

Social Efficiency or Vocational Efficiency?: Toward a Deeper Knowledge of a Misunderstood Term

J. Wesley Null
Baylor University

Abstract:

Curriculum historians must pay close attention to the historical time and social context in which previous scholars contributed their work. Social efficiency provides a good example of a complex term that seems to have grown larger than the specific time and social context in which various individuals from the past understood the term. This paper, rather than redefining social efficiency calls for a broadening and a more complete understanding of this highly important term to the history of the curriculum field.

The history of the American curriculum is a very complex topic. All individuals and the terms they advanced to support a particular position should be considered carefully. Moreover, historians of the curriculum must pay close attention to the historical time and social context in which previous scholars contributed their work.

Social efficiency provides a good example of a complex term that seems to have grown larger than the specific time and social context in which various individuals from the past understood the term. Indeed, the majority of contemporary literature on the history of American education in general and the history of the curriculum in particular rarely recognizes anything beyond one rather narrow and straightforward definition of "social efficiency."

The purpose of this paper was not to redefine social efficiency. The intent, rather, was to call for a broadening or for a more complete understanding of this highly important term to the history of the curriculum field. Toward this end, this study investigated three fairly recent considerations of the term social efficiency, detailed the creation of one concept of "social efficiency" by William C. Bagley in 1905, and considered how the meaning of this term changed drastically during the period from 1905-1922. A study of this term revealed that its use during the early decades of the 20th century was not simplistic, nor was one definition of the concept dominant over all of the others. To be sure, meanings of social efficiency differed from author to author and from decade to decade.

Recent Definitions of Social Efficiency

In her recent work *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms*, Diane Ravitch defined social efficiency as a movement "which held that children should get the education appropriate to their future roles as workers or homemakers."¹ She further argued that the movement suffered from a mistaken belief in curriculum differentiation, a deep sense of anti-intellectualism, and an inversion of the democratic concept of equal opportunity.² She also identified the movement as one that rejected an academic curriculum in favor of a course of study that prepared students for a life of work rather than a life of learning. In her short treatment of William C. Bagley, she wrote "Bagley, like (David) Snedden, was a well-known

educationist who made his reputation as a proponent of social efficiency."³ Although she acknowledged that Bagley was a critic of David Snedden, she failed to look more closely into Bagley's earlier work, more specifically his meaning of social efficiency.

In *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, Herbert Kliebard provided a definition of social efficiency similar to that of Ravitch. Kliebard defined the movement as one that emphasized rugged individualism, social control, and the scientific management principles of Frederick Taylor.⁴ He further identified John Franklin Bobbitt's 1918 book, *The Curriculum*, as exemplifying the "most explicit definition of the theory" followed by the social efficiency educators.⁵ For certain, Bobbitt argued incessantly during the 1910s and 1920s for a curriculum based upon the "future destinations" of students. Bobbitt also called for the meticulous study of adult occupations to determine the appropriate skills, techniques, and "paths" pertinent to each occupation that then would be used to "train" students for future occupations. The goal that Bobbitt had in mind, however, was "occupational efficiency" or "vocational efficiency" and not "social efficiency."⁶

In a final, somewhat less recent example of a definition of social efficiency, Edward Krug recognized that social efficiency, at one time, consisted of more than an advocacy for the vocational or occupational training promoted by Bobbitt and Snedden. Krug noted that the quest for social efficiency derived from the need seen by many educators to identify a social mission for the schools. He also acknowledged that at least two different conceptions of this desire for a social mission merged together to form the social efficiency of the 1920s:

From this (the desire for a social mission) came supposedly new directions of schooling, reflecting latter-day efforts to resolve the perennial dilemma of the individual and the group. One expression of this quest was education for social control; the other, education for social service. Soon they came together in one slogan, education for social efficiency.⁷

Krug was accurate in his acknowledgment that social efficiency consisted of more than one narrowly defined

term. To Krug, in other words, social efficiency could mean either social service or social control, depending upon the different meanings that individuals infused into the concept when they used it. The question that must be addressed, however, is the extent to which the meanings behind social efficiency changed from the time the phrase originally was advanced in 1905 to perhaps the apex of the efficiency movement around the mid 1920s. Moreover, the creation of the concept should be explored carefully, with a close consideration of the author's meaning and intent when he first proposed his version of "social efficiency."

William C. Bagley and Social Efficiency

All records indicate that William C. Bagley was the first person to define a concept of social efficiency as it related to education. In 1905, he described his understanding of social efficiency in his first major book, *The Educative Process*.⁸ At the time that Bagley wrote *The Educative Process*, he was serving as superintendent of public schools in Dillon, Montana. He also served as Vice-President of Dillon's Montana State Normal College. Notably, Bagley's "social efficiency," as he defined it in 1905, had nothing to do with rugged individualism, the training of individuals for occupations, the sorting of students into their "inevitable" places in society, or the elimination of monetary waste in school administration. In contrast to these ideas, social efficiency, to Bagley in 1905, was nothing if not a moral position about the relationship of the individual to society. Bagley's definition of this concept appeared in a chapter of *The Educative Process* that he entitled "The Ethical End of Education."⁹

As he extended the moral philosophy of well-known educator Johann Friedrich Herbart, Bagley began his description of social efficiency:

The point that Herbart and his followers have failed to emphasize is the social essence of morality. It is true that the social criterion is implicit in the Herbartian ethics, as, indeed, the same criterion is implicit in practically all ethical theories. There is an advantage, however, in using the term "socially efficient" in place of the term "moral." In the first place, it is more definite; in the second place, it emphasizes the social factor, and, inasmuch as the school is supported by society presumably for society's benefit, it is only right that this factor should find a definite expression in the aim of school.¹⁰

Bagley further defined his social efficiency as the development of "moral character" in students. He supported his conception of social efficiency with the point that the authors of "all recent educational writings" implied this concept of social efficiency in their work.¹¹ Bagley cited specifically John Dewey's *School and Society* and Michael Vincent O'Shea's *Education As Adjustment*.¹² Bagley also reached back as far as the ancient Greeks to cite Aristotle's consideration of ethics, or moral virtue.

A contemporary synonym for Bagley's use of social efficiency would be character education or the development of a spirit of "social service" in students. Bagley was concerned about the extent to which individuals learned the importance of suppressing their own individual wants, needs, and desires for the good of society as a whole. Throughout his life, he argued relentlessly against excessive individualism. In other books and articles, Bagley referred to this concept of social efficiency, under different terms, as negative morality, social service, or fidelity to humanity.¹³ In 1905, Bagley had in mind something quite different from social control. He wanted students to contribute to social reform or social advancement through their contributions to American culture. Later in his life, Bagley expanded this emphasis on social service to include a vision of society in which crime did not exist, in which all Americans enjoyed approximately the same amount of wealth, and in which all races lived together harmoniously.¹⁴

Much later than 1905, however, certain individuals rushed Bagley's notion of social efficiency, or social service, to its extremes. They severely distorted Bagley's social efficiency and began to advocate the sorting and training of individuals for their "destined" roles in society.¹⁵ Bagley's social efficiency had nothing to do with "job analysis" or vocational education. Importantly, Bagley's most frequent use of his notion of social efficiency can be found in *The Educative Process*, written in 1905, and his 1907 book *Educational Values*.¹⁶ As the efficiency movement gained momentum, however, Bagley wrote the phrase social efficiency less and less. After 1907, he very rarely wrote it at all.

In his classic work on efficiency and education, Raymond Callahan singled out Bagley and John Dewey. He referred to Bagley and Dewey as the two outstanding educators who provided the "most insightful" critiques of the efficiency movement and its destruction of important democratic ideals. In Callahan's words:

Both men (Bagley and Dewey) opposed the inappropriate application of business and industrial values and procedures to the schools and both criticized the oversimplified and superficial activity being engaged in, often in the name of science.¹⁷

To be sure, Bagley's social efficiency, as he defined it while writing in Dillon, Montana, in 1905, did not equate with the same positions of David Snedden and the early positions of Franklin Bobbitt.¹⁸

The Snedden-Bagley Debate of 1914

In the summer of 1914, Bagley debated well-known sociologist of education David Snedden at the annual meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Meanings of social efficiency and vocational efficiency were central to this debate. Meeting in St. Paul, Minnesota, Snedden and Bagley disagreed considerably over the role of vocational

education in the curriculum. The topic of their discussion was "The Fundamental Distinction Between Liberal and Vocational Education."¹⁹ Bagley argued for liberal education and Snedden advocated vocational education, which necessitated the differentiation of the school curriculum.

Snedden, who at the time served as Commissioner of Education for the state of Massachusetts, argued vehemently that the American public demanded a more "vocationally efficient curriculum." Snedden painted Bagley as hopelessly old-fashioned, un-scientific, and "unprogressive." Snedden, the cutting-edge sociologist, called for the dismantling of general education. In the name of vocational efficiency, he argued for the replacement of the traditional academic curriculum, or general education, with a curriculum that "truly met the needs of our changing civilization." Snedden based his assertions on definitions of science and "social efficiency" that differed markedly from Bagley's. Bagley promoted an inductive science that looked first at practice (or evidence) and a social efficiency that did not promote vocational education.²⁰ In fact, Snedden never once argued for something called social efficiency in his entire debate with Bagley. In 1914, the phrase social efficiency, although Bagley had almost completely quit using it by this time, retained the definition that he had attached to it in *The Educative Process*. One key phrase from Snedden's 1914 address to the members of the Department of Superintendence highlighted his disagreement with general, or liberal, education and Bagley's understanding of social efficiency:

A large part of the effort we expend on general education is directed by aims which are the outgrowth of custom, crude psychological analysis, and vague aspirations after culture and social efficiency. These aims do not yet stand the tests of efficiency as should aims that are scientifically derived and purposefully pursued.²¹

To use the phrase "social efficiency" as he did in this sentence, Snedden argued precisely against the social efficiency that Bagley introduced in *The Educative Process*. Since 1905, Bagley continued to believe that a liberal education based on such subjects as history, literature, and mathematics helped students to develop broad understandings of culture, moral character, and social efficiency. Instead of *social* efficiency, Snedden argued for *vocational* efficiency, an approach that did not gain support from Bagley. In a concluding sentence that probably incited Bagley to a considerable degree, Snedden proclaimed that "the vocational school should divest itself as completely as possible of the academic atmosphere, and should reproduce as fully as possible the atmosphere of economic endeavor in the field for which it trains."²² Immediately following Snedden's remarks, Bagley took the opportunity to argue for precisely that dastardly academic atmosphere that Snedden so wished to demolish.

In Bagley's defense of liberal education, he countered Snedden's proposal with several arguments. First, he pointed out that vocational education and liberal education each attempted to solve very different types of problems. Vocational education, on the one hand, treated a specific and tangible problem, whereas liberal education addressed a very complex problem that was highly resistant to the type of analysis proposed by Snedden. In Bagley's words:

The great difficulty lies not in the fact that the aims of liberal education are inherently obscure but rather in the fact that they are inherently remote and inherently broad and comprehensive. Because "social efficiency," for example, or "adaptability," or "morality" are so broad as to make analysis difficult, it does not follow that they are unimportant or that we can replace them by narrower aims.²³

The narrower aims against which Bagley argued included primarily Snedden's proposal that school administrators should design a curriculum that met the "recognized calling" of every student. Snedden further wished to narrow the curriculum by analyzing each vocational calling such as medicine, teaching, and carpentering and then deriving from these analyses "those specific requirements as to skill, technical knowledge, and ideals which persons trained for that vocation should possess."²⁴

After he heard these proposals for social control, Bagley disagreed with them strongly. He cautioned Snedden and the rest of the audience with his argument that the narrowing of the curriculum merely to vocational aims threatened to exacerbate the class distinctions already present in American society. A strictly vocational curriculum, Bagley argued, inevitably trapped a generation of Americans into a specific vocational position. To Bagley, one of the main purposes of education was to open opportunities or to provide possibilities for students. Snedden's curricular scheme, according to Bagley, worked toward exactly the opposite goals, namely those of reducing opportunities and narrowing possibilities.

Furthermore, Bagley labeled the approach by Snedden as suffering from a "production-consumption theory" that attempted to solve all of life's problems with economic terms, business analogies, and purely factory-model thinking. Bagley called attention to the dangers of this attitude with its tendency to overlook important values simply because they did not fit neatly into the special categories designed by analysts of the production-consumption type.²⁵ In addition to his critique of production-consumption thinking, Bagley also charged Snedden with perpetuating a worn out and unjust prejudice, namely the notion that liberal education somehow was impractical. The culprit behind this movement, to Bagley, was the cult of utility or the "fallacy of the immediate," as he also termed it.²⁶ Bagley simply would not accept the view that *all* learning had to be immediately useful and practical. He disagreed with this cult of utility whether or not the argument was for a

curriculum that attempted only to match students' interests or one that sought to train them for specific vocational callings. In the case of Snedden, Bagley viewed the Massachusetts sociologist as attempting to meet both criteria, students' interests and vocational efficiency, but ultimately producing a program that was both anti-democratic and a step backward in Bagley's vision for social progress.

In the months that followed the Snedden-Bagley debate, Bagley continued to criticize an overemphasis on curriculum differentiation and production-consumption thinking.²⁷ In February of 1915, Bagley recognized how the term social efficiency was undergoing a bizarre transformation. He now referred to the concept he first proposed in 1905 as an "ideal of social service" rather than social efficiency. In his terms:

Our individual difficulties have grown up in part because of the overemphasis of individualism in our national life and our national ethics. To be "successful" has meant individual success. It is true that we have in education a noisy emphasis upon "social efficiency" and upon the cultivation of the "spirit of social service." But thus far this has been mostly froth. Its expressions have been bizarre, superficial, and ineffective.²⁸

With his switch to an emphasis on social service, Bagley evidenced his rejection of much of the efficiency doctrine of Snedden and Franklin Bobbitt. A closer investigation of Bobbitt's work, however, revealed that Bobbitt himself, whom Kliebard has claimed was the father of "social efficiency," rejected the phrase social efficiency in his two highly significant works *The Curriculum* and *How To Make A Curriculum*.²⁹

Bobbitt and Occupational Efficiency

By the time that Franklin Bobbitt published *The Curriculum* in 1918, the term social efficiency was beginning to assume a vocational perspective in the minds of some educators. Despite this change in meaning, however, Bobbitt never argued for social efficiency in the book. In his only use of the phrase social efficiency in the entire work, Bobbitt rejected the concept as hopelessly vague and indefinite. In Bobbitt's terms:

The technique of curriculum-making along scientific lines has been but little developed. The controlling purposes of education have not been sufficiently particularized. We have aimed at a vague culture, an ill-defined discipline, a nebulous harmonious development of the individual, an indefinite moral character-building, an unparticularized social efficiency, or often enough nothing more than escape from a life of work. Often there are no controlling purposes; the momentum of the educational machine keeps it running. So long as objectives are but vague guesses, or not even that, there can be no demand

for anything but vague guesses as to means and procedure. But the era of contentment with large, undefined purposes is rapidly passing. An age of science is demanding exactness and particularity.³⁰

The social efficiency that Bobbitt rejected in *The Curriculum* was the definition that Bagley proposed in 1905. The definition of the end of education as the development of moral character or as the cultivation of a spirit of social service in students simply was too "unscientific" to Bobbitt.

Rather than the development of moral character, Bobbitt proposed that schools "train students for occupational efficiency." Bobbitt's understanding of occupational efficiency was very similar to the vocational efficiency for which Snedden argued in his debate with Bagley. In *The Curriculum*, Bobbitt, nevertheless, capitalized on the "spirit of social service" that was so prevalent in educational theory during the late 1910s. Bobbitt's understanding of social service, however, was one that attempted to teach students that their "calling" in life was to fill a specific occupation "for the good of society," a crucially significant change in the evolution of the understanding of social service. In his argument for vocational education in the name of social service, Bobbitt proposed a curricular plan that was the exact opposite of Bagley's. Bagley wanted to open opportunities for students by teaching them academic subjects, whereas Bobbitt wanted to narrow students' coursework through an extremely differentiated curriculum.³¹ In Bobbitt's words:

Occupational labors clearly represent the basic service to humanity, the most fundamental social service. In a day when the watchword of the world's humanitarian religion is "social service," it is well to note that the most solid and never-relaxing portions of this service are the labors of farmer and merchant, plumber and carpenter, housewife and seamstress, miner and engineer, physician, teacher, and journalist, and the rest of the valiant army of men and women who labor.³²

With his injection of social control rhetoric into the social service movement, Bobbitt helped to transform the original meaning of social efficiency. In the late 1910s and early 1920s, Bobbitt and Snedden began to use social efficiency, defined as social service, to benefit their argument for a vocationalized curriculum. Nevertheless, the original meaning of social efficiency did not die easily. In another of his very influential books on the curriculum, a work he entitled *How To Make A Curriculum*, Bobbitt again dissociated himself from the concept of social efficiency. In his only reference to this phrase in this 1924 book, Bobbitt still viewed social efficiency as too vague and undefined for his business-minded approach to curriculum-making:

Objectives that are only vague high-sounding hopes and aspirations are to be avoided. Examples are:

“character building,” the “harmonious development of the individual,” “social efficiency,” “general discipline,” “self-realization,” “culture,” and the like. All of these are valid enough; but too cloud-like for guiding practical procedure. They belong to the visionary adolescence of our profession, not to its sober and somewhat disillusioned maturity.³³

Bobbitt may have rejected social efficiency as defined as the development of moral character, but he nevertheless advocated relentlessly for more attention to the differentiation of the curriculum, an increased emphasis on activity analysis, and the further training of students for specific occupations. Although Bobbitt never argued for social efficiency in *The Curriculum* or in *How To Make A Curriculum*, his close intellectual companion, David Snedden, redefined the term social efficiency in 1922 to meet the needs of the vocational education movement.

Snedden and 1920s Social Efficiency

When Bobbitt published *How To Make A Curriculum* in 1924, either he had not seen or he chose to disagree with social efficiency as Snedden defined the term in 1922. In Snedden's *Educational Sociology*, the transformation of the original concept of social efficiency was complete.³⁴ In this book, Snedden, for the first time, used the term social efficiency to his advantage. He dedicated two chapters to the concept. He titled these chapters “Social Efficiency and Progress” and “Education as a Means of Social Efficiency.”³⁵ Significantly, the meaning of this phrase as Snedden redefined it in 1922 was similar in many ways to the social efficiency that has been proposed by Ravitch, Kliebard, Krug, and others. Notably, however, Snedden only began to argue in favor of something called social efficiency in this 1922 book. In four of his main works that preceded *Educational Sociology*, Snedden proposed that schools should work toward vocational efficiency or occupational efficiency but not social efficiency.³⁶ Why did he wait until 1922 to adopt the phrase social efficiency?

One simple answer to this question surely does not exist. In *Educational Sociology*, Snedden, nevertheless, commingled the understanding of social efficiency as moral character or social service with his previous, and continued, promotion of vocational education. He acknowledged that, before his redefinition, the concept of social efficiency had been devalued. In his words:

Social efficiency, a term recently somewhat corrupted by bad associations, is, nevertheless, very useful in denoting any assemblage of the qualities that make for “life more abundantly.”³⁷

In 1922, Snedden exploded the term social efficiency to include not simply vocational education but also the broad understanding of the role of humans in all of civilization. He argued that the socially efficient person and group sought to provide “security, health, and happiness” for all

human beings. With this vastly expanded definition of social efficiency, Snedden admitted that the objectives he identified with this concept became excessively complex. Much different from his earlier promotion of vocational efficiency, Snedden acknowledged that social efficiency was much different:

Sociology knows little as yet of objectives of social efficiency beyond those to be derived by projecting forward evolutionary tendencies already established and recognized.³⁸

Clearly, Snedden's social efficiency as he began to advocate it the concept 1922 encircled meanings very different from the social efficiency of the previous seventeen years. During the period from 1905-1922 when social efficiency took on so many different definitions, a final individual, John Dewey, proposed yet a third understanding of this concept. His social efficiency, moreover, differed notably from those of Bagley and Snedden.

Dewey and Social Efficiency

In 1916, Dewey devoted an entire chapter of *Democracy and Education* to the conflict between the natural development of the individual and the aim of social efficiency.³⁹ In typical Dewey fashion, he attempted to resolve the individual-society dualism upon which all the definitions of social efficiency were based. He recognized that the original concept of social efficiency, as defined by Bagley in 1905, was an idealistic view that subordinated the individual to society. Dewey thought that neither the individual nor society should be viewed as more powerful or more important than the other. In Dewey's words:

The dualism is too deeply established to be easily overthrown; for that reason, it is the particular task of education at the present time to struggle in behalf of an aim which social efficiency and personal culture are synonyms instead of antagonists.⁴⁰

To Dewey, a socially efficient society was a society that released individual human potential for the good of society; at the same time, however, Dewey's social efficiency did not dissolve individual hopes, aims, and desires in order for individuals to fill preconceived social positions. In his argument for the reconciliation of this dualism, Dewey both agreed and disagreed with Bagley's original conception of social efficiency.

To Bagley, social efficiency was an ideal, but Bagley's ideal had undergone serious transformation since he first proposed it in 1905. Dewey recognized this transformation that was underway. In a passage that sounded strikingly similar to the social efficiency that Bagley originally had in mind, Dewey wrote:

When social efficiency as measured by product or output is urged as an ideal in a would-be democratic society, it means that the depreciatory estimate of

the masses characteristic of an aristocratic community is accepted and carried over. But if democracy has a moral and ideal meaning, it is that a social return be demanded from all and that opportunity for development of distinctive capacities be afforded all. The separation of the two aims in education is fatal to democracy; the adoption of the narrower meaning of efficiency deprives it of its essential justification.⁴¹

Dewey, of course, was against the social stratification that inevitably resulted in the occupational and vocational efficiency theories of Bobbitt and Snedden. Dewey was making the same point that Bagley proposed in 1914 when he debated David Snedden. With his chapter on social efficiency, or social power as he described the phrase, Dewey wanted to eliminate the belief in social efficiency as an ideal aim of education. He desired for society to develop to its fullest potential, but not at the expense of individual opportunity.

Concluding Comments

To be sure, a very diverse and richly contextualized discussion about the concept of social efficiency took place in educational literature during the period from 1905-1922. A close consideration of some of the primary source material on this concept revealed a complex discussion that deserves careful attention from educational historians. From the time social efficiency first was defined in 1905 to its continued transformation in the mid 1920s, numerous individuals attached various definitions to this important concept. This brief study uncovered at least three different definitions of social efficiency. Bagley viewed social efficiency as an ethical or idealistic concept about the individual's responsibility to the improvement of society. On the other hand, Bobbitt, in his two major books on the curriculum, never advocated social efficiency. As a third example, Snedden argued for vocational efficiency rather than social efficiency, until 1922 when he redefined social efficiency to match his interest in vocational education. Finally, Dewey sought to arrest the idealistic social efficiency concept that Bagley proposed in 1905. On the contrary, Dewey's social efficiency viewed the individual and society as synonymous, or, perhaps, symbiotic.

Upon further investigation, historians of the curriculum quite likely could find an even broader and more diverse set of definitions for this concept. Broad assumptions or generalizations about the meaning of social efficiency during the first few decades of the 20th century, however, must not be made. Simply because someone from 1905 or 1910 or 1915 wrote the term "social efficiency" does not mean that he or she only had one definition in mind.⁴² Importantly, in 1990, Daniel and Laurel Tanner recognized the problems that existed in curriculum literature on the concepts of social efficiency and social control. Tanner and Tanner wrote that "the concepts of social efficiency and social control, which appeared widely in the educational literature between 1900

and 1920, came to be portrayed by educational historians mainly in their invidious meanings. To this day, the one-sided aspect of social efficiency and social control is promulgated by some writers on the history of the school curriculum."⁴³ More than ten years after Tanner and Tanner published this book, the problem persists.

As historians on the curriculum begin to work in the 21st century, problems caused by the narrow understanding of social efficiency only will worsen if additional studies do not investigate the primary source writings on the curriculum. In short, when conducting historical work, researchers who study curriculum should paint very carefully with small brushes and not widely with large brushes. Moreover, writers on the curriculum should look closely at the specific historical time and the social contexts in which significant terms were advanced. The guiding questions "Whose social efficiency?" or "Which social efficiency?" might help historians of the curriculum to break the cycle of misunderstanding that has befuddled this concept, because, to be sure, one straight-forward, monolithic definition of this much overused phrase simply never existed.

¹ Diane Ravitch, *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reform* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000), p. 89.

² *Ibid.*, 89-90.

³ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁴ Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 77-83.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁶ Franklin Bobbitt, *The Curriculum* (Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press, 1918), pp. 53-87.

⁷ Edward A. Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920* (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), p. 249.

⁸ William C. Bagley, *The Educative Process* (New York: Macmillan, 1905), pp. 40-65.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 40-65.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 58-59.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 65.

¹² John Dewey, *School and Society* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1899); Michael Vincent O'Shea, *Education As Adjustment* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1903).

¹³ James Wesley Null, "A Disciplined Progressive Educator: The Life and Career of William Chandler Bagley, 1874-1946," (Ph.D. diss., The University of Texas at Austin, 2001).

¹⁴ See, for example, William C. Bagley, *Education, Crime, and Social Progress* (New York: Macmillan, 1931); and William C. Bagley, *Education and Emergent Man: A Theory of Education With Particular Application to Public Education in the United States* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1934).

¹⁵ Raymond Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools* (Chicago: The

- University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 95-125; see, also, Paul Davis Chapman, *Schools as Sorters: Lewis M. Terman, Applied Psychology, and the Intelligence Testing Movement 1890-1930* (New York: New York University Press, 1988).
- ¹⁶ In 1907, Bagley clarified the moral or ethical emphasis that he placed upon his notion of social efficiency. He cited specifically Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative to support his concept of social efficiency. See his *Educational Values* (New York: Macmillan, 1907), pp. 107-116.
- ¹⁷ Raymond E. Callahan, *Education and Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 124; see, also, pp. 220.
- ¹⁸ For Bagley's cautions about the overextension of efficiency doctrine, see William C. Bagley, "Status of the Classroom Teacher," *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses* (1918): 385.
- ¹⁹ David Snedden, "The Fundamental Distinction Between Liberal and Vocational Education," *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses* (1914): 151-161; William C. Bagley, "The Fundamental Distinction Between Liberal and Vocational Education," *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses* (1914): 161-170.
- ²⁰ William C. Bagley, "The Scientific Spirit in Education," in *Craftsmanship in Teaching* (New York: Macmillan, 1912), pp. 123-143.
- ²¹ Snedden, "The Fundamental Distinction Between Liberal and Vocational Education," *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses* (1914): 153.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 160.
- ²³ Bagley, "The Fundamental Distinction Between Liberal and Vocational Education," *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses* (1914): 162.
- ²⁴ Snedden, "The Fundamental Distinction Between Liberal and Vocational Education," *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses* (1914): 155.
- ²⁵ Bagley, "The Fundamental Distinction Between Liberal and Vocational Education," *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses* (1914): 161-170.
- ²⁶ William C. Bagley, "The Outcomes of Teaching: Some Seemingly Simple Tasks That the School Finds it Difficult to Accomplish," *School and Society* 31 (November 1911): 101-110.
- ²⁷ See, for example, William C. Bagley, "Principles Justifying Common Elements in the School Program," *School and Home Education* 34 (December 1914): 119-131; see, also, William C. Bagley, "The Social Dangers of Premature Differentiation," *School and Home Education* 34 (September 1914): 3-4; see, also, William C. Bagley, "Differentiation and Elimination," *School and Home Education* 34 (September 1914): 5; see, also, William C. Bagley, "Differentiation in High Schools, --a Myth?," *School and Home Education* 34 (November 1914): 79-80.
- ²⁸ William C. Bagley, "Education and Ideals of Social Service," *School and Home Education* 34 (February 1915): 200-201.
- ²⁹ See Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 77-83.
- ³⁰ Franklin Bobbitt, *The Curriculum* (Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press, 1918), p. 41.
- ³¹ For a consideration of how Bobbitt recanted most of his earlier views toward an excessively differentiated curriculum, see J. Wesley Null, "Efficiency Jettisoned: Unacknowledged Changes in the Curriculum Thought of John Franklin Bobbitt," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 15 (Fall 1999): 35-42.
- ³² Franklin Bobbitt, *The Curriculum* (Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press, 1918), pp. 55-56.
- ³³ Franklin Bobbitt, *How To Make A Curriculum* (Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press, 1924), pp. 32-33.
- ³⁴ David Snedden, *Educational Sociology* (New York: The Century Company, 1922).
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 276-308.
- ³⁶ See David Snedden, *The Problem of Vocational Education* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1910); David Snedden, *Problems of Educational Readjustment* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913); David Snedden, *Vocational Education* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920); David Snedden, *Sociological Determination of Objectives in Education* (Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1921).
- ³⁷ David Snedden, *Educational Sociology* (New York: The Century Company, 1922), p. 280.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, 283.
- ³⁹ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1916), pp. 111-123.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 123.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 122.
- ⁴² For one consideration of how social efficiency held different meanings for different people, see Joseph F. Luetkemeyer, "The Snedden/Prosser Social Efficiency Paradigm of Vocational Education," *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education* 25 (Fall 1987): 31-43.
- ⁴³ Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner, *History of the School Curriculum* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990), p. 358. For writings from two other curriculum historians who have called attention to this problem with social efficiency, see William G. Wraga, *Democracy's High School: The Comprehensive High School and Educational Reform in the United States* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994); and Peter Hlebowitsh, *Radical Curriculum Theory Reconsidered: A Historical Approach* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1993).

