

The Consideration of American Civic Education in the Early 20th Century:

Focusing on the Relationship between Student's Educational Goals
and the Social Studies Curriculum

Jinichiro SAITO

(Graduate Student, Graduate School of Education, Tohoku University / JSPS)

This paper aims to demonstrate that the American social studies curriculum in the early 20th century was related to variations in the students' situations regarding their educational goals. Generally speaking, it is said that American Social Studies was created in the beginning of 20th century. And previous Studies have tended to suggest that the social studies curriculum in grades 1-12 had consistency. However, previous historical researchers of American social studies did not focus on the fact that students went to school for different reasons in each grade. The Report of Social Studies Committee (1916) , this paper demonstrated that the curriculum in grades 1-6, the curriculum in grades 7-9, and the curriculum in grades 10-12 were qualitatively different. And it can be said that the making of social studies was not a theoretical reform but a strategy to include various kinds of social groups. Therefore, the 1916 report suggested new kinds of curriculum which had flexibility to meet the many needs of the students.

Keyword : American Social Studies, Curriculum, Citizenship, Educational goal

I. Introduction

Generally speaking, it is said that American Social Studies was created in the beginning of the 20th century. And previous studies have tended to suggest that the social studies curriculum from grades 1 to 12 have consistency. From such a perspective, it seemed that the curriculum was made based on the contents of social sciences and the theory of psychological development and had the same principles from grades 1 to 12.

Such a way of viewing the curriculum was seen in much of the research about the formative era of American social studies. For example, when Moriwake (1994) considered the secondary school curriculum in a 1916 report, which was interpreted as the origin of social studies by many researchers, he explained that the curriculum in grades 7-12 had the same principles and consistency¹. Such interpretations intended to demonstrate that American Social Studies was

made by a coherent principle.

However, in those days, educational goals of students from grades 1 to 12 were not the same. As this paper will discuss in hindsight, while the total number of students who went to school increased rapidly, the dropout rate also increased dramatically after grade 6. Therefore, the purposes of going school were different for each student. In such a situation, it is difficult to compare whether the same educational content was suitable for all of the students.

However, previous historical researchers of American social studies did not focus on the relationship between educational goals of students and the curriculum development. Of course, generally speaking, previous studies pointed out that the making of social studies curriculum was related to the increasing numbers of school children and immigrant children. Still, these studies have not focused on the relationship between educational goals of students in each grade and curriculum development².

In contrast to this trend, recently, there are some researchers who have analyzed the social studies curriculum in the early 20th century from the perspective of educational goals of students. For example, Saito (2013) focused on the intention and the background of “vocational civics” which was made in those days. He demonstrated the reason why vocational civics was set in grades 6, 8-9 was because the dropout rate in those grades was huge³. But such reasoning in previous papers was limited to the topic of vocational civics.

To sum up, previous researchers have not discussed the differentiations of curriculum from grades 1-12 from the perspective of educational goals of students. It means that previous researchers have not discussed the possibility that social studies curriculum in each grade had different features depending on educational goals of students in each grade.

Therefore, this paper aims to demonstrate that the social studies curriculum in those days was related to variations in the students' situations regarding their educational goals. To do so, this paper describes the background of social studies which emphasized the training of citizenship.

II. Outline of Social Studies Reform and background

1. Outline of the Curriculum reform of social studies

Generally speaking, previous researchers focusing on the formative era of American Social Studies mainly analyzed a series of reports in those days, which started with the Report of Committee of Ten in 1892 and ended with the Report of Social Studies Committee in 1916⁴. These committees were mainly organized by two large private organizations, which were the National Education Association and the American Historical Association.

Social Studies curriculum reform mainly tended to focus on secondary school reform. In

addition to that, generally speaking, the features associated with the social studies curriculum in those days had two aspects. First, the content of the earlier curriculum was concentrated on history, and the content of the latter type included not only history but also civics and geography. Second, the earlier type of curriculum emphasized the discipline of history, but the latter type of the curriculum used the disciplines as tools to train citizenship⁵.

Before analyzing the features of the 1916 report, this paper focuses on the background of the educational reform especially, the various situations of the students.

2. Situation of Students

In those days, in fact, many students tended to dropout before entering high school. Table1 describes the rate of enrollment and the dropout situation, as reported by some famous educational scholars; Thorndike (1907), Ayres (1909), Strayer (1911). As shown, the dropout of students mainly started in grade 6 in elementary school and the rate rapidly increased from grade 7 - 9. All researchers demonstrated that about 10 percent of students stayed in school until the end of high school.

In those days, although the number of students in high school increased, the number of students dropping out was high⁶.

The social studies curriculum reform paid little attention to the dropout rate, but little by little, educators came to focus on this situation to make a new curriculum.

(Table1) Enrollment of students (%) ⁷

Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	I	II	III	IV
Thorndike (1907)	100	100	100	90	81	68	54	49	27	17	12	8
Ayres (1909)	173	129	128	120	106	90	71	51	40	19	14	10
Strayer (1911) boys	150	120	115	110	100	85	65	50	35	20	14	10
girls	140	115	110	110	95	85	75	60	45	30	20	16

(Frank Forest Bunker, *Reorganization of the Public School System*, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1916, NO.8, p.101.)

3. Students before grade 6

As already stated, social studies reform in those days mainly focused on the secondary school. Still, some educators discussed the situation of students at the elementary school level. For example, J. Montgomery Gambrell pointed out the features of Report of Eight which was published by AHA in 1910.

According to Gambill, a large number of pupils left school every years, in spite of the existence of compulsory education laws. He indicated that “general tendency is toward keeping nearly all the pupils to the end of the fifth year, and one-half to the end of the eighth”. In addition

to that, Gambrill said that “they may have felt that it is of great importance for children leaving school at the end of the fifth or sixth grade to have made at least a slight study of the history of their own country”⁸. Therefore, he evaluated the curriculum of the Report of the Committee of Eight as “a complete and co-ordinated course of study in history for the elementary schools”⁹.

That is the way some educators pointed out the relationship between the dropout rate, which began in grade 6 in elementary school, and the history curriculum. In that time, “at least a slight study of the history of their own country” needed to be provided to such students¹⁰.

4. Students who did not enter high school

So, what kinds of discussion took place about the students in grades 7-9 in which the dropout problem was the most serious?

In fact, the Committee of Ten (1892) has already recognized the situation that most of the students finished school education in grade 7-9. Regarding this, for example, the Committee of Ten raised the point that students of grade 8, who would finish school education in this grade, needed more than half of a year study of history because most of the children did not enter high school. Considering such a situation, the Committee of Ten suggested Greek and Roman history for students who finished school education at the end of grammar school. The committee pointed out that “the large number of pupils who leave the schools at the end of the grammar school course should not be deprived of the opportunity of leaning something of other civilizations”. This meant that the committee kept in mind to some extent about the students who finished school education at the end of the elementary school.

And, such a perspective was seen in the Report of the Committee of Seven (1899) . For example, the Committee of Seven assumed that a large number of students dropped out in the first or second grades of high school, and therefore the committee introduced the fact that some scholars recommended that American history should come in the first year of the high school because many pupils leave school before the later years. As to such opinions, the Committee of Seven answered that “for a large percentage of boys and girls do not enter the high school at all, American history should therefore be given in the grammar school. In fact, it is given in the eighth and lower grades in probably the vast majority of schools”¹¹. Therefore, the Committee of Seven thought that repeating the American history course in the first year of the secondary course was a waste of time. On the other hand, the committee estimated that “by putting the study late in the course, the pupil can work along new lines and attack new problems; the development of American institutions can be studied; new and more difficult books can be read, and more advanced methods used”¹².

As shown previously, the Committee of Ten and Seven had already indicated that many

students did not enter high school. However, both reports did not have specific treatment for such students.

5. Variation of schools after grade 10

i. Students who did not enter college

For example, the Committee of Ten said that “our interest is in the school children who have no expectation of going to college, the larger number of whom will not enter even a high school”¹³. As found in this explanation, the committee recognized some educational needs of students who did not enter colleges. Still, when the committee considered about such students, they basically assumed that “the instruction in history and related subjects ought to be precisely the same for pupils on their way to college or scientific schools, as for those who expect to stop at the end of the grammar school, or at the end of the high school”¹⁴.

In this way, the Committee of Ten thought that it was important for many high school students who did not enter colleges and a few students who would enter colleges to be provided the same educational contents equally. The committee believed that this same treatment was the justice of school education.

On the other hand, the Committee of Seven came to focus on the topic of students who did not enter colleges more directly. In fact, the Committee of Seven regarded education in high school as general education. This perspective of the committee was different from that of the Committee of Ten which mainly discussed the relationship between high school and college¹⁵.

Regarding this, the Committee of Seven described that “The first fundamental fact to be remembered is that a very large percentage of secondary pupils do not go to college, and that in a very great majority of schools the courses must be adapted primarily for the pupils who finish their study with the secondary school”¹⁶.

And, such features were seen in the Report of Five which emphasized the importance of learning modern history in most of schools¹⁷. The Committee pointed out that “The study of history in the schools is more important for those that do not go to college than for those that do. The thing that we deplore is that young men and women should leave the schools and encounter the work and pleasure of mature years without a knowledge of history, for history will peculiarly help to fit them for entering upon their duties in society and give them the basis for satisfaction in the intellectual life”¹⁸.

ii. Citizenship training for students in trade schools

The report of the Committee of Five was the first report which focused on the curriculum in the trade school whose number increased in those days. At that time, the position of the trade school was that students who finished grammar school went to such schools without going to the

general high school.

Still, the committee worried that the learning of history in trade school focused on only the specific needs. For example, the Committee of Five said that such schools should not have tended to treat the history of vocation and industry, rather than modern history, American history and government. Regarding that, the Committee pointed out that “The demand that our high schools should prepare for intelligent citizenship certainly makes necessary the requirement of these two courses in all of them. Pupils may or may not become artisans or captains of industry, but they will all be citizens and need the background of knowledge and of interest that comes, or should come, from the intelligent study of the social and political life of the past and the political organization of the present. If two years of history be given in the curriculum, this could scarcely be looked on as an excess of liberalizing study; for it is not unlikely that history will be the only, or almost the only, non-technical, non-occupational study offered”¹⁹.

In this way, the committee felt negative about history emphasizing vocation and industry, even in trade schools.

iii. Schools which prepared the college examination

As shown previously, a series of reports came to focus on the many students who did not go to college and high school.

By the way, did such reports explain students in college prep schools which prepared for the entrance examination? Actually, some reports pointed out about such students.

For example, the Committee of Ten promoted that student who did not enter college be provided the same education in college prep schools, and the Committee of Seven conducted an interview survey targeting private academies whose main roles were college prep schools in those days. Such facts realized that both reports included college prep schools in their discussion.

In addition to that, the Report of the Committee of Five often indicated college prep schools. For example, the Committee reported that some high schools emphasized classical history for entrance examinations that tried to cover the field required. And, the committee said “The conditions and difficulties are not the same in all sections of the country, probably”²⁰. For example, the Committee reported that although secondary school curriculum changed rapidly, college prep schools had a difficult situation because the college entrance exam still had not changed. Regarding this, the Committee pointed out that “The difficulty in the Eastern schools is not so much in the extent of the field to be covered as in the need of covering it all with a layer of equal and even thickness lest the unwary pupil be caught by an unexpected question of the examiner”²¹.

From such facts, each report considered college prep schools in their discussions.

6. The diversity of Targets

To sum up, in American in the late 19th and early 20th century, some educators discussed the diversity of students who received school education. Such diversity can be classified as follows: 1) Student who dropped out in school of 6th grade; 2) students who finished school education without entering high school; 3) high school students who did not enter college; 4) high school students who went to trade school; 5) high school students who prepared to go to college.

Still, as far as considering some topics about students, the social studies curriculum in a series of reports estimated that every student should have been provided similar educational contents, even though the diversity of the students was recognized.

However, as this paper will describe, there were many students who did not take up courses in social studies concentrating on history. Therefore, the 1916 report needed a new strategy to respect the diversity of students and unify such diverse situations without the separation of the curriculum.

Ⅲ. Qualitative differences of each grade in the 1916 report

1. Main principles of the 1916 report

i. Curriculum framework of 6-3-3

As already told, the curriculum reform in the early 20th century came to point out the various educational goals of students, especially the dropout problems and career problems.

And, the curriculum of the 1916 report tried to select realistic choices when considering the situation of students more than any previous report. Regarding that, Table2 provides a list of the previous curriculum of 1916 report.

At first, the 1916 report suggested “two three-year cycles”. These cycles assumed that elementary school education was done in grades 1-6 and divide grades 7-9 and grades 10-12.

According to the Social Studies Committee, this curriculum was that “This grouping coincides roughly with the physiological periods of adolescence, but is based chiefly upon the practical consideration that large numbers of children complete their schooling with the sixth grade and another large contingent with the eighth and ninth grades²²”.

(Table2) the Curriculum of the 1916 report

Cycle, grade	Subject
Junior Cycle (7-9 grade)	-geography -European history -American history -Civics
Senior Cycle (10-12 grade)	· European history · American history · Problems of American democracy : social, economic, political

(N.E.A., *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*, Report of the Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of N.E.A, U.S, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1916, No.23, p.12.)

ii. Curriculum making to create flexibility

The 1916 report did not suggest a curriculum in detail but introduced general principles and a case as practice. To do so, this report tried to provide teachers and schools with an outline to adapt their own practices.

This was described by the Social Studies Committee in the following way.

The committee has refrained from offering detailed outlines of courses, on the ground that they tend to fix instruction in stereotyped forms inconsistent with a real socializing purpose. The selection of topics and the organization of subject matter should be determined in each case by immediate needs. The attempt has been, therefore, to establish certain principles, to illustrate these as far as possible by examples from actual practice, and to stimulate initiative on the part of teachers and school administrators in testing proposed methods or in judicious experiments of their own²³.

In this way, the Social Studies Committee did not intend to suggest the curriculum in detail. Because the Committee suggested only some principles and cases of lessons, this report had flexibility to be adapted to various educational needs and different kinds of children.

The Social Studies Committee pointed out in the chapter of “Differentiation of courses” that “The course of study outlined is flexible and permits of differentiation to any extent necessary to meet the needs of characteristic groups of pupils”²⁴. Here, the committee suggested some examples for immigrant children where more emphasis might be given to American history and less to European history than in a class of native children, in “both European and American history the selection of topics for emphasis should, within certain limits at least, be made to meet industrial or other specific needs”²⁵.

As shown in this way, the main principle of this 1916 report was to suggest the social studies curriculum that could be adapted to different needs of students. The aims were related to the dropout problem in secondary school. As a result, while the curriculum in this report was viewed to have some limitations because it suggested a few lessons, this curriculum provided each teacher and each school with the discretion to make different curriculum that could be adapted to various situations.

2. Care of the students who dropped out in grade 6

So, what were the concrete features in each grade?

At first, the 1916 report explained grades 1-6 by introducing a course of study in Philadelphia and Indianapolis. About this, the Social Studies Committee pointed out that “Within this period the pupils get at least some picture of the development of civilization as typified in the customs,

historic personages and dramatic events of ancient and modern nations”²⁶. In these six years, pupils learned about “the simpler elements of American history from the period of exploration to the present time” and “beginning with the simple relations of home life in the first grade and gradually including the elemental relations of the larger community life, form a continuous phase of the work”. And both courses of study had features in which the study of work was emphasized. Actually the Philadelphia plan put this study in grade 6, and the Indianapolis plan put this study in grade 4-6. Therefore, the Social Studies Committee said that “With such a course of study, the pupil who leaves school after completing the sixth grade will have acquired some experience with practically the whole range of social studies”²⁷.

This is the way, the 1916 report estimated the social studies curriculum with care to students in grade 6 who was dropped out afterwards.

3. Curriculum in grade 7-9

The Social Studies Committee presented some options in each grade to be adapted to the specific situation in each locale and school. And, totally, civics played a central role in these grades²⁸. For example, while this report explained history and geography as a set, it explained civics independently²⁹.

In addition to that, this report discussed mainly the dropout problem of students in grades 8-9. And, the distribution of time that civics should have been emphasized. According to this committee, students in grade 8 needed to attend a class of either American history three times a week and civics twice a week, or just civics five times a week. As this paper will discuss in hindsight, this number of the social studies classes was very high as compared to that of the social studies classes in senior high school.

As shown in that way, the reason why such curriculum was needed was that it was perhaps particularly important that attention be concentrated upon civics at the time just before the pupils entered high school or left school altogether³⁰. Such civics made for vocational guidance and citizenship training at the same time. This meant that civics in the first half had contents focusing on community and citizenship in a general meaning, and civics in the second half had contents on the relationship between job selection, preparation and community³¹.

Regarding this, the Social Studies Committee said that “one of the chief purposes of both eighth-and-ninth year civics should be to provide the pupil with motive for the continuation of his education”³².

In this way, civics played a central part, when compared to history and geography, in grades 7-9 of the 1916 report. At that time, civics in earlier grades tended to treat civic values in the community. Civics in latter grades, where many students dropped out, tended to treat the

relationship between civic values and vocation, and social importance of vocation. Such study recommended student to keep schooling for many years. In this way, vocational civics promoted students not to dropout. On the other hand, educators tried to give students who would drop out in such grades civic values relating to vocation. These civics values were important for keeping society.

4. Curriculum in grades 10-12 which estimated specific educational needs

i. Curriculum adapted to the diversity of the form of schools

As shown previously, the 1916 report had strong concerns about the dropout problem. So, was it similar in grade 10-12? The point is that the curriculum after grade 10 had qualitative differences from other grades. This fact was in response to various issues: 1) many students also dropped out in each grade of high school; 2) the forms of school were expanded; and 3) diversity of curriculum was made by the tracking system in high school. Therefore, the curriculum of grade 10-12 in the 1916 report had some strategies to meet such various needs. At first, the Social Studies Committee explained about the contents in grades 10-12 in the following way.

The principal of organization suggested in the pages following for all of these courses makes them extremely flexible and easily adaptable to the special needs of different groups of pupils, or of different high-school curriculums (commercial, scientific, technical, agricultural, etc.)³³.

We can find that the curriculum in the 1916 report was made to be adapted to different vocational needs, such as commercial, scientific, technical, and agricultural. This meant that the curriculum in those grades assumed differentiation and diversity of the school and course. And the contents after grade 10 were not decided definitely in each grade. So, teachers and schools were supposed to change the educational content, such as “a half year of American history and a half year of European history” or “a half year of American history and a half year of the twelfth-year study of social problems”³⁴.

When this report described the features of the curriculum in grades 10-12, the Social Studies Committee quoted the opinion of James H. Robinson, who was one of the members of this committee. In this quotation, Robinson insisted that history in vocational school needed to be industrial history and such history should emphasize the existing situation of industry and the social importance of industry³⁵. He pointed this out in the following way.

It is our present business to see what can be done for that very large class of boys and girls who must take up the burden of life prematurely and who must look forward to earning their livelihood by the work of their hands. But education has not been wont, until recently, to reckon seriously with the common man, who must do common

things. It has presupposed leisure and freedom from the pressing cares of life³⁶.

His ideas about history were often quoted in this report and had strong effects in the committee's educational theory. His assertion suggested the need to include history for the "very large class of boys and girls" who were called "common men" in the society. And this "common men" meant people belonging to the working class. After the quotation from Robinson, the Social Studies Committee responded in the following way.

What Prof. Robinson suggests is that, given a group of boys and girls whose economic and social position is preordained to the ranks of the great majority of men and women "who do common things," the history instruction should be organized, not on the traditional basis of chronology and politics, but on that of their own immediate interests³⁷.

According to the committee, such features were especially seen in the practices of Blanche E. Hazard and J. L. Merriam which were introduced in this report³⁸.

Thereupon, this paper focuses on the educational practices of Hazard in a high school of practical arts. Hazard conducted the lessons of vocational and industrial history in the class in which there were many working class students³⁹. According to this case, students and parents originally did not have any interest in history. But, they became interested in classical and European history because such history focused on industry and vocation⁴⁰. Regarding this, the Social Studies Committee pointed out that "Her pupils were girls chiefly representing the "working classes." Neither they nor their parents looked with much favor upon an education that was not intensely "practical" from their point of view"⁴¹.

Like these cases, the social studies committee tried to get the interest of the working class students by using topics on vocation and industry history. Although the committee believed that students in vocational school had also fundamental interests other than economic, as a whole, vocational and economic aspects were emphasized.

ii. The background and necessity to fit the students' interests of working classes

As mentioned before, the Social Studies Committee regarded the working class as "common men", and the Committee tried to make a curriculum that could be adapted to the needs of working class students. So, what was the background in which the committee had to work?

Concerning this point, the committee pointed out some problems by citing a quotation from Jessie C. Evans.

There is a growing danger that the traditional history course will only be permitted to the college-preparatory student. I visited, the other day, one of the largest high schools in the country and found that the majority of the students took no history at all. The new definitions of culture and the new demands for efficiency are causing very severe tests to be applied to any subject that would hold its own in our schools⁴².

In this way, Evans insisted that traditional history was regarded as a subject only for the purpose of the entrance examination, and there was not any history class in many schools⁴³. Therefore, the social studies committee emphasized that "Whether pupils elect history or not depends, first, upon whether they want it; and, second, upon the demands of other subjects upon their time"⁴⁴.

This indication by the committee suggested that students had a right to decide whether they took courses in history or not. As a result of that, a large percentage of students did not select history courses in high school. Thus, the committee had to reorganize the history curriculum to meet the educational needs of working class students who represented the majority of students in school. This was inevitable to demonstrate the importance of learning history in the school curriculum.

In regard to such a situation, for example, Tashiro considered the background of the dropout problem in vocational school. And Tashiro pointed out that "one of the main reasons why students left school was that students could not understand the value of school education, and students were not satisfied with the efficiency of school education. So vocational education was made for adapting to the students' needs."⁴⁵.

IV. Conclusion

This paper considered the relationship between educational goals of students and the social studies curriculum development in the early 20th century. Previous researchers tended to conclude that the 1916 report was made based on the principles which were the same in grades 1-12. However, this paper demonstrated that the curriculum in grades 1-6 and the curriculum in grades 7-9 and the curriculum in grades 10-12 were qualitatively different from each other. The curriculum before grade 6 focused on the essential knowledge about American society. And the curriculum in grades 7-9 made a point of training citizenship with vocational aspects. This style of learning assumed that most students dropped out in these grades and such students should learn the minimum civic values with vocational aspects before they left school. In addition to that, the curriculum after grade 10 focused on the students who did not realize the value of social studies and students in trade or vocational schools. As a result, the curriculum in those grades was made for training students who had different specific goals about citizenship.

Therefore, this differentiation of curriculum was strongly related to the situations of students

in each grade who had different needs depending on their career planning. Regarding this situations, it can be said that the making of social studies was not theoretical reform but a strategy to include various kinds of social groups. Therefore, the 1916 report suggested new kinds of curriculum which had flexibility to meet the many needs of the students.

Before the late 19th century, the number of students who went to high school was very few. Therefore, high school curriculum was made for the few privileged people, and this educational need was very different from elementary school education which needed essential knowledge about American society. However, as the number of high school students increased, the dropout problem became serious. In such a situation, educators had to make social studies appealing to various kinds of student who had different kinds of educational goals. So, the 1916 report was made from the perspective of students' needs, because high school students tended not to select social studies classes.

In this way, we need to understand that social studies theory was made not for theoretical consistency but as a strategy to include various social groups because of the dropout problem and level of academic study. In addition to that, we need to look at social studies theory from the perspective of educational targets and historical social contexts.

- 1 Takaharu MORIWAKE, *America Syakaika kyouiku seiritsushi kennkyu*, Kazamasyobou, 1994, pp.827-861.
- 2 MORIWAKE(1994) evaluated that the consistency of the curriculum was not enough, and that the curriculum in those days included many old aspects from the 19th century. And, according to researcher, the 1916 report made by the social studies committee reflected the intention of the middle class. This intention was qualitatively different from that of the curriculum in elementary school. (Michael Lybarger, *Origin of the Social Studies Curriculum: 1865-1916*. Ph.D. Dissertation., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1981.) . And one researcher pointed out that the social studies curriculum in those days was made for students who dropped out of their schools. (David. W. Saxe., *Social Studies in Schools: A History of The Early Years*, State University of New York Press, 1991. Terutugu ANDO, *Dousinenkakudairon no seiritu to hihannteki tennkai*, Kazamasyobou, 1993. Masamichi UENO, *Minsyusyugi heno kyouiku*, Tokyodaigaku syuppankai, 2013). In addition to these researchers, there are some researchers who demonstrated the relationship between the curriculum of civics and the students who dropped out (SAITO, 2013). However, every study did not mainly focus on the factor of the situation of students and the relationship between curriculum development and the situation of students.
- 3 Jinichiro Saito, The Meaning and the Background about "Vocational Civics" In the early 20th century: Focusing on the case of Barnard's "Civics", *The Journal of Civic Education*, Vol.20, 2012.
- 4 For example, Hertzberg, H.W. *Social Studies Reform 1880-1980*, A Project Span Report, Social Sciences Education Consortium, 1981. David. W. Saxe., *Social Studies in Schools: A History of The Early Years*, State University of New York Press, 1991.
- 5 About such features of the curriculum in the formative era of American social studies, the book written by

- MORIWAKE (1994) is one of most profitable resource.
- 6 For example, Jenness, D, *Making sense of social studies*. New York: Macmillan, 1990. Except for Jenness' work, there are many researchers who pointed out the increasing number of students in school in those days. Still, these figures were only for the purpose of explaining the background in those days in a general sense.
 - 7 When I made Table1, it was based on the book of MIYAMOTO. (Kenichiro MIYAMOTO, *America sinposyugi kyoujyu riron no keisei katei*, tousindou, 2005, p.23.)
 - 8 J. Montgomery Gambrill, "History in the Elementary Schools", *The Historical Teacher's Magazine*, Vol III , Number 2, 1912, p.31.
 - 9 Ibid., p.32.
 - 10 ANDO(1993) have already noted such a trend.
 - 11 A.H.A., *The Study of History in Schools, Report to American Historical Association by the Committee of Seven*, p.38.
 - 12 Ibid., p. 38.
 - 13 N.E.A., *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies, with the Report of the Conference Arranged by the Committee*, American Book Company, 1894, p.167.
 - 14 Ibid., p.165.
 - 15 Please show the following paper about the features of curriculum of the Committee of Seven, AHA, Jin'ichiro Saito, A Study on the Content Structure of History Education Reported by The Committee of Seven: Focusing on the Citizenship, *The Tohoku Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 15, 2012.
 - 16 A.H.A., *The Study of History in Schools, Report to American Historical Association by the Committee of Seven*, Macmillan Co. 1899, p.119. Actually, the Committee of Seven indicated that "In the great majority of schools the curriculum must be prepared with the purpose of developing boys and girls into young men and women, not with the purpose of fitting them to meet entrance examinations or of filling them with information which some faculty thinks desirable as a forerunner of college work." (Ibid., p.120)
 - 17 A.H.A., "The Study of History in Secondary Schools: Report of the Committee of Five," *The Annual Report for 1910 of A.H.A.*, p.9.
 - 18 Ibid., p.67.
 - 19 Ibid., p.68.
 - 20 Ibid., p.8.
 - 21 Ibid., p.8. p.31.
 - 22 N.E.A., *The Social Studies in Secondary Education, Report of the Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of N.E.A*, U.S, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1916, No.23, p.12.
 - 23 Ibid., p.10.
 - 24 Ibid., p.13.
 - 25 Ibid., p.13.
 - 26 Ibid., p.12.
 - 27 Ibid., p.12-13.

- 28 Jinichiro SAITO, A Study of “Community participation” in the beginning of American Social Studies: Focusing on the Lessons of Arthur William Dunn, *The Japanese Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol.21, 2013.
- 29 Ibid., pp.18-30.
- 30 Ibid., pp.16-17.
- 31 Jinichiro Saito, The Meaning and the Background about “Vocational Civics” In the early 20th century: Focusing on the case of Barnard’s “Civics”, *The Journal of Civic Education*, Vol.20, 2012, pp.38-39.
- 32 N.E.A., *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*, p.14.
- 33 Ibid., p.35.
- 34 Ibid., pp.35-36.
- 35 James H. Robinson, *The New History, Essays Illustrating the Modern Historical Outlook*, MacMillan Co, pp.141-142.
- 36 N.E.A., *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*, p.50.
- 37 Ibid., p.51.
- 38 Ibid., p.51.
- 39 According to MORIWAKE(1994), this practice was “maybe as a series of lessons in a European history for one years” . (Takaharu MORIWAKE, *America Syakaika Kyouiku Seiritsushi Kennkyu*, P.848.)
- 40 N.E.A., *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*, pp.45-47.
- 41 Ibid., p.47.
- 42 Ibid., p.40.
- 43 Ibid., p.40.
- 44 Ibid., p.41.
- 45 Naoto TASHIRO, *Beikoku syokugyou kyouiku syokugyou shidou seisaku no tenkai, kazamasyobou*, p.328.

20世紀初頭のアメリカ公民教育に関する一考察

—生徒にとっての教育目的と社会科カリキュラムの関係に注目して—

齊藤 仁一朗

(教育学研究科 博士課程後期 / 日本学術振興会特別研究員)

本稿の目的は、20世紀初頭のアメリカ社会科カリキュラムが、生徒にとっての多様な教育目的に関わって、生徒の様々な状況と関連していたことを明らかにすることである。

一般に、アメリカ社会科は、20世紀初頭において開発された教科だと言われている。そして、先行研究では、当時の社会科カリキュラムの1～12学年にはある程度の一貫性があるものとして論じる傾向があった。しかしながら、アメリカ社会科の歴史に関わる先行研究では、それぞれの学年の生徒が異なった理由のために学校に来ていることに注目してこなかった。

本稿では、1916年の社会科報告書のカリキュラムを分析することを通して、1～6学年、7～9学年、10～12学年のカリキュラムが質的に異なることを明らかにした。それらの分析によって、社会科の成立は、純粋に理論的な改革というよりも、様々な社会諸集団を包摂するための戦略であったとすることができる。以上のことから、1916年の社会科報告書は、様々な生徒のニーズを満たすための柔軟性を持った新しいタイプのカリキュラムを提案したと言える。

キーワード：アメリカ社会科，カリキュラム，シティズンシップ，教育目的