

Did There Exist Two Stages of Franklin Bobbitt's Curriculum Theory?

LIU, Xing*

Franklin Bobbitt is the founder of modern curriculum theory. There is a generally supported saying that Bobbitt's theory went through two stages, the first focused on social efficiency with a mechanical and behavioral approach, and the second a more progressive approach, caring for the living experience of pupils. A close reading of his so-called turning point paper proves that this is a misunderstanding and that these two parts actually composed an organic unity in his theory from the very beginning. This misunderstanding happened mainly in the 1970s, with a tendency to criticize the Tyler Rationale as scientism. It influenced the canonical narrative in curriculum textbooks later and became a stereotype in our understanding of Bobbitt. It obscures the complexity of the history of educational thought.

Keywords: Franklin Bobbitt; curriculum; Ralph Tyler; social efficiency

1. Introduction

Many scholars locate the birth of the curriculum as a field of study in 1918 with the publication of John Franklin Bobbitt (1876-1956)'s *The Curriculum*, calling him the founder of modern curriculum theory. It is also generally believed that there were two stages of his thoughts on the curriculum. In an authoritative and often-quoted reference book, *The American Curriculum: A Documentary History*, it is claimed that "Bobbitt seemed to undergo a change of heart in the latter half of the 1920s, and in still later work (especially Bobbitt 1941) he turned very much in a Deweyan direction"(Willis et al., 1993, p.164). William Pinar et al., in their influential textbook *Understanding Curriculum*, also argue that Bobbitt's paper in 1926 suggests a possible turn in his curriculum theory which was "the most surprising" (Pinar et al., 2004, p.122) event during that time.¹

* Ph. D candidate, Hiroshima University
e-mail: liuxing@mail.bnu.edu.cn

Talking about Bobbitt's preceding stage of thought, Pinar et al. give a brief outline to the effect that he "had been instrumental in developing the rationale and techniques of the curricular orientation termed social efficiency. Borrowing from scientific management, Bobbitt developed a 'task analysis' to guide curriculum construction, insisting that the value of present educational activity was the vocational 'pay-off' in the future." In his 1926 paper, meanwhile, Bobbitt writes:

"In a very true sense, life cannot be 'prepared for.' It can only be lived. But fortunately, living it provides the momentum which continues it on the same level. Living it in proper ways impels it forward along the lines desired by education, and nothing else will do so. Preparation for life is thus a by-product of life itself." (NSSE, 1926, p.43)

This becomes the very argument of Pinar et al., supporting the conclusion that Bobbitt had rejected "scientific management, the ideal of an adult-centered school" (Pinar et al., 2004, p.122). This stance is so popular that Lagemann, in her highly regarded book on the history of American education research, also asserts that Bobbitt had given up his previous ideas and compared them to the dodo and the great auk in a museum (Lagemann, 2000, p.109).

And yet, is this prevailing stance really true? Does this argument definitely support this conclusion? This paper attempts to give a different answer and to explain how this kind of misunderstanding came about.

2. Analyzing the 1926 Paper

Bobbitt's 1918 book marks the birth of a field of professional activity which was soon to become a burgeoning one. This growth also brought different ideas and opinions into this field. In the mid-1920s, in order to reach some consensus on a common foundation for curriculum making, Harold Rugg (1886-1960) and others agreed, under the auspices of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE), to bring together a committee of the leading curriculum scholars of the time representing contending orientations. The committee members labored to identify eighteen central questions and to write a composite statement for this field. These were published in Part II of the 1926 NSSE Yearbook, entitled *The Foundations of Curriculum Making*. However, the fact that this section only occupied 18 pages shows how difficult this consensus was to reach and how vague this statement actually was. Following it were "minority reports", i.e., statements by each participant indicating personal additions to the overall report. Bobbitt's paper, which is considered a turning point, came in this context.

Let us first begin with a close reading of this paper.

Bobbitt makes it clear at the beginning that "education is for the social purpose of elevating the character of human conduct above what it would otherwise be". In part it is "child conduct; in part it is the conduct of youth; and in part it is that of mature men and women. Life is to be so lived at all ages or levels that it is diversified and wholesome, abundant and fruitful" (NSSE, 1926, p.41). It is a continuing process but is lived only "in the moving present" (Ibid., p.42). It is clear that Bobbitt defines the curriculum in a very broad sense, probably equal to education itself, when he claims that "the current activities of high-grade living twenty-four hours each day, and seven days each week are the curriculum" (Ibid.,

p.43). Thus, education cannot be understood only as schooling, for the hours a student spends outside of the school also occupy a great portion of his life and should be paid attention to. Furthermore, Bobbitt points out that "a school is not primarily an assemblage of classes where subjects are being taught" (Ibid., p.44) for this kind of indoctrination contributes so little to the real life of a person.

Here comes his famous term "activity analysis" which means that "the curriculum-maker will find the entire range of fruitful activities which ought to make up human existence on each of the age-levels. The task is first to find those individuals of a particular age-level who have been most successful in performing the activities desirable for that age-level, and possible for each ability-level as well" (Ibid., p.44). Quite different from the prevailing belief that, like Edward Thorndike, he only cares for behavioral or visible activities (Eisner, 2002, p.15), Bobbitt actually emphasizes that "the activity-analyst will be more concerned with subjective activities than the visible objective ones" (NSSE, 1926, p.44). These consist of "the activities of intellectual vision, valuation, judgment, planning, decision, and the other things out of which one's objective activities spring" and also "one's intellectual vision, one's aesthetic emotional reactions, meditations religious contemplations, one's longings and aspirations and other mental activities" (Ibid., pp.44-45).

Bobbitt realizes that "situations are infinitely diverse and never the same for any two individuals" (Ibid., p.45). Because of this complexity of life itself, individual curricula should also be developed according to different situations, as supplement to the general curriculum. For him, the curriculum is obviously not a thing to be prescribed or imposed upon all children and youth.

Following this, Bobbitt emphasizes the danger of indoctrination of facts again. "Instead of knowledge of textbook sort, as we have conceived it there should be subjective activities which are continuous, vigorous, diversified, abundant, and fruitful. They should be the constituents of high-grade intellectual living. Intellectual life of proper type is not an engulfing and a nursing within one's self of inert unassimilated bodies of knowledge" (Ibid., p.49). Bobbitt explains that his worry is closely related to the individualization of the curriculum. "The storage conception of education calls for a mechanical technique and assumes a relative uniformity in the natures and situations of the children and youths. It has been able, therefore, to employ a uniform curriculum, the same for all" (Ibid., p.51). But as the curriculum becomes activities that students must experience, they must be planned in accordance with the situation of each pupil. This makes the cooperation of pupils, teachers, and parents very important.

This would also bring some changes in the evaluation of the curriculum. "It should be noted that examination and standardized tests are for the most part portions of the technique of the archaic system of storage education. As usually constituted, they do not measure the efficacy of a behavioristic curriculum" (Ibid., pp.53-54). Bobbitt concludes that, in his view, this failure "results from so organizing the training as to expect practically all of education to be accomplished during the 25 hours per week at school", which only deals with vague, distant, and innocuous subject knowledge; however, "it is a most surprising oversight" not to regard education as something that could shape a pupil's whole life (Ibid., p.54).

Bobbitt does not stand with the claim that school must be an agency of social reform (Ibid.). But he does believe that individual goodness would automatically result in an enormous improvement in society in general, though this kind of improvement is not something

at which to aim directly. This is his concept of the relationship between education and society, different from more radical views.

Here we can have a comprehensive and clear understanding of his 1926 paper. But could this paper really suggest any turn in his curriculum theory? A comparative study of this paper and his previous works, like *The Curriculum* (1918) and *How to Make a Curriculum* (1924) which are generally considered representative of his “early” stage, may be helpful to clarify this problem.

3. Comparative Study with Bobbitt’s Earlier Works

In his 1924 book, Bobbitt defines education as “the process of growing up in the right way”, while “the objectives are the goals of growth. The pupil’s activities and experiences are the steps which make up his journey toward those goals. The activities and experiences are the curriculum” (Bobbitt, 1924a, p.44). His earlier book also suggests that a curriculum “is that series of things which children and youth must do and experience” (Bobbitt, 1918, p.42). These ideas are very close to the ones given in his 1926 paper. In several articles written over a number of years, he persists in criticizing the situations observed in schools, where “the teachers had a body of prepared subject-matter in a textbook. They were putting this prepared subject-matter into cold storage in the vaults of the pupils’ memories”, while what comforts him is only that “some of them had invented less unpleasant ways of doing it than others” (Bobbitt, 1924b, pp.45-46).

It is definitely true that Bobbitt believes such a process would be finally directed to the adult world, which is called by some researchers “social-centered”. Nevertheless, in the first chapter of *The Curriculum*, Bobbitt has already clarified that it is simply a problem of two levels of education. One is of play and the other is of work, paralleling the child and the adult. They are of quite different spirits and forms of learning. He gives an example from his own experience. When travelling to his work in the Orient, he noticed two boys on the same ship. Whenever the ship stopped for a day or two at ports such as Hong Kong, Shanghai, Nagasaki, Kobe and Yokohama, “scarcely had the ship come to anchor when the boys were off and away on an exploring expedition”. There was no assignment of anything for them to learn; they were not sent or “going ashore to get information so that they might recite upon it at night”. It was simply play-experience resulting from their intellectual hunger, and after coming back, they would offer “extended and enthusiastic verbal reports” about what they had experienced during the day (Bobbitt, 1918, p.10-11). The spirit of freedom has been given top priority at this level. It cannot be denied that such a process holds the adult world as the final end, but when asked which one is the right object of education, Bobbitt answered that “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 perform its full function” (Ibid., p.6).

From the very beginning, Bobbitt complained that “the direct fact-learning and recitation method, with which our profession is so familiar, is too primitive” (Ibid., p.98). In the 1924 book, he continues to complain that “education is mostly a matter of textbook memorizing followed by lesson-hearing. It is not usually regarded as primarily a matter of growing up in such a way that one develops the specific abilities and qualities which are to function

throughout life" (Bobbitt, 1924a, p.44). To define the curriculum as "activities and experiences" can be regarded as his strategy for working against this powerful tradition. To put a pupil in a designed situation to fix a particular problem is the only way in which he or she can develop the "the total range of habits, skills, abilities, forms of thought, valuations, ambitions, etc." (Bobbitt, 1918, p.43) which are necessary in such progress. Here is what education really consists in. Claiming that "even the crude activities of the past were directed by ideas" (Ibid., p.26), Bobbitt obviously objects to those who address this kind of learning simply in the behavioral sense. "The thought or subjective part of the work is the work, essentially" (Ibid., p.26); what makes him unsatisfied is that "the teachers... often do the thinking, drawing up the plans, and prescribe procedure for the students. This is exceedingly common in sewing-rooms, kitchens, and shops. So far as the pupil's experience is concerned, the intellectual element is largely dropped out. In such cases the pupils do not themselves perform the most vital portion of the work" (Ibid., pp.31-32).

His opinion on the relationship between education and society can be seen in the last chapter of his 1918 book, where his advice to school supervisors is that "not all progress is to be made in this generation; that something is to be left for those that come after us. And yet, he will attempt all of the progress for which conditions are ripe, and for which he can without forcing make them ripe" (Ibid., p.289). What he prefers is a stable and steady progress, instead of a radical one.²

In brief, there is no significant difference visible between his previous books and his 1926 paper. If anything is different, it might be his emphasis upon the individual curriculum. But this concept actually comes from the point that the curriculum consists of activities and experience. It is better to treat it as a small development, rather than any kind of turning point.

4. A False Presumption

Willis et al. also claim that "in still later work (especially Bobbitt 1941) he turned very much in a Deweyan direction". This refers to Bobbitt's last book during his whole academic career, *The Curriculum of Modern Education*, published by McGraw-Hill in 1941.

Space does not permit a detailed comparative study between this book and his previous ones, although it is worth noting that this book actually shares a similar structure with his 1918 one. Chapter I analyzes what a good life consists of and emphasizes that education should bear responsibility for people's entire lives. Chapters II "Play" and III "Work" obviously continue the topic of the two levels of education. Chapter IV "Intellectual Living" reminds us of Chapter IV of his 1918 book, *The Place of Ideas in Work-Experience*. From Chapter V through the end, Bobbitt separately treats the curriculum problems of language, reading, intercommunication, family life, sports, citizenship and vocation. It is quite similar to his 1918 book, except for the difference of order. The consistency of his curriculum theory is apparent.

No doubt Bobbitt clarified several issues in his later books, but this does not support the stance that he definitely changed his heart.

Willis et al. do not seriously justify their stance. In the introduction to their book, Bobbitt is described as "markedly influenced by the social efficiency movement" and having

“proposed a scientific approach to curriculum-making” (Willis et al., 1993, pp.163-164). This probably makes them believe that when he advocated “individualized curricula determined by students themselves”, instead of society, he “turned very much in a Deweyan direction”, for Dewey is generally believed to be “child-centered” (Ibid., p.164). But as argued above, the concept of individual curriculum actually came from his original theory system. In a 1921 paper, he is already arguing that “the curriculum is a thing which exists within the children, and within them differently according to their natures, capacities, social opportunities, social stimulations, etc.” (Bobbitt, 1921, p.614).

Here we can conclude that the so-called turn of Bobbitt is based upon a false presumption that there are two Bobbitts, one who focused only on society and wanted to arrange behavioral objects in a scientific way, and another one who attached importance to the living experience of children and went beyond these simply behavioral objects. In fact, these two dimensions formed an organic unity in his theory and there is no evidence to suggest that he underwent a radical turn in his career.

5. The Origin of This Misunderstanding

But how did this misunderstanding happen? As an active participant in the curriculum reforms that took place in several cities and schools throughout the U.S.A., Bobbitt left numerous documents, which could tell us what kind of curriculum, or individual curriculum, he was trying to build.

In the 1922 book which was a result of his work on “re-examination of the courses of study in junior and senior high schools” in Los Angeles, Bobbitt showed in detail how it could be. In order to get out of the rut of the academic curriculum, he put a “suggestive list of abilities and characteristics” at the heart of his curriculum, which covered nearly all the aspects of people’s lives. Holding the view that “experiences alone educate” (Bobbitt, 1922, p.42), he employed a plan “to take each objective individually or to take a related group of them collectively and to draw up a statement of the several specific things which a pupil may or ought to do or to experience in order that he may arrive at the desired goal” (Ibid., p.39). He particularly paid attention to those connected with one’s calling and citizenship. College entrance requirements had colonized the course of high school for a long time, as he realized. But there were so many students who would probably not go to college. Enabling them to enjoy their days in high schools in a beneficial way, Bobbitt introduced many practical courses for their selection. The list of abilities and characteristics went beyond the traditional subjects and students’ option became more open. For example, girls could learn household sewing, laundry work, household equipment and contrivances, gardening, parenting, etc. in school, while boys could get professional training in agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, trade, transportation, clerical occupations, etc. (Ibid., pp.33-61). More importantly, Bobbitt always realized that these classes of “the farmer, the small merchant, the housekeeper, the artisan, the factory-worker, and the unskilled laborer” serve the general welfare as fully and as fundamentally as the other classes, but that their labors were “not yet fully recognized as community service”(Bobbitt, 1918, p.59; Liu, 2016, p.69). The results of education, the development of a new generation of professional and responsible workmen, could bring some changes to this situation. As he felt, “out of the old, a new species of institution appears to

be arising" (Bobbitt, 1925, p.627). Actually, such a blueprint became the essence of comprehensive high schools in America later.

About 30 years later, in a 1951 paper, Paul R. Pierce, a fellow at Wells High School in Chicago, introduced another curriculum reform experiment carried out under the guidance of Bobbitt. It was in its fifteenth year at that time. It is very clear that the soul of Bobbitt's theory, as Pierce understood, is that "individuals learn what they live" and "current curriculum theory views the ends sought as desired change in the behavior of pupils", with a particular reminder that behavior is "being used in the broad sense to include thinking, feeling, and acting". According to this idea, "the staff of Wells High School went forward with the purpose of replacing the goal of the traditional curriculum— memorization of academic content— with the carrying-out of the experiences of successful daily living" and "this insistence on pupils' carrying out the significant experiences of daily living is the very essence of curriculum reconstruction" (Pierce, 1951, p.204). Building a unity of "school sponsors, parents, and community members" (Ibid., p.207), the teachers also offered more chances to encourage students' social cooperation. The broadening of subject fields was to provide "a workable framework for the guidance of experiences" (Ibid., p.205) through education in a general sense.

This presents a vivid image of this school, making it clear that at least some contemporaries of Bobbitt never treated him as a mechanical theorist who focused only on efficiency or behaviorism.

In his 1962³ doctoral dissertation on Bobbitt's educational ideas, Bernard George DeWulf notes that Herbert Spencer's *Education* influenced young Bobbitt very much and that this "proved to be one of the factors which compelled him to take the view that pupils first needed to know how to live rightly", while the one way to learn curricular content is through actual experience in life's activities (DeWulf, 1962, p.27). Spencer wondered why "the ornamental comes before the useful" in education and "knowledge which conduces to personal well-being has been postponed to that which brings applause" (Spencer, 1884, p.6). He refers to the academic subjects of the time. Bobbitt's experience as a teacher and curriculum-maker at the Philippine Normal School⁴ from 1902 to 1907 also made him realize that academic subjects borrowed from America were never fitted for the Philippines. A broad range of activities were introduced into the curriculum there under his guidance (Bobbitt, 1918, pp.283-284). It is no wonder that he would make the conception of experience a building block in his theory of the curriculum afterward. At about the same time, John Dewey (1859-1952) founded his theory of the curriculum basically upon a philosophical view of pragmatism, which "construes experience as the interaction of the self with its environment" (Perkinson, 1987, p.209). It is expressed explicitly in his *The Child and the Curriculum* (1902). Starting from different backgrounds and through different approaches, both of them reached a similar opinion, going against the traditional academic curriculum, with a focus upon the role of students' experience.⁵

But how an educationist is understood or accepted by his times may well not always be the same as he would wish. As Eisner says, the ideas of social efficiency, scientific management and psychological measurement were a part of the 1920s context in American education (Eisner, 1967, pp.29-30). Bobbitt, who also showed great enthusiasm for the application of science to education, acquired his reputation in that time mainly for this reason. Callahan shows us that Bobbitt was always recruited by different boards of education as an expert

who could do surveys in schools or cut out waste in the educational system. His vision of a school which could become a community center and bring a “slow, substantial growth” of appreciation amid society (Bobbitt, 1911, p.120) somehow got lost in the sight of those bureaucrats. The same thing also happened to Dewey, as we know that he was often oversimplified as “child-centered” after his works became more and more popular in America from about 1914 (Cremin, 1964, p.120; Tanner and Tanner, 1990, pp.148-157). Even though “in the late 1920s and the 1930s, Dewey made some trenchant criticisms about what he apparently felt to be distortions and misinterpretations of his own theories”, many protagonists of the radical child-centered theory, which leaves children to their own devices, attributed it to Dewey (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, p.151). This background gradually caused their images to end up at opposite extremes.

Written by Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell, *Curriculum Development* (1935) may have been one of the earliest textbooks widely used for colleges. This book refers to Bobbitt only with regard to “activity analysis”, beginning to fix his image in this direction. A 1965 paper titled *The Historical Development of the Term, Experience Curriculum* states that “the experience concept of curriculum stemmed from the child-centered schools of Dewey” (Phillip, 1965, p.123). It is clear that the exclusive rights to the term “experience curriculum” had been given to Dewey at the time, taken for granted by most people, including many scholars.

The 1950s also saw a growing tendency to reconsider the myth of science, especially its abuse in the humanities and social sciences. Hayek’s *The Counter-Revolution of Science* (1952) may be seen as a pioneering work in this context. The curriculum field responded to this tendency later, embodied in the criticisms of the Tyler Rationale. The Tyler Rationale, which comes from Ralph Tyler’s *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949), “the single most influential curriculum text ever written” (Pinar et al., 2004, p.148), is a linear, administrative procedure for curriculum development. His book identifies four steps that are central to the curriculum: 1) the selection and definition of learning objectives; 2) the selection and creation of appropriate learning experiences; 3) the organization of learning experiences to achieve those objects; 4) the evaluation of the curriculum. The simplicity and functionality of the Tyler Rationale were compelling for many educators during that time. Then, in the 1960s, early internal challenges to the Tylerian paradigm emerged from humanistic psychology identified with Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers (ibid., p.178), criticizing to the effect that the spirit of humanity is lost in such a curriculum of behaviorism. In the preface to a 1973 collection, researchers began to express that there had “appeared some published doubts” (Ibid., p.198) upon the Tyler Rationale. In brief, such an unchanging recipe to follow whenever making a curriculum only shows the arrogance of the self-proclaimed scientific method, which should be called scientism. As Nel Noddings criticizes, “the teacher who aims for a transformation of cognitive structure is concerned with how the child thinks and not solely with the product of his thinking. The teacher, so guided, cannot enter the instructional situation with predetermined behavioral objectives for the students; objectives must arise out of the situation in which, first, what is possible has been revealed” (Noddings, 1974, p.364).

Tyler was a student at the University of Chicago during Bobbitt’s tenure there and is typically cited as among Bobbitt’s intellectual progeny (Hlebowitsh, 2009, p.276). It is widely believed that Bobbitt’s scientific method “made the deepest impression on Tyler’s future intellectual stance” (Pinar et al., 2004, p.149). No wonder that when Tyler became the target

of criticism, Bobbitt also suffered from the same, as the origin of this model of efficiency or scientism. On the other side, it was very easy for those humanistic psychologists and curriculum experts who emphasized the cognitive dimension of children to see Dewey, the symbol of "child-centered" learning, as the predecessor of their theories. The conflicts of this field in the 1960s were projected into their understanding of the history. Callahan's *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* (1962) may be one example. He states that Bobbitt absolutely accepted the Taylor System, a scientific and efficient management system used in self-professed scientific industry. On the contrary, in his own book, Bobbitt discusses at length "the relative failure of the Taylor System" clearly and attributes it to "the insufficient attempt to enlist the intelligence and initiative of the men" (Bobbitt 1918, p.84). Nevertheless Callahan's book had become one of the classical works in the educational field and this image of Bobbitt was fixed.

Elliot Eisner and Elizabeth Vallance edited a book in 1974 entitled *Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum*. The word "conflicting" shows how extreme the hostility between these different ideas on the curriculum had become. In the Introduction, Eisner writes that "the first orientation to compete for inclusion in the scheme is that continuum implied by the 'child-centered versus society-centered' distinction", while the former was built by "John Dewey and the progressives" (Eisner & Vallance, 1974, p.3). Eisner and Vallance, who stand with Dewey, do not say who built the latter, but it is reasonable to suppose that most readers know the answer. There was also a popular belief that "closely associated with the child's interests, impulses, initiative, and freedom was the idea of the child's doing—learning through activity" (Tanner and Tanner, 1990, p.154).

William Pinar et al. accept these positions in their *Understanding Curriculum* (1995/2004), and the canonical historical narrative in the curriculum field became that "the 1920s saw the appearance of two rival reform movements, the social efficiency movement identified with Bobbitt, Charters, and Snedden, and the Progressive movement identified with Dewey, Kilpatrick, Childs and others" (Pinar et al., 2004, pp.116-117). Here comes a gap between Bobbitt and any others who would emphasize the importance of children or show more interest in the intellectual dimension of learning. But it is an artificial gap.

Interestingly, in an interview in 1981, Ralph Tyler said that "when people say 'Tylerian' as a single process it's like saying Dewey only mentioned child interests" (Tyler, 1989, p.252). Obviously, Tyler was not satisfied with the simplifications of both Dewey and himself.

Regrettably, this unfounded narrative is popular today and has become part of the common sense in the curriculum field.⁶ It only offers a popular stereotype about Bobbitt, concealing his complexity and that of the starting point of curriculum theory.

6. Conclusion

Did there exist two stages of Franklin Bobbitt's curriculum theory? Based upon all the arguments above, the answer seems to be No. Instead of any radical turning point, his life in curriculum studies shows a clear consistency.

It is true that anyone of today cannot be absolutely the same as he or she was yesterday. Bobbitt, who served in this field for more than 30 years, did make many modifications

to his own curriculum theory during his lifetime. As the intent of this paper is to refute the previous stance, these points of modification or re-clarification may not get enough attention here. This problem deserves arduous and painstaking work in the future.

To write a history of anything would unavoidably mean generalization or re-interpretation. Sometimes, this suffers from oversimplification. There is a distinct possibility of this situation especially in the editing of our textbooks. The narrative, or the stereotype, on Franklin Bobbitt may be one example of this kind. The complexity of educationists, especially those who were once of great influence, may sometimes be reduced to several clear but arbitrary slogans, and our understanding of these may verge on misunderstanding. This is what we need to be very careful of.

Notes

- 1 Bobbitt's paper was misquoted as from 1927 in several books (Pinar et al., 2004, p.122; Lagemann, 2000, p.105), while the exact date of publication should be October of 1926.
- 2 Criticisms on Bobbitt from this point of view can be seen in Bode (1927).
- 3 At the time this dissertation was written, the writer was able to interview Mabel Diewert Bobbitt, widow of Franklin Bobbitt, and "delve into what remained of her husband's personal library, papers, and published reports four year after his death" (DeWulf, 1962, p.5). Margaret Bobbitt Miller, the only child of Bobbitt, also furnished this dissertation with her memories of her late father. This made his writings about Bobbitt's early years reliable.
- 4 It was elevated to Philippine Normal University in 1991.
- 5 Actually, W. W. Charters (1875-1952), another educationist who is always seen as belonging to the group of social-efficiency, thanked both Bobbitt and Dewey in the preface of his *Curriculum Construction* (1925). Their personal relations seem closer than we supposed.
- 6 Most Japanese scholars share the opinion of American ones upon Bobbitt. Manabu Sato considers Bobbitt representative of the pedagogy of social-efficiency, which compares schools to factories and pursues the efficiency of production (Sato, 2011, pp.20-22); when writing the entry on *Franklin Bobbitt* in a professional dictionary, Kazumitsu Nakano also describes him from the view of social-efficiency (JSCS, 2001, p.509).

References

- Bobbitt, Franklin (1911). A City School as a Community Art and Musical Center. *The Elementary School Teacher*, Vol. 12, No.3, pp.119-126.
- Bobbitt, Franklin (1918). *The Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Bobbitt, Franklin (1921). A Significant Tendency in Curriculum-Making. *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 21, No.8, pp.607-615.
- Bobbitt, Franklin (1922). *Curriculum-Making in Los Angeles*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Bobbitt, Franklin (1924a). *How to Make a Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Bobbitt, Franklin (1924b). The New Technique of Curriculum-Making. *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 25, No.1, pp.45-54.
- Bobbitt, Franklin (1925). Review of *Curriculum-Adjustment in the Secondary School* by Philip W. L. Cox. *The School Review*, Vol. 33, No.8, pp.627.
- Bobbitt, Franklin (1941). *The Curriculum of Modern Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Bode, Boyd H. (1927). *Modern Educational Theories*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Callahan, Raymond E. (1962). *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Charters, W. W. (1925). *Curriculum Construction*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. (1964). *The Transformation of the School*. New York: Vintage Books.
- DeWulf, Bernard George (1962). *The Educational Ideas of John Franklin Bobbitt*. Doctoral disserta-

- tion of Washington University.
- Eisner, Elliot W. (1967). Franklin Bobbitt and the "Science" of Curriculum Making. *The School Review*, Vol. 75, No.1, pp.29-47.
- Eisner, Elliot W. and Elizabeth Vallance (1974). *Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum*, Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Eisner, Elliot W. (2002). *The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs*, New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hlebowitsh, Peter S. (2009). Generational Ideas in Curriculum: An Historical Triangulation. In Flinders, David J. & Thornton, Stephen J. (Ed.) *The Curriculum Studies Reader*, New York: Routledge.
- Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe (2000). *An Elusive Science: the Troubling History of Education Research*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Liu, Xing (2016). Revisiting Franklin Bobbitt's Thoughts on Vocational Education. *The Journal of School & Society*, Vol. 3, No.1, pp.65-70.
- Noddings, Nel (1974). Competence Theories and the Science of Education. *Educational Theory*, Vol. 24, No.4, pp.356-364.
- Perkinson, Henry J. (1987). *Two Hundred Years of American Educational Thought*. London: University Press of America.
- Pierce, Paul R. (1951). Extending Curriculum Theory: A Transition Experiment. *The School Review*, Vol. 59, No.4, pp.203-211.
- Phillips, Richard C. (1965). The Historical Development of the Term, Experience Curriculum, *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No.2, pp.121-130.
- Pinar, William F., William M. Reynolds, Patrick Slattery, and Peter M. Taubman (2004). *Understanding Curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Sato, Manabu (2011). *Pedagogy*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Spencer, Herbert (1884). *What Knowledge is of Most Worth*. New York: John B. Alden, Publisher.
- Tanner, Daniel and Laurel Tanner (1990). *History of the School Curriculum*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- The Japanese Society for Curriculum Studies (JSCS). (2001). *The Dictionary of Modern Curriculum*. Tokyo: Gyosei Co., Ltd.
- The National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE). (1926). *The foundation of curriculum making. Twenty-sixth yearbook*, Part II. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company.
- Tyler, Ralph (1989). *Educational Evaluation: Classical Works of Ralph W. Tyler*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Willis, George, William H. Schubert, Robert V. Bullough, John T. Holton (1993). *The American Curriculum: A Documentary History*. Westport: Greenwood Press.