

A Study of the Development Process of Extra-Curricular Activities and Integrated Curriculum Theory in the US, 1927-1952

—Focusing on the Discussion of E.K. Fretwell and H.C. McKown—

Division of Basic Theories of Education Daiki INOMATA

This article studies the process and character of the development of the extra-curricular activities theory in the United States from 1927 to 1952. In the article, the works of the leading theorists of extra-curricular activities, E.K. Fretwell's *Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary School* and the first (1927), revised (1937), third (1952) editions of H.C. McKown's *Extra-Curricular Activities*, were analyzed. As a result, it was clarified that the theory of extra-curricular activities is based on a unified and integrated view of school educational activities as a whole, and that its development can be organized in two directions: "step-by-step" understanding of the development process of activities, and concretization and fixing of the content of activities.

Table of Contents

1. Foreword
2. Extra-Curricular Activities Theory in the 1920s – focusing on Fretwell and McKown.
 - A. Comparison - Table of Contents.
 - B. Comparison - Principles of Extra-Curricular Activities.
 - C. Comparison - Principles of the Theory of Student Participation.
3. Development of Extra-Curricular Activities Theory-1927-1952.
 - A. Revised policy and added discussion content
 - B. Changes in Student Participation Theory
4. Conclusion

1. Foreword¹⁾

During the transition between 19th and 20th century and the first half of the 20th century, the United States experienced massive social transformation, such as rapid industrialization and urbanization. Under these circumstances, the rate of enrollment in secondary school dramatically rose, and the schools became places for a larger number of children from more diverse social and economic backgrounds. In order to adapt to these changes, and encouraged by the establishment of the concept of "adolescent" through the Child Study by G.S.Hall (1846-1924), a fundamental reform of secondary

education was promoted (Ichimura, 1987). As shown in the famous "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education" (Department of the Interior Bureau of Education, 1918), the reform had two aspects: firstly, the reform of the educational system, including the conversion to a 6-3-3 system influenced by the Junior High School Movement, and secondary, the reform of educational content, including the introduction of social studies.

The introduction of extra-curricular activities into schools is considered to be a part of these reforms. In particular, the "School City", a method of "moral and civic training" developed by Wilson L. Gill (1851-1941), was a typical example; The early practice was to introduce a student self-government system in schools to Americanize children, including new immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe (Sugano, 1987; Light, 2020; Inomata, 2022). Additionally, after 1900, urbanization and industrialization fully progressed, and communities based on homogeneous social and economic backgrounds were threatened. This led to a movement to artificially recreate communities in towns and schools grew. As a result, a variety of extra-curricular activities such as club activities, honor societies etc. was introduced into secondary schools (Gutowski, 1988). Furthermore, with the United States' entry into World War I in 1917, schools saw an increase in demand for citizenship education to strengthen community cohesion, which further accelerated the movement to

introduce extra-curricular activities. Based on these developments, Elbert K. Fretwell (1878-1962), specializing in extracurricular activities, arrived at Columbia University Teachers College that year, supporting these developments. The Extra-Curricular Activity Movement, spearheaded by Fretwell, persisted throughout the 1920s. Numerous dissertations were submitted, leading to the formation of a systematic theory on extra-curricular activities (Department of the Interior Bureau of Education, 1929; Beale, 1983; Inomata, 2023).

While a relatively large number of studies have been accumulated on the movement up to the 1920s, it is difficult to say that the development of extra-curricular activities theory since the 1930s has been sufficiently clear. In this regard, there is one study that focuses on Harry C. McKown (1892-1963), a student of Fretwell (Shimada, 1999), but this study lacks a comparative study with the accumulated discussions up to the 1920s. The article aims to synthesize preceding studies and explain the development of the theory of extra-curricular activities during the period from the 1920s to the 1950s.

In order to accomplish the above aims, this article will compare the theoretical developments of two individuals, Fretwell and McKown. As mentioned above, Fretwell was a leader in the extra-curricular activities movement of the 1920s. In particular, his work "*Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools*" (Fretwell, 1931) is the most typical example of extra-curricular activities theory organized through the 1920s movement. However, Fretwell did not publish any individual works after 1931, and only wrote short reports on extra-curricular activities²⁾, never updating his theory. In contrast, McKown studied under Fretwell and published his work "*Extra-Curricular Activities*" as early as 1927, and served as editor of journal "*School Activities*", "the only journal devoted to extra-curricular activities" (Shimada, 1999:4), from 1934 until his death in September 1963, and led the movement from the 1930s. McKown also continued to update his theory after the 1930s. Specifically, the first edition of "*Extra-Curricular Activities*" was published in 1927, followed by a Revised Edition in 1937 and a Third Edition in 1952 (McKown, 1927; 1937; 1952). In addition, he was also an enthusiastic publisher of works on individual activities that constituted extra-curricular activities such as clubs, homerooms, and student councils (e.g. McKown, 1929;

1931; 1934; 1944). This article examines the development of extra-curricular activities theory since the 1930s by comparing the contents of Fretwell's 1931 work and McKown's "*Extra-Curricular Activities*", which were published in 1927, 1937, and 1952. In addition, this article focuses on the fact that student self-government-like activities are placed at the center of extra-curricular activities, and examines the position of the student organization and student council activities.

Based on the above, this article will be organized as follows. In section 2, McKown's 27th and 31st books are compared, and in section 3, the theoretical development is examined using McKown's works from the 1930s onward.

2. Extra-Curricular Activities Theory in the 1920s – focusing on Fretwell and McKown.

A. Comparison - Table of Contents.

This section compares the first edition of "Extra-Curricular Activities." published by Harry C. McKown in 1927 and "Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools" published by Elbert K. Fretwell in 1931. First, Table 1 compares the table of contents structure of the two works.

There is a noticeable disparity in the number of chapters between the two books: McKown (1927) has 31 chapters, and Fretwell (1931) has 17 chapters. Nevertheless, there is a fundamental resemblance in how they approach particular extra-curricular activities. Moreover, both texts dedicate a significant section to practical techniques and substance. This suggests that the theory of extra-curricular activities was created as a practice-based system.

However, there are also clear distinctions between the two. Notably, McKown (1927) has a chapter on "2. The Student", in which he posits that the student is the "material" for the work of teaching, and that understanding the student is essential for teaching "intelligently and effectively. He then considered "high school age" students as "adolescents" and described their "physical characteristics" and "mental and social characteristics". For the latter in particular, eight characteristics consisting of "Curiosity," "Imitation," so on, were listed and explained in detail (McKown, 1927:13-15). These statements are thought to be strongly influenced by G.S.Hall's psychology. Of course, Fretwell also discussed the nature of adolescents. However, it can be said that McKown attempted to place more emphasis on the psychological understanding of

Table 1: Table of Contents of McKown (1927) and Fretwell (1931)

McKown(1927) <i>Extra-Curricular Activities</i>		Fretwell(1931) <i>Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools</i>
1. Principle Underlying Extra-Curricular Activities	18. 19. The School Newspaper	1. A Sense of Direction
2. The Student	20. The Magazine	2. The Home Room
3. Home-Room Organization and Activities	21. The Yearbook	3. Class Organization
4. The Student Council	22. The Handbook	4. Pupil Participation in Government - Purpose
5. The Assembly	23. Honor Societies	5. Types of Councils in Junior High Schools
6. Clubs	24. Commencement	6. How One Junior High School Grew a Student Council
7. Dramatics	25. Supplementary Organizations	7. Analysis of Senior High School Councils
8. Musical Organizations and Activities	26. Miscellaneous Activities	8. The Student Council at Work
9. Literary Societies, Debating, and Speaking	27. School Banks and Banking	9. The Assembly
10. Secret Societies	28. Financial Administration of Extra-Curricular Activities	10. Clubs
11. Student Participation in Control of Study Halls and Libraries	29. Encouraging and Limiting Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities	11. The High-School Newspaper
12. Citizenship and School Spirit	30. Director of Activities, Dean, Sponsor, and Teacher	12. The Pupil's Handbook
13. Manners and Courtesy	31. Conclusion	13. The High-School Magazine
14. Athletics		14. The Annual
15. School Trips and Excursions		15. Commencement
16. Parties		16. Athletics
17. School Publications		17. Extra-Curricular Finances

(McKown, H.C.(1927) *Extra-Curricular Activities* The Macmillan Co.; Fretwell, E.K.(1931) *Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools*. Houghton Mifflin Co.)

the student with a stand-alone chapter.

B. Comparison - Principles of Extra-Curricular Activities.

Below, I move on to a comparison of content. First, look at the principles of extra-curricular activities. Table 2 summarizes the items of the principles in both works.

As Table 2 reveals, Fretwell and McKown presented virtually identical arguments. This similarity is not surprising considering Fretwell acted as a mentor to McKown, but moreover, the discussion of the principles of extra-curricular activities in the 1920s was one of a certain commonality.

In particular, the emphasis on the mutuality between curricular and extra-curricular activities is noteworthy as a commonality in their discussions. For example, McKown, in his discussion of 3. in Table 2, stated that “Extra-curricular and curricular work need not be separated; they should be mutually complementary” (McKown,1 927: 8). Or, in the beginning of his work, he stated “knowledge and practice must go together,” and he emphasizes the mutuality of the two by positioning extra-curricular activities as the “opportunity” of the latter “practice” (McKown,1 927:3-4). In contrast, Fretwell went further, stating at the beginning of his work that “extra-curricular activities should grow out of

Table2: The Principles of Extra-Curricular Activities of McKown (1927) and Fretwell (1931)

McKown (1927)	Fretwell (1931)
1. The student is a citizen of the school	1. A constructive program
2. The school must have a constructive program	2. This constructive plan of extra-curricular activities shall grow out of the life of the school
3. Extra-curricular activities should help motivate the regular work of the school	3. This constructive plan shall recognize that the pupil is a citizen of the school
4. These activities should be given school time	4. Teacher shall accept, whole-heartedly, the responsibility of developing the school's extra-curricular activities
5. The entire school should participate	5. Extra-curricular activities shall be supervised
6. These activities should be considered in the regular program of the teachers	6. Intelligent public opinion shall be developed
	7. The principal is responsible

(McKown, H.C.(1927) *Extra-Curricular Activities* The Macmillan Co. pp.7-9; Fretwell, E.K.(1931) *Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools*. Houghton Mifflin Co. pp.12-18.)

curricular activities and return to them to enrich them” (Fretwell, 1931: 2) and grasped the mutuality of curricular and extra-curricular activities from a time-course perspective, as they grow together. This mutuality of the whole school's activities was the foundational argument of both extra-curricular activities theories, as they attempted to unify, integrated and curricularized the whole school's activities. By laying the above foundations, it can be seen as justifying the principles: the necessity of the same constructive program for extra-curricular activities as for regular class teaching, the importance and legitimacy of teacher direction, and the principle of participation by all students.

C. Comparison - Principles of the Theory of Student Participation.

Next, discussion of student government activities to follow. Comparing the relevant portions of Fretwell's (1931) and McKown's (1927) works, Fretwell allocated 119 pages for chapters 4 through 8, while McKown only allotted 30 pages. As a result, Fretwell presented a more detailed discussion than McKown. Nevertheless, the arguments in both works are basically the same. That is, both works briefly discuss the purpose of student government, in which students work through parliamentary methods, and furthermore, they address specific mechanisms, constitution, and activities in detail.

On the other hand, when examining the discourse on the nature and function of the student government, it becomes clear that Fretwell presents a more systematic argument.

Specifically, both parties share a common view of the nature of the student council, in that both paraphrase it as an organization for “student participation in school control/government” rather than an organization for “student self-government”. However, McKown provides a solely negative rationale for this paraphrase, contending that students “lack the experience,” and therefore, are unable to make “good judgments” necessary for self-governance (McKown, 1927: 40). Conversely, Fretwell offers a more positive implication, suggesting that this paraphrase was a result of a shift in “thinking” and “the direction of more exact expression” concerning student participation (Fretwell, 1931: 90).

Examined in context with other sections of the author's writing, this paraphrased version has two significant effects. First, the relationship between homerooms, club activities, and student council activities is captured in a unified and simple way by the term student participation. This has changed the discussion to view homerooms as the most basic opportunity for participation, club activities as a place for participation according to students' interests, and the student government, with its simple structure centering on the council, as a unified place for synthesizing these student participation activities. Secondly, based on a unified understanding centered on student participation as described above, a view was proposed to gradually expand its scope and cultivate the idea of participation. Specifically, instead of operating a complex self-governance system that emulates the structure of mature adults, students' extra-curricular organizations as an educational means that was

initially simple and gradually expanded by the teachers.

Thus, Fretwell's understanding of the paraphrase to student participation with positive connotations gives rise to a theory of the function and purpose of the student council that was not present in McKown as of 1927. As of 1927, McKown saw the function and purpose of the student government from only two ways: the "development of the student" and the integration of extra-curricular organizations, and does not discuss the growth aspect of the organization itself. In contrast, Fretwell proposed a view that also looks at the reform of the school itself by viewing the content and organization of extra-curricular activities as growing, based on student participation. Fretwell concludes his discussion of student government with the following statement.

The student council, as the one representative organization of the whole school, should plan constructively, coordinate and unify the whole extra-curricular life of the school....As it develops, the council should come increasingly to deal with every phase of extra-curricular activities that provides an educational opportunity for the pupils and the same time provides a favorable opportunity for the school progressively to reconstruct itself. (Fretwell, 1931: 206)

As described above, the theory of extra-curricular activities in the 1920s suggested a viewpoint of unifying and integrating curricular, extra-curricular activities around the concept of student participation to promote student growth and remake the school itself.

3. Development of Extra-Curricular Activities Theory- 1927-1952.

A. Revised policy and added discussion content

As seen in the introduction of this article, McKown continued to write extensively in the years following the 1930s. This resulted in multiple Revised Editions of Extra-Curricular Activities, including the 1937 edition ("Revised Edition") and the 1952 edition ("Third Edition"). Throughout his revisions, McKown maintained a consistent position as follows.

The purpose of this book is to provide immediate and practical assistance for the teacher and the administrator....

It deals rather briefly with purposes and principles because these are, in general, well-organized and established. It represents a minimum of theory and a maximum of not-too-exceptional practice. (McKown, 1937: vii-viii)

McKown revised his work in a manner that emphasized the practical aspects. In the 1937 edition, from the viewpoint of "comprehensiveness and serviceability" in order to put extra-curricular activities into practice, "early chapters had been enlarged" describing principles, etc., chapters dealing with activities that were divided into smaller chapters had been integrated, and references had been replaced with the latest ones. This policy of revision was continued in the 1952 edition (Third Edition).

Thus what specific areas were revised? In the following, particular attention is paid to the changes in the "enlarged" first half of the chapter, which is organized from three points: a) Addition of principles, b) Addition of historical descriptions, and c) Enhancement of practical examples.

To begin with a), continuing from Table 2, a comparison of the Revised Edition and Third Edition of the discussion of principles are shown in Table 3 on the next page.

As it appears on initial inspection, the discussion of the principles has become increasingly detailed with each edition. Several changes are particularly noteworthy.

First, the policy of growing the extra-curricular activities organization itself, which was not seen in the first edition, was clearly inserted as item 9. in the Revised Edition. Fretwell's name was directly quoted in the description of this item (McKown, 1937: 21; 1952: 22). In addition to this, the number of items added in the Revised Edition, such as 4, 8, and 10, not only encourage the students to conduct the program within the curriculum and regular school hours, but also mention the democratic system of management methods, etc., has increased.

Second, a principle was added that was created to view extra-curricular activities in schools as self-evident. For example, 12. in the Revised Edition and 7. added in the Third Edition were items that proposed a balanced school education with both curricular and extra-curricular activities, based on the assumption that extra-curricular activities are universally practiced in schools.

Third, the authority of administration and supervision was clarified. Specifically, the Revised Edition item 6's description explicitly states that the "administration head" is

Table3: The Principles Discussion of McKown's *Extra-Curricular Activities* Revised Edition (McKown,1937) and Third Edition (McKown,1952)

McKown (1937)	McKown (1952)
1. The student is a citizen of the school	1. The student is a citizen of the school
2. The school must have a constructive program	2. The school must have a constructive program
3. All students should participate	3. These activities should be scheduled in school time
4. All admission and participation requirements should be democratic	4. All students should participate
5. Students severing connection with the school should cease to participate in its activities	5. All admission and participation requirements should be democratic
6. Adequate provision for administering and supervising these activities should be made	6. Students severing connection with the school should cease to participate in its activities
7. These activities should be considered a part of the regular program of the teachers	7. Students should not be excused from class to participate in extra-curricular activities
8. The teacher-sponsor should be an adviser and not a dominator	8. Student leadership should be carefully promoted and developed
9. Activities should be started in a small way and developed gradually and naturally	9. Adequate provision for administering and supervising these activities should be made
10. No activity should be organized without very careful consideration, nor allowed to die without protest	10. These activities should be considered a part of the regular program of the teachers
11. Extra-curricular financing should be adequate, fair, and safe	11. The teacher-sponsor should be an adviser and not a dominator
12. Extra-curricular activities not all-important	12. Activities should be started in a small way and developed gradually and naturally
	13. No activity should be organized without very careful consideration, nor allowed to die without protest
	14. The necessary facilities and equipment should be provided
	15. Every organization should keep a permanent record of its activities
	16. Extra-curricular financing should be adequate, fair, and safe
	17. The school and community should be kept well informed about the activity program
	18. Extra-curricular activities not all-important

(McKown, H.C. (1937) *Extra-Curricular Activities* The Macmillan Co. pp.17-22; McKown, H.C. (1952) *Extra-Curricular Activities* The Macmillan Co. pp.17-25.)

solely responsible for all aspects of the school. Also, in the first edition, Chapter 30 addressed this subject with the title "Director of Activities, Dean, Sponsor, and Teacher". However, in the Revised Edition, this chapter was renamed Chapter 26, designated as "The Administration and Supervision of Extra-Curricular Activities". Through these, it was clarified that extra-curricular activities should be placed under administration and supervision with fixed authority.

Next, b) Additions to the historical description. Examining the changes in the chapters from the first edition to the Revised Edition, it is evident that a historical account

of extra-curricular activities has been included. For instance, from the beginning of the first chapter of the Revised Edition, McKown stated that "extra-curricular activities not new" and added a history of extra-curricular activities beginning in ancient Sparta (McKown, 1937: 1). Also in the chapter 4 on student government, McKown added a history of student participation beginning with Plato's Academy (McKown, 1937: 89). Furthermore, McKown depicted these histories as step-by-step developing, and at the end of the process, he saw the current status of extra-curricular activities that were mutualize to

the regular curriculum and positioned as part of the curriculum (McKown, 1937:5). Therefore, the key to developing the theory of extracurricular activities was to theorize the developmental stages of different aspects, such as history, instructional theory, and organization.

Continuing on c) Enhancement of practical examples. The enrichment of practical examples. As discussed in the previous section of this article, McKown's work was written to "provide immediate and practical assistance". Therefore, with each revision, the examples of practice were added and revised in a more comprehensive and specific manner. In particular, looking at the student government theory, the first edition devoted a lot of space to the discussion of the mechanism, and relatively little to the specific activities of the student government. In the Revised Edition and Third Edition, additions were made to this part of the work. In particular, the first edition listed 113 examples of activities (McKown, 1927: 62-65), the Revised Edition listed 135 (McKown, 1937: 118-121), and the Third Edition added 147 items (McKown, 1952; 111-116). McKown, 1952; 111-116). Furthermore, in the Third Edition, the image was made more concrete by including a photograph of an actual high school voting scene (McKown, 1952: 101).

B. Changes in Student Participation Theory

Following the interests of this article, changes in student participation theory will be examined. This change can be examined from two perspectives: a) strengthening the administrative perspective and b) expanding the developmental perspective.

First, regarding a), as discussed in the previous section, the administrative and supervisory authority over extra-curricular activities was clarified for the Revised Edition. This revision also affects the student participation theory. This change is particularly evident in the discussion of paraphrasing student self-government as student participation. The Revised Edition added a "legal" reason in addition to the "educational" reason of students' "lack the experience" discussed in the previous chapter of this article. McKown said below.

The principal of the school is officially charged by the community, through the board of education; with the responsibility for the school, its equipment, and its students' welfare. The students are not so charged and

could not be, even if it were desirable, because they are minors. (McKown, 1937: 91)

As mentioned above, in the Revised Edition, McKown attempted to establish the limits of its function and role by fixing the authority of student participation as part of the hierarchical administration.

Continuing on b), in the first edition, McKown did not describe the perspective of growing a student participation organization as noted in the previous section of this article. The revised edition, on the other hand, added a section on "principle underlying student council organization" to clarify the perspective of developing student government organizations under the appropriate guidance and supervision of schools and teachers. For example, the item "participation should be introduced gradually" could be added to the above "principles". The concept of "start in a small way and grow big" was discussed. Specifically, the basis for participation was seen as a gradual expansion from a small unit, the home room, to the entire school. And the responsibilities of the students were seen as a gradual expansion from a small unit to the entire school.

In parallel with this concept of expansion under the guidance and supervision of teachers, the idea of a "school council" was also introduced, a change that can be considered to have occurred since the 1930s. McKown said below.

The school is composed of both teachers and students and if... the council should represent the entire school, then teachers and students should be elected to it from their respective groups... The council should represent a genuine and honest co-operative effort on the part of both the faculty and the student body. Perhaps when this ideal is attained the term "student council" will be replaced by the more accurate "school council." (McKown, 1937:98)

As mentioned above, McKown's theory of student participation not only anchors students in a vertical teacher-student relationship, but also envisions an organization that students and teachers create together. As discussed in the previous section, Fretwell's 1931 work had already discussed the "progressively" reconstruction of schools as a consequence of the development of student participation. McKown's "school council" was a more concrete idea by setting up a mechanism to promote such school reform.

4. Conclusion

The following section summarizes the results of the analysis of each section and provides a concluding discussion.

First, in chapter 2., we compared H.C. McKown's 1927 work with E.K. Fretwell's 1931 work to analyze the nature of 1920s extra-curricular activities theory. In this, it was shown that the theory of extra-curricular activities in the 1920s was a theory created by organizing the various practices of extra-curricular activities in schools. It was also shown that the keywords were "unification" as a whole, and that extra-curricular activities were positioned within a curriculum that unifies and integrates the entire school, and that "student participation" was proposed as a concept to unify all extra-curricular activities, and the principle of developing these activities step-by-step. Furthermore, the theory included the idea of progressively remaking the school itself by promoting these activities.

As discussed in chapter 3, these ideas were essentially continued after the 1930s. To re-structure the discussion in chapter 3 to a large extent, the development of the theory since the 1930s has had two directions. First, the "step-by-step theory" was deepened. Specifically, the principles of student participation have been made more enhancements, from small-scale participation based on homerooms to the formation of "school councils" composed of teachers and students, and the viewpoint of developing student participation organizations in a step-by-step manner as students grow has been made clearer. Furthermore, a step-by-step developmental history of extra-curricular activities was organized, and the characteristics of curricularized extra-curricular activities were clarified from a historical perspective. Thus, as the process of time-course change in extra-curricular activities was theorized, in the second direction, discussions on "concretizing" and "fixing" the scope, role, and content of extra-curricular activities deepened. Specifically, a large number of examples of activities were added, and the nature of extra-curricular activities as educational means positioned under school administration and supervision was fixed. The combination of these two directions has led to the development of a more sophisticated theory that discusses extra-curricular activities as an educational means. However, the combination of these directions placed extra-curricular activities only as an

educational means to be carried out under the guidance and supervision of teachers, and limited the content and scope of these activities to administrative authority. Therefore, it can be said that no so-called "political" activities were envisioned that would question the boundaries of administrative authority or the nature of that authority itself.

Future issues in this article can be organized in the following two ways. The first is the connection with the history of education during the Japanese Occupation. As I have discussed in previous articles, during the Occupation period in Japan, under the strong influence of American extra-curricular activities theory, curricular out-of-class activities, called "special-curricular activities" were organized (Inomata, 2021a; 2021b). In this process, the theories of Fretwell and McKown were directly referenced and translated, and almost the entirety of the theories examined in this article was accepted. However, only the concept of a "School Council" as proposed by McKown was not accepted. From the perspective of this history of reception, it is necessary to elucidate the nature of "special-curricular activities" in Japan.

Second, the issue is also raised from the perspective of the history of American education. As is well known, the progressive educational movement, of which extra-curricular activities movement was a part, was forced to retreat after the 1940s (Ravitch, 2001). This article refers to the arguments of the leading theorists of extra-curricular activities theory consistently since the 1920s, but how did theorists who did not take the position of the progressive educational movement view extra-curricular activities in schools? Further research is needed from those perspectives.

Notes

- 1) This article was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP22J15192, JP22KJ0977.
- 2) Fretwell remained a leading figure in the movement, serving as chairman of the Committee on Student Activities of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, which he was appointed to in 1939, and as preface to a special issue of the NASSP Bulletin in 1941 (Fretwell, 1941).

References

- Beale, J.R. (1983) *Elbert K. Fretwell and the Extra-Curricular Activity Movement: 1917-1931*. Kent State University Graduate School of Education Dissertation (unpublished).

- Department of the Interior Bureau of Education (1918) Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. *Bulletin*, No.35.
- Department of the Interior Bureau of Education (1929) *Bibliography of Research Studies in Education 1926-1927*. United States Government Printing Office.
- Fretwell, E.K. (1931) *Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Fretwell, E. K. (1941) Foreword. *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 25 (102), 5-7.
- Gutowski, T.W. (1988) Student Initiative and the Origins of the High School Extracurriculum. *History of Education Quarterly*, 28 (1)49-72.
- Ichimura, T. (1987) *The Founding Process of the 6-3-3 Plan in America* (in Japanese). Waseda University Press.
- Inomata, D. (2021a) A Study on Student Council Theory in Monbusho during Occupied Japan (in Japanese). *Bulletin of the Division of Basic Theories of Education, Graduate School of Education, The University of Tokyo*. 46:81-92.
- Inomata, D. (2021b) A Study on Plan of Student Government in the Occupation Army (in Japanese). *Annual Report of the Kanto Educational Research Society*, 47: 1-12.
- Inomata, D. (2022) Developing Methods of Teaching Citizenship using Extracurricular Activities in the U.S. at the Turn of the Twentieth Century (in Japanese). *Studies in the History of Education*, 65: 103-116.
- Inomata, D. (2023) A Study of the Establishment Process of Extra-Curricular Activities in the U.S. (in Japanese). *The Japanese Journal of Educational Research*, 90(2):248-261.
- Light, J.S. (2020) *States of Childhood*. MIT Press.
- McKown, H.C. (1927) *Extra-Curricular Activities*. The Macmillan Company.
- McKown, H.C. (1929) *School Club*. The Macmillan Company.
- McKown, H.C. (1931) *Commencement Activities*. The Macmillan Company.
- McKown, H.C. (1934) *Home Room Guidance*. The Macmillan Company.
- McKown, H.C. (1937) *Extra-Curricular Activities*. Revised Edition. The Macmillan Company.
- McKown, H.C. (1944) *The Student Council*. McGraw Hill Book Company.
- McKown, H.C. (1952) *Extra-Curricular Activities*. Third Edition. The Macmillan Company.
- Ravitch, D. (2001) *Left Back: A Century of Battles Over School Reform*. Simon & Schuster.
- Sugano, F. (1986) A Study of the Expansion of Urban Public School Functions during the American Progressive Era (in Japanese). *Studies in the History of Education*, 29: 150-168.

(Advisor: Professor Shigeo KODAMA)