

“An Entirely New Interest Has Been Taken by the School:”
Meanings, Logistics, Values, and Evaluation in the
American High School Extracurriculum, 1905-1935

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Christen Lynn Opsal

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Peter W. Demerath, Adviser

June 2014

© Christen L. Opsal 2014

Acknowledgements

Many people deserve thanks for their role in this dissertation:

Cryss Brunner, who got me in the EdPA door, and Peter Demerath, who got me out of it. Thank you both for treating me as a colleague.

The late Dick Nunneley, who gave me both the ideas to play with and the opportunity to play with them with students of my own, and whose effortless and thoughtful teaching and rigorous thinking will always be models for me.

My dissertation committee, Bob Poch, Karen Storm, and Fran Vavrus, who were demanding in the most encouraging, collegial, and helpful way possible.

The Bricklayers' Guild, my fellow Ph.D. students who were "putting their bricks in the wall of knowledge" at the same time I was: Monica Howell, Ann Mavis, Amy Maynard, Cindy Reich, and Jeni Snyder. And my "remote cohort," Bob Tornberg. Dissertating is fundamentally a solitary process, but it was helpful to know that we were laboring separately, together.

Professors Bill Cronon and Charles Cohen at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, who first affirmed my identity as a historian and a historical thinker.

Historians of education Sevan Terzian, Jonathan Zimmerman, Barry Franklin, and Tim Cain, who were helpful and/or encouraging in large and small ways along the way.

My friends and colleagues who actually wanted to hear about my dissertation, reminding me why I chose a topic that "normal people" would understand and be

interested in, including Rhonda Cady, Mary McEathron, Katy Prugh Ploehn, Angie Pohl, Sarah Klimenko Riedl, and Ericka Tucker.

Julie Ann Mountain, who, as an upperclassman at Park Center High School, advised this “incoming” [freshman] to get involved in as many extracurriculars as she could, and to assume leadership roles in them, because colleges would like that (future dissertation topics notwithstanding).

The North Suburban Concert Band and the handbell choir at Central Lutheran Church, who help me carry an extracurricular interest in music into adulthood and clear my head during the dissertation process. (This involvement mostly met my individual needs, but some “socializing” and “democratic mixing” went on there too.)

Mom, Dad, and Ry, who tolerated my unavailability and each supported me in their own ways.

The unusually long and cold winter of 2013-14, which provided an excellent excuse to stay inside and write.

Finally, this dissertation would not have been possible without the vast print and online holdings of the University of Minnesota Libraries.

Any errors, half-baked thoughts, and ill-supported claims that remain are my own.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my late Grandma Doris, who once said to me,
“I wish I would’ve been able to go to college.”

Abstract

This study uses educational writings from 1905-1935 (including sources discovered and analyzed using new digital technologies, such as HathiTrust digitization and full-text search) to describe the evolution of the terminology used to label the American high school extracurriculum during the early 20th century and the logistical arrangements under which it was carried out, elucidate the existence of the extracurricular values claimed by educators at the time, add contextual detail about the meaning and intentions behind those values, describe attempts to limit students' participation in these activities, and discuss contemporary concerns about the extent to which the desired values of extracurricular participation had been or could be attained.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	iv
List of Tables	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Rationale of the Study	1
Background on the High School Extracurriculum as a Formal School Concern	2
The Extracurriculum as an Entity	3
Review of the Secondary Historical Literature on the Extracurriculum	7
Extracurricular Values as Identified by Contemporary Sources	24
Research Questions	29
Sources and Methodology	30
Limitations of the Study	39
Organization of the Study	40
Chapter 2: The Extracurriculum: The Basics	42
The Extracurriculum Defined: Evolution of Terms and Meanings	42
The Extracurriculum Executed: Scheduling and Credit	51

Chapter 3: Societal-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum:	
“Training in Some Civic-Social-Moral Relationship”	74
The Extracurriculum and the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education	76
“Training in Some Civic-Social-Moral Relationship”: Introduction	83
Social-Civic-Moral Improvement Through Practice	84
The Extracurriculum as a “Social” Phenomenon	89
The Extracurriculum and Civic Aims	101
The Extracurriculum, Moral Education, and Character Development	111
The Social-Civic-Moral Extracurriculum and “Educationalizing” Social Problems	120
Chapter 4: Individual-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum:	
Meeting Students’ Needs	122
Accommodating and Improving the Individual Through Extracurriculars	122
The Extracurriculum and Recognition of Adolescent Nature	127
Chapter 5: School-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum:	
“Improved Discipline and School Spirit”	133
“Group Consciousness”: School Spirit/Morale and the Extracurriculum	133
School Discipline and the Extracurriculum	139

Chapter 6: The Perils of Over-Participation, and Potentially for Naught: Concerns About Extracurricular Participation and its Evaluation	143
“Undue Attention to These Activities”: Approaches to Limiting Extracurricular Participation	143
“Values Now Assumed, Rather Than Proved”: Calls for Evaluation of the Extracurriculum	153
Chapter 7: Conclusion	163
Significance of the Study	169
Implications for the Present	170
References	172
Appendices	181
Appendix A: Word Count of Sources, with Value Keywords Bolded	181
Appendix B: Periodicals Represented Among Sources	182
Appendix C: Authors of Sources and Their Professional Roles	187
Appendix D: The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (condensed)	191

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Table 1	6
<i>Extracurricular Activities as Reflected in Chapter Titles of Five Books on the Extracurriculum</i>	
Table 2	27
<i>Number of Writers Recognizing Each Value in Extra-Curricular Activities (Values mentioned three or more times in 40 writings.) (from Koos, 1926a, p. 11)</i>	
Table 3	33
<i>Professional Roles Represented Among Source Authors</i>	
Table 4	37
<i>The Extracurricular Value “Training in Some Civic-Moral-Social Relationship,” 1905-1935, as Reflected in Primary Source Titles, Secondary Sources, a Word Count of Primary Sources, and Koos’ (1926a) Tally</i>	
Table 5	39
<i>Other Extracurricular Values, 1905-1935, as Reflected in Primary Source Titles, Secondary Sources, a Word Count of Primary Sources, and Koos’ (1926a) Tally</i>	

Chapter 2: The Extracurriculum: The Basics

Table 6	45
<i>Extracurricular Terms from Article or Chapter Titles, In Order of Date of First Use</i>	
Table 7	53
<i>Meeting Times of Extra-Class Activities from a Survey of 145 Illinois High Schools, 1920-1921 (adapted from Belting, 1923, p. 265, Table 4—(I)—Classified Replies to Questions 5-26)</i>	
Table 8	55
<i>A Twenty-School-Day Schedule of Extra-Class Meetings Held During a First Period Activities Period, Painesville (Ohio) High School, 1927-1928 (adapted from Billett, 1928, p. 354: Program of Regular Extra-Class Meetings, First Period, 8:30-9:15)</i>	
Table 9	68
<i>Schools Offering Credit Toward Graduation for Extracurricular Participation, Based on Data from Four Surveys</i>	

Chapter One: Introduction

Rationale of the Study

The U.S. Department of Education's Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) defines extracurricular activities as "Activities, under the sponsorship or direction of a school, of the type for which participation generally is not required and credit generally is not awarded."¹ These logistical parameters around the American high school extracurriculum seem straightforward, but the reasons why we have (and whether to have) such activities in our high schools and what we want them to do for students are far less so. On one hand, we see school-sponsored after-school activities (i.e., teams, clubs, etc.) as a supplement to the "real" work of schools and therefore an easy target for budget cuts (e.g., Weskerna, 2012); on the other, we see them as a community resource important enough to share with homeschooled students, as 22 states do (Home School Legal Defense Association, 2013; Toporek, 2012). In another example of extra-curriculum-related ambiguity, we have given successive generations of high schoolers conflicting advice about the desired result of their extracurricular participation: at one time, they were supposed to make themselves "well-rounded" by participating in various kinds of extracurricular activities, but in recent years they have instead been encouraged to identify and pursue a singular "passion" within the extracurriculum (Edmonds, 2012).

In the present, have we strayed from a clear early vision for the extracurriculum, or carried on in a long tradition of an ill-defined, even self-contradictory extracurriculum? What was the extracurriculum originally meant to be and do? Was it the province of "fads and frills" that were only reluctantly the domain of the school, or was

¹ <http://www.eric.ed.gov/>

there thought to be something fundamentally educative (or at least beneficial) to having it as part of the school's purview? The secondary literature on early American extracurricular thought offers only fragmentary answers to such questions. Even though primary sources on the extracurriculum in the early 20th century—when it first became a formal concern of educators and schools—abound (e.g., book-length treatments from this period include Deam & Bear, 1928; Foster, 1925; Fretwell, 1931; Johnston & Davis, 1934; Jordan, 1928; Meyer, 1926; Terry, 1930), few historians of education have made more than a cursory foray into them, and thus no one can say with any certainty what the American high school extracurriculum was originally intended to be and do, as articulated by its original proponents.

Before I review the extant secondary literature on the early American high school extracurriculum, I first describe the genesis of the school-sponsored extracurriculum in American high schools and explain my focus on the extracurriculum as a whole.

Background on the High School Extracurriculum as a Formal School Concern

Extracurricular activities existed in American high schools in the late 19th century, but only as ad-hoc, informal, student-initiated activities such as sports teams and literary societies. The proposed study begins when the field of education's interest in taking over these activities and harnessing them to formal educational purposes begins: about 1910, as noted by contemporaries and historians alike. In 1931, noted educationist Ellwood P. Cubberley observed, "Largely within the past decade, and wholly within the past two, an entirely new interest in the extra-curricular activities of youth has been taken by the school" (in Fretwell, 1931, p. v). Historian Edward Krug elaborated on the depth of this "new interest," finding that from about 1910 on, extracurriculars "came to be regarded as

more than desirable adjuncts to the academic program, as of equal, or possibly even greater, importance” (1972, p. 136). In a very short span of time, schools took over these student activities and formalized them, assigning them faculty advisers or professional coaches and imposing accountability measures such as budget oversight and limitations on who could participate. The “extra” in “extracurriculum” had gone from meaning “outside of” the school’s domain to meaning “supplemental to” it.

These developments were fueled by the writing, teaching, and speaking of many educators. During the 1910s and 1920s, these academics and educational administrators developed courses; wrote textbooks, journal articles, and magazine articles; and compiled books of readings on the extracurriculum: its importance, its intended effects on students, how best to oversee its various constituent activities, etc. However, why these educators recommended that American schools embrace the extracurriculum and how they proposed that schools do so is not well understood, even among historians who have studied the extracurriculum.

Both the educators of the 1910s and 1920s and historians have treated the extracurriculum as a unitary educational phenomenon, not simply as a convenient label for a collection of unrelated activities. Below, I explain why this is so.

The Extracurriculum as an Entity

While “extracurricular” connotes school-sponsored after-school activities to modern ears, to past ones it meant that and more. A century ago, “extracurricular” meant anything besides the curriculum, so homerooms², school assemblies, and activities that

² “In its least cosmic aspects, the home room, usually a group of about 30 students, served as a device for checking attendance and making announcements,” writes Krug (1972, p. 138). But he noted (and educators from this time corroborated) that “the doctrine of the home room in the 1920s” went beyond this, the ideal being “that of a time and place for teaching personal-social matters, and other topics such as school spirit

went on during the lunch hour were considered “extracurriculars,” as were high school sororities and fraternities (i.e., secret societies³), which typically involved students from the same school but operated outside school control. In Table 1 below, the specific activities considered part of the extracurriculum, as reflected in chapter titles of books on the extracurriculum, are listed to show the range of activities typically considered extracurricular at this time.

and citizenship” (p. 138). Possible homeroom activities described in the sources used in this study included homeroom teachers providing guidance to students (Johnston, 1932; Threlkeld, 1931) and programming, such as “the study of manners” (Fretwell, 1931). Homerooms even sometimes had their own elected student officers (Draper & Corbally, 1932) and sent delegates to the School Council or school “house of representatives” (Elliott, 1930; Threlkeld, 1931). Threlkeld provided the most comprehensive description of the potential activities of homerooms:

The homeroom may have other activities than those confined to its civic nature. It may prepare assembly programs or programs for its own purposes, lead in drives, study problems of attendance, punctuality, scholarship, courtesy, good health, etc., and through these activities and appropriate committees provide the necessary experience that may lead to self-realization on the part of many pupils. The possibilities are limited only by the vision, ability, and desire of the homeroom teacher. (1931, p. 415)

³ These were outlawed in many states during the Progressive Era because they were seen as undemocratic and thus incompatible with the values of the school (Graebner, 1987).

Table 1

Extracurricular Activities as Reflected in Chapter Titles of Five Books Devoted to the Extracurriculum

Title (Author, publication date)	<i>Extra-Curricular Activities in the High School</i> (Foster, 1925)	<i>Extra-Curricular Activities in Junior and Senior High Schools</i> (Roemer & Allen, 1926)	<i>Extracurricular Activities</i> (McKown, 1927)	<i>Extra-Classroom Activities in Elementary and Secondary Schools</i> (Jordan, 1928)	<i>Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools</i> (Fretwell, 1931)
Activities/ chapter titles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clubs • Student participation in school control • The school assembly • Social functions in the high school • School publications • High school athletics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home room activities • Assemblies • Student participation in school control • Club activities • Citizenship through the morals and manners program • Citizenship through the thrift program • Citizenship through the health program • Athletics • High school publications • Scouts and scouting • Dramatics, pageants, and carnivals • High school fraternities and sororities • High school honor societies • Study halls • School library • Commencements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home-room organization and activities • The student council • The assembly • Clubs • Dramatics • Musical organizations and activities • Literary societies, debating, speaking • Secret societies • Student participation in control of study halls and libraries • Citizenship and school spirit • Manners and courtesy • Athletics • School trips and excursions • Parties • School publications • The school newspaper • The magazine • The yearbook • The handbook • Honor societies • Commencement • School banks and banking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entertainments and dramatics • The school assembly • Student government organizations • Music • Societies and clubs • Social organizations • Athletics • Military drill 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The home-room • Class organization • Pupil participation in government • Student councils • The assembly • Clubs • The school newspaper • The pupil's handbook • The school magazine • The annual • Commencement • Athletics

It may seem odd that American educators thought about the extracurriculum in the aggregate, given its beginnings as individual student-initiated activities. Terzian saw schools' creation of a formal unified extracurriculum as reflective of a Progressive-Era consolidating impulse among educational leaders: "School administrators centralized the various social and academic groups in a manner that resembled the Progressive reform of city governments and the bureaucratic restructuring of corporations which were occurring during these years" (2000, p. 152). School control of extracurriculars resulted in the division of the school into "curricular" and "extracurricular" domains, enabling school leaders to bring Progressive-Era managerial efficiency to bear on extracurriculars through policies that applied to all student activities, such as school oversight of activity budgets.

As already noted, the history of the extracurriculum has received relatively little treatment in the American history of education literature. The literature reviewed here is, to the best of my knowledge, the sum of all historical writing on the extracurriculum from 1910-1930—the two decades in which the extracurriculum came to prominence as an official component and function of the American high school. I have also included one source from slightly outside of my time period (Fass, 1989, on 1931-1947) in order to fully encompass the historiography of the school-controlled extracurriculum. Modell and Alexander note that by the 1930s and 1940s, "there was an established set of school-run, nonacademic activities" (1997, p. 3). Therefore, this study encompasses a period of great flux and development in school sponsorship of extracurricular activities, as they were in the process of becoming an established function of the American high school.

Review of the Secondary Historical Literature on the Extracurriculum

Below, I review the extant secondary literature on the original intended aims of the American extracurriculum, as articulated both historians and early 20th-century educators, in order to demonstrate the need for a fuller study of those aims. This literature takes two main forms: 1) discussions of the extracurriculum within histories of American K-12 or secondary education and 2) discussions of the extracurriculum as part of historical “case studies” of particular American high schools or school districts.⁴ Some of these sources focus on one main goal for the extracurriculum as part of a broader argument about that goal within American education in general or at a particular school (e.g., fostering “life adjustment”); others aim to provide a more comprehensive account of extracurricular purposes as part of a larger story about American education or a particular school. In either case, though, we have no way of assessing the relative importance or comprehensiveness of those purpose(s) in the absence of a synthesis of early extracurricular thought.

This literature review first presents the historical/secondary sources, then reviews sources from the 1920s and 1930s which themselves attempted to capture the purposes of the extracurriculum.

The original purposes of the extracurriculum as identified by historians.

Historians of education have identified a multitude of possible purposes for the extracurriculum as it was taken over by American schools beginning in the 1910s. Some

⁴ The sources on the history of extracurricular thought—i.e., those discussed here—come almost equally from both types. It is unusual in the history of education literature to have so comparatively many sources exploring the extracurricular practices of individual educational institutions and a corresponding lack of insight into the national extracurricular movement (e.g., leaders, related policy) (Cuban, 1993).

historians identified a single primary purpose for the extracurriculum; others named multiple.⁵ Some purposes appeared in multiple historical accounts of the extracurriculum:

- Civic purposes (Gutowski, 1978; Herbst, 1996; Hines, 1998; Rudy, 1965; Spring, 1972)
- Social purposes (Herbst, 1996; Hines, 1998; Krug, 1972; Rudy, 1965; Spring, 1972)
- School spirit (Herbst, 1996; Hines, 1998; Ryan, 2005; Terzian, 2000, 2004, 2005)
- Moral purposes (Gutowski, 1978; McClellan, 1999)
- Worthy use of leisure (Herbst, 1996; Stovey, 2011)
- Leadership (Herbst, 1996; Hines, 1998)

Many other purposes the extracurriculum was thought to fulfill in the 1910s and 1920s are mentioned by only one historian, including fostering learning by doing and educating the whole man (Spring, 1972); controlling student behavior (Gutowski, 1988); fostering assimilation (Fass, 1989); promoting a classless society, scholarship, health, and a good reputation for the school (Herbst, 1996); accommodating adolescent nature and improving school discipline (Hines, 1998); and promoting conformity, obedience, wholesome individual skills, and a cooperative spirit among students, and providing oversight of them (Kett, 1977). However, these historians' claims of one or more extracurricular purposes are supported by historical evidence of varying quality and are only sometimes presented in the context of the national extracurricular movement. These

⁵ The shift from single to multiple purposes took place roughly chronologically, consistent with a general methodological shift in the historiography of education in the late 20th century toward seeking multiple explanations for educational phenomena instead of a singular cause or simplistic generalization (Fass in Franklin et al., 1991; Kaestle, 1997).

sources on the extracurriculum by historians of education are presented chronologically below, with the exception of Kett, 1977, which is presented last, as its purview differs from that of the other sources.

“Life adjustment” (Rudy, 1965). In a chapter on “The ‘Adjusted’ Child” in his book *Schools in an Age of Mass Culture*, Rudy (1965) noted that “officially sponsored extracurricular activity” was the “most conspicuous instance of efforts to provide ‘life adjustment’” in the American high schools of the early 20th century (pp. 109–110). By this he meant that extracurriculars were to be part of a “socializing process” among racial, class, and social groups, providing not simply social mixing but a combination of democratic acculturation and general social well-roundedness. Rudy was dismayed by the ongoing emphasis on “life adjustment” as a goal of education in his own time (because it trumped academic rigor and encouraged conformity, dependence upon others, and an unhealthy need to “belong”) and sought its origins in early extracurriculars as well as other aspects of public education. Thus in this chapter, the bulk of which is devoted to the extracurriculum (especially athletics), he cited as many sources from the 1950s and 1960s as from the 1910s and 1920s. The book is thus more of an interpretive essay than a rigorous historical argument (Burgess, 1965).

Rudy’s source base on the early extracurriculum is sound, if sparse. He substantiated “life adjustment” as a goal of early extracurriculars by citing the seminal *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* report of 1918 (which never uses the term) and the writings of Elbert K. Fretwell, “godfather” of the extracurricular movement (Beale, 1983). According to Rudy, Fretwell saw the extracurriculum as a means to do many things, “adjusting to life” being implicit in several: “prepare the student for life in a

democracy, to make him increasingly self-directive, to teach cooperation, to increase the interest of the student in school, to ‘foster sentiments of law and order,’ and to develop special abilities” (p. 110, quoting Fretwell, 1931, pp. 4–7).

But on the whole, Rudy’s treatment of extracurriculars is meandering and self-contradictory and often loses its focus on the theme of life adjustment. For example, he noted that the emphasis on “life adjustment” in both the curriculum and extracurriculum was meant to prevent the development of a one-sided, intellectually-focused identity, but later observed approvingly that proponents of extracurriculars often cited intellectual growth as an effect of extracurricular participation. While the concept of “life adjustment” and some of its constituent parts resurface in other historians’ accounts of early extracurricular thought, Rudy’s chapter on extracurriculars tells us little about whether proponents of extracurriculars in the early 20th century defined “life adjustment” or saw it as the main goal of extracurriculars in the same way as Rudy himself did.

Social efficiency (Krug, 1972). Krug (1972) identified several purposes of extracurriculars: socialization, growth toward adult responsibilities, and social efficiency (i.e., fitting students for their presumed future jobs), with social efficiency paramount among these. He observed that in 1920s education, “school activities loomed large in the achievement of this [social efficiency] ideal” (p. 150), but then described more generic enthusiasm for the extracurriculum among American educators at this time, not evidence of how it was supposed to further schools’ pursuit of social efficiency (p. 150 ff.). Thus he may have been pigeonholing the extracurriculum into his preferred goal of secondary schooling in the absence of any evidence from the 1910s and 1920s to support that claim.

Creating social solidarity, fostering learning by doing, educating the whole man, creating an ideal democratic community (Spring, 1972). Spring (1972) identified the main purposes of the early school-controlled extracurriculum as “creating social solidarity” (p. 111), fostering “learning by doing and educating the whole man” (p. 112), and rendering the school “an ideal democratic community” (p. 113). His source base for these claims—including Dr. Thomas Briggs, John Dewey, and the Cardinal Principles—is sound. However, his interpretation of these sources differs from that of the other historians reviewed here.

As a radical revisionist historian, Spring belongs to a historiographical tradition that believes that “modern systems of mass schooling, far from being benevolent and progressive, had developed as devices of social control that were designed to maintain existing social and economic attitudes, structures, differences, and injustices” (McCulloch, 2011, p. 17). He thus interpreted these purposes (and the sources upon which he bases them) in a skeptical if not suspicious light, claiming that the ultimate ends of the extracurriculum were “to produce a unified, cooperative populace with common ideals and goals” (pp. 112–113) reflecting “a concept of democracy which included personal sacrifice to the state and a social organization which allowed for the most efficient use of individual talents” (p. 113). Spring points out how the extracurriculum could become an instrument of social control of a “cooperative populace” convinced of the need for “personal sacrifice.” (He feared the same effects of the curriculum.) While social control was certainly among the merits of the extracurriculum for its original proponents, they saw that goal as a benign one—i.e., they sought to use activities

adolescents enjoyed to manage their in-school behavior, instead of more punitive measures (see the section on Discipline in Chapter 5).

Character training (Gutowski, 1978); behavior control (Gutowski, 1988). In his dissertation and later article, Gutowski (1978, 1988) studied the high schools of Chicago Public Schools (CPS). The focus of his dissertation was “the high school as an adolescent-raising institution,” an interpretation that he explored using CPS high schools as a “case,” during the period 1856-1940. The article looked specifically at student initiative and the origins of extracurriculars in CPS high schools from 1880-1915.

In his dissertation, Gutowski identified character training as the main goal of extracurriculars. He never defined “character training” per se, but introduced the concept into his discussion of extracurriculars with the following questions: “What, then, was to be the new method of character education? How were pupils to be led to see their own best interests as identical to those of the community and the nation?” (1978, p. 218) These questions imply that he saw character training as a kind of civic-mindedness.

Gutowski’s claims about the extracurriculum are the most rigorously documented of any history reviewed here. For example, the footnote associated with his general claims about the extracurriculum described above occupies 40% of the page on which it appears and is comprised exclusively of primary sources. But curiously, given all that evidence for “character training” as the main purpose of the curriculum, in his later article based on the same material, Gutowski (1988) put aside the theme of “character training” (the phrase never even appears in the article) to focus on extracurriculars as a

means of controlling student behavior (e.g., using student government to get students to police themselves).⁶

Gutowski identified several related factors in education at this time that enabled the extracurriculum to function as a mechanism of student behavior control:

The features of organized student life that gave schoolmen the handle they needed [on student behavior] were, first, the evolution of a kind of school spirit that was rooted in interscholastic rivalry, second, the growth within each school of a more-or-less self-contained status system based primarily on participation in student activities, and third, chronic problems with things like money, equipment, and administration. (p. 60)

That is to say, because the extracurriculum had become a major influence in CPS student life, school administrators were able to use participation in it as leverage in their attempts to control student behavior. But unlike the thorough documentation of his claims about character training in his dissertation, Gutowski did not footnote this claim. He thus leaves unanswered the question of the extent to which school spirit, social status, and logistical support were important considerations only in the extracurriculum of CPS high schools or within the broader extracurricular movement as well. Gutowski's single goals of the extracurriculum are puzzling—"character training" aligns with the theme of "adolescent raising" in his dissertation (much as Fass's concern with assimilation cuts across the aspects of education she explores; see below), but the theme of "student behavior control," while evident at CPS, may or may not reflect a desideratum from the early decades of extracurricular thought.

⁶ While these themes are related, "character training" suggests the internal cultivation of positive habits and dispositions, while "behavior control" suggests external influences on behavior and deportment.

Assimilation (Fass, 1989). Fass (1989) identifies a single rationale for the extracurriculum—the assimilation of culturally-diverse students—in her chapter-length study of extracurriculars in New York City high schools in the 1930s and 1940s. Here, the single rationale is in the service of a book-length argument about schools’ behavior toward “minorities.” She observed that “The school was, of course, the great institution of assimilation” (p. 75) and found ample evidence for the extracurriculum as an assimilating influence among primary sources. For example, she quoted Charles R. Foster, associate superintendent of Pittsburgh schools and author of *Extra-Curricular Activities in the High School* (1925), on the logic of extracurricular assimilative efforts in an era of curricular and demographic differentiation:

Children differ in ability, aptitude, sex, probable career . . . social status, environment, traditions, habits of work, race, nationality, age, health, . . . and in numerous other ways such as to make it imperative that our secondary schools provide not only a differentiated curriculum . . . but also such forms of extracurricular activities as may utilize the socializing, integrating factors important in establishing a common basis of feelings, aspirations and ideals, essential in a democracy. (p. 76)

Using other sources—including a survey of high school principals about their reasons for sponsoring extracurriculars, conducted by Leonard V. Koos; Koos’ own thoughts on the extracurriculum; and the writings of Dr. Thomas Briggs of Teachers College—Fass noted several extracurricular and educational goals related to assimilation that were also in circulation at the time:

The themes underlying extracurricular planning thus defined the educational issues of the period—institutional expansion and a new view of schooling as

socialization, a democratic invocation of individual differences in aptitudes and talent, and the injunction that schooling assist in the re-creation of national community. (p. 76)

Fass also noted that some extracurricular thinkers saw extracurriculars as “the repository for the old common school ideal” (p. 77), meaning that extracurriculars should accommodate participation by all on equal grounds, regardless of social differences. She presented all of these goals for extracurriculars—socialization, individual self-actualization, democratic living, equal participation—as related to the overarching goal of assimilation. Fass’ conclusions about the role of assimilation and related aspirations in extracurricular planning are based on sound evidence, but may not encompass all major extracurricular purposes as expressed at this time.

Promoting a classless society; establishing bonds of friendship and common understanding; fostering school spirit, desirable recreational habits, and capacity for leadership, higher scholarship, and citizenship; helping develop finer social sensibilities, promoting health; and advertising the school’s good name. (Herbst, 1996). One historical source’s treatment of extracurricular purposes provides perhaps the most comprehensive list of extracurricular purposes of all, because that list comes practically verbatim from a survey of high schools conducted by George S. Counts in 1926. In addition to noting the Cardinal Principles’ interest in the extracurriculum helping to promote a classless society and “establish bonds of friendship and common understanding that can not be furnished by other agencies,” Herbst (1996) recounted an extensive and specific list of purposes from Counts’ survey: “[Principals and teachers] believed these activities fostered school spirit, desirable recreational habits, and capacity

for leadership, higher scholarship, and citizenship. They helped develop finer social sensibilities, promoted health, and advertised the school's good name" (pp. 154–155). However, Herbst did not describe how Counts generated this list of "the most important purposes which [the principal] and his teachers attempt to make extra-curriculum activities serve" (and neither did Counts in the document Herbst cites: Counts, 1926). This list provides a glimpse of the many extracurricular purposes in circulation in the 1910s and 1920s and which, save for Herbst, have been rarely and inconsistently noted in histories of education, high schools, and extracurriculars.

Relationship training, leadership, adolescent nature, discipline, school spirit, citizenship (Hines, 1998). Hines (1998) used Muncie [IN] Central High School's extracurriculum as a lens through which to view the transition in American society from "the traditional, 19th-century communal order and the modern, 20th-century, bureaucratic one" (p. 117). She found that the bureaucratic structures that schools put on the extracurriculum in the 1910s and 1920s facilitated or at least did not impede the cultivation of community among students and within the school.

According to Hines, Indiana educators in general and perhaps MCHS administrators in particular were well-versed in the intended purposes of the extracurriculum as described by contemporary writing:

Indiana educators were familiar with [the] literature [by extracurriculum experts published in the 1920s] and most frequently cited the 1926 *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* and handbooks by Charles Foster and Harold Meyer as useful guides in planning and directing an extracurricular program. (pp. 106–107)

In fact, the Indiana handbook for school administrators summarized such literature on the aims of secondary education and how the extracurriculum aligned with them. Such direct evidence of state and local administrators' awareness of the national extracurricular movement is rare in the literature on the history of extracurricular thought.

Extracurricular aims as understood by Indiana school administrators encompassed a long and detailed list, per Hines:

The extracurriculum would give training in civic, social, and moral relationships, help in the socialization process, prepare students for leadership, recognize adolescent nature, and improve discipline and school spirit. Inherently practical, the extracurriculum was seen as preparation for citizenship: the school, with its activities program, would model the social life of the community and, therefore, provide the best education for life beyond the classroom. (p. 106)

However, this extensive list of purposes comes almost verbatim from the "top 5" values identified by Leonard Koos in the 1926 NSSE Yearbook: 1) Training in some civic-social-moral relationship, 2) Recognition of adolescent nature, 3) Socialization, 4) Training for leadership, and 5) Improved discipline and school spirit (Koos, 1926a, p. 11). But these and other values identified by Koos (see "Koos, 1926a, 1927" subsection below) were based on poor methodology, thus raising the question of the quality of a list of extracurricular values often cited in both the past and the present.

Character (McClellan, 1999). In his history of moral education in America, B. Edward McClellan briefly discusses clubs outside the classroom (as well as clubs formed as part of a class) as a means of character development and moral education. In the early

20th century, clubs and groups were thought to be necessary venues for cultivating character, in contrast to 19th-century individualistic approaches to fostering virtue:

Unlike 19th-century educators who usually viewed the classroom as a collection of individuals, each of whom learned values through direct contact with textbook and teacher, these 20th-century reformers emphasized the importance of the group in the educational process. Impressed both by the importance of teamwork in modern forms of production and by new psychological theories about the formation of social instincts, these educators expected group interactions to play a vital role in developing character. (p. 51)

McClellan cites a 1939 issue of *The School Review*, a bulletin of the Nebraska Department of Public Instruction, and an annual report of Boston Public Schools to provide examples of character-forming extracurriculars at specific schools. “Especially in high schools, students across the country were encouraged to join clubs that were expected to make a significant contribution to the development of character,” he observes (p. 52). Because of his purview of character education, McClellan only discusses the extracurriculum insofar as it contributed to schools’ efforts to cultivate students’ character. However, he acknowledges other reasons for the existence of clubs, as well as their ubiquity: “By the mid-1920s . . . clubs *designed in part* to build character were virtually universal” (p. 55, emphasis added).

School spirit (Terzian, 2000, 2004, 2005). In his dissertation and subsequent articles, Terzian (2000, 2004, 2005) studied Ithaca [NY] High School from its founding in 1875 to 1941, including its extracurriculars. He found that the main goal of the extracurriculum at IHS was the cultivation of school spirit—defined as a combination of

student extracurricular participation, loyalty to the school, and school pride—an ideal that both school adults and students (in the student newspaper, *The Tattler*) encouraged almost continuously from the 1890s to the 1930s. School spirit at IHS had an elusive quality: there never seemed to be enough of it to satisfy either IHS faculty or the students.

But where had this concern with school spirit come from—how did IHS faculty and students know that ample school spirit was something a 20th-century comprehensive high school should strive for, and that the extracurriculum was a prime way to cultivate it? Terzian leaves these questions completely unexplored. The way he tells it, all of a sudden there was great and unremitting concern with school spirit in the pages of *The Tattler* and on the lips of the faculty. He did note that this local concern with school spirit was part of a national trend of compensation for an increasingly fragmented high school curriculum, similarly to how Fass/Foster described it (see above), but relied on secondary sources (i.e., Herbst, 1996; Spring, 1972) to support that claim. While Terzian provided ample evidence of concern with school spirit at IHS, it is difficult to assess whether that local situation reflected an awareness of school spirit as a goal of the extracurriculum per the national extracurricular movement in the absence of more support from writings from that movement.

In the context of a discussion of other schools attempting to use the extracurriculum to unify the student body, Terzian did cite one 1924 article from *The Educational Review* that shows how the extracurriculum was being used and thought of elsewhere. It describes one school's efforts to, in his words,

foster school spirit by encouraging all students to participate in various extracurricular activities, by minimizing divisions between the student body and

faculty, and by challenging students to learn about the rules and regulations of the school in the form of competitions. (2000, p. 194)

But the date and purview of this article show it to be a “case study” much like that of IHS itself—the story of one school’s efforts to foster school spirit—not a source describing general goals for the extracurriculum. It is possible that the two high schools independently developed the same rationale for their extracurriculars; Terzian did not offer any evidence to suggest that they both got the idea from the same national sources. While school spirit was clearly a preoccupation at IHS, the source of this aspiration is unclear, and other aspirations may well have been present within IHS extracurriculars, even if school spirit was the most obvious. Perhaps Terzian simply did not recognize other extracurricular goals in play at IHS because he did not know what other possible goals to look for. Instead, he seems to have been as focused on school spirit as the teachers and students at IHS.

School spirit (Ryan, 2005). Ryan (2005) examined the extracurriculum at Cleveland, Ohio’s Central and East Technical High Schools from 1890-1918 in order to explore “how [CHS and ETHS] students constructed⁷ their participation and engagement in high schooling” (p. 71). Specifically regarding the extracurriculum, Ryan’s central concern was “the interplay among gender, sex, spectatorship, school spirit, and their implications for the foundation of American nationalism” (p. 74). Ryan noted that fostering “school spirit”—defined as supporting school teams, publications, and events—was a major goal of extracurriculars from these two schools’ point of view. Students and

⁷ While social constructivism as a concept is certainly not unknown to the discipline of history, it is rare to see this kind of language re: meaning-discovery used in a historical context. Meaning-discovery is more often mentioned in the context of interview approaches with present-day informants, not extrapolation from historical documents.

faculty alike attempted to encourage school spirit through exhortations to boosterism, fundraising to support school teams, and encouragement to try out for a team. The rise of school spirit at CHS and ETHS during the late 19-teens, especially, was not random; the U.S. became involved in World War I, and “school spirit became the teenaged equivalent to patriotism” (p. 92).

In his literature review, Ryan discussed extracurricular primary sources such as the writings of Luther Halsey Gulick—an early proponent of physical education and recreation—and the Cardinal Principles, but the emphasis on “school spirit” in Cleveland’s high schools seemed to have originated only from the pages of CHS and ETHS student publications, not the wider extracurricular movement. Ryan noted that even a decade after schools had begun managing youth social activities in an attempt to foster “school spirit,” students were not completely sold on the idea of “school spirit,” but where did the CHS and ETHS teachers and administrators get the idea that it was even necessary? Like Terzian, he is silent on this point.

Worthy use of leisure (Stovey, 2011). The subject of Stovey’s (2011) dissertation was the small-town high school experience in the early 20th century, using Petersburg, Illinois and Viroqua, Wisconsin as “cases.” These sites were chosen because they were situated in the Midwest (“America’s midsection has frequently exemplified the problems, trends, and attitudes of the nation writ large,” p. 8) and because they had materials from 1960s oral history projects available.

Stovey sought to capture many aspects of the high school experience in this context, from administration to school-community relations to within-school matters such as teachers, students, and classes. The bulk of her chapter entitled “Student Matters” is

devoted to describing several extracurriculars: assembly, literary societies, basketball, and student-initiated clubs. As with the rest of the dissertation, this chapter is highly descriptive of practices at the focal schools and others, with only minimal interpretation or analysis. To the question of why the high schools in these communities had an extracurriculum at all, she says only that the schools meant them to be “a way of providing teens guidance in the use of leisure time,” per the *Cardinal Principles* report (p. 196). Stovey may have been completely unaware of any other sources on the extracurriculum from that period (although this seems unlikely, since William J. Reese, a noted historian of education, was her adviser), or she may have seen the Cardinal Principles’ vision for the extracurriculum as sufficient to explain the presence of the extracurriculars she described based on what her sources had to say about them.

Extracurricular purposes from the vantage point of adolescence in American society: Conformity, obedience, oversight, wholesome individual skills, a cooperative spirit (Kett, 1977). Unlike the other histories reviewed here, the purview of which was education in general, secondary education in particular, or the extracurriculum in a particular district or school, Kett (1977) was interested in “adolescence in America” over the past two centuries. This wider scope allowed him to situate the extracurriculum within societal currents (e.g., the rise of progressive politics, the rise of bureaucracy) to a much greater extent than the other historians reviewed here. (While histories of education certainly can and do situate themselves within wider societal currents, they confine themselves to the reach of the institution of formal education; focusing on a life stage can encompass much more.) He thus illustrated how the extracurriculum was an artifact of a certain time, not simply a product of the whims of certain educators.

Kett examined not only high school extracurriculars, but also college extracurriculars and Christian youth organizations, noting that, in the early 20th century, “youth organizations” in all three contexts were characterized by adult leadership, youth passivity, and insularity from adult affairs. According to Kett, the high school extracurriculum was meant to promote conformity and obedience and virtually destroy student autonomy (this latter goal a notable departure from collegiate extracurriculars, of which high school extracurriculars were otherwise imitative), as well as teach “both a mastery of wholesome individual skills and a cooperative spirit” (p. 187). Kett echoed Spring in identifying the social control function of extracurriculars. But Kett failed to mention any specific educational ends here—the goals he identified for the extracurriculum could be those of any youth organization, although he used education-based sources to generate them, citing not only Spring (1972) and Krug (1964) but many articles from *The School Review* and several books from the early 1900s.

Insight into the purposes of the high school extracurriculum is both lost and gained when viewed from the perspective of institutions for American youth. Because this study looks at extracurriculars from the perspective of those within the institution of education, it may not be able to contribute Kett-like insight into American high school extracurriculars as a societal phenomenon. However, Kett offers several purposes of the extracurriculum, seemingly direct from educators even if not framed by him in specifically educational terms, to add to our growing list of extracurricular purposes. A reexamination of his sources from an education-centered point of view should provide valuable contributions to our understanding of how educators perceived the purposes of the extracurriculum.

Literature review: Conclusion. The historians of education whose work on the extracurriculum is described above identified a range of possible extracurricular purposes, substantiating them with evidence of varying quality. While some of them do rely heavily on sources from the educational literature of the 1910s and 1920s to make their claims, none of them seems to have carried out a thorough survey of the field to assess the magnitude of those purposes or plumb their meanings. Some educators from the 1920s and 1930s did attempt this, as described below, but their attempts had their own methodological weaknesses.

Extracurricular Values as Identified by Contemporary Sources

In addition to retrospective perspectives on the early extracurriculum from historians of education, several sources constitute contemporary “literature reviews” of extracurricular values. However, they each have their own shortcomings that limit the usability of their findings.

Koos, 1926a, 1927. As noted above, Volume II of the *25th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* was devoted to the topic of “Extra-curricular Activities.” Leonard V. Koos, professor of secondary education at the University of Minnesota, contributed Chapter 2: Analysis of the General Literature on Extracurricular Activities, which he introduced as “an attempt to capitalize the opinions and experiences reported in a wide array of recent literature appearing for the most part in educational periodicals, but also to some extent as chapters in books on education” (1926a, p. 9). Koos consulted 40 sources in this attempt, of which 10 concerned junior high schools. These sources came from 38 authors, mostly

men and women in positions of administrative responsibility in junior, senior, and four-year high schools. There is also a smaller representation of those not in actual control of affairs in secondary schools, although in almost all cases they maintain contact with such schools. (1926a, p. 9)

However, Koos apologizes that “Owing to limitations of space, the bibliography of sources is not given here” (1926a, p. 9), so the exact nature of his sources and the extent to which they overlap with mine is unknown.

The “opinions and experiences” about the extracurriculum Koos sought fell under 4 general headings: “(1) the values ascribed to extra-curricular activities, (2) obstacles to the achievement of these values, (3) the principles to be followed in organizing and administering the activities, [and] (4) the types of activities found” (1926a, p. 9). He identified 25 values ascribed to extra-curricular activities mentioned in three or more of his sources (see list below), which he sorted into two general groups: civic-social-moral values (denoted with an *) and other values.⁸ Koos notes the difficulty inherent in this kind of sorting, acknowledging the “great variation in modes of statement encountered” (p. 10), but he does not describe his methodology, so it is unclear which values he viewed as related and combined to comprise categories, and how he determined his category names. Many of Koos’ values also surfaced in my more extensive analysis and are described more fully in my Findings; they are therefore described only briefly below.

⁸ This paper adopts the term “values”, à la Koos, to indicate what various sources, past and present, have referred to as extracurricular purposes, aims, goals, ideals, etc.

Table 2

Number of Writers Recognizing Each Value in Extra-Curricular Activities
(Values mentioned three or more times in 40 writings.) (from Koos, 1926a, p. 11)

	Value	Number of Writers Recognizing This Value
1	Training in some civic-social-moral relationship	37**
2	Recognition of adolescent nature	24
3	Socialization*	23**
4	Training for leadership*	22
5	Improved discipline and school spirit*	21
6	Training for social cooperation*	19**
7	Actual experience in group life*	17**
8	Training for citizenship in a democracy*	16**
9	Training for recreation and esthetic participation	15
10	Training for ethical living*	11**
11	Health	10
12	Recognition of interests and ambitions	10
13	Improved scholarship	8
14	Intellectual development	7
15	Relation of school and community	7
16	Constructive influence on instruction	6
17	Exploration	5
18	Training for worthy home membership*	4
19	Vocational training	4
20	Training in business methods	4
21	Retention in school	4
22	Discharge of superabundant energies	4
23	Worthwhile friendships*	3
24	Training in parliamentary usage*	3
25	Training in fundamental processes	3

** denotes values combined by Rugg, 1930 into his “Training in civic-social-moral relationships implying socialization, co-operation, actual experience in group life, citizenship education, ethical training” category.

Koos only indirectly defined “civic-social-moral,” through the values he grouped within it. Note that when Koos and his contemporaries (e.g., John Dewey) used the term “socialization,” they meant it not as we would say students “socialize” today (i.e., that they “associate or mingle sociably with others” [dictionary.com]) but rather that they learned to function as a member of a group, as reflected in the first dictionary definition

for “socialize”: “to make social; make fit for life in companionship with others” [dictionary.com]).

“Social” values identified by Koos included “social cooperation,” “experience in group life,” “worthy home membership,” and “school spirit,” all of which have to do with developing one’s identity as the member of a group. Of course, “training for citizenship” represents another way in which to be “socialized,” to a civic end, a goal also reached by providing “training in parliamentary usage” (i.e., parliamentary procedure). Being socialized morally was another notable sub-type of socialization—that is, having right or ethical relationships with others. Koos and his contemporaries surely would have seen friendships and leader-follower relationships as “social” relationships that should be carried out conscientiously and morally.

Some of Koos’ non-civic-social-moral values are vague or unfamiliar. “Aesthetic participation” meant participating in or being appreciative of aesthetic activities such as art and music. “Business methods” meant primarily basic accounting—keeping the books for individual extracurricular activities. “Recognition of interests and ambitions” meant schools having extracurriculars in order to provide an outlet for individuals’ unique interests and ambitions; “exploration” meant getting involved in extracurriculars as a way to identify one’s interests and ambitions. The “adolescent nature” that schools aimed to recognize through extracurriculars was assumed to be highly social, including impulses and energies that required oversight. “Fundamental processes” is the term used in the *Cardinal Principles* report for “reading, writing, arithmetical computations, and the elements of oral and written expression.”

Koos reprinted his “values” findings practically verbatim in a chapter on “Allied Activities” in his 1927 book, *The American Secondary School* (Koos, 1927). That chapter included a reference list, but one containing only 31 sources, not the 40 upon which Koos based his original compilation of extracurricular values.

Koos accurately identified many extracurricular values that resurface in my analysis of more sources and sources spanning a larger time period, but he was clearly speaking to his contemporaries in that he failed to explicate the meaning of his categories, describe his methodology, or provide examples of any of the values he identified.

Rugg, 1930. In 1930, Colorado State Teachers College professor Earle Rugg published a volume entitled *Summary of Investigations Relating to Extra-Curricular Activities*. The book was comprised of 18 chapters, each of which summarized a “graduate thesis” Rugg had supervised in the field of extra-curricular activities. Rugg wrote the Introduction to the volume, entitled “General Philosophy and Practice [Digest of Literature].” In it, he rearranged Koos’ values in order of frequency, combining six civic-social-moral into an item entitled: “Training in civic-social-moral relationships implying socialization, co-operation, actual experience in group life, citizenship education, ethical training” with a reported frequency of 123 (which vastly overreports the civic-social-moral category, as it simply combines the tallies for these six values, thus double- and triple-counting sources that mentioned two or three of these values). He also checked some of “the systematic books” on the extracurriculum (by which he may have meant the manuals on the extracurriculum, such as Wilds, 1926) against Koos’ list and came up with two more values: 1) self-expression, and 2) provision for cultivating special

abilities and interests of pupils (which sounds strikingly similar to Koos' "recognition of interests and ambition of pupils").

Analyzing his newly-reordered list of Koos' values, Rugg made several observations, the first about the "dominance" of social values, the second about the conspicuous presence of the adolescent among the values (e.g., recognition of adolescent nature, exploration) and the absence of the younger child, despite compelling reasons for elementary children to also have extracurriculars. Finally, Rugg notes several desired ends for "school work" also being claimed for extracurriculars: improved discipline, improved scholarship, relation of school and community, and retention in school.

Rugg does not add any sources to Koos' list of values. His reordering of the values does not add substantially to our understanding of their prevalence among the sources Koos examined. But he did situate the impulse to codify extracurricular values in terms of the ongoing debate about the worth of extracurriculars and, as such, recognized the impulse as a necessary one:

These values or claims are in reality assumptions. They are entitled to serious consideration as theoretical but improved values. In fact, they are a necessary prelude or first step in any scientific justification of the tremendous amount of attention these activities now receive in the school program. (p. 7)

Like Koos, Rugg republished his findings on extracurricular values in another publication—a 1931 article published in the *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*.

Research Questions

Given the findings and shortcomings of the historical and contemporary literature on extracurricular values reviewed above, the main research question for this study is:

- What were the values educators used to rationalize the existence of school-controlled extracurricular activities in American high schools during the 1910s and 1920s? What perspectives, skills, attitudes, and virtues did educators hope students would gain from participating in these activities?

To establish the context in which students were supposed to experience these values, Chapter 2 describes both how these activities were labeled and described during this time period, as well as who was expected to participate and the logistical structures set up during this time to facilitate and reward that participation.

Sources and Methodology

I sought sources that met several criteria: they were published between 1905 (to anticipate the time of prime concern with extracurriculars, i.e., the 1910s and 1920s, per Cubberley) and 1935 (to account for publication delays of sources written in the late 1920s); they concerned American schools; they concerned high school extracurriculars (i.e., not college, junior high, or elementary school extracurriculars); they discussed the extracurriculum as a whole, not (or not exclusively) specific extracurricular activities or kinds of activities (e.g., student government, athletics); and they mentioned, directly or indirectly, the goals or aims of having such activities.

These sources took the form of magazine articles, journal articles, reports, books, and other manuscripts, with the exception of theses and dissertations, which I omitted due to concerns that they would not have been widely available and thus would not have contributed to the national “conversation” on the extracurriculum. Appendix B provides basic information on the scope and audience of the magazines and journals where available. These fell into three major categories: publications of professional associations,

publications of educational entities such as normal schools, and other publications for teachers or administrators. Except in one case, the professional associations were those of educators; that a substantive article about the extracurriculum were also accepted for publication by the American Academy of Political and Social Science is evidence of awareness of these activities beyond educational circles. Books discussing extracurricular values included those concerned with education/schools, high schools generally, high school administration/supervision, and other related subjects (e.g., *Vocational and Moral Guidance, The Practice of Citizenship*), as well as extracurricular activities specifically.

In addition to my own searching and scanning of digital and print sources, I consulted numerous bibliographies (Fretwell, 1923; McCabe & Jessen, 1934; Odell & Blough, 1926; Pierce, 1923; Sturtevant & Hayes, 1928; Terry, 1930, February 1932, September 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936), a collection of readings on the extracurriculum (Roemer & Allen, 1929), government reference publications (the *Current Educational Publications* and *Bibliography of Research Studies in Education* series from the U.S. Bureau of Education), and the notes/citations and reference lists of the sources I already had. These latter were usually sparse, since the kinds of articles and books I was interested in were typically written for teachers and administrators, not scholars. I also examined the primary sources used by the historians cited above.

Source authors. I limited my sources to those authored by people professionally affiliated with K-12 education in the United States. See Table 3 below for a summary of the professional roles represented among those authors. (See also Appendix C, which lists the authors by name and their individual professional roles.)

Table 3
Professional Roles Represented Among Source Authors

Postsecondary	
Dean, Department/College/School of Education or Normal School	4
Faculty of education	20
Faculty of secondary education	9
Principal of university-affiliated laboratory high school ⁹	2
K-12	
Superintendent or Assistant/Associate Superintendent	8
Principal or Vice/Assistant Principal	27
Advisor/Dean of Girls	2
Named as being in charge of their school's extracurricular activities	2
High school teacher (including department heads)	3
Affiliated with a high school (role unspecified)	12
Other	
Staff of state education agency	2
High school visitor/inspector/supervisor for university or state education agency	4
Office-holder with education professional association (National Vocational Guidance Association, National Education Association)	2

Note: These roles do not sum to the total number of sources, since some authors had more than one role (either serially or simultaneously). Authors in a unique role included one graduate student, a director of their university's bureau of educational research, an associate in a college of education, and a city director of vocational guidance.

Restricting my sources to those written by people directly involved in education eliminated only a few sources, such as those by authors who were non-education faculty members. While I refined my sources by author simply to focus my findings on the ideas circulating among educators at this time, limiting my authors in this way also aligns my source base with a shift in the 19-teens in the base of power in the field of education, from boards of education and academics in fields other than education to people closely involved in the actual work of educating children and educating those who educated

⁹ A 1926 standard adopted by the American Association of Teachers Colleges required normal schools to have laboratory schools—"Each teachers college shall maintain a training school under its own control as a part of its organization, as a laboratory school, for purposes of observation, demonstration, and supervised teaching on the part of students"—although it also stated that a local school system could satisfy this requirement with ample control and supervision by the college to ensure that these basic functions were realized (AATC Yearbook for 1926, p. 11, in Williams, 1942, p. 12).

children, as illustrated by the composition of the group of people who wrote the *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* report (1918):

Cardinal Principles was an assertion that educational professionals, now largely composed of faculty in schools and colleges of education, their graduates, and allies in school administration, should play a leading role in [curriculum] planning, rather than either faculty representing other parts of universities or lay boards of education. (Angus & Mirel, 1999, p. 16)

Based on Spring (1972)'s declaration of the early-20th-century extracurricular movement as an "educational cult" (p. 111), I had expected to find a relatively small and insular group of authors represented among my sources. Instead, 90 authors were represented among my final set of 112 sources. Of course, this is not to say that a group this size could not also be cult-like, or that the sheer volume of writing on the extracurriculum is not itself evidence of the "cultishness" of these ideas, only that this large group of authors seems to provide evidence of the ordinariness and variety of extant extracurricular thought, not a narrow, strict, or "fringe" set of ideas in circulation.

Source management and analysis. My sources came in three formats: digital text PDFs of articles from JStor, digital text of articles and books from HathiTrust Digital Library (a web site aggregating scanned PDFs from "major research institutions and university libraries,"¹⁰ rendered as text by HathiTrust using Google Optical Character Recognition [OCR] scanning), and print copies of articles and books not available online due to copyright restrictions or other reasons.¹¹

¹⁰ <http://www.hathitrust.org/about>

¹¹ The one exception to these three source formats was *Teachers College Record*, which is available online as web text for an inexpensive annual subscription.

The time period of this study (1905-1935) posed an unanticipated consideration regarding copyright. As summarized on HathiTrust, “Volumes that are published in the U.S. prior to 1923 . . . as well as U.S. federal government documents are treated as public domain.”¹² That is to say, this copyright cutoff bifurcated my time period into a period in which sources were available digitally (1905-1922) and one in which they were only available in print (if they were not available in JStor) (1923-1935). I therefore had to consult hard copies of post-1923 journal volumes and books published in 1923 and later. These sources I scanned to capture their text digitally.

I searched originally-digital sources (i.e., the journals housed in HathiTrust and JStor) for a series of terms and phrases that surfaced among the initial sources I found, including extraclass, extracurricular, and extracurriculum (including both with a hyphen and without); school activities (a term that sometimes means the extracurriculum, and sometimes means all the generic activities of a school), school clubs, school organizations, social activities, student activities, student clubs, and student organizations. In the indexes of print sources, I looked for terms including activities; clubs; extra-class/-curricular/-curriculum; high school; organizations; school, secondary; school activities/clubs/organizations; secondary school; and student activities/clubs/organizations.

My scanning meant that all of my sources were rendered in digital format and thus could be searched by Mendeley, the source-and-reference-management software I used to store and organize my sources. While Mendeley’s search function is basic, searching my sources by keywords suggested by the contemporary and current literature (i.e., that reviewed above) and my own observation helped both to generally confirm or

¹² <http://www.hathitrust.org/copyright>

deny the importance of themes or ideas within my sources, and to help me easily relocate the specific sources that discussed those themes and ideas.

However, my process of identifying themes in extracurricular values extended far beyond the limited capacities of Mendeley. My final list of values was generated based on their representation among 1) the values reflected in the titles of my sources, 2) their prevalence in a word count of all my sources (conducted via NVivo; see Appendix A for a list of the 100 most frequent words occurring in the sources), 3) their representation among Koos' list of values, and 4) their mention by the secondary sources reviewed above (see Tables 4 and 5 below). This process of triangulation among primary and secondary sources confirmed the values Koos labeled "Training in some civic-social-moral relationship," "Recognition of adolescent nature," "Recognition of interests and ambitions," and "Improved discipline and school spirit," as well as the overwhelming presence of Koos' civic-social-moral cluster in extracurricular thought, since it surfaced in all four types of theme-sources; the remaining values surfaced in two or more.

These values clustered into three broad units of analysis: "Training in some civic-social-moral relationship" reflects the extracurriculum attempting to meet perceived *societal* needs regarding interpersonal relations; "Recognition of adolescent nature" and "Recognition of interests and ambitions" reflect the extracurriculum attempting to meet perceived *individual* needs, both developmentally and personally; and "Improved discipline and school spirit" reflects the extracurriculum attempting to meet perceived *school* needs regarding student conduct and school atmosphere. Findings on these values are organized into chapters according to their unit of analysis: Chapter Three is devoted to societal needs, Chapter Four to individual needs, and Chapter Five to school needs.

Table 4

The Extracurricular Value "Training in Some Civic-Moral-Social Relationship," 1905-1935, as Reflected in Primary Source Titles, Secondary Sources, a Word Count of Primary Sources, and Koos' (1926a) Tally

Findings Chapter	Chapter 3: Societal-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum: "Training in Some Civic-Social-Moral Relationship"		
Value	Social	Civic	Moral
Sources about extracurriculars specifically	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social activities in the high school (Davis, 1913); The administration of the social activities of high school students (---, 1916) • Social training through school group activities (King, 1916) • The socialization of the six-year high school through the organization of the student activities (Fowler, 1921) • The social aim of the extra-curricula activities (Jones, 1924) • The social basis of extra-curricular activities (Holch, 1926) • Socializing the pupil through extra-curricular activities (Deam & Bear, 1928) • Promoting student life through extracurricular organizations (Elliott, 1930) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization of extra-curricular activities as a device for training in citizenship (Wiley, 1925) • Democratizing the extracurricular program (Johnston, 1932) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moral education through school activities (Johnson, 1912) • The growth of character through participation in extra-curriculum activities (Paul, 1921); Student organizations and the development of character (---, 1922)
Sources about education or high schools with significant attention to extracurriculars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social ethics in high school life (Morrison, 1905) • The social organization of the high school (Johnson, 1909); Methods of social training in high schools (---, 1913); Social and extra classroom problems of the co-educational high school (---, 1924) • The social side of high school life (McLinn, 1911) • Organization of the social life of the high school (Eaton, 1918) • A social program for secondary schools (North, 1918) • The need of a constructive social program for the high school (Pound, 1918); Cooperation of patrons in solving the problems of social life in the high school (---, 1919); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democracy's high school (Lewis, 1914) • What are the opportunities before the high schools of the country in training men for public service and for efficient citizenship? (Gruenberg, 1917) • Citizenship and the high school (Davis, 1921) • The practice of citizenship (Ashley, 1922) • Student citizenship at the Senn High School (Sleezer, 1924) • Viewpoints in civic education (Shiels, 1925) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social ethics in high school life (Morrison, 1905) • Vocational and moral guidance (Davis, 1914) • Moral values in secondary education (Neumann, 1918) • The present interest in character education

<i>Findings Chapter</i>	Chapter 3: Societal-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum: “Training in Some Civic-Social-Moral Relationship”		
Value	Social	Civic	Moral
	Social reconstruction in the high school (---, 1921) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An experiment in socialization (Roberts, 1918) • The social organization of a high school (Fowler, 1920) • Social guidance in Cleveland High Schools (1924) • Social equipment of the high-school student (Dargan, 1927) 		(Golightly, 1927) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education for character in secondary schools (Adams, 1928)
Frequency of related terms among top 100 words from all sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social (4th most frequent) • Group (26th); Groups (95th) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizenship (65th) • Civic (75th) 	Character (73 rd)
Koos' tally of values (values represented in 30% or more of his sources reviewed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training in some civic-social-moral relationship (37/40) • Socialization (23/40) • Training for social cooperation (19/40) • Actual experience in group life (17/40) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training in some civic-social-moral relationship (37/40) • Training for citizenship in a democracy (16/40) 	Training in some civic-social-moral relationship (37/40)
Secondary sources acknowledging this theme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herbst, 1996 • Hines, 1998 • Krug, 1972 • Rudy, 1965 • Spring, 1972 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gutowski, 1978 • Herbst, 1996 • Hines, 1998 • Rudy, 1965 • Spring, 1972 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gutowski, 1978 • McClellan, 1999

Table 5

Other Extracurricular Values, 1905-1935, as Reflected in Primary Source Titles, Secondary Sources, a Word Count of Primary Sources, and Koos' (1926a) Tally

Chapter Name	Chapter 4: Individual-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum: Meeting Students' Needs		Chapter 5: School-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum: "Improved Discipline and School Spirit"	
Theme	<i>Accommodating individual differences</i>	<i>Meeting adolescent needs</i>	<i>Improved school morale and spirit</i>	<i>Improved school discipline</i>
Sources about extracurriculars specifically	A program of student activities and the psychological problem of individual differences (Murray, 1931)	Student activities as a means of providing for adolescent needs (Rugg, 1931)		
Sources about education or high schools with significant attention to extracurriculars		Adolescence and high-school problems (Pringle, 1922)	School morale (McDaniel, 1919)	Constructive school discipline (Smith, 1924)
Frequency of related terms among top 100 words from all sources	Individual (48 th)		Spirit (90 th)	
Koos' tally of values (values represented in 30% or more of his sources reviewed)	<i>Recognition of interests and ambitions (10/40)</i> ¹³	Recognition of adolescent nature (24/40)	Improved discipline and school spirit (21/40)	
Secondary sources acknowledging this theme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kett, 1977 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hines, 1998 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herbst, 1996 • Hines, 1998 • Ryan, 2005 • Terzian, 2000, 2004, 2005 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gutowski, 1988 • Hines, 1998

¹³ "Recognition of interests and ambitions" was not among Koos' top values, but I included Koos' findings on it here since it had already earned a place in this list based on other sources.

My uses of technology, while basic, represent a unique methodological contribution to the scholarship on the extracurriculum. Many educators past and present have claimed to have captured the various purposes of the early high school extracurriculum. While much can be gleaned at a glance from contemporary sources, especially those which themselves attempt to encapsulate the field, my basic compilations and counts provide more solid evidence of the existence of those themes.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited by the nature of its source documents and the nature of historical research itself. First, the extracurricular values and practices described in published works may not describe what actually occurred “on the ground.” The kinds of historical sources I am using—published accounts, usually outlining someone’s vision for the extracurriculum, not describing actual extracurricular practices—can tell us nothing more than what was *intended to happen*, instead of indicating what might have *actually happened*. However, I contend that even those intentions provide a valuable and heretofore unexplored window on American secondary education in the early 20th century, even if they raise questions for further research about the extent to which those expressed values were realized in practice.

In addition, my collection of sources is wide but not comprehensive; it is possible that a new value theme or other important extracurricular detail might have surfaced given an even larger pool of sources. Finally, by definition, this study does not examine specific extracurricular activities. Certainly, the values sought (and potentially attained) could and did vary by individual activity.

Organization of the Study

Chapter Two describes several key logistical “basics” of the extracurriculum: the terminology used to describe it, the time of day activities met, whether credit toward graduation was awarded, and whether participation was compulsory. Chapters Three, Four, and Five describe various extracurricular values:

- Chapter Three: societal-level intended values: “Training in some civic-social-moral relationship,”
- Chapter Four: individual-level intended values having to do with meeting students’ needs, and
- Chapter Five: the school-level intended values of “Improved discipline and school spirit.”

Chapter Six illustrates two manifestations of concern among educators about the extracurriculum at this time: the need for policies to limit participation, and the question of evaluation of the attainment of the desired extracurricular values.

Broadly speaking, far from representing a monolithic “cult” of extracurricular zeal, ambivalence about the extracurriculum is as evident among my findings as is enthusiasm for it. Enthusiasm is evident in the volume of writing on the extracurriculum at this time, the numerous claims that the extracurriculum exemplified this or that value, the use of the extracurriculum to address larger social problems, and logistical attempts to provide all students with access to these activities. In fact, some educators of this time felt that the extracurriculum was the perfect embodiment of their vision for the comprehensive high school, better even than the curriculum. But even so, they were ambivalent about the extracurriculum, and expressed concerns about the pitfalls of

various extracurricular values and appropriate levels of teacher supervision, disagreed over whether extracurricular participation was primarily for a more well-lived present or preparation for the future, and attempted to limit students' participation in these activities. As the school function perhaps best reflecting the ideals of American high school education in the 1910s and 1920s, these activities had to be carefully conceived and managed so that their desired values could be attained.

Chapter Two: The Extracurriculum: The Basics

This study is primarily concerned with the values American high school students were to derive from participation in extracurricular activities in the 1910s and 1920s, as a window on the educational ideals of this time. However, those benefits are better understood when seen in their context, including what those activities were called and how those labels and their meanings changed over time, and how the extracurriculum was carried out logistically, including the time of day activities met and whether or not credit was awarded for participation. This chapter thus traces the definitional and logistical codification of the school-sponsored extracurriculum in its early decades.

The Extracurriculum Defined: Evolution of Terms and Meanings

The ever-expanding vocabulary of modern education has coined in recent years the term, Extra-Curriculum Activities. Though the practices defined by the title have existed as long as educational institutions have had their being, only in comparatively recent years have educators labored ardently to label such activities. (Houston, 1930, p. 282)

As with any new phenomenon, the extracurriculum experienced a proliferation of the terms used to describe it before common vocabulary became accepted.

Terms from source titles. Table 6 below shows the terms used for the extracurriculum among the sources that mentioned it in their article or chapter titles, presented in order of date at which they first appear. The terms in the table are those taken from source titles only and thus reflect the use of a single term by each author (i.e., with the exception of the terms in the table including the word “and” in their names, no authors used more than one term for the extracurriculum in their titles, although some used different terms in the titles of different articles); a reckoning of all terms used by

authors within the text of the sources would certainly be much larger due to many authors using multiple terms interchangeably in their text. However, authors (or their editors) would probably have used the most generic or widely known term (or the term the journal preferred) in their titles, so that others interested in the topic would notice the article or chapter in the table of contents or find it in the index.

Table 6

Extracurricular Terms from Article or Chapter Titles, In Order of Date of First Use

School organizations	Keller, 1905; Hollister, 1909
School activities	Lasher, 1910; Johnson, 1912
Student organizations	Cloyd, 1911; Paul, 1922; Terry, 1928
Extra-curricular activities	Froula, 1915; Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction, 1922; Belting, 1923; Hobson, 1923; Winner, 1923; Cleveland Teachers' Federation, 1924; Paul, 1924; Foster, 1925; Fretwell, 1925; Jones, 1925; Lamar, 1925; Wiley, 1925; Extra-curricular activities, 1925; Holch, 1926; Meyer, 1926; Roemer & Allen, 1926; Wilds, 1926; Douglass, 1927; Deam & Bear, 1928; Monroe & Weber, 1928; Spaulding, 1929; Rugg, 1930; Fretwell, 1931; Eaton, 1935
Student activities	Rynearson, 1917; Fowler, 1921; Johnson, 1921; Holch, 1925a, 1925b; Cox, 1930a, 1930b; Murray, 1931; Rugg, 1931; McKown, 1932
School group activities	King, 1916
Pupil activities	Neumann, 1918
Extra-curriculum activities	Steeper, 1919; Paul, 1921; Terry, 1925; Counts, 1926; Dodson, 1929; Houston, 1930
Student organization	Ashley, 1922
Extra curricula activities	Extra curricula activities, 1922; Skinner, 1925
Extra-curricula activities	Jones, 1924; Barton, 1925
Extra-classroom activities	Johnson, 1925; Jordan, 1928
Semicurricular and extracurricular activities	Miller & Hargreaves, 1925
Co-curricular activities	Jones, 1926
Allied activities	Koos, 1927
Extracurricular activities	McKown, 1927; Umstead & Thompson, 1929; Fretwell, 1930; Murray, 1930; Draper, 1931; Hausle, 1932; Kaye, 1933
Extra curricular activities	Singer, 1927; Draper & Corbally, 1932
Extra-class program	Billett, 1928
Extraclass and intramural activities	Roberts & Draper, 1928
Extracurricular organizations	Elliott, 1930
Outside activities	Hamilton, 1931
Activities	Threlkeld, 1931
Extracurricular program	Johnston, 1932; Williams, 1934

As expected, terms with the prefix “extra” predominate, with activities so denoted being presented as distinct from or supplemental to “class,” the “classroom,” or the

“curriculum.” Others thought of extracurriculars as being aligned with the curriculum (“co-curricular activities,” “allied activities”); to still others, they were simply “outside activities” (which could mean outside the curriculum, outside the school day, or outside the school). Such activities were also notable for belonging to or originating with “pupils” or “students.” Several terms were meant to reflect that these were activities for youth affiliated with the school (“school activities,” “school group activities,” “school organizations”), probably to distinguish them from community-based youth activities such as scouting.

In addition to the terms represented in Table 6, the “social” theme surfaced often in article and chapter titles, especially in the 19-teens, beyond simply labeling extracurriculars as “social activities” (Davis, 1913, 1916; Pringle, 1922); authors whose articles or chapters included significant coverage of the extracurriculum without naming it in their titles focused on:

- high school students’ “social equipment” (Dargan, 1927);
- the “social life” (Eaton, 1918; Pound, 1919), “social organization” (Fowler, 1920; Johnson, 1909), or “social program” (North, 1918; Pound, 1918) of the high school;
- “social ethics” in (Morrison, 1905) or the “social side” of high school life (McLinn, 1911); or
- “social reconstruction” (Pound, 1921) or “social training” (Johnson, 1913) in the high school.

“Social” was not always synonymous with “extracurricular;” it sometimes denoted social activities such as school dances. (See the “Social” section in Chapter 3 for more on various meanings of “social” in the context of the extracurriculum.)

Terms and timelines.

“School,” “student,” “social.” Terms incorporating “school,” “student,” and “social” emerge early in my sources. Terms including the word “school” or “student” are among the first terms used to discuss the extracurriculum. They predominate early on, and persist in use infrequently until at least 1932. The cluster of “social” terms also first appear in titles in 1905 and are used until at least 1927. None of the sources using these terms pre-1920 defines them outright. It may be that they were using the terms descriptively and generically—i.e., the term itself was the definition, and was not a label so much as a way of describing the activities: “school” organizations and activities were distinct from those not under school oversight (e.g., secret societies, about which more below); “student” organizations and activities were being distinguished from those instigated by the school faculty; and “social” activities were those in which student interaction was the main focus of the activity.

The “extra-” terms. Beginning in 1915, the “extra-” terms appear, with intensive use throughout the 1920s and early 1930s. “Extra-classroom” and “extra-class” failed to catch on, but the “extra[-]curricula-” cluster did: together, “extra-curricular activities,” “extra-curriculum activities,” “extra curricula activities,” “extra-curricula activities,” “extracurricular activities,” “extra curricular activities,” and “extracurricular organizations” account for 48 of the 80 sources represented in the table (60%).

As “extra-curricular” and related terms emerged and were widely adopted, some educators sought to define these new labels. At base, “extra-curricular” activities were those organized and/or student-instigated activities not officially recognized as part of or included in the curriculum (Houston, 1930; Johnson, 1921). Some educators desired a reciprocal arrangement between the curriculum and the extracurriculum, intending that extracurriculars grow out of the courses of study and ultimately enrich them, presumably by helping students have deeper experiences around their curricular topics of interest (Barton, 1925; Fretwell, 1930); others acknowledged that extracurriculars varied in their actual or potential connections to the curriculum. “Extra-curricular activities are varied,” wrote Shiels:

They constitute clubs or societies, established with the approval of school authority, as well as visits, excursions and extramural experiences which the school recognizes and influences in some degree. Some of the activities, such as a school orchestra, an athletic association or a debating club, may be tied up rather closely with the regular work of instruction; others, such as a social circle or a walking club, may have more general aims. (1925, p. 836)

At the very least, extracurriculars were activities outside of the curriculum “which the school recognizes and influences in some degree.”

Jordan described the extent to which even this basic definition was only recently settled upon, observing in 1928 that it was not easy to define “extra-curricular,” although it would have been in 1900, when

one would have said that extra-curricular activities were those carried on by pupils of a school principally on their own initiative and under their own control,

for which no credit was given in the school, either toward promotion or for graduation. (p. 1)

Almost three decades later, Jordan declared, many activities were both motivated and controlled by the teachers, participation was required, and credit was given. (These latter two were less universal than Jordan supposed—see the sections on credit and compulsory participation below—but he was correct that these activities were now under school administrative control.) For an updated definition, Jordan proposed: “Extra-curricular activities are those voluntary tasks which are carried by pupils in addition to the regular classroom requirements, either after regular school hours, or at a time within the program specially designated for such purposes” (1928, p. 2) The extracurriculum was still defined in opposition to the curriculum, but Jordan also raises the question of meeting time, another logistical detail examined in more detail below.

Intra-curricular, intro-curricular, semi-curricular. Despite the growing momentum of its use, several educators went on the record that “extra” was not their prefix of choice to describe these activities. The NEA Department of Superintendence accepted “extra-curriculum activities” as its preferred term; Houston objected that “it does not exactly describe the practices in vogue; inasmuch as some of them are unmistakably intro-curriculum,” but did not define that term (1930, p. 282). He may have meant “intra-curricular,” a term used by both Foster (1925) and Skinner (1925), although Foster noted that these activities sometimes also were known as “semi-curricular.” Skinner felt as though “extra-” implied too much distance from the curriculum—distance that should not exist if these activities were truly educative. “Under ideal conditions there would be no such thing as extra-curricular activities,” he wrote:

There is no valid excuse for outside activities which do not aid in broadening the life and experience of the pupil and so prove a valuable adjunct to the regular work and ideals that the school is attempting to teach. Those enterprises which are an outgrowth of the intellectual curiosity aroused in the study of a given subject or which are a natural development of the social life in the school should be cultivated but should be guided and checked as an integral part of the scheme of education. When so regarded, they will cease to be extra-curricular, will become intra-curricular and the problem [of definition] which now confronts us will be solved. (1925, p. 151)

As described later in this chapter, some educators attempted to make even activities called “extracurricular” more of an “integral part of the scheme of education” by providing time for them during the school day and awarding credit toward graduation for participation in them. What these activities were called and how the school treated them did not always align.

Other notable terms. Some notable terms appear only in the text of articles or chapters, including “adscititious school activities” (Briggs, 1920); “outside collateral activities” (McDaniel, 1919), “collateral student organizations” (Davis, 1921), “collateral activities” (Houston, 1930; Koos, 1927), “correlative activities” (Kaye, 1933), “non-scholastic activities” (Gruenberg, 1917), and “voluntary organizations” (Hollister, 1909). “Adscititious,” meaning “added” or “additional,” aligns with the “extra” theme. “Voluntary” describes another way these activities differed from the (compulsory) curriculum, although not in all cases (see the sections on awarding credit and compulsory participation in extracurriculars below).

“So-called” terms. A final indicator of the evolving nature of the terminology used to label the extracurriculum is the use of the descriptor “so-called” to modify the term one was using. “So-called” can either connote a neutral use of a label or an inaccurate one; both uses are in evidence here. The neutral uses of “so-called” include four earlier authors who discussed the “so-called outside activities” (Fowler, 1920; North, 1918; Roberts, 1918; Rynearson, 1917); by the mid-1920s, it was the term “extracurricular activities” (with or without the hyphen) that was widely denoted as “so-called” (Douglass, 1927; Hamilton, 1931; Kaye, 1933; McKown, 1932; Rugg, 1930, 1931; Shiels, 1925), suggesting that a new preferred or consensus term was on the rise, if tentatively. Kaye (1933) also mentioned “the so-called extracurricular idea,” as in “The *so-called extracurricular idea* is no more a program than it is a philosophy of education, a philosophy functioning in such a manner that the school takes a new and broadened view of its responsibilities” (p. 17). There is no record of anyone else referring to “the extracurricular idea” except Kaye himself; so it is unclear who besides him called it that.

“So-called” could also denote a less neutral/descriptive or positive view of the extracurriculum; Roemer and Allen (1926) acknowledged that some were calling extracurriculars “fads and frills.” And finally, in the report of a study of the academic credit that could be earned for extracurricular participation, Draper and Corbally note one school with low extracurricular participation, where “Evidently the majority of the students were not deriving any of the so-called benefits that accrue through participation in the extra curricular program” (1932, p. 10). One wonders what term Draper and Corbally would have preferred or substituted for “benefits.”

Terminology: Conclusion. The evolution of the terminology used to label the extracurriculum shows some telling variations in use and thought about what these activities were, what they were considered supplemental to, and how readily different terms were accepted in the educational community. Another way in which the extracurriculum was in flux during this time was in logistical considerations, such as the time of day activities met and whether students were awarded credit toward graduation for participating in them. I turn to these issues next.

* * * * *

The Extracurriculum Executed: Scheduling and Credit

From a very small beginning, unsupervised, ignored and even opposed by authorities, [extra-curricular activities] have advanced to a stage where they demand and receive an allotment of time in the regular school day, the time of teachers to serve as advisors, and even credit towards a diploma. (Dee, 1929, p. 583)

This section describes how the extracurriculum was logistically carried out in schools during the 1910s and 1920s, including the time of day activities met (during the school day, after school, and/or in the evening) and whether academic credit was awarded for participation. These two ways in which the extracurriculum was in logistical flux during this time represent questions not just about extracurricular *management*, but also about extracurricular *access*—when a school held activity meetings during the school day and/or awarded credit toward graduation for participating in such meetings, it made it more likely that students would participate in extracurriculars, and thus more likely that they would experience the values extracurricular participation was thought to yield, values which the extracurriculum was perhaps uniquely positioned to deliver.

The extracurriculum and the school day. During the 1920-1921 school year, the High School Principals' Association of Illinois (HSPA) surveyed 145 Illinois high

schools about their “extra-class activities.” Among their questions were several inquiring about what time of day most of the school’s activity meetings took place. During the early decades of the school-sponsored extracurriculum, this was very much an open question. Because the extra-curriculum was by definition supplementary to the curriculum, one might assume that it was also supplementary to the official school day, but in fact “extra-curricular” did not necessarily mean “outside the daily official schedule of the school.” Instead, there were at least three possible times for extracurricular activities to meet: 1) during a designated “activities period” within the school day itself, 2) immediately after school, or 3) in the evening. While several school surveys captured schools using one or more of these options at one point in time, change over time in the use of these options is difficult to discern from available sources, if it occurred at all.

In the HSPA survey, holding meetings after school was the most common choice, but no option had no schools reporting its use, and the responding schools were almost evenly split on whether or not their extracurricular meetings were held during school hours (see Table 7 below), an option that sounds foreign to modern ears, but which was discussed extensively in the educational literature of the time.

Table 7
Meeting Times of Extra-Class Activities from a Survey of 145 Illinois High Schools, 1920-1921
 (adapted from Belting, 1923, p. 265, Table 4—(I)—Classified Replies to Questions 5-26)

	<i>N</i>	Yes	No
Are 50% or more of meetings held during school hours?	105	52 schools (49.5%)	53 schools (50.5%)
If not, are 50% or more of meetings held after school?	104	82 schools (78.8%)	22 schools (21.2%)
If not, are 50% or more of meetings held at night?	92	33 schools (35.9%)	59 schools (64.1%)

Extracurriculars as part of the school day.

Ten schools out of 32 report that no school time is spent in student activities, the other 22 varying in their practice. Among the answers received were: "For glee clubs, orchestra, school paper, school annual, some sports," "Some of them," "When necessary," "At times," "Very seldom," "It might well be," "Rarely," "Not often," "Where credit is given," "Yes, an extra-curricular hour," "Assembly period is used for activities," "Each organization one meeting a month on school time and one on its own." (Holch, 1925a, p. 610)

Logistics of extracurriculars during the school day. Schools at which extracurriculars met during the school day varied in the duration and frequency of time they allotted for extracurriculars in what were often called "activity periods" (although Hamilton, 1931 called them "social periods"). Fowler (1920) observed that many schools allotted "one entire period on one or more days of the week to social organizations" (pp. 397-398). Umstead and Thompson (1929) reported on the findings of a survey of 401¹⁴ of the 500 or so rural high schools in North Carolina, 36 of which had regularly scheduled activity periods ranging from 75-225 minutes per week, although a notably lower percentage of North Carolina high schools reported having activities meet during the school day than Illinois high schools, as captured by the HSPA I survey of nearly a decade earlier. Elsewhere, the DeWitt Clinton High School in New York City had an activity period one day a week: the school had an alternate schedule on Fridays, with nine periods encompassing six class periods, an assembly, a lunch, and a club period (Murray, 1930); the Fifth Avenue High School in Philadelphia had an activity period every day for meetings of all activities except athletics, during the third period of a school day of seven 45-minute periods (Rynewson, 1917); the high school in Painesville, Ohio used the first

¹⁴ It is unclear whether 401 is the response rate from a survey of 500 schools, or if only 401 of the 500 existing schools were surveyed (with the response rate not reported); the text provided is, "One of the authors recently made a study covering 401 of the approximately 500 standard rural high schools in North Carolina" (Umstead & Thompson, 1929, p. 160).

period of the day for its activities period (Billett, 1928; see Table 8 below for the rotating schedule of activities taking place during that period).

Table 8

A Twenty-School-Day Schedule of Extra-Class Meetings Held During a First Period Activities Period, Painesville (Ohio) High School, 1927-1928 (adapted from Billett, 1928, p. 354: Program of Regular Extra-Class Meetings, First Period, 8:30-9:15)

Day	First Week	Second Week	Third Week	Fourth Week
M	Home Economics Club Boys' Glee Club Traffic Board	Student Council Boys' Glee Club	Study-hall Board Boys' Glee Club	Finance Board Boys' Glee Club Dramatic Club
Tu	Girls' Glee Club Orchestra Assembly Board			
W	Assembly			
Th	Girls' Glee Club Band			
F	Anvil Board Girl Reserves Merit Board	Athletic Board Anvil Board Bldg. & Grounds Board Merit Board	Anvil Board Noon Board Merit Board	Anvil Board Social Board Merit Board

Professor Paul Terry of the University of North Carolina surveyed about 500 high schools across the country on their extracurricular practices, including activities periods, of which 231 responded. Among the questions asked was: "Is a part of the regular school-day schedule assigned to extra-curriculum activities? If so, how many periods a week? How long are the periods?" (1925, p. 736) Unfortunately, Terry did not report quantitative findings, so we have no sense of the magnitude of the responses, but he did describe four general answers to these questions, including options beyond simply a designated general "activities period". In the first option, schools assigned periods in the daily schedule to a limited number of "preferred" activities, with the periods assigned to any one organization ranging from two a month to five a week and lasting as long as other class periods. "Under these conditions," Terry observes, "the work of the protected

activities prospers, and pupils may be expected to obtain the desired training values” (p. 736). Table 8 above provides an example of one school using this approach—its principal made up a monthly schedule for a limited number of “preferred” activities. Of course, if some student activities were “preferred” and thus allocated time in the “activities period,” the non-preferred activities were forced to meet after school (see the “Extracurriculars both during and after school” section below for more on that option).

In the second approach to “activities periods” described by Terry, activities were not assigned regular periods in the daily school schedule, but instead meetings were called by the principal at any time of the day, lasting from five minutes to an entire period or longer.¹⁵ Such meetings were most often called during the first period of the day and the first period after recess. The third option was that of assigning extracurriculars a certain period during which regular classes were not held. These periods ranged from one to five a week and lasted 10-30 minutes, with nonparticipating students staying in their home rooms. The fourth approach was similar to the third, but with longer designated periods for meetings: one to ten periods a week lasting 40-80 minutes each.

As for what was supposed or allowed to take place during activity periods, Hamilton said “organization meetings” (1931, p. 25); while Winner explained that any extracurricular activity with school approval might make use of the “activity period”:

This period may be used for assembly purposes when needed: for meeting of musical clubs; debate clubs; leaders clubs; language and science clubs; meetings

¹⁵ In arguing for an activities period, Winner specifically cited this option as undesirable:

This [activities] period not only conserves the features of extra-curricular activities, in providing a time and place for them, but also provides for full time for the regular work of the school. This is a distinct advantage in that the sale of tickets for athletics, concerts, class plays; meetings of clubs; student government groups; honor societies, etc. may be held without encroaching upon the time of regular instruction periods. (1923, p. 1022)

in interest of school athletics, school magazine, in fact for all activities approved by the school. (1923, p. 1022)

Note Winner's last six words here: "all activities approved by the school." Kaye described the antithesis of school-approved activities: "Extracurricular activities were originally considered merely as pupil organizations meeting after school hours" (1933, p. 19). "Pupil organizations" (meaning organizations under pupil, not school, control) and "after school hours" were correlated in the minds of the educators who embraced activities periods. Logically, activities outside the school's control were held outside the school day. Thus, it followed that if extracurriculars were under school control (as "activities approved by the school"), they merited an allocation of time during the school day.

Rationales for extracurriculars during the school day. Of course, educators were not content to leave the scheduling of extracurriculars as a logistical argument when an educative one could be made. Extracurriculars merited time during the school day not only because they were now the *domain* of the school, but because they were an important *function* of the school (Kaye, 1933). Alluding to the undesirability of activities being student-controlled and meeting after school or in the evening, McKown mused that a new golden age of extracurricular recognition and even dignity was dawning with the inclusion of the extracurriculum in the school day:

The good old days when the Literary Society met after school, and the Dramatic Club at night, are fast passing, and the day when activities will be *recognized* and *dignified* by being given time in the regular schedule is fast approaching. (1927, p. 8, emphasis added)

Similarly, Winner claimed that extracurriculars had been incorporated into the school day on the basis of their importance: “So important is this work deemed in the high schools of Pittsburgh that a special period or activity period is provided in the daily schedule” (1923, p. 1022).

And anything sufficiently important to merit time during the school day ought to be carried out well. Hence, another reason used to justify the allocation of time in the school day for extracurriculars was so they could be better overseen by school staff, to better assure that their desired ends were achieved. Professor Earle Rugg of Colorado State Teachers College traced the trajectory of extracurriculars from student to school control, framing a now-familiar narrative in the context of administrative oversight. Note his repeated use of the word “control” as well as his mention of “supervision”:

In origin these activities represented principally pupil initiative. Evils developed, and as a result school authorities developed an administrative program for their proper control and rationalized or justified values for these new student activities. The result now is evident in the virtual addition to the school program of a host of new activities (athletics, clubs, dramatics, debating, student government, school publications, etc.). . . . [T]hey are under school direction and control. Supervision is demanded, and they are now assigned definite time allotments in the daily schedule. (1931, p. 296)

Of course, ease of oversight was directly related to availability of teachers to be what were typically referred to as activity advisors or sponsors. “Under the present plan” of activity periods “teachers render valuable assistance in guiding and directing all phases of

the work,” wrote Rynearson. “To do this work after school hours entails an unnecessary hardship on the few teachers who act as guardians” (1917, p. 49).

Rugg also mentions what was seen as another desirable byproduct of extracurriculars becoming part of the school day: desired extracurricular values and goals became more explicit when the extracurriculum was carried out as part of what was commonly referred to as “the normal school program” (i.e., the school day). Kaye tells a similar tale, saying that once the extracurriculum passed into school control, its “values became more discernible” (1933, p. 20); Winner observes that “Faculty members are more prone to appreciate real values [i.e., the real values of the extracurriculum] by such an arrangement” of activity periods (1923, p. 1022). One wonders whether anything that occurred during the school day (or was under school control in general) was apt to have educational aims attributed to it, even passing time or lunch—or, conversely, if educators would have been so quick to attribute “educational” values to the extracurriculum had it never been part of “the normal school program.”

Another change in the extracurriculum following its transition to school control was that “the desirability for correlation with the traditional curriculum was generally recognized” (Kaye, 1933, p. 20). Holding extracurriculars during the school day made the connections between curriculum and extracurriculum more apparent for students and school staff alike. “In providing thus a special period for such [extra-curricular] work there is developed a finer cooperation between regular school work and extra-curricular work,” wrote Winner, without elaboration (1923, p. 1022). Kaye found one manifestation of this in the fact that “[The extracurriculum’s] very philosophy was taken over into traditional subject matter courses” (p. 20), presumably through classes becoming more

“socialized” and participatory (Kaye also does not elaborate), an occurrence that could have had the effect of making the extracurriculum less necessary as a source of socialization and other desired extracurricular values.

An efficiency argument surfaced in the discussion of “activity periods,” too, predicated on the fact that after-school meetings could be open-ended: “by beginning and closing at a definite time the programs, etc., are carried on in a much more businesslike manner than they were when the activities began 10-30 minutes after school and closed whenever it was convenient,” noted Rynearson (1917, p. 49).

A final argument made for holding extracurriculars during the school day is the most obvious and least lofty: more students could participate in the extracurriculum (and receive the benefits presumed to accrue thereby) if activities took place during the time when they would be at school anyway, especially those students who worked after school (Fowler, 1920; Johnson, 1924; Rynearson, 1917). Some schools took facilitating participation one step further and used having an “activity period” during the school day as a way to make extracurricular participation compulsory. One such plan was reported by Principal E. F. Osborn of Carroll, Iowa to the *American Educational Digest*: “We are forming ten clubs including every pupil. We expect to have one meeting each week. All clubs will meet at the same period” (Extra-curricular activities, 1925, p. 415). Murray (1930) reported a similar approach at the DeWitt Clinton High School for boys, but without the compulsory element. Even so, only about 50 boys chose not to participate. A similar scenario unfolded at Newberg High School in Newberg, Oregon, with six student organizations meeting during a daily “social period,” with their membership comprising about 60% of the student body (Hamilton, 1931). Houston, an extracurricular skeptic,

reported that even if participation in the activities period was not required, students were not off the hook in terms of participating in something educative during that time: “Some schools have become so activities-mad that they are forcing students to join some club or be sentenced to the greatest of scholastic punishments—study. ‘To the club or to the study-hall! Take your choice’” (1930, p. 286). So one consideration when holding extracurriculars during the school day with a policy of voluntary participation was what to do with non-participants.¹⁶

Some educators went so far as to claim that, in effect, the extracurriculum could only be fully realized when situated within the normal school day: Winner maintained that an activities period “conserves the features of extra-curricular activities, in providing a time and place for them” (1923, p. 1022). Of course, by “features” he probably meant “those features deemed desirable by the school.”

Extracurriculars both during and after school. A few sources reported that their extracurriculars met both during *and* after school (e.g., Paul, 1922). Elliott (1930) claimed that holding extracurricular meetings both during and after school was necessary, due to the varying nature of extracurriculars, with honor societies often having overlapping membership and an activities period not allowing eligible students to belong to more than one, but participation in volunteer service organizations and holding elected student government offices being well-suited to the use of an activities period, so the student’s service was not spread too thin or poorly executed. Billett (1928), whose school

¹⁶ Indeed, as Osborn and Houston both mention, some schools did require participation in extracurriculars—a policy easier to implement when the activities were allocated time in the school day. Jordan, too, noted that the definition of “extra-curricular” implied that “some participation is required of all pupils,” (1928, p. 1), but most schools seemed to opt for providing many extracurricular options and strongly encouraging all students to participate in something, but not requiring that participation (McKown, 1927; Murray, 1930; Umstead & Thompson, 1929).

was the source of the “activities period” table above, had the activities that did not merit time in the “activities period” meet after school. The only criterion he gave for whether an activity was allowed time in the school day was that the privilege be limited to activities “to which one hundred percent attendance is vital to success” (pp. 353-354). This criterion makes sense in the context of the glee clubs, band, and orchestra listed in Billett’s table; it is less clear why perfect attendance would be required for the Home Economics Club or the Building and Grounds Board.

Arguments against extracurriculars as part of the school day. A few writers argued against incorporating extracurriculars into the school day. Principal Virgil Stebnitz of Cobb, Wisconsin lamented that an activity period was simply not an option in his community: “if I were to set a period aside every day in which the orchestra was to practice and the boys to play basketball, I would lose my job” (Extra-curricular activities, 1925, p. 390). Deam and Bear noted in their book on extracurricular activities that an activity period was inadvisable, because students were more apt to show true interest and initiative in the absence of formal structures:

It is in free expression, whether extra-curricular or curricular, that the interests, abilities, and latent energies of adolescents are discovered. . . . The semi-direction, if not entire self-direction, of the natural impulses during periods of relaxation and self-imposed activities plays a large part in the social development of the individual. (1928, p. 4)

Elliott also objected to activity periods, not because they stifled individual development but because they were carried out under artificial conditions. Activities undertaken during a designated formal time during the school day with compulsory participation did not

“offer the same parallel to life situations that organizations do living under their own form of government, controlled by their own laws, guided when wise by an interested sponsor, and rendering a definite service to the school community” (1930, p. 292). That is, the activities themselves were more likely to be fruitful when carried out under conditions more like life itself. Even if extra-curricular activities could be held during the school day, Deam, Bear, and Elliott seem to say, scheduling them outside the school day provided another layer of potential benefit. This perspective contrasts sharply with the concerns about lack of school control expressed by some proponents of holding extracurriculars during the school day.

Extracurriculars after school. Contrary to the attention given “activity periods” as an option for extracurricular meetings in extracurricular writings, the HSPA survey described at the beginning of this section found after school to be the most popular meeting time (in Belting, 1923). It could be that there was so much writing on “activity periods” in part because they were a minority option: their proponents were trying to recruit others to this approach. Regardless, despite the apparent popularity of after-school extracurricular meetings, very little was said about this option in the literature. One notable exception was McDaniel, who made one argument for after-school meetings that surely had broad appeal to adults: “With the exception of the orchestra and glee club, these organizations all carry on their activities after school hours, thus depriving poolrooms, soda fountains, and other loafing places of much patronage” (1919, p. 3). McDaniel does not put it as such, but in the words of the *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* report (1918), student activities at the school were a “worthy use of leisure;” poolrooms, soda fountains, and loafing after school were not.

Extracurriculars in the evening. As reflected in the HSPA survey, relatively few schools permitted or encouraged extracurricular meetings and events being held in the evening, but some did. “Owing to the long school day and the resulting lesson preparation at school there is little objection to opening the building at night from the standpoint of interference with study,” wrote Alexander C. Roberts of Everett, Washington, continuing:

Hence on several evenings of each week throughout the winter months various groups hold their regular meetings with a social hour following, and many basketball games, a series of four declamatory recitals, from four to eight debates, numerous club programs and parties, and musical evenings are held. (1918, p. 34)

Students presumably did not have enough homework to interfere with evening meetings. Roberts does not say whether those “regular meetings” changed to a different meeting time during the fall and spring. Regardless, many activities took place in the evening at his school, with no noted limitations put upon them. Elsewhere, evening extracurricular meetings were required to end at 10:30 p.m. (Hobson, 1923) or were restricted in their frequency; Principal D. K. Hammond of Santa Ana, California reported that at his school, each club was only allowed two evenings a semester to hold special events, for undisclosed reasons (Extra-curricular activities, 1925).

Franklin W. Johnson opposed evening meetings of extracurriculars in his publications for 15 years, writing in 1909 (as principal of the University High School at the University of Chicago) that no club at his school held meetings in the evening, noting in 1912 (still as principal) that “the requirement that all meetings of clubs shall be in the daytime removes many difficulties that are found where pupils gather in the evening” (p.

496), and explaining in 1924 (as professor of secondary education at Columbia) that “The holding of meetings in the evening introduces difficulties in control which render it extremely undesirable” (p. 144).¹⁷ If educators wanted to maintain a tight grip on how the extracurriculum was executed, they needed to keep it within arm’s reach of the school day, Johnson seems to say. Whereas Deam and Bear (1928) saw holding extracurriculars after school as a way for the school to back off from them and allow the students to express their own interests and exercise their own initiative, Franklin neither saw nor desired any diminution of school control when activities were held after school.

Extracurriculum vs. curriculum content. Further adding to the confusion over what should take place during the school day and what shouldn’t, Fretwell noted that not only could extracurriculars take place during what would otherwise be curricular time (i.e., the school day), but also that certain subjects and activities themselves were considered curricular at some schools and extracurricular at others. That is, not only were the temporal boundaries between curriculum and extracurriculum blurry (as when extracurriculars were held during the school day), but the content boundaries between curriculum and extracurriculum were too. Fretwell provided a few examples:

in one school the newspaper may be independent of any course in English and in another it may be the product of one or more courses in English. . . . In many schools dramatic clubs are really extracurricular, while in other schools courses in dramatics and the study and production of plays may be regularly accredited. Glee Clubs, choruses, orchestras, and bands existed in some high schools that have no

¹⁷ Johnson never elaborates on what he means by these “difficulties,” but Rynearson (1917) provides one potential “difficulty” and barrier to evening extracurricular meetings: “Teachers and parents object to boys and girls loitering in the school building or on the streets after dark” (p. 49).

music department, and in other schools these musical activities are regularly accredited towards graduation. (1930, pp. 304-305)

Monroe and Weber (1928) made a similar observation about the unclear distinction between curriculum and extracurriculum and added athletics—since football, basketball, track, and other sports were considered curricular at some schools—to the list of activities that could be curricular or extracurricular depending on the school. Fretwell mentions the awarding of credit as a way to distinguish curriculum (“accredited”) from extracurriculum (not), but this distinction was not as clear as he assumed, as I describe below.

Crediting the extra-curriculum.

How to support these activities, what time to devote to them, what school credits to give them, and how to secure the type of teacher leadership that will stimulate right student initiative are among the puzzling problems confronting the progressive principal. (Extra-curricular activities, 1925, p. 389)

Not only were the content lines between curriculum and extracurriculum unclear, but credit toward graduation¹⁸ was sometimes awarded for extracurricular participation, including participation in some activities that were never considered curricular or related to curriculum subjects.

School surveys help to set the stage for the discussion of credit—here, as an indication of shifting sentiments toward it and typical practices in awarding credit. Several of these surveys are summarized in Table 9 below. As Holch observed, “There seems to be a general tendency to recognize student activities as worthy of crediting toward graduation” (1925a, p. 615) with the percentage of schools awarding credit for

¹⁸ Other types of credit were in play, too, including a separate, specific kind of credit being awarded for extracurricular participation and then converted into credit toward graduation (Cox, 1930b), and activities being assigned a certain number of “point credits” for “the amount of work required of the student in the particular activity and the value to the school administration” of the activity as an “objective” way to capture student extracurricular participation for colleges, which were starting to request this information (Hausle, 1932). In this section, I focus on credit for extracurricular participation directly awarded toward high school graduation only, since this was the most common approach.

some kind of extracurricular participation increasing from 24% in Johnson's 1921 survey to about 80% in Holch's own 1925 survey.

But equally apparent is that often, credit was awarded only for participation in particular activities, with athletic, musical, and communication-related (e.g., debating, dramatics, the school paper, declamation [a public speaking activity in which students delivered famous speeches], the annual [i.e., the yearbook]) activities most often awarded credit. Athletics and communication-related activities had analogues in the curriculum in physical education and English class, respectively, which may account for why these activities were more likely to be considered "creditable" as extracurriculars. Music classes had also been deemed worthy of academic credit by this time; as of 1912, the Music Supervisors National Conference (later known as the National Association for Music Education) recommended granting full credit for music classes with homework and half credit for rehearsals (Mark & Gary, 2007). It is unclear whether those rehearsals would have been considered extracurricular, thus explaining how musical extracurriculars could be "credited," or if the rehearsals were considered part of music classes, with other supplementary ensembles (e.g., glee clubs) considered purely extracurricular, but with greater potential to be "credited" because music classes and rehearsals already were.

Table 9

Schools Offering Credit Toward Graduation for Extracurricular Participation, Based on Data from Four Surveys

	Johnson, 1921	Belting, 1923	<i>American Educational Digest, 1925</i>	Holch, 1925a
Surveyees (Respondents)	30 Michigan superintendents (23 respondents to survey; 21 respondents to the credit question)	145 Illinois high schools (136 respondents to credit question)	1071 high schools in 43 states	100 Colorado and Nebraska principals and superintendents (32 respondents)
Schools awarding <i>no</i> credit for extracurricular participation	16 schools of 21 responding to the credit question (76%)	81 schools of 136 responding to credit question (60%)	As many as 683 schools of the 1071 surveyed; 64% of schools ¹⁹	Fewer than 20% of schools: “less than one school out of five refusing credit on all activities” (p. 615)
Schools awarding credit for general or specific extracurricular participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 schools (14%): 1 credit toward total of 16 or 17 credits required to graduate • 1 school (5%): for debating only • 1 school (5%): a “slight amount” of credit for orchestra, glee club, debating 	55 schools (40%)	388 schools (36%): “activity credits” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 136 schools (13%): credit for music only • 53 schools (5%): credit for athletics, gymnasium only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several schools: 2 credits of 32 given for activities, usually athletics, debating, dramatics. • Fractional credits: One school gives .5 credit for each semester in dramatics and .25 credit for each semester in athletics, band, orchestra, glee clubs. One school gives .1 credit for each semester in the glee clubs, band, orchestra. • One school gives 1 credit for 18 weeks in debating practice; 1 credit for a year of athletic practice, glee club. • Activities receiving some credit in one or more schools: athletics, dramatics, expression, debating, band, orchestra, glee clubs, the school paper, declamation, the annual.

¹⁹ *Ns* for individual questions were not provided; this percentage was calculated using the 1071 figure even though that many schools may not have replied to each relevant question.

Why award credit? At least three reasons for awarding credit for extracurricular participation were offered in educational writing of this time: to reflect the general “value” and “worth” of these activities (D. Jones, 1924, p. 43); to attribute to extracurriculars “certain standards and standing and [put] all of it definitely under school direction and control” (Roberts, 1918, p. 31); and to reward enthusiasm in the high school in general, as part of a package of every pupil selecting “some outside activity in consonance with his interests . . . and give credit for faithful performance as is done in other subjects” (Belting, 1923, p. 337; note that Belting seems to be referring to the extracurriculum as a “subject” here—another indication of the blurred boundaries between curriculum and extracurriculum). The arguments made for awarding credit were thus symbolic, administrative, and motivational. The “value and worth” and “control” arguments mirror those offered by proponents of granting extracurriculars meeting time during the school day.

Conditions under which to award credit. The surveys summarized in Table 9 imply that the schools surveyed awarded credit simply for extracurricular participation, but that was rarely the case. Paul E. Belting, whose survey of Illinois high schools found 94% of them *not* giving credit for simply belonging to an organization, himself wanted the awarding of credit made contingent upon the attainment of “certain standards of achievement,” but he does not specify what he meant, nor probe the standards used by these 94% of schools for awarding credit (1923, p. 271). One example of a criterion for awarding credit offered by other educators was holding a leadership role in a club or on a team (Davis, 1916; Jones, 1924).

Extracurricular credit as substitute for curricular credit. Extracurricular credit could be substituted for curricular credit or could be its own free-standing kind of credit. In his survey of Illinois high schools, Belting asked whether extracurricular credit “took the place of scholarship credit” (i.e., if it could be substituted for credit awarded by courses). Seventy-seven schools answered this question, with 39 (51%) saying it could and 38 (49%) saying it couldn’t (1923, p. 267). This decidedly mixed finding gives the lie to Jones’ claim a year later that “it is very common to find this [student activities] work substituted for parts of subjects which are similar in nature” (1924, p. 43). Indeed, Belting himself was opposed to this substitution, writing that “Credits earned in such a manner [i.e., through extracurriculars] should not take the place of credit in a subject such as English, but should be given in addition to the regularly required class subjects” (1923, pp. 271-272).

As Belting mentions, where credit substitution did occur, it seemed to occur at least with English credit being awarded for participation in communication-related activities—e.g., Holch reported that “in one school debating and declamation count as regular English credit” (1925a, p. 615). Davis described several courses with possible extracurricular substitutions, including “pupils acting as editors-in-chief of the school paper, representing the school in an interscholastic debate or oratorical contest, or taking a leading part in a dramatic production” earning English credit, students serving as business managers for activities earning credit in the commercial department, students who were members of extracurricular musical ensembles receiving credit from the music department, and students participating in athletics receiving credit for physical training (1916, p. 427).

Opposition to awarding credit. Some educators opposed any effort to “credit” extracurriculars on principle, because they felt awarding credit would fundamentally change the nature of extracurricular participation. Pringle felt that extracurricular participation should be spontaneous and voluntary, not formal and incentivized, in order to convey to youth the importance of a spirit of service, writing: “We should early learn that in many of the affairs of life it is the seemingly superfluous and unrewarded labor and the willingness to perform it that counts most” (1922, p. 214) The “spirit of service” argument also appealed to others who were less adamant about not awarding credit. Samuel M. North, Maryland state supervisor of high schools, did not mind if a small amount of credit was awarded for extracurricular participation; if it were, extracurriculars still had their all-important social virtues (see also Chapter 3):

As far as the administration of the school is concerned, these activities may carry some slight credits toward graduation, or they may not; the point is, that the student is doing something with his fellows for themselves, for the school, for the community, and thus learning not books alone, but life. (1918, p. 471)

Professor Francis T. Spaulding of Harvard had a different concern about awarding credit for extracurricular participation—that because extracurriculars were still considered experimental, “they should stand completely upon their own values, in respect to the advantages which they offer” and should not be awarded credit as an “artificial advantage” in terms of their appeal to students (1929, p. 150). Withholding credit would provide “a check upon the interest which they arouse” (p. 150). Since extracurriculars were still new and somewhat suspect (at least to this educator), the school should treat

them with skepticism and make them fend for themselves in the universe of student opportunities, not make them artificially more appealing by awarding credit for them.

Not necessary to award credit. Several other authors noted that students participated eagerly in extracurriculars even in the absence of credit, or did not seem very interested in the credit offered. Spaulding (above) thought extracurriculars should prove themselves in the court of public opinion without the added advantage of credit; Cox thought they already had:

Obviously, our schools have far to go before official extrinsic rewards to socially active, artistically enthusiastic, executively efficient members of the student body are as adequate as those given to academically superior youths. Fortunately, however, student activities are usually intrinsically satisfying; hence, school official approvals [e.g., credits] are unnecessary. (1930b, p. 268)

In an article on school morale, McDaniel concurred that students “loved” to participate in extracurriculars even in the absence of credit, and used this “love” as evidence for his theme of school morale, describing student activities as organizations in which “the pupils themselves do the work, and they love to do it for the school even if they don’t get credit for it” (1919, p. 3). It raised school morale when extracurricular participation was done “for the school”; McDaniel does not speculate on whether credited work done for the school might also have positive effects on school morale.

The experience in Newberg, Oregon, as reported by Superintendent James T. Hamilton, suggested that students themselves were not actually that incentivized by receiving credit for their extracurricular participation, at least when extracurriculars were

held during the school day. For three years, Newberg High School had been awarding a half credit for enrollment/participation in the “social period”:

Although membership in the group is entirely voluntary, during the past three years the number of pupils enrolled for the social period has been steadily increasing. No pupil is given credit for more than two years of such work, but, despite this fact, a great many pupils are taking it for their third year without credit. Indeed, for a large number of pupils, the artificial reward of credit is a minor consideration. (1931, p. 26)

Hamilton does not elaborate on what motivated students to register for the “social period” (i.e., the activity period) if not credit, nor does he describe what their alternatives were for how to spend their time during this period. If their only option was study hall, as Houston (1930) described, then it is not surprising that ever-increasing numbers of students opted to register for the “social period,” credit notwithstanding.

Meeting times and credit: Conclusion. Objections to allocating time in the school day and/or awarding credit for extracurricular participation aside, the considerable numbers of schools with activities periods and/or awarding credit for extracurricular participation suggests that the majority agreed with Avery W. Skinner, Director of Examinations and Inspections Division, New York State Education Department, that allocating time and credit were important ways for schools to recognize the value of current extracurriculars, as well as other activities that had the potential to be brought under the purview of the school:

On the other hand those organizations and clubs which exist on the fringe of the educative process and which contribute in some degree to the well-being of the

school ought to be drawn more closely into the center. If they are worthy activities, if they help to maintain a democratic morale, if they keep social groups sweet and wholesome, and if they supplement and promote scholarship, then they should be given school time and school credit. (1925, p. 150)

Two important sentiments are evident from Skinner's quotation and this discussion of extracurricular logistics: that the potential values realized through extracurricular participation were worth "dignifying" with the two mechanisms of formal institutional recognition that schools could bestow: time during the school day and academic credit; and that the extracurriculum itself was (at least in some cases) important enough to be treated logistically like an academic subject. Coupled with the idea that providing extracurriculars credit and time during the school day encouraged greater access to these activities, these considerations heighten the discussion of extracurricular values in the next several chapters. During this time, the benefits of extracurricular participation were never intended to be reserved only for a certain type or class of student; instead, they were so universally desired for students that they caused the school to treat the extracurriculum more like the curriculum than as a set of activities supplemental to the "real" work of the school.

Chapter Three: Societal-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum: “Training in Some Civic-Social-Moral Relationship”

During the 1910s and 1920s, the student population of the high school was newly large and heterogeneous. About 10% of American 14-17-year-olds were enrolled in secondary school in 1900; this percentage had increased to about 70% by 1940 (NCES, 1993); secondary school attendance had shifted from an elite phenomenon to a mass one. Skinner summarized what this change looked like in 1925:

From 1890 to 1920 our total population doubled but our high school population increased tenfold. Then one in ten of the children of secondary school age attended high school, now the proportion is one in three, and in some states it is one in two. Less than 25 years ago the clientele of the public secondary school was a relatively homogeneous and select body, recruited for the most part from native American stock; now it is heterogeneous, and representative of all social ranks and of all types of intellect. (p. 146)

In light of these major changes in the population of the American high school, it is no coincidence that the predominant values that arose in the extracurriculum in the 1910s and 1920s (i.e., Koos’ category of “training in some civic-social-moral relationship”), as well as a new national vision for the high school, had to do with students learning to live together and get along in this new larger and more diverse school community, considered a proxy or miniature of American society.

American society itself was undergoing major changes in the early 20th century, including several directly related to the realities schools were seeking to address through

a new set of aims for American secondary education (as described below) and other new initiatives, including extracurriculars. First, the great increase in high school enrollment at this time was fed in part by a massive influx of immigrants to the U.S., with the number of foreign-born Americans increasing from about 4 million in 1860 to almost 14 million in 1920 (Hirschman, 2005). New immigrant youth were well-represented among the ever-growing population of American youth attending high school; Fass reports that “by 1930, 90.0% of all fourteen- and fifteen-year-old children of native-white parents were in school, while 91.3% of the children of foreign or mixed parentage and 92.6% of all those who were themselves immigrants were at school” (1989, p. 43). Child labor laws, compulsory school attendance laws, and fears of vagrancy and delinquency among youth not under adult supervision all contributed to these high rates of school attendance among American youth of all origins (Fass, 1989; Herbst, 1996).

The United States also became a predominantly urban nation during the early 20th century. While high schools certainly existed in rural areas and received special attention in the field of education through such outlets as the *Journal of Rural Education* and the Rural Department of the NEA, which published it, high schools in urban areas typically had the largest student populations, often encompassing students from many different ethnic groups (e.g., Fass’ 1989 article on seven New York City high schools focused on “native white, Irish, German, Italian, Jewish, and black” students, while noting the presence of many more nationalities and racial groups among the students at these schools)—and offered the greatest number of extracurriculars (often, dozens of clubs and activities) in an attempt to accommodate them all. Thus it was often in urban areas, where

the problems of living together in school and community were most pronounced, that extracurricular thought and practice was most intense.

A major national reframing of secondary education, which occurred at the same time as extracurriculars were gaining momentum as a function of the secondary school, sought to address the new educational and societal realities of the early 20th century. It also provides some institutional context for the desired extracurricular values of this time, even if it did not reflect them entirely.

The Extracurriculum and the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education

In 1918, a major redefinition of the goals of the American secondary school was published in the form of the report from the National Education Association's Commission for the Reorganization of Secondary Schools, entitled *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*. The *Cardinal Principles* report, as it became commonly known, appeared halfway through the time period of this study, codifying the educational sentiments of the previous years, and positioning those ideals to inform American secondary education in subsequent years.

In order to understand the meaning of the *Cardinal Principles* report (and its constituent principles) for American secondary education in general and for extracurricular activities in particular, we must understand its predecessor, another NEA report on secondary education, this one from 1893. As Diane Ravitch observed, "Both reports were sponsored by the prestigious National Education Association on behalf of the leaders of American education; both sought to redefine the curriculum of the high school" (2000, p. 123). But that was where their similarities ended.

The Committee of Ten report, as the 1893 *Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies* became known, was authored by a group comprised of six college and university presidents and professors, three school principals/headmasters, and the U.S. Commissioner of Education. It was an attempt to standardize the curricular aims of the American secondary school. According to the Committee, secondary education was then considered the most “defective” branch of American education because of its curricular haphazardness, thus impairing its ability to receive students from elementary education and transition them into postsecondary education:

There is a wide divergence in the course of study, and the difference of opinion regarding what constitutes a secondary education works injury not only to the elementary schools by setting up an uncertain standard of admission, but also through a want of proper requirements for graduation prevents in thousands of cases the continuance of the course of education of youth in colleges and universities. (pp. I-II)

William Torrey Harris, U.S. Commissioner of Education, continued on in his Letter of Transmittal of the report to the U.S. Department of the Interior (then the home agency of the Bureau of Education) to anticipate, “The recommendations of this report will draw the attention of great numbers of teachers to the question of educational values” (p. II), but in reality, and especially when compared to the *Cardinal Principles* report, the Committee of Ten report expressed variations on a single, literal set of educational values: the content of the curriculum, which the committee determined should be comprised of four programs of study, each including some combination of the following subjects: Latin; Greek; English; other modern languages; mathematics; physics,

astronomy, and chemistry; natural history; history, civil government, and political economy; and geography.

The report of the Committee of Ten seemed logical as a statement of vision for secondary education, but the *Cardinal Principles* report presented an entirely different approach to stating a vision for our nation's junior high and high schools—one that chose not to specify the *means* of secondary education, as the Committee of Ten had with its focus on the curriculum, but rather lay out the desired *ends* of secondary education. Its eponymous Cardinal Principles, summarized in Appendix D, presented curricular mastery (“command of fundamental processes”) as only one of seven intended outcomes of secondary schooling, the others being health, worthy home-membership, vocation, civic education, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character.²⁰ In place of a focus on mastery of academic subjects, the Cardinal Principles sought “social, personal, and occupational amelioration” for secondary schoolers (Franklin & McCulloch, 2007, p. 38); this vision of secondary education intended to “prepare students for actual activities in which they would engage as adults” (Hines, 1998, p. 106). Kliebard claims that the *Cardinal Principles* report “met with almost universal approbation when it was issued” (2004, p. 96), a claim supported by a contemporary source, Elmer H. Wilds, who in 1926 observed that “No attempt to sum up the sociological objectives of education has attracted more attention than their statement as the seven Cardinal Principles of secondary education” (p. 32). It was no longer sufficient for education to have academic aims; sociological aims were what constituted effective education to the educators of the early 20th century.

²⁰ Notably, too, the word “social” was the third-most-frequent content word used in the *Cardinal Principles* report (and 14th most frequent word overall), after “school” (10th) and “education” (13th), although it does not appear in the names of the Cardinal Principles themselves and only appears repeatedly in the principle “civic education”.

Kliebard (2004) claims that “The curriculum became the instrument through which the aims [i.e., the Cardinal Principles] were to be achieved,” (2004, p. 97) but that is only half true. As noted above, the *Cardinal Principles* report did not confine itself to curricular matters per se, but took as its purview “secondary education.” The description of the individual Cardinal Principles in the report thus mentions school activities that encompassed both the curriculum and the extracurriculum. For example, it stated that the principle of “health” could be realized through the organization of “an effective program of physical activities” (p. 11), which could either mean curricular physical education or extracurricular school athletics. “Civic education” meant “habits of cordial cooperation in social undertakings” (p. 13), probably social undertakings outside the classroom. “Worthy use of leisure,” probably the Cardinal Principle most literally related to the extracurriculum, recommended (among other things) that the school provide “adequate recreation,” help students discover their own “special avocational interests,” and realize through the worthy use of leisure “the re-creation of body, mind, and spirit.” While potentially curricular subjects like art, drama, and music were suggested to these ends, so were “social activities” (p. 15). The *Cardinal Principles* report was less concerned with drawing a bright line between the curriculum and the extracurriculum than it was with expressing desired values for the whole of secondary education, which schools or districts could allocate to the curriculum and/or the extracurriculum as they saw fit.

But several educators took it upon themselves to elaborate how the *Cardinal Principles*’ broad recommendations might map onto the extracurriculum specifically, as well as explore how the extracurriculum could be brought into closer alignment with the

vision articulated in the *Cardinal Principles* report.²¹ Meyer (1926) took as his starting place in answering the question of what were the “outstanding objectives and values” in extra-curricular activities that they should “conform in aiding the advancement of the Cardinal Principles of secondary education,” reflecting, “An interpretation and application of any extra-curricular activity may test its worthiness as it is able to aid in promoting one or more of these principles” (p. 4). Roberts & Draper (1928) modestly claimed that extracurriculars did indeed have something to contribute to the realization of the Cardinal Principles, and thus they aligned with the best educational thinking of their time:

extracurricular activities, guided by administrators and teachers with vision and participated in by students trained to assume and discharge responsibility, contribute in a worthy manner to practically all²² of these objectives of education [i.e., the Cardinal Principles] and thus are in harmony with the best educational philosophy which has been developed. (pp. 24-25)

Several writers offered concrete suggestions of which specific extracurricular activities aligned with which specific Cardinal Principle (Barton, 1925; Dee, 1929; Meyer, 1926; Wilds, 1926).

Graduate students in education were also trained to make such determinations for themselves. Students in a course on “Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools” offered by the Extension Department of the University of Arkansas in 1924 assessed both the extent to which the Cardinal Principles were being taught (i.e., in the classroom) and

²¹ Many of the extracurricular values described in this Values chapter are related to the themes raised in the *Cardinal Principles* report, if not actual individual Cardinal Principles themselves. The extracurricular sources I focus on in this section are those that make an explicit connection between the extracurriculum and the *Cardinal Principles* report and set of principles.

²² Regarding which Cardinal Principles might not be attained through extracurriculars, Gallagher, Bacon, Cox, Downey, and Fretwell (1928) noted that “command of fundamental processes”—the only Cardinal Principle dealing explicitly with academic content knowledge—“is not a purpose of the student activity” (p. 238). The remaining Cardinal Principles could potentially be realized in extracurricular activities.

the extent to which various extracurricular activities reflected them. The instructor of the course, Charles Forrest Allen, principal of a local junior high school, published a sort of workbook documenting the activities of this graduate course, including a worksheet of a table with columns for the Cardinal Principles and rows for curricular subjects and individual extracurricular activities. A note at the bottom of the page instructed users to “Compare [extra-curricular activities] with curricular activities and determine whether extra-curricular activities also meet the aim of education [i.e., the Cardinal Principles]” (p. 10). The class found that the curriculum alone could no longer realize the desired aims of education:

The results of the study convinced all members of the class that best to provide for adolescent needs in meeting the aims of education there must be a definitely planned program broader than is now generally provided in the curricular programs of secondary schools. (Allen, 1924, p. 3)

With the new goals for secondary education articulated by the Cardinal Principles, the curriculum was no longer sufficiently educative.

Some writers went further than claiming or showing a connection between the extracurriculum and the Cardinal Principles, by claiming the extracurriculum as a major or even the main site of Cardinal Principle attainment. Barton (1925) observed that each of the seven Cardinal Principles “can be attained *to a great degree* through the carrying out of a well-planned program of extra-curricula activities” (p. 238, emphasis added). Not only could extracurriculars help the secondary school “attain” the Cardinal Principles—they could in fact be the best site for Cardinal Principle realization: “A search of the [extracurricular] activities will show that almost all of them aid in furthering the

[Cardinal] Principles and offer, many times, *the best medium for presentation* (Meyer, 1926, p. 4, emphasis added).” Note this claim carefully. If the *Cardinal Principles* report aimed to redefine secondary education, and the extracurriculum could epitomize the Cardinal Principles, what role remained for the curriculum in the realization of the “new” secondary education? The clear alignment between the Cardinal Principles and how educators saw the extracurriculum show that at the very least, the extracurriculum could contribute to the realization of the Cardinal Principles in the reconceptualized secondary school, and that it was compatible with the values that were coming to the fore in American secondary education at this time.

Historian Laurie Moses Hines observed, “The values ascribed to the extracurriculum by the most frequently mentioned literature mirrored those values deemed important by the Cardinal Principles” (1998, p. 106). But the correlation between the Cardinal Principles and the values associated with the extracurriculum was not perfect; the *Cardinal Principles* report and principles illustrate the lines along which secondary education was being reconceptualized at this time, but do not exactly map on to the categories of values being envisioned for the extracurriculum. In fact, only the Cardinal Principles “civic education” and “ethical character” find exact matches among my themes of extracurricular values (“civic” and “moral” values, respectively). The most common extracurricular values overlap with the Cardinal Principles, but also extend beyond them. As such, they illustrate further ways in which secondary education was being reconceptualized at this time.

In this chapter, I describe the social, civic, and moral extracurricular values—values through which the extracurriculum aimed to meet societal needs; in Chapter Four,

I discuss the two values that had to do with meeting students' individual needs—accommodating individual differences and meeting adolescents' needs—and Chapter Five is devoted to what Koos labeled “Improved discipline and school spirit,” two related attempts to use the extracurriculum to meet schools' needs.

* * * * *

“Training in Some Civic-Social-Moral Relationship”: Introduction

If a majority of the adolescent boys and girls in this country are coming in contact with these [extracurricular] activities either directly or indirectly and are in this manner being exposed to a practical training in citizenship, social consciousness, and moral attitudes, they are a vital program in working out the philosophy of secondary education. (Roberts & Draper, 1928, p. 48)

Koos (1926a) clustered social, civic, and moral values together to comprise his largest category of extracurricular values: “Training in some civic-social-moral relationship.” These three values—civic, social, and moral—did share common ground, notably in the discussion of the need for students to “practice” them and their ability to do so in extracurriculars, although the nature and conditions of that practice differed by value, as described below. But despite Koos' conflation of the civic, social, and moral values, they were more often discussed separately, each of them considered to have different components, requirements, and effects. Therefore, following the section about how students could “practice” social, civic, and moral²³ values in extracurriculars, each value is described in turn.

Some educators claimed that the extracurriculum embodied the spirit of its age in a way the curriculum could not (Miller & Hargreaves, 1925); these three values thus say as much about the anxieties of American society in the 1910s and 1920s as they do about

²³ The values are presented here in the order of their magnitude in the extracurricular literature—a slightly different order from Koos'.

the goals and aims of the American high school at this time. What these three values truly held in common was that they were each attempts to use the extracurriculum to solve larger social problems, whether that be the ability of people to be good members of groups, to know and do their civic duty, or to behave ethically toward others. (The shared emphasis on “practice” across these values may have reflected educators’ anxieties about cultivating these key societal skills among students.) As such, the social-civic-moral triumvirate of extracurricular values represents an underappreciated instance of the “educationalization” of social problems (Cuban, 2013; Labaree, 2008), as I describe after the discussion of these values’ shared emphasis on “practice” and respective unique characteristics.

Social-Civic-Moral Improvement Through Practice

To educators of this time, “genuine” and “real” situations were those that most resembled life, meaning adult life, or life beyond school walls (Roberts & Draper, 1928). Monroe and Weber noted that the specific activity itself did not matter so much as did “the opportunity for working and mingling with other students under conditions approximating those of life outside of school” that the extracurriculum provided (1928, p. 406). The extracurriculum was thought to prepare students for life in American society because it provided conditions like those encountered in American society.

Social contact and negotiation in life-like situations.

[Extra-curricular activities] give practice in adapting means to ends and personality to personality under conditions of reality . . . (Smith, 1924, p. 116)

First among the ways in which the extracurriculum provided students a venue in which to practice social-civic-moral relations, the socializing work of the extracurriculum was realized through experience in both social contact and social negotiation. “[Extra-

curricular activities] provide experiences in the social relationships of life,” wrote Wilds (1926, p. 21; see also McKown, 1927). Indeed, he felt as though there were “infinite possibilities” for youth to learn to get along with others in extra-curricular activities. “These activities should become an effective means of training young people to live together on the highest plane,” he projected (1926, p. 21). But social contact could be perilous. Learning to get along with one’s peers was not simply a matter of social mixing; in the parlance of the time, it required “social adjustment”—active effort on the part of both (or all) parties in the encounter to adapt to each other, human nature, and society as a whole. Fortunately, “social adjustment” was another ability the extracurriculum was thought to cultivate (Counts, 1926; Klapper, 1929; Lamar, 1925; Pringle, 1922; Roberts, 1918; Pegg, in Roberts & Draper, 1928). Elliott provided an example of one form such “adjustment” could take, observing that the extracurriculum provided a laboratory for social experiences in which individuals could learn the skills of “living together amiably without sacrifice of individual principles” and making “fair-minded adjustments of individual opinion” (1930, p. 291).

Note how Wilds and Elliott talk about the social opportunities provided by the extracurriculum: not in terms of youth practicing social contact in an environment unique to them, but in terms that could also describe adult social interaction in “real life”: learning to live together amiably, experiencing “the social relationships of life.” Many educators of this time sought to blur the line between the school (and its extracurriculars) and life itself. When Froula wrote that “the extra-curricular activity has within it many of the essential traits of a real social group; it is in a sense a real unit of society” (1915, p.

737)²⁴, he surely had John Dewey's famous quotation and sentiment—"I believe that education . . . is a process of living and not a preparation for future living" (1897, Article II, ¶ 2)—in mind. Dewey was intolerant of those who would frame adolescent education as a means of preparing for adult life—to youth, their present life *was* life, their current problems immediate and genuine. To educators of the Deweyan bent, youth were not community-members-in-training; they were community members. Their training for living in American society took place in the context of living in the school society.

Other educators still saw adolescence as a time of training and preparation for "real life" (e.g., those concerned with vocational guidance for youth), but both camps agreed that society was in such great need of improvement that whether youth were fully members of it now or would only become so later, their contributions to solving social problems were necessary. It is thus telling that Davis does not clarify whether he is referring to current social problems or future ones when he asks

whether the schools are to-day employing the various collateral student organizations to the extent which they might be employed, and whether, thru [sic] them, they are securing the transference of general powers in a manner that will necessarily contribute to the solving of particular social problems in the community, state and nation? (1921, p. 221)

It is unclear whether Davis was anticipating that youths' "general powers" would be applied to these social problems in the present, or after youth reached adulthood. Surely, some educators would support either perspective, and youth might well be prepared to so

²⁴ See also Paul's call for "the recognition of the fact that our students are even now members of the larger community" (1922, p. 1274).

contribute in the present, if through extracurriculars they were already members of a “real unit of society.”

Laboratories for practicing citizenship.

Extracurricular activities must be built upon the broad principle that the school is a laboratory for citizenship and wherever possible the situations in the school should resemble the situations which the future citizen will face. (McKown, 1927, p. 9)

Unlike many of the proponents of social practice through extracurriculars, who insisted that school was life, educators who focused on the opportunity provided by extracurriculars to train students in citizenship did not insist that the high school was anything but a practicing ground for “real life.” They articulated the notion that the democratic nature of the extracurriculum was realized when students had opportunities to practice or experience the skills, qualities, and duties of citizenship; the extracurriculum provided a kind of laboratory for such practice (Dee, 1929; Fretwell, 1931; Kaye, 1933; Extra-curricular activities, 1925). The extracurriculum was well-positioned to fulfill the need for practice in cultivating citizenship. Civics classes were becoming ever more popular, but Meyer noted that they were insufficient for teaching citizenship: “The best way to teach citizenship is not only by formal civics but through methods of participation” (Meyer, 1926, p. 5). It was not enough to be taught about citizenship; citizenship was something one had to *do*. Or, as Roberts and Draper put it, citizenship was the result of performance: “This practice in actual deeds of citizenship in the high school makes for the life habits and attitudes that govern the reactions of the individual toward every situation” (1928, pp. 23-24).

Even though the proponents of citizenship-through-extracurriculars felt that the school was not truly a society itself but a place in which to rehearse for one’s future role

in society, they had a great deal of faith in the ability of the extracurriculum to prepare students to be good citizens in the future. It was generally recognized that the school was a prototype of adult society, and thus when students practiced the acts of citizenship—participating in the recreational activities of their community, assisting in solving the problems of their community, electing their own leaders and participating in the government of the school, conducting meetings according to parliamentary procedure, performing the activities essential to group life, grappling with problems of social control, etc.—they were training for their future participation as citizens in society (Douglass, 1927; Fretwell, 1930; Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction [PA DPI], 1922; Rugg, 1930; Terry, 1928). It was assumed that “the best guarantee that pupils later will participate actively and intelligently in civic affairs is their active and intelligent participation in the cooperative management of their own affairs” (Douglass, 1927, pp. 440-441). Even as just a venue for rehearsal of citizenship, much was expected of the extracurriculum in terms of training future citizens.

Moral training through practice in extracurriculars.

The best method of imparting moral training to the youth is to get him to take part in the actual social life about him, for every ounce of moral experience is worth a pound of ethical instruction. (Froula, 1915, p. 740)

Finally, extracurriculars were thought to yield the moral dividends because they provided an opportunity for practice or application of moral precepts taught in the classroom. Educators who wanted to marshal the extracurriculum for moral ends were less concerned with whether the moral practice provided in the school context was fundamentally like life or fundamentally an opportunity to rehearse life skills, than that extracurriculars provided a better venue for the exercise of moral skills than did

classroom-based moral instruction. Wilds asserted, “There is no better way of applying lessons in ethics—the difference between right and wrong—than through the participation of students in the extra-curricular activities of the school” (1926, p. 29). Deam and Bear speculated upon why the extracurriculum was such a good venue for moral practice, observing that not only did extracurriculars provide an opportunity for moral practice, but they provided an opportunity that was more appealing to youth than abstract discussions of morals in the classroom: “Youth takes more kindly . . . to a principle if it is taught through actual practice in connection with a real enterprise or by example than if it is taught merely as a precept in some formal course of study” (1928, p. 5). Others felt that formal moral instruction itself was less necessary than the opportunity to practice (or, at least, to be trained to practice) applying moral ideals. “Whether or not we recognize a necessity for the direct setting forth of moral ideals, in stated [class] periods or as occasion demands, we must agree that opportunity should be presented for training in the application of such ideals,” wrote Francis H. J. Paul (1921, p. 55). Such opportunity was, of course, afforded by extracurricular activities, which once more provided a valued outlet in which youth could develop the fundamental skills of living together in society.

Next, I describe the ways in which social, civic, and moral values, respectively, were thought to be offered by the extracurriculum.

The Extracurriculum as a “Social” Phenomenon

Shot through the whole extra-classroom organization is the social motive.
(Roberts, 1918, p. 34)

The word “social” was the fourth most frequently used word among my aggregated sources—only the words “school,” “activities,” and “high” occurred more

frequently (see Appendix A). Even though some of the uses of the word “social” did not have to do with the extracurriculum directly (e.g., social studies, social problems) or are discussed elsewhere in this paper (e.g., adolescents’ social instincts, discussed in Chapter 4), several uses of it pertinent to the extracurriculum remained, including: the opportunity to develop social skills and abilities, the need for social efficiency, Deweyan “social” influences, and social service. In short, the extracurriculum was thought to be the school function most suited to “socializing” students: “The management of social activities in a high school should aim to accomplish the socialization of the school by giving every pupil the opportunity to gain the maximum benefit possible from participation in outside activities” (Holch, 1925b, p. 6). The “socialization” of the school was accomplished when its students were “socialized,” through efforts such as extracurricular activities; more student-centered, participatory classroom pedagogy (i.e., the “socialized recitation”); and less hierarchical approaches to school organization, supervision, and administration (North, 1918; Roberts, 1918; Rynearson, 1917). These various ways in which the extracurriculum could “socialize” students are described below, after a brief discussion of various definitions of “social” in the context of education and extracurriculars in use at this time.

Defining “social” in the context of education.

[T]here are many school organizations of students whose purpose is incidentally educational but primarily social, using the term social in a broad sense. (Ashley, 1922, p. 104)

Historian Paula Fass observed that the themes informing the creation of the school-sponsored extracurriculum included “a new view of schooling as socialization” (1989, p. 76). Indeed, several writers on the extracurriculum described the high school’s

new approach to education. “More and more does the public school endeavor to train the pupil for his place in society as a cooperative individual, as one who is a part of a larger corporate life” (1926, p. 290), wrote Holch, elaborating that being a successful member of society meant getting along with others:

The new ideal in education is not to produce simply individual efficiency of mind and body and spirit, but to produce socialized individuals, able to cope with their environment, able to rub elbows with their fellow men and neither harm nor be harmed by the contact. (1926, pp. 294)

Klapper elaborated on some of the “desocializing forces to which critics of our day ascribe the social unrest,” making this new approach to schooling necessary: “Pressure of poverty, poor housing, urban congestion with its attending demoralization, lack of play space and opportunities for wholesome recreation, the weakening of family ties, the alienation of the masses from the church” (1929, p. 628). The only factor that could mitigate these forces was a “socially minded citizenry,” and the place to create that citizenry was the school.

The extracurriculum and “social” confusion. The extracurriculum was considered a prime venue for socialization and other social aims. But it was also subject to some confusion about what it meant when it claimed that its activities were “social” or “socializing.” Educators themselves were guilty of using two meanings of the term in the same breath when referring to the extracurriculum, as when Pringle provided an extensive list of “social activities and organizations” existing at one high school, then indicated, “As the names of these organizations suggest, all efforts along *social* lines in this school had in each case a very definite aim; there was no attempt to organize for

purely *social* purposes or merely to have a good time” (1922, p. 226, emphasis added). None of the social activities at this high school were exclusively social. Holch also succumbed to this “social” confusion, sending principals and superintendents a survey asking both whether extra-curricular activities were desirable as “socializing agents” and whether their school had “any purely ‘social’ activities” (1925a, pp. 606-607). The definition of “social” could seem so generic as to be unhelpful, although other educators did use it to describe aspects of the extracurriculum in better-specified ways.

Extracurriculars as a venue for developing social skills, traits, and abilities.

Surely the extra-curricular activities, if properly conducted, furnish an excellent laboratory for the development of social skills. (Hobson, 1923, p. 116)

Generically speaking, extracurricular activities were thought to provide an excellent venue for the development of social skills, traits, and abilities (Dargan, 1927; Eaton, 1935). The social skills and abilities educators hoped would develop in extracurricular contexts had to do with getting along with and feeling connected to and governed by others, being able to work with others, and adapting oneself to the group. Social skills and abilities to be developed through extracurriculars mentioned by more than one author included cooperation (King, 1916; Paul, 1921; Pringle, 1922; Smith, 1924); lawfulness (King, 1916; Paul, 1921), presumably as a reflection of respect for the rules of society; and loyalty to the group (King, 1916; Pringle, 1922). About the latter, Pringle elaborated:

When the enthusiastic youth identifies himself with the group of his own choice, he is no longer a mere individual, but a member of a debating club, an orchestra, a football team, or a play cast; and he must put forth his best effort in order that he may loyally serve the purpose of his organization. (Pringle, 1922, p. 218)

Cooperation was learning to work with the group; loyalty was the feelings of identification with the group one developed as a result.

Other social traits and abilities thought to develop among extracurricular participants included skill in the interpretation of social situations (Pringle, 1922); freedom of the individual (to choose which groups to join, perhaps) and service (Paul, 1921); and ability to meet people, fair-mindedness, tolerance, social conscience, and social graces (Roberts & Draper, 1928). Smith, who had noted how extracurriculars provided “conditions of reality” in which to become socialized, also observed that extracurriculars provided “a human nature and social conduct laboratory of vital significance in the educative process” (1924, p. 117). He offered several examples of specific social gains students could experience through extracurricular participation, including refinement of “crudities of speech and manner by social attrition” (i.e., social disapproval), elimination of “individual idiosyncrasies and petty selfishnesses through the force of social pressure” (i.e., increased conformity and group-mindedness), and improved habits of “sharing interests, efforts, and responsibilities” (pp. 116-117).

In light of the major personal changes and collective efforts seen by educators as optimally “social,” it is no wonder that some students opted instead to come off as “not socially inclined” (Singer, 1927, p. 17). But educators held out hope that extracurriculars could “socialize” the “not socially inclined,” as Fowler described:

We all know of cases where belonging to the school band or the student council has revolutionized a boy’s attitude toward his school life, has improved his personal appearance, his conduct, has, in short, transformed him from a crude, anti-social being into a social asset to his school and community. (1920, p. 397)

This reasoning surely stood behind efforts to make extracurricular participation compulsory. One did not always have the option of remaining “not socially inclined.”

Social efficiency.

True social efficiency is the art of acting with others toward a definite end, and through school organizations is learned the value of co-operation . . . (McLinn, 1911, p. 355)

The opposite of “not socially inclined” was, in the parlance of the time, “socially efficient.” Among the nuances and subtypes of the extracurriculum-as-socialization, “social efficiency” deserves particular mention, because early 20th century extracurricular thought adds a new definition to the multiple historical definitions of this educational catchphrase. In his 2004 article, “Social Efficiency Splintered: Multiple Meanings Instead of the Hegemony of One,” historian J. Wesley Null identifies three basic definitions of “social efficiency” extant during the period 1905-1922: one about social control through vocational curricula, one concerning social service and the development of moral character, and one Deweyan, seeking to reconcile the dualism of individual and society. But the educators who discussed social efficiency in the context of the extracurriculum used none of the definitions identified by Null. Instead, they seemed to define “social efficiency” simply as “being effective in social contexts/settings/groups,” reflecting both the extracurriculum’s emphasis on socialization and the common use of the term “efficiency” at this time, as synonymous with “effectiveness” (Null, 2004)—hence McLinn’s use of “social efficiency” in the quote above to mean “acting with others toward a definite end” and as an attribute acquired in settings requiring “co-operation.”

The educators who held up the extracurriculum as a means to greater “social efficiency” provided examples of the social *inefficiency* the extracurriculum was to

remedy. Pringle observed that school social activities “will not aid greatly in producing the conscientious book-worm” (1922, p. 231); rather, as Davis noted, bookworms required that their social nature be “drawn out” via extracurriculars so that they might become “socially efficient” (1916, p. 412). On the other end of the “social efficiency” spectrum, students who were natural leaders of dubious social activities also needed to be made “socially efficient.” Davis gives the example of “the boy who was the leader of every scheme of outlawry and the plotter of every prank during his school career,” whose crude social powers “should have been trained” by participation in extracurriculars to be channeled toward more appropriate ends (1916, p. 412).

How, specifically, could the extracurriculum transform socially inefficient youth into socially efficient youth? First, it provided the all-important “practice” in social contexts. Wilds noted that extracurriculars “provide experiences in the social relationships of life” (1926, p. 21). The school had long talked about right social relations in the abstract; extracurriculars provided a venue in which to practice proper social conduct toward the goal of improving one’s social efficiency:

Too long have we put our trust in talking about etiquette, good manners, and social virtues. It is time we are providing associations in which youth will actually learn its code of conduct, actually build its social habits, actually crystallize its ideals in the right direction of a sound social efficiency. (Wilds, 1926, pp. 22-23)

Pringle elaborated on how the day-to-day operations of extracurriculars provided this social cultivation: “The high-school dramatic club, debating society, and athletic team, each with its own style of strenuous criticism, coaching, and give-and-take, will aid greatly in removing the social kinks” (1922, p. 220). Through communication with and

guidance from their peers and their activity's advisor, students improved their social effectiveness.

To educators of the 1910s and 1920s, extracurriculars did not just put students in intensive and constructive contact with their peers, but they also made students effective navigators of those informal group situations. Given the examples provided here, it is doubtful that the educators who discussed such "social efficiency" in the context of the extracurriculum were referring to the extracurriculum helping students identify their future career path, to social service or societal improvement as the main goals of extracurricular participation, or to individual concerns being reconciled with social needs in the context of the extracurriculum. Instead, where they referred to "social efficiency" by name, they meant the attainment of their major overarching extracurricular goal: the effectiveness of a student as the member of a group.

Deweyan influences and socialization. Some educators thought they knew where the emphasis on socialization in education in general and the extracurriculum in particular came from. Houston found nothing new in education's emphasis on socialization (others would have disagreed), but also conceded that John Dewey had managed to breathe new life into this perennial concern, with effects on the curriculum and extracurriculum alike:

Strangely enough, as far back as any theory of the aim of education has been ventured, and from that earliest date throughout the ages, social adjustment has been the major objective of every system of education; but Dewey's modern presentation of the aim has set socialization aflame, and now curricula are being fashioned to turn out citizens. Small wonder is it, then, that the extra-curriculum

activities should argue their right for attention on the grounds of their social values . . . (1930, p. 286)

Houston was concerned that students would be harmed by the new fervor for socialization, but others saw the extracurriculum as the perfect fuel for a desirable Deweyan student socialization. In an article concerning “the social basis of extra-curricular activities,” A. E. Holch reminded his/her readers of the basics of Dewey’s approach to education as socialization by quoting his *Pedagogic Creed*:

I believe that the school is primarily a social institution. Education being a social process, the school is simply the form of community life in which all those agencies are concentrated that will be most effective in bringing the child to share in the inherited resources of the [human] race, and to use his powers for social ends. (Dewey, 1897²⁵, p. 7)

The individual is not neglected in this new ideal of education, Holch notes, but he/she is also considered as a member of society and taught to “cope with their environment” and “rub elbows with their fellow men” (1926, p. 294).

Others elaborated on how the extracurriculum was a great venue for Deweyan “socialization.” In 1928, Thomas Deam and Olive Bear devoted an entire book to the topic of “socializing the pupil through extra-curricular activities,” introducing the volume with a nod to Dewey’s thought on socialization as the impetus for the growth of extracurriculars:

It is perhaps not too much to say that the socialization of the high school program had its origin in the John Dewey philosophy. . . . [O]ne of its most important

²⁵ Interestingly, the publication date of Dewey’s most famous statement of the social ends of schooling is much closer to the Committee of Ten era than the publication date of the *Cardinal Principles* report (1918).

results has been the constantly increasing number of school activities known as extra-curricular. (p. 1)

Other functions of the school were attempting to “socialize” themselves, including instruction and school administration, but those efforts were not as far along (in the case of instruction) or as widely distributed (as in the case of school administration, the socialized form of which usually meant student government) as the extracurriculum. But whether Deweyan socialization had set extracurriculars aflame or extracurriculars had provided fuel for efforts toward Deweyan socialization, the net effect was the same: the school, and especially the extracurriculum, were consumed by the goal of socialization.

Social service. Today, we think of “social service” as solving social problems via government services for the disadvantaged, or volunteer work for civic purposes, but Froula offered a more generic definition more consonant with Dewey’s goal of students using their “powers” for social ends: belonging to a football team could provide the youth with “a clear notion of social service,” because his efforts were being combined with those of the other members to yield a group in the form of “a social instrument with common needs, working along common lines, and embodying a common purpose” (1915, p. 738). This kind of social service meant simply contributing to the efforts of the group—that is, an individual being of service socially. This definition recurs under the civic theme below, with the notion that in extracurriculars, students should use their individual talents for the benefit of the community.

The danger of anti-sociality in extracurriculars. Just because the extracurriculum *could* socialize students in numerous desirable ways did not mean that it always *did* (especially among the “not socially inclined”), or that it did not have the

potential to do otherwise. Several educators offered examples of ways in which the extracurriculum could be anti-socializing, as well as ways to prevent that from happening. The first example was educators' *bête noire*, secret societies (i.e., sororities and fraternities). Educators could and did specify why secret societies did not or were incapable of achieving practically every desirable extracurricular value, starting with "social." Here, their objection was that secret societies fostered cliques (that were, presumably, intensely social as opposed to diffusely social, an ideal of extracurricular socialization) (Pound, 1919). Cliques in general were undesirable, and Belting pointed out that they could arise from school-sponsored extracurriculars, too, if those activities were not well-supervised, along with a host of other "anti-social practices": "Improper dancing, misappropriation of school funds, yellow journalism, intense class rivalry, painting and hanging of class colors, class fights, slighting of school work, disrespect for teachers, development of snobbery, destruction of standards of decency and morality" (1923, p. 270) Many of these seem to be "social" simply because they involved more than one person, but individuals could ignore their own schoolwork and embezzle funds; such acts must have been considered "social" because they potentially affected others.

Others noted the school's role in capturing student energies for "social" ends, lest students choose to expend them in ways considered "anti-social." Here, the peril was that extracurriculars would not be sufficiently compelling to capture students' attention and then be able to "socialize" them. Holch put the responsibility for students' preferred "type of amusement" firmly in the hands of the school, noting that students might opt for activities "of the 'jazz' type" or even "more vulgar" types of amusement, unless the school successfully performed its "functions of socialization" by instilling in students "a

taste for higher and more educational and cultural types of recreation” (1926, p. 298).

North used a metaphor of energy and efficiency to make the same point, that if the school did not capture the social energy “generated by the daily contact of pupils in the social relation” and apply it toward efforts to train the pupils for life, it was wasted:

Socialization has, therefore, an aspect of educational thrift; for if not guided, it dissipates itself and turns no useful wheels, or turns only useless or dangerous ones; but, if guided, it elicits in many a boy and girl interests, powers, and abilities which he would have been years later in recognizing or which he might never suspect he had. (North, 1918, p. 470)

From the point of view of the school, perfect socialization through extracurriculars meant attracting students to these activities and then overseeing the activities in such a way that students were not tempted to behave in “anti-social” ways. But here we also see the idea of “social” used in its broadest and perhaps most meaningless sense. Since no extracurriculars were individual endeavors, the extracurriculum was inherently “socializing”—that is, taking place in the context of a group, having to do with interpersonal relations. It was thus sometimes difficult to pinpoint how, if ever, extracurricular participation did anything but “socialize” students.

The connection between socialization and democracy.

Training for work, play, health, character, and home membership must be provided for all in the wide-awake high school. The school group with its diverse activities of school citizenship serves as an excellent training field for this process of socialization. (Fowler, 1921, p. 672)

Finally, several educators found the socialization and training-for-citizenship functions of the extracurriculum to be intertwined. Fowler (above) referred to “citizenship” in a generic sense, synonymous with “membership”, in the context of

socialization as training youth to be functioning members of all the spheres of their lives. Lamar offered a similar overview of the life arenas in which youth were expected to become contributing members, but saw this not just as preparation of individual youth for life, but their preparation for life as citizens who might need to respond to social crises:

Actual practice in meeting the demands of society is required of our boys and girls in their relationships on the playgrounds, in clubs, in assemblies, at games, and in their inter-school contests. It is only by such practice that our future citizens can be expected to react correctly in social crises. (1925, p. 611)

Sleezer believed that the extracurriculars at Senn High School were “contributing to the development of the social mind, which is one basic need today if democracy is ever to be achieved.” Her components of the “social mind”—students forming “habits of community consciousness and alertness to the need of civic reforms,” gaining “experience in adopting direct and honest methods of achieving those reforms,” and “developing their ability to lead with integrity and to follow with intelligence” (1924, p. 520)—sound like major democratic acts that students who had been “socialized” would be equipped to perform in the future. But extracurricular thought also encompassed some aims and attributes of extracurriculars specific to the civic/democratic value (i.e., aims and attributes without any explicit connection to socialization); these are described below.

The Extracurriculum and Civic Aims

Clubs and organizations of, by, and for the pupils have sprung up with mushroom growth to train the youth of the land in the duties of future citizenship. (Davis, 1914, pp. 245-246)

The extracurricular aspirations specific to the value of citizenship can be summarized as follows: participation in extracurriculars should be open to all students or

only restricted on the basis of skill or merit; extracurriculars called for cooperation, teamwork, and other democratic skills; extracurricular participants should seek to use their individual talents for the greater good; and students should assume civic responsibility under guidance.

Democratic criteria for participation. One key way in which the extracurriculum was meant to be democratic was in the criteria for who could participate in extracurriculars, and the implications of that participation. A counterexample is most illustrative here: proponents of school-sponsored extracurriculars felt that high school secret societies were undemocratic because the only criterion for membership was “social”—i.e., popularity, and also (and relatedly) belonging to a certain social class. By contrast, membership in extracurriculars being open to all students was the democratic ideal. Professor Thomas Briggs of Teachers College, in a quotation regarding junior high extracurriculars cited approvingly by both Foster (1925) and Kaye (1933), pointed out some key differences among students that could have had bearing on their membership in a secret society, but should not affect their eligibility for extracurriculars:

the one place above all else where [clear-cut and unmistakable democratic ideas and objectives] may be made to function in a natural matrix is in the conduct of the extra-curricular activities. Whether a pupil is notably dull, studious, clever, rich, poor, handsome, or ugly, he should have an equal opportunity to be a member of a school organization. (1922, p. 4)

Some extracurriculars also had membership criteria, but ones that were seen as less arbitrary or artificial than social status; extracurricular membership based on skill or merit was acceptable in cases where membership was limited by definition (e.g., athletic

teams, honor societies) (Pound, 1918). As Pringle summarized, “the way [to extracurricular membership] is always *open to all who can qualify*, otherwise we have present the chief evil of the fraternities and sororities, and the principle of democracy is violated” (1922, p. 230, emphasis added). Similarly, to Paul, student organizations were valuable because they recognized achievement and rejected “accidental differences” of birth and wealth (1922, p. 1274). It was acceptable for students to distinguish themselves among their peers through their efforts and skills, just not through their attributes.

From the perspective of democratic goals for extracurriculars, the chief evil of secret societies was exclusivity on unjustified social grounds, an evil with implications for the social perspective of their members. Pound observed that “the fraternity splits the school into small cliques whose interests are more important to the members than are the interests of the school. . . . [E]ven the best of them seldom throw themselves wholeheartedly into projects of general interest” (1919, p. 442). So not only was universal eligibility for extracurriculars important on principle, as a reflection of democratic notions of access, it was also important for what it enabled: democratic cooperation among the various and varying members of the school community toward shared ends (King, 1916).

Threats to democracy in extracurriculars. Just as widespread (and ideally, universal) extracurricular participation was optimally democratic, participation monopolized by a small subset of students was undemocratic (Jones, 1925). “In the very things which should make for democracy and wide participation, to encourage the development of individual stars is highly undemocratic,” wrote Froula, admonishing teachers who recruited those “stars” for their particular activities “so as to make a showing” (1915, pp. 741-742). Other factors potentially contributing to extracurriculars

becoming undemocratic included expense (which could disqualify certain students from participating on the basis of their inherited characteristics—i.e., wealth) and the difficulty in controlling these activities, which could prevent educators from helping students derive the maximum democratic and other benefits from them (Pound, 1918). The democratic benefits thought to accrue to participants included improved teamwork, cooperation, and other skills.

Teamwork and cooperation as skills of citizenship.

There is no finer expression of citizenship than teamwork. The ability to work together, play together, keep together, with common interests are worthy of attainment. The club, the team, the council, the staff, and so on, all call for and demand togetherness. (Meyer, 1926, p. 5)

Teamwork and cooperation in “projects of general interest” were regarded as democratic aspects of extracurricular participation, since they meant students were working together “for the common good” (PA DPI, 1922, p. 117) and forming habits of cooperation “which it is hoped will carry over into community life” (Pringle, 1922, p. 218). Traditionally, the school did not teach cooperation—an important demand of citizenship (McKown, 1927); to democratically-minded educators, extracurriculars provided a welcome venue in which to practice it. McKown observed that cooperation was not just helpful or possible but practically required in extracurricular contexts: “Membership in a student council, athletic team, or club, teaches cooperation because the student has to exercise it in order to retain his position and standing” (1927, p. 6). Whether students or advisors would depose a student leader who opted for dictatorship instead of cooperation, McKown didn’t say.

Other qualities of citizenship to be developed through extracurricular participation. In addition to cooperation and teamwork, many qualities thought to

belong to a good citizen were thought or hoped to result from extracurricular participation, including the following named by more than one writer:

- initiative (Eaton, 1935; Foster, 1925; Kaye, 1933; Roemer & Allen, 1926);
- respect for others (Meredith, 1920; Roemer & Allen, 1926);
- leadership (Foster, 1925; Kaye, 1933; Roemer & Allen, 1926);
- intelligent obedience (Foster, 1925; Kaye, 1933; Roemer & Allen, 1926);
- and
- self-direction (Eaton, 1935; Roemer & Allen, 1926).

Other qualities mentioned included “a spirit of the square deal” (Meredith, 1920, p. 122), self-reliance (Roemer & Allen, 1926), and “the development of judgment through exercise of choice” (Eaton, 1935, p. 66). Some of these were individual dispositions thought to help the student be a better citizen (initiative, self-direction, self-reliance, judgment), whereas others had more to do with interpersonal relations (respect, leadership, obedience, cooperation, a sense of fairness).

As though all of those qualities were not enough for future citizens to strive for in their extracurricular participation, several other writers offered their own well-elaborated lists of qualities of sound citizenship that could be developed through extracurriculars. In this, Paul took the approach of specifying skills, dispositions, and attitudes possessed by “real” citizens and acquirable through extracurriculars, introducing themes of obligation, careful selection of democratic leadership, and independence of mind:

Our country needs citizens who shall be able to think for themselves on public questions, citizens who recognize the fact that the right of self-government can be maintained only when all members of the community respond to the obligations

upon them of respect for and obedience to self-imposed law, citizens who seriously assume the obligation upon them of wise choice of those to whom the enforcement of law is entrusted. (1922, p. 1274)

Wilds found the following to be some essential qualities of a good citizen:

A high sense of honor, fairness, and justice; initiative, resourcefulness, and enthusiasm in voluntary service for the state; self-control [and] consideration for the rights of others; a sense of civic responsibility; respect for law and order [and] a sense of the distinction between liberty and license.

Again, we see a mixture of individual dispositions and “social” skills. “Do not extracurricular activities furnish training along all these lines in the highest degree?” he asked. The answer, of course, was yes: “Here the future citizen can learn these civic virtues” (1926, p. 27). It seemed as though the civic aim alone provided ample qualities for students to potentially acquire through their extracurricular participation. But the individual civic qualities to be gained or improved through extracurricular participation were not only for the benefit of the individual.

“Each for all and all for each”²⁶: Individual talents in the service of the community. In the democratic high school, students should come to understand their own individual responsibility for community improvement through their extracurricular participation—and, indeed, how their individual extracurricular participation was only meaningful in the context of its benefit to the community. Paul expounded on this goal in philosophical terms in several publications, but a concrete example he gives of how one school presented extracurriculars at their orientation for incoming students shows how the students themselves might have experienced this goal:

²⁶ Several sources used some version of this phrase: Rynearson, 1917; Paul, 1924; Williams, 1934.

[The incoming students] are acquainted with the opportunities for student activities afforded by the school, and each is urged to consider the particular talent, scholastic, athletic, or social, that he possesses. He is reminded that through that talent he can perpetuate and extend the traditions of the school as a democratic community in which the motto is each for all and all for each. He is impressed with the fact that when he graduates four years later he will be asked in what way the school has become better because of his presence. (1924, p. 917)

From day one at the high school, students who would participate in extracurriculars were taught to see that participation not primarily as an opportunity for personal betterment, but for community betterment. “Pupils trained only to be efficient [i.e., effective] in personal effort for personal ends are not the type of pupils America expects from its schools,” Paul elaborated elsewhere, in the context of the extracurriculum (1921, p. 58); instead, “Our country needs citizens that have had their individual talents so developed that they will render to the community the best of which they are capable” (1922, p. 1274). These talents could, of course, be discovered and developed within extracurriculars. Paul called this use of personal talents for community gain “service” or “social responsibility.”

But Paul was not the only educator to see the extracurriculum as a democratic venue for individual contribution to the greater good. Meredith thought that extracurriculars should give students “a sense of personal responsibility for the common weal” (1920, p. 122); Williams observed that at Littleburg High School, “Each pupil is taught to feel that the success of the group depends in the main upon his individual performance in each activity” (1934, p. 492). Of course, Williams may have borrowed

that sentiment from Paul, who a decade earlier had recommended that individual achievement in extracurriculars be “weighed and honored according to its effect upon the student body and the purposes and good name of the school” (1924, p. 916). In the democratic high school, individual efforts found their meaning in community benefit. Each extracurricular participant labored for the benefit of all, and the efforts of all contributed to the community for each.

Responsibility and guidance.

Extracurricular activities, where the students are actually carrying responsibilities under carefully concealed guidance, present an opportunity for training in character and citizenship which a course in “moral education” or a course in “citizenship” could never approach. (Roberts & Draper, 1928, p. 24)

In order for students to gain even some of the desired qualities of a good citizen, and for individual students’ efforts to benefit the school as a whole, it was not enough for students just to participate in extracurriculars. They needed to experience the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship, and they needed to be carefully (and subtly) guided by the faculty in meeting those obligations and carrying out those responsibilities. Johnston approvingly shared an extant definition of democracy as “responsibility widely shared” (1932, p. 88); he and others felt that a democratic extracurriculum should do the same—that is, that extracurricular responsibilities should be shared as widely as possible among the students (e.g., PA DPI, 1922). While this discussion of responsibilities and obligations took place in the context of fostering citizenship, educators did not mean just sharing responsibilities regarding student government; all types of extracurricular activities carried obligations concerning their organization and development, and thus were grounds for the development of citizenship:

in the four years of their high-school life, students should have the obligations and privileges of citizenship opened up to them in a real and concrete manner in sharing in the duties and responsibilities of determining their school policies both in the larger sense of school government and in the narrower sense of the organization and development of all activities. (Roberts & Draper, 1928, p. 24)

However, students could not fulfill their responsibilities as school-citizens if left alone with those responsibilities. Yes, pupils should be given as much opportunity to manage their own activities as possible, Holch concurred, but they also needed to learn “the necessity of law and order in the carrying out of their own group plans,” meaning that a faculty advisor would always be on hand (1925b, p. 6). The advisor’s influence was softer than “law and order” might suggest; Holch thought faculty advisors would be “looked to for expert advice and assistance” (1925b, p. 6); similarly, Jones spoke of providing “supervised training in citizenship,” since “faculty guidance with student co-operation means true democracy in the control of the social life of the school” (1925, p. 510).

The extracurriculum and the maintenance of American democracy. So seriously did some educators take the democratic mission of extracurriculars that they seemed to stop just short of attributing all responsibility for the maintenance of American democracy itself to these activities. Pringle fretted that “In general the high school is the last chance for the widely differentiated social groups to become integrated and to learn to work with each other for a common and worthy purpose” (1922, p. 230); to Barton, extracurriculars could remedy (and thereby prevent?) the fundamental interpersonal problems of democratic society:

The heterogeneous character of the population of most high schools provides through the various extra-class activities favorable situations for rubbing off many of the rough edges of social relationships resulting from the various causes of social cleavage operative in all democracies, no less in the United States than elsewhere. (1925, p. 239)

Pringle seems to discount the opportunities for “democratic mixing” in adult life, including in neighborhoods and at workplaces. Adult work and social environments were certainly more physically segregated by race and class than the school, but that did not necessarily mean that youth “mixed” democratically in extracurriculars to the extent that educators desired. Fass (1989) examined student extracurricular involvement by ethnic group in seven New York City high schools in the 1930s and 1940s, finding both certain activities favored by certain ethnic groups across schools (e.g., Jews in academically-focused clubs, black male students on the track team), but also that individually, “except for blacks,²⁷ students from different groups elected to participate widely in a range of activities” (p. 106). While educators hoped for “widely differentiated social groups to become integrated” through extracurriculars, that seems to have occurred for individuals, even if different groups of students still favored certain kinds of activities.

Some of these educators’ anxiety about the need for democratic mixing through the extracurriculum surely was the result of other things schools were doing at this time to accommodate student differences—things that were not at all unifying or integrating, including providing differentiated curricula and utilizing ability grouping. So while educators like Pringle and Barton seemed to be concerned with society at large, it may

²⁷ Fass observes that “Blacks were most consistently absent from a wide range of activities,” an absence she attributes to “a strong exclusionary bias against them” (p. 81).

well have been the climate of democracy (or the apparent lack thereof) within their own schools that concerned them most. Similarly, educators recommending the use of extracurriculars for moral training may have been concerned about societal morals in the abstract, but were probably motivated to direct their school's extracurriculars toward moral ends because of immoral habits and behaviors they observed among their own students.

The Extracurriculum, Moral Education, and Character Development

[T]hose who grasp the true significance of such [extra-curricular] activities find in the moral field their chief claim to recognition. (Paul, 1921, p. 55)

While the only historian of education to give much attention to the extracurriculum as a character-forming institution dropped that theme after one publication on Chicago high schools, and moreover, discussed it in more of a civic than an ethical light (Gutowski, 1978), the national literature on extracurriculars included sufficient material on these activities' role in moral and character training²⁸ specifically to support Koos' (1926) identification of "moral" as a major component of the "civic-social-moral" cluster of extracurricular goals. Several themes arise in the literature on the extracurriculum's role in moral and character training. First, schoolchildren were so diverse in the early 20th century that schools had to provide some sort of standard or common moral training, and indeed, schools (and their extracurriculars specifically) were well-positioned to do so. In addition, as adolescents, high school students possessed several characteristics that made the extracurriculum a particularly fruitful venue for molding their characters, in the context of careful supervision from school staff. Finally, the moral value in extracurriculars had a strong connection to "socialization," 20th-

²⁸ In this section, I use the terms "moral" and "character" interchangeably, since my sources saw them as intertwined, as with Paul—"Character is the outgrowth of the moral principles that guide us in our practical responses to life situations" (1922, p. 1273)—or successive, per Golightly: "Moral education is the older term for which character education is being substituted" (1927, p. 140).

century moral education witnessing a shift from individual to collective morality, a shift reflected in extracurricular thought.

The school and the extracurriculum as necessary and prime sites for character training. Jones (1924) describes how, before the school assumed control of the extracurriculum, it felt as though students required moral guidance, but considered moral training to be the domain of the home. However, writing in 1926, Wilds observed that “The day of the birch rod is over; old-fashioned parental authority of the wood-shed variety is on the decline” (p. 30). Ultimately, schools assumed responsibility for students’ moral training, at least in part because during this time, the heterogeneity of the student population was also increasing and the school was one of the few places most youth could receive some sort of shared moral education. Foster listed many differences among American students by the mid-1920s: “ability, aptitude, sex, probable career (educational and vocational), social status, environment, traditions, habits of work, race, nationality, age, health, intellectual development, economic status, *moral atmosphere*” (1925, p. 4, emphasis added). An unwitting elaboration on what Foster may have meant by “moral atmosphere” was provided by Klapper: “If each child were given a helpful inheritance, an intelligent home, a well-balanced regimen of life, and a social environment free from undesirable influence, the school would probably encounter no serious difficulty in the problem of character development.” But many children lack these things, he continued, leaving the school to “carry the burden of these other social agents [i.e., the home, the social environment] as well as its own duties in order to achieve its major aim—character training” (1929, p. 628). Certainly, there were other institutions concerned with moral training at this time, such as settlement houses, churches, and community youth

organizations (e.g., scouting, the YMCA), but none of those touched as many children of a community, and as many different kinds of children.

Note how Klapper describes character training—as the major aim of the school. Paul concurred and offered a reason why schools must be concerned with student character: “The character of our citizens is determined by the character of our pupils and the development of character in this broadest sense must be the goal of education” (1921, pp. 54-55). Nothing less than the moral quality of American society itself depended on the quality character training of schoolchildren. Wilds, who had noted the loss of the birch rod as an instrument of moral training, evocatively presented his alternative plan for teaching youth sound and moral conduct through moral actions. These tasks were now the domain of the school—specifically, the extracurriculum:

It is for the school to catch up the loosened reins of moral control and hold them taut over the lives of the pupils by insisting that they decide and choose the right and learn the great values of self-control and temperance and moderation in all things. The vigorous and intelligent administration of a sane extra-curricular program is one of the most potent agencies for the achievement of this purpose. (1926, p. 30)

Many other educators also noted that the extracurriculum was uniquely positioned to meet the major and high-stakes educational need of character training. Of these, some (like Wilds) simply claimed that the extracurriculum was the best school activity for moral training (e.g., *Extra-curricular activities*, 1925; Johnson, 1909; Smith, 1924); others elaborated on why this was so. Froula speculated that “the greatest dividends which are to be realized from investments in extra-curricular activities will be ethical,” because these

activities provided “the rich soil upon which will grow and flourish those basic qualities, such as loyalty, honesty, justice, sympathy, from which character is molded” (1915, p. 740). “[I]n these activities . . . every moral quality, such as honesty, truth, justice, and purity, is put to the test,” concurred Wilds himself (1926, p. 29). Moritz did not just *anticipate* moral effects from extracurriculars, but *found* actual moral effects from them evident in his own high school in Seward, Nebraska: “the results of our efforts along this [extracurricular] line is reflected in better scholarship, cleaner athletics, less rowdyism and above all a good wholesome moral atmosphere among our students” (1922, p. 116).

“Eager to engage”²⁹: Adolescent nature, moral character, and the extracurriculum. Part of what made the extracurriculum such a promising site for character development was the fact that youth seemed instinctually to want to organize into groups (Pringle, 1922). Left to themselves, youth formed organizations that could have good or bad effects on their characters; it was the responsibility of the school, therefore, to channel youths’ social tendencies to positive moral ends by providing well-supervised extracurricular activities (Paul, 1922; Wilds, 1926). Once in such groups, youth instinctively wanted to engage in activity. Neumann observed that “pupils take to activity so much more readily than they do to the relatively passive business of listening or reading” (1918, p. 10), thereby discounting classroom-based moral education. Among the activities in which youth were eager to engage, according to Neumann, were athletics, running a school paper, dancing, acting in plays, and building. Youth were natural do-ers in groups, making the extracurriculum a particularly suitable venue for their moral education.

²⁹ Neumann, 1918, p. 10

Paul elaborated on other attributes of adolescence that facilitated the use of extra-curriculars to moral ends, including not only youths' instinctive affinity for cooperative group activities but also their need to experience freedom, initiative, and self-reliance.

For the creation of social reactions that will eventuate in higher character and thus prepare for the highest duties of citizenship, the extra-curricular activities possess certain advantages. Interest in them is instinctive and needs guidance rather than creation. . . . They can be closely associated with adolescent tendencies such as the desire for freedom and for an opportunity to exercise initiative, the growing feeling of self-reliance, and the desire to co-operate in important community activities. (1921, pp. 55-56)

Holch added one more characteristic of youth to the argument for why extracurriculars could yield moral dividends among high-schoolers: their impressionability. "He feels so deeply," wrote Holch about the high school student, "that an ideal once gained is likely to become a permanent possession, especially in situations similar to the one in which he originally became introduced to the ideal" (1926, p. 300). Not only did the extracurricular activities themselves intrinsically appeal to youth in a number of ways, but youth were also considered uniquely susceptible to the "ideals" that could be presented in extracurricular contexts.

Threats to morality. But youth were uniquely susceptible to other, less desirable moral influences, too. Moritz elaborated on the other potential sources of moral training—the influences facing schoolchildren in their leisure time: "cribbing, petty thievery, cigarette smoking, swearing, dirty stories, obscene pictures and immoral conduct can be almost eliminated from the school where such organizations are fostered

by school authorities” (1922, p. 116). To this list of immoral undertakings, Wilds added commercial amusements, which also competed with the school for students’ attention:

In a day when commercialized amusement enterprises³⁰ are offering on every hand the most alluring, easy, passive, and socially undesirable pleasures, it is time that more wholesome pleasures, within the reach of all and without the ulterior and demoralizing motive of commercialism and profit, be offered to our boys and girls under the right kind of supervision and environmental conditions. (1926, p. 29)

Wilds felt that extracurriculars protected youth from such “sordid evils,” but only under the right supervision and circumstances.

Extracurriculars + “the right kind of supervision” = Moral/character training.

Holch cautioned that student activities could only yield “useful moral habits” if they were “organized along the lines of actual life situations, and then guided by careful supervision” (1926, p. 300). What did it mean to direct and control extracurriculars “in ways that will make them most productive in character development” (Smith, 1924, p. 119)? No one offered specifics, although everyone seemed to think some kind of “vigorous and intelligent administration” was necessary (Wilds, 1926). One small point of agreement was that of supervision: these activities should be “properly supervised and controlled” (Wilds, 1926) or “guided by careful supervision” (Holch, 1926). Wilds himself uses the terms “supervised” or “supervision” four times but never says more than that these activities require it. This obsession with oversight makes sense in light of educators’ sense that student activities, left alone, could turn out either morally sound or

³⁰ i.e., “the moving-picture machine; public dancing; pool, billiards, and bowling alleys” (Davis, 1914, p. 107)

morally suspect. But while writing on general extracurricular administration and management proliferated during this time, those plans and guidelines were not framed specifically in terms of administering and managing these activities toward moral ends. One thing was clear, however: when educators claimed that extracurriculars required careful oversight, what they envisioned their peers overseeing was not individual moral improvement, but a new kind of social morality—morality seen in terms of right relations within a group.

“The social aspects of morality”³¹ realized through extracurriculars. It was not just the opportunity for moral practice that made extracurriculars valuable, but the opportunity for moral practice in social contexts. Continuing the theme of rejecting curricular moral education in favor of moral practice in real-life situations, Deam and Bear introduce what it was about real-life situations that contributed most to moral development: the presence of others as valuable role models: “The association with those whose behavior is efficient and socially right makes courses in abstract character-training and citizenship less necessary” (1928, p. 5). Those “others” in the extracurricular company of whom students could learn moral conduct could be teachers or other students. Paul observed that teachers had a unique opportunity to mentor their students by advising extracurriculars:

It is in activities outside the classroom that the teacher gains one of his greatest opportunities to influence the character of his students. . . . It is this that requires that they participate in and direct such organizations, if through their own characters they are to influence the characters of their students. (1922, p. 1273)

³¹ Paul, 1921, p. 55

Monroe and Weber claimed that it was not a specific type of extracurricular activity that had a beneficial moral effect, but rather “the opportunity for working and mingling with other students under conditions approximating those of life outside of school” (1928, p. 406). Indeed, historian David P. Setran observed that “While adults never surrendered their authority in group [extracurricular] activities, they believed so strongly in group character building because they recognized the power of peer influence and its potential to elicit a potent social conformity” (2003, p. 455). No one said so outright in their discussions of how adolescent nature made youth susceptible to moral training through the extracurriculum, but not only did youth want to organize in cooperative groups, but once they had so organized, they were tremendously susceptible to each other’s influence. The presence of a teacher was required to ensure that students’ effects on each other were moral ones.

Moral training had not always been considered something that should take place in a group or social context. Historians B. Edward McClellan and David P. Setran both note that in the 19th century, moral education was thought of as something provided to individuals so that they could become moral individuals, the 20th century saw a shift to morality as something realized and required in a social context. Specifically, McClellan describes how, while 19th-century educators saw their classes as collections of individuals who each learned values from their textbook and teacher, 20th-century reformers noted the importance of the group in the process of moral education (1999). Setran elaborates on the nature of individual and group morality, respectively:

While 19th-century moral educators thought of the good society as a collection of moral individuals, each devoted to personal moral conviction and self-mastery,

mainstream character educators by the 1920s had begun to define the moral person as someone who could fit smoothly into group efforts, conforming to public opinion and fulfilling efficiently the obligations of his/her role. (2003, pp. 435-436)

Both of these historians acknowledge extracurriculars as one such morally auspicious social context, and contemporary sources support this. For example, Paul observed that the extracurriculum of the early 20th century was concerned with “the social aspects of morality” (1921, p. 55), suggesting that he knew there were other potential aspects of morality that were not the domain of the extracurriculum (i.e., individual aspects). Some educators even recognized the trend from individual to social morality of which their “socialized” extracurriculars were a part. Froula contrasted the (individualistic) teaching of moral precepts in the classroom with the ethical experiences provided by the (social) extracurriculum: “The group life of the school [i.e., extracurriculars] has within it ethical possibilities such as the classroom régime has rarely realized. It provides the youth with ethical experiences, which is a different thing from furnishing him with moral precepts” (1915, p. 740). Pringle offered a strikingly strong definition of the new social morality, writing that “morality is simply knowing the will of the community in matters affecting the welfare of others, either directly or indirectly, and doing it; it is knowing and obeying the social-will,” but he understood that this perspective was new:

It would appear that the Baconian adage which affirms that character is perfected in solitude and talent in society is out of date; we have a new gospel which proclaims that character is perfected and strengthened by vigorous and frequent contact with the will of others; and this social impact is most effective when

experienced in a group, all the members of which are striving for a common purpose. (1922, p. 219)

In this new age of social morality and character education, participating in extracurriculars was considered one key method of knowing and obeying the social-will in matters of common purpose.

The Social-Civic-Moral Extracurriculum and “Educationalizing” Social Problems

Whether socialization, citizenship, or morality, educational thinking of this time dictated that the school needed to cultivate it, lest it be inadequately developed among youth when they acted as or became members of society, and that the extracurriculum was a prime school function in which to do so. In this logic we find reflected historian David Labaree’s concept of “educationalizing” social problems, or asking the school to solve societal problems that in fact might be better solved by other institutions, such as the family, religious organizations, or civic organizations. For example, we see clearly above that moral education was transitioning out of the home and into the school at this time—at least, according to the educators who wanted a firmer hold on it.

While Labaree discusses “educationalizing” social problems in the present (e.g., “We ask education to ameliorate race and class inequality through school desegregation, compensatory coursework, programs to reduce prejudice, and free lunches” [2008, p. 447]), the history of the American high school extracurriculum, especially its social-civic-moral values, locates the school’s attempt to solve social problems within the history of American education. It may even extend the timeline of American schools’ known attempts to do so. Historian Larry Cuban writes that

Since the early 1950s, policy elites including federal and state officials have slowly and steadily “educationalized” national social, economic, and political problems. In short, policy elites have expected schools to “solve” alcohol, tobacco, and drug abuse as well as teenage pregnancy, and defend the nation against the Soviet Union during the Cold War. (2008, ¶2)

In this chapter, we see educators attempting to use the school to teach children to be better members of social groups, better citizens, and more moral individuals as early as the 1910s. The social problems of “unsocialness,” lack of feelings of civic duty or responsibility, and amorality found among American adults in the 1910s and 1920s were as much social problems as inequality, substance abuse, teenage pregnancy, national security, or any of the other social problems Labaree or Cuban name elsewhere in their articles. Whether or not the school *could* solve these social problems, it was attempting to—in part, through the extracurriculum.

The following two chapters turn to within-school concerns in extracurricular values, including individual-level values and school-level values. While these values did not loom nearly as large in the minds of educators of this time as the social-civic-moral triumvirate, it is important to note that not all prominent values in the extracurriculum were concerned with the school meeting society’s needs—schools also had their own students and their own climates in mind when considering the values to be realized through extracurriculars.

Chapter Four: Individual-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum: Meeting Students' Needs

The primary themes in extracurricular values—the civic-social-moral triumvirate—had to do with uniting the many students and the many different kinds of students who were now attending high school, and teaching them to live ethically and democratically together. Several of the remaining themes also had to do with inter-group relations: discipline among the student body, school morale (both examined in Chapter Five), and meeting the needs of adolescents as a developmentally distinct group of people (examined below). But one of these remaining values has to do with the opposite consideration of the newly large and heterogeneous school population—how, in the extracurricular program, to accommodate the diversity of all the individuals that comprised it, for if a youth became involved in an extracurricular activity of personal interest, he or she would then be able to derive the other (social) values from extracurricular participation as well as develop as an individual, and also be more likely to stay in school (Gaddy, in Roberts & Draper, 1928). This chapter examines the two main ways in which the extracurriculum was intended to meet individuals' needs: by meeting the needs of adolescents as a developmental group, and by meeting the unique needs of individual students.

Accommodating and Improving the Individual Through Extracurriculars

As a member of the cast of the play or opera, as a member of an athletic team or of the staff of the school paper, the boy or girl for the performance, the game, the issue, is the cast, the team, the staff. The whole voltage of the organization discharges through each individual member. (Miller & Hargreaves, 1925, p. 320)

Specific considerations of extracurricular participation from the point of view of the individual included acknowledgement that the extracurriculum could have different effects on different students, the need for flexible extracurricular policies to accommodate individual students' needs, and using extracurriculars to identify one's future career path. It was also widely acknowledged that the extracurriculum was superior to the curriculum in its ability to accommodate individuals' needs and preferences.

Various activities for various individuals.

There should be student activities varied enough to take in every pupil in the school. (McDaniel, 1919, p. 2)

The most obvious way for the extracurriculum to meet individuals' needs and interests was by encompassing a wide variety of activities. Several educators either recommended that schools have a varied set of extracurriculars or observed that they did have, to accommodate the individual differences, capacities, and interests of their heterogeneous pupils (Winner, 1923; Kaye, 1933). It was thus not uncommon for individual high schools to have dozens of activities in operation at any given time (e.g., Hausle, 1932, reported that James Monroe High School in the Bronx had more than 100). Murray optimistically claimed that *all* students could be accommodated in this way: "a program of student activities can be organized to provide outlets for all the energies of all the children in a school however they, as individuals, may be differentiated" (1931, p. 23).

As for what individual students stood to gain through their unique and varied extracurricular involvements, the possibilities were wide-ranging: character growth, individual expression, development of capacities, discovery of interests, self-discovery, self-realization, and self-fulfillment (Gaddy in Roberts & Draper, 1928; Meyer, 1926; Miller & Hargreaves, 1925). Bacon hoped for "the personal development of the

individual in relation to behavior, attitudes, responsibilities, initiative, personal charm, leadership, special talents, the balanced life” as a result of his/her extracurricular participation (in Roberts & Draper, 1928, p. 39). Few of these attributes are repeats from those thought to result from the social aims of the extracurriculum—seeing the extracurriculum as a venue for individual development opened up new possibilities in terms of potential benefits to students.

Differing extracurricular experiences for different individuals. Educators observed that individual students experienced the extracurriculum differently, derived different benefits from it based on their individual personalities, and required different pacing in and policies governing their participation. For example, coming together with one’s peers in activities of shared interest had different effects depending on the student, empowering some and moderating others: “Consciousness of common interests gives courage to the timid and patience to the aggressive individual. The student organization may thus bring educational opportunities to the one, and furnish valuable lessons in self-restraint to the other” (Eaton, 1935, p. 67). Once students were actively participating in activities of common interest, Miller and Hargreaves found that the unstructured nature of extracurriculars allowed for individually-determined progress: “In these activities no participant can be told exactly what to do next. . . . Each individual moves forward in the challenging situation at his own best speed and according to his ability and interest” (1925, p. 342). Murray observed that activity advisors could also adjust the content and flow of the activity to accommodate the participating students: activities should be “elastic, flexible, suited to the needs of those who take part,” and could be adjusted “from day to day, if necessary, to meet changing conditions and the desires of the children

involved” (1931, p. 23). The theme of “accommodating individual differences” provides a micro-level view—illustrating what it meant to execute extracurriculars on the ground among a heterogeneous student body.

Such individual differences in extracurricular experiences caused some educators to question blanket management policies such as point systems (see Chapter 4). In the name of providing for individual differences, Johnston conceded that “a variation in the number of activities in which the pupil may engage . . . seems justifiable” (1932, p. 90). So much of the extracurricular literature is concerned with the group and with universal values, intended effects, and policies—this minority of voices reminds us that not everyone thought of the extracurriculum in terms of mass experiences and effects. Some educators sought to accommodate individuals not just in the extracurricular offerings, but also in the structures of extracurricular management and oversight.

Extracurriculars and identification of individual career paths. Students were *meant* to have different extracurricular experiences so that they might identify a career path—or, as educators put it, discover their “vocational motive” (Miller & Hargreaves, 1925, p. 325) or “possible avenues of life work” (Meyer, 1926, p. 6). Such identification required specialization on the part of the student, in choosing activities related to his/her vocational aspirations (Miller & Hargreaves, 1925; Paul, 1922), and special knowledge on the part of the activity adviser of “the qualifications that are necessary for success in the vocation toward which an activity may be directed” (Dodson, 1929, p. 767). Again among “individual” considerations, we find concerns that stand in direct opposition to majority rhetoric—here, in opposition to voices claiming that education was life and the extracurriculum was a laboratory of actual life problems. The educators concerned with

the extracurriculum as a means of vocational discovery reminded their peers that the future still loomed and required preparation, no matter how compelling the present.

The extracurriculum accommodating individual differences better than the curriculum. Although educators were striving to reform classroom education in response to the great growth of the high school, incorporating such individual-recognizing approaches as the “socialized recitation” (i.e., class periods centered on discussion and project work instead of lecture), they acknowledged that until such efforts were in more consistent use, students were still more likely to be taught in a standardized, uniform, impersonal fashion and the extracurriculum would have to take up the slack in terms of seeing students as individuals and providing outlets for their unique interests (Douglass, 1927). Miller and Hargreaves observed that the value of semicurricular and extracurricular activities lay “in the opportunity they offer for realization of one’s own individual difference or bent, as opposed to or in contrast with the usual hopper method of regimentation of the classroom” (1925, p. 319).

At least two attributes of the extracurriculum allowed it to accommodate individual interests where the curriculum could not: it encompassed a wider range of activities, and it had less structure. Beebe found that extracurriculars gave individuals opportunities to develop talents beyond the scope of the subjects of the curriculum, including musical, dramatic, and athletic talents (in Roberts & Draper, 1928). “The club is freer” than the curriculum, noted Dodson, providing the individual more opportunity for original work; “hence, in it he finds a readier outlet for his interests than in the more formal class activity” (1929, p. 769). Given such great potential differences between students’ curricular and extracurricular experiences, we see that access to extracurriculars

meant more than just an opportunity to work together with one's peers on projects of shared interest—it meant an equally rare opportunity to discover and develop one's own skills and interests.

The Extracurriculum and Recognition of Adolescent Nature

Adolescents were thought to have a multitude of characteristics and desires that rendered the extracurriculum especially appropriate and useful for people at this developmental stage of life. These aspects included adolescents' sociability, spontaneity, plasticity, and energy. Of these, sociability was the most extensively discussed.

Adolescents as fundamentally social.

With adolescence comes normally an enlargement of social interests, a strong desire for the company of others, and also for voluntary organization into groups for all kinds of corporate activities. (Holch, 1926, p. 297)

“To the demands of society and to the psychological demands of adolescence the extra-curricular activities are peculiarly responsive,” wrote Jones (1924, p. 42). In both demands, the social motive was seen as paramount. As already described, the extra-curriculum was, first and foremost, about helping students become better social beings. Conveniently, adolescents were also noted for their prominent social tendencies: “The high school age is essentially a social age” (Holch, 1926, p. 297). (Of course, the causality may well have gone in the other direction: adolescents' social proclivities could very well have motivated the concern with guiding their social development through the extra-curriculum.) Certainly, a larger educational and societal zeitgeist of the “social” provided a convenient rationale for that aspect of both the extracurriculum and adolescence.

Numerous educators noted adolescents' tendency to create and join groups. “[High school age] is the age when most individuals of both sexes have strong

inclinations toward the formation of clubs for athletic, social, religious, and intellectual purposes,” observed Holch (1926, p. 297). Because of young peoples’ desire to be with one another, they “form natural groups for team games, for literary and artistic pursuits of a more or less serious nature, and for less serious enjoyments such as dancing” (Johnson, 1912, p. 493). Wilds elaborated on the particular aspects of sociality that were especially strong in adolescence and caused youth to form social groups: gregariousness, cooperation, emulation, rivalry, and altruism. “There is thus a natural and strong desire for these outside activities [i.e., extra-curricular activities] on the part of the students,” he declared (1926, p. 18).

Note Johnson’s and Wilds’ use of the term “natural” above to describe adolescents’ group-forming ways. These adolescent social tendencies were framed in terms of physical factors beyond adolescents’ rational control, social “instincts” (Hausle, 1932; Holch, 1926; Johnson, 1912; Jones, 1924; McLinn, 1911; North, 1918; Wilds, 1926) or social “impulses” (Koos, 1927; McLinn, 1911) being common terminology. But that didn’t mean that all youth were inherently social or would become positively socialized without careful guidance from school authorities. Roberts observed that his high school had created many “social agencies” in an attempt to hold “the ill-adjusted and unsocial adolescent youth” in school (1918, p. 25)—presumably, until they became properly “socialized.”

The school could not simply create “social agencies” and trust adolescents’ social instincts to result in their optimal “socialization” through them. Instead, the school had an active role to play in helping youth channel their social instincts through extracurriculars. First, the school should permit extracurriculars to exist, not seek to repress or ignore

youths' social instincts by suppressing or forbidding the organizations that were the results of those instincts (McLinn, 1911; Koos, 1927). Allowing extracurriculars to exist provided an all-important alternative to other non-school outlets for youths' social natures, such as street corners and pool halls (Holch, 1926). Paul reminded the school of its role in providing positive outlets for youths' self-organizing tendencies: "it is natural for students of adolescent age to form organizations good or bad in the ultimate effect on their characters. We cannot escape our responsibility in determining which type of organization, the good or the bad, shall prevail" (1922, p. 1273). Likewise, McLinn had declared a decade earlier, "Upon this we seem agreed: That the nature of adolescence and the present-day ideals of education call for control on the part of the school of the social activities of its students" (1911, p. 345).

However, educators were characteristically short on detail regarding how extracurriculars should be overseen for optimum adolescent sociality and socialization, as well as control of the undesirable effects of adolescents' social instincts; the consensus was only that they should be "directed" towards ends desired by the school, as in "the spontaneous social activities manifesting themselves in this period [i.e., adolescence] must be encouraged and directed" (Koos, 1927, p. 93). By "direction," educators probably meant, at least in part, oversight from advisors and management through policies like point systems. Properly directed, extracurriculars could yield "social responsibility" (Jones, 1924, p. 42)—that is, proper manifestation of adolescents' social tendencies. Extracurriculars could have beneficial effects and influences under school oversight because of other adolescent characteristics, too.

Adolescents as “plastic” and impressionable. Youth were thought to be particularly susceptible to the influences of extracurriculars (and particularly needful of those influences, lest they be influenced by less wholesome factors) because they were “impressionable” (Holch, 1926) and “plastic” (Roemer & Allen, 1926) by nature. Recognizing the malleability of youth, educators embraced extracurriculars to provide opportunities for the practice and formation of desirable social, civic, and moral habits—habits thought to be more likely to be permanently attained when acquired during this phase of life (Holch, 1926).

Adolescents’ energy and vitality. Youths’ “energy” and “vitality” were also noted, at least in some cases as euphemisms for their emerging sexual feelings (Pringle, 1922) (although youths’ sheer physical stamina was surely also readily apparent to their exhausted teachers, who advised extracurriculars after a full day of teaching). Extracurriculars were considered an essential outlet for this “superabundant adolescent vitality” (Roberts & Draper, 1928, p. 37)—if the school did not provide “safe and attractive avenues” through which youth could release their energy (Pringle, 1922, p. 216), youth would channel their energy into other, less wholesome pursuits (Billett, 1928).

Other adolescent traits and extracurriculars. Adolescents were thought to have other characteristics and tendencies simply by virtue of their developmental stage that the extracurriculum could channel or provide opportunities to exercise: dreams, determined will, desire for activity and recognition (McLinn, 1911); love of approval, rivalry, mastery, and altruistic effort (PA DPI, 1922); a desire for freedom, a growing feeling of self-reliance (Paul, 1921); a need to express themselves (Pringle, 1922); a spontaneity in interests and activities (Foster, 1925; Roemer & Allen, 1926); and the need for play,

reflecting the recapitulation theory idea that youth, in their stage of development, resembled primitive people (Houston, 1930). Adolescent desires identified by educators included desires to act, accomplish, create, take initiative, assume responsibility, and cooperate for the common welfare (Billett, 1928); “to carry on serious life affairs similar to those of their elders” (Jordan, 1928, p. 4); to render service to the school and community (Deam & Bear, 1928); and cooperate in important community activities (Paul, 1921). Even in the era of G. Stanley Hall and others providing elaborate descriptions of the newly-identified phase of life called “adolescence,” it is difficult to see how most of these characteristics and desires were unique to adolescence—but these characteristics and desires do echo the potential results of extracurricular participation. Perhaps these lists of traits and characteristics (because none of these sources elaborate upon them) should instead be viewed as an attempt by these educators to claim a place for the extracurriculum in the burgeoning thinking on adolescence, instead of providing any real contribution to the thinking on adolescence.

Finally, adolescents were highly sensitive to the school’s attempts to provide them opportunities to develop along lines sanctioned by the school, and consequently would not get behind any activity that struck them as imposed or artificial. Spaulding observed “An extra-curricular program established by administrative authority is likely to possess one of the very defects which it should seek to remedy: it runs serious danger of failing to convince [its potential participants to join up]” (1929, p. 145). Youth would only become involved if the activity was provided to meet a specific need they felt, or in response to a problem they wanted to solve. One can easily see where, adolescents being adolescents,

they would feel a need for activities of a social nature, at minimum—or their adult overseers would understand them to need such activities, at any rate.

Chapter Five describes two ways in which schools could make extracurricular activities more intrinsically appealing to youth: by creating an atmosphere of school morale or spirit, which made students more likely to join activities because they felt allegiance to and identification with the school; and by providing an opportunity for friendly student-teacher relationships and a decreased need for punitive discipline in the school.

Chapter Five: School-Level Intended Values of the Extracurriculum:

“Improved Discipline and School Spirit”

The American high school earnestly wanted to solve societal needs and meet individuals’ needs through the extracurriculum, reflecting several major educational and societal concerns of this time, but it also had hopes for extracurriculars particular to itself as an institution—namely, that the extracurriculum could contribute to students’ feelings of membership and allegiance to the school, in the form of school spirit or morale (in part as a way to keep students coming to school, in this era in which school attendance was increasing but not yet universally compulsory); and that the extracurriculum might create conditions under which punitive discipline of students was less necessary.

In his survey of extracurricular values, Koos (1926a) combined school spirit and discipline into one category he called “Improved discipline and school spirit” for undisclosed reasons. Some educators did make a connection between improved school spirit through extracurriculars and a diminished need to discipline students, but others only discussed how extracurriculars fostered school spirit (or morale), or how they lessened the need for discipline.

“Group Consciousness”³²: School Spirit/Morale and the Extracurriculum

The spirit and morale of a school will stand or fall very largely on the basis of the kinds of things that are done in the extracurricular activities. (Monroe & Weber, 1928, p. 489)

When Margaret Sleezer of Chicago’s Senn High School described school spirit as “that mysterious and mighty thing,” she captured two key aspects of it as expressed by other educators, too: that it was ill-defined, and that it was nonetheless important (1924,

³² Templeton, in Roberts & Draper, 1928, p. 36

p. 509). Only one educator defined school spirit outright, when he mentioned as a benefit of extracurriculars the “development of *group consciousness* or school spirit binds together the school and the community” (Templeton, in Roberts & Draper, 1928, p. 36, emphasis added); writing in 1932, educational sociologist Willard Waller called the spirit of the school a “*we-feeling*” (p. 13). “School spirit” was the group—in this case, the school—being conscious of itself as a group. As with the terminology used to label the “extracurriculum,” the terminology here evolved, too: while educators did use the phrase “school spirit” during the 1910s and 1920s, some also referred to the “spirit of the school” or the “spirit of a school”, suggesting that “school spirit” had not yet become a term, but instead may have been spoken with the emphasis on the “school,” to distinguish it from “community spirit,” “class spirit,” “scout spirit,” or other forms of group consciousness in which youth might find themselves members.

While they did not define school spirit outright, other educators discussed various aspects of it as it related to extracurriculars specifically: it was both a prerequisite for and a result of successful extracurricular activities (Meyer, 1926); it was fed by school traditions created through extracurriculars (Klapper, 1929); it resulted from activities in which students cooperated, and it involved the subordination of the self to the group goal or activity (McDaniel, 1919). Two other key characteristics of school spirit or morale (for educators used the terms interchangeably, or in tandem) include the cooperation between students and teachers that fed it, and the emotional appeal that created the conditions for it; both of these are described in the context of the extracurriculum below.

School morale as the result of student/teacher cooperation.

[I]n the club, teacher and pupil are partners, pioneers together, and friends.
(Murray, 1930, p. 271)

One widely noted way in which teachers could encourage school morale was by cooperating with students in the actual extracurricular activities themselves. Educators contrasted this cooperation with both the feelings of antagonism between teachers and students that had often characterized student/teacher interaction prior to the era of school-sponsored extracurriculars (McDaniel, 1919) and/or the inevitable constraints of formality within the classroom setting, which required teachers to be judges and evaluators of students (Murray, 1930). But when teachers advised extracurriculars, they became advisors, co-workers, collaborators, and even friends with students (Barton, 1925; Lasher, 1910; Murray, 1930; Roemer & Allen, 1926). These new kinds of cooperative teacher/student relationships contributed to better school spirit and morale by creating a more collegial interpersonal climate in the school.

The sense of personal investment students felt in their school and its activities as a result of working side-by-side with teachers in extracurriculars was also thought to be a major contributor to school morale and spirit. Roemer and Allen described a feeling of “our-ness” that grew when students and faculty worked together in extracurriculars, resulting in improved school spirit:

Sharing with the teacher all interests, and having more responsibility, the pupils think of the school in terms of *ours* instead of *his*, as formerly. . . . As workmen labor more earnestly when they are to share in the company’s earnings, so pupils, when they realize that the school’s success devolves upon them, enter upon their duties with greater zeal. What does this increased interest mean? It is, or becomes, what we call school spirit. (1926, p. 11, emphasis in original)

Kaye also discussed the importance of a student feeling of ownership in school endeavors. “When the pupils actually develop this sense of ownership and feel that what they do is for their own good or harm, they begin to emerge from their childish inclination to regard the teacher in an unfriendly light,” he wrote, connecting this sense of ownership and positive feelings toward teachers to school spirit and morale, which could develop “to a high pitch” under such cooperative conditions (1933, p. 22).

School morale as the result of emotional appeal.

Also the whole [extracurricular] program is justified in the promotion of that favorable “emotionalized attitude” of the pupil toward the institution — in other words, morale. (Wellemeier, in Roberts & Draper, 1928, pp. 40-41)

Several educators elaborated on the emotional nature of school morale or the process of fostering it. For example, just as America had tried to keep up the morale of its soldiers during World War I, high schools should build up the morale of their students, wrote Roemer and Allen in their book on extracurriculars, continuing:

To accomplish this we must make [students] happy and joyous, for a sullen or despondent person lacks morale. Again we find through an extra-curricular activities program the instinctive means of group activity so essential to the development of school spirit or morale. (1926, p. 12)

Roemer and Allen do not elaborate on how to use extracurriculars to increase student happiness and therefore morale (was happiness thought to naturally or automatically result from extracurricular participation? Or were activity advisors supposed to do something special in the context of extracurriculars to make participating in them a happier undertaking, like help students have more “fun” in lieu of serious effort toward a common goal?), nor do they concede that being a soldier was surely neither happy nor

joyous, nor could extracurricular participation always be. Masters had a more realistic and compelling rationale for how extracurriculars yielded loyalty and morale by appealing to the emotions: “[extracurricular] activities make an emotional appeal when properly organized. Only when an idea, or concept, comes to have warmth and meaning, does it really call forth the deepest allegiance of the individual holding it” (1926, p. 52). The “idea, or concept” to which Masters refers might mean the concept of the particular school itself, or the idea of belonging to a specific team or activity. Feelings of “warmth” and “meaning” seem like more realistic sentiments to result from extracurricular participation than happiness or joy, and ones more likely to actually result in school spirit.

Note in both of these examples how the onus was on the school to create the emotional conditions in which school morale could develop—school staff were to make students “happy and joyous,” or properly organize extracurriculars so they would appeal emotionally to students. Barton similarly discusses school spirit as something that “every principal and his staff of teachers should endeavor to instill into *the hearts* and lives of all the students” (1925, p. 240, emphasis added). Why didn’t these educators place the impetus for emotional connection with the school on the students themselves? Surely students could develop emotional connections to the school and its activities amongst themselves, through their shared experience of extracurricular participation. Perhaps these educators thought those sentiments needed to be jump-started by school staff in controlled conditions so that students’ sense of meaning and emotional connection did not become overstimulated in harmful directions, as they had been in secret societies.

Sources outside the primary sources for this study were more willing to acknowledge that students could and did generate their own school spirit. Waller

acknowledges both sources of school spirit—as arising from within the students themselves, and as cultivated by school faculty: “The *we*-feeling of the school is in part a spontaneous creation in the minds of those who identify themselves with the school and in part a carefully nurtured and sensitive growth” (1932, p. 13). Waller noted that this group spirit associated with the school, however it arose, also extended to students’ parents and school alumni. Writing about Muncie [IN] Central High School, historian Laurie Moses Hines echoes Waller’s two sources of school spirit and also found evidence of it radiating out into the greater community:

The extracurriculum was not just an adult-controlled mechanism to extend control over students. A boosterism or school spirit developed among the students and the adults that could not easily or completely be manipulated by educational administrators, the school system, or the new bureaucratic order. Muncie citizens were maintaining a sense of local identity and unity through the extracurriculum and the school teams. (1998, p. 102)

What Hines found happening at Muncie Central High School—school spirit among students and community members exceeding the school’s capacity to manage or control it—may reflect what educators of the 1910s and 1920s feared would happen if they did not themselves instigate and keep a handle on school spirit. Even if the school wished to channel school spirit to its own bureaucratic, institution-building ends, school spirit refused to be so narrowly focused.

Threats to school morale. Improved school morale, whether arising spontaneously among students or generated by the faculty, was not guaranteed to result from extracurriculars, however. McCormack noted that having too many different

activities to meet students' individual needs could jeopardize school morale, lamenting "the distraction, disorganization, and gradual enfeeblement of the morale of the group through too many activities" (in Roberts & Draper, 1928, p. 37). Likewise, Gertrude Jones describes an erstwhile "slouch" day held at Lincoln (NE) High School, in which seniors wore "tattered and outlandish costumes" and disrupted the entire school day. Instead of being a special event that improved school spirit, "slouch" day tended to decrease school morale, and was ultimately replaced by an unspecified event that was notably "beautiful, inspiring, and dignified" (1925, p. 518)—descriptors consistent with the desired happy, joyous, meaningful, "warm" morale-generating school atmosphere.

School Discipline and the Extracurriculum

It is notable that wherever these [extracurricular] activities are strong the problem of discipline practically disappears. (Lewis, 1914, p. 18)

Several educators noted that extracurriculars, when provided in sufficient variety and properly administered by the school, resulted in less need for discipline in the school (Froula, 1915; Lamar, 1925; McLinn, 1911; Smith, 1924). Reasons suggested for this effect included that extracurriculars provided outlets for students' "superabundant adolescent vitality" (McCormack, in Roberts & Draper, 1928, p. 37) and gave them something "legitimate" to do during times when they would otherwise potentially be idle and therefore prone to mischief, devilment, trouble-making, or unwholesome pursuits (Belting, 1923; Lamar, 1925; Smith, 1924).

McKown also noted the relationship between the aforementioned feelings of personal investment in the school and the diminished need for discipline:

The best discipline is that which comes from within and comes because the group itself takes pride in holding up its own standard. The more students there are

interested in the welfare of the school, the less discipline there will be necessary, because there will be more lovers of the school to stand up for it. (1927, p. 6)

Some educators noted that the existence of positive, collaborative student-teacher relationships (surely something that could feed students' feelings of affinity toward their school) also lessened the need for discipline, since extracurriculars provided a way for students and teachers to get to know each other and labor together for shared ends (McLinn, 1911; McDaniel, 1919). Belting observed, "Each teacher will find the problems of discipline disappearing to the extent that he can act as a leader of the interests of any group of high school pupils" (1923, p. 249). Here is one way in which "improved discipline and school spirit," per Koos' categorization, were seen to co-occur.

Another reason offered for why extracurriculars contributed to a reduced need for discipline had to do with the nature of the activities themselves. Smith observed that extracurriculars added an element of pleasure to school, which flavored everything the students did at school, not just their extracurricular participation. "[Extracurriculars] add a zest to school life which reacts favorably upon the pupil's whole attitude toward school work," he wrote, then described how that "zest" made even the undesirable tasks of schooling palatable: "If the pupil finds the school a desirable place in which to be, if it stimulates and provides an occasional thrill, those features which appear as tasks may be the more readily and cheerfully undertaken" (1924, p. 134). Murray acknowledged the motivation inherent in extracurriculars, which by definition involved "spontaneous, well-motivated self-action in learning" that essentially overrode the need for discipline. When students did those things that were presented "so as to appear immediately important and

significant,” they had no need to oppose the other demands of the school which may have seemed less so (1930, p. 270).

Finally, Smith offered one more way in which extracurriculars reduced the need for discipline: extracurriculars required pupils to discipline themselves in their interactions with one another—to learn self-discipline, as it were. Smith saw these activities as “organized phases of student life where conduct is more conspicuous than knowledge” (1924, p. 118). The effects of extracurriculars upon conduct included inspiring emotional reactions and fostering habits of sharing interests, efforts, and responsibilities. All of these effects promoted “social and moral controls”—an early-20th-century way of saying that these effects required social and moral self-control or self-discipline. Extracurriculars could prevent the need for discipline by providing wholesome recreational opportunities, helping students feel personally invested in the school, providing opportunities for fun in school, and teaching students to discipline themselves in their interactions with one another.

The school-level extracurricular values of “improved discipline and school spirit” may well have been quite evident to schools. After all, school spirit was usually gauged by its concrete manifestations: wearing school colors, cheering at games, and so on. And teachers and principals were surely aware of the extent to which they needed to discipline students outright or could rely on extracurriculum-nurtured feelings of cooperation and collaboration in the school to keep students in line. But some educators still wondered whether these and other extracurricular values were truly being attained, and how schools would know if they were. In addition, despite the extensive and detailed values students were to attain from participating in extracurriculars, some educators sought to limit

students' extracurricular participation in order to accommodate other educational values, such as academic achievement and democratic distribution of opportunity.

Chapter Six:

The Perils of Over-Participation, and Potentially for Naught: Concerns About Extracurricular Participation and its Evaluation

Neither a description of the logistics of the extracurriculum from 1905-1935 nor a description of the values presumed to accrue to students from extracurricular participation would be complete without due consideration of two general kinds of concern about the extracurriculum at this time. The first type saw serious drawbacks to too much extracurricular participation and sought to limit individual students' participation through various administrative schemes. Concern of the second type asked whether extracurricular values were attained (or were even capable of being attained) and called for evaluations to determine whether and to what extent they were.

“Undue Attention to these Activities”³³: Approaches to Limiting Extracurricular Participation

It seems fair to demand that every point system should provide some limit to the amount of activity which a pupil may undertake, as otherwise he is likely to carry an extracurricular load which is unjust to himself and to usurp more than his fair share of positions of prestige. (Johnston, 1932, p. 89)

As beneficial as extracurriculars were presumed to be to students, and as much as the extracurriculum was presumed to epitomize the aims of the comprehensive high school, many proponents of extracurriculars also sought to limit or manage students' participation in them. As Johnston observed and declared in 1932: “No secondary school is without some extracurricular activity. No school can escape the responsibility for regulation of these activities in terms of a well-defined educational policy” (p. 91). This

³³ Johnson, 1924, p. 145

account of the perceived appeals of extracurriculars would be incomplete without consideration of what proponents of the extracurriculum saw as the potential pitfalls of too much of a good thing (a list which encompassed only some of the extracurricular purposes detailed above), and how they proposed to prevent those pitfalls through extracurriculum management schemes.

Some pitfalls of excessive extracurricular participation are described below, alongside the description of the point system they inspired. Generally speaking, these seemed to be of two types: potential harms to the student (e.g., too much extracurricular participation jeopardizing their good grades, their health, or their ability to be a contributing member of their activities) and potential harms to the school's vision of itself as a democratic community (i.e., distributing leadership roles democratically among the student body) (Froula, 1915). But more notable than the reasons why educators felt they had to limit students' extracurricular participation (some of which are also described in previous chapters) were the lengths to which they went to regulate it. Several such plans for extracurricular management are described below.

The first step in limiting students' extracurricular participation was typically a determination of the relative "value" of each individual activity, so that students could then be allotted a certain "quantity" of participation. Sorting activities or roles in activities into "major" and "minor" categories was a common approach, with students being allowed to participate in a certain number of activities or assume a certain number of roles in each category, as was attributing a certain number of "points" to each activity and allowing students a certain number of participation "points" based on their grades. In either case, school staff (with or without students' assistance) at each individual school

determined which category each activity or position belonged to or how many points it was worth, sometimes with the help of a survey of students about the extracurricular opportunities available, the commitment required by them, their perceived importance, etc. (Singer, 1927; Johnston, 1932).

Schemes of major and minor activities. At the Fifth Avenue High School in Pittsburgh, for example, activities were grouped into “major” and “minor” categories (and for some activities, the designation of “major” or “minor” depended on the students’ role in the activity, e.g., managers and editors of the school journal had a “major” role, but all other staff members were considered “minor”) “in order that the activities may be selected with discrimination” (Principal Edward Ryneerson, 1917, p. 49). So, the FAHS major/minor system was to help students make strategic choices in their extracurricular participation, not just join clubs, organizations, and teams willy-nilly. Principal Ryneerson does not elaborate on what criteria students were to use to select activities (vocational exploration? socialization? improvement of personal attributes, such as health?), but students with sufficient “scholarship, strength, and conduct” (thresholds for “sufficient” also unspecified) (1917, p. 50) could participate in a) one major activity and two minor activities or b) three minor activities.

Leavenworth (KS) High School had a similar scheme but with a greater number of activities permitted (two majors and two minors, one major and three minors, or four minors) and a more elaborate rationale for limiting students’ extracurricular participation: having too few students with too many extracurricular responsibilities “interferes with a student’s opportunity to do good school work; he is not able to discharge adequately the duties of all his offices; it establishes a narrow limit for the number of leaders which a

school may develop” (Principal H. T. Steeper, 1919, p. 373). In the name of scholastic success, extracurricular success, and democratic distribution of extracurricular opportunities, LHS restricted students’ extracurricular participation through a scheme of major and minor activities.

Schemes based on points. Professor Paul W. Terry of the University of North Carolina surveyed about 500 high schools about their “measures of restriction” of extracurricular activities (1925, p. 740). Among the responses were two very detailed examples of the “point” approach to regulating extracurricular participation, both reported approvingly by Terry. At both the University High School in Oakland, California and the West Side High School in Denver, extracurriculars and/or specific roles in them were assigned point values. Both schools seemed to limit participation only on the basis of grades and brought elaborate arithmetic to bear on the determination of how many points’ worth of extracurriculars students with what grades could participate in. For example, UHS set the ceiling of extracurricular participation at 19 “activity points” and determined students’ eligibility thus:

The pupils’ marks are graded 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, 1 being the highest and 5 the lowest.

The amount of participation which is allowed to any pupil is determined by subtracting the square of the average grade of his marks from 20. The remainder is the number of points of participation which are permitted. (p. 741)

Thus “exceptional pupils” with an average grade of 1 could carry 19 activity points, but “only 4 points of activity are allowed the poor scholar who makes an average grade of 4” (p. 741). Terry reported that “The effect of this plan is to limit the participation of unsuccessful pupils to minor positions or to mere membership and to place important

official responsibilities in the hands of pupils of superior scholarship” (p. 741). Terry does not report on whether being relegated to “minor positions or to mere membership” motivated students with low grades to work to raise them.

The West Side High School’s approach to extracurricular regulation through points aligned with scholarship was even more elaborate. WSHS sorted *positions* in its activities into “major, submajor, and minor” categories, attributed 45, 30, and 15 “scholarship points,” respectively. Students earned “points” to “redeem” in extracurricular participation based upon their previous semester’s grades.

To be eligible for any elective or appointive position of honor in any student organization, a pupil shall have obtained for the preceding semester not less than 60 points in scholarship earned from the marks A, B, and C. . . . The marks A, B, and C count five, four, and three points, respectively, for each weekly recitation period in the subjects in which the marks were earned. A mark of A in a subject which met five times a week would count 25 scholarship points; a mark of B in the same subject would count 20 points; etc. (pp. 741-742)

As at UHS, this scheme had the effect of tying extracurricular intensity to academic success, with no other considerations for limiting extracurricular participation mentioned. Given the many intended effects of extracurricular participation described in previous chapters, as well as that of making school more appealing for academically weak students, it seems as though these schools had an unusually focused and potentially detrimental view of the extracurriculum (i.e., as a reward for academically successful students), one that was, unfortunately, codified in their extracurriculum management policies.

Studies of point systems. Two educators took a broader view of systems of management of extracurriculars by conducting large-scale surveys. First, as noted above, Professor Paul Terry surveyed about 500 high schools about their “measures of restriction” of extracurriculars (1925). He received responses from 231 schools in 35 states, ranging in size from 100-3,700 pupils (with a median of 595 pupils). Among the responding schools, Terry identified three kinds of “restriction” in common use, each serving a different function. The two school examples from his survey provided above (UHS and WSHS) illustrate the first kind of restriction: that focused on students’ grades. In Terry’s words, this restriction was “designed to protect the intellectual life of the pupil from the ill effects of a disproportionate emphasis on extra-curriculum work” (p. 740). Such restrictions were often general rules about the number of subjects students had to be passing to participate in extracurriculars or the GPA they had to maintain, but sometimes were elaborate formulas pegging magnitude of participation to strength of grades as calculated by a formula, as described above.

Terry’s second general category of restrictions—those aiming to spread leadership positions among as many students as possible—echoes Steeper’s concern (1919). In this category Terry placed the schemes of major and minor activities and point systems. Terry also found evidence of some schools simply limiting all pupils to a certain number of activities, typically no more than four, and sometimes varying by year in school:

Seniors are permitted to take part in more activities than are underclassmen, for the reasons that they are ordinarily better prepared for responsible positions and that the senior year is the last opportunity which they have to obtain experience of this kind. (p. 743)

Finally, Terry's third category of restrictions reflects a central concern of this time period, efficiency. These regulations were intended "to prevent ineffective work or waste of time" (p. 743). This was something of a catch-all category covering concerns such as required advisor presence at meetings, required agendas for meetings, forbidding students to drop out of one organization and join a similar one during any given term to encourage responsibility and commitment to one's obligations (except where the pupil's first choice was determined to have been unwise, an occasional occurrence attributable to adolescents' developing decision-making skills), and only allowing students who had been enrolled at the school for a certain period of time to hold a leadership position.

Terry's survey confirms the themes of restriction of extracurricular participation based on grades and the concern with spreading positions in organizations among as many students as possible. Unfortunately, he does not report how many schools reported each concern, a tally that would be especially useful in assessing the magnitude of the various concerns he lumped under "efficiency", a new category to this discussion, surprisingly, given its credence as a general educational concern at this time.

Edgar G. Johnston, principal of University High School at the University of Michigan, also made a study of point systems. He mailed his survey to 600 schools in 1929, of which 350 responded, of which 145 had "some type of system for limiting or distributing participation in the activity program," of which 54 took students' academic achievement into account when considering limits on their extracurricular participation (1932, p. 89). He felt that limitation of extracurricular involvement was necessary "to prevent overdoing on the part of the popular and aggressive" (p. 89); overdoing one's extracurricular commitments could be "unjust" to oneself and cause the student "to usurp

more than his fair share of positions of prestige” (p. 89). Johnston identified the specific kinds of point systems already described—limiting student participation to a certain number of activities, the major/minor activities approach, and assigning points to individual activities or roles therein (the approach he found to be the most popular, although he also did not report his specific numerical findings)—and uncovered one more: classification of activities by type with students limited to a certain amount of participation within each type of activity.

Johnston also recommended not simply quantitative limits to extracurricular participation, but also guidance in the selection of the limited extracurriculars one participated in: “there needs to be guidance in the choice of activities, that a pupil may choose wisely those extracurricular experiences which will be of most value to him” (1932, p. 89). (Here, Johnston may have been describing what Rynearson (1917) meant when he said students should make extracurricular choices discriminately.) A high school student’s need for guidance was thought to be all-encompassing, including the spheres of “recreation” and “social pursuits.” Teachers and advisers were to be prepared to advise students on choices both within the classroom and without:

Guidance in health, in recreation, in social pursuits is needed as well as guidance in the choice of occupation or of a high-school course. . . . The teacher or adviser who conceives his function in terms of modern educational ideals will accept the obligation to be intelligently informed about those important phases of education which lie outside the classroom and to assist each pupil to choices which will contribute most in the growth of his personality. (p. 90)

“Modern educational ideals” obliged teachers and advisers (often the student’s homeroom teacher; sometimes an administrator, such as a dean of girls) to not only guide students in their choice of classes, but also in their use of leisure time, with all of the student’s endeavors culminating in growth of a vague phenomenon called “personality.”

Johnston was the only writer on point systems to make a connection between extracurricular regulation and all students’ access to *all* the values thought to be inherent in the extracurriculum: “The organization of such a [point] system in every school should do much to make possible a fair distribution of those values which are inherent in the extracurricular program” (p. 91). To Johnston, limiting and distributing extracurricular participation was not just about (for the individual) choosing activities wisely and giving them enough but not too much of one’s attention, participating successfully and efficiently in one’s activities of choice, having enough time and energy left to be a successful student, being healthy, and (for the school community) sharing extracurricular opportunities among the student body and having efficient activities—it was about all the other values described in this paper, too.

Discretionary limitation of participation. One educator, Franklin W. Johnson, professor at Columbia, rejected universal policies restricting extracurricular participation in favor of the student’s or his mentor’s judgment:

The extent to which this participation may go without detriment to the pupil’s health or the performance of other necessary tasks cannot be reduced to a formula of universal application. It is probably best to leave this to the judgment of the pupil or to that of his mature advisers . . . (1924, p. 145)

Johnson's concerns about extracurricular over-participation included the pupil's health and the performance of other necessary tasks, probably referring to students' coursework.

Johnson did advocate that students' assumptions of "offices" be restricted quantitatively, however, by allowing students no more than one major or two minor roles. He offered different reasons for restricting students' office-holding than for restricting students' extracurricular participation as a whole, including "conserving the pupil's time" and "to allow opportunities for exercising responsible leadership to the largest possible number" (p. 145). Conserving the pupil's time for what, he does not clarify; his plea for wide accessibility of "offices" echoes Steeper's (1919) plea for more widespread extracurricular participation.

Finally, Johnson also called for consideration of the pupil's academic record when determining whether he/she could hold office in an activity or participate in intermural contests, but only insofar as his/her academic record was or was not "satisfactory." Like the two "points" examples described above, Johnson sought an extracurriculum in which "Representing the school thus becomes a privilege to be earned by the faithful performance of school tasks" (p. 145). He also wanted extracurricular management in order to prevent students from "devoting undue attention to these activities" (p. 145). On the one hand, Johnson and other proponents of the extracurriculum saw many potential benefits for students from extracurricular participation; on the other hand, students might find those activities too attractive and give them "undue attention," to the detriment of their grades, other students' access to these opportunities, etc. "Attention" to extracurriculars was desirable and sometimes even required; "undue attention" was to be guarded against.

Objections to academic qualifications for extracurricular participation. At least one educator felt that the common policies pegging extracurricular participation to academic achievement or even just “satisfactory” academic performance were completely misguided: in an editorial in the *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, Phillip W. L. Cox of the New York University School of Education lambasted such approaches: “some administrators are so unspeakably stupid as to deny the privilege of engaging in such activities to any who do not pass in the academic hocus pocus,” he railed. The “social purposes of the school” and “the changing social order” had left such considerations behind—or, as he put it, “pronounced the death sentence on the compulsory academicism of the conventional school” (1930a, p. 263). To Cox, educators who insisted upon academic achievement as the main criterion for extracurricular participation were applying old rules to new realities, given that the high school was no longer primarily focused on academic content learning but now was being seen as an institution that prepared students to live with each other—and that so prepared them, in no small part, via extracurriculars.

Regardless of the magnitude of students’ extracurricular participation, their attainment of the anticipated values and benefits was still uncertain. Several educators wanted the field of education to take a harder look at whether the desired outcomes of extracurricular participation were being realized.

“Values Now Assumed, Rather Than Proved”:³⁴ Calls for Evaluation of the Extracurriculum

Haven’t we rather generally accepted these [activities] as a ‘most important part of education’ and joined in a mad rush to set them up irrespective of capable direction, relation to the whole, or adequate evaluation? (Threlkeld, 1931, p. 413)

³⁴ Koos, 1926b, p. 226

While some educators were concerned with regulating extracurricular participation at individual schools so that individual students were more likely to attain the desired values, others took a broader view, wondering if the much-touted benefits of extracurricular participation were attained among students in general. Or, as Koos (1926b, p. 231) put it, “To what extent are the positive values claimed [for extracurriculars] directly achieved for the participant?”³⁵ These educators thought carefully about what it would take for the extracurriculum to yield the desired values, and how that value-attainment could be recognized or measured. While one wondered aloud whether such values could be “proved” (Houston, 1930, p. 284), others thought rigorous evaluation should be attempted. “[S]uch extenuation of a want of evaluation in the past will not suffice for the future,” wrote Koos, “and those interested should set about without delay to devise and put in operation the instruments and technique of more nearly unequivocal appraisal of the activities represented” (1926b, p. 227). This section describes the state of the art of the “instruments and technique” of extracurriculum evaluation—considerations expressed from the mid-1920s onward, once extracurriculars had been under school control for a decade or more and were firmly established, if not firmly substantiated.

The question of implementation. Threlkeld put the responsibility for ensuring that extracurriculars were having the intended effect—that is, for ensuring quality “implementation” of extracurriculars—on educators. To this line of thinking, extracurriculars’ values had not been proved in part because the activities were not necessarily being carried out in a way that would yield those values. Threlkeld wrote of

³⁵ Several educators noted that curricular initiatives had traditionally been greeted with the same kind of unsubstantiated zeal (Counts, 1926; Koos, 1926b).

his belief “that many of these values have not been proved or, at least, that we, as educators, have not taken time to direct our activities so that we are certain that these supposed values are realized” (1931, p. 413). Before the extracurriculum could be evaluated, it had to be carried out in a way that the desirable ends were deliberately being pursued. Houston (1930) took a similar approach to the question of evaluation, putting the onus for quality implementation on administrators specifically: “Surely, any wide-awake administrator should be able to trace the benefits or the injuries resulting from students’ activities, but he must first take the leadership in these activities and hold himself responsible for their direction” (p. 284). Quality implementation of extracurriculars—meaning implementation in such a way as to maximize the likelihood of extracurricular benefits being realized—began with the adults in the school, and their “direction” of those activities toward the desired ends.

Recommended approaches to evaluation. Others skipped over the question of quality implementation and moved directly to evaluation of the activities. Leonard Koos, who opened the *25th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* with a chapter including an extensive compilation of values ascribed to extracurriculars, concluded the volume with a short (10-page) chapter devoted to evaluating extracurriculars in terms of realization of those values. The chapter has five sections with illustrative headings: Evaluation is Imperative; Values Now Assumed, Rather Than Proved; Steps Already Taken Toward Evaluation; Appropriateness of All the Types of Evaluation; Extra-Curricular Activities in Some Respects Self-Evaluative. The “steps already taken toward evaluation” included:

- 1) “that discriminating educational workers believe they see values being achieved in current practice,” indicated in part by the fact that “these values recur in each new treatment of the field” (1926b, p. 227), such as accounts of one school’s experience or summaries of the state of the field as a whole;
- 2) “studies of the attitudes of the participants themselves” (p. 228);
- 3) “efforts to ascertain the extent and nature of pupil-participation in these activities” (p. 228), probably the most common evaluative approach, with surveys of this type common in the extracurricular literature; and
- 4) studies that inquire “into the relationships between membership or participation in extra-curricular activities and scholarship” (p. 229).

Koos also suggested a future direction for evaluation of extracurriculars: “testing constructive influence along lines pertinent to the activity represented” (1926b, p. 232)—i.e., assessing athletics participants for improvement in physical fitness or honor society members for improvement in grades.

Phillip Cox of NYU noted that the first and third of Koos’ suggested approaches had serious methodological flaws, due to teacher bias and uncertainty about the implications of extent of participation, respectively:

Few educational workers are sufficiently discriminating to be free from scholastic prejudices and the preconception that docility is a fundamental civic attitude and behavior. Of the extent and nature of participation, an interesting status study may be made, but it would contain nothing within itself that would tell whether much or little, or a wide or narrow range of participation is desirable. (1930b, pp. 266-267)

Cox recommended the third item in Koos' list: seeking the opinions of the student extracurricular participants themselves, an approach that circumvented the potent influence of adult approval. "To the pupils themselves," he wrote, "the good esteem of their fellows, the judgments of their peers, the applause of their immediate 'galleries,' are much more significant" than adults' opinions of students' behavior or experiences (1930b, p. 267).

But Cox's own recommendations for how to evaluate extracurriculars do not encompass student perspectives. In his 1930 article on the subject of "the evaluation of student activities," he writes:

If school recognition is to accord with educational progress of the individual, some formal awards must be made either for the specific desirable activities wherever and however engaged in, or for the character modifications regardless of how they are made. (1930b, p. 269)

That is to say, if schools were truly going to recognize the individual's "educational" (broadly defined) progress, they must either reward participation in "desirable activities" or the attainment of desirable character traits, however attained. Cox seems to recognize (in this statement as well as the space he devotes to describing different schools' awarding of credit or letters for extracurricular participation) that the former was more easily measured than the latter. It is unclear whether Cox thought it impossible, undesirable, or unnecessary to seek a clear connection between participation in specific activities and changes in character, but that would represent the "gold standard" in evaluating whether extracurricular values were attained by students.

Cox speaks approvingly of a plan he proposed in his 1927 book *Creative School Control*, in which the student's character traits would be recorded, including "endurance,

distractibility, fatigue, regularity; . . . his reactions to intellectual, athletic, and social competitions, to responsibility, discouragement, and criticism; . . . his emotional controls, his self-reliance, and self-direction, or his dependence and inferiority” (1930b, p. 269). While some of these traits hint at the associated extracurriculars (e.g., “endurance” and “competitions” in athletics), they are not presented in the context of the extracurriculum specifically. Instead, Cox is more concerned with how the school can “most adequately evaluate the truly educational activities of its pupils” (1930b, p. 269) whether curricular, extracurricular, or outside the school altogether. His discussion of evaluating student activities is thus less concerned with the fundamental question of extracurriculum evaluation—*are the desired ends attained?*—than with the question of whether students develop in character during the course of their high school years, whether as a result of the school’s efforts (including extracurriculars) or not.

Professor George S. Counts of Yale also examined Koos’ (1926a, 1926b) and others’ contributions to the *25th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Vol. 2, and made what is by now a familiar observation: “Those who favor the inclusion of these [extracurricular] activities in the school program make most ambitious claims with regard to their potential and actual educational values” (1926, p. 413). Regarding evaluation of the attainment of these extracurricular values, Counts asks, “Are these sentiments [i.e., the fact of the extracurriculum being in educational favor] the product of a critical examination of ends and means, or are they largely the reflection of our chance associations and the educational milieu in which we have lived?” (p. 416). He finds that the continued existence of extracurriculars rested on an insecure foundation of esteem that had nothing to do with whether they resulted in the anticipated values. First,

their proponents were not unbiased evaluators: “the validity of the extra-curriculum rests on evidence from . . . uncontrolled observation” (p. 414).

Second, Counts found that the sheer persistence of extracurriculars has resulted in them acquiring more supporters than they initially had, since “few educational procedures or practices lack friends after they become established” (p. 414). “We exhibit an inclination to regard as progressive and worthy any change which survives” (p. 416), he observed. Relatedly, Counts noted, fans of any school endeavor tend to claim for it all the values for which the school is organized. Although at the time he was writing, the extracurriculum appeared to encapsulate all the educational goals in vogue in the 1920s, Counts wondered if the extracurriculum was not quintessentially social, civic, moral, etc., but instead quintessentially able to reflect the values of its time: “Is it unfair to suggest that, if a study of the values of extra-curriculum activities had been prosecuted in 1890, they would have been defended in terms of the theory of formal discipline [an educational theory in vogue at the time]?” (p. 415)

Third, Counts wondered if his peers supported the extracurriculum simply because it was established—that is, they supported it since opposing it would be fruitless, despite the lack of any evidence of its effectiveness.

To what extent does the present favorable attitude toward extra-curriculum activities reflect the reasoned judgment of experience, and to what extent is it the recognition of a *fait accompli*? . . . May it not be a case of capitulation rather than a case of increased wisdom? (p. 415)

Accordingly, in order to properly evaluate whether the extracurriculum yielded the projected values, Counts recommended that would-be evaluators set aside their

current assumptions about the value of extracurriculars, not assume that extracurriculars were inherently valuable simply because they existed, and not rely upon the opinions of their participants and supervisors as evidence of their worth. In addition, evaluators should approach the extracurriculum the same way as they would evaluate components of the curriculum, i.e., in terms of it resulting in desirable changes to the student's skills and abilities in an efficient manner:

Only by the measurement of its contribution to the accepted objectives of education, through the development of habits, knowledges [sic], attitudes, dispositions, and powers, can the value of any school procedure be determined. Only as the pupil is changed by participation in the activity, only as the changes wrought are desirable, and only as the maximum economy of time and energy is attained in the process can the activity find justification as a part of the school program. (p. 419)

Finally, Counts recommended what could be called "extreme contextualization": each desirable outcome for each activity should be scrutinized, for each individual student, in the context of their own particular educational program.

Whether an activity possesses educational value must depend on its own nature, on the degree and character of its regulation, and on the abilities and interests, the educational history, and the home and community surroundings of the pupil engaging in it. (p. 419)

In light of the state of current extracurricular evaluation and his recommendations for how to properly evaluate extracurriculars, Counts recommended that procedures and instruments be developed to measure extracurricular effects, insofar as they could be measured: "It is quite possible that certain of the more intangible values involved will

always defy objective treatment and will have to be rated by subjective methods” (p. 419). Attempts to evaluate the extracurriculum should also look beyond the school context and school years in determining the effects of extracurricular participation: “investigations of this character should reveal objectively the contribution made by extracurriculum activities to the development of the more permanent leisure and other interests” (p. 420). Counts also recommended the use of a case study approach to examine the effects of extracurricular participation on individuals, particularly their “socialization.”

Counts concludes by noting that evaluation had not kept pace with the growth of the extracurriculum, and that it was incumbent upon educators to scrutinize the extracurriculum for its desired ends. He saw the projected values as attainable and strongly associated with the act of evaluation:

Ahead lies the difficult task of discovering to what extent and under what conditions the various extra-curriculum activities possess educational values. . . . We must strive to derive from them the largest crop of educational values which they can be made to yield. This result can be achieved only as the work of evaluation is prosecuted with success. (p. 421)

Because of this relationship between value-attainment and extracurricular evaluation, educators had a responsibility to evaluate the extracurriculum of which they were so fond: “we cannot evade the responsibility of devising and employing procedures which may enable us to test the claims now so confidently made” (p. 418). Future research on the extracurriculum should seek to determine whether Koos’, Counts’, and others’ recommendations for extracurricular evaluation were ever acted upon in the late 1930s,

the 1940s, and beyond, using what methods, and with what findings. Were the extracurricular values ever “proved,” and if so, by what evidence?

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

We could even well afford to lose a little on the side of intellectual training, if through these extra-curricular activities, properly supervised and controlled, we can secure the broader social, vocational, civic, physical, moral, and avocational training so essential for a successful, well-rounded modern life. (Wilds, 1926, p. 35)

This study uses educational writings from 1905-1935 (including sources discovered and analyzed using new digital technologies, such as HathiTrust digitization and full-text search) to describe the evolution of the terminology used to label the American high school extracurriculum during the early 20th century and the logistical arrangements under which it was carried out, elucidate the existence of the extracurricular values claimed by educators at the time, add contextual detail about the meaning and intentions behind those values, describe attempts to limit students' participation in these activities, and discuss contemporary concerns about the extent to which the desired values of extracurricular participation had been or could be attained.

Specifically, the dissertation identifies a variety of terms in use for the extracurriculum from 1905-1935, but with "extracurriculum" and its variants most popular and becoming the consensus term; schools holding extracurriculars during "activity periods" during the school day, after school, and/or in the evening; and an increasing number of schools awarding credit for extracurricular participation. It confirms the existence of a handful of extracurricular "values" identified by Leonard Koos in his 1926 scan of literature through their presence in source titles, a combined word count of the source documents, and the secondary literature on the history of the extracurriculum. It discusses each of these values in turn, describing how educators of

this time thought the extracurriculum could or did reflect each, as well as concerns they had about the realization of each.

Koos had identified “Training in some civic-social-moral relationship” as the predominant extracurricular value; this study confirms that the triumvirate of civic, social, and moral concerns were foremost among the values present even in a much larger pool of sources than Koos himself examined. While these values were usually discussed separately, these societal-level values each provided the much-desired opportunity for students to be able to *practice* their respective value (social, civic, or moral behavior) in the context of the extracurriculum. The social-civic-moral cluster of themes provides an example of a way in which American schools have sought to “educationalize” social problems—that is, solve larger societal problems that may or may not have been suited to amelioration by the school.

The social value was focused on students developing the skills, traits, and abilities to become effective members of groups (or, in the parlance of the time, to become “socially efficient”), an aspiration fed by the work of John Dewey. But extracurriculars also ran the risk of being “anti-social,” if they resulted in students forming cliques or if they were not sufficiently appealing to keep students away from less beneficial leisure pursuits.

Civic aims were also prominent in the extracurricular literature, but they, too, were at risk of not being realized if extracurriculars were monopolized by a few students, if participating in them cost too much, or if they were not properly overseen. Educators were very concerned about “democratic” criteria for extracurricular participation, by which they meant participation open to all, or all who were qualified—to guard against

membership criteria based on what were seen as arbitrary personal characteristics. Teamwork and cooperation, among other skills, were thought to result from the “civic” extracurriculum—when individual students used their talents in the service of the school community. Students were to assume civic responsibility within the school community under guidance from faculty. Providing students with opportunities to become responsible citizens within the school community would help to safeguard democracy in their future communities.

The extracurriculum was also thought to be a necessary and prime site for character training. Adolescent nature made high school students particularly susceptible to moral messages when presented in the context of activities that interested them. Properly supervised, extracurriculars could provide a necessary alternative to the immoral leisure temptations of the time. During the 1910s and 1920s, “character” was shifting from something to be cultivated within an individual to something only realized in social contexts, rendering the extracurriculum a prime venue for character development in the newly popular institution of the public high school.

In addition to the social-civic-moral cluster of themes, several more of Koos’ themes were evident among my sources, including two individual-level values concerned with meeting students’ needs (as individuals, and as adolescents, respectively) and one school-level value regarding, in Koos’ terms, “Improved discipline and school spirit.” The extracurriculum was recognized as being a better venue for meeting individual students’ needs than the curriculum, since it encompassed a variety of activities that could appeal to a variety of student interests, including student career interests. It was also recognized that, as individuals, students had unique extracurricular experiences, and

that policy governing the extracurriculum should recognize this. Adolescents were understood to be fundamentally social, plastic, impressionable, energetic, and “vital,” among other traits, and the extracurriculum could accommodate all of these inherent developmental characteristics. The last theme corroborated by this study had to do with discipline and school spirit. These were sometimes discussed separately and sometimes seen as related, with school spirit diminishing the need to discipline students outright.

The quotation from Ellwood P. Cubberley that appears in the title of this paper and provided the time parameters of this study takes on new meaning when considered in light of the value-related findings of this study. “Largely within the past decade, and wholly within the past two, an entirely new interest in the extra-curricular activities of the youth has been taken by the school,” he wrote in the introduction to Elbert K. Fretwell’s 1931 textbook entitled *Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools*. I abbreviated that quotation in the title of this paper so as to not specify what the school was taking an interest in. Of course, the point of this paper was that the school was taking an unprecedented interest in extracurricular activities, but the school would not have taken an interest in those activities had it not also taken a new kind of interest in students’ social, civic, moral, adolescent, and individual development, and a new kind of interest in its own culture of discipline and morale. The curriculum could not accommodate all these new interests of the school, but the extracurriculum could.

This study concludes with a brief examination of two major concerns about the extracurriculum—the need to carefully regulate students’ extracurricular participation so as to democratically distribute extracurricular opportunities among the student body and

protect individual students from their own extracurricular zeal, and calls to evaluate whether the intended extracurricular values were ever attained or could be.

Evident within my findings are two major sentiments: enthusiasm for these activities and ambivalence about them. These conflicting sentiments suggest that educators concerned with the extracurriculum were less of a single-minded and zealous “cult” than Spring (1972) assumed. Their enthusiasm is clear in the volume of writing on the extracurriculum at this time, the numerous claims that the extracurriculum exemplified this or that value, and the logistical attempts to provide all students with access to these activities. The ambivalence arises in concerns about the pitfalls of various extracurricular values, concerns about appropriate levels of supervision, disagreements over whether extracurricular participation was primarily for a more well-lived present or preparation for the future, and attempts to limit students’ participation in these activities.

In addition to contributing new understandings of the axiological origins of the extracurriculum, this study also contributes to our understanding of certain specific topics in the history of education, including the relationship between the Cardinal Principles of secondary education and extracurricular values, extant definitions of “social efficiency,” the shift from individual- to group-based moral education, student-teacher relationships, and the “educationalization” of social problems at this time. In addition, the extant secondary sources on the extracurriculum hardly discuss its logistics at all, thereby giving the misimpression that the way the extracurriculum is carried out today—usually after school and with no credit awarded—is the way that it has always been carried out, and that it has always been limited to a certain kind of student, whereas it was open to many

more, and in some cases all, students during the early 20th century, thanks to activity periods and the occasional school where participation was compulsory.

Certainly, the extracurricular values identified here were rhetorical goals, with very little evidence for their realization in practice provided by these kinds of sources. But especially at this time, rhetorical goals such as those expressed in the *Cardinal Principles* report were both reflecting and defining the nature of the new comprehensive, democratic high school. It made a tremendous amount of difference to students, teachers, and the public that the high school was now describing itself and acting as an educator of whole persons to social ends, as opposed to a provider of knowledge through various curricular subjects.

But knowing more about how the extracurriculum was carried out on the ground during this time would also add to our understanding of its intended values. Historians who have studied the extracurriculum at a single school or district during this time have often found abundant evidence of one specific value (e.g., Krug on social efficiency, Terzian and Ryan on school spirit) but do not discuss others. Partially, this reflects necessary scholarly focus or attachment to particular theoretical frames, but the values I have substantiated and the descriptions I have provided could provide future historians studying extracurriculars with better acquaintance with the kinds of ideas and practices they would be likely to find in the historical record of that school or district's extracurriculum. For example, without my analysis, historians might encounter the term "social" being used in school board minutes or student handbooks to describe extracurricular goals and dismiss it as a generic, meaningless buzzword of the time, not appreciate the shade(s) of meaning being employed in that context.

Significance of the Study

The extracurriculum is a particularly valuable window on this period in educational history because it embodied the spirit of its age in a way the curriculum could not. Houston observed that, had the extracurriculum come to prominence in the 19th century instead of the 20th, it would have developed along lines consistent with the educational zeitgeist of that time, which was not socialization but an educational approach known as “formal discipline” (1930, p. 285). But by being “adopted” as an official school function when it was, the extracurriculum absorbed “socialization” and other dominant ideas of its time. A close examination of the extracurriculum during this period thus tells us more about what early-20th-century educators wanted the high school to be than any curricular changes that also occurred during this time, as Miller and Hargreaves described:

[Extracurricular activities] are attuned to the movements of the times and are as sensitive to change in the social world without school walls as the weather-vane to the wandering winds of the plains. They follow no moribund patterns, but adopt the fashions and fancies of the hour; they keep pace with and mirror the changing customs of the day. . . . The accent and emphasis in all these activities are on the present. They are infected with the spirit of the 20th century, whereas the curricular activities are tainted with the spirit of the past. (1925, pp. 343-344)

The extracurriculum was, perhaps, the most accurate reflection of educators’ aspirations for the 20th century American high school. The minimal treatment of the extracurriculum in existing works of educational history has thus deprived us of a window onto educational ideals of this time that is not so evident from study of the curriculum alone.

Further research should explore the extent to which the guiding values of the extracurriculum shifted in response to changing educational times in subsequent decades (e.g., the effects on the extracurriculum of educational milestones like *Brown v. Board of Education* or the launch of Sputnik) and to what extent the “template” for it was set during the early 20th century. Further research could also explore the extent to which different individual activities reflected (or were intended to reflect) which extracurricular values more or less, and in different time periods, since specific activities were intentionally not examined in the current study.

Implications for the Present

The early American high school extracurriculum has informed the extracurriculum that American youth experience today. Because the extracurriculum came to prominence when it did, it set a certain “template” or “grammar” or cultural logic to the extracurriculum that persists, even as the extracurriculum has also absorbed the educational concerns of the present day. It may appear as though individualistic resume-building is the latest iteration of extracurricular values (e.g., Levy, 2013), and in 2014, ERIC defines “extracurricular activities” as “activities, under the sponsorship or direction of a school, of the type for which participation generally is not required and credit generally is not awarded,” in stark contrast to the extracurricular logistics of an earlier time, but the current research literature on the extracurriculum includes articles exploring students’ experience in “school clubs and *prosocial* activities” and attendant “psychological adjustment” (Fredricks & Eccles, 2006, p. 698, emphasis added), and seeking to capture “the civic lessons of high school student activities” (Shelly, 2011). Parents and teachers fear that youth have become “over-scheduled,” although researchers

claim that relatively few are, and that they should worry more about “those who do not participate at all” (Mahoney, Harris, & Eccles, 2008, p. 1). The values and concerns expressed by proponents and opponents of the American high school extracurriculum in the 1910s and 1920s became ingrained in how we think about it today, and any attempts to wholly redefine it (e.g., by making it fundamentally a pursuit for individual gain, or using it to emphasize a value not among the main ones discussed here) is likely to fall foul of tradition and historical inertia, at the very least. Each era adds its own veneer to the educational “surface” that is the American high school extracurriculum, but the basic structure still shows through.

References

- Adams, W. H. (1928). Education for character in secondary schools. *Education*, 49(3), 167-172.
- Allen, C. F. (1924). *Outlines in extra-curricular activities*. Little Rock, AR: Little Rock High School Print Shop.
- Angus, D. L., & Mirel, J. E. (1999). *The failed promise of the American high school, 1890-1995*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ashley, R. L. (1922). *The practice of citizenship*. New York: Macmillan.
- Barton, Jr., A. W. (1925). The importance of extra-curricula activities in junior and senior high schools. *The High School Quarterly*, XIII(4), 238-242.
- Belting, P. E. (1923). *The community and its high school*. New York: D. C. Heath & Co.
- Beale, J. R. (1983). *Elbert K. Fretwell and the extra-curricular activity movement, 1917-1931* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Kent State University, Kent, OH.
- Billett, R. O. (1928). The high school extra-class program. *American Educational Digest*, 47(8), 353-356, 374.
- Briggs, T. H. (1920). Can character be taught and measured? *School & Society*, XII(312), 595-601.
- Briggs, T. H. (1922). Extra-curricular activities in junior high schools. *Educational Administration and Supervision*, VIII(1), 1-9.
- Burgess, C. (1965). Review: *Schools in an age of mass culture: An exploration of selected themes in the history of 20th-century American education* by Willis Rudy. *History of Education Quarterly*, 5(3), 197-199. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/367121>
- Cleveland Teachers' Federation. (1924). *Social guidance in Cleveland high schools*. Cleveland, OH: Author.
- Cloyd, D. E. (1911). Student organizations in city high schools. *Education*, 31, 17-20.
- Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. (1918). *Cardinal Principles of secondary education*. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 35. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Counts, G. S. (1926). *The senior high school curriculum* (Supplementary Educational Monographs). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago.
- Cox, P. W. L. (1930a). Editorial: Student activities. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 4(5), 259-263. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173116>
- Cox, P. W. L. (1930b). The evaluation of student activities. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 4(5), 265-269. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173118>
- Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1980-1990*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cuban, L. (2013, September 16). Problems that schools are expected to solve. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/09/16/problems-that-schools-are-expected-to-solve/>
- Dargan, J. A. (1927). Social equipment of the high-school student. *Journal of Educational Research*, 15(4), 292-293. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27523468>
- Davis, C. O. (1921). Citizenship and the high school. *Educational Review*, 61, 214-223.

- Davis, J. B. (1913). Social activities in the high school: Organizing and utilizing the social life of the students. *Religious Education*, 8, 219-224.
- Davis, J. B. (1914). *Vocational and moral guidance*. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- Davis, J. B. (1916). The administration of the social activities of high school students. In C. H. Johnston (Ed.), *The modern high school: Its administration and extension with examples and interpretations of significant movements* (pp. 410-428). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Deam, T. M., & Bear, O. M. (1928). *Socializing the pupil through extra-curricular activities*. Chicago, IL: B. H. Sanborn & Co.
- Dee, M. B. (1929). Objectives and activities in the extra-curricular field which illustrate the seven Cardinal Principles of education. *Education*, XLIX(10), 583-591.
- Dewey, J. (1897). *My pedagogic creed*. New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co.
- Dodson, N. E. (1929). What are the vocational possibilities in extra-curriculum activities? *The School Review*, 37(10), 767-770. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1079310>
- Douglass, A. A. (1927). *Secondary education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Draper, E. M. (1931). The realization of worthy living through extracurricular activities. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 5(10), 582-586. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173596>
- Draper, E. M., & Corbally, J. E. (1932). *Extra curricular credits*. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co.
- Eaton, E. J. (1918). Organization of the social life of the high school. *Yearbook of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 2, 49-52.
- Eaton, E. J. (1935). Basic conceptions for extra-curricular activities. *Education*, 56(2), 65-69.
- Edmonds, D. (2012, July 2). Does every kid need a 'passion'? *TIME Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://ideas.time.com/2012/07/02/does-every-kid-need-a-passion/>
- Elliott, F. V. (1930). Promoting student life through extracurricular organizations. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 4(5), 290-295. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173124>
- Extra curricula activities of high schools. (1922). *Education*, XCV(2), 43-44.
- Extra-curricular activities in high schools. (1925). *American Educational Digest*, 44, 389-392, 415-416.
- Fass, P. S. (1989). *Outside in: Minorities and the transformation of American education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Foster, C. R. (1925). *Extra-curricular activities in the high school*. Richmond, VA: Johnson Publishing Co.
- Fowler, B. P. (1920). The social organization of a high school. *School & Society*, XII(305), 396-399.
- Fowler, B. P. (1921). The socialization of the six-year high school through the organization of the student activities. *Addresses and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the NEA*, 59, 672-673.
- Franklin, B. M., & McCulloch, G. (2007). *The death of the comprehensive high school? Historical, contemporary, and comparative perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Franklin, V. P., Gordon, L. D., Seller, M. S., & Fass, P. S. (1991). Understanding American education in the 20th century. *History of Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 47–65. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/368782>
- Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2006). Is extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes? Concurrent and longitudinal relations. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(4), 698-713.
- Fretwell, E. K. (1923). Extra-curricular activities of secondary schools: A bibliography of pupil participation in the extra-curricular life of the school. *Teachers College Record*, 24(1), 60-72.
- Fretwell, E. K. (1925). The place of extra-curricular activities in education. *School & Society*, XXI(544), 633-639.
- Fretwell, E. K. (1930). Extracurricular activities: Two guiding principles. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 4(5), 304-308. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173129>
- Fretwell, E. K. (1931). *Extra-curricular activities in secondary schools*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Froula, V. K. (1915). Extra-curricular activities: Their relation to the curricular work of the school. *Addresses and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the NEA*, 53, 737-742.
- Gallagher, O. C., Bacon, F. L., Cox, P. W. L., Downey, J. E., & Fretwell, E. K. (1928). Chapter X: Evaluation of extra-curriculum activities. In *Sixth yearbook of the department of superintendence: The development of the high-school curriculum* (pp. 230-242). Washington, DC: NEA.
- Golightly, T. J. (1927). The present interest in character education. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 9(5), 140-144. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20257549>
- Graebner, W. (1987). Outlawing teenage populism: The campaign against secret societies in the American high school, 1900-1960. *The Journal of American History*, 74(2), 411–435. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1900029>
- Gruenberg, B. C. (1917). What are the opportunities before the high schools of the country in training men for public service and for efficient citizenship? *School & Society*, 5, 577-582.
- Gutowski, T. W. (1978). *The high school as an adolescent-raising institution: An inner history of the Chicago public secondary education, 1856-1940* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Gutowski, T. W. (1988). Student initiative and the origins of the high school extra-curriculum: Chicago, 1880-1915. *History of Education Quarterly*, 28(1), 49–72. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/368283>
- Hausle, E. C. (1932). Control of extracurricular activities in high school. *School & Society*, 35(901), 462-463.
- Hamilton, J. T. (1931). Centralizing outside activities. *The Nation's Schools*, 8(4), 25-29.
- Herbst, J. (1996). *The once and future school: Three hundred and fifty years of American secondary education*. New York: Routledge.
- Hines, L. M. (1998). Community and control in the development of the extracurriculum: Muncie Central High School, 1890-1930. In W. J. Reese (Ed.), *Hoosier schools past and present* (pp. 99–120). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Hirschman, C. (2005). Immigration and the American Century. *Demography*, 42(4), 595-620. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4147331>
- Hobson, C. S. (1923). An experiment in organization and administration of high-school extra-curricular activities. *The School Review*, 31(2), 116-124. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1078630>
- Holch, A. E. (1925a). Student activities in the high school. *Education*, XLV(10), 606-618.
- Holch, A. E. (1925b). The administration of student activities. *Educational Review*, 70, 6-10.
- Holch, A. E. (1926). The social basis of extra-curricular activities. *Education*, XLVI(5), 290-301.
- Hollister, H. A. (1909). *High school administration*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
- Home School Legal Defense Association. (2013). Sports and public school classes. Retrieved from http://www.hslda.org/docs/nche/Issues/S/State_Sports.asp
- Houston, G. D. (1930). Extra-curriculum activities in their true light. *Education*, 50, 282-292.
- Johnson, E. (1921). Student activities in the small high school. *The American Schoolmaster*, 14, 383-387.
- Johnson, F. W. (1909). The social organization of the high school. *The School Review*, 17(10), 665-680. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1077393>
- Johnson, F. W. (1912). Moral education through school activities. *Religious Education*, 6, 493-502.
- Johnson, F. W. (1913). Methods of social training in high schools. *Religious Education*, 8, 200-209.
- Johnson, F. W. (1924). Social and extra classroom problems of the co-educational high school. *Report of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the National Association of Deans of Women*, 135-148.
- Johnson, F. W. (1925). *The administration and supervision of the high school*. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- Johnston, E. G. (1932). Democratizing the extracurricular program. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 7(2), 86-91. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30176307>
- Johnston, E. G., & Davis, C. O. (1934). *The appraisal and re-direction of extra-curricular activities*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, School of Education.
- Jones, A. H. (1926). Co-curricular activities. *School & Society*, XXIV(603), 79-80.
- Jones, D. J. (1924, July 10). The social aim of the extra-curricula activities. *Journal of Education*, C(2), 41-43.
- Jones, G. (1925). Three principles underlying the administration of extra-curricular activities. *The School Review*, 33(7), 510-522. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1079123>
- Jordan, R. H. (1928). *Extra-curriculum activities in elementary and secondary schools*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Kaestle, C. F. (1997). Recent methodological developments in the history of American education. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (pp. 119-138). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

- Kaye, O. W. (1933). Why extracurricular activities are necessary in the school. *The Nation's Schools*, XI(4), 17-22.
- Keller, P. G. W. (1905). Open school organizations. *The School Review*, 13(1), 10-14. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1075537>
- Kett, J. F. (1977). *Rites of passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the present*. New York: Basic Books.
- King, I. (1916). Social training through school group activities. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 13, 13-25.
- Klapper, P. (1929). *Contemporary education: Its principles and practices*. New York: D. Appleton & Co.
- Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958* (3rd Ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Koos, L. V. (1926a). Analysis of the general literature on extra-curricular activities. In G. M. Whipple (Ed.), *The 25th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part II: Extra-curricular activities* (pp. 9-22). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Co.
- Koos, L. V. (1926b). Evaluating extra-curricular activities. In G. M. Whipple (Ed.), *The 25th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part II: Extra-curricular activities* (pp. 225-235). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Co.
- Koos, L. V. (1927). *The American secondary school*. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- Krug, E. A. (1964). *The shaping of the American high school, volume 1*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Krug, E. A. (1972). *The shaping of the American high school, volume 2: 1920-1941*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Labaree, D. F. (2008). The winning ways of a losing strategy: Educationalizing social problems in the United States. *Educational Theory*, 58(4), 447-460.
- Lamar, F. S. (1925). Extra-curricular activities. *Addresses and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the NEA*, 63, 609-614.
- Lasher, W. R. (1910). School activities as an educational factor in secondary schools. *Addresses and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the NEA*, 445-450.
- Levy, P. (2013, May 16). Twin Cities students find all A's aren't automatic ticket to college of choice. Star Tribune. Retrieved from <http://www.startribune.com/printarticle/?id=207649641>
- Lewis, W. D. (1914). *Democracy's high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Mahoney, J. L., Harris, A. L., & Eccles, J. S. (2008). The over-scheduling myth. Research-to-Results Brief #2008-12. Washington, DC: ChildTrends. Retrieved from http://childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/02/Child_Trends-2008_02_27_Myth.pdf
- Mark, M. L., & Gary, C. L. (2007). *A history of American music education* (3rd ed.). New York: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Masters, J. G. (1926). General survey of practices: Four-year and senior high schools. In G. M. Whipple (Ed.), *The 25th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II: Extra-curricular activities* (pp. 39-54). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Co.

- McCabe, M. R., & Jessen, C. A. (1934). *Good references on secondary education: Extracurriculum*. Bibliography No. 19. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- McClellan, B. E. (1999). *Moral education in America: Schools and the shaping of character from colonial times to the present*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- McCulloch, G. (2011). *The struggle for the history of education*. London: Routledge.
- McDaniel, M. R. (1919). School morale. *Chicago Schools Journal*, 2(3), 2-5.
- McKown, H. C. (1927). *Extracurricular activities*. New York: The Macmillan Co.
- McKown, H. C. (1932). The place of student activities in a public relations program. *Education*, LIII(2), 77-83.
- McLinn, C. B. (1911, October 5). The social side of high school life. *Journal of Education*, LXXIV(13), 345, 346, 355, 356.
- Meredith, A. B. (1920). Why high school principals succeed and why they fail. *Teachers College Record*, 21, 117-123.
- Meyer, H. D. (1926). *A handbook of extra-curricular activities in the high school especially adapted to the needs of the small high school*. New York: A. S. Barnes.
- Miller, H. L., & Hargreaves, R. T. (1925). *The self-directed school*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Modell, J., & Alexander, J. T. (1997). High school in transition: Community, school, and peer group in Abilene, Kansas, 1939. *History of Education Quarterly*, 37(1), 1-24. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/369902>
- Monroe, W. S., & Weber, O. F. (1928). *The high school*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran, & Co.
- Moritz, R. D. (1922). A neglected subject. *Nebraska Educational Journal*, 2, 116.
- Morrison, G. B. (1905). Social ethics in high-school life. *The School Review*, 13(5), 361-370. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1075765>
- Murray, E. C. (1930). A program of extracurricular activities. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 4(5), 270-272. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173119>
- Murray, E. C. (1931). A program of student activities and the psychological problem of individual differences. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 6(1), 17-23. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173616>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1993). *120 years of American education: A statistical portrait*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Author. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=93442>
- Neumann, H. (1918). *Moral values in secondary education: A report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, appointed by the NEA*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- New York University. (1936). *An annotated list of 100 education serials*. New York: Author.
- North, S. M. (1918). A social program for secondary schools. *American Physical Education Review*, XXIII(8), 469-474.
- Null, J. W. (2004). Social efficiency splintered: Multiple meanings instead of the hegemony of one. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 19(2), 99-124.

- Odell, C. W., & Blough, J. H. (1926). *An annotated bibliography dealing with extra-curricular activities in elementary and high schools*. Bulletin No. 29. University of Illinois, Urbana, College of Education, Bureau of Educational Research.
- Paul, F. H. J. (1921). The growth of character through participation in extra-curriculum activities. *Yearbook of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 5, 54-60.
- Paul, F. H. J. (1922). Student organizations and the development of character. *Addresses and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the NEA*, 60, 1273-1279.
- Paul, F. H. J. (1924). The value of extra-curricular activities. *NEA Proceedings*, 62, 916-917.
- Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction [PA DPI]. (1922). *Report of the survey of the public schools of Philadelphia, Book IV: Instruction*. Philadelphia: The Public Education and Child Labor Association of Pennsylvania.
- Pierce, A. E. (1923). *Catalog of literature for advisers of young women and girls*. New York: H.W. Wilson.
- Pound, O. (1918). The need of a constructive social program for the high school. *The School Review*, 26(3), 153-167.
- Pound, O. (1919). Cooperation of patrons in solving the problems of social life in the high school. *Addresses and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the NEA*, 57, 440-443.
- Pound, O. (1921). Social reconstruction in the high school. *School & Society*, 14(362), 509-513.
- Pringle, R. W. (1922). *Adolescence and high-school problems*. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co.
- Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of failed school reforms*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Roberts, A. C. (1918). An experiment in socialization. *The School Review*, 26(1), 25-34. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1077648>
- Roberts, A. C., & Draper, E. M. (1928). *Extraclass and intramural activities in high schools*. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co.
- Roemer, J., & Allen, C. F. (1926). *Extra-curricular activities in junior and senior high schools*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
- Roemer, J., & Allen, C. F. (1929). *Readings in extra-curricular activities*. Richmond, VA: Johnson Publishing Co.
- Rudy, W. (1965). *Schools in an age of mass culture: An exploration of selected themes in the history of 20th-century American education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rugg, E. U. (1930). *Summary of investigations relating to extra-curricular activities*. Greeley, CO: Colorado State Teachers College.
- Rugg, E. U. (1931). Student activities as a means of providing for adolescent needs. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 5(5), 294-299. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173501>
- Ryan, P. J. (2005). A case study in the cultural origins of a superpower: Liberal individualism, American nationalism, and the rise of high school life, a study of Cleveland's Central and East Technical High Schools, 1890-1918. *History of Education Quarterly*, 45(1), 66-95. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20461924>

- Rynearson, E. (1917). Supervised student activities in the school program. *Yearbook of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 1, 47-50.
- Setran, D. P. (2003). "From morality to character": Conservative progressivism and the search for civic virtue, 1910-1930. *Paedagogica Historica*, 39(4), 435-456.
- Shelly, B. (2011). Bonding, bridging, and boundary breaking: The civic lessons of high school student activities. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 7(3), 295-311.
- Shiels, A. (1925). Viewpoints in civic education. *Teachers College Record*, 26(10), 827-845.
- Singer, L. E. (1927). Extra curricular activities. *American Educational Digest*, 47(1), 15-17, 35.
- Skinner, A. W. (1925). The limitations which should be set upon a small high school with respect to its extra curricula activities. *The High School Quarterly*, 13(3), 146-151.
- Sleezer, M. M. (1924). Student citizenship at the Senn High School. *The School Review*, 32(7), 508-520. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1079601>
- Smith, W. R. (1924). *Constructive school discipline*. New York: American Book Co.
- Spaulding, F. T. (1929). What extra-curricular activities ought a good school not to offer? *Educational Method*, IX, 140-150.
- Spring, J. H. (1972). *Education and the rise of the corporate state*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Steeper, H. T. (1919). The extra-curriculum activities of the high school. *Education*, 39, 367-373.
- Stovey, P. A. (2011). *High school on the middle border* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI.
- Sturtevant, S. M., & Hayes, H. (1928). A partial bibliography for deans of women and girls. *Teachers College Record*, 29(8), 739-752.
- Terry, P. W. (1925). Administration of extra-curriculum activities in the high school I. *The School Review*, 33(10), 734-743. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1079567>
- Terry, P. W. (1928). Value of supervision of high school student organizations. *School Life*, XIV(2), 21-24.
- Terry, P. W. (1930). *Supervising extra-curricular activities in the American secondary school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Terry, P. W. (1930, October). Summary of investigations of extra-curriculum activities in 1929. *The School Review*, 38(8), 605-612. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1080210>
- Terry, P. W. (1932, February). Summary of investigations of extra-curriculum activities in 1930. *The School Review*, 40(2), 124-137. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1080945>
- Terry, P. W. (1932, September). Summary of investigations of extra-curriculum activities in 1931. *The School Review*, 40(7), 505-514. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1080746>
- Terry, P. W. (1933, April). Selected references on the extra-curriculum. *The School Review*, 41(4), 299-306. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1080704>
- Terry, P. W. (1934, April). Selected references on the extra-curriculum. *The School Review*, 42(4), 299-306. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1080303>

- Terry, P. W. (1935, April). Selected references on the extra-curriculum. *The School Review*, 43(4), 300-306. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1080289>
- Terry, P. W. (1936, April). Selected references on the extra-curriculum. *The School Review*, 44(4), 298-306. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1080258>
- Terzian, S. G. (2000). *The emergence of a comprehensive high school: Ithaca High School in Ithaca, New York, 1875-1941* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Terzian, S. G. (2004). The elusive goal of school spirit in the comprehensive high school: A case history, 1916-1941. *The High School Journal*, 88(1), 42–51. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40364276>
- Terzian, S. G. (2005). The struggle for the American extracurriculum at Ithaca High School, 1890-1917. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 20(4), 319–341.
- Threlkeld, C. H. (1931). Guidance through activities. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 5(7), 412-416. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173410>
- Toporek, B. (2012, August 3). Ark. home-schooled athletes eligible for public school sports. *Education Week Schooled in Sports blog*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/schooled_in_sports/2012/08/ark_homeschooled_athletes_eligible_for_public_school_sports_in_2013-14.html
- U.S. Bureau of Education. (1893). *Report of the committee on secondary school studies appointed at the meeting of the National Educational Association, July 9, 1892*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Umstead, L. W., & Thompson, E. M. (1929). Extracurricular activities in a North Carolina rural high school. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 4(3), 158-162. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30173080>
- Waller, W. (1932, reissued 1961). *The sociology of teaching*. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Weskerna, N. (2012, March 17). School officials eye extracurriculars for cuts. Daily Chronicle (DeKalb County, IL). Retrieved from http://www.daily-chronicle.com/mobile/article.xml/articles/2012/03/12/r_3vonlwgwsvokkzjrwyv07a/index.xml
- Whipple, G. M., Ed. (1926). *The 25th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part II: Extra-curricular activities*. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Co.
- Wilds, E. H. (1926). *Extra-curricular activities*. New York: Century.
- Wiley, W. E. (1925). Organization of extra-curricular activities as a device for training in citizenship. *The School Review*, 33(1), 62-66. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1079181>
- Williams, S. J. (1934). Littleburg solves for “X” in the extracurricular program. *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, 8(8), 490-493. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30174284>
- Williams, E. I. F. (1942). *The actual and potential use of laboratory schools in state normal schools and teachers colleges*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Winner, H. E. (1923). The place and value of extra-curricular activities in the high school. *Addresses and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the NEA*, 1021-1023.

Appendix A: Word Count of Sources, with Value Keywords Bolded

	Word	Count
1	school	4864
2	activities	2677
3	high	1659
4	social	1517
5	pupils	1212
7	extra	1128
8	may	1120
9	student	998
10	schools	953
11	education	942
12	work	940
13	curricular	922
14	life	780
15	students	713
16	program	701
17	must	691
18	time	638
19	training	601
20	teachers	581
21	many	570
22	pupil	558
23	organization	555
24	organizations	541
25	class	540

	Word	Count
26	group	512
27	part	484
28	made	459
29	clubs	453
30	club	450
31	curriculum	437
32	use	435
33	activity	429
34	boys	429
35	educational	415
36	good	415
37	guidance	402
38	make	399
39	every	395
40	community	386
42	well	379
43	teacher	377
44	conditions	375
45	secondary	375
46	much	374
47	new	373
48	individual	370
49	subject	355
50	girls	343

	Word	Count
51	members	341
52	first	329
53	general	325
54	society	322
55	public	320
56	principal	317
57	interest	312
58	number	309
60	best	305
61	given	303
62	participation	301
63	self	301
64	study	301
65	citizenship	298
66	development	297
67	also	296
69	interests	286
70	faculty	283
71	terms	282
72	extracurricular	279
73	character	278
74	need	276
75	civic	270
76	certain	268

	Word	Count
78	present	265
80	way	261
81	opportunity	256
82	place	253
83	means	252
84	service	246
85	control	244
86	years	244
87	large	243
88	value	243
89	year	243
90	spirit	241
91	possible	240
92	whole	237
93	problem	236
95	groups	235
96	practice	235
97	now	234
98	various	234
99	better	233
100	even	233

Words omitted: One, two, 1, 2, 3, 4, jstor

Appendix B: Periodicals Represented Among Sources

Publications of Professional Associations

- *American Physical Education Review*

Published by the American Physical Education Association

- *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*

- *Educational Method*

1921: “Published by the World Book Company . . . for National Conference on Educational Method.”

1935: “Official Organ of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the NEA.”

- *The High School Quarterly*

1912: “*The High School Quarterly* has been adopted by the twelve Congressional District High School Associations and the State High School Association, of which the 12 district associations are members, as their official organ.”

1935: “Official organ of the Southern Commissions on Accredited Colleges and Schools, the Georgia College Association, the National High School Inspectors’ Association, and the Georgia High School Association.”

- *Journal of Educational Research*

Published by the Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois.

“Official organ of the National Association of Directors of Educational Research.”

- ***Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Annual Meeting / Addresses and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, National Education Association of the United States***

Published under various titles at different times such as “Proceedings,” “Addresses and Journals.” In recent years each volume centering about one theme has included the speeches before the General Sessions, reports of active committees, addresses and minutes of the National Council of Education and the departments of the association. Also contains the association records and general information. (New York University [NYU], 1936)

- ***The Nebraska Educational Journal***

Official organ of the Nebraska State Teachers’ Association

- ***The Phi Delta Kappan***

1915: “The official national magazine / National news letter of Phi Delta Kappa”

1935: “A journal for the promotion of research, service, and leadership in education”

- ***Religious Education***

The journal of the Religious Education Association

“A quarterly devoted to the development of character through the family, the church, the school, and other community agencies.”

- ***Report of the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Deans of Women***
 Includes lists of officers, minutes, reports of special committees, membership list, speeches on many phases of student problems, and the duties of the dean. (NYU, 1936)
- ***Yearbook of the National Association of Secondary School Principals***
 Published five times a year. One number covers annual meeting. Others on secondary-school administration, the National Honor Society, diploma practices, departmental specialization, the tercentenary celebration, the emergency and economics in administration. (NYU, 1936)
- ***Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education***
 Issued annually in two parts. Prepared by a Committee of the **society** and issued before the annual meeting for discussion at that time. Covers a broad field including the teaching of history and geography, teacher training, sex education, health and education, the school as a community center, industrial and agricultural education, supervision, school surveys, elementary- and high-school curricula, tests of efficiency of schools, home backgrounds, economy of time in education, gifted children, intelligence tests, vocational guidance and education, safety education, extracurricular activities, “nature and nurture,” preschool education, the textbook, liberal-arts education, school buildings, and educational diagnosis. (NYU, 1936)

Publications of Educational Entities

- ***The Chicago Schools Journal***

Published by the Board of Education of the City of Chicago

- ***School Life***

Official organ of the United States Bureau/Office of Education

“Congress, in 1867, established the Office of Education to ‘collect such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories’; to ‘diffuse such information as shall aid in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems’; and ‘otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country.’ To diffuse expeditiously information and facts collected, the office of education publishes *School Life* . . . *School Life* provides a national perspective of education in the United States.”

- ***The School Review***

“A journal of secondary education edited by the Department of Philosophy and Education in the University of Chicago”

- ***Teachers College Record***

Published by Teachers College, Columbia University

1904: “A journal devoted to the practical problems of elementary and secondary education and the professional training of teachers”

- ***The Western Journal of Education / The American Schoolmaster*** (title from 1913)

Published by State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Michigan

“An educational magazine devoted to the professional aspects of teaching”

Other Publications

- *American Educational Digest*
- *Education*

“A monthly magazine devoted to the science, art, philosophy, and literature of education”
- *Educational Administration & Supervision*

“including teacher training” (tagline added in 1920)
- *The Journal of Education*

“A weekly journal devoted to education, science, and literature”
1935: “Twice a month for better schools”
- *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*

“The journal for progressive junior-senior high school people”
- *The Nation’s Schools*

“Devoted to the application of research in the building, equipment, and administration of schools”
- *School and Society*

“A weekly journal . . . covering the whole field of education in relation to the problems of American democracy. Its objects are the advancement of education as a science and the adjustment of our lower and higher schools to the needs of modern life.”
1935: “with which are combined the *Educational Review*, established in 1891, the *Teachers Magazine*, established in 1878, and the *School Journal*, established in 1874.”

Appendix C: Authors of Sources and Their Professional Roles

Author Name	Professional Role/Position/Title	School, College, or Organization
Adams, Walter H.	Assistant Professor, Secondary Education	Christian College, Abilene, TX
Allen, Charles F.	Principal	West Side Junior High, Little Rock, AR
Ashley, Roscoe L.	1913 ³⁶ : Head, Department of History and Economics	Pasadena High School
Barton Jr., A. W.	Professor of Secondary Education	Southeast State Teachers College, OK
Bear, Olive M.	Head, English Department	Decatur High School, Decatur, IL
Belting, Paul E.	Assistant Professor, Secondary Education	University of IL
Billett, R. O.	Principal	High school, Painesville, OH
Briggs, Thomas H.	Professor of Education	Teachers College, Columbia University
Cloyd, David E.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1917: Dean; Professor of Education and Psychology • Dean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highland Park College, Des Moines, IA • School of Education, Des Moines College
Corbally, John E.	Assistant Professor of Education	University of WA
Counts, George S.	Professor of Secondary Education	Yale University
Cox, Phillip W. L.		School of Education, NYU
Dargan, Jane A.		Bulkeley High School, Hartford, CT
Davis, Calvin O.	1930: Professor of Secondary Education	University of MI
Davis, Jesse B.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal • Director of Vocational Guidance • Secretary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central High School, Grand Rapids, MI • City of Grand Rapids, MI • National Vocational Guidance Association
Deam, Thomas M.	Assistant Superintendent	Joliet Township High School and Junior College, Joliet, IL
Dee, M. Barbara		Jamaica Plain High School, MA
Dodson, Nora E.		Senior High School, Hazleton, PA

³⁶ When a year is provided in this table, it is because the biographical information dates from that year, which is not the year in which their source used in this paper was published (i.e., the information came from a source other than their source used in this paper).

Author Name	Professional Role/Position/Title	School, College, or Organization
Douglass, Aubrey A.	Head, Department of Education	Pomona College
Draper, Edgar M.	Associate Professor of Education	University of WA
Eaton, Edward J.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal • Professor of Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North High School, Des Moines • Boston University
Elliott, Floy V.	Dean of Girls	Central High School, Tulsa, OK
Foster, Charles R.	Associate Superintendent	Pittsburgh, PA
Fowler, Burton P.	First Assistant Principal	Central High School, Cleveland, OH
Fretwell, Elbert K.	Professor of Education	Teachers College, Columbia University
Froula, V. K.	Principal	Lincoln High School, Seattle
Golightly, T. J.	“Psi”, also Ph.D.	
Gruenberg, Benjamin C.		Julia Richman High School, New York City
Hamilton, James T.	Superintendent	Newberg, OR
Hargreaves, Richard T.	Principal	Central High School, Minneapolis, MN
Hausle, Eugenie C.	In charge of extracurricular activities	James Monroe High School, NY
Hobson, Cloy S.		High school, Kearney, NE
Holch, A. E.	Biology Department	State Normal School and Teachers’ College, Peru, NE
Hollister, Horace A.	High School Visitor	University of IL
Houston, G. David	Principal	Armstrong High School, Washington, D.C.
Johnson, Ethel	Principal	High school, Milan, MI
Johnson, Franklin W.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal • Professor, Secondary Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University High School, University of Chicago • Teachers College, Columbia University
Johnston, Edgar J.	Principal	University High School, University of MI
Jones, Alfred H.		Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Jones, David J.		Eugene, OR
Jones, Gertrude		Lincoln High School, Lincoln, NE
Jordan, Riverda H.	Professor of Education	Cornell University
Kaye, Orin W.	Superintendent	Paw Paw, MI
Keller, Paul G. W.	Principal	Manitowoc, WI
King, Irving	Assistant Professor of Education	University of IA

Author Name	Professional Role/Position/Title	School, College, or Organization
Klapper, Paul	Dean	School of Education, College of City of New York
Koos, Leonard V.	Professor of Secondary Education	University of Minnesota
Lamar, Franklin S.	Vice-Principal	Manual Training High School, Kansas City, MO
Lasher, William R.		Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, NY
Lewis, William D.	Principal	William Penn High School, Philadelphia
Masters, Joseph G.	Principal	Central High School, Omaha, NE
McDaniel, M. R.	Principal	Oak Park High School
McKown, Harry C.	1928: Assistant Professor, Secondary Education	University of Pittsburgh
McLinn, Charles B.	Principal	High school, New Albany, IN
Meredith, Albert B.	Assistant State Commissioner of Education	NJ
Meyer, Harold D.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associate Professor of Sociology • Chief 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of NC • Bureau of Recreation and Community Development, University of NC
Miller, Harry L.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associate Professor of Education • Principal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of WI • WI High School, University of WI
Monroe, Walter S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor of Education • Director 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of IL • Bureau of Educational Research, University of IL
Moritz, R. D.	Superintendent	Seward, NE
Morrison, Gilbert B.		McKinley High School, St. Louis, MO
Murray, Effingham C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor in History • Director of Extracurricular Activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City • DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City
Neumann, Henry		Ethical Culture School, New York City
North, Samuel M.	State supervisor of high schools	MD
Paul, Francis H. J.	Principal	DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City
Pound, Olivia	Adviser of Girls	Lincoln High School, Lincoln, NE
Pringle, Ralph W.	Principal	University High School, IL State Normal School
Roberts, Alexander C.	President	CA State Teachers College
Roemer, Joseph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor of Secondary Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Florida

Author Name	Professional Role/Position/Title	School, College, or Organization
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High School Visitor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Florida
Rugg, Earle U.	Head	Department of Education, CO State Teachers College
Rynearson, Edward	Principal	Fifth Avenue High School, Pittsburgh
Shiels, Albert	Professor of Education	Teachers College, Columbia University
Singer, L. E.	Principal	Jefferson High School, Lafayette, IN
Skinner, Avery W.	Director, Examinations and Inspections Division	NY State Department of Education
Sleezer, Margaret M.		Senn High School, Chicago
Smith, Walter R.	Professor of Educational Sociology	University of KS
Spaulding, Francis T.		Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Steeper, H. T.	Principal	Leavenworth High School, Leavenworth, KS
Terry, Paul W.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor of Education • Professor of Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of NC • University of AL
Thompson, E. M.	Principal	Garner High School, Wake County, NC
Threlkeld, C. H.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal • First Vice-President 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Columbia High School, South Orange and Maplewood, NJ • Department of Secondary School Principals, NEA
Umstead, L. W.	Supervising principal	Rural-school unit in Wake County, NC
Weber, Oscar F.	Associate	College of Education, University of IL
Wilds, Elmer H.	Professor of Education	Western State Normal School, Kalamazoo, MI
Wiley, Will E.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate Student • Formerly Superintendent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stanford University • The Dalles, OR
Williams, S. Joe	Superintendent	Duenweg Consolidated Schools, Duenweg, MO
Winner, H. E.	Principal	South Hills High School, Pittsburgh, PA

Appendix D: Summary of the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918)

<p>Health</p>	<p>“The secondary school should . . . provide health instruction, inculcate health habits, organize an effective program of physical activities, regard health needs in planning work and play, and cooperate with home and community in safeguarding and promoting health interests.”</p>
<p>Command of fundamental processes “such as reading, writing, arithmetical computations, and the elements of oral and written expression”</p>	<p>“Throughout the secondary school, instruction and practice must go hand in hand, but . . . only so much theory should be taught at any one time as will show results in practice.”</p>
<p>Worthy home-membership: “the development of those qualities that make the individual a worthy member of a family, both contributing to and deriving benefit from that membership.”</p>	<p>“The social studies should deal with the home as a fundamental social institution and clarify its relation to the wider interests outside. Literature should interpret and idealize the human elements that go to make the home. Music and art should result in more beautiful homes and in greater joy therein. The coeducational school with a faculty of men and women should, in its organization and its activities, exemplify wholesome relations between boys and girls and men and women.</p> <p>“Home membership as an objective should not be thought of solely with reference to future duties. These are better guaranteed if the school helps the pupils to take the right attitude toward present home responsibilities and interprets to them the contribution of the home to their development.”</p>
<p>Vocation: “Vocational education should equip the individual to secure a livelihood for himself and those dependent on him, to serve society well through his vocation, to maintain the right relationships toward his fellow workers and society, and, as far as possible, to find in that vocation his own best development.”</p>	<p>“This ideal demands that the pupil explore his own capacities and aptitudes, and make a survey of the world’s work, to the end that he may select his vocation wisely. Hence, an effective program of vocational guidance in the secondary school is essential.</p> <p>“Vocational education should aim to develop an appreciation of the significance of the vocation to the community, and a clear conception of right relations between the members of the chosen vocation, between different vocational groups, between employer and employee, and between producer and consumer. These aspects of vocational education . . . demand emphatic attention.”</p>

Civic education “should develop in the individual those qualities whereby he will act well his part as a member of neighborhood, town or city, State, and Nation, and give him a basis for understanding international problems. For such citizenship the following are essential: A many-sided interest in the welfare of the communities to which one belongs; loyalty to ideals of civic righteousness; practical knowledge of social agencies and institutions; good judgment as to means and methods that will promote one social end without defeating others; and as putting all these into effect, habits of cordial cooperation in social undertakings.”

“Among the means for developing attitudes and habits important in a democracy are the assignment of projects and problems to groups of pupils for cooperative solution and the socialized recitation whereby the class as a whole develops a sense of collective responsibility . . . ”

“[T]he democratic organization and administration of the school itself, as well as the cooperative relations of pupil and teacher, pupil and pupil, and teacher and teacher, are indispensable.”

“While all subjects should contribute to good citizenship, the social studies — geography, history, civics, and economics — should have this as their dominant aim. . . . The work in English should kindle social ideals and give insight into social conditions and into personal character as related to these conditions . . . ”

“The comprehension of the ideals of American democracy and loyalty to them should be a prominent aim of civic education. The pupil should feel that he will be responsible, in cooperation with others, for keeping the Nation true to the best inherited conceptions of democracy, and he should also realize that democracy itself is an ideal to be wrought out by his own and succeeding generations.”

“Civic education should consider other nations also. As a people we should try to understand their aspirations and ideals that we may deal more sympathetically and intelligently with the immigrant coming to our shores, and have a basis for a wiser and more sympathetic approach to international problems. Our pupils should learn that each nation, at least potentially, has something of worth to contribute to civilization and that humanity would be incomplete without that contribution. This means a study of specific nations, their achievements and possibilities, not ignoring their limitations. Such a study of dissimilar contributions in the light of the ideal of human brotherhood should help to establish a genuine internationalism, free from sentimentality, founded on fact, and actually operative in the

	affairs of nations.”
Worthy use of leisure: “the ability to utilize the common means of enjoyment, such as music, art, literature, drama, and social intercourse, together with the fostering in each individual of one or more special avocational interests.”	“Education should equip the individual to secure from his leisure the re-creation of body, mind, and spirit, and the enrichment and enlargement of his personality. . . . One of the surest ways in which to prepare pupils worthily to utilize leisure in adult life is by guiding and directing their use of leisure in youth. The school should, therefore, see that adequate recreation is provided both within the school and by other proper agencies in the community. The school, however, has a unique opportunity in this field because it includes in its membership representatives from all classes of society and consequently is able through social relationships to establish bonds of friendship and common understanding that can not be furnished by other agencies.”
Ethical character	“Among the means for developing ethical character may be mentioned the wise selection of content and methods of instruction in all subjects of study, the social contacts of pupils with one another and with their teachers, the opportunities afforded by the organization and administration of the school for the development on the part of pupils of the sense of personal responsibility and initiative, and, above all, the spirit of service and the principles of true democracy which should permeate the entire school — principal, teachers, and pupils.”