Business Efficiency, American Schooling, and the Public School Superintendency: A Reconsideration of the Callahan Thesis

BARBARA BERMAN

A HIGHLY REGARDED WORK in recent educational history, Raymond E. Callahan's Education and the Cult of Efficiency (1962), persuasively described early twentieth-century educators' capitulation to principles of business management. However, my research into nineteenth-century teacher-training literature has indicated that, long before 1900, schoolmen had assumed a business rather than a scholarly identity. Subsequent investigation into the origin and development of the public school superintendency amplified my earlier findings.

Because school promoters fully accepted the Prussian maxim that "as is the teacher, so will be the school," production of teacher-training literature was a major preoccupation of nineteenth-century school enthusiasts—lay and professional alike. In addition, many superintendents were active in developing city training schools for teachers. The distinction between teaching and supervision was not sharply defined in the past century. Consequently, teacher-training literature is as legitimate a source for determining the nineteenth-century educator's values and sense of identity as are the administrator-training texts used by Callahan to assess the twentieth-century schoolman's policies and self-concept.

Callahan's basic argument in The Cult of Efficiency, later intensified in his The Superintendent of Schools: A Historical Analysis, can be divided into three interlocking points:
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1. The adoption of business values and practices within educational administration occurred about 1900. These methods invaded public education as a spin-off from the efforts of muckraking journalists whose solution to corruption on all levels of society was the application of modern business techniques. Lay propaganda in newspapers, journals, books, and speeches at educational meetings, augmented by more direct pressure from school boards, businessmen, and industrialists, transformed public education from a nineteenth-century scholarly endeavor into a twentieth-century business problem. The stage was thus well set for the spectacular debut of the efficiency expert in the fall of 1910. Not only educators but all Americans were captivated by a new idea, "scientific management."

2. As a result, by 1930, school administrators saw themselves not as philosophers and educational statesmen, but as business managers and school executives.

An important corollary to the general infatuation with business practices was the growing urge to make public education more practical. A strong current of anti-intellectualism emerged and was expressed in such catch phrases as "mere scholastic education" or "mere book learning." The consequence was "an American tragedy" in education (the initial title of Callahan's manuscript), for the movement had produced a new breed of educational administrator, "men who did not understand education or scholarship. Thus they could and did approach education in a businesslike, mechanical, organizational way."

While educators were not blameless, for many had jumped on the efficiency bandwagon, their action was not prompted by anything indigenous to public education but by the American people who got what they deserved for forcing their educators to become bookkeepers and public relations men instead of educators.

3. In answer to the question "why had school administrators adopted business values and practices" Callahan developed what he termed his "vulnerability thesis," which he considered the most important aspect of his research. He was convinced that "very much of what happened in American education since 1900 can be explained on the basis of the extreme vulnerability of our schoolmen to public criticism and pressure and that this vulnerability is built into our pattern of local support and control." The antidote to administrative vulnerability was a long-tenured, if not permanent, public school superintendent.4

A straightforward and provocative work, Callahan's book received many favorable reviews. None questioned its essential arguments. Timothy Smith, however, pushed back the date of educators' assumption of an efficiency ethic to the two decades after 1880, and, in addition, suggested that this ideal was not born in businessmen's minds but in the minds of urban school administrators who courted the support of businessmen and other progressive citizens. Smith also noted that his own studies of the Mesabi Iron Range towns
indicated that, far from being vulnerable and weak, the office of superintendents was one of great power.\(^5\)

Carmine Yengo called attention to Merle Curti’s *The Social Ideas of American Educators* (1935), which also discussed the influx of a scientific, business ethos into education. Indeed, chapter 6 of Curti’s work is entitled “The School and the Triumph of Business Enterprise, 1860–1914.” Curti, however, like Timothy Smith, did not consider this phenomenon to be particularly apparent in public education until the 1890s.\(^6\)

Melvin Tumin thoroughly subscribed to Callahan’s position regarding the evils of community pressure, seeing it as but one of many examples of the American public’s “low-brow assaults on the school system.” In the invariable jargon of the sociologist, he found *The Cult of Efficiency* “an excellent case history in the dysfunctional consequences of institutional imbalances and invasions.” Great vigilance was needed, he said, in “preventing the norms and values appropriate to one institution from spilling over and dominating another, where such exportation would introduce patently dysfunctional elements.”\(^7\)

The problem Tumin did not address was how to tell when, where, and in what way “exported” norms are actually dysfunctional. As William Cartwright realistically observed, public education in the twentieth century had become a colossal business operation. In the face of this development, school superintendents must become business administrators. In one North Carolina county, Cartwright noted, “the superintendent of schools operated a public transportation system of greater magnitude than the state’s largest city bus system. . . . yet transportation was only one of the many business matters for which that superintendent was responsible.”\(^8\)

Lawrence Cremin found Callahan’s conclusions “irrefutable.” But, he argued, Callahan’s own “progressive propensities” had led him to contrast deleterious business influence with benign progressive influence, a dichotomy that was misleading: “The progressives were just as interested in developing a science of education as the businessmen were in working out a science of management.” Above all, Cremin concluded, “however much educationists would like to locate the fault in their stars, they had best seek it in themselves. They have cut themselves off from the humanistic traditions that must ultimately provide the basis for their educational judgments . . . . Thus alienated, they have fallen victim to each new changing fashion in pedagogical ideas, grimly acting out Santayana’s prophecy that those who forget history are condemned to repeat it.”\(^9\)

**Callahan’s Use of Historical Evidence**

In his subsequent study, *The Superintendent of Schools: A Historical Analysis*, Callahan attempted to augment his original argument by introducing new evidence. His use of this material substantiates Cremin’s observations regarding Callahan’s unconscious progressive propensities.
Callahan's use of new data is a clear example of how a strong personal commitment can lead to highly selective use of research documents. To buttress his position, Callahan relied heavily upon the observations of William A. Mowry, whom he described as a "competent witness" to the purported transformation of the schools from nineteenth-century citadels of scholarship to twentieth-century bastions of business efficiency.  

Who was Mowry? What was his relationship to public education? And what were his recommendations regarding it? William Augustus Mowry was fundamentally a private school educator who, in the fluid educational climate of the nineteenth century, nevertheless exerted much influence upon public education. Mowry was school teacher, school board member, city school superintendent, Teachers' Institute lecturer, and, for nineteen years, executive head of the pioneer Martha's Vineyard Summer Institute. Perhaps most importantly, Mowry's own Providence, Rhode Island, school for boys, considered a showcase of advanced educational procedures, made him a national authority on many phases of "practical" pedagogy.  

Mowry's justification for strengthening the school superintendency in 1895 sounds, at first, exactly like Callahan's, yet his succeeding argument seems amazingly like all that Callahan opposed. Perhaps the contamination of schoolmen's minds by a business ethos had been more insidious than Callahan wished to consider.  

Said Mowry, sounding here like any progressive schoolman:

Psychology, pedagogy, the study of the child mind, new methods, new arts and devices in teaching, have so arisen and have received such attention that to secure the best results to-day, professional experts, who have made a study of these subjects, and who have had the necessary training and experience, must be placed in charge of the schools.

Good, Callahan would say. But to clinch his proposal and in addition "to make the superintendent an efficient, active force," Mowry continued:

It ought to need no argument to show that the schools of a great commonwealth should be managed on business principles. But would the directors of a cotton mill, a woolen mill, a machine shop, a railroad corporation or other business which employs a large number of workmen, undertake to dictate to their superintendent, in detail, what he must and must not do? Could they understand the complicated business as well as he? If so, why employ him at all? No! They place the business in his hands, give him all necessary power, and hold him responsible for results. . . . What, then, is absolutely necessary for the greatest success in business is equally necessary in the schools.

Therefore, concluded Mowry, resuming Callahan's argument, then dropping it, only to pick it up once more:

The appointment of the superintendent should be permanent and not annual or biennial. . . . The superintendent of a manufacturing establishment is not subject to
Indeed, Callahan's thesis and antithesis ruptured an old educational synthesis. Well before the advent of muckraking journalists, common school promoters had used principles of scientific business efficiency to achieve pedagogical progress.

Callahan asserted that "all through the nineteenth century leading administrators such as Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and William T. Harris had conceived of themselves as scholars and statesmen and, in professional terms, the equal of the lawyer or the clergyman. After 1900, especially after 1910, they tended to identify themselves with the successful business executive." Mann and Barnard, however, did not need to conceive of themselves as "equal" to lawyers—they were lawyers. And highly atypical William T. Harris, America's leading Hegelian philosopher, was most assuredly a "scholar," but it was the practicality of Harris's ideas and the efficiency of his superintendency that were most frequently applauded by schoolmen.

Callahan's conclusion that, particularly after 1910, men in administration had become a new type of leader "oriented toward the business side of education, not the social or philosophical side," was based solely upon the unpublished research of his own graduate student, Henry Button. Button, he said, had found that older generations of superintendents considered themselves scholars and gentlemen, never businessmen. Unfortunately, neither Callahan's nor Button's work offers any documentation of the actual career lines or perceived status of nineteenth-century school administrators. In fact, across the century, "leading" school administrators were powerful, successful men whose careers traveled varied paths, often moving from business, law, politics, and the ministry, to normal school, private college, and university presidencies, and on into substantial government posts. Such men were hardly weak and vulnerable, either professionally or as individuals.

Further, despite Callahan's assertion that superintendents' vulnerability was indicated by their short term of office and lack of tenure, a number of prominent nineteenth-century men—Gove in Denver, Harlan in Wilmington, Baker in Savannah, Tingley in Louisville, Marble in Worcester, Greenwood in Kansas City, Luckey in Pittsburgh, and Leach in Providence—served as city superintendents twenty-five or more years each.

On the other hand, "typical" nineteenth-century superintendents were described by Button as having attended an academy or, at best, a year or two of college but seldom graduated. Their time in office was equally short. On what basis, then, could nineteenth-century superintendents have thought of themselves as scholars or statesmen?

Button offers several examples of the older type of scholarly nineteenth-century superintendent. First is Francis W. Parker, the largely self-taught city superintendent turned normal schoolman who championed the late-century proto-progressive New Education movement that arose in opposition to the
sterile, mechanized quality of urban education. The next example provided is Swiss-born William Nicholas Hailmann, leader of the kindergarten movement that joined forces with the New Education movement at century's end. Finally, Button mentions Thomas M. Balliet who became Parker's associate at the Cook County Normal School. In was Balliet who understandably insisted that "the superintendent must do a work that is almost identical with that of the teacher of pedagogics in a normal school." These were hardly typical schoolmen but inspired revivalists of an earlier "progressive" pedagogy which had disappeared from educational texts and urban educational practice.

Actual statements by nineteenth-century superintendents concerning their professional self-image are difficult to uncover. Long-time Kansas City Superintendent James M. Greenwood, however, wrote a reminiscence entitled "Some Educators I Have Known" which provides evidence of how one influential and long-tenured superintendent viewed his equally prestigious and long-tenured colleagues. Greenwood's comments are of particular importance because he is cited by Callahan and Button as one of the handful of opponents of the efficiency movement. And, in a manner similar to Callahan's incomplete presentation of Mowry's position, both Callahan and Button misconstrue Greenwood's actual observations.

Greenwood's memoir suggests that leading nineteenth-century superintendents quite probably did view themselves as "statesmen." Three kinds of statesmanship, however, were admired: 1) the practical business executive, typified by Denver superintendent Aaron Gove; 2) the pragmatic professional leader, personified by Andrew S. Draper, New York State and Cleveland City Superintendent, as well as president of Illinois University; and 3) the gentle, modest Lewis Henry Jones, Oswego Normal School graduate, Superintendent of Schools in Indianapolis, and eventually Michigan Normal College President. While the characteristics ascribed to Gove and Draper are virtually identical, those attributed to Jones are markedly different.

Aaron Gove, the first type of schoolman, was described by Greenwood as "the best educational, financial city superintendent in the country." Whereas Greenwood was dismayed that "some school superintendents have little or no business capacity whatever, and more school wreckages have been caused on this account than all other causes combined," Aaron Gove possessed "splendid resources" in "planning the construction of school buildings, or devising ways and means of solving financial difficulties." And, asserted Greenwood, "a cool, level-headed business superintendent is the only person who can do it." 

Gove would have agreed with Greenwood's evaluation. "The requisite power and wisdom of the city superintendent is identical with that of the competent man in industrial, commercial, or diplomatic life," he assured the NEA in 1900. In the nineteenth century, no conflict was seen between educational, diplomatic, and industrial statesmanship. Gove's greatest capacity was clearly his expert business ability. In 1904 he resigned from his long
Greenwood's second type of educational statesman was Andrew Sloan Draper. Draper was characterized as "a well-balanced, level-headed lawyer, sensible and judicious." Draper was as practical as Gove; his mind, said Greenwood, "dabbles not in philosophical or psychological speculations and hair-splitting distinctions"—a tendency Greenwood had found disconcerting in William Torrey Harris. What Greenwood considered "first and foremost" about Draper was his "practical common sense" which "goes on the principle of mechanics." Able to put education "in good working order and popular favor," Judge Draper was also "a splendid mixer with the people." Draper's major assets were his pragmatic common sense and his political and public relations skills which served him well in his eventual university presidency. "There was one point, however," observed Greenwood, for which "Judge Draper's previous experience had not fitted him, and that was the detail work of the schoolroom. So that when he had put the machine into good working order on all sides he wisely stepped aside."

It was normal schoolman Lewis H. Jones who "supplied the element that President Draper lacked—experience in the schoolroom." Professor Jones, Greenwood pointed out, "had been a teacher in the Normal School before he was elected to the superintendency. . . . When he first appeared before the teachers. . . . one of the lady principals. . . . said: 'When he began to speak we all felt we had a friend in him.'" Unlike Draper, who possessed "a strong decisive character," Jones was endowed with a "character [which] is a loveable one, and he advances his opinions with modesty." Jones was the kind of administrator women understood and worked with easily; his professional training and personal characteristics were identical to their own.22 In 1911, as the efficiency movement gathered momentum, Jones published Education as Growth, a work characteristic of another facet of progressive education—humanistic self-development.23

In terms of personal values and professional identity, it seems reasonable to say that "leading" nineteenth-century superintendents believed they stood "for both the practical and cultural side of education," the words chosen by Greenwood to describe one of the greatest of their clan, Ohioan Emerson Elbridge White.24 What "ordinary" superintendents thought is not recorded. Such men were, in the opinion of Charles Francis Adams, "apt to be a grammar school teacher run to seed, or some retired clergyman or local politician out of a job." Charles Northend described them as "lawyers, whose business could not 'wane' because it had never 'waxed'; doctors, whose patients were not troublesomely numerous; clergymen, afflicted with bronchitis or some other malady, or not overburdened with hearers; office seekers of various kinds and all sorts of 'do nothings.'" Equally unknown are the attitudes of the many administrators recruited from "commercial, mercantile, professional and industrial vocations" which, according to Aaron Gove, comprised the superintendency's "tramping throng." The self-concepts of the
former bank cashier who became superintendent of the Springfield schools, or
the former yard foreman for a local contracting company who served as
superintendent in Buffalo, also remain a mystery.25

What is certain, however, is that the lack of precise qualifications for the
nineteenth-century superintendency gave the office a varied character, highly
dependent upon the individual abilities of each superintendent. As Theodore
Lee Reller observed, "The relation of the superintendent and the board of
education was the relation of a particular superintendent to a particular
board. . . . Frequently a strong superintendent would improve conditions
strikingly, only to have a weak superintendent, who followed him in office,
permit all or nearly all that had been gained to escape his control."26

On the positive side, the fact that many superintendents were successful
business and professional men helped them deal effectively with school board
members who were often their professional peers. In addition, the unrestricted
nature of the nineteenth-century superintendency allowed individual super-
intendents to withstand pressures for uniformity, pressures which increased
with the development of specialized twentieth-century administrative
training. In 1900, Aaron Gove could still announce proudly to his fellows:
"There is no authority for us. Each man is bound to trek upon his own
domain." For such men, unhindered by prescribed professional qualifica-
tions, no conflict between business efficiency and educational statesmanship
existed in the nineteenth century.27

Affirmation of Business Efficiency within Nineteenth-Century Teacher-
Training Literature

Throughout the nineteenth century, educators explicitly adopted business
principles and gave every indication of having identified with business
leadership. In 1838, the American Institute of Instruction offered a substantial
five hundred dollar prize for "the best Essay on a system of Education best
adapted to the Common Schools of our country." The winning essay was
published in 1840, under the direction of Horace Mann, as The Teacher's
Manual: Being an Exposition of an Efficient and Economical System of
Education Suited to the Wants of a Free People. Thomas H. Palmer, the
author, stated as his goals:

I. To show the inequality, inefficiency, and wastefulness of our present system of
education. . . .

II. To show that an equal, complete, and efficient system would be productive of an
immense saving, both of time, and money. . . . by thus providing situations for a
body of permanent, experienced, female teachers, looking solely to their profession for
a support.28

The novel reliance upon a predominantly female work force, continually
justified "chiefly on the score of superior cheapness," a superiority which, in
the labyrinth of nineteenth-century thought, was also the "superior effi-
ciency" of female moral superiority,29 allowed public education to expand
rapidly, far beyond its promoters' initial expectations. Nevertheless, for most people, education in the nineteenth century consisted of a brief instructional encounter similar to today's concept of "the basics." The most basic subject of all was moral development. Proper moral character, to be instilled through diligent work in the classroom, would fit children for dutiful service to future employers. Work and morality were indistinguishable and held the social fabric together. Thus the moral obligation to work in an efficient manner pervaded common school literature. For teacher and pupil alike, "irregularity in relation to school duties" would "manifest themselves for evil in all the business regulations of life."30

On this basis, Alonzo Potter, Professor of Moral Philosophy at Union College, and a prominent common school promoter, saw no conflict between educational philosophy and business efficiency. The purpose of public instruction was "to make men (a) more industrious; (b) more active and systematic . . . more economical, as producers and preservers of property." For Potter, public education would provide "the most certain means of developing the industrial resources of a country, and promoting its growth and prosperity."31

The utilitarian thrust of common school reform as a republican safeguard generated its own current of spontaneous anti-intellectualism. As early as 1848, John Kingsbury's Lecture on Failures in Teaching, delivered before the American Institute of Instruction, Bangor, Maine, and printed for gratuitous distribution by order of the Institute, emphasized that "Teachers ought to possess sufficient knowledge of business affairs, to give them influence with practical men." Nothing would raise teachers' esteem higher, Kingsbury advised his audience, than for the public "to find that he has an intelligent interest in business affairs. At the same time, it will save him from shriveling up into a 'mere pedagogue.'"32

By 1862, Pennsylvania Public School Superintendent H. C. Hickok was certain that "the due classification and grading of the schools is but the application of labor that prevails in all well-regulated business establishments, whether mechanical, commercial, or otherwise. It is not only the most economical, but without it there can be little progress or prosperity."33 For normal schoolman Alfred Holbrook, in 1872, the philosophy of education could be divided into two aspects—the false and the true. "The false idea accepts acquisition of knowledge as its aim, culture and scholarship as its ends, and the life of a refined and polished gentleman as its legitimate result. The true idea claims the training of every human power and susceptibility as its aim; an energetic, varied and joyous activity as its end; and the life of a successful businessman, an influential citizen, of a working Christian, as its result."34

Insistence that teachers follow business precepts, in and out of the classroom, inundated nineteenth-century educational literature. One of the most thorough expositions of schoolmen's identification with business management appeared in 1881, within A Graduating System for Country
Schools, written by A. L. Wade, long-time West Virginia school superintendent. Wade maintained that because "the need of enlightened supervision in mechanical employments, in business, and in government is everywhere acknowledged to be absolutely essential," the use of business procedures was equally important in the schools. Consequently, the task of instructional supervision did not conflict with school administrators' growing vision of themselves as expert business managers. "The foreman of a factory is required not merely to keep his eye on the operatives, and to report at stated periods how busy they have been, but he is required to inform the stockholders how many kegs of nails have been made, how many yards of fabric have been woven, in a given time, and the amount and condition of unfinished material still on hand," reasoned Wade. "If we examine carefully the annual catalogue of any school of high order, we find, that in its make-up it is near akin to the annual report of the factory manager." Therefore, he concluded, "the country school ought not to be an exception to well-established laws of industry and business. It ought to be in harmony with all higher schools. The same educational method should prevail everywhere from the primary school to the University." But this "great educational ladder, with one end in the gutter and the other in the university" would be achieved "not by regarding the school as a brain factory, where the teacher is attempting to get up intellects to order, but by the adoption of a uniform system of common-sense motives." This realization had already "come with the force of a revival of religion" and, in its wake, even women school officers had "shown themselves fully the equals of men in their business capacity."35

So overwhelming did educators' identification with the business sector become that A. C. Mason's 1000 Ways of 1000 Teachers, a compilation of methods advocated by prominent United States educators, announced in 1887 that "A school is a business institution. . . . It should be conducted in all of its management upon the principles of business. Its business is to assist, as being one of the many corporations created and fostered by the state, in increasing the wealth by increasing the productive power of the state." Thus, concluded Mason, "to keep the imp of mischief away, put the angel of business on guard." Unitng the older Puritan belief in work as a means of controlling Satan's "idle hands" with the modern evangelical concept of active service on behalf of God's Redeemer (and now highly industrial) Nation, public education's "ineradicable, forever-enduring gospel" had become "Work, and therein have Well-being." "Produce; produce . . . in God's name."36

Opposition to Business Efficiency within Nineteenth-Century Education

The strong emphasis upon business efficiency within nineteenth-century public education is easy to document. What is more difficult to interpret is the growing opposition to it as the century advanced. A consideration of schoolmen's dual response to the use of business principles is essential to the understanding of the eventual compartmentalization of business efficiency
within the office of the superintendency and its attendant administrative training programs.

In the preceding discussion I have argued that, for the most part, principles of business efficiency and common school purpose did not conflict within nineteenth-century thought; they formed a unified whole seen as essential to the progress and prosperity of the republic. However, the very success of the common school idea made the original goals of its promoters less and less feasible. This mission was to provide a universal “Christian Nurture” which would, through its unifying communal emphasis, save the Republic from moral turpitude, dissolution, and strife. Creation of efficient, and hence increasingly impersonal school systems inevitably clashed with school promoters’ equal hope of providing a warm, nurturing, and homelike classroom environment. For that reason, hostility to uniformly graded schools arose almost immediately within the new profession of public education, especially toward large urban systems. Reservations regarding the adoption of business efficiency were most intense among religiously inclined normal schoolmen and among the female-dominated kindergarten movement.37

Therefore, as early as 1859, Ohio Central Normal School Principal John Ogden, speaking before the first annual convention of the American Normal School Association, while thanking Heaven for system, also warned that “We have systematized, we have aggregated, we have classified, so that the fewest teachers could take charge of the greatest number of scholars.” While Ogden conceded this to be “an important move in the right direction—a grand, a glorious, a necessary move” towards schoolmen’s “glorious ideal of perfection,” progress had gotten out of hand. “Many of our public schools . . . the Union Schools in large cities in particular, where the system has fully developed itself—resemble planing-machines,” he lamented. “Every pupil must pass through the same orifice—must have just so much trimmed off here, and so much added there. . . . The scholar is bent to the course, and not the course to the scholar.” From his “careful eye of observation,” Ogden concluded that “this excessive system and classification only educates children in masses—often at the expense of individual talent and development.”38 It was, of course, precisely the problem of children in masses with which city superintendents were increasingly forced to deal.

While both acceptance of and reservations concerning scientific efficiency—of which business efficiency was only a special case—surfaced well before the twentieth century, all nineteenth-century common school men and women favored its use. Educators disagreed only about what type and degree of scientific classification and system were necessary to perfect the schools. It made an enormous difference which science one embraced—the naturalistic and feminized normal school pedagogy of “child study,” with its overtones of child rescue and conversion, or the efficiency of male superintendents’ business and military tactics designed to facilitate the operation of uniformly graded schools.39
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Michael Katz has pointed out the early nineteenth-century conflict between traditional "hard-line" educators such as the Boston School Masters, who perceived education to be a process of rigorous discipline—mental and physical—and Horace Mann’s phalanx of "soft-line" common school promoters who thought more in terms of child rescue and conversion, which had to be more palatable, humane, and pleasant to fulfill its mission. Parallel to the soft-line position, which, at root, was the normal school position, there developed a third or "smooth-line" approach. The smooth-line strategy was first concretely developed by city superintendents and then expanded into full-blown pedagogic philosophy by mid-century normal schoolmen. Smooth-liners were attracted to systematic efficiency wherever found, whether within business, machine shop, or army.

Following the Civil War, increased interest in the smooth-line emphasis upon factory-like efficiency in education paced the quickening of the national industrial tempo—which, in turn, aided both the growth of urban educational systems and the consolidation of rural district schools. Superintendents desperately needed to develop efficient and economical means of dealing with constantly expanding numbers of students and sky-rocketing costs. Stress on achieving educational efficiency, therefore, understandably escalated toward century’s end, eventually forming the nucleus of twentieth-century administrative training programs. Yet, precisely as public education prospered, it was seen by some educators to fall victim to an atmosphere of routinized instruction even more pervasive than that which common school reform had initially been designed to remedy. In response, normal school men and women once again attempted to save the nation and its schools through a messianic re-infusion of early century Pestalozzian principles. By the 1890s, once-unified soft-line and smooth-line positions began to fracture into separate career and policy lines—that is, classroom pedagogics as opposed to administrative training.

Indeed, when one juxtaposes the twentieth-century leaders of the efficiency movement cited by Callahan—Frank Ellsworth Spaulding, George Drayton Strayer, John Franklin Bobbitt, Ellwood Patterson Cubberley—against its opponents—William Henry Maxwell, James M. Greenwood, Burke A. Hinsdale, William Paxton Burris, Nicholas Murray Butler, Margaret Haley, Ella Flagg Young, Jessie H. Newlon, and eventually John Dewey—the most outstanding feature of the pro-efficiency group is their virtual lack of training or interest in teacher education. The most outstanding feature of those opposing an excessive emphasis upon efficiency is their overwhelming contact with either normal schools or teacher-training departments within other institutions. Two of the most vocal antagonists to the efficiency movement were women—Young was a pioneer progressive educator and Haley took a semester’s leave to study with Francis W. Parker at the Cook County Normal School. Women's traditional area of concentration within education was child study, moral conversion, and social uplift, and hence progressive soft-line pedagogy rather than hard-line intellectual rigor or
smooth-line professional management. Soft-liners and smooth-liners were equally interested in scientific efficiency, but soft-liners were after scientific principles of *internal* moral conversion—thus their interest in psychology. Smooth-liners were concerned with establishing *external* or environmental control—thus their attraction to modern organizational techniques and, eventually, sociology.\footnote{42}

Significantly, administrative training, specifically designed for professional leadership instead of classroom teaching, was instituted within the male-dominated university with its growing emphasis upon modern techniques of hard science and research. Elevating the superintendency to a managerial position, largely divorced from immediate classroom affairs, and creating university administrative training programs outside the female-dominated normal schools or departments of pedagogy in universities, cut administrators off from schoolmen’s older instructional emphasis. Within the sexually segregated career lines of public education, those educators who were primarily concerned with upgrading classroom instruction continued to pursue Francis W. Parker’s dream of rendering indistinguishable the realms of motherhood and teaching. Such school personnel rediscovered early century progressive precepts which had emphasized creation of a nurturing communal home.\footnote{43} University administrative programs, on the other hand, stressed the modernizing techniques of smooth-line, bureaucratic efficiency. Through their efforts ‘the work of the school [became] to regulate rather than stimulate the working of the child’s mind.’\footnote{44} In neither case could older concepts of hard-line intellectual rigor find congenial ground to flourish.

**Some Observations regarding Business Efficiency and the Evolution of the Public School Superintendency**

Contrary to Callahan’s thesis, admiration for business procedures, as well as reservations regarding their use, appeared repeatedly throughout common school reform. Therefore, the following sketch is offered as a beginning consideration of the early and continuing role of business efficiency within the development of one of education’s most influential offices.

The nineteenth-century evolution of the public school superintendency may be divided into three identifiable, although (due to the westward movement) often overlapping, developmental phases. The initial period, roughly 1830-1860, was marked by essentially organizational concerns, often under primitive conditions. In the middle period, 1860-1880, as urban population rose dramatically, the need for graded schools became acute. Hence, securing efficient instruction became superintendents’ dominant concern. During the final period, 1880-1900, even greater school enrollments, expanding curriculums, and increasing costs made expert management of complex systems imperative.

Conceived as the means whereby common schools would become “the fitting temples of science, the nurseries of virtue, and the pride and boast of the state,”\footnote{45} the actual post of superintendent was at first largely advisory,
preoccupied with a host of mundane tasks. Lacking both clearcut responsibilities and authority, superintendents were referred to, at best, as “chief advisors” and “right hands” of the board of education, or, when the value of their services was disputed, as “a fifth wheel to a wagon.” It was frequently impressed upon them that “the whole theory of the office and its duties had ever been to make it the medium of the [school] committee's action.”

The universal conditions of superintendents’ employment were two-fold: that they prove themselves a “wise and true economy” and that they rescue public education from “a state of anarchy and confusion, and complete disorganization.” At no time were superintendents allowed to forget that payment of their salaries was directly dependent upon their ability to prove the axiom “without superintendence the waste is many times greater than the cost of furnishing it.” While the superintendent’s need to provide order, economy, and efficiency eventually came together in the institution of graded schools, such was not his initial concern. Early superintendents' organizational tasks were often far more elemental. In Buffalo, New York, credited with being the first city in the United States to employ a clearly designated superintendent, the initial problem encountered was “to ascertain where the schools were situated.” This job was successfully accomplished by the new superintendent “after a few days’ exploration with a horse and buggy and innumerable inquiries.”

For superintendents assuming posts in less-settled Western states, the situation was often more critical. In Kansas City, when the schools were authorized in 1867, there was not a public school building in the city. The school board rented “old deserted dwellings, unoccupied storerooms, and damp, gloomy basements in some of the churches.” Only after much persuasive effort could superintendents in frontier communities move on to a higher objective, the construction of buildings suitable for the operation of a graded system of schools.

The concept of superintendent as scholar or even pedagogical theoretician appears more a by-product of the office’s evolution than a necessary element of its creation. As Aaron Gove noted in 1900, “Schools of philosophy and pedagogy cannot be seen along the earlier trail [of the superintendent]. Their establishment and conduct is one of the later improvements upon which we congratulate ourselves.” Indeed, in many cases, such training would have been superfluous. Elsie Garland Hobson’s Educational Legislation and Administration in the State of New York from 1777 to 1850 points out that the duties of early New York state superintendents were “to make plans for the better organization of the schools and for the management of the school fund; to distribute the state money to counties and towns; to apportion the state money; to receive county reports, and from them to make an annual report to the legislature.” Superintendents had “no authority for direct supervision or inspection [of schools] until the office was made that of State Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1854.”

During all periods of the nineteenth century, practical ability and
experience, rather than formal academic accomplishment, seemed basic to administrative appointment. Although not a necessary prerequisite, classroom teaching, followed by a principalship, was the most common route to the superintendency. Nevertheless, business or professional experience was frequently an entirely sufficient credential. Los Angeles appears to have led in this respect, having hired, as school superintendent, five lawyers, two doctors, two clergymen, two merchants, one transportation and shipping leader, and one accountant and bookkeeper. The city’s third superintendent combined remarkable business and professional abilities. Not only was he a doctor, but he was also the city’s first drugstore proprietor, first auction house operator, and first nursery business owner. Evidencing much political skill, he was, in addition, its postmaster, coroner, and marshal.  

A major factor contributing to the rise of superintendents—in numbers as well as in stature and authority—was population growth. During the thirty years between 1820 and 1850, the percentage of the national population living in centers of 8,000 and over increased 510 percent. The increase in rural inhabitants was 111 percent, while the total population of the United States expanded 255 percent. Once adequate modes of school administration became increasingly ineffective, particularly in rapidly growing urban communities. Thus Cleveland, whose population within the period expanded a phenomenal 2,711 percent, was one of the first cities to employ a superintendent; Philadelphia, whose expansion was only 90 percent, was one of the last. 

Adaptation to social change seldom occurs in a direct A to B progression. While the drive towards economy and efficiency was prominent within nineteenth-century educational policy, the growing complexity of school management was matched by a gargantuan increase in school committee membership. Radical changes in school board organization were required before the superintendent could become, in reality, the executive officer of the school system. These changes occurred slowly in the face of strenuous opposition. Thomas Gilland concluded that “as a general practice the reduction in size of boards of education and the consequent reduction in the number of standing committees; and the naming of the superintendent as the executive officer of the board of education and the investment of the authority in him to appoint or nominate teachers came at about the same time.” This time was roughly between 1890 and 1900. With or without the influence of Callahan’s muckraking journalists, a heightened realization of the need for centralized authority and efficient management within public education was inevitable. The passage and enforcement of compulsory attendance laws throughout the nation brought with it another jump in school enrollment. Fast on its heels the capital outlay for education increased tremendously. The post of school superintendent had arisen as a direct response to the growing need for economy and efficiency in the rapidly developing system of public instruction earlier in the century. In a time of heightened financial pressure, it would have been unrealistic not to have emphasized business efficiency within the newly developing professional training programs for superintendents.
The twentieth-century efficiency movement may be viewed, then, as the result of a complex set of nineteenth-century developments. It had taken intense personal commitment tantamount to religious fervor, along with astute political ability, to accomplish the transition from independent lay community control to modern centralized professional authority. From the outset of common school reform, superintendents found it vital to convince the public that their new office was valuable—that is, they found it necessary “not only to sell a product but to create good will.” And, judging from the growth of their institution, this they did with a success that long antedated the emergence, in 1921, of the public relations man, whose principles, Callahan believed, had so corrupted twentieth-century public schoolmen. Because, as early school promoters saw it, “our whole system proceeds upon the principle of accomplishing by persuasion what the Prussian effects by force,” salesmanship and public relations ability were considered key attributes of successful superintendence throughout the nineteenth century.

When the county superintendency was established in New York in 1843, the new superintendents were reminded that “their usefulness will depend mainly on the influence they shall be able to exercise.” In 1875, William H. Payne advocated that “superintendents of schools should be the apostles of this new gospel, and should preach its truths to those who depend on them for guidance.” All successful superintendents understood the delicate nature of this task. “The superintendent of schools finds it his most important duty to create and foster an enlightened public opinion,” noted William Torrey Harris, in 1882, adding that “no structure has any stability if its educational results are too complicated or too subtle for popular recognition.” Harris emphasized that in order to survive, the superintendent “must make his educational ideal valid in and through the conviction of the people.” Indeed, warned the Educational Review in 1898, “The Superintendent who does not actively educate public opinion as to the work and needs of the schools is unconsciously preparing the way for the overthrow of what he holds most dear.”

While the need for public relations skills had been a constant of nineteenth-century common school reform, by 1897, as the expense of public instruction mounted, such skills became imperative. “A good modern system of state education can be supported only at great public cost,” observed the Report of the Committee of Twelve. “At present the money expended by the states together is $175,000,000 annually, which is more than twice the cost of supporting the national government before the Civil War.” Therefore, if public education could no longer be sold in terms of its economy, then, at the very least, its efficiency must be stressed. The careful compilation of statistics was one necessity, but “by far the most important work of . . . creating public opinion and arousing public interest” devolved upon the state superintendent. It was his role “to go among the people in the spirit of Horace Mann, and by public addresses, by the liberal use of the press, and by securing the assistance of the leading men of the state, to arouse and keep alive an
interest in the cause of popular education." By marshaling "facts, arguments, persuasion," legislatures would be "induced to act" in favor of instituting "an efficient law and efficient school authorities."61

The expanding industrial system, and after the Civil War, the nation's military apparatus, were universally seen as the superintendent's models. Reller noted that "the modern organization of industry, with a board of directors and executives, while in one sense not a cause for the establishment of the superintendency, furnished a splendid analogy to a system of schools, an analogy which was brought out a number of times in school committee reports, periodicals, and addresses. Very rarely were other analogous situations presented."62 The superintendent's role was so frequently equated with that of business management that it would have been extremely difficult for the majority of superintendents to have escaped such an identification. Even soft-line revivalist Francis W. Parker, presented by Button as a prime example of a scholarly, nineteenth-century educational statesman, uncontaminated by a business ethos, recommended the use of business principles to increase the effectiveness of public school superintendence. "If any business in the world, any railroad, bank, store, or manufactory were conducted upon the same principles that obtain in the management of schools in most of our large cities and in many small districts, hopeless bankruptcy would be the inevitable result." Parker warned. "Superintendents are too seldom chosen for professional skill or executive ability, and when they are, the school boards often take away from them every vital influence that would make them efficient managers. . . . Every other business in the world except the care of immortal souls, requires experts!!"63 Small wonder that, well in advance of the twentieth-century efficiency movement, the smooth-line position, which was based upon principles of industrial and military efficiency, became the basic "philosophy" of school superintendence.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that the major emphasis of the nineteenth-century superintendent was upon the business aspects of his position. School board members, who were often businessman, seldom granted superintendents direct control of financial matters. Yet, the primary obligation of the superintendent to his board was ever to render school systems more economical and efficient; it was precisely this ability which justified the additional expense of his office. To insure maximum economy and efficiency, schools needed to be graded. The grading of schools demanded properly trained teachers capable of putting superintendents' plans into action. Hence, superintendents increasingly operated city training schools for teachers. In New Haven, by 1880, not more than one grade-school teacher a year entered the system who had not received instruction in the local training school.64

The host of new pedagogical ideas and procedures flowing from normal schools and city training schools convinced many school board members that they were incompetent to deal with such complex instructional matters. Yet, as businessmen, board members continued to hold tightly to all financial reins; it remained the superintendents' chief duty to insure efficient, econom-
ical operation of his instructional plant. These principles of business efficiency and instructional management meshed in the idea of the graded school. The superintendent’s stature as well as influence grew in direct proportion to his ability to grade urban systems. In this way, business concepts at first supported and then dominated public school pedagogy. Hence, the principal move toward real professional status for superintendents derived not from their business activities but from their pedagogical concerns. As more and more superintendents published teacher-training texts, and their position and salary continued to depend upon their ability to organize chaotically expanding city school systems, the flavor of teacher-training texts became overwhelmingly mechanized. At the same time, the business and industrial environment surrounding city systems became increasingly prominent and influential. Schoolmen had always utilized business metaphors to sell their professional services, and had continuously advocated a variety of business procedures to modernize common schools. In the last quarter of the century little difference was seen between industrial practice, military tactics, and educational methods. William H. Payne, while holding the first chair of education in the United States at the University of Michigan, was one of the many educators to join superintendents in their campaign for efficiency. Acknowledging his debt to city superintendents Doty, Rickoff, and Harris, Payne proclaimed, in his *Chapters on School Supervision* in 1875:

> He who secures uniformity, accuracy, and harmony in a complicated industrial process, imparts additional value to the products of each man’s toil. Superintendence is therefore not only a necessity, but is the highest and most productive form of labor. . . . The work of teaching thus follows the law which prevails in all well-regulated industries. This general movement is characteristic of a growing civilization, and it is as reasonable to cry out against the division of labor in general as against that special application of the law which has called into being the Graded-School.

Payne was certain that “by this means, a large school may be rearranged somewhat as military forces are distributed by the aid of maps of the seat of war.” In all their endeavors teachers were to remember that “For one man competent to plan a military campaign, there are myriads of soldiers whose province is to obey the orders of their commanders. . . . the masses of mankind voluntarily submit to the guidance of those who have the faculty of directing.”

As city and state systems burgeoned in the closing decades of the century and the number of administrative assistants also expanded, the superintendent, once directly involved with teacher training and supervision, began to assume the more remote position of school manager. In 1888, the President of the Board of Education in Chicago—the same city that had, several decades earlier, launched the career of graded-school expert superintendent William H. Wells, whose *The Graded School* had done much to regularize public instruction—now recommended that “the superintendent be relieved of all responsibility for visiting schools and spend his time in the office.” Thus, it came to pass that “the preeminence of the superintendent meant that in the
profession of teaching the paradigm was not an instructor." Concomitantly, throughout American society, standardization increased in all professions. With the institution of separate university training programs, primarily offered to male administrators, normal schoolmen and university professors of pedagogy returned to their former mission of inspiring a largely female audience destined to become classroom teachers. Throughout the twentieth-century efficiency movement, which dominated the newly established university programs designed to upgrade the equally new position of non-teaching school administrator, many normal schoolmen and their counterparts in university teacher-training programs remained soft-line in approach. Educators in this group continued to publish a multitude of basically soft-line pedagogical tracts.

What happened to male-dominated twentieth-century administrative programs within American universities is, of course, well documented by Callahan. In these programs, the emphasis upon economy, efficiency, and public relations skills achieved full, if not grandiose, expression. A new type of administrator was fashioned, a man remote from both teacher training and daily classroom activities, and, hence a man less concerned with either humanizing or communalizing public instruction than with securing its efficient operation. However, this type of administrative training was not simply a result of the efficiency movement, nor was it primarily caused by public interference in purely professional matters; it was largely a response to massive population reorganization and growth as well as the rapid industrialization of a rural, frontier nation. In many ways, schoolmen were less "vulnerable" than active participants and even beneficiaries of this modernization process. Superintendents owed both the institution of their office and its rise to power and authority to the growing problems and complexities of urban-industrial growth.

How superintendents and their smooth-line precepts usurped the influence of soft-line normal schoolmen and the power of lay boards of education is a fascinating example not of the "dysfunctional consequences of institutional invasions" but of the profitable way in which principles generated in one quarter of society can be transformed by another sector to aid its own advancement. William H. Payne saw this clearly in 1875:

> The work of instruction follows the law which prevails in all other industries—differentiation, classification, system, and, as in a complicated process of manufacture, while each workman is held responsible for the part which he executes, some one man is held responsible for the general result; so in an extended system of instruction there should be a responsible head...vested with sufficient authority to keep all subordinates in their proper places, and at their assigned tasks.

The means whereby nineteenth-century school promoters were able to use their society's advancing industrial ethic to further their own interests of professional consolidation, autonomy, and power—as reflected most spectacularly in the rise of the superintendent—might be summarized in these steps:

1. The rise of the American business community itself.
2. The appearance of businessmen on boards of education.
3. The wish to free such committeemen from time-consuming school supervisory tasks which interfered with their own private business interests.
4. The need to organize efficiently, and administer economically, the growing problems and expense of mass education.
5. The emergence of the superintendent as a pedagogical expert and an overseer of complex graded school systems.
6. The reduction in size of boards of education and standing committees, followed by the necessary entrusting of more responsibility to the superintendent of schools.
7. The delegation, at last, of the board of education's executive functions to the superintendent, who was then officially designated as its executive officer.

By 1900, the superintendent no longer needed to work with, or wait for, school committeemen, but could act quickly and authoritatively on his own. Schoolmen were always deeply influenced by changes in society at large, and under the more immediate pressure of internal growth, their quest for educational efficiency focused on expert management. First an organizational advisor, then a pedagogical efficiency expert, and finally an executive director, the superintendent gained his leverage and power directly, through artful employment of his society's business principles—principles which many of his colleagues opposed.

**Conclusion**

In the preceding discussion I have suggested that schoolmen's interest in principles of business efficiency did not emerge at the close of the nineteenth century but was a basic tenet of common school reform. Nor was this use of business concepts prompted solely by public pressure. Rather, school promoters frequently adopted business techniques, first to sell their new institution, and then to alleviate problems encountered in its expansion. Superintendents, especially, used business procedures to organize, then standardize, and finally to manage increasingly complex and costly public school operations.

Throughout this development, superintendents identified with business-industrial leadership and within less than sixty years converted a humble advisory post into an executive office of much status and influence. Newly introduced administrative training programs transformed the principles of business efficiency once employed by superintendents to organize graded schools into a policy by which to guide their entire office. Yet, even as the position of superintendent gained ascendancy, hostility to standardization, also deeply embedded in common school reform, resurfaced. Superintendents, now divorced from both teacher preparation and classroom supervision, encountered increasing aversion to modern techniques of smooth-line business efficiency at the expense of individualistic or communal soft-line progressive pedagogy.

It is impossible to determine when schoolmen used business metaphors
primarily to sell their institution to a business-minded public and when they believed such procedures exemplified the best of pedagogical and administrative practice. There is, however, no indication within any nineteenth-century educational literature that schoolmen did not believe their own words. The evidence does, in fact, support the opposite conclusion. Had schoolmen merely directed business metaphors outward toward the public, one might suspect them of hypocrisy; when they aimed such pronouncements inwards, toward themselves, and filled their professional literature with business recommendations and analogies, then their words deserve to be taken as a serious professional statement. It is possible that the concept of graded education might have prospered irrespective of nineteenth-century schoolmen’s drive to achieve order and economy. But the swiftness of the graded school’s rise, and the thoroughness of its institution, offers testimony to public school superintendents’ ability to utilize principles of business efficiency to fulfill their own professional needs.

Whether or not one applauds the emphasis upon business efficiency evident throughout common school reform, there is considerable irony in twentieth-century educators’ pejorative statements concerning the stress upon efficiency in superintendents’ offices. For despite the nineteenth-century vision of the teacher as common school savior, it was the ever practical, efficient, and resourceful superintendent who held together the rapidly developing public education system and helped it adapt to the changing climate of American life. “The situation of readiness—readiness for the great preacher of the gospel of efficiency, Frederick W. Taylor, and his disciples” in the fall of 1910, had, thus, not been occasioned by “a critical, cost-conscious, reform-minded public, led by profit-seeking journals.” Quite the contrary, the “situation” had been prompted some seventy years earlier to overcome the “coldness” with which school promoters’ “first efforts” were “met by the community,” a community which reformers of the time implied was bent upon “retard[ing] the progress of society.”

As their system grew, the very success of educators’ proselytizing brought with it an increased need to emphasize efficiency. By the end of the century, American citizens, initially taxed to support common school reform as a basic and economical republican safeguard, were financing an expanded and highly expensive ladder of social opportunity. There is, thus, something incongruous in Callahan’s conclusion that the way of salvation for twentieth-century public educators is to “investigate the size of classes and the teaching load that is characteristic of the excellent private schools such as Exeter or St. Paul’s or the Country Day schools.” Such a recommendation begs a deeper question. If the only way to create a reasonable system of public instruction is to “face the fact that there is no cheap, easy way to educate a human being” and, therefore, to pattern public education, both in its “teaching-learning process” and in its expense, after private schools, why have a system of public schools at all? Finding an acceptable answer to this question, is, of course, one—if not the—major problem facing today’s educator. In view of public
education’s long justification of itself as at once an economical as well as socially efficient institution, achieving a satisfactory solution may prove exceedingly difficult.

As an exposition of early twentieth-century public school administrative policy, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* remains irrefutable. However, as an historical explanation of why one group of schoolmen could so easily embrace the efficiency movement, or as a basis for deriving solutions to present-day educational dilemmas, Callahan’s work is open to considerable reassessment.
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