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Franklin Bobbitt and the "Science" of Curriculum Making

The 1920's were a fruitful decade in American education. The scientific study of education had survived its infancy; the survey movement was well into its adolescence. Thorndike and Judd had, through their work, established themselves as leaders in scientific education; the innovations and methods which were initiated twenty years earlier were beginning to bear fruit.

Yet despite the growing abundance of new tools and methods, few people were ready or willing to take on what is perhaps the most complex educational task of all, the systematic and scientific development of curriculum. Dewey’s The Child and the Curriculum,² published in 1902, was a philosophical statement, persuasive and insightful to be sure, but was not easily translatable into practical terms. Kilpatrick’s The Project Method³ dealt with a piece of the curriculum problem but left out much that the practical schoolman wanted and needed to reconstruct curriculums. While a few men, such as Frederick Bonser,⁴ W. W. Charters,⁵ and David Snedden,⁶ had made important beginnings in applying scientific principles to solve curriculum problems, for the most part the task of constructing curriculums was a mixture of practical know-how and tradition. The goal of developing a scientific system of curriculum construction was yet to come. Charles H. Judd describes the state of affairs in 1922 this way:

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. There is plenty of social
machinery to check up a course after it is once launched. The principal of a school, the district superintendent, the college inspector, or the examining board, are all at hand to decide whether the class is doing well in the course. Suppose, however, that by some exercise of wisdom we had reached the conclusion that the subject ought to be thoroughly overhauled. Whom would we expect to do the overhauling? Would the principal regard it as his task? Or the superintendent, or the inspector?

The question arises: Can a substitute for initiative be found in some kind of systematic procedure that will bring to the door of the school new ideas as fast as these ideas are produced? Can we find some way, other than the brilliant inspiration of the reformer, to break into the complaisant routine of the schools? In answer to such questions one can project a plan of organized revision which shall lead to an annual overhauling of the curriculum. The mere suggestion of such a plan serves perhaps better than any extended argument to show how far we are at the present moment from any study of the problem and certainly from any solution.

It is hoped that the net impression produced by the discussion will be one of conviction that there is here a broad field for the exercise of scientific ingenuity. While the testing movement and certain other lines of scientific work in education are becoming so highly routinized that they fail at times to stimulate workers to original and constructive efforts, the re-making of the curriculum with its manifold problems and possibilities seems to offer unbounded and inviting opportunities for the exercise of all the genius that educational workers can contribute.7

The ideas of social efficiency, scientific management, experimentalist theory, and psychological measurement were a part of the educational context of the day. The beginnings of scientific inquiry in education had already been made, and piecemeal investigations had done much to generate debate and controversy. But the systematic general formulation of methods of curriculum construction had hardly been approached.

Franklin Bobbitt was one of those dedicated to the construction of a science of education and, more than most, concerned himself with the application of scientific principles to the practical problems of schooling. How To Make a Curriculum,8 published in 1924, is an effort to demonstrate how such principles could be used intelligently to go about the task of curriculum building; indeed much of the book’s material was derived from the curriculum work that Bobbitt
guided for the schools in Los Angeles, California. As a consultant to the Los Angeles school system, Bobbitt was asked to assume responsibility for developing and supervising the construction of the curriculum of the junior high school, and although his employers recognized that “Dr. Bobbitt does not figure as a specialist in the junior high school realm . . . the underlying principles of curriculum making are universal and should apply fairly well to any consecutive group of grades.”

Thus it was that Bobbitt set out to operationalize as best he could some of the principles he had laid down six years earlier in his book, *The Curriculum*. What were those principles? How were they employed empirically? On what educational assumptions did they rest?

Bobbitt seemed quite aware of the fact that in order to speak intelligently about as complex a problem as the construction of the curriculum, useful distinctions would need to be framed—and this he did. Distinctions between the play and work aspects of education, between antecedent and objective performance, between the general and the vocational curriculum were only a few that he employed in *The Curriculum*. These distinctions he used and elaborated upon in *How To Make a Curriculum*.

*How To Make a Curriculum* contains nineteen chapters which can be divided into three general sections. The first section deals with the generic problems of curriculum construction, such as the rationale to be employed, the procedures to be used in formulating educational objectives, and the criteria and characteristics of pupil activities. The second section consists of exemplary educational objectives and curriculum experiences in a variety of subject areas of life domains. The third section of the book presents suggestions for administrators and others in supervisory positions.

For Bobbitt the solution to educational problems could most efficiently be obtained if the procedures of science could be employed, and this he believed was possible. Although he reiterated throughout his work that the educational sciences were still in a relatively undeveloped state, the tools that were available could be used with
profit and, if so used, could eliminate waste. The tool that was perhaps most important was the survey or task analysis; and its importance rested upon the assumption that education, insofar as it is carried on in the school, was to prepare children to assume their roles as productive adult citizens. The school was, after all, a social institution. Its support came from the community, and its products ought to feed back into the community to replenish and maintain the society which made education possible in the first place. Bobbitt did not view this function as antithetical or incompatible with the personal or idiosyncratic development of the child. He saw the one as a precondition for the development of the other. Children were, to be sure, unequally endowed, but each ought to have an opportunity to develop his potentialities. And these could not really come to fruition unless they could be employed in some socially useful way. The common skills that man needed to live a socially useful life were what, in Bobbitt’s view, constituted the general curriculum of the school. And it was this curriculum which was to be the primary and dominant program of the schools from kindergarten to the junior college.

“Education,” Bobbitt writes, “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.”

But granted the notion that education is to be useful and that it ought to serve the individual throughout life, how is such a functional education to be achieved? In 1893 the Committee of Ten, like subsequent national committees, thought they had the answer, but they had viewed education too narrowly, Bobbitt believed. Their focus was on the subject matters to be learned not on the tasks to be performed. Thus, the educational programs that the Committee of Ten advocated were inefficient and ineffective; they rested on an antiquated conception of mind as muscle. Had not Thorndike and Woodworth demonstrated the limited transfer value of subjects supposedly suited to mental disciplines; Was not the social order
changing rapidly, and did not the curriculum of the school need to keep pace with these changes? Bobbitt’s answers were affirmative and his solution straightforward. For this solution we must go back six years to 1918. In The Curriculum he writes:

The central theory [of curriculum] 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. This requires only that one go out into the world of affairs and discover the particulars of which these affairs consist. These will show the abilities, attitudes, habits, appreciations and forms of knowledge that men need. These will be the objectives of the curriculum. They will be numerous, definite and particularized. The curriculum will then be that series of experiences which children and youth must have by way of attaining those objectives.¹³

Educational objectives and their formulation constituted the hub of curriculum planning. The first step for Bobbitt was to identify the domains of activity or responsibility in which all children should develop skills. To do this he “surveyed” twenty-seven hundred “cultivated and well trained adults.”¹⁴ Fifteen hundred of this group had been students in his course, “The Curriculum,” given in the Department of Education at the University of Chicago. The remainder of the group was composed of school personnel in Los Angeles, where he had served as a consultant. From the suggestions of this group he identified ten major fields of experience, the first nine of which the curriculum of the school should deal with. These were: (1) language activities, (2) health activities, (3) citizenship activities, (4) general social activities, (5) spare-time activities, (6) keeping oneself mentally fit, (7) religious activities, (8) parental activities, (9) unspecialized or non-vocational activities, and (10) the labor of one’s calling.¹⁵

Once having identified the significant areas of human life for which schools have responsibility, it was a simple matter to follow this logic through in an attempt to identify the array of tasks that one needed to perform well within each of these domains. This Bobbitt did with meticulous care: The list he presents in How To Make
a Curriculum contains 160 educational objectives which range from items such as “ability to use language in all ways required for proper and effective participation in community life,”" to “ability to make one’s sleep contribute in maximum measure to the development and maintenance of a high level of physical vitality.”

What we see in this approach is a serious effort to make curriculum planning rational and education meaningful, to build a curriculum for the schools that was not a product of armchair speculation but a product of the systematic study of society and the demands it makes on men. The survey movement, which began in 1892 with Rice’s studies of the performance of students and teachers in the nation’s schools, brought in its development a variety of tools that could be employed in order to identify areas of pupil strength and weakness. Cubberley, Sears, Snedden and others had all conducted important investigations of educational progress. W. W. Charters, for example, had constructed elaborate studies of academic achievement in the language arts. If the tools these men employed could be used to make the school more efficient in improving its means, perhaps they could be used to formulate educational ends as well. Bobbitt apparently believed this was possible, since he calls people using such tools “curriculum discoverers.” In this view, the objectives of the curriculum are discovered by finding out what successful or skilled individuals do in life. The difference between what these competent adults do and what children are able to do constitutes the gap to be reduced through curriculum experience. He outlines the steps to be followed succinctly:

Step 1: Divide life into major activities.
Step 2: Analyze each major activity into specific activities. This process is to continue until he, the curriculum discoverer, has found the quite specific activities that are to be performed.
Step 3: The activities once discovered, one can then see the objectives of education.

In taking this approach to curriculum construction, a number of consequences followed. First, the array of objectives that were for-
mulated reached the hundreds and once "discovered" needed to be graded and placed in sequence. Second, since Bobbitt viewed with disdain what he believed were academic and unrealistic assumptions employed by previous curriculum committees, he laid emphasis on the formation of objectives that were related to life. Thus, the objectives were to be stated in activity or, as we say today, in behavioral terms. The student, for Bobbitt, was not a receptacle to be filled but an active organism that needed "unfoldment," a term he used throughout his writings. A third consequence of this approach to curriculum construction was a lack of sufficient attention to the is-ought problem in formulating educational ends. While Bobbitt was aware of the fact that people disagree about the ends of education, he did not adequately speak to this issue in his work. It appeared rational to him to employ scientific procedures to "discover" what the ends of education shall be. And since the society which provided the subject matter for such study was changing, the continuous study of society was an important aspect of curriculum development.

It may be argued fairly that this view is socially adaptive rather than reconstructive in nature. It rests upon the assumption that the end of education is the production of citizens who will be able to perform well in the existing, albeit changing, social order. Bobbitt writes: "The School is not an agency of social reform. It is not directly concerned with improving society. Its responsibility is to help the growing individual continuously and consistently to hold to the type of human living which is the best practical one for him. This should automatically result in an enormous improvement in society in general. But this improvement is not a thing directly aimed at. It is only a by-product." Bobbitt was no social reconstructionist. Although he apparently was sympathetic to some of the insights of experimentalism, the tenor of his educational philosophy was conservative in character.

A fourth consequence of the approach he took in constructing curriculum deals within the variety of personnel he believed was needed
for making curriculum decisions. Since he believed that life required the use of a diversity of skills and since education was to prepare the young adequately to use those skills, it was not likely that any one individual—a superintendent, curriculum co-ordinator, or teacher—would have the competence necessary for their identification. Thus, it was important to draw upon the resources of skilled personnel in the community for aid in curriculum making. “Specialized groups, within the community,” Bobbitt writes, “should be held responsible for specially expert services in locating the abilities involved in those portions of the field with which they have to do. This principle is especially clear in locating the vocational abilities. Salesmen and supervisors of salesmen are especially competent in pointing out the abilities which are needed by salesmen. Printers are specially competent to point out the abilities needed by successful printers. . . . The principle applies also outside of the vocational field. Physicians and nurses possess specialized ability to assist in formulating the objectives of health education.”

Bobbitt goes on to identify the potential curriculum contributions of civic and social workers, of religious leaders, and of specialists in the field of recreation. While the educationist has the primary responsibility for providing leadership and cohesiveness to the larger educational map, he lacks the skills necessary for laying out the details. Thus, for Bobbitt, curriculum construction was in a significant sense a community enterprise in which the co-ordination of the judgment of specialists was crucial.

A fifth consequence of this view was the belief that, while a curriculum could be effectively planned within a school system or district, it was not likely to be planned effectively for a state or nation. The reason for this belief is not so much due to a commitment to the local control of the schools but more a realization of the difficulties inherent in the latter approach.

The curriculum, which he viewed as a general map of the educational terrain to be covered with general means identified to carry the student successfully on this journey, needed to take into account
the pupils, their backgrounds and capabilities.\(^27\) The larger the domain to be covered by any single curriculum “map,” the less it was likely to be useful in the particular school or classroom. This belief became so significant that two years after the publication of *How To Make a Curriculum* he differentiated between the general and the individual curriculum, saying that the general curriculum, while important as an over-all map, was not the most important curriculum at all.\(^28\) What was most important was the particular or individual curriculum that the classroom teacher built for her pupils. The experimentalist’s concern for individual differences appeared to have an impact on Bobbitt’s thinking.

Bobbitt emphasized, however, that although the teacher needed to play a significant role in the planning of the individual curriculum and although scientific survey and measurement tools could be used to locate particular deficiencies having educational import, “The major task of curriculum-making at present is the discovery of the goals in a general way and this general planning of the general outlines of the routes.”\(^29\) This was the first and the basic step in curriculum work. And this step called for a conception of education itself; it required a point of view regarding the unique functions of the school. And this Bobbitt attempted to formulate.

Bobbitt held that education existed on two levels: the foundational and the functional. The foundational level developed the child’s powers as a by-product of normal play activity. Such development, he believed, was not formed in relation to specific tasks to be performed. It was a natural process of “unfoldment.”

Functional education, however, is related directly and consciously to the tasks that are to be done; it is the systematic attempt to prepare the child to exercise power in the performance of life’s duties. And it is this latter type of education—the functional type—for which schools have a unique responsibility.

But Bobbitt went on to say that, although a part of functional education deals with vocational preparation, he was concerned in *How To Make a Curriculum* only with those human tasks that were
common to all men; thus his concern was with the general rather than the special or vocational aspects of education. These latter aspects should, he believed, be reserved for the collegiate years and beyond. He abhorred inflicting courses that had only vocational utility upon the general school population—trigonometry, and in many cases algebra, physics, drawing, practical arts, Spanish, and economic geography frequently were employed this way. "Never," he italicized in his book, "will a subject be placed in the general training for all persons simply because it's of specialized value for certain occupations."

Thus far I have attempted to identify the principles and premises upon which Bobbitt's work rested. It is clear that he was concerned with relating education to life, that he focused upon the social demands of the society for the formulation of educational objectives, that he emphasized the active role of the student in learning. In many ways he shared with the experimentalists a concern for the education of the whole child. And like the experimentalists, he was concerned with the use of science in educational planning while recognizing the limitations of the young, if lusty, child. His work lacked the jargon or, in a more positive sense, the technical precision and language of a Dewey. But Bobbitt believed that clarity was a virtue and that ordinary discourse would go a long way as long as thought was not muddled. His book is a monument to this belief. In spite of the variety of concepts that he framed for thinking about curriculum, it is a book that is comprehensible—one that applies the common sense and straightforward logic of a practical educator.

Given these qualities, how was the book received? The Peabody Journal of Education called it "A very important book: the school library ought not to be without it." The Educational Review saw it as "a marvelous piece of work . . . remarkably readable and as definite as a manual. It will be studied by superintendents for many a day." David Snedden of Teacher's College, writing in the School Review, was enthusiastic enough to say: "Professor Bobbitt's latest book represents thinking and work in education so advanced and
sound that, if the phrase were not hackneyed, it would deserve to be called ‘epoch-making.’”

Henry Harap, however, who himself had some things to say about curriculum theory was somewhat less enthusiastic. Writing in *School and Society*, Harap found the book useful but incomplete—an admirable first step, but in Harap’s view, “The author’s work is not done.” Although Harap’s review of the work was generally favorable, it lacked the accolades that the previous reviewers accorded.

Boyd Bode was even less enthusiastic than Harap. And as one might expect, the rub in Bobbitt’s *How To Make a Curriculum* for philosopher Bode was the blunder of believing, as he thought Bobbitt did, that scientific methods could yield educational ends. Bode’s comments are pungent when he writes, “Bobbitt’s *How To Make a Curriculum* conveys the idea that the question of ideals is at bottom just a question of ‘scientific analysis...’ The author seems to be unaware that in the scheme the cart is placed before the horse. How such analyses are to be made unless we know in advance which persons are good citizens, good parents, and true believers is not clear. It is assumed that if we dug up the facts by means of scientific analysis, the appropriate ideals will come to the surface too. But this simply means that science, like patriotism, may be used as a cover for prejudice and as an obstacle to progress.” Bode concludes his review by saying, “In other words there is no social vision or program to guide the process of curriculum construction.” A more devastating comment could hardly have been made.

Bode put his finger on a significant weakness in the book, one which Bobbitt probably recognized. Bobbitt was aware of the fact that men disagree to some extent as to what constitutes the good life. But the social order was not without its share of reasonable men, and some consensus existed. Furthermore, his practical bent left him ill-equipped to wait to construct curriculums until the philosopher’s stone had been found. Bobbitt stuck out his practical neck,
and it was roundly severed by one of the leading educational philosophers of the day.

Although Bode’s criticism was telling, it was not the foible that he identified which weakened the impact of Bobbitt’s work in the late twenties and thirties. The approach Bobbitt took, as indicated earlier, was rational, systematic, and meticulous. Education was for him a no-nonsense affair. And even though he shared some of the concerns of the experimentalists, the pervasive quality of his writing and his educational position lacked the romance that characterized theirs. While no one, least of all those experimentalists who called themselves “Progressives,” could deny that education should prepare for life, the system and procedures that Bobbitt prescribed had a wooden quality to those who viewed the child as a budding organism who develops primarily from the inside out. Their conception of the child and of meaningful education was far more intimate in character. Yes, society should be studied by those who build curriculums, but the teacher should, at the same time, take her lead from the child. The Progressive spirit was not to be br idled by the formulation of hundreds of specific educational objectives because education as process and flux was a dynamic affair in which the teacher was to make educational capital out of the spontaneous developments emerging in the classroom. Furthermore, children did not progress in the neat systematic steps implied by Bobbitt’s educational objectives. Listen as Ernest O. Melby’s writing in 1935 says of the Progressive philosophy,

This philosophy assumes that education is growth. It assumes that we shall choose such bodies of experience as will contribute to the growth of an individual child. It proceeds on the assumption that the child is more important than the subject. The conflict between the traditional course-of-study notion of education and that of a really dynamic and creative educational concept is so direct and so vital that the prescribed course of study in the traditional sense becomes one of the major obstacles to a really creative and dynamic educational program. . . . Were we to organize the school with primary regard for the welfare of children we would probably make sure that nowhere in that school do we have a book or pamphlet or set of instructions which prescribes the subject-matter to be taught to any group of children without regard to their needs, interests, or abilities.
In this sally by Melby, one can sense what the Progressives of the thirties emphasized. It is not difficult to understand why Bobbitt’s cool approach did not capture their imagination. Bobbitt looked to the society primarily for curriculum cues. The Progressives placed more emphasis on the child. Bobbitt placed much more reliance on the use of principle, science, and specificity; the Progressives more emphasis on art and the idiosyncratic aspects of instruction. In short, the hundreds of objectives that needed to be formulated in Bobbitt’s approach collapsed under its own weight; as practical and rational as it appeared, it did not mesh well with the vision of education advanced by Rugg, Mearns, Shumaker, Melby, Zirbes, and Brim. And as might be expected, their work neglected or omitted reference to Bobbitt. *The Child-centered School,*49 for example, makes no mention of his work; the same is true for *The Activity Movement*40 and other works hoisting the Progressive banner.

If Bobbitt’s work had little impact on the Progressive movement of the thirties because it laid too little emphasis on the role of the child in curriculum construction, it was neglected by the essentialists and rational humanists for other reasons. Robert Maynard Hutchins, for example, while not attending to the problems of elementary education, nevertheless represents a position to which the essentialists subscribed. For Hutchins the assumption that social analysis could be used to formulate educational objectives was indefensible. If we know anything about American society, he said, it is that it is changing—and rapidly. What we need in education, Hutchins held, is not a philosophy of adjustment or adaptation which “was carried to its logical extreme in a women’s college in America, which based its curriculum on a job analysis of the diaries of 323 mature women,”41 but a return to the dialectic examination of the greatest ideas formulated by the greatest writers who ever lived. And where are these to be found—in the great books. Thus Hutchins and others of his persuasion rejected Bobbitt’s approach, not because it neglected the child, but because it neglected the very subject matter which they believed made human intelligence possible.
But if Bobbitt was neglected by the Progressives and essentialists, the ideas that he presented were of use to others. It is an old and familiar story now that the Progressive movement lost its strength in the late forties. It's also familiar that the essentialists led by organizations and men such as The Council for Basic Education, Arthur Bestor, Admiral Rickover, and Albert Lynd gained in influence during this period. Their views of appropriate curriculum for American youth departed drastically from that advocated by the Progressives. But at the same time curriculum specialists who had a more theoretical bent were employing ideas similar to those advanced by Bobbitt twenty years earlier.

Among the most influential of these specialists were Ralph W. Tyler and Virgil Herrick. Tyler and Herrick had worked together in the Department of Education at the University of Chicago and, consonant with the spirit of that institution, were concerned with the development and application of theory and research to educational problems, the curriculum being of special interest to both. Tyler's approach to curriculum especially shows a quality similar to that of Bobbitt's, not in its conservative outlook or in its simplicity, but in its rationality. Tyler's curriculum rationale, which was presented in part in *Toward Improved Curriculum Theory*, was later published in monograph form as a syllabus for a course on curriculum that he taught, and since its publication has had wide dissemination at the University of Chicago and elsewhere. Tyler raises four questions that he believes a curriculum specialist ought to deal with in constructing curriculum for any educational level. These are, "What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes? How can these educational experiences be organized? How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?" Tyler, like Bobbitt, attempts to provide a system for coping with the complex problem of curriculum construction, and like Bobbitt he emphasizes the importance of educational objectives stated in behavioral and content terms. But unlike Bobbitt, Tyler
does not limit himself to the study of society for the selection of objectives or for the formulation of learning experiences. For Tyler, the psychologist and philosopher must also be consulted. But Tyler includes reference to philosophy only incidentally in his rationale, devoting only a few sentences to its role in curriculum construction, and when it is included, the philosopher’s contribution is conceived of on the same level as the other specialists, who are to provide data for the formulation of objectives. Tyler, it seems, like Bobbitt, understates the importance of values as a guide to the selection of data sources he would use in making curriculum decisions.

Tyler and Herrick share another characteristic found in Bobbitt’s work. This deals with the personnel needed for curriculum construction. Tyler and Herrick write in their concluding statement to the 1947 conference on curriculum theory, “Curriculum development by its very nature is a co-operative problem. No one person is going to be able to encompass all the knowledge or perceive all the problems that would be essential in the formulation of an adequate conception of curriculum.”

A major difference exists, however, in the ways in which they would go about using specialists. Tyler and Herrick would have specialists not only provide data relevant for curriculum decision making but would use specialists to screen each other’s recommendations. Thus, the psychologist would presumably be in a position to say whether a particular activity to be performed or a generalization to be learned was appropriate for the cognitive abilities of a child of a particular age. Their use of specialists goes well beyond the recommendations advanced by Bobbitt.

But the ideas that Bobbitt formulated are related not only in the work of Herrick and Tyler but in the work of Benjamin Bloom and John I. Goodlad, two men who studied under Tyler and Herrick. The benchmark that these men share with Bobbitt is the rational, systematic, and social orientation they bring to curriculum theory. Bloom employs recommendations regarding the formulation and use of educational objectives that Bobbitt, I believe, would have
applauded. And Goodlad, in attempting to extend the work of Tyler, would receive similar bows. Bloom’s recommendations for the construction of curriculum centers, which would apply some of the recommendations made in Tyler’s work, carry the spirit of Bobbitt’s approach even further.

It should be mentioned that I am not here attempting to deal with historical causality. I am certain that most of us do not know where we have gotten most of our ideas. What I do see in the work of Virgil Herrick, Ralph Tyler, Benjamin Bloom, and John Goodlad are family resemblances to many of the ideas formulated in How To Make a Curriculum. But most of all I see some of the same rational spirit, even if less conservative and considerably more complex.

When one looks back at Franklin Bobbitt’s contributions to the curriculum field, an interesting picture emerges. If Bobbitt attended to the analysis of life’s duties, he neglected the logical difficulties of moving from “is” to “ought.” As much as he wanted to use scientific procedures to formulate curriculums, he paid little attention to the assessment of educational outcomes. In spite of the fact that he considered the curriculum-building process complex, he underestimated the dynamic character of the teacher’s tasks. Even though he attempted to build a conception of education that would provide the foundation for his curriculum recommendations, he neglected previous scholarship in his own field upon which he might have built. Although he valued clarity and specificity in formulating educational ends, this very specificity became a quagmire from which teachers wanted to escape.

But these observations are easy in retrospect. It is always easier to look back and to say what should have been. Franklin Bobbitt, the cool pragmatic conservative, should be viewed in the context of his day. And for his day, I think he moved his team forward.
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