Формирование тенденции прагматизма и деловитости в американской общественной мысли и педагогике в первой половине XX века

Введение. Актуальность исследования связана с потребностью современной российской педагогической науки в изучении закономерностей и особенностей развития американской общественной мысли и педагогики. Цель исследования заключается в изучении процесса формирования тенденции прагматизма и деловитости в американской общественной мысли и педагогике в первой половине XX в.

Методы и методологические подходы. Ведущими методами исследования выступают: критический анализ оригинальной научно-педагогической литературы, преимущественно, американских авторов и научно-педагогическая интерпретация информации, содержащейся в источниках; сравнительно-сопоставительный и исторический методы, а также аксиологический подход, позволяющий выявить ценностную сущность явлений и фактов, подлежащих исследованию.

Результаты. Идея практицизма, предприимчивости и деловитости наиболее ярко проявилась в США, что было обусловлено бурным развитием капитализма, большими масштабами производства, массовостью предпринимательской деятельности и научно-техническим прогрессом. Увлечение деловитостью усилило внимание общественности к тем институтам общественной жизни, которые «подозревались» в неделовитости и неэффективном управлении. Школа была объявлена неэффективным институтом, не выдерживавшим сравнения с промышленными предприятиями по критериям эффективности и экономичности. Такое поверхностное понимание образовательного процесса было в интересах тех, кто хотел бы сократить школьный бюджет, прежде всего, военных монополий. В американской педагогике появилось определение деловитого человека как продуктивной личности, вносящей зримый и значимый вклад в общее дело. Такой человек обладает богатым воображением, восприимчив к новому, проявляет творческий, новаторский подход к решению жизненных проблем, проявляет ответственность в отношениях с другими людьми. Для деловитого человека характерны самостоятельность, настойчивость, альтруизм, высокая степень самоконтроля, высокоразвитое чувство понимания моральных ценностей, оптимистический подход к жизни.

Дискуссия. Философия и практика прагматизма в значительной степени продолжает определять школьную образовательную политику в США. Одной из важнейших задач обучения Дж. Э. Дэвис и Ф. М. Хетчингер провозгласили умение «выглядеть хорошо на случай перемен», приобретение умений, которые можно продать на рынке труда. Наличие этих умений должно позволить личности интегрироваться в обществе, приспособиться к жизни. Важным способом достижения этих задач объявлялся пересмотр школьных программ в сторону их большей практической направленности. Э. Торндайк поддерживал идею снижения удельного веса общеобразовательных предметов, ссылаясь на практические потребности. Он проводил в жизнь мысль, согласно которой математика, физика, химия и естествознание равноценны по своему значению таким прикладным предметам, как домоводство, кулинария, стенография, шитье, химия в быту. В итоге, в средней школе в значительной степени был расширен перечень учебных дисциплин. Среди них вождение автомобиля, малая авиация, личная гигиена, гигиена умственного труда, отношения людей, уход за ребенком, написание пьес, самодельный театр, учебное радио и телевидение. Те, кто пытался критиковать создавшееся положение с содержанием и количеством предметов, объявлялись отсталыми людьми, чьи взгляды не соответствуют практичной Америке. Прагматисты Дж. А. Погдон, В. М. Керёнски, М. Киг, Ф. Колпел, М. Колер и др. провозгласили «и алфавит, и дорогу к билетной кассе», т.e. и знания, и их практическое применение в жизни. При этом явное предпочтение отдавалось ими обучению практических навыков, хотя бы и без глубоких теоретических знаний.

Заключение. Философия и практика прагматизма во многом определяли и продолжают определять политику школьного образования в США. Начинала новизна исследования заключается в содержательном анализе научных взглядов ряда американских прагматистов, которые ранее не были предметом тщательного изучения отечественных педагогов-компаративистов. Вместе с тем, исследование воззрений ведущих педагогов США представляет собой актуальность и значимость для российской науки в силу их, несомненно, существенного влияния на формирование глобального образовательного пространства. Перспективы дальнейшего исследования связаны с изучением научных установок современных американских ученых-педагогов.

Ключевые слова: образование в американском обществе, американская педагогика, практицизм, деловитость, прагматизм, приспособление к жизни, Каллаген, Тайер, Дэвис, Хетчингер, Дьюи, Хэвигхёрст, Гилмор

V. B. Pomelov

The formation of the tendency of pragmatism and business-like efficiency in the American social thought and the pedagogy in the first half of the 20th century

**Introduction.** The relevance of the research is connected with the need of modern Russian pedagogical science to study the patterns and features of the development of American public thought and pedagogy. The purpose of the study is to study the process of formation of the trend of pragmatism and efficiency in American public thought and pedagogy in the first half of the XX century.

**Methods and methodological approaches.** The leading research methods are a critical analysis of the original scientific and pedagogical literature, mainly of the American authors, and a scientific and pedagogical interpretation of the information contained in the sources; comparative and historical methods, as well as an axiological approach that allows us to identify the value essence of the phenomena and facts.

**Results.** The idea of practicality, entrepreneurship and efficiency was most clearly manifested in the United States, which was due to the rapid development of capitalism, large-scale production, mass entrepreneurship and scientific and technological progress. The fascination with efficiency increased public attention to those institutions of public life that were "suspected" of indelicacy and inefficient management. The school was declared an inefficient institution that could not stand comparison with industrial enterprises according to the criteria of efficiency and economy. Such a superficial understanding of the educational process was in the interests of those who would like to reduce the school budget, first of all, military monopolies. In American pedagogy, the definition of a busy person as a productive person making a visible and significant contribution to the common cause has appeared. Such a person has a rich imagination, is receptive to new things, shows a creative, innovative approach to solving life problems; shows responsibility in relationships with other people. A businesslike person is characterized by independence, perseverance, altruism, a high degree of self-control, a highly developed sense of understanding moral values, and an optimistic approach to life. The concepts of genius, talent, giftedness, according to J. F. Gilmore, are outdated. Instead, he proposed the term self-actualization, which, in his opinion, reflected the human desire for self-realization.

**Discussions.** The philosophy and practice of pragmatism largely continues to determine school educational policy in the United States. One of the most important tasks of training J. E. Davis and F. M. Hetchinger proclaimed the ability to "look good in case of changes", the acquisition of skills that can be sold on the labor market. The presence of these skills should allow the individual to integrate into society, adapt to life. An important way to achieve these objectives was the revision of school curricula in the direction of their greater practical orientation. E. Thorndike supported the idea of reducing the proportion of general education subjects, referring to practical needs. He put into practice the idea that mathematics, physics, chemistry and natural science are equivalent in importance to such applied subjects as home economics, cooking, shorthand, sewing, chemistry in everyday life. As a result, the list of academic disciplines was significantly expanded in secondary school. Among them are driving a car, small aviation, personal hygiene, mental hygiene, people's relationships, child care, writing plays, amateur theater, educational radio and television. Those who tried to criticize the current situation with the content and number of subjects were declared backward people whose views do not correspond to practical America. The pragmatists J. A. Logsdon, V. M. Kerensky, M. Kig, F. Koppel, M. Kohler and others proclaimed "both the alphabet and the road to the ticket office", i.e. both knowledge and their practical application in life. At the same time, they clearly preferred teaching practical skills, even without deep theoretical knowledge.

**Conclusions.** The philosophy and practice of pragmatism have largely determined and continue to determine the policy of school education in the United States. The scientific novelty of the study lies in a meaningful analysis of the scientific views of a number of American pragmatists, who had not previously been the subject of careful study by domestic comparative educators. At the same time, the study of the views of the leading teachers of the USA is relevant and important for Russian science due to their undoubtedly significant influence on the formation of the global educational space. The prospects for further research are connected with the study of the scientific attitudes of modern American scientists and educators.

**Keywords:** education in the American society, the American pedagogy, practicism, business-like efficiency, pragmatism, life adjustment, Callahan, Thayer, Davis, Hetchinger, Dewey, Havighurst, Gilmore

INTRODUCTION. THE URGENCY OF THE PROBLEM

Global socio-political and economic processes that took place in the Soviet, and then in the Russian society, starting from the second half of the 1980s, generated a significant interest of domestic scientists to those objects of the scientific research that were previously, most often, beyond their attention and, of course, not through the fault of the researchers themselves. In particular, in the sphere of the pedagogical science and educational practice, the processes taking place in developed capitalist countries, are of particular interest. Previously, these processes had been evaluated in the Soviet comparative pedagogy exclusively from critical positions. With the establishment of the policy of pluralism in the Russian Federation, native comparative educators at last have got the opportunity to give an objective assessment of the relevant processes and phenomena occurring outside of Russia, primarily in the Western countries. At the same time, interest to the USA pedagogy remains traditionally high [1].

Some researchers highly appreciate the contribution of the American teachers-theorists and practitioners to the development and democratization of schools around the world [2]. Other scientists speak from critical positions. In order to support their scientific positions, they bring to the fore, in particular, the theory of the fundamental finiteness of the hegemony of the industrial West and the essential foundations of machine civilization, which are traditionally considered the material foundations of socio-cultural processes, including the Western education [3].

Modern Russian authors actively study doctrines containing a certain value potential, such as the concept of "investing in human capital" [4], the network model of the capitalist world order [5], the global sociology of G. Terborn, justifying social inequality [6], etc. These theories, as well as a number of others, similar to them, that have become widespread in the American social thought, including the pedagogical thought, have their fundamental basis in the theory of pragmatism.

Despite the fact that more than seventy years have passed since the death of D. Dewey, interest in his legacy is only increasing, as evidenced by numerous publications in Russian and foreign scientific literature. Modern authors reveal new aspects of the scientific creativity of Dewey, his associates and antagonists.

M. N. Kozhevnikova identifies as the subject of her research the concept of "growth and development", developed by Dewey already in the early period of creativity (1882-1889). It was then, according to the Russian researcher, D. Dewey for the first time formulated the rejection of a fixed goal of education; he linked the goal with the growth and development of the child, which corresponded to the tendency to overcome metaphysics [7].

S. R. Maboloc in his research seeks to find a "golden link" between the pragmatism of John Dewey and the "critical pedagogy" (or "pedagogy of the oppressed") of the Brazilian educator Paolo Freire (1921-1997). The latter in his works emphasized the need to provide the indigenous population with an education that would be both truly modern and anti-colonial [8]. He rejected the so-called traditional education, i.e. patriarchal, introduced into Latin America by colonialists at one time [9]. According to Freire, traditional educational activities serve to preserve the status quo in society, i.e. contributes to the preservation of social inequality [10].
Nevertheless, in a significant majority of publications, the authors positively assess D. Dewey and his followers [11]. Traditionally, for many researchers in Latin America, he is still "amigo", i.e. "friend" [12].

For American sociologists, D. Dewey and his legacy still remain a kind of fundamental basis and a starting point in conducting research. The authors use such concepts as "methodological pragmatism in educational research" [13], «pragmatism in professional practice» [14]. H. Waight even considers Dewey a scientist who "restored the lost vision of social science» [15].

All this confirms the relevance of our study of the legacy of Dewey and his followers, which resulted, in particular, in the concept of a productive personality the disclosure of the content of which we proceed.

As a hypothesis of the research, the author suggests that pragmatism and the so-called efficiency act as methodological foundations of American educational thought and practice. The author, relying on original sources, makes an attempt to study the process of formation of the trend of pragmatism and business-like efficiency in the American public thought and pedagogy in the first half of the XXth century. This is the purpose of the study.

The main task of the research is to reveal the content of the views of the leading American representatives of pragmatism in the first half of the twentieth century.

THE METHODS AND APPROACHES

The leading research methods are: a critical analysis of the original scientific and pedagogical literature, mainly of American authors, and a scientific and pedagogical interpretation of the information contained in the sources; comparative and historical methods, as well as an axiological approach that allows us to identify the value essence of the phenomena and facts to be studied. In the process of preparation of the article, the author used the content of authoritative Russian and foreign journals. Among them are "Pedagogy", "Philosophy of Education", "Pedagogy and Education", "Pedagogical Journal", "Bulletin of the Tomsk State University", "Philosophia", "Encuentros sobre Educación", "Systems Research and Behavioral Science", "Espacio, Tiempo y Educación", "International Journal of Research & Method in Education", "The American Sociologist", as well as works of leading native (Z. A. Malkova, E. N. Yanzhul, M. N. Kozhevnikova, V. O. Savostyanov etc.) and foreign (X. Taylor, A. Arredondo, A. Padilla, R. Bruno, C. Martínez, C. R. Maboloc, R. E. Callahan, J. F. Gilmore, R. J. Havighurst, F. M. Hechinger, H. Waight, R. J. Ormerod, C. Foster) scholars.

RESULTS

The views of J. F. Gilmore

The value system that encourages entrepreneurial activity includes, as it is well known, the preaching of hard work, efficiency, practicality, and similar qualities. Activity in this sphere has always been considered in any society divided into opposing classes as a way to achieve the so called "personal success", as a means of realizing the main ideal of the bourgeois society, – the accumulation of capital, the acquisition of prestige and power over other people.
The term "business-like efficiency" has established itself in the American socio-economic and pedagogical literature by the middle of the XXth century. It embodied the range of requirements imposed on the employee. This term can be translated as effective, productive, practical, efficient, skilled, prepared. It was also interpreted as "the ability to achieve the desired result with the minimal expenditure of energy, time, funds and materials" [16, p. 264].

However, none of these definitions conveys with sufficient completeness the content that the Americans usually put into this concept. The most adequate translation of this word seems to us to be "businesslike". The well-known American sociologist of the mid-twentieth century, J. F. Gilmore defined a busy person as a productive person, as a person who makes a visible and significant contribution to a common cause. Such a person has a rich imagination. He is receptive to new things.

He shows a creative, innovative approach to solving life's problems. He manifests responsibility in his relationships with other people and demands the same responsibility from others. A businesslike person is characterized by independence, perseverance, altruism, a high degree of self-control, and a highly developed sense of understanding moral values [17, p. 126]. Concepts of genius, talent, and giftedness, according to Gilmore, are outdated nowadays. Instead, he proposed the term self-actualization, which, in his opinion, reflected the human desire for self-buying.

This approach expressed the desire to evaluate the business qualities of a person based on the results of his work. Gilmore argued that any productive act was a manifestation of creativity, and represented the unity of three characteristics.

First, this act must be original, or at least infrequently occurring in practice; second, it must serve to solve the problem (to resolve the situation), but most importantly, third, a productive act must ensure to achieve the positive result.

The creative aspects of productivity can be seen in all areas of the human activity. The manifestation of efficiency can consist in an innovative approach to solving a problem, in producing a product that is unique in its qualities, in a personal example that serves as a model for others. Productivity isn’t limited to the quantity of a certain product; it means, first of all, the quality of the contribution, including the impact of this contribution on a society as a whole and on specific people in particular. A productive act is always an action that does something.

A businesslike person is a kind of "a tool for the constructive change", regardless of the profession and the type of an activity of a person.

J. F. Gilmore distinguished among the businesslike people that are capable of academic work (academic achievers), creativity and design (creative persons) and leadership (leaders). These people may differ in their abilities, motivation, and areas of social competence. However, despite some differences, all three types of a highly productive personality have much more similarity and unity among themselves than with less productive personalities of "their" types. According to Gilmore, the most striking trait that distinguishes a businesslike person is self-esteem, which is associated with great productivity (efficiency) of human activities, regardless of whether this productivity is expressed: in academic performance, creativity or leadership qualities.

The second characteristic of a businesslike personality, according to Gilmore, is his optimistic approach to life. Such person is more likely to meet life's problems than to leave them. He brings to any situation a deep faith and hope, which are based on the inner
confidence that, regardless of the nature of the task standing in front of him, he will be morally rewarded by those who, in his opinion, belong to the same social group. This hope helps a businesslike person to look with confidence to future, to set difficult-to-achieve, but highly valued goals.

The degree of the productivity (efficiency) of a person is determined by the rating scale. The latter shows how skillfully and effectively a person copes with problems. A businesslike person is characterized by a sense of optimism: he lives with the expectation of success and faith in luck. As a rule, after achieving a specific goal, the level of competence and self-esteem increases.

The third characteristic of a businesslike personality is a sense of social responsibility, which is expressed in empathy and concern for other people, respect for their inner world, the manifestation of skills of interaction with people, the ability to communicate with them, to work together productively, to show disposition and patience. Gilmore determines important qualities of a businesslike person, in particular, such ones as the ability to make a final decision, as well as the ability to copy, that is, to "automatically" perform any work on the model. Gilmore calls this adaptation (or adjustment).

According to another American sociologist, R. J. Havighurst, efficiency is especially important for people from the middle strata of a society. For them, it is a necessary weapon in the life struggle. For those who were born "with a silver spoon in the mouth", this is, of course, also an important quality, but for the elite it’s not vital. The task of educating business qualities isn’t so acute for social "outsiders"; for them, life is a struggle for a piece of bread and nothing more, because, even with remarkable efficiency, it’s especially difficult for them to find their "way up" ("room to the top") [18, p. 131].

The idea of practicality, enterprise and efficiency

The above named idea of practicality, enterprise and business-like efficiency was most clearly manifested in the United States of America. It was due to the rapid development of capitalism, large-scale production and, in a certain sense, the mass nature of entrepreneurial activity, scientific and technological progress. All these facts of reality found a particularly strong embodiment in the country.

This idea was reflected in the philosophy of luck and mercantile success, and it proved to be as resilient as there was still "room for playing economic passions" in real life. Consequently, the idea of practicality, enterprise and efficiency as the main means of ensuring personal success existed in the mind of the rising bourgeois society during the period of free competition in a particularly clear form. All this contributed to the emergence of that feature in the mental warehouse of many Americans, which was named American efficiency. This feature has become a classic expression of the innermost credo of bourgeois progress, – personal success, and the goal of every American, – the desire to advance. Gradually the symptoms of the crisis of the traditional ideology of efficiency and hard work began to appear more and more clearly. But the era of free competition came to an end and imperialism quickly put an end to the illusions of Freedom, equality and Fraternity.

The basis of social illusions of efficiency and similar moral and psychological incentives was greatly weakened. In these conditions, hopes for individual success in "competition" on the part of small and even medium-sized entrepreneurs have become more and more
illusory. American researchers complained about the depreciation of values of hard work and efficiency [19, p. 219].

However, what they characterized as a decline of respect for work, in reality reflected, rather, growing unwillingness of workers to put up with state-monopolistic forms of production. Nevertheless, according to the fair assessment of Russian researchers of the 1920s, "business philosophy" became one of main characteristics of the American society [20, p. 80].

School in the era of efficiency

The period 1910-1920 was named the era of business-like efficiency in the United States of America. The passion for efficiency increased public attention to those institutions of public life that were "suspected" of non-efficiency and inefficient management, and were also supported by taxpayers at that. And such an "inefficient" institution was eventually found, – a school! The school administration, under pressure from industrialists and the press for more practical education and training, was sharply criticized. The criticism seemed all the more justified because now it seemed that a remedy had been found for indelicacy and inefficiency.

This tool was declared the system of "scientific" management of Frederick W. Taylor. It was put into practice at the beginning, first, in the organization of "sweatshop" conveyors at enterprises for the production of cars, and then it found application in other industries. According to the adherents of the "Taylorization" of the educational system, it was necessary in some way to extend the idea of efficiency to school and university education. At the same time, the critics didn’t advocate a revolutionary break-up of the school system, but they stood only for more effective management within the existing system. Their main argument was a reference to the dissatisfaction of representatives of all branches of business life (businessmen, farmers, etc.) that the school didn’t teach how to earn a living.

For example, economist Simon Platten demanded that school should provide visual evidence of its real contribution to society. Otherwise, he said, it’s necessary to sharply reduce school budgets: "Why to spend money on schools, instead of spending it on the construction of the subway, the arrangement of parks?... Why to finance an indelicate teacher? It’s better to raise the salary of an active expert on the quality of milk. The school provides a useless invisible product" [21, p. 47].

(Noteworthy is the title of the book, from which the above quote is taken – "Education and the cult of efficiency"). Such a superficial understanding of the process of education and upbringing was expressed, mostly, by those who would like to reduce the school budget, and, above all, the military monopolies.

School was reproached with the fact that the industry was constantly doubling and tripling its output. Schools, from the point of view of some economists, allegedly didn’t stand up to comparison with industrial enterprises, if one applied such criteria as efficiency and economy to evaluate them. Soon, the ideology of efficiency, or rather, business-like work, was adopted by the teachers themselves.

In the XXth century, representatives of business and political figures began to play an increasingly important role in the management of school. Accordingly, an appearance of a typical school administration began to change. If prominent educators and public education figures of the XVIII-XIXth centuries, such as Benjamin Franklin and Horace Mann, considered
themselves primarily scientists and statesmen, then in the XXth century, more and more, the type of a successful business manager from pedagogy began to prevail.

In 1907, W. C. Bagley's book "School Class Management" was published. It was saturated with business terminology. The author, in particular, argued that the problem of managing a class team is mainly a problem of ... economics. He pointed out how to use school work team at the factory, in order to get the most practical benefit from invested time and money. Classroom management was seen as an economic problem. The author emphasized that unquestioning obedience on the part of students is the key to effective management and education of business qualities of the child's personality. This book was an incredible success in the United States, and only in 1907-1927 it went through 30 editions. It was important to change a school curriculum in order to make learning "more practical" in addition to the political and economic pressure exerted on schools by the financial community,

According to the American scholar T. H. Briggs, the author of the book "Pragmatism and Pedagogy", "the movement of utilitarianism permeated the entire educational system from elementary school to university" [22, p. 5]. He also noted: "At first, not very noticeable, and therefore even more dangerous, was the influence of the current of anti-intellectualism, whose supporters in every possible way reviled "dull scholastic education", "poring over books"... "Many students waste time on a book, while they need to be brought up to understand their social responsibility to the family and society," they said [22, p. 5].

Another American researcher D. Counts noted that in the United States everywhere school is viewed exclusively from an instrumental, utilitarian point of view. The principle of practical utility, in his opinion, is one of the cornerstones of American education [23, p. 17]. The emphasis on the practical value of knowledge is explained by many American researchers as completely natural for a nation who has taken on the mission "to bring the world civilization out of the state of savagery".

What one can really agree with is the statement that the Americans, who trace their ancestry from the unprivileged strata of Europe, didn’t have deep pedagogical traditions, and they were least inclined to master the theoretical side of pedagogical work. They grasped, first of all, the practical value of education and paid attention mainly to the material opportunities that it could bring.

The secret of the success of American teachers was not only the result of the manifestation of knowledge by themselves and their students, not so much in teaching, but, above all, in the manifestation of energy, initiative and "good old common sense". The voices of individual educators who warned about the danger of the omnipotent dollar entering the school environment, their demand to reduce the influence of capital on the school curriculum, couldn’t determine the main direction of the USA pedagogical thought in the first half of the twentieth century. "The practical direction of thought is very strong in our people. The demand for short-term, cheap, effective training, aimed at meeting the needs of the farm, the store, the household, – is a real demand. Having received such a social order, the school is obliged to fulfill it", – this was the leitmotif of numerous speeches of teachers in the press and at conferences.

As noted by P. E. Callahan, numerous attempts were made (by Leonard Ayres, Franklin Spalding, Franklin Bobbitt, Joseph S. Taylor, etc.) to link the idea of efficiency with the practice of school education, to transfer the ideas of Franklin W. Taylor to education, in other words, to reorient school to dollar.
In the early 1930s, "the business wave" in the sphere of school education began to wane. Numerous speeches by a number of American teachers against the dominance of the "business-like" approach to school have been spoken. But the main reason for this "pacification" was the protracted economic crisis in the United States of America, which affected, among other things, the school.

In the post-war years, various management models in education developed. Many Western specialists proceeded from the concept of "reporting", which interpreted the school as one of the variants of the capitalist enterprise. The economic category "investment – result" was applied to it and "reporting" was expected almost "for every dollar spent" [24, p. 115].

At the same time, the goal was to achieve the greatest return on the invested capital without taking into account the moral factor. The desire to get the highest quality product with minimal costs was proclaimed. The consistent implementation of such model led to this state of things that in reality, often only the second part of the plan was implemented, namely, "obtaining a product with minimal costs". But the "highest quality" often had to be sacrificed. And what should be considered as "a product of the highest quality", – experts differed in this regard. Most of them still agreed that the indicator of it, i.e. "a product of the highest quality" is, first of all, success in life. Results of the implementation of the principle of effectiveness in the educational process at the American school include the following pitiful consequence: the education had become subservient to the interests of business. School administrators were often people who knew more about economics than about pedagogy. Pseudo-scientific methods appeared. The atmosphere of anti-intellectualism have got stronger.

In the 1950s and 1960s, American educators seized on what they thought was a new "panacea", – teaching machines and educational television. As for half a century before, articles with titles such as "Low productivity of the educational industry" began to appear [25, p. 256]. The main purpose of them was the desire to "scientifically" prove the need to reduce the cost of education, especially at the public, mandatory level by reducing teachers and replacing them with appropriate technical devices. And such publications appeared at a time when, as American researchers noted, solid studies appeared in Western, primarily American, sociology, about high effectiveness of financial investments in education.

Scientists from the socialist countries also fully agreed with them; in particular, we will refer to the well-known research of the Academician S. G. Strumilin. However, it should be noted that at the same time, economists haven’t developed any specific method for calculating this efficiency. Usually, an increase in earnings after an employee has completed a particular course of study (from short-term programs up to a full-fledged study at the university) was taken as a measurable result of education. At the same time, the increase in earnings was interpreted as a consequence of more efficient work [26, p. 14-15].

The idea of bourgeois efficiency and enterprise and the philosophy of pragmatism

The idea of bourgeois efficiency and enterprise received its theoretical foundation in the philosophy of pragmatism, the most prominent representatives of which were William James, John Dewey and William Heard Kilpatrick [27].

According to the teaching of pragmatism, morality doesn’t need any general principles and rules that could be applied in everyday life, because a person is in constant conflict with the people around him [28, p. 12]. This conflict interaction creates, according to
Dewey, certain situations. He noted: "The statement that individuals live in the world means specifically that they live in a series of situations" [29, p. 3]. Each situation is unique and it has its own "goodness", and the efforts of a person should be directed to finding out this goodness.

It follows that a moral theory that operates on general principles is useless, because we, the pragmatists convince us, always deal with unique situations, with specific people; we are costantly in a position that requires a certain decision.

Therefore, a person needs only "working action plans". Every life situation sets a person a task to solve it, and for this, according to J. Dewey, it is necessary not moral, but business qualities, that is, organization, efficiency, enterprise, etc.

Thus, need to cultivate business qualities is justified by pragmatic laws of life's struggle. The process of teaching and upbringing should be designed so that entire training course could be a set of situations and a display of their solutions, Dewey argued. He proposed to abandon systematic courses.

After all, in life, he said, science wasn’t used anywhere in "pure", constantly used form. At the same time, all "situations" should be solved from a position of personal interests, which pragmatism, "for sake of objectivity", brings under the definition of "self-realization" of an individual. It’s clear that such a "self-realization" can be summed up in any way of behavior.

A person, according to ideology of pragmatism, is a kind of a businessman, who adapts to a situation; he doesn’t accept social necessity, he is a "free person". In fact, this apparent "rejection" of foundations of mass consumption society is embodied in the formation of a socially conformal personality, whose entire "freedom" is limited not only by the narrow limits of bureaucratic organization, of which he is a screw, but also by the opposition of other people.

Pragmatism was at one time actually the most adequate expression of the individualistic worldview, constantly reproduced by private-property relations. It claimed to act as a (quasi)scientific basis for the ideology of business, based on the shaky foundation of anti-intellectualism and narrow practicism.

"The language of pragmatism" was spoken not only by "captains of industry", but also by politicians who served their interests. All of them were always and above all concerned with the "efficiency" of their plans. If they gave themselves up to reflection, it was, of course, not on what was right or wrong, moral or immoral, but on what was appropriate in this "unique" situation.

Success and profit are the main criteria for choosing behavior. From the standpoint of this subjective criterion, any action and any arbitrariness of the subject can be justified if they are beneficial to him in this situation. Pragmatism has thus framed in "philosophical" categories the position of a self-interested businessman, for whom all science makes sense and is justified only to the extent that it serves his individualistic interests. Such an approach can justify any unscrupulousness, and in fact, any crime. Pragmatism claimed to be a "title" of science, but in fact it belittled science, reduced it to the sum of useful and convenient views for capital.

The American educator I. Edman, in a monograph devoted to the legacy of J. Dewey, rightly called him "a specifically American philosopher who captured the voice and temperament of the American tradition, its desire for business" [30, p. 21].
J. Dewey's follower W. H. Kilpatrick made a lot of effort to translate the ideology of pragmatism into the language of school pedagogy [31, p. 140].

In one of his works, describing purposeful activity and highlighting well-known typical steps (task setting, planning, execution, and evaluation of results), he insisted that students should perform all these steps independently. Here a fictional opponent raises the question: "Don't you think it would be more appropriate if the teacher offered the children a plan of action? Let's take such a case. A child decided to grow corn. Science has accumulated a lot of knowledge on this issue and has developed better approaches than the student himself can come up with. Think about the inevitable waste of time, land, fertilizers, and effort if the student himself, without experience and knowledge, plans this work?".

To this perfectly reasonable and self-posed question, Kilpatrick gives the following astonishing answer: "It all depends on what you are trying to achieve. If you are interested in the corn crop, then give him a plan. If you are more interested in child than in corn; if you want to teach him to think and plan, then let him do it himself" [32, p. 119].

It's clear that with such "independence" there will be neither corn, and no enrichment of the experience of the child himself. Precisely because the teacher is interested in a child, and not in "corn", it is necessary to systematically teach him to "grow it", but not through empirical trial and error, not through a primitive understanding of "pedagogical robinsonade", but taking into account all the knowledge that pedagogy has accumulated. To leave a child to himself means to deliberately deprive him of the universal experience, to delay his spiritual growth for a long time.

Here is a typical postulate of pragmatism: "Since life is changing rapidly, the task of a school is not to prepare a child for a future life, but to teach him to live today, because only by living the momentary events, a child learns to live".

Hence demands for "a life-like school, for "a school of life" that would teach the child to adapt to life, for "justice", "fair play" and "a sense of responsibility for the common good". The main requirement of D. Dewey for school is that the entire educational process should be carried out in the form of labor actions; the student's work should resemble the work of a worker, a farmer, an employee.

To do this, school should be equipped with appropriate equipment and workshops, which are met everywhere in life. A child should practice repair, installation and operation of everything that surrounds him in real life (electricity, water supply, driving a car, etc.). He generally advocated almost for the elimination of school, stating: "If school takes the above character, a child, in the end, will participate in the general work, but this is not participation for the sake of participation, but participation for the sake of its results. The life of children in school should be the same in everything as the life of adults, so that school is the same factory, kitchen, post office, railway junction or agricultural enterprise" [33, p. 119].

**DISCUSSIONS**

Dewey's pedagogy encourages us to recall the activities of A. S. Makarenko, who managed to successfully combine children's studies and productive work, both agricultural and industrial, including modern production (power tool factory, photo camera factory). However, a careful analysis of the legacy of the outstanding Russian teacher shows that, first, in the entire exceptionally extensive scientific and literary
heritage of A. S. Makarenko, there are very few pages where the characteristics of the didactic work of the institutions headed by him are given.

Secondly, it's sad, but the experience of Makarenko was and remains up to this day the kind of experience that modern domestic teachers don’t seek to perceive.

Of course, all teachers in Russia recognize that Makarenko's pedagogy is "great", but very few people are in a hurry to build a pedagogical process "according to Makarenko". At the same time, Dewey's pedagogy, on the contrary, has become extremely widespread, including outside the USA. Dewey's ideas and the practice of the school he organized in Chicago looked, of course, attractive: a break with European school scholasticism, the development of technology, the desire to "keep up with life", etc. But one can pour only one liter of liquid into a liter vessel, and no more. In other words, one needs to save on something.

So, Dewey "saved" on arming a child with a system of knowledge. At the same time, he tirelessly repeated the thought about the need of preparing a child to handle various tools in order to be a cultural worker at a factory and agricultural enterprise. Even true supporters of pragmatism don’t doubt that "the school of life", according to Dewey and Kilpatrick, is a reliable tool for preserving existing public relations.

D. Dewey drew his pedagogical ideas mainly in relation to the strata of the population consumed by need. The teacher can’t be denied his desire to do at least something for children of the poor, to put the means of pedagogy at the service of charity and career guidance, and this can’t fail to attract in his philosophy and practice. Something else can’t explain the following statements: "The school should take care of poor children so that at the end of school life each child can take up some work and perform it successfully, whether it is work at the machine in some enterprise, in the family and at school. To succeed as a person in general and as an American citizen is the ideal of the popular school in America; earning bread is, as it was, part of this ideal, its natural consequence" [32, p. 120].

All above said proves the fact that the philosophy and practice of pragmatism has largely determined and they continue to determine school education policy in the USA. Dewey's followers (Andrey Thorndike, etc.) supported him in his efforts to reduce the proportion of general subjects in school.

A. Thorndike promoted the "theory" according to which mathematics, physics, chemistry, natural science were supposedly equivalent in their importance for the mental development of children to such applied subjects as home economics, cooking, shorthand, sewing, chemistry in everyday life, etc.

Another follower of D. Dewey, the American educator V. T. Thayer, in the post-war years, justified the use of pragmatic education by the need to bridge the gap between the child’s home life and the complex adult world in which he would be forced to live. At the same time, neither his native home nor school prepare a child for the future life to the necessary extent [33, p. 270].

That's why one of the most important goals of training, in "the theory of adaptation to life" ("life adjustment"), American teachers (J. E. Davis, F. M. Hetchinger) proclaimed the ability "to look good in the case of change" [34, p. 16], the acquisition of skills that can be sold "on the labor market" ("marketable skills") [35, p. 135]. All this should allow the individual to integrate into society, to adapt to life. The main way to achieve these goals was announced the revision of programs in the direction of their greater practical orientation.
Therefore, the followers of Dewey, the modern pragmatists (J. A. Logsdon, V. M. Kerensky, M. Keegh, F. Koppel, M. Kohler, etc.), proclaimed "both the alphabet and the road to the ticket office", in other words, both knowledge and its practical application in life. At the same time, they clearly preferred the second direction, that is, training in practical skills, even without deep theoretical knowledge [36, p.19].

In this regard, referring to the diverse practical needs of most people, the list of academic disciplines in secondary school has been significantly expanded. Among them are driving a car, small aircraft driving, personal hygiene, mental health, people's relationships, child care, play writing, amateur theater, radio and television, etc. Those who tried to criticize the current situation with the content and number of subjects were called backward people whose views didn't correspond to practical America [37, p. 412].

In justifying the inclusion of such subjects in the curriculum, American educators have usually added that young people need not only old virtues of the era of pioneers of Western exploration, but also new virtues of a modern citizen; more precisely, not even new ones, but an updated application of old ones to various situations of today. The theory of "adaptation to life" thus represents a further step in translating the theory of "functional" and "useful" learning into a more dynamic program of action, including the cooperation of school and public, and in its essence it doesn’t differ significantly from the previously popular concept of "effective worker". It also proceeds from the desire to get maximum economic effect from an employee, even at the expense of his spiritual and physical development.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Thus, the study analyzes scientific positions of a number of American teachers on the problem of the essence and content of the concept of "efficiency", the introduction of pragmatism and practicality in public education and the formation of efficiency in the younger generation. The research hypothesis, – pragmatism is the methodological basis of American pedagogical thought and practice, – turned out to be correct. Thus, the goal of the study was achieved and the task of the study was solved. The research has a scientific novelty, which consists in a meaningful analysis of views of American pragmatists, which hadn’t been previously the subject of study of domestic comparative educators.

Thus, the study of the essence of these phenomena is undoubtedly relevant for modern Russian pedagogical thought. Russian researchers shouldn’t reject "from the doorstep", as was the usual practice in the recent past, the results of research search of foreign colleagues, but they ought carefully study it, carefully selecting what could be useful for the domestic educational system.
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