students and 197 faculty members, and turning out about 150 well-trained graduates a year.¹

IV. Opposition to Washington's Program of Educational and Social Reform

In September, 1895, Washington delivered his famous Atlanta speech more popularly known as the Atlanta Compromise. In this speech Washington laid down a program that advocated that the Negro accept his condition in society as it was at that time and embark on a self-help plan to lift himself from the bottom rung of society. He specifically advocated industrial education. Two eventualities became evident pursuant to Washington's speech. The first outcome was the catapulting of Washington on the national scene in the role of the major spokesman and leader of the black people of America. The second outcome seems to be concomitant with the first in that there began to surface opposition to his plan of social reconstruction.

His leadership role was acknowledged by W.E.B. DuBois in an oft-quoted passage:

"Easily the most striking thing in the history of the American Negro since 1876 is the ascendancy of Mr. Booker T. Washington. It began at the time when war memories and ideals were rapidly passing;
a day of astonishing commercial development
was dawning; a sense of doubt and hesitation
overtook the freedmen's son's - then it was that
his leading began."

Early in 1896 public reaction began to be noted, of a
negative nature, concerning Washington's plan. On February
22, 1896, John Hope, President of Atlanta University, voiced
criticism contrary to Washington's approach. "I regard it
as cowardly and dishonest for any of our colored men to tell
white people and colored people that we are not struggling
for equality....Now catch your breath, for....I am going to
say we demand social equality. In this republic we shall be
less than freemen if we have a whit less than that which
thrift, education and honor afford other freemen." 2 However,
opposition was led by two individuals - William Monroe Trotter

Monroe Trotter, editor of the Boston Guardian, was almost
fanatic in his opposition to Booker T. Washington. Puttkammer
and Worthy characterized Trotter as possessed with an
overwhelming "Idea" - as citizens, he believed, colored people
deserve the same opportunities as whites; these equal rights

---

1 W.E.B. DuBois, The Souls of Black Folk, Dodd, Mead and

2 Daniel Walden, "The Contemporary Opposition to the
Political Ideals of Booker T. Washington," The Journal of
will be secured only by persistent manly agitation, untempered by compromise.¹

Trotter centered his attack on Washington's public racial policy and industrial education program. Personally the two men could scarcely have been more different. Trotter was born in freedom; Washington, in slavery. Washington presented himself as a man of patience, optimism, and humility; Trotter operated from a continuing sense of crisis and was impetuous, volatile, sometimes arrogant. Washington read history and found cause for hope: "merit, no matter under what skin found is in the long run, recognized and rewarded." Trotter read the same history and discerned a continuity in the Negro's treatment by White Americans: "a spirit of ruthless and rapacious domination of his interests by them from the foundation of the republic."²

An increasingly popular Bookerite idea, to which Trotter particularly objected, was the doctrine of industrial education. Both men agreed that education was crucial for the black man. But their emphases were quite different. For one it would be practical training leading to a good job; for the other it was a necessary right that could prove the qual-


ity of the black man's brain.\textsuperscript{1}

Trotter granted that industrial schools such as Tuskegee did have some value. He opposed industrialism because the idea lying back of it is the relegating of a race to serfdom. That underlying idea, the innate mental inferiority of Negroes, "must be admitted to be the reason why industrial education is more popular with the general white public than advanced or classical education."\textsuperscript{2}

By far the most articulate opposition to Washington was led by W.E.B. DuBois. Like Trotter, DuBois was a freeman and received his higher education from Harvard. DuBois criticized Washington's plan of social reform as representing in Negro thought the old attitude of adjustment and submission.\textsuperscript{3}

To him, Washington's plan asked that black people give up three things:

"First, political power. Second, insistence on civil rights. Third, higher education of Negro youth - and concentrate all their energies on industrial education, the accumulation of wealth, and the conciliation of the South."\textsuperscript{4}

Asking the rhetorical question, "What has been the return?" In these years there have occurred:

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid. p. 36.
\textsuperscript{4}Ibid. p. 38.
1. The disfranchisement of the Negro.
2. The legal creation of a distinct status of
civil inferiority for the Negro.
3. The steady withdrawal of aid from institu-
tions for the higher training of the Negro.₁

After acknowledging that Washington's program did not
lead directly to these movements, he did state that his prop-
aganda "helped their speedier accomplishment." "Is it possi-
ble," he insisted, "that nine millions of men can make ef-
fective progress in economic lines, if they are deprived of
political rights, made a servile caste, and allowed only the
most meagre chance for developing their exceptional?" With
this general statement began what is popularly known as the
Washington-DuBois controversy, a controversy which attempted
to answer the problem of the most feasible education for the
Negro in America.

₁W.E.B. DuBois, Souls of Black Folk, Dodd, Mead and
Chapter 5

WILLIAM EDWARD DUBOIS' CONCEPT OF THE TALENTED TENTH

DuBois' concern for curriculum-making grew out of his role as a professor of history and sociology at a black educational institution, Atlanta University, where he developed a strong desire to improve the overall status of the American Negro. In truth, one would be hard put, and DuBois himself might even object, in classifying him as a curriculum specialist. This statement does not intend to imply, however, that he had no interest in educational program development. That he did. The concern in this chapter, as it treats DuBois, attempts to view his educational pronouncements, through the eye of a curriculum specialist.

I. Biographical Notes of W.E.B. DuBois

It was August 28, 1963, and people from every corner of the nation had assembled in Washington D.C., participants in the grandest protest march in our nation's history. At the climax of the day, a young black man, Martin Luther King, Jr., also a protester, and at the pinnacle of his career, arose and delivered what many considered the most eloquent oratory of his public life. After the speech, as the throng of people was preparing to disassemble, Ozzie Davis, a black actor and
writer, announced to the deporting assemblage that on the day preceding, William Edward Burghardt DuBois had died in Accra, Ghana.¹

In a large sense, the massive protest, the "March on Washington," was a fitting climax to the long and colorful life of the distinguished black scholar and educator, W.E.B. DuBois, for he, too, had spent a number of his ninety-five years agitating for the rights of black folks in the United States. He, himself, on one occasion stated that his life has been one of continued protest.² And, indeed it was, for his enemies were many and his friends were few and, perhaps, in the vein of a modern intellectual Don Quixote, he went about righting the world of its mistreatment of people of color.

DuBois' (pronounced Duboyce) life began three years after the close of the Civil War, in 1868. In the little town of Great Barrington, Massachusetts, where he was born, the people were returning to a state of normal activity after the rather long and fratricidal civil strife, and in the words of George R. Metcalf, "it was a time to live and


to forget, to recapture the pre-war values of thrift and industry, to revel in the strength of the newly formed Republican Party."\(^1\)

W.E.B. DuBois was born on February 23, of mixed African and European parentage. On both his maternal and paternal sides, there were grandparents with strong personalities. Mary Burghardt, William's mother, was descended from a slave who had been given his freedom after fighting for the colonial forces in the American Revolution, and one of the Dutch Burghardts who settled in the Berkshires in the late eighteenth century.\(^2\)

On his paternal side, DuBois could trace his ancestry back to a wealthy American of French Huguenot stock, and a mulatto slave girl whom he met in the Bahamas. Their son, Alexander, William's grandfather, proud of being an American, resented the Anglo-Saxon insistence on Negro separation, a distaste that his grandson would share. DuBois himself would say, somewhat later, that "he had been born with a flood of Negro blood, a strain of French, a bit of Dutch, but thank God, no Anglo-Saxon."\(^3\)

As a youth, his days were largely devoid of unpleasant

---


\(^2\)*Ibid.* p. 11.

incidents of discrimination. For one thing, there were not more than fifty Negroes in the community of 5,000 persons. These were, for the most part, well-known families who had resided in Great Barrington for several decades. The color line separating them from the whites was evident, but not absolute. He could recall almost no experience of segregation or color discrimination. It was a life he later remembered with pleasure.

Social consciousness in his home town was more a matter of class than color.¹ Young DuBois found that in the eyes of his playmates, he was more acceptable than children of the newly-arrived Irish and German immigrants whose parents worked in the mills. As a result, DuBois acquired a middle-class "down East" concept of life, that is, the rich are rewarded for their competence and the poor penalized for their ignorance. Later in life, he would dislike this kind of thinking, but he would always maintain a certain Yankee austerity and reserve acquired in those early days in New England.² Throughout his life, many people would speak of his haughty bearing, indifferent, cold-like attitude, and his unfriendly behavior. This kind of criticism, however,


makes light of his basic upbringing.

His personality was further shaped by a sharp intellect that gave him preeminence among his peers. He was able to compete on equal terms with the children of the community's prominent families, at times even beating them. His outstanding ability led his high school principal, Frank A. Hosmer, to suggest that DuBois prepare for college, a very rare step for Negroes in that day.¹

Only gradually did DuBois realize that his neighbors in Great Barrington placed him in a special category because his skin was colored. There were one or two minor incidents, but nothing could shake his standing in the community. He graduated from high school in 1884 with high honors, was president of the school lyceum, and was beginning to show some talent as a writer.

Before graduation from high school, DuBois had become a correspondent for the New York Globe, a pioneer newspaper that published articles about Negroes in the northeast.² As his experience broadened he was to discover prejudices in the adult world of Great Barrington; he saw that whites thought nothing of elbowing Negroes aside. On one occasion


he informed _Globe_ readers that a Republican town committee had given the job of night watchman to a Democrat rather than hire a Negro Republican who was pleading for the position.

DuBois' _Globe_ experience was to prove useful later in his life. He wrote hundreds of essays, some nineteen books, and founded at least two journals, the _Crisis_, the NAACP journal, and _Phylon-Study of Culture and Race_, both of which are still in publication.¹

Long before graduating from high school, the young DuBois had relished the thought of attending Harvard. But the difficulty of hurling the scholastic barrier separating Great Barrington from Cambridge plus the task of collecting tuition funds became insurmountable. He promised himself, however, that in the fall of 1885, he would start in college.

By that time, his situation had changed materially. DuBois' mother, the inspiration of his early years, was dead. She had become the family breadwinner after his father, an itinerant barber, had drifted away. The few dollars she earned by boarding a relative and by working occasionally as a domestic kept the family from disintegrating. A stern disciplinarian, she was adamantly on the subject of drinking. She warned him to never enter a saloon which he obeyed.

throughout his life. Now, with his mother gone, his eagerness to enter college waned.

Unexpectedly, through the cooperative generosity of four Connecticut churches, young DuBois was offered a scholarship to Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee. He was disappointed not to enter Harvard, but he accepted the scholarship, determined to do his best, yet considering the move only temporary. He vowed he would go to Harvard in the end.

Fisk had been in existence less than twenty years. It was founded by the American Missionary Association shortly after the Civil War "to establish for the colored people of the South a university that should adequately provide for them the advantages of Christian Education to whatever extent the capacity and energy of the race should in the future demand."¹ The experiment was a noble one, but because as DuBois said, "the southern world was split into white and black halves," he saw for the first time a caste system he had never witnessed in Great Barrington — in trains and living quarters, in schools and courts, prejudice and insult and violence, utter disregard of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, even of life itself if it happened to be a colored skin."²

Attending Fisk, however, was a worthwhile experience for the Great Barrington native. "I was thrilled to be for the first time among so many people of my own color or rather of such various and such extraordinary colors, which I had only glimpsed before, but who it seemed were bound to me by new and exciting and eternal ties."¹ Probably contrary to what he was told by many of his friends and relatives, he found the curriculum at Fisk a challenge to him. He enjoyed the classics, he delved into French and German literature, and he labored with the physical and social sciences. He established a good relationship with his teachers whom he respected and who were struck by his unusually quick, active mind.

Between the spring and fall semesters of the school year of 1885, DuBois struck into the back country of Tennessee to teach school. This initial experience taught him considerably about his people and the effects that poverty and race prejudice had upon them. He would return the following year.

DuBois graduated from Fisk in 1888, still determined to get a degree from Harvard. His application for admission was accepted and he entered as a junior in the undergraduate

program, having been highly recommended by the Fisk faculty. But life along the Charles River held none of the fascination he had experienced in Nashville. For one thing he felt excluded from the university's social life. However, this lack of fellowship with fellow students was more than compensated by the acceptance accorded him by his instructors.

Describing his experience at Harvard somewhat later, DuBois commented:

"The Harvard of 1888 was an extraordinary aggregation of great men. Not often if ever since that day have so many distinguished teachers been together in one place and at one time. There was William James, the psychologist; Palmer in ethics; Royce and Santayana in philosophy; Shaler in geology; and Hart in history. The President was the cold, precise but exceedingly efficient Charles William Eliot and there were a dozen lesser lights. By extraordinary good fortune, I was thrown into a contact with most of these men. I was repeatedly a guest in the house of William James; of all teachers, he was my closest friend. I was a member of the philosophical club; I talked often with Royce and Shaler; I sat alone in an upper room and read Kant's Critique with Santayana, I became one of Hart's favorite pupils and was afterwards guided by him through my graduate course and started on my work in Germany." 

Other professors encouraged him in other ways. Harvard's English pundit Barrett Wendell read to his class a

---

DuBois composition on the value of education and learning to express oneself well. "I believe foolishly perhaps, but sincerely, that I have something to say to the world, and I have taken English 12 in order to say it well," DuBois had written. Wendell was quite pleased, to put it mildly.

After receiving a B.A. degree in 1890, he set his mind on getting a master's degree. He applied to the Harvard graduate school and was awarded a fellowship that enabled him to embark on further studies in history and political science. During this period he read in the Boston Herald that former President Rutherford Hayes, who was president of the newly organized Slater Fund, had said "If there is any young colored man in the South whom we find to have a talent for art or literature..., we are willing to give him money...to send him to Europe." Coming from the man whose decision to withdraw United States occupation troops from the South that in the seventies had opened the floodgates of Jim Crow legislation, this was indeed a remarkable statement. DuBois wrote him immediately asking for a scholarship. Hayes' answer was pleasant enough, but he said, "the newspaper quotation was incorrect."

---


DuBois was not to be put down but rather became more insistent. He deluged Hayes with letters from everyone he knew at Harvard. Finally, DuBois was promised $750 to study abroad. Rushing to New York, he met Hayes at the old Astor House in lower Manhattan and discussed the terms of the agreement. The Fund would grant him half and loan the remainder with the possibility of renewal the following year. DuBois was so happy over the outcome that he rushed out and bought a shirt for three dollars, "about four times as much as I had ever paid for a shirt in my life." 

It was customary in the latter part of the 19th century for students in their doctoral program to study in Europe and by the summer of 1893, DuBois arrived by ship in Amsterdam, Holland. The Dutch people he found to be very orderly, neat, and not hampered by the conflict of race. He spent the rest of the summer after his arrival traveling, attending places of culture, and meeting the native people.

In the autumn, DuBois went to Berlin to begin his advanced courses at the university. As at Harvard, he had a good relationship with his instructors. He wrote later:

---


"I had again at Berlin as at Harvard unusual opportunity. Although a foreigner, I was admitted my first semester to two semesters under Schmoller and Wagner, both of them had pleasant testimony of my work. My work was in economics, history and sociology. I sat under the voice of the fire-eating Von Treitschke and heard him assert the general inferiority of mulattoes and mixed races; I wrote on American agriculture for Schmoller and discussed social conditions in Europe with teachers and students. But more especially I traveled; living cheaply, I saved good sums for the numerous vacations."

His study in Europe ended all too soon and by the end of the academic year of 1893-1894, he began to make preparation for his return home. He began at this time to entertain a different kind of concern - his place in the real world of work. In a mood of reflection and anticipation, he viewed the world which lay before him:

"I returned to the United States by way of Paris, where I stayed as long as possible and then having reduced myself almost to the last cent, took passage to the United States in the steerage, quite penniless. It was by no means a pleasant trip, but perhaps it was a good introduction to the new life, because now at last at twenty-six years of age and after twenty years of study, I was coming home to look for a job and to begin work. I need not dwell on the difficulties of landing that job. It was a disturbed world in which I landed: 1892 saw the high tide of lynching in the United States, 235 untried Negroes being slaughtered in that one year. Cleveland had entered his second term in 1893, and the Chicago Exposition had taken place. The Dreyfus case had opened in France with his conviction and imprisonment and he was destined for twelve years to

---

suffer martyrdom. The war between China and Japan broke out the year of my return and Nicholas II was ruling in Russia.¹

When DuBois arrived in the United States, he was convinced of two things: first, that he had received a thorough and an unusual education; secondly, that he was certain that his life's work was to be among his own people.

Needing work, DuBois sent out several applications. The first school to respond was Wilberforce University, in Xenia, Ohio, at $800 a year, which offered him a chair in the classics. His two years spent at Wilberforce, however, were not happy years. For one thing, he could not adapt to the ecclesiastical restrictions placed on his academic freedom.² While at Wilberforce, he did manage to complete his dissertation and win a wife. The opportunity to settle in a more stimulating environment arose when the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania offered him a research fellowship to study conditions in Philadelphia's seventh ward slums, where 20 percent of the city's Negro population lived. He spent the next fifteen months interviewing 45,000 Negroes, going door to door, spending an average of twenty minutes in each household, discussing such topics as family status,


²Ibid, pp. 56-57.
morality, employment, religion, and social well-being. He was convinced, at the outset, that research would produce a solution to the Negro problem in large American cities.\(^1\)

As a sociologist, he believed that an empirical study could initiate constructive action. In this he was to be disappointed. Yet the final product, entitled the *Philadelphia Negro*, was to become a classic of its kind. Gunnar Myrdal, who would do an extensive study of the Negro in the 1940's, found the *Philadelphia Negro* very useful.\(^2\)

In 1897, when DuBois was not yet thirty, he received a call to Atlanta University. Then, president, Horace Bumstead, had learned of the young Harvard graduate's work in Philadelphia and was eager for him to direct the sociology program and to guide a recently organized series of conferences on Negro life. For more than a decade, DuBois served as the guiding spirit of these annual conferences, which assembled a vast encyclopedia on Negro activities.

In a speech delivered at Atlanta University in 1938, to mark the celebration of his seventieth birthday, he was asked to address the University of Convocation and review his life. He organized the speech by periods of ten years.


\(^2\)Ibid. p. 59.
Of the period from 1898–1908, he declared, "this fourth decade was the real beginning of my lifework."¹ Generally speaking two developments occurred during this period which led DuBois to take a more radical approach toward solving racial matters. First, the social plight of the Negro worsened rather than improved. Something had to be done.

His academic work and his empirical study, *The Philadelphia Negro*, had led him to accept the notion that a scientific approach to studying a problem would yield encouraging results. Race prejudice, he believed, was grounded on ignorance. He reasoned that if the true facts were known about the cause of Negro crime and other social problems, then the solutions would occur in time. This attitude was to change, however. Racism was too ingrained in the public consciousness to be dissolved by any simple solution.²

Secondly, by 1898, Booker T. Washington had emerged as the leading spokesman for problems facing Negro Americans. Washington's program was widely accepted by most of the leading white leaders. In 1895, he had advocated a policy of gradualism which suggested that Negroes give up for the time being political and social equality and concentrate on becoming economically independent. DuBois saw in Washington's


²Ibid. p. 39.
program an inherent danger.

The big break between the two men occurred publicly in 1903 with the publication of *Souls of Black Folk* by DuBois. In this book, which is a series of essays on various aspects of the Negro problem, DuBois included an essay entitled "Of Mr. Booker T. Washington" in which he clearly pointed out that Washington's insistence on an accommodationist philosophy of racial adjustment between blacks and whites and his almost inclusive emphasis on large scale industrial education for Negro people were abetting the white establishment in creating a caste system for black people.¹ This, Washington, he claimed, failed to see or would not see.

The "controversy" between DuBois and Washington was now in the opening. Both sides claimed adherents and criticized severely the opponents. The end of the controversy was not to be until 1915 with death of Washington. The philosophies of the two men are important to this study because they raised a fundamental question relative to the query, "What education is most appropriate for a people recently joining the community of a free society?" To Washington the answer was industrial education. To DuBois it was the selection of students with higher ability for advanced training in col-

lege. Thus there was created two educational philosophies early in the twentieth century affecting black people and the resultant need to analyze these philosophies from a curriculum point of view.

The period from 1919 in the life of DuBois until his death in 1963 in a large measure is anticlimatic to the further concerns of this paper. He did become involved in some rather significant developments both in his public and private lives, however. And, he did write scattered articles dealing with education. These will be referred to later....He became a co-founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1910; he is called the Father of Pan-Africanism which developed after World War I; he with Carter G. Woodson can be called the Fathers of the Study of Black People in America. Three years before his death at the age of ninety-two, he publicly announced his political allegiance to the Communist Party. He died a citizen of Ghana.

In several of his publications, DuBois examined the problems of education of black people in American society and in so doing evolved an educational program which he thought would go far in bringing needed reform to problems restricting Negro advancement in America. His educational innovation called the Talented Tenth is discussed in the next section.
II. The DuBoisian Concept of the Talented Tenth

DuBois' thinking on educational matters cannot be considered profound in the sense that it broaches an entirely new approach to educational problems nor can it be considered deeply intellectual involving any detailed analysis of the best of the current educational thought of his period. He owed it to his great enthusiasm for the black people and his ability to articulate his concept of their need that attention is drawn to his philosophy.

His great faith in education made him cognizant of the large mission which education had to perform in the progress of the masses, especially, the black masses. His faith in education led him to look to it as the chief agent performing the miracle needed in the social regeneration of a people. It is needless to say that he expected much from education. He therefore, posited a method, or philosophy, for dealing with the problem, and that method, unsurprisingly, mirrored his own educational development in becoming a leader and thereby fulfilling a useful place in society.

Generally speaking, DuBois tended to view education in its larger cultural setting with added inclusion of the Negro as an integral part of it. He was not inclined to perceive of education in its impact on the individual rather he tended to conceive of education, perhaps unconsciously, in terms of its effects on the masses. This orientation
undoubtedly grew out of his belief that the Negro was struggling for survival as a race.

His educational thinking centered around the best system of achieving racial equality for black Americans. To accomplish this end, he advocated a program of education starting with the early years of the child and extending, for some, through college. First, he wanted common school training for every Negro child. Secondly, and in agreement with Washington, he wanted industrial education for the masses. But unlike Washington, he opted for, and placed as a priority, the higher education of selected Negro youth. It is this latter phase of his system which gained wide popularity and which discussion here will focus.

DuBois' conception of the Talented Tenth emerged as a consequence of the continuing deterioration of the condition of the American Negro during the latter part of the 19th century and the first part of the 20th century. It also developed as a counterforce to the growing impact of industrial education thrust advocated by Booker T. Washington. By 1903, DuBois had crystalized his position.

In essence what he meant by his Talented Tenth concept was that given the free opportunity, the most able tenth of all blacks would go on to college and after obtaining broader knowledge through higher education that Talented Tenth would have an obligation and a duty to guide and to lead the rest of the race toward a fulfilling life. He knew that
without black leadership the black American would have to accept white leadership and whatever consequence would result.

Thinking as an historian, he argued that the Negro race if it were to succeed must follow the example of other successful races. He elaborated on this notion in a statement published in 1903:

"The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth; it is the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination and death of the Worst, in their own and other races."\(^1\)

DuBois was quick to recognize the difficult and intricate task of training men and was quite willing to leave the technical problems in operationalizing educational techniques to educational experts. But in the establishment of goals and the setting up of objectives or aims for education these were to be left to the seers or the statesmen with educational foresight and vision.\(^2\)

"If we make money the object of man-training, we shall develop money-makers but not necessarily men; if we make technical skill the object of education, we may possess artisans but not, in nature, men. Men, we shall have only as we make


\(^2\) Ibid.
manhood the object of the work of the schools — intelligence, broad sympathy, knowledge of the world that was and is, and of the relation of men to it — this is the curriculum of that Higher Education which must underlie true life. On this foundation we may build bread winning, skill of hand and quickness of brain, with never a fear lest the child and man mistake the means of living for the object of life.¹

What DuBois calls for, then, is an idea popularized later by John Dewey — education for life. Men are to be trained not only to accept the fact that each has a work to perform in the betterment of mankind but who also are aware of the deeper meanings of life.

If what DuBois said of the need of a Talented Tenth was true, he had the responsibility of proving three points. First, he had to show from the past that the Talented Tenth as they had arisen among American Negroes had been worthy of leadership. Secondly, there was a need to show that these men may be educated and developed. Thirdly, he had to show their relation to the Negro problem.

Although omitting specific mention of names, DuBois, in an essay devoted to the explanation of his Talented Tenth, argued that from the very first it had been the educated and intelligent of the Negro people that had led and elevated the mass. The success of any mass effort, however, was

nullified and retarded by the obstacles of slavery and race prejudice.¹ And yet, in spite of contradictions of some of the present leaders (here he is speaking of the period in the early 1900's and Booker T. Washington in particular) who he described as cowards, vacillators, and compromisers, there was, even then, a Talented Tenth who was holding the line against an oppressive social system. He cited a number of black college presidents as examples of the trained leadership doing the kind of job the times demanded.

Rising to a crescendo of emotion, he explodes with two directed questions: "Can the masses of the Negro people be in any possible way more quickly raised than by the effort and example of this aristocracy of talent and character? Was there ever a nation on God's fair earth civilized from the bottom upward?" The inevitable response was a resounding "Never!" "It is, ever was and ever will be from the top downward that culture filters. The Talented Tenth rises and pulls all that are worth the saving up to their vantage ground. This is the history of human progress...."²

With the question of the history of past leadership of the talented settled in his mind, he proceeds to describe


²W.E.B. DuBois, Souls of Black Folks, New York: Dodd, Mezdzand Company, 1903, p. 77. See also Philip S. Foner, p. 133.
how the Talented Tenth would be developed. The answer was forthright and simple:

"The best and most capable of black youth must be schooled in the colleges and universities of the land."\(^1\)

All people could not attend universities, but it was his conviction that some young people who could not attend universities must go to college. Society had to have for the talented few centers of training where "men are not so mystified and befuddled by the hard and necessary toil of earning a living."\(^2\) DuBois wanted to see the development and growth of a few, well-endowed black universities on the order of Atlanta, Fisk, and Howard Universities. These universities would have outstanding liberal arts programs with a curriculum that promoted a broader base of knowledge and cultural understanding.

It was in the area of broadening the base of cultural life for the masses that college preparation for the few would indirectly benefit the race.

"Knowledge of life and its wider meaning had been the point of the Negro's deepest ignorance, and


the sending out of college-prepared teachers whose training has not been simply for bread winning, but also human culture, has been of inestimable value in the training of these men."1

As a scientist, as well as an educator, DuBois knew well the problems of the Negro, especially the southern Negro. He knew that many of their difficulties stemmed from the fact that Negro society was disorganized and had little structure. He pointed out that the Negro people needed social leadership perhaps more than most groups. He attempted to show that they had no traditions to fall back upon, no long established customs, no strong family ties, and no well defined social classes and that the lack of these essentials created in black society a vicious circle of social demoralization and disorder.

DuBois' plan for social reform called for a type of self-directed racial uplift through social responsibility in the tradition of the Mexican reform movement of the early twentieth century - "each one help one." This notion is implied in the following statement:

"...Human education is not simply a matter of schools; it is much more a matter of family and group life - the training of one's home, of one's daily companions, of one's social class."2

2 Ibid. p. 46.
Yet DuBois never relinquished for one moment the notion that the impetus, the moving force, for his program came from those individuals receiving higher education. "The teachers...are the group-leaders of the Negro people - the physicians and clergymen, the trained fathers and mothers, the influential and forceful men about him of all kinds."\(^1\) Here it was, he felt, that the culture of the surrounding world trickled through and was handed on by the graduates of the higher schools.

Thus it was that the Talented Tenth would relate itself to the larger Negro problem. Anyone trained in higher education was morally responsible to work for the social regeneration of his fellow black man.

With a cautious resignation to the task set before him, he outlines the general problem to be solved and the means through which the solution to the problem will be achieved:

"Whether you like it or not," he concluded,

the millions are here, and here they will remain. If you do not lift them up, they will pull you down. Education and work are the levers to uplift a people. Work alone will not do it unless inspired by the right ideals and guided by intelligence. Education must not simply teach work - it must teach life. The Talented Tenth of the Negro race must be made leaders of thought and missionaries of culture among their people. No others can do this work and Negro colleges must train men

for it. The Negro race, like all other races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men."¹

Thus DuBois would accomplish the work of rebuilding black society. First, by selecting black youth of exceptional talent and ability; educating them in the fine art of living through black universities staffed with exceptional black instructors; lastly, by sending them out as leaders to apply their skills in the uplift of the Negro community. Such a program has implications for curriculum theory and development. Attention will be directed shortly to these considerations.

Chapter 6

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS
OF THE CURRICULUM THEORIZING OF
BOBRITT, CHARTERS, WASHINGTON, AND DUBOIS

Whether Washington, DuBois, Bobbitt, or Charters knew or knew of each other or had any direct communication whatever is anyone's guess. Each was a nationally known figure in his own right with Washington, perhaps, having access to more of the political and educational leaders of the day, consequently wielding more influence, especially as it related to black education. Each, however, was a member of the same generation and must have felt the impact of the host of problems of the day as it effected him.

Washington's influence often spilled over into the political and social lives of many people, both North and South. He knew personally Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft. He created quite a social stir in 1901, when he became the first black man to dine in the White House. He often visited with John D. Rockefeller and was a personal friend of Andrew Carnegie. He received an honorary degree from Harvard then under the administration of Charles Eliot. He was loved or hated by both white and blacks. He seemed never to maintain a middle ground. At Tuskegee, his over-
bearing rule made him, at one and the same time, feared and often disliked by members of the faculty.

DuBois, during this period, as well as throughout the rest of his life, remained the gadfly, the provocateur of racial differences that separated blacks and whites. He deftly blended many of the qualities of an H. L. Mencken, a Bertrand Russell, or a William Buckley. His close friends were obviously few in number. His interests spanned the breadth of the concerns related to the colored races of the world.

Bobbitt appeared the energetic professor whose efficiency as an educator was never in question. From his bailiwick at the University of Chicago, he traveled throughout the country advising, in a consultative capacity, school boards, schools of education, school districts, on how to make their school programs more efficient and productive.

Charters, whose pioneer-like life in his birthplace in Canada, felt well-suited for the pioneering efforts in the educational specialty of curriculum-making. Unlike the other men whose work is under review in this study, Charters was a member of the Baptist denomination and possessed the zeal of an itinerant Baptist minister. (Washington's religious stance tended toward deism or agnosticism. DuBois was more of a humanist. Christianity as it was practiced, he thought, made man contented with his social position. Although not known, Bobbitt's religious position appeared
more like DuBois'.) He worked closely with the denomination as is revealed by his study done for a Baptist women's college. Whereas Washington, DuBois, and Bobbitt spent long years with one institution, Charters accomplished much of his work over a span of time at several different colleges and universities.

However, different each man was in personality and calling, each possessed, at least, one thing in common—each was an educator whose educational concerns established a precedent in the making of curriculum.

Historians of education agree that American education went through a kind of metamorphosis after the turn of this century, but the nature and effect of the changes are in some dispute. In the popular mind, the reforms that were wrought during that period—indeed the whole first half of the 20th century—have become associated with a broad and loosely defined "progressive education" movement.¹ John Dewey is seen as the dominant force in American educational practice with an undisciplined child-centered pedagogy dubiously ascribed to him. Even a cursory examination of the work of educational reformers during this period, however, indicates that influential leaders differed widely in the

doctrines they espoused and in the pedagogical reforms they advocated.¹ Booker T. Washington favored a program of industrial education whose method of curriculum organization anticipated somewhat the activity curriculum of John Dewey. W.E.B. DuBois' Talented Tenth proposal which draws upon the mental faculty theory popular during the late 19th century, also has features comparable to the Essentialists of the 1940's and 1950's, men the likes of Robert Hutchins, Arthur Bestor, and others. Franklin Bobbitt's educational ideas differed enormously from those of John Dewey while those ideas of W. W. Charters are a blend of the Herbartians, Dewey, and Bobbitt. There is no doubt that this was a period of ferment in education, with new ideas filling the void being created by the steadily declining theory of mental discipline.

To aid in the provision of a context or perspective from which to understand the thrust of what Bobbitt, Charters, Washington, and DuBois had to say regarding curriculum development, one might consider two questions: (1) what were they fighting against? and, (2) how did what they were fighting against effect what was going on in education at that time?

Bobbitt, for one, was overwhelmed by the rapid changes taking place in the social order at the opening of the twentieth century. These changes were proceeding with great and ever-accelerating rapidity. As the world pressed forward toward the accomplishment of new ideas and goals, he felt that the same outpouring of energy should be exhibited in education:

"The present program of public education was mainly formulated during the simpler conditions of the nineteenth century. In details it has been improved. In fundamentals it is not greatly different. A program never designed for the present day has been inherited."¹

Like Rugg,² Bobbitt saw an "educational lag" between what was current in the various societal practices and what the schools were doing. What Bobbitt attempted to do was to bridge the gap that existed between society's accomplishments and school practices. His curriculum formulating ideas were his effort to make the school program fit the needs of a technological society. "Civilization," said Bobbitt, "is a system of activities."³


Charters saw the same problem that Bobbitt identified but from a different vantage point. Charters looked at what society wanted in terms of its ideals and he questioned how the schools were realizing these ideals. It was his belief that the most sincere of educators had not sufficiently dealt with what were set up as ideals of education and how these ideals were to be achieved. Most educators took a "mental leap" when it came to actualizing the curriculum to achieve those ideals.\(^1\) He questioned, for example, if the aim of education is to make good citizens, how was good citizenship to be developed and what courses would achieve that aim. Most educators had little scientific proof that a series of courses would realize an ideal.

It is interesting to note that both Bobbitt and Charters, in their curriculum decision making, were more concerned about the effects of an ever-accelerating, rapidly developing technological society on the lives of people than they were about ideas as such. Men were not the problem but their inventions had complicated life. In one sense, their educational model was crisis oriented.

Washington and DuBois not only had to contend with a rapidly developing technological society but had to justify the black man's role in it.

---

What was the impact of these men on their contemporaries? For Bobbitt and Charters, the answer would be minimal. Their contemporaries probably considered their thrust too laborious, costly, time-consuming and unworthy to continue as a permanent method of curriculum organizing. Washington, on the other hand, was more successful than DuBois in winning approval of his way of organizing curriculum.

The picture that emerges from the apparently frenetic educational activity during the first few decades of this century seems to be one of growing acceptance of a powerful and restrictive bureaucratic model for education which looked toward the management techniques of industry as its ideal of excellence and source of inspiration. The dominant metaphor for educational theory in the early 20th century was drawn not from the educational philosophy of John Dewey or even from the romantic notions of childhood, but from corporate management. The theory applies also to the education of the Negro, but on a different level of significance. Ellwood Cubberly explicated that model in 1916:

"Every manufacturing establishment that turns out a standard product or a series of products

of any kind maintains a force of efficiency experts to study methods of procedure and to measure and test the output of its work. Such men ultimately bring the manufacturing establishment large returns, by introducing improvements in processes and procedure, and in training the workmen to produce larger and better output. Our schools are, in a sense, factories in which the raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of twentieth-century civilization, and it is the business of the school to build its pupils according to the specifications laid down. This demands good tools, specialized machinery, continuous measurement of production to see if it is according to specifications, the elimination of waste in manufacture and a large variety in the output.  

Children, in other words, were to become the "standard products" which would be fashioned according to the design specifications set forth by the social world.  

The institution of schooling was simply that vast bureaucratic machinery which transforms the crude raw material of childhood into a socially useful product. A redesigned curriculum, stripped of the playful and wasteful, was to be the chief instrument in effecting the change.

I. Scientific Management and Its Significance at the Turn of the 20th Century

The context for the bureaucratization of the school

---


curriculum that was to take place in the 20th century was manifest in the general social and intellectual climate of American society at the turn of the century. The late 19th century saw the breakdown of a community-centered society and with it the ideal of the individual as the unit element in social life. The press of corporate expansion and urbanization made the individual merely a cog in a great machine. Whereas the individual retained a measure of recognition in a community-centered society, the vast new social and economic units robbed him of his identity.\footnote{1

Newby and Tyack described this same phenomenon. During the latter half of the 19th century, a fairly pluralistic system of control of urban schools by wards had resulted in interest group politics in which different constituencies, if they could summon power, could exercise some degree of influence over schools in their communities. Thus one found, for example, 3102 students in Milwaukee studying Polish in their elementary schools as late as 1915. At the turn of the century, however, came the movement to centralize control of schools in small boards elected at large and

to turn over effective operations of the schools to the professionals. ¹

Responses to this fundamental change in American society ranged from the economic radicalism of Henry George to the utopian socialism of Edward Bellamy. ² But the ideas that filtered through and eventually took the fort were the bureaucratic ones peculiarly suited to the fluidity and impersonality of an urban-industrial world.

The particular response that captured the imagination of Americans at the turn of the century was a form of idealized bureaucracy known widely as scientific management. Its principal spokesman was Frederick W. Taylor, and its watchword was efficiency. ³ Under Taylor's concept of scientific management, productivity is central, and the individual is simply an element in the production system. Basic to Taylor's conception of scientific management was the assumption that man is motivated by economic gain and would sacrifice much


in the way of job satisfaction and physical ease in order to achieve such gain.\(^1\) Yet scientific principles had to be applied to the workman as well as to the work, and this involved careful study of the workman's "own special abilities and limitations" in an effort "to develop each individual man to his highest state of efficiency and prosperity."\(^2\)

The individual under Taylorism was not ignored; on the contrary, he was made the subject of intense investigation, but only within the context of increasing product output. Through time and motion studies, the worker's movements were broken down into minute operations and then standards of efficiency were developed for each of the operations. The rules of scientific management and psychological principles were then applied to the worker to bring him up to the appropriate level of efficiency. The essence of scientific management was the fragmentation and analysis of work and its reordering into the most efficient arrangement possible.\(^3\)

One of the attractions of Taylorism was that it carried with it an ethical dimension which bore a superficial re-


\(^2\)Ibid. p. 43.

semblance to some of the tried and true virtues of the 19th century. Taylor's first professional paper, for example, delivered in 1895 at a meeting of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, made the case for a "piece-rate system" partly on moral grounds. The minimum time for each operation would be computed and the worker would be paid for his performance relative to that fixed performance level. In this way, the workman's interest would coincide with that of his employer and a "soldiering" (loafing on the job) would be eliminated. Once the work load was broken down into elementary operations, an "honest day's work could be scientifically computed. "If a man won't do what is right, Taylor argued, make him."¹ Since scientific rate-fixing could be used to outline the dimensions of virtuous activity, industry could be rewarded and indolence punished.

II. **Bureaucratic Efficiency in School Management and Curriculum Theory as Evolved by Bobbitt and Charters**

The bureaucratic model for curriculum design had a rather unremarkable birth. School administrators simply reacted to the influence of the scientific management movement in industry by interpolating those methods to the

management of schools. Managers of schools patterned themselves after their counterparts in industry and took pride in adapting the vocabulary and techniques of industry to school administration.¹ Cost accounting and maximum utilization of school plants were among their paramount concerns. The period, in fact, may be regarded as one in which the "transition of the superintendent of schools from an educator to a business manager" took place.²

The efficiency movement, however, was to affect more than just the administration of schools. Its most profound effect was on curriculum theory itself. Among the early prophets of the new efficiency in school administration was the man who later was to become the preeminent force in curriculum reform, and, indeed, the man who gave shape and direction to the curriculum field, John Franklin Bobbitt. W. W. Charters' impact on the curriculum field would follow several years later.³


³Herbert M. Kliebard, "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory," p. 79.
Bobbitt's early work essentially followed the main line of adapting business techniques for use in schools. In 1912, for example, Bobbitt took as his model of efficiency the operation of the Gary, Indiana, schools. "The first principle of scientific management," he announced, "is to use all the plant all the available time."\(^1\) His second principle of scientific management, "to reduce the number of workers to a minimum by keeping each at the maximum of his working efficiency,"\(^2\) reflected the need for division of labor and job specialization in the school. Bobbitt's third principle simply involved the elimination of waste. Here, Bobbitt commented on the wasteful concomitants of "ill-health and lowered vitality" and commended Superintendent Wirt's efforts to provide appropriate recreational facilities for the students in the Gary schools.

Bobbitt's fourth principle of general scientific management made the leap from the areas of simple plant and worker efficiency into the realm of educational theory itself:

"Work up the raw material into that finished product for which it is best adapted. Applied to education this means: Educate the individual according to his capabilities. This requires that the materials of the curriculum be sufficiently various to meet the needs of every class of in-

\(^1\) John Franklin Bobbitt, "The Elimination of Waste in Education," The Elementary School Teacher, Vol. 12, No. 6 February, 1912, p. 263.

\(^2\) Ibid. pp. 263-264.
dividuals in the community; and the course of training and study be sufficiently flexible that the individual can be given just the things he needs.¹

This inferring of the principles of scientific management to the area of curriculum made the child the object on which the bureaucratic machinery of the school operates. He became the raw material from which the school factory must fashion a product drawn to the specifications of social convention. What was at first simply a direct application of general management principles to the management of schools became the central metaphor on which modern curriculum theory rests.²

"Educate the individual according to his capabilities" has an innocent and plausible ring; but what this meant in practice was that dubious judgments about the innate capacities of children became the basis for differentiating the curriculum along the lines of probable destination for the child. Dominated by the criterion of social utility, these judgments became self-fulfilling prophecies in the sense that they predetermined which slots in the social order would be filled by which "class of individuals."³ Just

¹John Franklin Bobbitt, "The Elimination of Waste in Education," The Elementary School Teacher, Vol. 12, No. 6 (February, 1912)


³Ibid.
as Taylor decided that "one of the first requirements for a man who is fit to handle pig iron as a regular occupation is that he shall be so stupid and phlegmatic that he more nearly resembles in his mental makeup the ox than any other type,"¹ so it was the schools that now were to determine (scientifically, of course) what biographical, psychological, or social factors in human beings fit them to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water in our society. Although still in undeveloped form, this conception of the work of the school in relation to the child and his studies became a central element in Bobbitt's influential curriculum research and theory a decade or so later. The ramifications of this central production metaphor in educational theory are now widely felt.²

Through the first quarter of the 20th century, Bobbitt continued to take the lead in reforming the administration of public schools along the lines of scientific management advocated by Taylor. Increasingly, however, Bobbitt was moving from the mere translation of general principles of scientific management to the management of schools into the domain of curriculum theory. As a kind of quality control,

²Ibid. p. 81.
Bobbitt advocated that "definite qualitative and quantitative standards be determined for the productive." In the railroad industry, he pointed out, each rail "must be thirty feet in length, and weigh eighty pounds to the yard. It must be seven and three-eighths inches in height, with a head two and one-sixty-fourth of an inch in thickness and five inches deep, and a base five inches wide."¹

Based on studies by Courtis and others and using standard scores, Bobbitt showed the relation between the foreman in a plant and outcomes which could be expected by the teacher (who is comparable to the industrial foreman):

"The third-grade teacher should bring her pupils up to an average of 26 correct arithmetic combinations per minute. The fourth-grade teacher has the task, during the year that the same pupils under her care, of increasing their addition speed from an average of 26 combinations per minute to an average of 34 combinations per minute. If she does not bring them up to the standard 34, she has failed to perform her duty in proportion to the deficit, and there is no responsibility upon her for carrying them beyond the standard 34."²

In 1915, Bobbitt was to apply principles of cost accounting in business organizations to school subjects.


This brought the heart of the school curriculum, the sub-
jects, into the orbit of bureaucratic efficiency. Bobbitt
continued to be impressed by standardization in relation
to efficiency in railroad administration. He pointed out,
for example, that railroad companies know that "locomotive
repair-cost should average about six cents per mile-run"
"and that lubricating oils should cost about eighteen cents
per hundred miles for passenger locomotives, and about
twenty-five cents for freight locomotives."¹ The implica-
tions of such an accounting procedure were developed later
by Bobbitt, his colleagues, and his present-day intellec-
tual heirs.

The great curse of bureaucracy is uncertainty. The
inevitable course of the bureaucratization of the curric-
ulum, therefore, was in the direction of predictability. As
in industry, this was accomplished mainly through the stan-
dardization of activity or work units and of the products
themselves. In the curriculum field, vague conceptions of
the purposes of schooling became intolerable, and "particu-
larization" of educational objectives became a byword. "An
age of science is demanding exactness and particularity,"
announced Bobbitt in the first modern book on curriculum.²

¹Franklin Bobbitt, "Some General Principles of Manage-
ment Applied to the Problems of City-School Systems," Twelfth
Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,
Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913, p. 82.
²Franklin Bobbitt, The Curriculum, Boston: Houghton
Mifflin Company, 1918, p. 41.
The curriculum became something progressively to be discovered through the scientific analysis of the activities of mankind. Just as scientific management became associated with virtue, so the incipient field of curriculum looked to scientific curriculum making as the source of answers to the great value questions that govern the purposes of education.

The process had a commonsensical appeal. "The curriculum-discoverer will first be an analyst of human nature and human affairs. He would go out into the world of affairs and discover the particular abilities, attitudes, habits, appreciations, and forms of knowledge that human beings need. These would become the objectives of the curriculum. When these multitudinous needs are not filled by "undirected experiences," then "directed experiences" would be provided through the curriculum. Bobbitt set forth the basic principle: "The curriculum of the directed training is to be discovered in the shortcomings of individuals after they have had all that can be given by undirected training." ¹

The curriculum was the mechanism for remedying the haphazard effects of ordinary living, for achieving the standard product which undirected socialization achieved so imper-

fectly.

One major concomitant of such a conception of the curriculum was the broadening of its scope into the boundless domain of human activity. Instead of being merely the repository of man's intellectual inheritance, the curriculum now embraced the gamut of human experience, "the total range of habits, skills, abilities, forms of thought, valuations, ambitions, etc., that its members need for the effective performance of their vocational labors; likewise, the total range needed for their civic activities; their language; their parental religions, and general social activities."¹

As strong as the movement toward standardization of education was, echoes of opposition could be heard. President emeritus of Harvard University and the chief architect of the Committee of Ten report, Charles W. Eliot, then 89 years old, pointed out that while standardization of the worker's movements in industry may have resulted in increased productivity, "the inevitable result was the destruction of the interest of the workman in his work." Standardization, he argued, was also having the same effect in education. What is more, it was antithetical to the true process of education as he saw it. "The true ed-

ucational goal," he said, "is the utmost development of the individual's capacity or power, not in childhood and adolescence alone, but all through life. Fixed standards in labor, in study, in modes of family life, are downright enemies of progress for the body, mind, and soul of man."

Whether Eliot would have voiced a similar concern as the goal of Negro education is questionable. But W.E.B. DuBois reflects this same ideal as the only way black people could gain first class citizenship.

Apart from its implications for the individual as producer, the production metaphor in curriculum theory carries with it important implications for the individual as product. By the 1920's, a massive effort was under way to reform the curriculum through product standardization and predetermination. As usual, Bobbitt set the tone:

"In the world of economic production, a major secret of success is predetermination. 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 the output. They standardize and thus predetermine the processes to be employed, the quantity and quality of raw material to be used for each type and unit of product, the character and amount of labor to be employed, and the character of the conditions under which

---

the work should be done. . . . The business world is institutionalizing foresight and developing an appropriate and effective technique.

There is a growing realization within the educational profession that we must particularize the objectives of education. We, too, must institutionalize foresight, and, so far as conditions of our work will permit, develop a technique of predetermination of the particularized results to be obtained.¹

The technique that Bobbitt referred to, the analysis of man's activities into particular and specialized units of behavior, came to be known as activity analysis.

By the 1920's, Bobbitt had been joined in his campaign to reform the curriculum along the lines of the bureaucratic model by such extraordinary influential leaders as W. W. Charters and David Snedden. The concern here will concentrate on the influence of Charters.

In the main, the reform in the 1920's took the form of using activity analysis to strip away the nonfunctional, the "dead wood" in the curriculum. Increasingly, this was being done with reference to particular groups in the school. "The curriculum situation has become acute," Charters declared in 1921. "The masses who send their children to school are growing restive under what they consider to be the useless

material taught in the grades." Having a background as a teacher and an educator of teachers one can sense the importance which Charters places on the subjects to be taught. ¹

Charters' approach in dealing with the problem of the curriculum followed the teacher's concern. The basic question which he thought to answer was "how can subject matter be made more practical. John Dewey had provided the theoretical framework upon which to build a curriculum. Charters found the guiding principle on which he would evolve his curriculum method from the Deweyan notion that "structure follows function."²

It was while Charters was at the University of Missouri when he made his first major effort to put theory into practice in building a curriculum. He was asked to give assistance to the Stephens College faculty of Columbia, Missouri, in making a curriculum suited for the student body. The college was a Baptist women's school and Charters' task was to develop a program which would provide "specific training for the specific job of being a woman." What constitutes being


a woman, of course, was determined through activity analysis, the idea which Charters borrowed from Bobbitt. Women all over the country were asked to write a complete statement of what they did for a week, and 95,000 replies were received.\(^1\) The replies were then analyzed into about 7,300 categories such as food, clothing, and health. Using these activities as his base, Charters developed the curriculum for Stephens College.

Just as Taylor found it necessary to identify discrete units of work, so were the educational leaders of the period embarking on the task of identifying the units of all activity as the first step in curriculum planning. As Charters expressed it, the job is one of "finding out what people have to do and showing them how to do it."\(^2\)

Putting it somewhat humorously, as well as animously, Kliebard stated, "the possibilities were limitless. Once women were identified and trained to be women, so could almost any other identifiable group in our society be trained for its role."\(^3\) To be sure, all persons would be trained to


\(^3\)Kliebard, _op. cit._, p. 85.
perform some activities in common, such as some of those involved in maintaining physical efficiency, but their differentiated roles in society could be programmed as well.

Charters saw activity analysis as a very limited and restrictive device.¹ For one thing it caused isolated activities to stand out in relief or without any relationship to the whole. Reasoning that one cannot analyze sufficiently in activity by itself, Charters expanded on the method of activity analysis redesignating it as functional analysis. He described the method somewhat in an article published in the Journal of Educational Research:

"Job analysis [functional analysis] is a term which smacks of its origin. It has been taken over from the industrial field where the job is the unit of operation. The term is used rather loosely, and in its application to the general educational field it has come to include not only the manual operations, but activities are carried on by individuals in the performance of tasks. It is a deliberate and persistent attempt to apply the method of analysis to constellations of activities from the functional point of view...The term functional analysis is a better name than is job analysis with its restricted connotations."²

Charters, by 1919, was using functional analysis to cope with two problems: selection of educational objec-


²Ibid. p. 214.
tives, and alignment of them with activities to be undertaken in a school situation. Prior to this time his approach had been to seek minimum essentials within traditional subject matters. These subjects had been analyzed in order to find those aspects that are most useful for the learner's efficient functioning in society.¹

From around 1919 on, Charters was increasingly interested in applying a technique of analysis to broad aims of education. These included such categories as training teachers and pharmacists and fostering ideals. The method of functional analysis was to be used to reduce broad aims to the level of concrete particulars. The assumption Charters was to make was that abstractions, or aims, could be broken down into concrete, behavioral increments that could be learned by the students.²

Thus, Bobbitt and Charters using similar approaches, referred to respectively as activity analysis and functional analysis, attempted to direct educational efforts into specific channels in order to arrive at specific outcomes.

By the mid to late 1920's signs began to appear of a decline in efficiency as the predominant educational ideal


²Ibid.
and social control as a major function of the schools. In How To Make a Curriculum, Bobbitt set forth as one of his major premises that, "Education is primarily for adult life, not for child life. Its fundamental responsibility is to prepare for the fifty years of adulthood, not for the twenty years of childhood and youth." It was on this fundamental assumption that Bobbitt based his case for the analysis of adult activities as the source of curriculum objectives.¹

Two years later, in 1926, Bobbitt seemed to have had a change of mind. He declared in the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education:

"Education is not primarily to prepare for life at some future time. Quite the reverse; it proposes to hold high the current living, making it intense, abundant, fruitful, and fitting it firmly in the grooves of habit...In a very true sense, life cannot be "prepared for."² It can only be lived."

Such a declaration can only mean a rejection of the production model of curriculum theory, since it denies such central concepts as predetermination and predictability. Bobbitt's change of mind may have been due to illness which


was to overtake him. When in 1934, Bobbitt was asked to prepare a statement summarizing his curriculum theory, his rejection of his former work was clearly evident and nearly complete. His last major work, *Modern Curriculum*¹ evidenced a strong tendency toward the philosophical aims of curriculum development.

Charters did not go through any fundamental change of curriculum making theory nor resulting change in philosophy like Bobbitt who became philosophical toward the end of his professional career. Charters remained true to the end in his efforts to make theory practical.

III. **Activity Analysis and Booker T. Washington**

There is no basic difference between the curriculum theorizing, the methods and outcomes of education as advocated by Booker T. Washington and the theory, methods, and outcomes of education as intended by Bobbitt and Charters. Each looked upon the child as "raw material" to be shaped into a useful product. Each was concerned more with the individual's role in society rather than with the individual himself. Each advocated a program that was predeterministic in nature. In a

real sense, Washington's program and curriculum formulating procedures anticipated Bobbitt's and Charters'.

Washington did not use the method of activity analysis in formulating his curriculum methodology since the method of activity analysis did not emerge as a formalized doctrine until the early 1920's. What must be done in the case of Washington's methodology is to look for elements or characteristics of activity analysis as it appeared in its earlier and later forms.

For one thing activity analysis was based on the philosophical notion of social utility. The idea of social utility is a basic characteristic of American education with threads of the notion dating to the educational ideals of Benjamin Franklin's school. It was not until Bobbitt was confronted with the task of developing a curriculum for the natives of the Philippine Islands that the theory of social utility struck a meaningful note to his thinking. On this experience he commented,

"The thing [the curriculum] was not adapted to the conditions within the islands. As a matter of fact, we did not try to adapt it to those conditions – though we honestly thought that we were doing the thing needed. The difficulty was that our minds ran so completely in the grooves of traditional thought that we did not realize the possibility of anything else. We greatly needed something to shatter our self-complacency and bring us to see education in terms of the society that was to be educated. We needed principles of curriculum-making. We did not know that we should first determine objectives from a study of social needs. We
supposed that education consisted only of teaching the familiar subjects. We had not come to see that it is essentially a process of unfolding the potential abilities of a population, and in particularized relation to the social conditions.  

Washington's educational philosophy was above all pragmatic, stressing the importance of relating education to life. The Tuskegee system of "industrial" or vocational training was designed to fit Negroes to live in the South and improve their economic condition but not to make them discontented with conditions which they could not change. It included such basic matters as personal cleanliness and correct behavior.  

Washington came by his theory of the social utility of education by a different route. While still a young man, he had worked for several New England families of culture, then living in West Virginia. They had instilled in his mind the virtue of being thorough in his work. Since he did not have a good foundational education, the contacts in these various homes were like a formal education. It was not until Washington became a student of Hampton Institute did the significance of socially useful training have an impact upon

---


him. It was at Hampton where Washington learned thoroughly the idea that "any man, regardless of color, will be recognized and rewarded in proportion as he learns to do something well."\(^1\)

Nor was Washington alone in the acceptance of this theory. The most influential black man in the country up to 1895, Frederick Douglass, held a similar view. "Men are not valued in this country, or any country, for what they are," Douglass commented, "they are valued for what they can do."\(^2\)

Samuel Chapman Armstrong, Washington's mentor at Hampton constantly urged upon the students at Hampton to have a high regard for the dignity of labor and that their training should prepare them "to go out and teach and lead their people, first by example, and then by acquiring property."\(^3\)

In addition to having a similar philosophy of education - social utility, Washington's and Bobbitt's curriculum organization was not totally dissimilar. Both urged what would be labelled today as performance - or competency - based learning. Speaking on one occasion, Washington explained,


"we ask help for nothing that we can do for ourselves; nothing is bought that the students can produce. The boys raised vegetables, have done the painting, made the brick, the chairs, the tables, the desks; have built a stable, a carpenter's shop, and a blacksmith's shop. The girls do the entire housekeeping, including the mending, ironing, and washing of the boys' clothes; besides they make many garments to sell."

Bobbitt suggested that a task or duty be analyzed into discrete units and these units would be learned by the students. The whole process is called activity analysis. Bobbitt was more concerned about analyzing the activity than developing a program or curriculum which would aid in learning the activity, so Washington, in the case of relating subject matter to expected outcome, would follow the tradition of Charters.

Washington did have a label for his curriculum emphasis. He referred to it as "dovetailing," an inexact expression by which he meant the interlocking of the academic and industrial courses somewhat at the expense of the former.

---


What Washington had in mind by employing this method was that a class in mathematics should work on practical problems to be met in carpentry or agriculture, that essays in the English class should treat the everyday concerns of dressmaking or the blacksmith shop.¹

Not only did he follow this procedure when he taught a course, but he urged his faculty to do the same. On one occasion he sent to the head of the academic department a memo instructing the academic head to "Please send into my office by the 16th of Dec [sic] a report showing what progress has been made in dovetailing the academic work into the industrial in the manner I suggested to you and Mr. J. H. Washington sometime ago."² Evidently the academic faculty found the task somewhat difficult to perform as seen by the reply of the academic head, "As yet no organized effort has been made toward this end; but I am sure that individual efforts are being made to make the academic work more and more practical."³

What Washington had in mind in organizing his program in this manner was the idea that his students would learn


²Ibid.

³Ibid.
in school those activities which will be found useful in the larger society. In the quotation which follows, Washington expands on his social usefulness doctrine while at the same time expresses his curricular method.

"...We find the industrial system valuable in teaching economy, thrift, and the dignity of labour and in giving moral backbone to students. The fact that a student goes into the world conscious of his power to build a house or a wagon or to make a set of harness gives him a certain confidence and moral independence that he would not possess without such training.

"A more detailed example of our methods at Tuskegee may be of interest. For example, we cultivate by student labour seven hundred acres of land. The object is not only to cultivate the land in a way to make it pay our boarding department, but at the same time to teach the students, in addition to the practical work, something of the chemistry of the soil, the best method of drainage, dairying, cultivation of fruit, the care of live-stock and tools, and scores of other lessons needed by people whose main dependence is agriculture."1

Like most of the educators of the day, when Washington talked about curriculum he meant the course of study. He did make statements concerning objectives, methodology, and he even on occasion looked at curriculum along lines of organizational patterns. However, he was not an experimenter and therefore, did not get involved in the area of curric-

---

ulum improvement which of course was a major concern of Bobbitt and Charters.

Another element of similarity in the curriculum-making of Washington, Bobbitt, and Charters was their basic agreement on the role of the school in the social order. All three men accepted the idea that the school was not an agency of reform in reconstructing society. The school had a definite function – to prepare the student to assume a specific role in society. It is the acceptance of this fundamental belief that caused Washington to fail in obtaining the general public acceptance of his program of industrial education for the Negro. One of the objections sometimes urged against industrial education, to which Washington often responded, is that it, industrial education, aims merely to teach the Negro to work on the plane that he worked on when in slavery. The black intellectual and educator, W.E.B. DuBois, strongly opposed the view that the school had no responsibility in reconstructing society.

As a curriculum maker Washington failed to respond adequately to the social implications of his program. Industrial education was considered by many of the intellectual blacks of the day as a type of inferior education, a program designed mainly to keep Negroes at the bottom of the social and economic ladder.

Probably far more damaging to Washington's industrial training program was its implications on race relations
between blacks and whites. Since Washington did not look upon the school as an agent of change but as a transmitter of the cultural heritage, this meant to most thinking blacks a system of education designed to keep them in a state of peonage.

They were not encouraged when in 1895 Washington recommended in his famous Atlanta speech that black and white society can be separate as the fingers and united as the hand. At the back of this pronouncement was the accommodationist philosophy of Washington by which he meant that black people should accept the attitudes of the whites toward them, build a strong economic base while waiting to achieve social and political equality with white society.

Washington's speech, however, came at a time when the nation's racial situation was at its lowest ebb. In the South, the whites, by 1877, had regained control of the several state governments and in doing so set aside many of the educational and political reform measures passed during the so-called "Black Reconstruction Era." From 1890 to 1920, blacks saw their voting privileges snatched from them and their political activity squelched by the complete domination of southern political life by the all-white Demo-

ocratic Party. Lynchings and other forms of physical destruction against Negroes took place during this period.

Neither was the racial situation in the North a place where blacks could find redress from racial grievances. L. A. Pechstein, then a professor at the University of Cincinnati, describes the state of Negro education in the North.

"The education of Negroes in the North was variously treated. On occasion the 'liberal' policy of the North was shown to be not so liberal. In the southern system of public education, it was overtly segregationist in policy."¹

In his study, Pechstein argued for segregated schools to train Negro children and finalized his statement with several conclusions:

"1. While all would prefer to have democracy in education, this goal has not been reached and is not likely to be reached in the northern cities studied, since separation of the races in all walks of life is operating and seems likely to continue.

2. The aims of education may be best realized by Negroes in separate public schools. Especially can the features of school and community life which form a large part of an effective educational program be best handled in separate public schools.

3. Greater inspiration, greater racial solidarity, superior social activities, great-

er retention and greater educational achievement are possible for Negroes in separate public schools than in mixed schools."¹

To be sure Washington's curriculum, emphasizing industrial training, as well as Negro education in general, was trapped between the Charybdis of white institutionalized racism and the Scylla of black discontent.

The question could be asked at this point, "Why did Washington continue to agitate for industrial training and economic development in the face of the growing antagonism between blacks and whites?" The question has implications for a better understanding of Washington's curriculum making and educational focuses.

First of all, and in spite of his faults, Washington was an "idealist of the first rank. He had to be in order not to bring the system under attack. Then, again, Washington was concerned that his school be a success and he was not one to rock the boat that supplied him his resources. Another possible reason why Washington continued in his support of industrial education was his renewed confidence in the improvement of race relations in the United States.

Sometime between 1908 and 1909, Washington became acquainted with the noted anthropologist and sociologist, Robert E. Park. In an autobiographical note found among his papers, after his death, Park wrote that his interest in blacks was stirred by Booker T. Washington, with whom he had enjoyed a seven year association at Tuskegee Institute. Park wrote, "I probably learned more about human nature and society, in the South, under Booker T. Washington, than I had learned elsewhere in all my previous studies."\(^1\) Washington did not acquire his accommodationist racial stance at the time he met Park. What he did gain from Park, however, was a justification or a rationale for it.

What Park postulated was, as he referred to it, a generalized law of the race relation cycle which he believed was universally applicable and at the same time descriptive of the evolution of race relations in any particular society. The theory would thus be a guide to both history and current affairs. It would pass on as well as evaluate current activities in terms of their evolutionary propriety. It was ideology, too, for Park believed that once the racial cycle was completed, the social arena would be cleared of

those racial impediments interfering with the inevitable class struggle.¹

According to Park, the racial-relations cycle would proceed in four stages — contact, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation — in the course of which there unfolds a great cultural and social drama. Each act of the drama is dictated by laws of history and culture, and the sequence cannot be halted or diverted.²

The first stage, contact, occurs when two races meet on a "racial frontier" and are obliged to interact. Conflict arises when the races compete for valuable resources. The conflict is resolved by accommodation in which a stable but asymmetrical and unequal social order is established. Finally, accommodation gives way to assimilation, when the two races merge culturally, and, ultimately, physically, society becomes homogenous in the end.³

Accommodation, the penultimate stage in the race-relations cycle, would lead to assimilation as deepening interpersonal intimacy between the races broke down stereotyped thinking. Park was sure that the opportunities for inter-

²Ibid. p. 28.
³Ibid. p. 28.
racial friendship would arise in peaceful relations generated by the acquiescence of minority groups to temporary second-class citizenship. "Personal relations and personal friendships are the great moral solvents," Park reasoned. "Under their influence all distinctions of class, of caste, and even of race, are dissolved into the general flux which we sometimes call democracy." ¹

To Park, the race-relations cycle was ineluctable. "The race-relation cycle is apparently progressive and irreversible. Customs, regulations, immigration restrictions, and racial barriers may slacken the tempo of the movement; may perhaps halt it altogether for a time, but cannot change its direction, cannot at any rate reverse it." ²

Just how much of the race-relations theory of Park was adopted by Washington into his own educational and curriculum theorizing may never be known. It would appear, however, that he was more encouraged by its pronouncements than he was discouraged. If it can be assumed that he had been influenced by the theory, then, it can be said that Washington must have felt a sense of elation over the prospects of an eventual and inevitable triumph of black social accep-


tance though the racism of the day seemed insurmountable. It follows that Washington would feel confident that this program of racial accommodation was the right path to follow.

In the long run Washington had hopes, too, that his program of industrial education would provide the basis upon which the cultural assimilation of the Negro would be accepted by the larger society. To aid in this development, Washington urged blacks to direct their efforts in gaining economic independence. In 1903, he himself took the leadership in the movement to encourage black entrepreneurship by organizing the National Negro Business League which had as its chief goal the creation of a black merchant-capitalist class of size and affluence proportionately comparable to that of white America. The League still operates today but under a new designation, The National Business League.¹

He also advocated home and farm ownership for black families. Rather than massive black migration to the uncertainties of the urban North, he spoke out in favor of the race gaining economic independence while remaining in the South. Washington's program of reconstruction contemplated a larger role than what could be gained through education alone. This is understandable in light of the fact that he

had to confront a society bent on keeping the Negro in a subjugated class.

In summary, Washington's curriculum emphasis has elements of the concepts that would be labelled later as activity analysis. The industrial program of Washington and the activity and functional analyses of Bobbitt and Charters, first of all, were based on job analysis used in industry.

Other elements of similarity were in the underlying philosophical base called social utility or social usefulness. The individual under the curriculum formulations of the three men was not to be trained for general usefulness but for a specific or predetermined function. In their method of course development, also, Bobbitt, Charters, and Washington followed similar paths. Each attempted to have the course taught in terms of specific activities which the students were to learn. Neither man accepted the notion that the school was an agency for change but viewed it more as a transmittor of the cultural heritage.

On the other hand, there were definite elements of dissimilarity the most distinct being that Bobbitt and Charters were specialists, or technicians, in developing curriculum, and their pronouncements led to the emergence of a new educational specialization called curriculum-making. Washington, however, was concerned with curriculum simply because he had a school to administer and a program which he had to
make successful.

IV. The Curriculum Theorizing of W.E.B. DuBois

Booker T. Washington, viewed as a curriculum person, would fall into the tradition of Bobbitt and Charters, that is, the individual was trained to fill a useful place in society and the purpose of education was to determine that training which was necessary to make him useful. This would not altogether be the case for W.E.B. DuBois, however. In a sense it would be difficult to classify him as a curriculum maker. He may or may not have heard of the curriculum development theory in vogue in the 1920's called activity analysis; or, he may or may not have been familiar with the methodology of organizing goals, instructional processes, and materials which are common concerns of the curriculum-maker. Yet, DuBois did involve himself in curriculum formulation. In this section an attempt will be made to determine the extent to which DuBois promoted curriculum making.

DuBois' concern with education emerged as a reaction to the educational thrust of Booker T. Washington. In these two men there developed two ways of looking at the problem of Negro education. Washington, as has been noted, previously, built an educational structure around industrial training. DuBois, who was not opposed to industrial education, but did question the advocacy of an education built solely around man as a producer of goods and services.
Dudley Randall, in poetic verse, captures, with some levity, the mood and the essence of the "Great Controversy" which raged in the black community in the earlier part of the 20th century between the two chief protagonists, Washington and DuBois. The poem is entitled, "Booker T. and W.E.B."

"'It seems to me,' said Booker T.,
'It shows a mighty lot of cheek
To study chemistry and Greek
When Mister Charlie needs a hand
To hoe the cotton on his land,
And when Miss Ann looks for a cook,
Why stick your nose inside a book?'

'I don't agree,' said W.E.B.
'If I should have the drive to seek
Knowledge of chemistry or Greek,
I'll do it. Charles and Miss can look
Another place for hand or cook,
Some men rejoice in skill of hand,
And some in cultivating land,
But there are others who maintain
The right to cultivate the brain."

"'It seems to me,' said Booker T.,
'That all you folks have missed the boat
Who shout about the right to vote,
And spend vain days and sleepless nights
In uproar over civil rights.
Just keep your mouths shut, do not grouse,
But work, and save, and buy a house.'

'I don't agree,' said W.E.B.,
'For what can property avail
If dignity and justice fail.
Unless you help to make the laws,
They'll steal your house with trumped-up clause.
A rope's as tight, a fire as hot,
No matter how much cash you've got.
Speak soft, and try your little plan,
But as for me, I'll be a man.'

"'It seems to me,' said Booker T. -
'I don't agree.'
Said W.E.B. 

As a person having curriculum concerns, DuBois concentrated his attention upon three large matters of importance, especially as these matters related to black people. First he wanted a larger understanding of the total perspective of the climate and mood of the country. Once having gained an over-all perspective, DuBois, then, questioned what should be the goals and purposes of Negro education. It follows then that this third concern would center around the organizational patterns which would realize the goals and purposes as previously determined.

Harold Rugg once stated, "it is most important that those who are constructing our school curriculum shall maintain an overview of the total situation; lacking that, their orientation will be biased, their emphases misplaced."  

DuBois accepted and recognized this notion as a part of his educational concern.

DuBois often wrote on the growing complexity of American society:

---


"Today we are faced by great aggregations of capital and worldwide credit, which monopolize raw material, carriage and manufacture, distribute their products through cartels, mergers and chain stores, and are in process of eliminating the individual trader, the small manufacturer, and the little job. In this new organization of business, the colored man meets two difficulties: 1) he is not trained to take part in it; 2) if he gets training, he finds it almost impossible to gain a foothold. Schools cannot teach as an art and trade that which is a philosophy, a government of men, an organization of civilization...."

The essential problem of curriculum and Negro education he placed in a political, industrial, and social context.

"The immediate program of the American Negro means nothing unless it is mediate to his great ideal and the ultimate ends of his development. We need not waste time by seeking to deceive our enemies into thinking that we are going to be content with a half loaf, or by being willing to lull our friends into a false sense of our indifference and present satisfaction....

The American Negro demands equality - political equality, industrial equality, and social equality...

Only in a demand and a persistent demand for essential equality in the modern realm of human culture can any people show a real pride of race and a decent self-respect. For any group, nation or race to admit for a moment the present monstrous demand of the white race to be the inheritors of the earth, the orbiters of mankind and the sole owners of a heritage of culture which they did not create, nor even improve to any greater extent than the other great division of men -

---

to admit such pretense for a moment is for the
race to write itself down immediately as in-
disputably inferior in judgment, knowledge and
common sense.¹

DuBois was willing to look at and to speak out against
the institutional racism of the day that caused the Negro
to be discontented with his status in American society.
Washington was hesitant to do this.

The second curriculum concern DuBois dealt with was
the problem of the goals and purposes which should direct
Negro education. In this matter DuBois would assume the
role similar to the philosopher of education, a person like
Boyd Bode. DuBois probably relished the role of philosopher.

Speaking of the goals and purposes of education, DuBois
emphasized the total man:

"...Now the training of men is a difficult and
intricate task. Its technique is a matter for
educational experts, but its object is for the
vision of seers. If we make money the object
of man-training, we shall develop money-makers
but not necessarily men; if we make technical
skill the object of education, we may possess
artisans but not, in nature, men. Men we shall
have only as we make manhood the object of the
work of the schools - intelligence, broad symp-
athy, knowledge of the world, that was and is,
and of the relation of men to it - this is the
curriculum of that Higher Education which must
underlie true life. On this foundation we may
build bread winning, skill of hand and quickness
of brain, with never a fear lest the child and

¹Francis L. Broderick and August Meier, editors, Ne-
gro Protest Thought in the Twentieth Century, Indianapolis:
man mistakes the means of living for the object of life."  

Faced with the growing complexity of the modern world and a hostile society, the next concern of a curriculum nature which DuBois had was what organizational patterns would most likely bring about the goals of importance to him. In his own worlds, the essential question was: "How are we going to place the black American on a sure foundation in the modern state?"  

To strengthen the argument for the support of his program, DuBois first had to show the failure of industrial education and his argument seemed to be valid.

"...The industrial school has failed because with a definite object it lacked appropriate method to gain it. In other words, the lack of success of the industrial education of Negroes has come not because of the absence of desperate and devoted effort, but because of changes in the world which the industrial school did not foresee, and, which even if it had foreseen, it could not have prevented, and to which it has not the ability to adapt itself."  

---


3Ibid. p. 63.
To DuBois the industrial school assumed that the technique of industry in 1895, even if not absolutely fixed and permanent, was at least permanent enough for training children into its pursuit and use as a basis of broader education. Therefore, school work for farming, carpentry, bricklaying, plastering and painting, metal work and blacksmithing, shoe making, sewing and cooking was introduced and taught.¹

"But, meantime, what has happened to these vocations and trades?" DuBois questioned. Machines and new industrial organizations have remade the economic world and ousted these trades either from their old technique or their economic significance. The planing mill does today much of the work of the carpenter and the carpenter is being reduced rapidly to the plane of a mere laborer. The building trades are undergoing all kinds of reconstruction, from the machine-made steel skyscraper, to the cement house cast in molds and the mass-made mail-order bungalow. Painting and masonry still survive but the machine is after them; while printing and sewing are done increasingly by elaborate machines. Metal is being shaped by stamping mills. Nothing of shoemaking is left for the hands save mending. In most cases, it is cheap-

er to buy a new shoe then to have an old one cobbled.  

DuBois felt that industrial education suffered from the dynamics of change, and with the dynamics of change, the continued problem of obsolescence with which an industrial-type education had always to contend if it were to remain relevant.

In place of an education based solely on industry, DuBois advocated a pattern of curriculum organization which he termed the Talented Tenth. He believed that if the Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved, it will be by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth. It is the problem of developing the best of the race that they may guide the mass away from the contamination and death of the worst, in their own and other races.

DuBois' program sought the best among young black minds in the country. These young minds were to be trained in the best of the academic tradition at the best black colleges in the country. Once having gained leadership experience in these schools, they would be sent to the various Negro communities to provide leadership and example to the black masses.

He never totally renounced industrial education, however, "I am an earnest advocate of manual training and trade teaching for black boys, and for white boys, too. I believe that next to the founding of Negro colleges the most valuable addition to Negro education since the war [the Civil War] has been industrial training for black boys." ¹

But it was the Talented Tenth among the black race that DuBois thought would provide impetus for the uplift for the race.

As a curriculum maker, then, DuBois stipulated three ways of looking at the curriculum for the education of black students. First, any program of education for the black youth must grow out of the political, industrial, and social concerns of the nation at large as these concerns relate to black people. The goals and purposes of education should be no less then the full development of the potential of every black child and his full utilization in society. Thirdly, to realize these ends, DuBois suggested an organizational pattern that would accomplish the goals as set forth.

Bobbitt, Charters, Washington, and DuBois were each in his own way, social realists. The school and its curriculum

had to be related to the conomic and technical demands of the times. To some extent the programs offered and suggested by each individual gained the respect of contemporaries. Over time, however, the influence of each became limited as new ways of doing things became more popular.

Attention is now directed to a critique of the study with consideration to several implications and recommendations relevant to it.
Chapter 7

CRITIQUE, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Bringing it all together is the overall aim of this chapter and to accomplish this end consideration will focus around three larger and pertinent problems: 1) what reactions were there to the curriculum theorizing exemplified by the four individuals under study? 2) what implications of their work are significant and relevant to the education-problems of today? 3) in the light of information gathered for the present study, what recommendations could be made for further investigations based on the interest developed here?

There is a common expression that states that history repeats itself, probably, based on the larger assumption that there is nothing new under the sun. If this notion is true, it should be more incumbent upon students in the various walks of life to know at least the history of those special areas of a personal interest to the individual, if only to avoid the pitfalls of those who preceded us in similar lines of activity. One way to approach the first problem is to analyze what critics, both past and present, have
said in regard to the principles and practices promoted by the individuals whose life's works are under study.

I. Critique
A. Bobbitt and Charters

When Bobbitt and his fellow workers were attempting to develop a curriculum for the schools in the Philippine Islands in 1901, it was soon discovered that their work would have been a much simpler process had they a set of principles of curriculum construction as a basis or guideline for their curriculum building efforts.

Yet had they thought to research what was done up to that time in developing principles of curriculum, no doubt they would have found very little, if any, information which might have been useful. Curriculum-making as late as 1893, followed the "armchair" method in which individuals concerned with curriculum sat in committees, in armchairs, and around a large conference table and wrote out a course of study which the public schools were practically forced to follow.¹ Neither was the situation much better as late as 1922 if Charles Judd's observation of the state of affairs is to be judged as accurate. Judd commented, "Not only is the problem

of curriculum construction inherently baffling, but there are few individuals, and practically no recognized agency, in school systems that make this problem a special subject of attention.\textsuperscript{1}

It was largely to the efforts, first, of Franklin Bobbitt, and later, of W. W. Charters, that serious attention was directed toward the delicate and intricate problem of curriculum making.

What Bobbitt and Charters have given us is a scientific method of developing curriculum. Basing their philosophies on the notion that education should serve a useful function, Bobbitt and Charters came up with the idea that the way to achieve a functional curriculum is to analyze educational outcomes on the basis of specific objectives.

Like most movements in education, the movement toward specific objectives had its forerunners. Charters pointed out that Herbert Spencer anticipated the modern trend when he voiced the demand for objectives of a more specific sort than those of traditional education. Spencer proposed a list of five objectives, viz., self-preservation, the earning of a living, the duties of parenthood, the activities

of citizenship, and the occupation of leisure hours.\textsuperscript{1}

This was a step in the direction of specific objectives, but it was only a step. Spencer's work, however, was on the level of vague generality and opinion and needed to be analyzed out.

Bobbitt first used the expression "activity analysis." But in its early form it resembled the method of job analysis as derived from the analysis of the activities that are involved in the performance of jobs in the industries and in business. An expert bricklayer, for example, goes through certain motions in the performance of his work. It was found, however, when these experts were assigned to the task of teaching beginners that they did not succeed very well, for the reason that they were unable to make an analysis of their own activities so as to tell the beginners just what to do.\textsuperscript{2}

Charters was among the first to recognize that job analysis, in its limited application, aimed at the mechanization of conduct and at providing a substitute for intelligence. Accordingly, the method was extended so as to include the factor of intelligence.\textsuperscript{3} Education, it was argued, is in-

\begin{footnotesize}
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interested in processes that are not just "jobs" in the sense of having to do with "definite operations." These processes include psychical as well as physical factors. The term "activity analysis" began to be used because it took into consideration the larger notion.

Defining the term, Charters states, "an activity analysis is the analysis of both the mental and the physical activities which are carried on by individuals. Used in this broad sense activities include not only what people do, but what they think and feel and will. In its most complicated form the analysis is concerned with a broad range of physical actions, feelings, and purposes, as in the analysis of the activities of women made for the purpose of constructing a college curriculum for women. Charters would later extend the use of the term to include several operations which may be going on at the same time. He called the latter emphasis "functional analysis."¹

One of the earlier critics of activity analysis was Boyd Bode, the educational philosopher. Bode saw several limitations to activity analysis. For one thing, Bode argued, activity analysis cannot be used very effectively in the training of good judgment or in the cultivation of

opher for constructing an educational program or else may be used for realizing objectives that have already been selected; it is not a method for determining what our program is to be. "^1 It tells us what is, but not what ought to be. ^2

It was on the is-ought question that Bode based his strongest criticism. The matter of curriculum construction involved a large question of direction or purpose which the zeal for activity analysis was disposed to overlook, he argued. "It is a question...of educational statesmanship." ^3

Using Dewey as a point of reference, he raises a significant concern:

"...if I interpret him [Dewey] correctly, the struggle over the curriculum represents an attempt by democracy to think clearly about its own meaning and purpose. It wants a larger measure of opportunity for the individual. But it does not understand clearly what this means or how it is to be attained. From the standpoint of a democratic program this is our outstanding problem. It is only too easy to train a youngster so as to make him just a cog in a machine, to make the ideas, the beliefs, the attitudes which he acquires a limitation upon his development instead of a means for future growth. If our chief concern is to make provision for flexibility, both in the individual and in the social organization, then...we are confronted with such problems as individual dif-


^2Ibid.

^3Ibid. p. 118.
ferences, the context to be provided for the material that we attempt to teach, the place of logical organization, and a host of others—all of them growing out of the attempt to take account of individual capacities and tendencies on the one hand and the conception of a democratic social order on the other."

Bode's criticism of job analysis applies equally to Bobbitt and Charters. Kirschner's study of functional analysis, which has its basis in job analysis, however, concentrates solely on the work of Charters. In its early form functional analysis, as described by Kirschner, focused on existing subject matters in the schools to find minimum essentials needed to enable school subjects to function more efficiently in the schools. The method was later directed toward "life objectives" in order to find ideals and activities actually in society. Eventually, it was directed to a study of various socially desirable activities with the hope of gaining ideals inductively and subsequently applying them in new contexts.

Kirschner makes several criticisms of Charters' functional analysis. According to Kirschner, Charters attempted to make curriculum construction so scientific as to

---
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eliminate all personal or subjective choice.¹ To Kirschner this was both its virtue and vice. The method partook of virtue in that it sought to demonstrate what the content of the curriculum should be rather than assert this from some kind of unreasoned faith. In developing his method, Charters endeavored to follow "the method of intelligence" as he saw it. The vice was that not all problems of curriculum building could be neatly wrapped up scientifically, even assuming that Charters understood what it means to be "scientific" and "objectives" according to the method of intelligence.²

Charters tended to view science, its methods, and its findings as something apart from value judgment. The findings of science were considered "objective" since they were assumed to be applicable, without further modification, in a variety of contexts. For instance, in functional analysis, once a series of steps were arrived at by quite mechanical means, with as little overt choosing as possible, they could be imparted to the learner forthwith. "Objective" determination of these steps meant an almost mechanical selection process in conformity, with certain prescribed principles


²Ibid. p. 129.
and techniques.¹

For Charters, the nature of science is that study which provides guiding principles. Moreover, these principles are treated as universals that govern experience regardless of the context in which the experience arises. Thus, scientific principles are applied in a variety of contexts without noting that they are in fact modified every time they are applied in a new context. To Kirschner, however, too much reliance on principles derived from science is too risky. These principles may appear universal in application but they are not, mainly because science cannot deal adequately enough with decisions or choices arrived at on a value or priority basis.²

Kirschner pointed out another limitation of Charters’ approach to curriculum construction related again to Charters’ attitude toward science. Kirschner related the story of one writer who had worked closely with Charters in setting up a curriculum for printing executives. The writer asked the question of Charters, “What ought to be taught in order to fit men to perform this or that duty?” Those who ask questions such as this, Kirschner pointed out,
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Filmed as received
without page(s) 214.
Unavailable for microfilming.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.
its isolation but must be known, if knowledge of it is to be valid, in its context or relationships. Patty went on to say that to look at curriculum as these three individuals have was to imply that curriculum could be set up on a mechanistic basis.\textsuperscript{1}

Charters and Bobbitt both recognized that their method of constructing curriculum was not foolproof. For example, in responding to Bode's criticism that activity analysis was used to determine objectives, Charters reaction was that this was not his intention. Activity analysis was a technique and he, and other curriculum constructionists like him, was a technician.\textsuperscript{2}

Charters often used the letter designations (AIPRT) to both summarize his method of functional analysis and to meet the objections of some of its critics. Each activity (A) is controlled by ideals (I). The method of performing each activity is controlled by the traits of the performer (P). Reasoning (R) is used in order to plan the proper method of carrying on the activity. After the plan-


ning stage, the activity is carried out by a technique (T). Emotional (E) factors grow out of the experience of action.¹

After the 1920's, activity analysis and its later development, functional analysis, became less popular. In the 1930's the "Progressive Movement" in education became the fad of the day and it rejected Bobbitt's and Charters' approaches as having a wooden quality and preferred to view the child as a budding organism who develops from the inside out.²

The Progressive Movement, too, would lose its momentum, by the forties, to the humanists or essentialists, like Robert Hutchins, Arthur Bestor, Admiral Rickover, and Albert Lynd, who rejected not only the Progressive attitudes toward the curriculum and the child, but also the Bobbitt's and Charters' approaches, on the basis that both neglected the very subject matter which they believed made human intelligence possible.³

Finally, what contributions did Bobbitt and Charters make to the field of curriculum? In spite of the seemingly
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evidence to the contrary, Bobbitt and Charters method of curriculum construction did make a contribution to the present day mode of curriculum construction. As Bode pointed out in his book, their method was rational, systematic, and meticulous.\(^1\) It had emancipated education from the verbiage of tradition. It had brought education into intimate and vital relation with life, and had given the specialist in education a chance to regain his self-respect. Even more important was its concern with bringing abstractions down to the level of the learner's experiences. There was even an effort to provide workable ideals, and, like Kirschners and others, such a serious attempt at reconciling ideals with practice was worth examining.\(^2\)

Then, too, several individuals living today, in the 1970's, seem to be discussing curriculum construction in the tradition of Bobbitt and Charters. Among those are: Edgar Dale, still active, Ralph Tyler, the late Virgil Herrick, Benjamin Bloom, David Krathwohl, Bertram Masia, just to mention a few.


It is not usual that one thinks of either Washington or DuBois as persons concerned with curriculum. It certainly is a novel way of estimating the impact of these two individuals on the education of the Negro during a crucial period in American history. It is to their credit, however, and to their concern with education that the type of approach as presented in this study is possible.

There has been a revival of interest in Booker T. Washington over the past few years. A large part of the interest has been, as Calista so aptly states it, an attempt to clear up the "haziness clouding Booker T. Washington's image." ¹ A large number of black people, even in the 1970's, see Washington as one of the all-time traitors of the black cause in America, and perhaps this is so, as Calista points out again, "because each generation of historians, following Washington's death in 1915, refused to accept responsibility for their own generation's failure to eradicate racial strife."²

However way it is put, Washington's and DuBois' curriculum making activities must be seen in the background
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of a society divided by racial strife.

Washington advocated industrial education for Negroes. It was not that industrial education was an evil, or even unpopular in the nation at the time, that it was rejected by leading blacks, but because it was tied up with the notion that to receive such an education would relegate the mass of blacks to a permanent lower class body in a "classless" society.

Washington's program was successful at Tuskegee; in fact, it was too successful. There seemed to have been an unannounced and unpublicized effort to create a national curriculum that would be for all black people, following the outlines of the Tuskegee plan of training. By 1915, Alabama had a number of vocational training programs and the idea was being accepted more and more in surrounding states and in far off states as well. There was organized, during the early part of the twentieth century, an industrial program in Liberia, West Africa, based on the same plan as that established by Washington at Tuskegee.

Val Rust, in a study of the Nationalist Socialist Party of Germany, ¹ attempted to show that the Nationalist Socialists had made studies of the Negro during the 1930's

and 1940's and came up with a plan that offered a chance for whites and blacks to come to a better understanding of themselves and their relationship with other races. Val Rust stated that the major aim of the Nationalist Socialist Party was to become a colonial power of the world. They lacked, however, understanding of the colored races. To accomplish their purpose, they embarked on a plan which followed the United States' method of commercial imperialism.¹

To the Nationalist Socialists, colonization was educational training, and this training was grounded in the peculiar racial and social condition of the colored peoples, and was restricted to farming, skilled labor, housework, and health. The form that the colonial educational program of the Nationalist Socialists Party of Germany during the 1930's and 40's followed, was patterned after the industrial program established by Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee.²

Of course, Washington would never know the purposes of the Nationalist Socialists Party. Yet, Harlan who made a substantial study of Washington in 1972, was not certain whether Washington realized that his program encouraged a
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colonial policy toward black people.¹

Here then was the rub in Washington's curriculum-making and educational policies. It appeared too much like a program designed to keep the Negro in a subjugated class.

DuBois, and others, detected this thrust of Washington's educational plan and forthrightly denounced it. DuBois, like Bode, argued, the objectives of education in a democracy should allow the full development of the individual and not the predetermined and predicted outcomes of an industrial program.

As has been mentioned, neither Bocker T. Washington nor W.E.B. DuBois ever commented on the curriculum theory known popularly in the 1920's as activity analysis. It remained for another leading Negro educator, Horace Mann Bond, the father of Julian Bond of Georgia, to make an observation of curriculum building in general and activity analysis in particular. This section concludes with his observation. Writing in 1935, Bond says:

"Whatever the limitations maybe as to our choice in the matter, Negroes now participating in curriculum study should at least satisfy themselves that certain fundamental issues are met. In the first place, since the method of

curriculum construction in vogue is principally an adaptation of an 'activity analysis,' we should appreciate the social forces which have resulted in the activities now open to study. It should be realized that the method of 'activity analysis' in the construction of a curriculum presupposes an elastic, democratic social order in which there are no artificial barriers set against the social mobility of the individual. In such a society, classes are assumed to be highly fluid and there can be no such thing as caste. Beginning with such a theory — and the 'activity' curriculum can have no other justifiable basis — any activities peculiar to Negro children, and so susceptible to inclusion in a 'Negro' curriculum concedes the falsity of the initial premise. This is no academic quibble.

The conflict is the application of a procedure, theoretically founded on egalitarianism, to a practical situation which is shot through with inequality. Curriculum building on an activity-analysis basis for Negro children must abandon either the concept of racial adaptations, or the concept of equalitarian democracy, if it is to remain honest with itself. To do the first demands a sacrifice of all of the 'social orthodoxies' of the curriculum builders; and to do the second is to destroy the reason for curriculum revision as now in process. In the opinion of the writer [Bond] revision will do neither; but Negroes themselves should face the alternative. In the second place, Negroes interested in curriculum building should seek definitions of the social forces which motivate them and which motivate others, in terms of fact, and not of platitude. Let us concede that our schools, and our curricula may not influence in the final direction those same social forces which we are so intent on controlling.

Let us confess that the schools have never built a new social order, but have always, in all times and in all lands, been the instruments through which social forces were perpetuated. If our new curriculum revision is to do better, it must undertake an acceptance of the profound social and economic changes which are now taking
place in the world."¹

II. Implications

Among the many implications which this study has for present-day curriculum making and curriculum theory decisions, four areas seem to be most relevant. They are educational objectives, vocational education, urban education, and continuing education.

There is a renewed interest in educational objectives today as is shown by many discussions and papers on behavioral objectives, competency-based education, performance objectives, and other similar terms. The present concern in statements of specific objectives dates back to the period which was under study in this paper and to the individuals who were investigated. The curriculum that arose during this period came as a result of certain social and economic forces inspired by industry which provided the curriculum builders of the day the chance to look at the training of young people in terms of the needs of society. Today we are in a second revolution, an electronic or technological revolution. Educators today are somewhat at a loss as to how to prepare youth for life in a technological society. In the 1920's there was a move-

ment to design specifications which set forth how a student will turn out in terms of observable behaviors. The modern design specifications tend to call for a student to identify certain points on a map or to reel off the valences of a set of chemical elements instead of emphasizing practical, nonacademic activities. This approach is nothing but a thin veneer of academic respectability covering what really is a type of education that still attempts standardization and predetermination comparable to the educational concerns of the 1920's.

One writer of today shows how teachers may now order from a catalog 96 objectives in language arts 7-9 for $3.00 or 158 objectives in social science (geography) K-9 for $4.00, or 25 objectives in English literature 10-12 for $3.00.¹ Those who are responsible for the education of the young must be on guard against overstressing the outcomes of education when viewed in terms of statements of behavioral, content, or performance objectives.

The appropriate curriculum theory acceptable in today's democratic society must aim at those objectives that lend themselves to the education of young people for a broad

understanding of today's complex society. Just as activity analysis was viewed by many educators of its day as the panacea for various educational problems, there is the same danger that educators will lay too much stress on the applicability of behavioral objectives to the problems of today's generation.

Vocational education has not gone over well to many people. Especially is this true for parents and young people of the black race. Ask a black parent or a black child to consider a vocation as a choice for a career and it will be, almost every time, taken as an insult. Blacks, and many others, have tended to view vocational training as an inferior type education. No doubt this attitude dates back to the period of slavery and the period immediately after when there was a class connotation related to manual or vocational training.

That class connotation which once existed in connection with vocations, however, does not hold true today. There are excellent vocational programs that might be more suitable to many young people today than what a college education would be. But many parents and young people still have a rather negative attitude whenever vocational education is mentioned.

What is needed to change the image of vocational education is a vast public relations effort to win those par-
ents and young people over to vocational education who might benefit the most. To aid the acceptance, state departments of education and boards of education might do a greater service by putting as much emphasis on the vocational educational program as it does on the general academic program.

Urban education is another area for which this study has implications. Most of today's black young people attend an urban school. It is common knowledge that most of these young people have not received what is commonly termed "quality" education. Somewhere along the line educators have failed to come to grips with the problem, presently or in the past.

Part of the problem has to be that we have inadequately assessed the skills needed by the urban youngster. An adequate assessment of skills certainly must include the following:

1. Urban young people must be shown the good in the ghetto and capitalize on it. One of these "good" things is the sharing aspect that exists in the ghetto. All ages are willing to share their knowledge as well as their services.

2. Urban young people must have opportunity to share in the authority that exists within the community. This includes police authority as well as authority existing within the community. Of course, with authority must come responsibility.

3. Urban young people must be taught how to render goods or services for the upkeep of the community.
4. Urban youth must be taught the skill of inclusion rather than exclusion. They are so often told how they do not fit into a program that they develop a type of left-out syndrome.

5. Urban youth need to develop the ability to make rapid assessment of personality. Some people are for them and their interest; some people are against them. The young people need to know how to cope with both.

6. Urban young people need to develop the skill of resiliency which is the ability not to strikeout. Poverty, broken families, poor academic records should not deter them from seeking quality education.

7. Urban education must seek out and identify the significant other personalities or groups in the life of the young person. To whom does the young person go when he is in trouble? is a good way to find out the significant other persons in the life of the urban young.1

The curriculum of urban education must be made relevant to the needs of the urban youngster. Curriculum theory should take note of the various realities.

Lastly, the present study has implications for continuing education. The time has come when the curriculums of the public school and the college are too overloaded to teach the individual what he needs to know about life. The public school curriculum should be responsible solely for the general education of the young person. Since most young

---

1Personal notes taken from the comments of the chairman of a panel discussion on Urban Education at the 1973 Convention of the American Association of Teacher Colleges of Education, James B. Jones, Texas Southern University, Houston, Texas.
people attend some form of school after graduation, university or trade, the university or trade school should be responsible for the training in a profession or skill. The question now which now looms in importance is, "Where can the young person learn about life?" Of course he can learn it in the school of "hard knocks" where most of us learned it. A better way to learn about life would be in schools of continuing education where people of all ages can come together and share their experiences of life. This area of curriculum development is wide open.

III. Recommendations for Further Study

This study basically investigated the curriculum practices and theorizing of four men who lived during the same period in American history. This study, identified very little research grounded in the curriculum-making or curriculum theorizing activities of leading black educators. Further study of this matter is worthy of attention.

An extended study of black perceptions of vocational education is another area that could withstand further investigation. With college enrollments down and college graduates having difficulties finding work, more attention should be given to vocational education.

Little empirical research has been undertaken to verify the outcomes of education based on behavioral, competency-based, or performance objectives. Do predetermined goals
lead to better education? This open-ended question merits further investigation.

Lastly, other black educators have had much to say about Negro education in American society, particular reference is made to Horace Mann Bond. A study of Bond's concerns in curriculum, and other aspects of American education as it relates to black people is a significant field for further study.
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