UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

The University of Oklahoma and the Hidden Curriculum of Its Early Years

A Thesis
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of
Master of Arts

By
Brittany Ann Boone
Norman, Oklahoma
2019

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/319768

The University of Oklahoma and the Hidden Curriculum of Its Early Years
A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY

Dr. Ben Keppel, Chair

Dr. Warren Metcalf

Dr. Bala Saho

© Copyright by Brittany Ann Boone 2019
All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

A key part of the founding myth of the University of Oklahoma is the imagery of its first president, David Ross Boyd, combing the untamed territory in a buggy for potential students, promising that "no one will find he is too poor or old for a course of study." However, twenty years after Boyd's departure from Norman, William Bennett Bizzell would remind students that "...You are, therefore, selected lives – selected for special intellectual attainment by virtue of the mental capacities which you have revealed." This thesis examines the tension between these two visions for the University. The first vision—the founding myth created by David Ross Boyd emphasizes a populist vision of why the university existed: to provide a broad based "liberal education" to the many people in the state whose access to education had been both limited and shaped by the pragmatic necessities of their lives. The statement by President Bizzell—especially his emphasis on "selected lives" and on encouraging "special intellectual attainment" suggests a more elitist public mission, one that was required by the imperative that OU become be the incubator of Oklahoma's future political, social and economic leaders. From the very beginning, these two understandings of OU's public mission were present and in tension with each other, with the more elite vision gaining strength over the next century. The thesis argues that this ever-present tension, and the university's institutional tilt over time toward a more elite, and restrictive understanding of "higher education" can be documented by studying the "hidden curriculum" of the university, an institutional force which every day decisively shaped the social and intellectual environment at the university into the present. Furthermore, his hidden curriculum is not a unique feature of the University of Oklahoma; rather, it is the defining feature of higher education throughout the United States.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements vi

Statement of Thesis 1

Introduction 2

The Origins of a University 25

Enrollment from 1892-1932 50

Hidden Curriculum 6

University Society 61

University Finances 74

The University Today 80

Conclusion 83

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the encouragement and guidance of my committee, but most especially Dr. Ben Keppel. During my time as an undergraduate in his history capstone course, Dr. Keppel saw within me a capacity for scholarship that I myself could not realize. It was his encouragement that gave me the courage to submit my application to the University of Oklahoma's graduate program. During my graduate course work I had the honor to work many professors who helped to guide me. One of these professors was Dr. Mirelsie Velazquez, who introduced me to theories and ideas in regard to the history of education and the role education plays in shaping the directions our lives take. This thesis would not have been possible without the support of my family; my husband and our son, along with my sister in law and my nieces. The long days and nights, the stress that research and deadlines place upon a person, it is my family who weather these trials with me. And finally, to my parents, who while they did not live to see me begin my journey at the university level, it was they who encouraged within me a passion to learn and to always ask questions.

"Never give up on a dream just because of the time it will take to accomplish it. The time will pass anyway." - Earl Nightingale

Statement of Thesis

Public universities are in a unique position within higher education and within the states that created them, they are expected to meet the needs of their state and uphold the standards which are set forth for universities in terms of accreditation. Sometimes it can appear as if these two obligations are mutually exclusive. This position is further made difficult by the fact that these institutions rely on public funding. These universities then must prove to a legislative body that the work they are doing is vital and necessary, thus worthy of monies earned from tax revenue. This becomes even more difficult as the financial support provided by taxpayers to state supported universities dwindles to the single digits after a generation or so of steady decline. These public universities must then generate funding from other sources. As the funding from private sources is accrued we find ourselves asking the question, what then does the phrase "public university" mean?

In order to answer this question, one must look beyond the fact that there has been a marked decline in support for universities in state legislatures in both "red" and blue" states. In order to go beyond this one must look toward the first and original leaders of these universities. What did these founding fathers want to see in their student populations or student bodies? The early history of the University of Oklahoma suggests that, from the beginning, the retention of members of the economic and political elite was equal to or only slightly less important than welcoming and nurturing those who came from backgrounds not generally thought of as compatible with receiving a liberal arts education.

The University of Oklahoma's first president, David Ross Boyd, traveled around the territory in an effort to recruit students for the university. He had discovered that parents were sending their children "back home" to universities in the eastern states in which they had once lived. His goal was to convince these parents to send their children to Norman instead.[1] This created in a way an unintended class bias within the university. Boyd faced a quadrium, he wanted the university to provide educational opportunities for what might best be termed those from riskier socio-economic backgrounds. But he also wanted to prevent a brain drain of talent from the frontier in terms of the settler class. The bias that resulted from his desire to keep the more affluent minds in the state and at the state university were not rooted in greed, rather they were done in a democratic or meritocratic manner. Boyd simply wanted what was best for the university and the state. But, the considerable efforts to keep members of the more affluent class at the University of Oklahoma came at a cost; a heavy institutional cost, resulting in the reorienting of resources to the retention of the already fortunate in place of recruiting those from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

Introduction

Established as a small state school and located where the timberline and the prairie met, the University of Oklahoma was built two miles from the nearest train depot and on the western edge of the city of Norman. Ideally, the university was open to all prospective students. However, the territorial government of Oklahoma had begun implementing Jim Crow laws. As a result, African Americans were barred from enrolling at the university. Instead there had been established through the Second Morrill Act of 1890 a separate institution for these students.

[1] George Milburn, "Planting a University: First Varsity President Recounts How He Did It," *Sooner Magazine* Vol. 1, Issue 2, November 1928, Western History Collection (University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 39.

African American students would not be granted admission to the University of Oklahoma until the 1948. When the university held its first classes in September 1890, both male and female students were admitted, as well as Native American students from the then-separate Indian Territory whom were also allowed to enroll.

The university began as a small territorial school and its students gained a certain local prestige for having had access to an institution of higher education. These students and graduates played a large role in the development of the university. Today the university tracks current and former students with an incredible attention to detail. The success of its students and graduates reflects the success and prestige of the university itself. The university itself and outside observers track student retention and the institutional and individual characteristics that make a given student successful at great length. There is a trend in the history of the University of Oklahoma of a struggle between populist ideals about education, where the university exists to educate individual citizens of all circumstances and means to fulfil their roles in society, and elitist concepts in which the university strove for prestige and to produce the educated elite of society. These ideas influenced the type of student university leaders expected and idealized within the student body.

One of the many theoretical concepts that I have found useful in understanding the constant tensions between the university's origins as an expression of populism and its elite goals and aspirations is the concept of hidden curriculum and how it (along with an unhidden one) created specific sets of standards for the type of student who was accepted into the university. In the case of the hidden curriculum, students and prospective students are unaware of the lessons that they are being taught and evaluated. There is more than one hidden curriculum, and each is based on teaching the social norms of the dominant culture that an institution represents.

On the other hand, Boyd and others like him would have been looking for anyone willing to attend classes and attempt to learn. For them, a scholar could have been anyone. They simply had to have a willingness to learn. “Any young man or woman who has finished the course in a good country school may enter the university and find educational work and a welcome."[2] All these scholars had to do was be willing to learn and work hard. Universities like the University of Oklahoma and other state or public institutions that were created during the same era were places which were designed with the goals of “reaching the unreached” and “serving the underserved.”[3]

Echoing Boyd were university presidents such as Julien Monnet, who served as interim president for the 1911-1912 academic year. In a speech delivered to the student body in 1911, Monnet welcomes all to the university. Monnet believed that all students were at the university to learn and that they were in fact eager to do so. He also talked of other universities around the world and how they differed from those in the United States, it seems for some the biggest difference is that these institutions displayed a particular view, “The thought is not so much to produce citizenship as it is to secure progress. It undoubtedly is a large view, a view that sacrifices the individual for the race.”[4] As will be later demonstrated, Monnet supported the admittance of all capable students to the university, in turn expecting those who graduated to aid the state in various ways.

One thing that both educational philosophies have in common is the belief that education, particularly higher education should be for the benefit of the state. An educated citizenry would

---

[2] David Ross Boyd, Roy Hadsell, and Betty Kirk, “My Days as First University President” Part I, *Sooner Magazine* Vol. 1, Issue 2, November 1928, Western History Collection (University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 24.
[3] Association of Public & Land-Grant Universities, “1890 Universities,” Accessed May 7, 2019, http://www.aplu.org/members/councils/1890-universities/.
[4] Julien C. Monnet, acting President of the University of Oklahoma, *Address*, September 21, 1911, Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell - 1926, University Records Group 03, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma), 6.

improve the overall health of the state. This is evident in the school motto, *civi et reipublicae*. The motto which will be discussed more in depth later, loosely translates to for citizen and the state. It was penned by a faculty member who was hired by Boyd. At his inaugural address, Bizzell echoed the sentiment embodied in the motto, stating as one of his goals for the university was for, "The development of a more versatile and more conscientious citizenship."[5] There was a belief that the more educated the citizens of the nation were, the more they could assist the government. First, educated citizens were more informed and it was believed that they made better educated choices at the polls. Secondly, with greater knowledge and skill citizens could help boost the economy. Finally, educated men could participate in the physical running of the government in the form of elected officials and bureaucratic officials. These men could also be called upon to lend their expertise to officials if necessary. Therefore, those of both philosophies, rather they looked for any man off the street or for one with a supposed natural aptitude, believed that the scholar once he finished his education, would serve the state in some capacity.

And finally, it may not be immediately obvious, but a university's financial status is strongly tied to its presidents and the goals set forth by the same. Furthermore, the financial status is also closely linked to the student body, and the ways in which the university is perceived. For some, the perception of the university was important as it implied certain things about the institution. First, there is and was a general belief that the education one receives at more affluent universities is of better quality than the one received at university that is financially struggling or believed to be struggling. During the times in which there was a more elitist focus on prestige at the University of Oklahoma, the perception of the school as being financially secure was critical to the desired image. University leaders believed that such

[5] Roscoe Cate, "16 Years of Achievement," *Sooner Magazine*, Vol. 13, Issue 11, (July 1941), Western History Collection (University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 8.

affluence would attract the more scholarly minded students. Furthermore, such an image would attract the attention of upper middle-class parents. If their children could attend a prestigious school close to home, it made higher education all the more economical.

Hidden Curriculum

The hidden curriculum or more accurately, hidden curricula, are something that people often hear about but are not entirely sure what it is exactly. Furthermore, hidden curriculum is primarily associated with primary and secondary education; it is rare that it is discussed as being present within higher education. However, there is ample evidence that hidden curricula exist within institutions of higher education. If some aspect of hidden curriculum exists at all levels of education, then what exactly is it? A hidden curriculum is the curriculum that is imbedded in the way a society, or a system within that society, works. Simply put, a hidden curriculum is a side-effect of schooling, in which students learn socially acceptable behaviors and what their place is within society. It is composed of lessons that are taught that the students are not aware that they are learning. At its simplest, the hidden curriculum is lessons that are taught that we do not know we are learning.

The term hidden curriculum was first used in 1968 by Philip W. Jackson, but it is believed that the concept was first discussed in the early twentieth century by educators like John Dewey. Now hidden curricula includes students learning cultural norms, beliefs, and customs. The lessons of the hidden curriculum are based on thought and ideals of the dominant culture. Furthermore, the socio-economic status of those who control the administration of educational institutions. As a result, students who are not part of this group can experience trauma and often suffer negative effects or influences from the hidden curriculum. There are several key contributors to the idea of hidden curriculum and its effects on students. Among these

contributors are Jonathon Cobb, Richard Sennett, and John McDermott. These men primarily focus on the effects that hidden curriculum has on college students who come from lower socio-economic groups. For Cobb and Sennett who co-authored *The Hidden Injuries of Class*, they discovered that when members of the working class were promoted to white collar jobs they began to feel as if the work they are doing is meaningless. What is more, this feeling is felt by working class children who attend college and universities. McDermott takes this future and discovers that students from blue-collar backgrounds were ostracized by professors and peers from more affluent backgrounds. Additionally, in a volume edited by Eric Margolis and titled *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*, each essay is a detailed account of how college are subjected to a variety of influences which dictate their position within society.

How is a hidden curriculum manifest in higher education? At its simplest, hidden curriculum in higher education advances and hones the culture and norms of whatever culture is dominant or representative of the institution in question. In fact, for the majority of universities the hidden curriculum teaches the cultural norms, beliefs, and customs of the American elite. The problem becomes that there are those who do not come from the elite that still advance into higher education, especially in modern times with such measures as affirmative action. These students find themselves entering into a world in which they do not know the rules, but it is assumed that they do. These students struggle to fit in and find it difficult to relate to professors and peers, most of whom have origins in the dominant culture. The exposure and interactions with this dominate culture and the assumed understanding of the same leads to a negative impact on a person's self-esteem and self-worth, which in turn negatively impacts their ability to learn.[6]

[6] Eric Argolis, Michael Soldatenko, Sandra Acker, and Marina Gair, "Peekaboo Hiding and Outing the Curriculum," Eric Margolis, ed., *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*, (Routledge: New York, 2001), 1-20.

Wealth and social class have always affected students' decision to attend institutions of higher education. In their book, *Hidden Injuries of Class*, authors Jonathan Cobb and Richard Sennett investigate the impact that socio-economic class has on a person and their attitudes. Those individuals they interviewed who were promoted to white collar positions from blue-collar labor experienced feelings of unproductiveness, inadequacy, and ultimately viewed work in the new position as less valuable than previous work. Cobb and Sennett noticed that the children of these workers had the same experience when they entered college. Despite knowing that higher education provided prestige and additional security, these students disrespected the university and viewed it as intangible, since the work done there did not produce something that was physical.[7] It was through interviews with students of te University of Chicago, MIT, and Harvard that Cobb and Sennett were able to make many of these observations. During the course of their interviews, they observed that students demonstrated "authentic" and "inauthentic" selves. Students would "play dead" when they were engaged in "institutional activity." The feelings of inauthenticity and the activities that caused these feelings were related to situations specific to academia. It was in these moments that students believed the university was judging them.[8] The ways in which the students viewed class is reflective of the initial concept of civic virtue, as only propertied white males held the right to vote in the early days of the republic. The students, who were children of blue-collar workers and immigrants, found that academia considered them to be of less worth due to archaic standards of society.

In his 1969 article "The Laying on of Culture," John McDermott expands on the findings of Sennett and Cobb. Dermott observed that professors and students from more prestigious

[7] Jonathan Cobb and Richard Sennett, *The Hidden Injuries of Class*, (W.W. Norton and Company: New York, 1972), 26-28.
[8] Ibid, 211.

backgrounds ostracized those students who came from blue-collar backgrounds. The ostracism occurred because blue-collar students had difficultly navigating the cultural norms of academia.[9] These cultural norms are a small part of the hidden curriculum that exists within higher education. In *The Hidden Curriculum of Higher Education*, a volume edited by Eric Margolis, the authors of the various essays detail that students in settings of higher education are subjected to various influences which dictate their position within the university and society at large. Oftentimes, while the students are unable to articulate it as such, they know the hidden curriculum exists and that it impacts them negatively. Whether or not they can name the system which they struggle with, these students must learn how to both contend with and compensate for the hidden curriculum.[10] As will be demonstrated later, the hidden curriculum at the University of Oklahoma changed and evolved as the state did. Furthermore, it was greatly influenced by the unhidden curriculum or ideals of education that various university presidents held and applied during their tenure.

One way to examine whether the student body at the university met the expectations that were held about their make-up is by reviewing the available information on student enrollment. The university administration had an idealized image of who the proper student was. Through these students they sought to validate this image and the university itself. In many ways it was a difficult task to determine who the ideal student was because some of the information from the earliest years are missing, which is likely a result of the series of devastating fires that ravaged the Norman campus in its first twenty years. However, through extrapolation of the available data and the use of sources not directly related to students and enrollment, it is still possible to

[9] John McDermott, "The Laying on of Culture," *The Nation*, Vol. 208, no. 10 (March 10, 1969).
[10] Eric Margolis and Mary Romero, "In the Image and Likeness…," Eric Margolis, ed., *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*, (Routledge: New York, 2001), 79-97.

evaluate trends in student enrollment. What can be seen is that students who were enrolling for courses at the University of Oklahoma constituted a unique minority of the territorial population. They were not representative of the population of Oklahoma as a whole, even allowing for influences outside of the university's control, such as the racial bar against African American students. It becomes clear from the data that the administration sought students who came from a more urbane background, students that could be molded to into studiously minded scholars and purveyors of culture. By seeking this image, the university excluded or marginalized students who came from a more rural or isolated locale, the rational being that these students lacked a certain appearance of sophistication.

While this thesis primarily focuses on university society and campus life during the 1920s, due to the availability of source materials, this section still demonstrates the ways in which the student body changed and how the influence of different university presidents facilitated this change. The shift in the 1920s from the populist view of higher education to that of the elitist view becomes most apparent. It is during the 1920s that the elite begin to fear the encroachment of working class individuals into higher education. While this is a trend seen at the national level, it appears that for the University of Oklahoma the opposite occurred: more children of wealthy Oklahomans enrolled at the university as opposed to attending schools in the east, as had been done previously. Furthermore, it was during this time that one university president, William Bennet Bizzell, begins to discuss in speeches that students must learn to conduct themselves according to their status as scholars, additionally he speaks how the students' conduct reflects upon the university. "*No university can be great unless the student body can be brought to appreciate the opportunities and caused to make the best possible use of the facilities*

provided for them."[11] In other words, not only must they behave as students with serious scholarly goals and ambitions, it must appear as though these behaviors are extensions of the university itself. But these behaviors, especially as they pertain to the image the university seeks to cultivate, must be learned and are to a large extent taught at the university in the form of a hidden curriculum. For Bizzell and perhaps others, these characteristics become part of the image in which the university projects, all of which is reflected in the student body.

"Our schools and colleges are designed to test out the natural aptitudes of our young people and give direction to human effort."[12] Bizzell believed, as did many of his day, that scholarship and one's ability to succeed as a scholar and intellectual could be determined by a series of tests. First used by the United States military, these tests were soon administered by colleges as part of admission requirements. Prospective students had to meet minimum score requirements in order to enter the school. A scholar for Bizzell and others was someone who scored exceptionally high on these exams.[13] Furthermore, a scholar was someone who was serious and focused in terms of their studies, someone who would frequently be found studying instead of engaging in extracurricular activities. They would also display what at the time would be considered innate talent or knowledge, this is an abstract idea that is difficult to articulate now. The best comparative example maybe a modern-day child who has tested into a public school's gifted and talented program. It is these types of students who would appeal to those seeking to promote an elitist ideal in terms of who should attend the university.

---

[11] William Bennett Bizzell, PhD., D., LL, D, "The Student's Attitude Toward His Educational Task," September 23, 1925, Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell - 1926, University Records Group 03, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma), 7.
[12] Ibid, 6.
[13] Nicholas Lemann, *The Big Test: The Secret History of the American Meritocracy*, (Farrar, Straus, and Giroux: New York 2000), 5.

One trend that is quite consistent at the University of Oklahoma in its early years is that in many ways the hidden curriculum was determined by the administration of the university, and specifically the president. Some presidents appear to be more elitist in perspective than others. This is particularly noticeable in speeches given at certain occasions in the life of the university, such as commencement. The most telling speeches are the ones given at convocation ceremonies that marked the start of each academic year. As part of the University Archives which can found in the Western History Collections at the University of Oklahoma are the speeches of Julien C. Monnet and William Bennet Bizzell. Monnet's speech was given when he served as acting president of the university in 1911. The other speeches were given by President William Bennett Bizzell, fifth president of the University of Oklahoma. Beginning in 1925 there are a total of four speeches, and it is clear from these speeches that Bizzell was a man who believed that the only reason one attended college or university was because they were serious about their studies and scholarship, and that the graduates of the university represented the elites of the state.

Julien C. Monnet served as acting president for the University of Oklahoma while the Board of Regents searched for a permanent replacement for the previous president, Arthur Evans. Simply titled *Address*, Monnet's speech is more hopeful than those of Bizzell. Monnet refers to the convocation gatherings and addresses as times of "joy." He assumes in his speech that all students are at the university to learn and that they are eager to do so. However, Monnet speaks fondly of college friendships, whereas Bizzell seems to disparage any social interactions, regarding them as a distraction from intellectual pursuits. Monnet then discusses how universities provide a number of benefits for students, saying that, "No university student should fail to appreciate then how greatly he is favored."[14]

[14] Monnet, 3-4.

Monnet then goes on to detail the various differences in how colleges and universities were run around the world, as well as across the United States. In the speech Monnet gave special attention to the universities of Germany, England, and of course those of the United States. Monnet then considered how the University of Oklahoma compared to these other institutions. Finally, he discussed what he hoped for the future for the University of Oklahoma. He began his examination of universities with the universities of Germany, stating that the German ideal of the university is one in which exists to train and produce "effective specialists."[15] He also states that German higher education is not about a person becoming well rounded in the sense that American universities intend; while American students have a specialization, they still are given general knowledge about several other subjects. In Germany, Monnet states, there is a deep, single-minded focus on one subject. Monnet's assessment of this system of higher education is thus: "The thought is not so much to produce citizenship as it is to secure progress."[16]

Furthermore, Monnet stated that the English had an entirely different view on what higher education was for. "The Englishman believes that a college exists primarily for the purpose of developing the social side of one's character so that he may be fortified and prepared to meet any emergency within the vast Vance of the interests of the world wide British Empire."[17] Monnet goes on to emphasize that colleges in England are for the elite, and that few students focus on their studies. Instead they spend the majority of their time socializing and participating in extracurricular activities.

[15] Ibid, 5.
[16] Ibid, 6.
[17] Ibid.

After discussing higher education in Germany and England in this fashion, Monnet shifts his focus to universities across the United States. He first begins this discussion by stating that in the United States there is no singular idea about what a university is. "In America a university is coming to be regarded as that aggregate of academic and professional schools usually clustered together in the larger and more ambitious colleges."[18] He further adds that American universities are a mixture between the German and the English versions, taking what is best of both and combining them into something uniquely American. From here he turns to a discussion about how previously American universities were primarily private institutions run by individuals and corporations in which people paid to attend. But this trend was shifting at the time the speech was given, and Monnet indicates state ran public institutions like the University of Oklahoma were becoming more common and that these institutions had certain advantages over private universities.[19]

Monnet states that "the state university is merely a part of the state's educational activities as is the public school."[20] He goes on to add that state institutions become "the head and front" of the entire state's schools. That the public schools are part of a plan to feed students into the state institutions of higher education and that once the students graduate from the colleges and universities, they can assist the state governments. The states of Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, according to Monnet, had their systems of higher education planned out the best. These state institutions were centers of experts in technology, professional knowledge, and academics, and that gives the states direct access to these experts. States like

[18] Ibid, 7.
[19] Julien C. Monnet, acting President of the University of Oklahoma, *Address*, September 21, 1911, Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell - 1926, University Records Group 03, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma), 7.
[20] Ibid, 8.

Wisconsin expected to be able to draft the public university professors into doing state work. Monnet then asked if the University of Oklahoma is "to become here a great factor in the development of all that is best and most progressive in the state?"[21]

He went on to say that Oklahoma and the University of Oklahoma need to follow the example of other states and their institutions of higher education.

> Oklahoma, therefore, is the last great opportunity for putting into practice the experimental knowledge of education learned from the other states and profiting by their example and developing even greater institutions.[22]

Monnet further urged that Oklahoma not get too creative in forming and maintaining its institutions of higher education as he felt that other states and other institutions had already discovered efficient and successful ways to run an institution. He says that only after such time that the university has more notoriety and prestige should it begin work on creating new educational ideas. Until then, "in the history of a commonwealth, in conservatism lies safety." It is interesting that from here Monnet goes on to discuss that in following examples from other states that Oklahoma should shut down its multiple normal schools and its agricultural and mining school and combine them all into one, making the system stronger and more effective.

The way that the public institutions of education worked together to ensure the good of the state was a hidden curriculum. While Monnet calls direct attention to the state's actions, it is very unlikely that school aged children and high school students would have known that their state had planned for making explicit use out of the higher education that these students would receive once they graduated from the state university. Furthermore, the idea that graduates would help the state is part of the Jeffersonian ideal of public education which as discussed comes with

[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid, 9.

its own set of standards as outlined by Jefferson. Readers will recall that Jefferson stipulated that only the best and brightest of the male students would continue to advance until they had earned a degree in higher education. Furthermore, by urging that the state of Oklahoma and its universities follow the examples of other older state institutions of higher education, Monnet perpetuates an idea of educational elitism in that the younger and less prestigious must follow the older and established institutions, as it is they who know best. Fifteen years later Bizzell echoes Monnet and the general idea expressed in his *Address* that students should serve the state, stating "…that those who accept the advantages offered here expect to make the most of these facilities, and return to the State in future years both interest and principle in terms of productive achievements."[23]

The first of Bizzell's speeches found in the Western History Collections is titled "The Student's Attitude Toward His Educational Task." In this speech Bizzell is, as the title suggests, instructing students to be responsible for their choices and to fulfill the expectations that family and friends have for them.[24] This speech also establishes a trend that gives insight into Bizzell's thoughts on education and its role in society, because as will be shown later, none of his speeches outline what students expect from the university and their time as students. Instead, they inform readers of what the university expected of the students, and while doing so they can potentially demonstrate the general public's idea of what college students should be doing and how they should be acting.

[23]William Bennett Bizzell, PhD, LL. D., President of the University of Oklahoma, "Education and the Useful Life," September 22, 1926, Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell 1926, University Records Group 03, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma), 5.
[24] William Bennett Bizzell*,"* The Student's Attitude Toward His Educational Task."

It is also in this speech that he tells students that they were in some way pre-selected to attend a university, hinting at a hidden curriculum in grade schools.

> Your presence here today indicates that you have survived the intellectual and moral tests of primary and secondary schools. …You are, therefore, selected lives – selected for special intellectual attainment by virtue of the mental capacities which you have revealed.[25]

From here he continues on stating that students are selected to attend the University of Oklahoma based on their "…*physical competency, intellectual aptitude, moral integrity, and spiritual efficiency*. (emphasis my own)"[26] What is perhaps most telling and important about this particular speech is that Bizzell ultimately forces students to look behind the velvet curtain. According to Bizzell, the purpose of the American educational system is to weed through society. Through this weeding out process, youth are directed into the place that they should hold in society. Furthermore, he suggests that over the course of one's educational career it should become ever more selective until only the best are left, presumably with advanced degrees such as doctorates.[27]

In his speech "Education and the Useful Life," Bizzell even tells students that it is through learning that one gains happiness. Furthermore, he brings up the fact that many students only have a vague idea as to what college really is. It is clear that on this particular day he is going to inform students as to what he and others like him believe that college is and why one should pursue a college education.[28] The speech opens with Bizzell discussing an inscription found on a building at Harvard. But he goes on to say that this quote embodies what college is about adding,

---

[25] Ibid, 6.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid, 6.
[28] Bizzell, "Education and the Useful Life," 6-7.

> The high purpose of every college or university is to impart a knowledge of the laws that govern our social relations; of the ethical principles that should guide our conduct; and to prepare each student for the work he should do in the world.[29]

The inscription found at Harvard is a bit of scripture from the book of Exodus 18:20, "Thou shall teach them ordinances and laws and shall show them the way in which they must walk and the work that they must do."[30] Furthermore, Bizzell stresses that one must work hard at the university. He also states that it would be a disservice to any university to be thought of as a place that allows laziness. There are those he goes on to say that believe a college education means you do not have to labor in anyway once you obtain a degree.[31]

It is clear that Bizzell feels to bring up what colleges and universities are really for is his opinion. In 1930 he brings up the topic again in another speech titled *The Higher Levels of Learning*, from the September 23, 1930 convocation. In this address Bizzell stresses that the university is a place where "knowledge is communicated," a phrase which he uses repeatedly throughout. He also places emphasis on "circulation of thought," in which students are not just empty vessels which blindly absorb knowledge. He states that "The university has no higher function than that of training men and women to live rationally on the highest levels of intelligence."[32] It is as if Bizzell is welcoming the students into the world of the hidden curriculum. Now that they have made it this far they are allowed to know the secrets if only they are paying attention and learning the "correct way;" of course, the correct way is subjective and a hidden curriculum itself. Bizzell discusses what he feels is important to be successful with one's

---

[29] Ibid, 5.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid, 7.
[32] William Bennett Bizzell, PhD., D., LL, D, *The Higher Levels of Learning*, September 23, 1930, Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell - 1926, University Records Group 03, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma), 22
[32] Ibid, 6.

college education, but you are only successful if you follow his ideals of its usefulness and meaning.

Bizzell then engages with the question of what colleges and universities are for. It seems that this debate in regard to the answer to this question still continues to this day. Bizzell quotes the author of *Gray Towers,* who discusses the idea that colleges and universities should provide all students with some knowledge of various scholarly topics.[33] This is something that was echoed to a more recent class of University of Oklahoma students. Nearly a hundred years after Bizzell's speech, Dr. Gary Anderson echoed him when he told his own students that they should be able to discuss in gatherings the different merits of various famous pieces of art; that they should know the artists, and they should also be able to recognize different musical composers. While Bizzell and the anonymous author do not go that far, this idea of general education in which students gleam basic knowledge from multiple disciplines is one that continues today.

All of Bizzell's speeches begin in a similar manner. Bizzell asks the students a series of rhetorical questions. These questions are clearly aimed to get students ready to be self-reflective. Furthermore, they help to set up what the main topics of the speech will be. But it is through these questions that Bizzell asks that readers of today can gleam the direction in which he wished the university to take in terms of how the public should perceive the institution. It is clear that Bizzell differed from Boyd and others in that he wanted the University of Oklahoma to be seen as a prestigious institution. Bizzell was clearly up to date on such new at the time topics in education. These topics include such things as aptitude exams, which were first created for the United States military during World War I. He states that colleges were testing the natural aptitude of students. It is clear that he is hoping that the University of Oklahoma would recruit

[33] Ibid, 8-9.

those that scored high on the aptitude exams.[34] The vision that a university president creates for the institution becomes an alternate mission for the university beyond that which is engraved on a plaque. And it is these visions that the Board of Regents looks for when they search for a new university president. Therefore, they help set the tone for a hidden curriculum each time they select a president.

Through these speeches it is easy to track the various ways that the university's leadership thought in regard to higher education. They further aid in tracking how the university's purpose changed over time. Also, what things remained constant across the changes in attitudes and personalities. One thing that can be seen throughout is a dedication to civic virtue and the training of men to take their place in roles of state business. This is something that is seen through the text of Boyd, Bizzell, and Monnet. It is clear to see that Boyd and Monnet are the most similar in their views that the university is a place that people can come to learn, and each person has a chance to succeed. Bizzell on the other hand views the university as something that helps to continue an intellectual elitism and that only those who wish to learn should be enrolled as to do otherwise is to waste resources. It easy to see that through these very different personalities with different views of higher education that the University of Oklahoma would experience changes, especially as the student body changed as well. What the student expected from the university, and what the university expected from the student all can play into the hidden curriculum.

Another part of the university that created both a hidden and an unhidden curriculum was the university motto. Today few people can understand the Latin, but at the time of the school's establishment the Latin language was part of the public school curriculum, and understood by

[34] Bizzell, "The Student's Attitude Toward His Educational Task," 6.

many. The motto, written by Joseph Paxton, one of the early instructors at the University of Oklahoma, is *civi et reipublicae*, and as discussed previously means 'for the benefit of the citizen and the state.' Because early students knew what this meant, they knew to expect an education which would prepare them in ways that would enrich the state.[35] This is a concept that both Monnet and Bizzell discussed in their respective convocation speeches. What becomes somewhat murky at times is just how the courses that students took at the University of Oklahoma would enrich the state.

To have a motto in Latin ties the university back to the long tradition of academia. For centuries Latin was the international language. This meant that all university courses were taught in Latin. At that time, there were fewer universities and only the wealthiest could attend due to the need to travel, frequently out of the country to attend. As a result, a language that could be learned and understood by all was needed, and Latin was that language. By the time of the establishment of the University of Oklahoma, while all students were expected to know some Latin, it was no longer the language used to teach courses. However, it was still important to university founders and instructors that the school still reflect this much earlier tradition. By doing so they also implied a certain level of elitism, which later became part of the hidden curriculum.

There are those that argue that having the motto on the university seal is a sign of hard work, something that is believed to be necessary to achieve a degree. The university seal consists of a sower sowing seeds across a freshly plowed field. This imagery can have several different meanings, which is likely why it was chosen. First the sower or farmer can be seen as a person

[35] "History and Mission," *Department of Classics and Letters*, The University of Oklahoma, http://www.ou.edu/cas/classicsandletters/about/history-mission, Accessed March 31, 2019.

who understands that learning new things takes a great deal of work and determination.[36] Another interpretation is that the freshly plowed field represents the minds of students and the sower is a professor and his seeds are knowledge that he will plant inside the students' minds. This would imply that not only must the student work hard, but so must the professor, in shaping the mind of the students. However one looks at the seal, they should recognize that it represents hard work in various forms. Such an image becomes part of the subconscious of the student, which leads to a hidden curriculum of hard work being necessary to succeed within the university setting that is the University of Oklahoma.

Regardless of which interpretation early students of the university drew from the school seal, one thing is certain; they knew that hard work would be needed to graduate. Furthermore, they all knew that upon graduation they were all expected to help the state in some way. The most obvious why that these students could help is to use their university education to help inform and advise legislatures when called upon to do so. This of course is one of the loftier ways an university alumnus would support the state. Another lofty way of assisting the state is for male graduates to run for office and of course apply their knowledge to the direct running of the government, this of course is the Jeffersonian ideal of higher education. Finally, the more mundane and most common way that alumni were to help the state is simply by boosting the state economy, thus of course bringing in more revenue.

In the earliest days of the university leadership and policy changed rapidly. There were frequent faculty changes and even some frequent presidential changes after President Boyd's dismissal for political reasons in 1908. Turnover led to frequent changes in the ideals and mission that surrounded the university. Despite these changes, there were still those, particularly

[36] "The Makings of the Motto," *Department of Classics and Letters*, The University of Oklahoma, http://www.ou.edu/cas/classicsandletters/about/university-motto, Accessed April 1, 2019.

professors, who played important roles at the university for decades. Those who stayed absorbed aspects of the various ideals, goals, and general rhetoric shared over the years. These elements worked their way into the classrooms and into the subconsciousness of students and faculty alike. What is more, in years of change there were students who bridged the gap between the old and the new, and they would carry old ideals and values into the classrooms as well.

All of this overlap and change built a narrative in which key aspects of the official curriculum of the university leadership, became the hidden curriculum over the years. In the speeches discussed within, the school motto, and the school seal, an overt or unhidden curriculum can be seen when they are viewed in the time in which they came into existence. As we move farther away from the founding of the university overt curriculum becomes hidden. In this manner a trend develops in the form of three tiers; expectation which becomes habit, until finally a tradition is formed.

Students also helped to create hidden curriculums within the university. This can be seen in a short article that appeared in the December 1928 issue of *Sooner Magazine*. The article is a call to students to help increase enrollment at the university. The article further calls for students and those who attended the university previously to organize a "Sooner Club" where they live. Such a club would enable current and former students to socialize, but more importantly it was to encourage that high school students be invited to attend certain club functions. In this manner the club would serve as a way to recruit new students to the university. But the article stresses that while more students mean more money, club members should focus on recruiting "the better students, as well as the athletes."[37] With this statement it becomes apparent that there was a need among students and alumni to encourage the enrollment of a particular type of person. That they

[37] Frank S. Clecker, "Organize Your Sooner Club," *Sooner Magazine*, December 1928, Vol 1, Issue 3 Western History Collection (University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 88.

wanted the university to be made up of those who displayed academic and athletic talents. Such a campaign forms a curriculum that new student recruits are unaware of.

Paula A. Fass, author of *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education*, references Carl Kaestle when she says that schooling in the early 20th century was to be used to instill ideas that would continue the capitalistic economy, teach Protestant morals, and republicanism. Thus, schools were to be the socializing experience of America. Prior to the common school era it was in Protestant churches and family socialization that children learned what it was to be an American. While not specifically addressed by Fass, it can be understood that colleges and universities continued this socialization for those who could and did attend. However, the socializing lessons learned were likely more specific to how to act in matters that related to a field of study or were more professional in nature.[38] That is to say that students were not only taught the necessary skills of their profession, but unbeknownst to them they were being taught the ways in which they should acted based on their chosen profession. These can be more readily described as social expectations based on their degree and career choices. Society expects members of various professions to behave in certain ways. These expectations still exist today, and maybe best labeled as stereotypes, such as surgeons are frequently viewed as arrogant, that historians are old men in tweed jackets who are out of touch with the modern world, and teachers are young enthusiastic women who absolutely adore children. In a more serious vein however, students were taught the ways in which they should interact with others of their profession, in other words they were taught how to fit in within their chosen professional society.

Fass further writes that during the Gilded Age work was where a person learned their "social responsibility." Many people believed that it was through work that one learned how to

[38] Paula S. Fass, *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education*, (Oxford University Press: New York, 1989), 13.

be an American. Therefore; work, independence, and citizenship were all tied together during this time. But one man, John Dewey, helped to change this view so that schools would take on this task. He believed that everyone who attended public schools would have the skills necessary for life.[39] Ultimately progressives believed that schools were the "instruments of social change." Fass argues that this has not changed since reformers first began to use the classroom in such a manner.[40] To use a classroom in such ways as to entice social change and to teach students the social norms as things change is the precise thing that becomes the hidden curriculum.

The Origins of a University

Universities are established in a variety of ways. Early American universities were established as private institutions, and over time, these institutions developed a reputation for being exclusive. This included basing admission on whether a student had close ties to alumni; that is, so-called 'legacy' students. Furthermore, these schools were for men only. But some universities, such as the University of Virginia were public schools created on public land and funded through donations and public resources. But the University of Virginia was still exclusively male. It was during the nineteenth century that public institutions of higher education that would be recognized today were being created. These institutions opened up higher education to persons who may have been less affluent than those who attended such universities as Harvard and Yale. These public universities were also open to women. One reason for this increase of publicly funded universities was the use of land grants to fund higher education, which took center stage when Congress passed the Morrill Act of 1862.

[39] Ibid, 17 and 25.
[40] Ibid, 34-35.

President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act of 1862 in July of that year. Authored and sponsored by Justin Morrill, a senator from Vermont, the act mandated that federal lands be set aside in tracts located inside the boundaries of each state and territory in order to establish public institutions of higher education. The land was to be sold by the territory or state at a set rate to provide the funds to build these universities and colleges. Each territory or state was to receive 30,000 acres for each representative they had in Congress. Upon accepting the grant, a state had five years in which to build at least one college.[41] The land was to be awarded in full sections or in the usual divisions of a section. Mandated in the Morrill Act was the amount per acre the land had to be sold at if it was sold to raise funds. That amount was set at one dollar and twenty-five cents.[42] As a point of reference, a section is a square mile on each side and contains a total of six hundred forty acres. Thus, a quarter section was one hundred sixty acres in size.

The act also stipulated what was to be done with the profit from the sale of the allotted land. It was to be invested in low risk stock, with preference given to state or federal stock. Additionally, funds generated via interest could be used beyond "endowment, support, and maintenance," it could also be used to purchase land for expansion. Explicitly the act states that farm land can be purchased, this land was to be used for experimental farming.[43] Congress amended the Morrill Act in 1890 in light of lessons learned administering the original Act, creating what is known as the Second Morrill Act. The amendments made several changes to the original provisions of the Act. Under the new version of the Act, states could also receive specified federal monies as well as land grants. These funds had a specific purpose; they were to

[41] George P. Sanger, ed., "An Act donating Public Lands to the several States and Territories which may provide Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts," *The Statutes at Large, Treaties, and Proclamations, of the United States of America from December 5, 1859 to March 3, 1863*, Vol. XII, (Little, Brown and Company: Boston, 1863), 503-505.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid, 504.

be used to teach courses in food and agricultural sciences. The funds were to be counted as part of the endowment of the institution and totaled $50,000 per year. Furthermore, it was stipulated that, in order to receive the funds, former slaves had to be admitted to existing institutions or separate schools needed to be built for them. The schools created under the Morrill Act were to be agricultural and mining schools. These schools were to teach agricultural, mining, and mechanical sciences. Furthermore, these institutions could not exclude courses in the classics and other sciences.[44]

As soon as they were able to, the territorial government of Oklahoma began making plans to create the territory's land grant institutions. The idea was to take advantage of the Second Morrill Act and to establish two agriculture and mining institutions, one for the former slaves who had made the territory their home and one for white residents. They also began to create the territorial university and the normal schools. The Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges specified by the Morrill Act emphasized practical training: the theory and practice of agriculture, animal husbandry, farm and business management, carpentry, and blacksmithing. These institutions also educated professionals in the mechanical fields, such as engineers. Additionally, states established separate schools for those looking to earn their teaching certificates. These schools were known as normal schools. Today they are the state's liberal arts colleges and universities.

The University of Oklahoma of course has its own place in the creation of higher education in the state. The territorial legislature passed Council Bill No. 114 on December 19, 1890. This bill created the University of Oklahoma.[45] In the university's official history, *The*

[44] 7 United States Code, Agriculture Chapter 13 – Agriculture and Mechanical Colleges, (U.S. Government Publishing Office: 2011 Edition https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2011-title7/html/USCODE-2011-title7-chap13.htm), Sections 321-322 of the new edition of the act.
[45] David W. Levy, *The University of Oklahoma a History Volume I 1890-1917*, (University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, Oklahoma 2005), 16.

University of Oklahoma: A History, David Levy states that Section 9 of the bill outlined the purpose of the university:

> The object of the University of Oklahoma shall be to provide the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of learning connected with scientific, industrial, and professional pursuits, in the instruction and training of persons in the theory and art of teaching, and also instruction in the fundamental laws of the United States and of this Territory, in what regards the rights and duties of citizens.[46]

Further stipulated in the bill were the logistics of the building and locating of the university. It would be built in Norman, but the city and county had to meet certain demands set forth by the legislature. These demands included that the city of Norman had to post a $5,000 bond and donate 40 acres of land upon which the university would be built. These provisions had to be met within thirty days of the bill's passage. Additionally, Cleveland County had to provide $10,000 that would go to a trust fund for the university. Another thirty-day provision was placed on this demand, and half the money had to be paid before the thirty days were up. This was because it was expected that these funds would be used to begin building the facilities needed to operate a school. If all the demands placed on the county could not be met within a year the bill would become null and void. Residents of the city and county went straight to work. In his book Levy states that "a very not subtle laundering process" was used to guarantee the funds.[47] The $10,000 grand total was presented to the territorial treasurer with five days to spare.[48]

Roy Gittinger, in his book *The University of Oklahoma: A History of Fifty Years 1892-1942*, provides more details on the ways in which the Cleveland County raised funds to guarantee the university's presence in Norman. Gittinger writes that in order to raise the funds the county elected to vote on a bond issue. The bond would be set at the $10,000 as stipulated in

[46] Ibid, 17
[47] Ibid, 20.
[48] Ibid, 15-20.

Council Bill No. 114. The bond election was set for May 19, 1891. The bond passed by a majority of 314 votes. The final tally was 804 votes for and 463 votes against. According to Gittinger, the southern third of the county gave a decent majority to the issue, the central portion including Norman voted overwhelmingly in support of the issue, and the northern portion voted against. There were some issues when it came time to dispose the bonds and the county was forced to sell them at a discounted rate, therefore the bond only raised $7,200. That left the city of Norman to come up with an additional $2,800 on top of the money which was already stipulated by the bill. Gittinger does not discuss how the difference in the balance was raised; there is no speculation on his part of where the funds may have come from. He simply states that all necessary funds were presented to the territorial treasurer five days before the allotted time was up.[49]

At first glance it may seem that the territorial legislature was attempting to sabotage the creation of the university, but while they had some ulterior motives, they were not trying to prevent the university's creation. Cleveland County residents were told they had to come up with the funds because if the county failed to raise the money then other counties could raise the funds and thus the university would be placed there instead. The governor at the time, George Washington Steele, wished to encourage competition. He did this knowing that the territory could only create so many public institutions of higher education. This is why when the territorial legislature debated and amended Bill No. 114, the words "in Norman" were struck out. The bill was amended several times before it was passed. The stipulation that Cleveland County

[49] Roy Gittinger, *The University of Oklahoma: A History of Fifty Years 1892-1942*, (University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, Oklahoma 1942), 6.

must raise the $10,000 was added as the bill was voted on one section at a time instead of being voted on in its entirety.[50]

There is a very popular myth that the University of Oklahoma is a school founded in the barren plains for the children of homesteaders. However, a look at the demographics of students from the early years of the university tells a different story. The data sourced from early course catalogs demonstrate that a disproportionate fraction of students hailed from areas that would now be considered suburbs; while their parents may have been involved in agriculture, they were much more likely than was normal for the state population of the day to live near a town of 2,500 residents or more. This, of course, begs the question: how then did this myth come to be? The answer lies in the stories that surround the university's first president, David Ross Boyd. It seems that Boyd was something of a legend before he came to the university, and it was this status that drew those in charge to offer him the job in the first place. Boyd was serving as superintendent of schools in Arkansas City, Kansas prior to the Land Run. Arkansas City, like many towns around the Oklahoma border, experienced an influx of people as they gathered in preparation for the Land Run. Rather than leave these folks to idle mischief, Boyd decided to employ them around town, much to the chagrin of town officials.[51]

It is here perhaps that the legend begins, or possibly it begins with the tale of Boyd's arrival in Norman and his description of the town upon first seeing it. "Behind me was a crude little town of 1,500 people and before me was a stretch of prairie on which my helpers and I were to build an institution of culture. Discouraged? Not a bit. The site was a challenge."[52] With an attitude such as this, it is not difficult to see how the legend came to be. And this legend grew, in

[50] Ibid, 15-16.
[51] Milburn, "Planting a University: First Varsity President Recounts How He Did It," 39.
[52] Boyd, Hadsell, and Kirk, "My Days as First University President" Part I, 25.

large part due to the stories of how Boyd began planting trees on the campus grounds, hauling water during a drought to ensure that the trees grew.[53] Even during his lifetime, persons with a connection to the university viewed Boyd as a pioneer, a sort of latter-day Johnny Appleseed who brought knowledge and education to the territory along with beautifying the plains with his trees.

Another part of the Boyd myth that gained a great deal of traction is the great extent to which he was personally involved in recruiting students for the university in its earliest days. This work became an integral part of the myth: the story of the university president traveling the territory in a horse-drawn buggy encouraging parents in far-flung dugouts and cabins to send their children to the territory's fledgling university. But as previously stated, Boyd did in fact travel around the territory a great deal, because he had discovered that many parents were sending their children "back home" to Eastern universities to earn college degrees, so he set out to convince these families to send their children to Norman instead. His account of what he found on those tours exemplifies the conflicted status of some of these early students: dugout houses that contained grand pianos and collections of classic works of literature. He was not finding the yeoman farmers of the foundation myth of later years. Instead he had discovered families who came to extend their fortunes. In this manner he found that these families were looking for a land of further opportunity. However, he also found many students whose families were poor and who needed to find jobs to work through school. But it appears more students from affluence came to the new university than did the rustic farm boy of the myth that survives today.[54]

[53] Milburn, "Planting a University: First Varsity President Recounts How He Did It," 40.
[54] Ibid.

Boyd walked a difficult line between the needs of the university, the needs of the state, and the needs of the people. It was clear that the university needed the children of the more affluent, therefore he needed to build in which these people would feel comfortable. But he also wanted to attract the farm kids of the myth, and a university in which the affluent feel comfortable is one in which the less affluent are made uncomfortable. Ultimately, the university remained dedicated to both, though a greater focus would be given to recruiting and retaining the affluent Oklahoma children.

It is difficult, however, to track this affluence, as Boyd remembers that the students who first arrived had faced hard labor with their families in order to stake their claims and maintain their homesteads. The first students were earnest and willing to learn and work for their education, and new things were a luxury as families scrimped and saved in order to get by. So then how does this image join with that of the grand pianos and copies of great works of literature in dugouts? A great number of those looking to claim homesteads during the Land Run were white families who had been displaced by the American Civil War. Some of these families had been more prosperous in the antebellum era and likely brought what they could of family heirlooms and items that harkened back to better days. Still others came from northern states, again bringing with them signs of wealth and affluence from days gone by. It is for these reasons that there develops this juxtaposition of affluence and poverty.

The myth of the pioneer president and his trees continued to influence the appearance of the university long after he was gone. The students have been viewed as pioneers with "cheer" and work ethic. This myth has created a hidden curriculum at the university. At first the university's students were seen as pioneers who were concurrently conquering the rugged land and concurring the harsh demands of academia. By the time of the university's fifth president's

tenure, the view of the pioneer student had shifted to one of the students boldly concurring the furthest reaches of academia. Arguably, this images continues on at the university today. Students and faculty hold titles for many of academia's most prestigious honors and the university is listed as a "research one" university, meaning that rigorous and extensive research activities take place there.

Funding and development issues are integral to all large organizations, and universities, whether they are public or private, are no exception; if anything, these issues have gained more importance as universities age. The University of Oklahoma has not escaped these issues, whether the past or the present is examined. It falls to the university presidents and board of regents members to obtain the physical grounds and revenue for the school. The problem of course is that the funds are limited, and colleges and universities are placed in competition with one another. This is especially true of state-run public institutions, who must look to an often-uninterested state legislature for funds. If a state has more than one such college or university, then public funds are further reduced as they are divided across other institutions. With this in mind, the University of Oklahoma's first president, David Ross Boyd penned a letter to Del Larsh, board of regent member. Dated February 12, 1902, the letter provides information about land grants and funds that other institutions have access to.

The letter further details that Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanics (later Oklahoma State University) president A.C. Scott had arrived in Washington D.C., Scott traveled to Washington to present a plea to Congress that the college be given more land. It was Boyd's belief that this land should be split among all the territory's institutions of higher learning. At the same time the National Association of Agriculture Colleges was lobbying for a bill that would grant $15,000 a year to mining schools. This gave Boyd cause for concern for states and

territories like Oklahoma, as these states housed the mining school at the state university, not at the state A and M college. Boyd wished for the funds from the proposed bill to be split between the two schools. The University of Oklahoma needed more funds and Oklahoma A&M was already receiving $40,000 in federal funds. Besides, Boyd argued, the mining school equipment was housed in Norman at OU[55] (This distinction continues to this day, where Oklahoma is a leader in geology and petroleum engineering).

Oklahoma became a state in November of 1907. Because of this, there was a flurry of activity in 1906 and 1907 as the territory prepared to petition to become part of the union. Delegates traveled back and forth from Oklahoma to Washington. These proceedings would directly affect the territory's public colleges and universities. The territory submitted its statehood bill in 1906, which called for the joining of Oklahoma Territory and Indian Territory and declared that they would enter the union as one state. In addition to the statehood bill, the Board of Regents and President Boyd hoped to get a land grant bill passed. In February and March of 1906 Henry E. Asp and Larsh were in frequent correspondence. In these letters the two gentlemen discuss land grants made to universities. Their correspondence indicates that they spent a great deal of time and effort gathering information about the subject and making comparisons between other institutions. According to Larsh, Boyd was working on a detailed summary of the land acquisition of each state university. What the men wanted to know was how much land each university had at its establishment, in order to meet the demands of growth how much more land was needed and what was its cost, and finally how much land each institution had in that current moment. The conclusion reached was that the university needed more land,

[55] David R. Boyd to Del Larsh, Letter dated February 12, 1902, University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regents, Record Group 03, Location 11195, Box 1, Folder 2, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma).

hence the bill that was being submitted to Congress.[56] Bill H.R. 17431 was a request that federal lands be granted to the University of Oklahoma in order to expand the physical plant of the university.[57] The bill encountered one glitch as it made its way through Congress, as Congress reviewed the bill after the bill making Oklahoma a state was passed. As a result, the land requested was no longer federal land, but now belonged to the new state of Oklahoma. The bill went through a special subcommittee in order to be amended.[58] Ultimately the bill was passed, and it granted "all of section 36," land that was part of Norman, to the university.[59]

A good source of information on the establishment of the university and its requirements are the course catalogs. While the earliest catalogs are missing, several decades worth of printed and bound catalogs can be found in the archives, with the earliest dating to the 1906-1907 school year. This edition of the catalog contains a section titled, "Endowment and Income." It is here that more information is provided on H.R. 17431 and other funding as provided through land grants. The University of Oklahoma is not an agriculture and mechanical college and was never intended to be such, but it is still a land grant institution. Because it is not an A&M institution it has never been funded through the provisions of the Morrill Act. However, "endowment in land" was provided to the university from the federal government. The endowments were provided through three separate grants, two of which came before H.R. 17431.[60]

---

[56] Henry E. Asp to Del Larsh and Larsh to Asp, Letter dated February 27, 1906 and March 2, 1906, University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regents, Record Group 02, Location 11195, Box 1, Folder 1, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma).
[57] McGuire, *H.R. 17431,* 59th Congress, 1st Session, March 27, 1906, University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regents, Record Group 02, Location 11195, Box 2, Folder 15, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma).
[58] Boyd to Larsh, Letter dated February 6, 1907, University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regents, Record Group 03, Location 11195, Box 1, Folder 4, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma).
[59] *Course Catalog 1906-1907*, *Bulletin of the State University of Oklahoma*, New Series No. 9, Published Quarterly, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 17.
[60] Ibid, 15.

One land grant was created in 1901. This grant provided that section 13 of each new township would be for the use of paying for public education. These new townships were created when the federal government opened up to settlement lands that were previously held as parts of reservations for the numerous relocated groups of native peoples. This land came from areas formerly held by the Comanche, Kiowa, Wichita, and Cherokee peoples. Instead of being sold these land sections were leased out and the money earned was used to fund public universities, agricultural colleges, and normal schools across the territory. The university received 200,000 acres per the statehood bill. Approved on June 16, 1906, the land granted was public territorial land. Through these grants the university was able to create an income for itself.[61] This generation of income through the lease or sale of land establishes that by definition the university is a land grant institution, despite the fact that it received none of the lands or funds allocated by the Morrill Acts.

As stated earlier, finding funding for the university was an on-going issue from its creation. A modern-day solution of funding issues is to increase the amount of money in tuition and fees that students pay. However, as a public institution, the University of Oklahoma was tuition free to all territorial residents who could prove that they had resided within the territory's boundaries for two years. This and other information deemed critical to current and prospective students of the university could be found in the course catalogs that were published for each school year. Most of the early catalogs contain a section titled "Foundation." This section quotes the various sections of the territorial bills that were written and passed in order to create the university. One such section is the often quoted is Section 11. It is in this section that it was

[61] Ibid, 15-16.

mandated that the university was to be co-educational. Furthermore, able-bodied male students were to receive military training as part of their course work at the university.[62]

The university also offered preparatory course work for those students who were not yet qualified to begin collegiate work. Oklahoma had barely been settled for a year when classes began at the University of Oklahoma. For this reason, President Boyd anticipated that few prospective students would have had access to a high school education. Because of this, while Boyd was touring the territory promoting the university he made sure to stress that all were welcome to apply. He announced to all who would listen that he was looking for those who were, "willing to work," and "that no one will conclude that he is too poor or too old to take a course of study…"[63]

There was a prevailing belief at the time the university was established that all citizens should be educated in order to aid and strengthen the state. But the university still had admission requirements. According to the 1906-1907 *Course Catalog* each academic department set forth specific admission standards that prospective students had to meet. A student could prove their worthiness for admission into their chosen program either by passing an exam created by the department or by presenting "a certificate from a high school of acceptable standing."[64] If a student was submitting a certificate it had to have certain substantiating documents attached. These documents included a letter from the school's principal, to be mailed directly to the university, in a similar manner to the way in which transcripts are sent to prospective employers and universities today. The catalog stated that, "A convenient blank certificate may be obtained

[62] Ibid, 14-15.
[63] Levy, 45.
[64] *Course Catalog 1906-07*, 44.

from the registrar." Certificates were similar to modern high school diplomas. All necessary paperwork was due the week before the academic year started.[65]

Students could prove their worthiness in a variety of ways, including simply enrolling in preparatory courses offered at the university for those that had no other way to meet the requirements. But there was one thing that some prospective students could not get past. There was an absolute color bar at the University of Oklahoma until 1948.[66] This meant that all African American students were turned away. Native American students were always welcome, but it took a series of landmark civil rights cases that directly involved the university before African American students were allowed to attend. Most are familiar with the Supreme Court case *Plessy v Ferguson*, in which the court ruled that so long as facilities were equal there could remain a separation between the races. In *G.W. McLaurin v. Board of Regents, University of Oklahoma* the Supreme Court found that the state of Oklahoma could not provide an equal education at its segregated Langston University, and therefore McLaurin had to be granted admission to the University of Oklahoma.[67] The university president at the time, George Lynn Cross, signed paperwork denying admittance to McLaurin. Cross also signed admittance paperwork denying Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher, who had attempted to enroll prior to McLaurin. This in and of itself was significant, as Cross had been instructed to find an alternative pretense to deny admission to Fisher, in an attempt to prevent the NAACP from challenging the law, but he declined to do so. Following the court cases the legislature and the Board of Regents made mad dashes to prevent these two students and others from attending the University of Oklahoma, but ultimately these efforts failed.

---

[65] Ibid.
[66] George Lynn Cross, *Blacks in White Colleges, Oklahoma's Landmark Cases*, (University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, Oklahoma, 1975), vii.
[67] Ibid, 85.

The territorial government of Oklahoma had a specific ideal in mind when they created the university: they wished to educate the populace of the territory in their roles as citizens of a republic. Among those who played an active role in the creation of the University of Oklahoma were the territorial governor, George Washington Steele and Mort Bixler a council member from Norman who introduced Council Bill No. 56, the predecessor to Council Bill No. 114. Also playing key role in the passage of the bill and ensuring that the university was placed in Norman was Tom Waggoner, Norman's first mayor and member of the territorial House of Representatives. Finally, there was Delbert LaSalle Larsh, the man who called a meeting at the railway depot in Purcell prior to the Land Run in order to gather men to help lay claim to the township of Norman.[68] These men also had specific ideas about educating African Americans of the territory. The fact that they created a racial bar against African Americans attending the university demonstrates that the leadership believed that members of different races should play different roles in the management and maintenance of the territory. This meant that African Americans were regulated to their own university which taught very specific courses intended to keep them within specific, subservient roles in society. By having separate institutions and by having these institutions teach courses that differed from one another the territorial government established a hidden curriculum that would be maintained for decades. But one thing was the same for all the territorial institutions and that was free tuition.

First the territorial, and then the state, government allocated funds for the continuation of higher education at its normal schools, the university, and the agriculture and mining schools. For more than fifty years, tuition would remain free at the state institutions of higher education. Furthermore, the leadership at the University of Oklahoma would maintain a belief in the ideal of

[68] Levy, 10-15.

civic virtue for the good of the republic. This approach appealed to the residents of first the territory and later the state, it also appealed to the governing body of the same, through this lens of education for civic virtue the university was able to make an appeal for funds as a civic duty.

Because of the Morrill Act and a growing public desire that public education not only should be but must be universal, the University of Oklahoma joined the ranks of several state universities across the United States. It is worthwhile to compare the university to similar institutions across the country. Such a comparison between Oklahoma and these other institutions can result in a better understanding of motivations behind its creation and evolution during its early days. Furthermore, it can help to establish whether or not the University of Oklahoma was a part of a national trend or if Oklahoma's territorial legislators were innovators in higher education. By examining these other state institutions at a national level, with special emphasis on the establishment and development of a selected few, it will be possible to place the University of Oklahoma in its place in the wider stream of educational thought of the day. This review also places the university in a wider national context, as it helps to establish if there were national trends in the establishment of state universities.

The Universities of Nebraska, California, and Wisconsin provide a wide range of examples of western universities that were established under similar circumstances to those of the establishment of Oklahoma's universities. In addition to being state-run public institutions, all were established in the 19th century. This examination of the different universities and the search for trends demonstrates that there were competing ideals of higher education. On the one hand existed the desire to create ideal republican citizens in the mold of Thomas Jefferson's educational ideas, and on the other the acknowledgment of the need to provide an education in

useful arts that benefitted the people. Ultimately these ideals were combined to create the institutions as they exist today.

Among one of the first characteristics that becomes apparent when examining these other state institutions is whether or not they were codified in the constitutions of the states that created them. As stated previously the University of Oklahoma was created by a bill that was written and passed by the territorial legislature.[69] It may be that because the university was created before statehood, certain items related to its existence, particularly funding, are discussed in the Oklahoma state constitution.[70] In a similar manner the delegates from California also wrote into their constitution certain provisions for the University of California. They too petitioned Congress for land that would be used to fund the state's new university.[71] Wisconsin also codified its university into its state constitution, and therefore there are provisions for the University of Wisconsin outlined within that state's constitution.[72] The last institution examined for comparison is the University of Nebraska. Nebraska is the only institution discussed that is not codified in its state's constitution.[73]

In terms of geographical location and in terms of demographics of potential students, the University of Nebraska bears the closest resemblance to the University of Oklahoma. In fact, as previously discussed, Oklahoma territorial legislators used wording from the bill that created the University of Nebraska in their bill to create the University of Oklahoma. Furthermore, because it was established in 1869, the University of Nebraska is also the closest in age of these

---

[69] Levy, 16.
[70] R.A. Sneed, Secretary of State, Article XI State and School Lands, Section 5, *The Constitution of the State of Oklahoma*, (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 1907), 67.
[71] Patricia A. Pelfrey, *A Brief History of the University of California*, (University of California Press: Berkley, 2004), 6.
[72] Merle Eugene Curti and Vernon Rosco, *The University of Wisconsin: A History Volume I*, (University of Wisconsin Press: Madison, Wisconsin 1949), 49.
[73] Robert E. Knoll, *Prairie University: A History of the University of Nebraska*, (University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, Nebraska 1995).

institutions to the University of Oklahoma. There still remain, however, key differences between the two institutions. The first of these differences is that despite intense debate in regard to the university in Nebraska territorial legislative sessions prior to statehood, the university did not make its way into the state constitution. The bill to establish the University of Nebraska was not passed until the legislature was called into session for the first time as a state body in 1869. Furthermore, Nebraska legislature saw it fit to only create one state institution. Therefore, the university offered the agricultural, mining, and mechanical courses as lined out by the Morrill Act, in addition to the liberal arts. Thus, the University of Nebraska offered degrees in all major fields of study.[74] Recall that Oklahoma established three separate institutions, a liberal arts university, an A&M college, and a separate institution entirely for African American residents.

The establishment of state institutions of higher education was a topic of great debate in both territorial and state legislative sessions. This is one of the trends seen throughout the comparison of other institutions. The territorial legislature of California did not stray from this trend, as they extensively debated the benefits of creating a state institution. The matter was discussed extensively, particularly in the California constitutional convention. Unfortunately, the funds to create a state institution were simply unavailable. As a result of the social dislocation caused by the Gold Rush, the territorial government was simply too poverty-stricken.[75] Constitutional convention delegates decided to petition Congress. They requested an endowment of public lands be created and granted so that funds could be raised to establish the university. Congress granted the petition in 1858, and fifty-three thousand acres were set aside to create the university. The act granting land to California in order to create a state institution of higher education was passed five years before the Morrill Act was passed in Congress. Upon that

[74] Ibid.
[75] Pelfrey, 4.

passage of the Morrill Act, California was granted another one hundred and fifty thousand acres in order to further fund and maintain the school. Furthermore, in 1866 California established an "Agricultural, Mining, and Mechanic Arts College," with additional funding through the Morrill Act.[76]

There is something else that is entirely unique about the establishment of the University of California. It took nearly ten years following the passage of the 1858 act before the university would have a physical plant. However, there was a private school created in 1853, known as California College. This institution which was located in Oakland had been created to fill the void that existed due to the lack of a public university. However, this school had struggled financially since its establishment. Its administration and faculty approached the state of California with a proposition. They wished to give the land and buildings held by California College over to the state to open the state school, provided that the university be a comprehensive one that included liberal arts as well as the courses required by the Morrill Act.[77] The terms were accepted, and the 1866 act was repealed and replaced by a new act on March 23, 1868 which established the University of California. Included in the agreement between the state and California College was not only the existing campus in Oakland but also land four miles north of the existing campus. It was at this location that the university would be built, which also led to the creation of a new town, and thus Berkeley, California was established.[78]

In Wisconsin, the territorial legislature passed several acts establishing a university, but a university was never built during territorial days. However, at statehood the state constitution mandated that the University of Wisconsin be created. Article X reads: "Provision shall be made

[76] Ibid, 6.
[77] Ibid.
[78] Ibid, 9.

by law for the establishment of a State University, at or near the seat of the state government, and for connection with the same, from time to time, such colleges in different parts of the State, as the interest of education may require."[79] Thus the university was formally established on July 26, 1848.[80] Despite this there was still no physical plant for the university, and unlike the University of California, there would be no offer of a merger with another existing institution.

Spirited debate occurred about what kind of courses the University of Wisconsin would offer. When the university was established it was codified that it would consist of four departments, "science, literature, and the arts; law, medicine; and the theory and practice of elementary instruction."[81] But there were those that believed that the university should provide a "practical" education as well, and they supported their arguments with the belief that such training would be more beneficial to the citizens of Wisconsin than liberal arts training would be. The idea was "…that the object of the University was to serve the interests of the people."[82] Because of this belief the Board of Regents created a "Department of Practical Applications of Science," and this department offered courses in agricultural science and other applied science topics such as engineering and mining. But the debate over the true purpose of the university could continue for years.[83]

In Oklahoma, the territorial government was committed to introducing higher education to the territory as soon as possible. The topic of giving citizens access was of such high importance that provisions for all the state institutions of higher education, the University of Oklahoma included, were placed in the state constitution.[84] Among these provisions was the

[79] Curti and Carstensen, *The University of Wisconsin: A History*, 49.
[80] Ibid, 53.
[81] Ibid, 72.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Ibid, 75.
[84] *The Constitution of the State of Oklahoma*, 67.

establishment of boards of regents for the various institutions. The University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Agriculture and Mining College each had their own boards. The Colored Agricultural and Normal University and all normal schools also had boards of regents established for them. Thus, each school or sector of schools has its own board. Because of this break down based on school or type of school the Oklahoma state constitution established four distinct boards of regents.[85]

Of the universities examined the University of Oklahoma was the only that was not established to serve as both the liberal arts and the agricultural and mining school. But it was not different in the fact that state institutions of higher education were almost always fighting for funding and in the early days of their establishment, lawmakers spent considerable effort requesting money from the federal government. Also, its status as a liberal arts rather than agricultural and mining college meant that the University of Oklahoma was not likely to benefit from funding established through the Morrill Act. But territorial delegates and the university Board of Regents were not to be deterred from guaranteeing some form of federal funding for the University of Oklahoma. It was because of these efforts that in March of 1906 several members of the University of Oklahoma's Board of Regents were in Washington D.C. These members had visited Washington to help ensure that Oklahoma's statehood bill would be pushed through Congress.

The Board of Regents and other supporters of the university took such an active interest in the statehood bill because it provided provisions of funding for the university, including additional land for endowment purposes. Specifically, the bill included a section on "providing

[85] Ibid, 114.

for granting the school section to the university."[86] Board members could not risk this one small line of text being altered. Fortunately, Oklahoma was granted statehood and the provision in favor of the university remained, resulting in more land for the university.

As we have already discussed, when the University of Oklahoma is examined with other state institutions there are similarities and trends that become obvious. One of these trends is that each territory and later state wished to educate their citizens in order for them to better be able to participate in government. It is seen through a comparison of several state institutions that by providing a place for higher education both the state and the people would benefit. This is evident in the University of Oklahoma's motto, *civi et reipublicae*, which translates to "for the benefit of the Citizen and the State." Those states which codified their public universities and colleges into their constitutions ensured funds and land would always be available unless there was a constitutional amendment. For places like Nebraska and California there was rigorous debate in regard to the creation and funding of their institutions. Ultimately, all the schools examined received some kind of funding through the assignment of federal lands or federal funds, ensure that the masses could attend classes and receive advanced degrees and training.

The idea that there should exist within the nation an educated citizenry was not an entirely new idea for those seeking to create state institutions of higher education. The American system of public education, which includes primary education, is based on the idea of citizens being educated so that they can effectively exercise their rights in a republican form of government. In a letter to George Washington dated January 4, 1786 Jefferson remarked that, "It is an axiom in my mind that our liberty can never be safe but in the hands of the people

[86] Unnamed Bill, University Archive: University of Oklahoma Board of Regents, 11195, Box 1, Folder 1, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma.)

themselves, and that too of the people with a certain degree of instruction."[87] It was Thomas Jefferson, then, who was perhaps the first and strongest proponent of public education for the reason of preserving the liberty of the people and the republican form of government. Beyond discussing the topic frequently in his voluminous correspondence, he dedicated several pages in *Notes on the State of Virginia* to the topic of public education. It was Jefferson's belief that if the education of the citizens on their roles and responsibilities in a republican government resulted in a more stable state. His belief in the necessity of this was so strong that he proposed a constitutional amendment:

> An amendment of our Constitution must here come in aid of the public education. The influence over Government must be shared among all the people. If every individual which composes their mass participates of the ultimate authority, the Government will be safe; because the corrupting the whole mass will exceed any private resources of wealth: and public ones cannot be provided but by levies on the people.[88]

Jefferson believed that all white children should receive three years of primary education at minimum. This of course excluded all children of color from obtaining a free Western style education. This was because Jefferson believed that Native Americans and African Americans were inferior races. He goes so far to say in *Notes on the State of Virginia* that when compared white people they are, "in reason much inferior." He goes on to say, "But never yet could I find that a black had uttered a thought above the level of plain narration."[89] It is clear that Jefferson believed that African Americans were inferior to whites in every way and that they are lesson human, thus they were not worth the effort to educate. He further believed that for white children

---

[87] Julian P. Boyd, ed, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. 9, *1 November 1785-22 June 1786*, (Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1954), 151.
[88] Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, 160. The edition of the book used for this paper was printed in 1853. The book belongs to Harvard Libraries and was digitized and distributed by Google. The information on the original printer is all but illegible save that it was printed in Richmond, Virginia.
[89] Ibid, 149-150

that the best and brightest of the impoverished male students should continue their education at the public's expense. At each succeeding level of education, the best and brightest out of the group would continue to the next level, ultimately being sent to a university, all at the expense of the public.[90]

Unfortunately, his ideas in regard to public education would not bear fruit in his life time. This was particularly the case in the South, the place of Jefferson's birth, where public schools would only be established on a consistent basis after the Civil War. But the idea of a common school system did take hold in other parts of the United States. Jefferson's concept of education to produce better citizens was later reflected in the common school movement and would also be implemented in higher education.[91] It is perhaps in the purview of public higher education where Jefferson's influence remains the most tangible. In his later years, Jefferson would be the driving force behind the creation of the University of Virginia. Some of the earliest public universities would be based explicitly on the model established by the University of Virginia. Thus, the idea of the university as an incubator for republican citizenship would spread west, inspiring a next generation of public institutions of higher education, particularly institutions such as the University of Wisconsin.

As discussed there are many trends that begin to develop when several state institutions of higher education are examined in conjunction with one another. One of the places that these trends are seen is through the Morrill Act and its guidelines. This is especially the case when examining schools such as the Universities of California and Wisconsin. While these institutions were created before the passing of the Morrill Act, they still follow a remarkably similar

[90] Ibid, 157.
[91] David Tyack, *The One Best System A History of American Urban Education*, (Harvard Press: Cambridge, 1974), 40-45.

template. It is clear that many believed that there should be a place where the non-elite could receive practical and professional training in order to be self-sufficient. Furthermore, as demonstrated by the fact that the Morrill Act stipulated that schools could not prohibit courses in the classics and classical science, it is clear that these more academic topics were also viewed as necessary. The classics combined with practical arts demonstrates a belief in a well-rounded education. There is no denying however that the discussion of whether a practical or classical education was better, or even if the two could be combined, became a heated debate. This is best demonstrated in the discussions that surrounded the establishment of the University of Wisconsin. Ultimately, these were the two competing strands of intellectual thought in the discussion of creating public universities in the 19th century.

In hindsight, it becomes apparent that the trends that are seen in each of these universities were developed over several decades. Furthermore, the intellectual thought upon which they were based can be traced even further back. What has stayed constant throughout the lives of these institutions is the idea that both practical and classical education are necessary to the well-being of the state. There has also been the continuing belief that public resources should be utilized in the endeavor of educating the citizenry, even at the highest levels. Therefore, it can be said that those responsible for the creation of the University of Oklahoma were not innovators of higher education, but rather following national trends that were established in intellectual thought predating the foundation of the university by a hundred years, that allowed for the establishment and maintenance of public institutions of higher education. However, no one institution can ever be exactly alike, and the University of Oklahoma was created with variations that were unique to Oklahoma and the people who inhabited first the territory and later the state.

This will become apparent when investigating the interaction between the student body and administration of the University.

Enrollment from 1892-1932

Students play an important role in universities. Without the students the schools would not exist. While this may seem self-evident, many histories about institutions of higher education focus heavily on the leadership and faculty of the university, and give little attention to students or their lives at the university. This oversight causes readers to lose sight of the important ways in which the student body and students' experiences at the university help to shape the institution. As stated, the first president of the University of Oklahoma advertised the university as a place that welcomed all students. The preparatory department was established as a way to help students who may not have had access to a high school education. President Boyd realized that due to the youth of Oklahoma Territory and the rigors of settling and establishing homesteads, finding students qualified for and available to attend the new university would be a challenge. But what did this really mean for the student body of the university, particularly from its founding and through the end of World War II?[92]

At the time that the University of Oklahoma was created most universities across the nation were relatively small. Their entire student bodies averaged half the size of a modern-day university class. In 1891 the combined total number of students at the six largest universities in the nation was approximately half of the University of Oklahoma's current undergraduate student body. For 1891 the University of Michigan was the largest university with 2,400 students. Harvard was the second largest with just over 2,000 students. Oberlin came in third at

[92] Levy, 45.

1,800 students. Northwestern, Yale, and Columbia were tied in terms of total student enrollment at 1,600. Most state public institution of the West were considerably smaller, The Universities of Texas, Kansas, and Nebraska all had roughly five hundred students enrolled at the start of the University of Oklahoma's second academic year.[93]

At the start of the first academic year for the University of Oklahoma there were one hundred forty-two students enrolled. Of these students, only eight of them were enrolled in university level courses. The remaining one hundred thirty-four students were enrolled in the preparatory department.[94] While it was unlikely that he knew to expect that so many students would need preparatory courses, President Boyd had anticipated many students needing what would now be considered remedial course work. After all, there had not yet been sufficient time for school districts in the territory to establish high schools, or for students to graduate from them.[95]

In an article written for the *Sooner Magazine,* President Boyd, along with some contemporaries, reminisced years later about the first class of students to arrive at the university. The building in which administration was housed and classes took place was a stone structure in downtown Norman. Many students arriving to enroll were apparently unused to multi-storied buildings and would scuff their shoes on the stairs. Again, according to Boyd, the students were older students, having moved to the territory with their families. Many had not been to school for several years as the territory lacked close and consistent schools. Boyd claimed that there were a number of students who had been unable to attend school because they were needed at the

[93] Gittinger, 7.
[94] Ibid, 19.
[95] Ibid, 11.

homesteads to work the farms.[96] A few years later, Boyd was appointed to serve on the territorial board of education. It was at this time that he began traveling the territory where he "…used this position to preach the gospel of the University of Oklahoma…"[97] He goes on to say that he took every opportunity to invite people to enroll at the university. Furthermore, if students lacked the proper funds to attend, Boyd personally aided them in finding work.[98]

The last academic year that the preparatory department was open was the 1909-1910 academic year. The following academic year showed one hundred twenty-three students listed as unclassified. This was likely because the preparatory department no longer existed as a separate school. In his book, Gittinger speculates that these students were unable to declare a major because they still had high school level courses to take. These numbers are only reflective of the College of Arts and Sciences. The College of Fine Arts had one hundred five unclassified students enrolled.[99] Gittinger omits the number of unclassified students enrolled in the College of Engineering, which was fifteen.[100] There were also significant numbers of students who, while not formally in the preparatory department, still needed some remedial work. In the 1908-1909 school year, the course catalog lists 103 out of 304 non-preparatory students as 'conditional freshmen' who, while they had been admitted to one of the university's colleges, still officially lacked coursework specified by the admissions requirements.

President Arthur Evans, the University of Oklahoma's second president (July 1, 1908 to May 24, 1911) worked hard to establish open communication and mutual understanding between the university and state high schools. In conjunction with the Board of Regents, the university

---

[96] David Ross Boyd, Roy Hadsell, and Betty Kirk, "My Days as First University President" Part II, *Sooner Magazine*, November 1928, Western History Collection (University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 61.
[97] Boyd et al, "My Days as First University President" Part I, 26.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Gittinger, 63-66.
[100] *Course Catalog, 1910-1911*, *University of Oklahoma Bulletin*, (Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 270.

created a position for a high school visitor. For a brief time period this visitor was in charge of accrediting high schools and recruiting students. Later the task of accreditation would be placed under the purview of the State Board of Education when it was created in 1912.[101] However, prior to the creation of Board of Education and before the high school visitor, there was no accreditation process for Oklahoma high schools. The possibilities for difficulties as relate to students moving between schools and enrolling in universities abounds. One such difficulty could include students being enrolled in college level courses when they were not ready for such course due to lack of preparation at their high schools.

Alternately titled *Course Catalog* or *General Catalog*, the University of Oklahoma published one of these books for every academic year for decades. The Western History Collections' holdings contain volumes beginning in 1906 and continuing until the mid-1980s. The course catalogs from the early years, unlike their more utilitarian successors, contain a fascinating amount of background information about the institution, although their primary purpose was to help guide students each year on various tasks associated with enrollment, degree planning, and other general information students might need. Until the 1932 course catalog, while the school was still relatively small, the names of every student enrolled at the time the catalog was printed are given. For most of these years, the student is listed along with their hometown, as well as their major and class standing. Such detailed information allows for examination of such trends as graduation and retention rates and the average amount of time students took to graduate. Most of the earlier catalogs also include the list of those who graduated the previous academic year. Finally, beginning in 1912, course catalogs include a

[101] Gittinger, 70-71.

coded system that permits readers to determine how many credit hours each student had in what disciplines.

The information on students in regard to enrollment and graduations is obtained from the 1906 to 1914 General Catalogs. The amount of information contained in the catalogs varies as the format changed subtly over the years. The early catalogs list students by college and class, but they may or may not indicate what the student's major was. Furthermore, most graduation lists do not give a student's major. Instead they list whether a student obtained a bachelor's of arts or of science, a master's of arts, or a bachelor's of music. Beginning in 1912 the catalogs use a coding system that can be used to determine the student's real major(s) and the number of credit hours completed; however for the purposes of this research the coding system is not used as it does not apply to all years examined. Also, the number of students enrolled each year becomes unmanageable as time goes on and the University of Oklahoma's enrollment grew. In 1932 student names were removed from the General Catalogs, possibly because of this reason.

The necessary pages from the catalogs were photographed. From these photographs the data were entered manually. No data were entered for law, medicine, and pharmacy students, as these fields of study are on separate campuses today. The entry for each student includes at a minimum the student's full name, their college, their class, and their hometown. The preparatory department is counted as if it were a college based on its enrollment and the fact that while it did not have a dean, it had a principal and for all intents and purposes was its own school within the university. Data on class includes the standard four classifications as well as graduate students. It also includes conditional freshmen; that is, those freshmen who still had some preparatory course work to complete, and special students. These data are stored year by year for comparative purposes, as spelling for individual names is not always consistent from year to year and a few

names change due to marriage. The listings from each year were used to create a master student database where name inconsistencies and other potential data errors could be repaired.

Much of the demographic data that the University of Oklahoma and other universities collect is assumed to have been always important, measured, and thus available. This is an erroneous assumption. Trying to reestablish baseline data for the University before the later years of the twentieth century requites some detective work. Since each student's hometowns are known, some inferences can be made about the student body through an evaluation of the state's population at large. This type of analysis requires the use of some statistical data from other sources besides the General Catalogs. The 1910 United States Census contains population data for all municipalities and counties in Oklahoma. This includes population densities for both rural and urban areas. Examination of these data can indicate what sort of backgrounds these early students may have come from, and whether background in this sense had any effect on academic performance.

To investigate the urban or rural background of the student body, the mean population of a student's hometown, the population density of their county, and what percentage of the population of the county was urbanized, were computed for the student body. Furthermore, the same analysis was done for those students who ultimately obtained a degree, in an effort to determine whether or not population demographics played a role in graduation rates. One final note on the data used: while there were a small number of students from out of state attending the University of Oklahoma at this time, they were not included in these statistics.

Table 1: Population Demographics for OU Students 1906-1908

	Mean Student Body	Graduates	State
Hometown Population	7011	6842	861

Home County Population Density (per square mile)	36.05	35.70	23.9
Home County Urban Population Percentage	26.20%	26.19%	19.8%
Percentage of Students by Hometown Population	Student Body	Graduates	State
50000	4.28%	4.28%	3.9%
25000	0.19%	0.00%	1.5%
10000	10.70%	12.68%	4.8%
5000	5.25%	0.00%	2.7%
2500	41.25%	50.70%	6.5%
0	28.99%	25.35%	80.7%

The University of Oklahoma first began holding classes in 1892, but the data complied here begins in 1906. The absence of data for the first sixteen years of the university's history is due to the unavailability of such documents as the course catalogs for these years. While this does make getting a complete picture of enrollment trends over time nearly impossible, these data are still significant and still help to provide insight into the student body of the university. For instance, students who were asked by President Boyd in 1903 to compile their lists of reasons why they chose to attend the University of Oklahoma are included in this data provided that they followed a four- or five-year track for graduation. Furthermore, the trends established for the university help establish a comparison between it and national trends in which much work has been done, particularly in terms of the middle class and their enrollment in higher education.

One of the first things demonstrated by the table is the average population of the average student's hometown. The university's student body originates from much larger towns than the average town population for the state. As discussed previously in this thesis, there are some myths and legends surrounding the university and recruitment that suggest themselves to the belief that the students at the university in its earliest years came from tiny independent farms and small farming communities. As these data show, this is not the case. Whether rural people of college age were choosing not to attend a university at all, were instead attending the state's Agricultural and Mining College, or attending a state normal school is beyond the current scope

of this work. But what this analysis demonstrates is that relatively few were enrolling at the University of Oklahoma in comparison to their share of the state's population as a whole.

To further help demonstrate the population break up of university students the second part of the data included contains information on the home county population density of the students. This data shows the overall population density of counties in Oklahoma and what percentage of students lived in those counties with higher population densities as compared to the overall state population density per county. This was done to help correct for abnormalities that may have been seen in the high number of urban students enrolling at the university. Perhaps each county comprised of a town with a population over the 2500 size, thus skewing that data. However, this is not the case. Overall, Oklahoma had a relatively low population density, but the majority of students came from home counties that were more densely populated. These statistics show that University of Oklahoma students came from communities that were more urban than was represented by the state's population density and average town size.

The second part of the table demonstrates the same data in the form of a histogram. While eighty percent of Oklahoma was rural in 1910, only a quarter of the student body at the university came form these rural areas. Furthermore, students were over represented from cities with a population at fifty thousand people. In 1910 there was only one city in Oklahoma whose population was fifty thousand and that was Oklahoma City. Oklahoma City made up 3.9% of the overall population of the state, but students from Oklahoma City made up 4.28% of the student population enrolled at the university. Most of the students at the university came from towns that had populations between 2500 and 5000. In those days Norman itself fell into this category, with a population of 3,724 in 1910, and a large fraction of the university's students originated there: 151 of the 514 students identified in the database listed Norman as their hometown. However,

several of the course catalogs indicate that students that lived full time in Norman were counted as residents of Norman for this purpose, so that value may be inflated.

Another thing that can be determined from this data is that based on their representation in numbers, both rural and urban students graduated at very similar rates. Regardless of their overall representation within the school population, rural and urban students enjoyed a very similar success rate when it came to graduating and earning a degree. Today it is known that students from rural areas have lower graduation rates because they are considered disadvantaged due to rural public schooling. [102] These disadvantages were created over the last hundred years as rural areas began experiencing losses in population, economics and finally resources. These losses have contributed to the destabilization of rural communities and have resulted in lack of funding for rural public schools. When schools lack the appropriate resources, it affects the quality of education students receive.[103] However, in early twentieth century Oklahoma, these trends in graduation rates had not yet manifested themselves.

It is also possible to use this data set to investigate graduation rates. The University of Oklahoma today prides itself on its graduation rate, which for full time students who began their undergraduate degrees in 2012 with the author stood at 62.7% after five years.[104] In contrast, the equivalent graduation rates for the freshmen who began undergraduate degrees in 1906 and 1907

[102] Claire McNeill, "Rural Students Put Off by Perceived Weakness of College," *AP News*, November 24, 2018, Accessed March 15, 2019, https://www.apnews.com/b85d516e91964d37a93c0109d86626b3.
[103] Megan Lavalley, "Out of the Loop: Rural Schools are Largely Left out of Research and Policy Decisions, Exacerbating Poverty, Inequality, and Isolation," January 2018, (National School Boards Association Center for Public Education: Alexandria, Virginia), 3-13.
[104] "Retention of Undergraduate Students – Fall 2017", http://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Annual%20Reports/First%20Time%20Student%20Retention/PGRTF%202017.pdf

stood at 26.6 and 30.2 percent respectively. However, this was not especially unusual for the time; other universities had graduation rates as low as ten percent.[105]

In addition to the catalogs the university printed up and that were used to create the above analyses, they also printed pamphlets called the *Registration Bulletin*. These bulletins were to be used in conjunction with the course catalogs and were published on a semi-monthly basis. The bulletins contained complete instructions for how a student was to register for classes and included a list of each class a student should take and at how many credit hours for each degree conferred at the university. In this manner these bulletins were not unlike the degree checksheets that the university uses to assist modern students in keeping track of necessary courses for graduation. The students were required to see the dean of their college or department for assistance in filling out their enrollment card. This was particularly true of freshmen.[106] Furthermore, bulletins contained other useful information; specifically items such as how to obtain lodging, as was the case in the bulletin printed September 15, 1925. This particular bulletin is quite detailed, listing not only the estimated cost of lodging, but the specific places that students were allowed to live.[107]

In 1903, President Boyd asked a group of students why they had decided to come to the University of Oklahoma instead of any other institution. These responses, most of them handwritten, were turned in on a variety of different types of paper, demonstrating in some small

---

[105] John R. Thelin, *A History of American Education*, 2004, https://collegeeducation.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=006578, Accessed March 13, 2019.
[106]*Registration Bulletin, The University of Oklahoma, University of Oklahoma Bulletin,* Series No 173, University Archive Record Group 10 Admissions and Records Location: 12937, Box 2: Publications, 1919-1988, Folder 2, (Norman, Oklahoma August 1, 1919) (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 3.
[107]*Freshman Registration First Semester, 1925-26, University of Oklahoma Bulletin*, New Series No. 317, (Norman, Oklahoma September 15, 1925), , University Archive Record Group 10 Admissions and Records Location: 12937, Box 2: Publications, 1919-1988, Folder 7, (Norman, Oklahoma August 1, 1919) (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 4-5.

way the differences in the students. Some used paper that had letterheads from local businesses, others used the backs of university examination sheets, and still some used sheets of notepad paper. Their responses to the question were also varied, though there were some similarities between them. The answers depended on what the individual found important. It is interesting to see what things students felt compelled to include in their responses. These lists offer a fascinating insight on how students felt about college and why they were there in the first place. They also offer insight on how the university was perceived at the time.

Many students, such as Tom F. Carey, came to the university for religious reasons. "High religious and moral character of the student body."[108] It is clear that access to churches and like-minded people was a decided drawing point. Roy C. Smith specifically mentioned the number of churches to be found in the city of Norman. W.J Pointer states that, "It is free from the vices common in larger cities."[109] Another student, E. Paddock, remarked on the appeal of having religious services on campus. It is clear from these responses and others that many students who enrolled at the University of Oklahoma felt that a strong belief in religion and moral character were important. Furthermore, it is clear that they wished to surround themselves with like-minded people and that they believed that such persons attended school at the University of Oklahoma. This view aligns with the common school movement's emphasis on public education as a place of moral training.

In addition to enrolling for reasons of morals, students also appear to enroll for reasons related to civic obligations. Several students mentioned that one should attend the University of Oklahoma because of how the school was funded. Alfred Cherry [?] wrote that, "Because you or

[108]Presidential Papers: David Ross Boyd, 1903-1905, Location: 09572, Box 7, Folder 10A, University of Oklahoma Archives Record Group 03, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma), Tom F. Carey
[109]Ibid, Roy C. Smith.

your parents support the University through taxation. If you do not attend, you lose, in a sense, what you have paid for."[110] Still other students believed that by attending the University of Oklahoma that they would have a chance to become or befriend future state leaders. Again Tom F. Carey wrote, "One meets and associates with the men who are to do the most in moulding Oklahoma's future. The men Oklahomans will have to deal most with in the future." These students are also demonstrating a belief in the Jeffersonian idea of becoming educated in order to become men of power.

University Society

University society is very closely tied to the hidden curriculum. It is found within the classroom in interactions between students. It is also seen in extracurricular activities. But what is the university society? It may first be helpful to define the word society, in the simplest of terms it is a group of people who live in the same community. It can also be used to describe a club or organization that was created for a specific purpose or activity. Furthermore, those of a given society share the same geographical location, are exposed to the same cultural expectations, and are subject to the same authority figures.[111] Therefore, the university society is the community of the university in which the students are engaged in continuous and varied social interactions with one another based upon their close proximity. Because of the nature of universities there are two basic places in which students interact with each other and occasionally their professors. One place in which the students interact is within the classroom, here the students are engaging with their peers and also with their professors. They also interact with each other outside of the classroom all over campus. Students must navigate various behaviors which

[110] Ibid.
[111] *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/society.

fit both scenarios and the expectations of both. Here however there exists an overlap. The classroom setting is more formal but is a space in which students still see and engage with their peers. Therefore, they behave in a manner that communicates to their peers that they belong within the society. This can include participating in class discussion to display knowledge of the material but also be willing to engage in a discussion of the latest social activity occurring on campus. Today an example of overlapping behavior between the classroom and the extracurricular would be a student who voices concern about attending a social event because there is an exam soon. Ultimately the student attends the event out of fear of appearing bookish. The student's peers may then voice similar concerns and perhaps agree to have group study session in order to compensate for attending the event.

It is within university society that aspects of the hidden curriculum are not only demonstrated, but also reinforced. If the hidden curriculum is the system in which students learn socially acceptable behaviors and their place within society, then it is through aspects of campus life that these lessons find their application. Social interactions between students and sometimes between students and faculty are the times in which students demonstrate their social standing, in this manner they show their understanding of how society is supposed to work. There are social cues that others watch for to determine at what level a person is in the social pecking order. In academia this social pecking order is typically rated by whether you have read certain theories of various academic topics. Furthermore, it is easy to establish a person's position in academic society based on their use of the English language. The use of or familiarity with certain terms of art or jargon mark an individual as a member of a certain elite group within the academy.

In the second decade of the twentieth century high school and university education became accessible to more individuals. There were those who feared the presence of social and

economic climbers in these institutions. For this group of people what they feared most was an undesirable element of otherness entering their institutions of higher education. The traditionalists believed that increased enrollment numbers would result in the devaluing of higher education. Students were expected to mature while in college. They were also expected to learn social morals through close association with professors. Instead the increase in the number of students on campus meant that there were fewer campus housing options available. But the invention of the automobile meant that students could live off campus and commute to classes, cars also granted students more freedom in general. The 1920s also saw an increase in the number of student organizations. It had become apparent that students preferred the company of their peers over that of their professors. The ultimate result of these changes at universities created a distance between students and professors.[112] However, according to Paula S. Fass, author of *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s*, universities continued to instill morals in students, "schools provided the settings and context for an effective set of institutional controls which utilized just those youthful energies suspected by traditionalists and over-glamorized by progressives."[113]

The issue of automobiles and basic autonomy of students is echoed in a speech given by President Bizzell titled, "The Spirit of Learning in a Motor Age." In 1929 the University of Oklahoma had a "no car rule." While there were likely a variety of reasons why there were no cars allowed on campus, Bizzell gives his own reasons. He clearly believes that they are a distraction, one that prevented students from learning.

> Students crowd their lives with a thousand and one engagements, most of them unnecessary and some of them actually detrimental to health and peace of mind. …It simply means that we have transferred the feverish anxieties and mental

[112] Paula S. Fass, *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s*, (Oxford University Press: New York, 1977), 46-47.
[113] Ibid, 49.

> stresses of commercial life to the academic corridor and the inviting shades of the campus trees.[114]

Bizzell worries about the ways in which noise and technology intrude upon the learner. How does the loss of quiet affect those in pursuit of knowledge? The old masters sought solitude and quiet to learn. Bizzell wonders how William James, a psychologist, would have viewed the "nervous tension" of his time. Bizzell also discusses that the student body of the university was growing. He brings up a topic that he discussed in previous speeches, which is his belief that some students are not at the university to learn and that he hopes that, over time, these students will gain a desire to learn.[115] Through Bizzell's speech it becomes clear that as a university president he is concerned by and fearful of the same things that bothered the social conservatives identified by Fass.

Bizzell stresses that, "It is our earnest desire to create here an atmosphere of learning."[116] Throughout the address he has students reflect upon why they are at the university, particularly what he wants them to think on what their goals and motives are. He tells students that the university has two resources, people and materials. But that to his mind,

> The thing that constitutes a real university is its human resources. In final analysis, it is this factor that determines the greatness of a university. These resources comprise officers, teachers and students.[117]

It is perhaps in his speech, "The Student's Attitude Toward his Educational Task" that Bizzell calls directly to the students, here he speaks of what would now be called retention rates and he advises students that it is their responsibility to conduct themselves in the appropriate manner.

---

[114] William Bennet Bizzell, *The Spirit of Learning in a Motor Age*, September 17, 1929, Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell - 1926, University Records Group 03, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma), 15.
[115] Ibid, 9-11.
[116] Ibid, 10.
[117] Ibid, 8.

He discusses the many reasons why students were attending college. He argues that previously one only attended college for intellectual pursuits, but that in that given moment students were drawn to college for social reasons and for reasons of self-fulfillment.[118]

He reminds students that no matter the pull and allure of social organizations that can bring leadership opportunities, college is still a place for learning. He further reminds students that tax dollars pay for their education and that they must not waste the money of the taxpayers. He says that it is the role of colleges and universities to teach students respect, self-control, and reverence. Furthermore, if upon leaving the university, students have not learned to follow a path of righteousness, then the university has failed in its mission to society. Bizzell devotes some time to discussing co-eds specifically. Women should learn from universities, "gentleness, refinement, and high ideals." They should also learn culture while at the university; if such lessons are not imparted onto the female student then the university has failed to function as it should. Ultimately, Bizzell argues that a university's greatness depends on its students and their realization of the impact that a university education will have on their lives. As previously quoted, Bizzell lays the responsibility of a university's prestige and in his words greatness, firmly at the feet of the students. "No university can be great unless the student body can be brought to appreciate the opportunities and caused to make the best possible use of the facilities provided for them."[119]

During Bizzell's early years as university president, enrollment in colleges, universities, and high schools grew at a startling rate; this trend started in 1900 and continued into the 1930s. High school enrollment saw a 650% increase between 1900 and 1930. At colleges and universities, attendance increased at a rate of three times that of preceding decades. Institutions

[118] Bizzell, "The Student's Attitude Toward His Educational Task," 8-9.
[119] Ibid, 7.

of higher education saw their highest increase in attendance in the 1920s, nearly every college and university saw their student body double. Nearly two-thirds of these new students enrolled in co-educational colleges and universities. In the middle of this mass increase in enrollment, school officials at the primary level began grouping students by age, similar to the current K-12 system.[120] This grouping by age may have helped lead to the strong peer influence that is seen at colleges and universities in the 1920s.

Youth culture, which refers to the way in which adolescents live and the ways in which they share various practices, norms, and values. At the university the youth culture is a culture in which students share customs and social institutions that are specific to their enrollment and status as a student. Because those who participate in youth culture form a dynamic social group, particularly as that group relates to university life, it was something that is alternately mocked and revered in the 1920s. Fass explores this idea in her book. Her work provides a new insight to the culture of the United States in the Roaring '20s. She takes the decade out of its stereotype as a "novelty" or a time of frivolity. *The Damned and the Beautiful* goes beyond classic historical images of alcohol consumption, flappers, and cigarettes and instead discusses the complex manner in which the youth shaped the decade.[121] Among the many things that Fass does in her book is to look at those who attended college during the 1920s and analyze the family structures in which they came from. In addition to basic demographical information, Fass also details the trends that psychologist and sociologists were noticing in childrearing and family structures of the day, particularly their discussion on how children were treated. Such an analysis is crucial because contemporaries believed that childrearing practices and family structures were the cause of the so called "improper" behavior of college students.

[120] Fass, 124 and 130.
[121] Ibid, 3.

While perhaps not to the same degree or with as much detail as Fass, others have looked at demographic information as it related college students in the early twentieth century. David Levy made use of information in the University of Oklahoma's course catalog to give some demographical information on students who attended the university. This thesis also attempts to continue and broaden Levy's work on the demographics of students at the University of Oklahoma. Levy's second volume on the history of the university, *The University of Oklahoma: A History Volume 2 1917-1950*, however is limited to a short sample in terms of student demographics. In addition to tracing demographics of the student body the goal here is to also take Levy's work further in an effort to determine how the university effected students of differing socio-economic status and how they in turn effected the university and its mission. Because Fass's monograph is a nationwide history and this is a regional history, the reading and comparison of both is useful in determining how accurate national trends were and where statistical outliers existed. As a further caveat, Fass focuses nearly exclusively on the middle class and the children of middle-class parents, though her work does contain information on rural and working-class families as a means of comparison of trends.

"The child had assumed a new prominence in middle class affairs, and as a result in these families the care and rearing of children had superseded all other functions within the household."[122] One of the things that had changed the most was the average family size. Across the nation couples were making the decision to have fewer children. This trend in which families were smaller impacted college students' lives. One of the largest factors in deciding family size was the level of education a student's mother had received. The higher the level of education achieved by a mother resulted in the family being smaller. A smaller family meant that parents

[122] Fass, 54.

could focus their attention more on each individual child, including focusing on a child's future. Smaller families in many cases also meant that parents had more financial means to provide support and funding for any child who did attend college. In her review of family size Fass notes that most students had an average of two siblings. She also notes that students from the South and the Midwest still came from larger families, however these families were still smaller than the ones in which the parents grew up in. The students who grew up with the largest families were those in which the family's primary source for income was through agriculture.[123]

Middle class urban families were smaller than those of the urban working-class and rural families. The children of the urban working-class and rural families were required to work in order to help support their families. The children of the middle class were sent to school, particularly the youth. "In an industrial society, expertise had become the necessary basis for success."[124] Thus upon graduation a middle-class student would maintain the same financial status that they grew up in.[125] Though overall, it became necessary in the 1920s to receive some type of education because the labor market created a demand for more educated employees. Ultimately these new trends in childrearing practices meant that parents focused more on their children then on other matters, children were sent to school because an education demonstrated a greater emphasis on a child's wellbeing. This dichotomy between schools and families created a new social exchange.[126]

But what about the University of Oklahoma? How do the demographics of its student body compare to the national trends in the 1920s? Overall, the statistics show that the demographics of the university's student body are in line with that of national trends. As

[123] Ibid, 60-63 and 65.
[124] Ibid, 91.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Ibid, 56.

discussed previously there were some slight deviations. There was a one percent deviation between the University of Oklahoma and national averages in terms of the number of students who were self-supporting during this era. Also, at the university more students reported that their parents were farmers by profession than those at the national level. A comparison of the university's student body make up in the years leading up to the 1920s can also be made based on the sources. For the 1920s the answer is easy to find, as for the 1923-24 academic year the university requested that students answer a series of questions. This list of questions provided the university with knowledge on the demographical makeup of the student body. The students were asked their religious preference, hometown, financial support, and primary occupation of their parents. One of the first things that becomes apparent is that the majority of students at the University of Oklahoma were children of farmers. This is a marked difference from other universities across the nation, the national trend being that the parents of students were professionals. It is also interesting in light of the study of the students' hometowns shown earlier in this work. Of the 3,680 students enrolled at the University of Oklahoma 523 relied solely on their own income in order to pay fees and living expenses while they were enrolled.[127] This data demonstrates how the University of Oklahoma's students both mirrored and departed from national trends. In the 1920s fifteen percent of students were self-supporting. The majority of students were raised in households in which the family could afford to support the student while he or she was in school.[128] The University of Oklahoma was one percent below the national average at fourteen percent.

[127] David W. Levy, *The University of Oklahoma: A History Volume 2 1917-1950*, (University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, Oklahoma 2015), 78.
[128] Fass, 135.

The middle-class youth of the 1920s appeared to be a problem without a solution. They were seen as an inside problem, which is to say that they were a problem which had been created by middle-class society. Therefore, they were a problem that needed to be contained and perhaps rehabilitated.[129] Furthermore, they were seen as the cause of the supposed failure of American society. This belief was partially influenced by the disillusionment caused by World War I. Socially conservative members of society believed that college aged women were the worst offenders in terms of causing the fall of American society. Women were supposed to be the guardians and keepers of the home. It was believed that socially acceptable behaviors were learned inside the home and that women were the teachers.[130] If conservative elements in society believed that women had vanished from the home, then it begs the question of where they went. The answer is they were enrolling in colleges and universities across the nation. While this was a national trend, things were a little different at the University of Oklahoma, for the 1923-24 academic year there were 2,260 male students compared to 1,420 female students. At the close of the decade the male to female ratio of students at the University of Oklahoma was 2 to 1.[131]

Not every member of society believed that young women or youth more broadly were the scourge of the earth. Perversely, there was a group that believed that youth were in fact destroying society, but that the destruction was not only necessary but also beneficial. This group was known as the progressives and they believed not in political or economic reform, but in social reform. This is particularly noteworthy given that both the conservative and progressive elements of society had an odd fascination with the sex life of 1920s youth. Progressives embraced the new sexual mores that college students were establishing, while conservatives

[129] Ibid, 14.
[130] Ibid, 124 and 130.
[131] Levy, *The University of Oklahoma: History Volume II*, 77 and 121.

feared them. While these mores brought about two visceral and opposite reactions between the two groups the reason for the responses were the same. The creation of new sexual morals would lead to social change.[132] Of course then the question becomes where sexual morals changing, the answer is contraceptives. Contraceptives completely removed or at least greatly reduced that chances of an unwanted pregnancy. Relieved of this fear, young men and women began to explore their sexuality.[133] In relation to colleges and universities, it was in these spaces that young men and women found opportunities to mingle together where previous generations had not.

Just how did colleges and universities offer more opportunities for the sexes to mingle? To begin with, state public institutions like the University of Oklahoma were as discussed, co-educational. Those institutions that were older and typically private kept the sexes segregated. But it was also campus life itself which was made up of three aspects; extracurricular activities, studies, and social relationships. Students found the most opportunities to mingle during extracurricular activities and through various social relationships. Furthermore, according to Fass, these experiences were consistent across the nation.[134] There was also a growing sense of conformity. "It was conformity above all that was the glue of campus life, the basis for group cohesion and identification on the campus…"[135] This is seen through the examination of campus life at the University of Oklahoma. In his second volume on the history of the University of Oklahoma, Levy discusses the focus students had on social aspects of campus life and that the general gaiety that occurred on campuses were nationwide, thus supporting Fass's observations. University of Oklahoma students joined fraternities and formed clubs at the same rate as their

[132] Fass, 30-32.
[133] Ibid, 69-71.
[134] Ibid, 129 and 133.
[135] Fass, 129 and 135.

national peers. Roy Gittinger, long time professor at the university and dean during the years in question, was particularly annoyed with students and their frivolity. He found groups such as the Ruff-Neks, immensely annoying and he had a general disapproval for the ways in which the university atmosphere was changing.[136]

In his study, Gittinger states that enrollment of financially well-off students started to increase at the University of Oklahoma beginning in the nineteen teens. Previously these students would have been sent elsewhere, such as colleges and universities in the East. However, economic hardships in Oklahoma led these more affluent families to keep their children in Oklahoma at a tuition free university. Originally, once a family overcame a hardship these students would be transferred out and into whichever institution their family had originally intended. Instead a developing social life kept them at the University of Oklahoma. In 1905 the first fraternity opened on campus, Kappa Alpha. The first sororities, Kappa Alpha Theta and Delta Delta Delta, were established during the 1909-1910 school year.[137]

Fraternities and sororities are important places in which hidden and unhidden curriculums are displayed and in many cases continued. Not just anyone is accepted into such an organization. Students wishing to join such a society must first meet certain criteria. There is also a process in which the student must first make a pledge and from there the organization must chose to accept them and then initiation takes place. During the pledge process a student has to demonstrate their commitment to the organization and that they fit in with its goals and standards. Furthermore, once initiated the student must participate in the organizations various events and activities.

[136] Levy, 56.
[137] Gittinger, 67-68.

It is during the pledge process that the individual wishing to join must demonstrate their willingness to adhere to the social standards set forth by the organization. It is in this circumstance that a person demonstrates the things they have learned over time which have prepared them to become a member. It is their behaviors here that the hidden curriculum of early education and days spent at the university itself are placed on display. Though the individual is likely completely unaware that this is occurring. Furthermore, it is during the pledge activities that the individual is learning, through observing current members, how one is to behave as a member.

There is also an unhidden curriculum associated with fraternities and sororities, once a person has been initiated into the organization, they must learn the rules that are associated with said organization. This would include such things as whether or not one must maintain certain grade point average while in school, how many organizational activities a member must attend, and what events if any have mandatory attendance. As a society grows and if they have a house established on campus, any student wishing to reside in the residence would also have to meet certain rules and criteria associated with living in the house. Furthermore, some societies are representative by a person's chosen major or by a set of majors, in these cases a student would be required to maintain their status in the field to remain within the organization.

In his speech "Education and the Useful Life," Bizzell did not just speak of what the university was for and why students should be there, he also spoke of the students who were there for social reasons. Bizzell discussed student participation in extracurricular activities and their divided attention and "loyalties" between such organizations and activities and a loss of focus on studies. It is clear that Bizzell in many ways disapproves of the new developments in student life. Student run organizations are a distraction from the real reason a person enrolls in a

university, which is to learn.[138] Furthermore, Bizzell acknowledges that some students may only be at the university for social reasons and to these students he asks them to begin focusing on learning. And finally, he stresses that many critics of colleges and universities believe that they are places were the affluent can go and be idle for four years.[139]

University Finances

School finances are heavily tied to the student body. The financial stability of a university helps to influence who enrolls and attends classes at an institution. It is known that in the earliest years of the university, wealthy Oklahoma families were sending their children east for higher education. It was not until state economics took a down turn that this changed. But prior to this, there was still an emphasis on financial stability for the school. This is evident in all the measures taken to secure funds for the establishment and expansion of the university. In order to hold classes and build a student body at all, the university must have buildings to hold classes. Much thought was placed in the design of the University of Oklahoma buildings because the architecture chosen influences the perception people have of the school. Furthermore, the more funding the university has the more renowned professors it can hire. Having elite academics teaching courses comes with a steep price tag, but greatly increases the prestige of a university.

University finances have always been an important topic of discussion among university officials. Primarily the focus has been on how to obtain more funds for the running and maintenance of the institution. In the early years of the university there was frequent correspondence between Board of Regents members, the university president, and the governor. One such letter dated December 3, 1905 was written by Del Larsh to Oklahoma Territorial

[138] Bizzell, "Education and the Useful Life," 12.
[139] Ibid, 7.

governor Thompson Benton Ferguson, the letter was about the financial status of the university. There had been a request made by Ferguson that the Board of Regents provide an annual financial report to him. As board secretary the duty of drafting and sending such a report fell to Larsh. The letter contains the financial information for the 1902-03 school year. Among the information included is an itemized list of salaries, purchases, and bills. It also includes the monies received as payment from students in terms of deposits and fees. Finally, there is a general statement of purpose from Larsh, about why each piece of information was included.[140]

The annual report to Ferguson seems to have been a special one as the Board of Regents submitted biennial reports to the legislature. Larsh's letter to Ferguson was a typeset letter with pencil mark corrections. Typically, these reports were published in a manner similar to those of pamphlets and bulletins. These documents were created in order to convince state officials that the university required more funding. The reports outlined the current funding and current expanses, including salaries that the university had. They also gave the current student enrollment numbers, sometimes there were projections of future enrollment.[141] These projections were likely included to convince officials to provide more funding so the university would be prepared for an increased student population. One of the most detailed reports in terms of money on hand verses money owed was the report covering 1898-1900. Here it is significant to note the university's accounting did not consider student fees as net revenue. There were only two sources of funding listed in this report, that of lease payments on land owned by the university

[140] Del Larsh to Governor Ferguson, Letter dated December 3, 1905, University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regents, Record Group 02, Location 11195, Box 6, Folder 9, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma).
[141] Board of Regents, *The Financial Needs of the University of Oklahoma with Brief Analysis of Facts and Figures in Support of the Budget Estimates. Prepared for the Information of the Governor and Legislature*, University Archives Record Group 02, Location 1119, Box, Folder 3, (Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma).

and territorial funding. The total amount of money collected over this two year span per the report was $41,308.91, or approximately $1.2M in 2017 dollars.[142]

While student fees were not counted as net revenue, they along with enrollment numbers played a significant role in the overall health of the university. As long as the university continued to experience an increase in student enrollment the legislature seemed inclined to provide enough funding to keep the university running. As far as the use of student fees as a source of funding is concerned, a quick glance at the existing *General Catalog*s, it is easy to understand why they were not considered revenue. Deposits and fees that students paid were just that. The fees were collected to cover the materials used in courses, particularly the science courses. Deposits were money that covered the student in case they lost or broke equipment. These deposits were returned to the students at the end of the year if no damage or loss occurred.[143] It is also important to remember that for the first fifty years the university was tuition free for residents, and during the 1899-1900 school year the Board of Regents decided that residents of Indian Territory would also be allowed to attend the university tuition free.[144] For the first year that the University of Oklahoma was open for classes, which started in September 1892, tuition for students from outside of Oklahoma Territory was $8 a semester or $15 for the entire year.[145]

There was only one exception to the university being tuition free, which was that students enrolled in fine arts paid tuition. Their tuition paid for their music and art lessons and went from the university straight to the instructors. In other cases, certain fees and deposits were paid by all

---

[142] *Biennial Report of the Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma to the Governor of Oklahoma Territory 1899-1900*, University Archives, Board of Regents, Record Group 02, Location 11203, Box 6, Folder 1, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 3.
[143] *Course Catalog 1906-1907*, 35-36.
[144] *General Catalog 1947-48, University of Oklahoma Bulletin*, (Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), 25.
[145] Gittinger, 19.

students. As stated students would receive their deposits back when they completed the course or if they withdrew from it within a certain time frame. In order to receive their deposit back students had to submit a request, all requests for deposit returns had to be made by July 1st of that school year. Fees however were not refundable. The course catalog is quite extensive when it comes to listing all the fees associated with being a student at the University of Oklahoma. There was a $2 library deposit which protected against lost or damaged books. Students were required to pay $5 for the issuance of their diploma. For those enrolled in science courses the fee was between $2 and $10 depending on what course was being taken. Finally, there was an optional 50 cent fee if a student wished to rent a locker in the gym. Ultimately deposits and fees were distinct from one another, deposits protected equipment and fees were used to purchase supplies such as chemicals.

There were also fees in the preparatory department, primarily for students enrolled in the sciences courses. The School of Fine Arts had very set expenses, since these students also paid for private lessons. These lessons were to occur once or twice a week per quarter. How much a student paid was based on who their instructor was and also depended on what instrument or performing art they received their lessons in. If a student took two lessons a week per quarter, they paid between $5 and $18 per quarter. There was also the School of Pharmacy which over lapped with the sciences meaning that deposits were $2 to $10 and fees were $2 to $6 per semester. For the School of Applied Science or what is now the College of Engineering, there was a large variance in their deposits and fees if students could provide their own instruments for various types of field work and calculations. A student without any instruments would pay up to $8 in deposits and $10 in fees. Those with instruments may pay the same in fees but only paid $1.50 in deposits.

In terms of fees associated with lodging, the university did not have dorms until 1906. Prior to this, students were to take up lodging in boarding houses and private homes. As with the other descriptions of fees the course catalogs are quite extensive in the amount of information about cost given. Essentially, rooming cost was tied up in how extravagant a student wished their meals to be and whether or not they wanted a single or double room. Based on this, the catalog claimed that a student could live in Norman for between $170 and $250 per school year. The catalog also provided information to students on finding employment. If a student was completely without means, they were discouraged from enrolling. But, employment could be found if a student needed to work while taking classes. Among the suggestions listed were those of doing grounds work around campus and cleaning rooms at the boarding houses. The catalog is careful to note that employment is not promised to students. It does however state that, "students who work their way are advised to plan for an extra year in which to finish their course; but self support is possible here to any student who is willing to make necessary sacrifices."[146]

While the fundraising efforts to build a football stadium might not seem like a place to gauge theories about the student body, a lot can be gleamed from the information former university president George L. Cross provides on the early days of the fundraiser. Benjamin Gilbert Owen or Bennie Owen as long time University of Oklahoma football fans know him as, proposed the idea on a large scale at a pep rally on December 16, 1921. His goal was five hundred thousand dollars. Almost immediately students were willing to pitch in, the class of 1922 decided to donate their class memorial fund money to the effort of building the stadium. Their contribution totaled two thousand dollars. But first Mildred Finley a junior from Norman wrote a check for $5, this was her first installment of a $25 pledge. Mildred was the first student

[146] *Course Catalog 1906-07*, 35-38, quote on page 38.

to make a contribution to the fundraiser. Later, Richard H. Clyde alumni from the class of 1919 and employment secretary for the alumni donated two bird dogs to be auctioned off during half-time at a football game. The dogs brought in a total of $850.[147]

Another campaign that was ran alongside that of the stadium was one for the union. Here Cross writes there was one particular student who was very active in pushing for the university to build a student union. That student was Eugene Faulkner, class of 1923 who would become chairman of the committee to build the structure. The union became a pressing need after a fire destroyed the YMCA building. It is important to note that when Brooks called to facilitate the discussion of building a union or rebuilding the Y, he called together the male student leaders to discuss the issue, in all Brooks assembled 25 such young men. Those heading the campaign to raise funds for the stadium hired a firm to help facilitate fundraising efforts. This firm, Tamblyn and Brown, suggested that the Stadium and Union fundraisers be combined. They said that to combine the two would increase the likelihood of success. Cross adds that at some point during the discussion it was brought up that the campaigns would generate even more funds if the union and stadium were to be dedicated as memorials to university students, alumni, and other personnel who had been killed in the line of duty during World War I. And thus, the University of Oklahoma Memorial Union and Memorial Stadium came to be.[148]

After a great number of struggles, stalling, reorganization of efforts, changes in governors, and university presidents the stadium was completed in 1928 and the union in 1929. Those who are familiar with university history will recognize that the issues that plagued the building of the two memorial structures were typical of the woes the school faced when it came

[147] George L. Cross, *The Seeds of Excellence*, (Transcript Press: Norman, Oklahoma 1986), 11-13.
[148] Ibid, 14-15.

to building new structures on campus.[149] The fire that destroyed the campus YMCA office and building was not the first fire to hit the campus leveling buildings. The difficulty raising funds was not new either. There was much difficulty and scrambling to raise the initial funds to have the university placed in Norman to begin with. And the school lost its first couple of administration buildings and at least two libraries to fire. One almost wonders with so much strife attached to continuing the endeavor to build this state school what kind of optimism must have been required. Especially in the face of presidential turnover seemingly occurring each time a new governor was elected.

These struggles demonstrate the dedication the student body had to their university. The students recognized that by having these facilities their overall enjoyment and fulfilment during their time at the university would increase. These spaces would be entirely their own which would allow them to engage in the social activities they had come to enjoy while on campus. Furthermore, this example demonstrates the dedication that students had towards improving their university, in this way the students are making it their own. It seems here that the extra-curricular activities that some had so feared in the 1920s gave these students a drive and vision that is still reflected on the university campus today.

The University Today

In a lot of ways, the university has changed significantly since the days of Boyd, Monnett, and Bizzell. The most obvious way being in the form of the physical plant of the university. There are far more buildings than there were during the tenure of these men. The campus comprises of numerous dorms, lecture halls, state of the art research facilities, multiple

[149] Ibid, 22.

museums, and a renowned medical research hospital. The student body has grown exponentially over the last one hundred twenty-seven years. The university has reached Bizzell's goals of reaching beyond the geographic boundaries of the state of Oklahoma, with students enrolled from all over the world. Academically, the university has demonstrated its commitment to scholarship.

However, there are issues that have remained with which the university's "founding fathers" would find very familiar. The dichotomy between provided higher education for all of the state's residents and fulfilling the desire to recruit the best and brightest is still in existence. As are the issues of funding as less of the university's funding comes from the state and more of it is generated through private donations. Throughout the history of the university all presidents have faced the issue of generating funding for the school, including that of finding ways to fund students. Beginning in 1948 the university began charging students who are residents of the state of Oklahoma tuition fees. The struggle has been how to make the tuition fair and reasonable for the students and still guarantee that the university was financially solvent.

The university's most recent two presidents are much like Boyd and Bizzell, both working to ensure student enrollment and provide a place of learning for the state's residents. The two men also have share similar views as to what is best for the university in nearly the same ways as Boyd and Bizzell. These men are David Lyle Boren and James L. Gallogly. President Boren served as university president from 1994 until his retirement in 2018. President Gallogly has of the writing of this thesis has not yet served a full year as university president. Despite Gallogly having only been in office a few short months, there are already some stated goals and policies that mark him as different from Boren.

One of the key ways that Boren attracted donors and students was by increasing the prestige of the university by recruiting those students who were the most academically inclined. Boren did this by offering funding for National Merit Scholar winners. In later years he and the university began to take great pride in the number of National Merit Scholars who came to the university. "Over the years, OU has likely spent hundreds of millions of dollars to attract National Merit students, many from out of state, in an effort to raise the quality of students, recruit strong faculty and improve its academic reputation." But at what cost? The money spent to recruit the Nation Merit students primarily went to students who were from out of state, leaving little to no funding for residential students whose high schools did not offer the PSAT, thus automatically disqualifying them from receiving the funding.[150]

But the decision was made to scale the program back as more pressing financial issues began do develop at the university. It is unclear exactly what the future for the program is given that Gallogly is set on reducing the university's spending as much as possible. But one thing is for sure, some of those funds will go to help recruit local students to the university.[151] Gallogly has demonstrated repeatedly that he wishes to provide more funding for local students who due to circumstances have few options when it comes to attending a university. He is interested in granting greater access to these local students, both those who may be discouraged from attending a university and those who may otherwise attend elsewhere thus resulting in a continued brain drain.

[150] Jennifer Palmer, "OU Pulls Back on its National Merit Scholars Program," *The Norman Transcript*, August 3, 2018, (Norman, Oklahoma), Accessed May 9, 2019, https://www.normantranscript.com/news/university_of_oklahoma/ou-pulls-back-on-its-national-merit-scholars-program/article_6d6fca6a-a427-5075-a5b8-a02d1e0bca76.html.
[151] Ibid.

Conclusion

Ultimately the University of Oklahoma was established as a small state school that was meant to provide higher education to the territory's residents in a hope that the territory would reap the benefits of a better educated populace. Over time the small school began to grow and in many ways its function began to change. This is especially true as it began to serve a social function for students. It also changed in the ways in which it served the young state. The students and university presidents played a large role in the shaping of the institution, especially in the 1920s. In the end there developed a struggle at the university that waxed and waned over the years. The struggle was centered around whether or not the emphasis and purpose of the University of Oklahoma would be to serve through the populist ideal of higher education for all able-bodied persons, or whether it would serve as an institution with an emphasis on prestige and focus on producing an educated elite.

There are many factors that go into establishing and maintaining a university. This is particularly the case for state ran institutions where politics have a large role in the outcome of the university's success. But institutions of higher education that were established by state or territorial governments do have some advantages in that nearly all were eligible for federal funding through the Morrill Act and other federal funding. Also, in cases like the University of Oklahoma, these public institutions are protected by the constitutions of their states, granting them more security than other institutions may have. All of these factors apply to the University of Oklahoma and helped to shape it during the early days of its foundation.

Another thing that can be seen when exploring the early years of the University of Oklahoma are the national trends that were also occurring across the nation. The rise in enrollment rates, the ways in which the universities were established, and the ways in which

universities were viewed are all things that were seen on a national level. The curriculum and the campus society were also similar across the nation, there was an emphasis on education for civic virtue and moral standards. Furthermore, in the 1920s it can be seen that there was a shift in who was attending universities and why these students were attending. Campus life came to be a huge part of why students were enrolling, not just chances to earn degrees and advance in life.

Furthermore, it has been established that a university president greatly influences the direction a university takes. This is particularly true when the institutions are smaller and there is less of a personal gap between the president and the students. As was demonstrated by some early presidents at the University of Oklahoma, some feel that access to higher education should be open to all who are willing to learn. This was true of Boyd and Monnet, who both believed that any able-bodied person should attend the university. Bizzell, on the other hand, clearly sought to have for the university only the best and the brightest attend, and he stressed that students should only focus on their studies during their time at the university. These types of beliefs also play into the role that the university has within society. Students are either enrolled for economic improvement, intellectual advancement, or for the support and continuation of the republic and its ideals. All of which is shaped by the university president. A university president would greatly influence the hidden curriculum of the institution of which he worked, both while in charge of the university and after leaving.

The students also play a large role in the university. At the University of Oklahoma it has been demonstrated that during the early years that students took an active role in shaping the type of institution it would become. The student demographics at the university also prove interesting as they demonstrate interesting trends as to where students came from based on where they grew up. A majority of students came from urban areas when a majority of the state was rural. This

may be because these students had greater access to transportation as larger towns typically have railroad depots.

President William Bizzell once said that, "A university community differs in many respects from that of the normal urban or rural community."[152] This becomes self-evident when one examines university society. In the 1920s students had greater freedom to move around because of automobiles. This was such a change from the status quo that they were banned on the campus of the University of Oklahoma. But that did not stop students from socializing. Students began petitioning for charters and opening up fraternity and sorority houses. At the University of Oklahoma, the students were directly involved in the fundraising efforts to build a football stadium and student union. Both structures would provide students a place to mingle with peers and engage in extracurricular activities. The students wished to participate in a greater number of social activities and to interact with one another outside of a classroom setting.

Raising the funds necessary to support a public university has never been an easy task. The University of Oklahoma did not have any less of a difficulty than other institutions in the western United States. But those in charge of building the university did have to get creative when seeking federal funding because the institution did not qualify for money that was provided through the Morrill Act. Instead President Boyd and members of the Board of Regents had to directly petition Congress by submitting bills in order to gain funding. Also, the county and city in which the university was placed had to raise tax dollars in order the guarantee that it be placed in their area. Once the university was established, fundraising and petitioning had to continue to be able to keep it open and running. It was through dedication to the university that this funding was maintained.

[152] Bizzell, "The Student's Attitude Toward His Educational Task," 3.

The sources on which this thesis is based demonstrate that even in its first weeks the university attracted these more affluent students. This is evident in their demographics, in which the students came from the moderately populated areas of the state. The students who came to the university initially were not necessarily the students of the myth, they were those who lived in towns and whose parents had more affluence, rather that affluence originated in the east or was developed in the territory. The trend of students coming from these more affluent local families continues now, in which the majority of in state students originate from the three most populous counties in the state.

Bibliography

n.d. *1890 Universities.* Accessed May 7, 2019. http://www.aplu.org/members/councils/1890-universities/. .

2011. "7 United States Code, Agriculture Chapter 13 - Agriculture and Mechanical Colleges." U.S. Government Publishing Office. https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2011-title7/html/USCODE-2011-title7-chap13.htm.

Argolis, Eric, Michael Soldatenk, Sandra Acker, and Marina Gair. 2001. "Peekaboo Hiding and Outing the Curriculum." In *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*, by Eric Argolis, 1-20. New York: Routledge.

Asp, Henry E., and Del Larsh. n.d. "Leter Dated February 27, 1906 and March 2, 1906." Henry E. Asp to Del Larsh and Larsh to Asp, Letter dated February 27, 1906 and March 2, 1906, University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regents, Record Group 02, Location 11195, Box 1, Folder 1, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman.

n.d. "Biennial Report of the Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma to the Governor of Oklahoma Territory 1899-1900." University Archives, Board of Regents, Record Group 02, Location 11203, Box 6, Folder 1, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma.

Bizzell, William Bennett. 1926. "Education and the Useful Life." Norman: Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell 1926, University Records Group 03 Western History Collections University of Oklahoma, September 22.

—. 1930 . "The Higher Levels of Learning ." Norman: Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell - 1926 Unviersity Records Group 03, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma, September 23.

—. September. "The Spirit of Learning in a Motor Age." Norman: Location 12921, Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell - 1926 University Record Group 03, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma, 17 1929.

—. 1925. "The Student's Attitude Toward His Education Task." Norman, Oklahoma: , Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell - 1926, University Records Group 03, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma), September 23.

Boyd, David Ross, Roy Hadsell, and Betty Kirk. 1928. "My Days as First University President Part II." *Sooner Magazine*, November.

Boyd, David Ross. 1902. "Letter Dated February 12, 1902." University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regents, Record Group 03, Location 11195, Box 1, Folder 2, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma), February 12.

—. 1907. "Letter to Del Larsh." Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regents, Record Groupd 03, Location 11195, Box 1, Folder 4, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma, February 6.

—. n.d. "Presidental Papers: David Ross Boyd 1903-1905." Location 09572, Box 7, Folder 10A, University of Oklahoma Archive, Record Group 03, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma.

Boyd, David Ross, Roy Hadsell, and Betty Kirk. 1928. "My Days as First University Preseident Part I." *Sooner Magazine*, November: 24.

Boyd, Julian P., ed. 1954. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, 1 November 1785-22 June 1789.* Vol. 9. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cate, Roscoe. 1941. "16 Years of Achievement." *Sooner Magazine*, July: 8.
Clecker, Frank S. 1928. "Organize Your Sooner Club." *Sooner Magazine*, December.
Cobb, Jonathan, and Richard Sennett. 1972. *The Hidden Injuries of Class.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
1906. *Course Catalog 1906-1907, Bulletin of the State University of Oklahoma.* Vol. 9. Norman, Oklahoma: Western History Collections University of Oklahoma .
1910. *Course Catalog 1910-1911, University of Oklahoma Bulletin.* Norman: Western History Collections University of Oklahoma.
Cross, George L. 1986. *The Seeds of Excellence.* Norman: Transcript Press.
Cross, George Lynn. 1975. *Blacks in White Colleges, Oklahoma;s Landmark Cases.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Curti, Merle Eugene, and Vermon Rosco. 1949. *The University of Wisconsin: A History Volume I.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Fass, Paula S. 1989. *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education.* New York: Oxford University Press.
—. 1977. *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s.* New York: Oxford University Press.
1925. "Freshman Registration First Semester 1925-26." Norman: University Archive Record Group 10 Admissions and Records, Location 12937, Box 2: Publications, 1919-1988, Folder 7, Western History Collections University of Oklahoma, September 15.
n.d. *General Catalog 1947-48 University of Oklahoma Bulletin.* Norman: Western HIstory Collections, Univeresity of Oklahoma.
George P. Sanger. 1863. "An Act Donating Public Lands to the Serveral States and Territories WHich May Provide Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts." *The Statutes at Large, Treaties, and Proclamations of the United States of America form December 5, 1895 to March 3, 1863.* Vol. XII. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 503-505.
GIttinger, Roy. 1942. *The University of Oklahoma: A History of Fifty Years 1892-1942.* Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
n.d. *History and Mission.* Accessed March 31, 2019. http://www.ou.edu/cas/classicsandletters/about/history-mission.
Jefferson, Thomas. 1853. *Notes on the State of Virginia.* Richmond.
Knoll, Robert E. 1995. *Prairie University: A History of the University of Nebraska.* Lincol: University of Nebraska Press.
Larsh, Del. 1905. "Letter to Governor Ferguson." Norman: University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regenst, Record Groupd 02, Location 11195, Box 6, Folder 9, Western History Collections University of Oklahoma, December 3.
Lavalley, Megan. 2018. "Out of the Loop: Rural Schools are Largely Left Out if Research and Policy Decisions, Exacerbating Poverty, Inequality, and Isolation." *National School Boards Association Center for Public Education.*
Lemann, Nicholas. 2000. *The Big Test: The Secret History of the American Meritocracy.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
Levy, David W. 2005. *The University of Oklahoma a History Volume I 1890-1917.* Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
—. 2015. *The University of Oklahoma: A History Volume 2 1917-1950.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

n.d. *Makings of a Motto.* Accessed April 1, 2019. http://www.ou.edu/cas/classicsandletters/about/university-motto.
Margolis, Eric, and Mary Romero. 2001. "In the Image and Likeness..." In *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*, by Eric Margolis, 79-97. New York: Routledge.
McDermott, John. 1969. "The Laying on of Culture." *The Nation* 208 (10): 296-301.
McGuire. 1906. "H.R.17431 ." *59th Congress, 1st Session.* University of Oklahoma Archives, Board of Regents Record Group 02, Location 11195, Box 2, Folder 15, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma: Norman, Oklahoma, March 27.
McNeill, Claire. 2018. "Rural Students Put Off be Percieved Weakness of College." *AP News*, November 24.
n.d. *Merriam-Webster Dictionary.*
Milburn, George. 1928. "Planting a University: FIrst Varsity President Recounts How He Did It." *Sooner Magazine* 1 (2): 39.
Monnet, Julien C. 1911. "Address." Norman, Oklahoma: Location 12921 Box 7: Published Speeches and Writings, Speeches and Lectures Bizzell - 1926, University Records Group 03, (Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma), September 21.
Palmer, Jennifer. 2018. "OU Pulls Back on its National Merit Scholars Program." *The Norman Transcript*, August 3.
Pelfry, Patricia A. 2000. *A Brief History of the University of CAlifornia.* Berkley: University of California Press.
R.A. Sneed Secretary of State. 1907. "Article XI State and School Lands, Section 5." *The Constitution of the State of Oklahoma.* Oklahoma City.
Regents, Board Of. n.d. *The Financial Needs of the University of OKlahoma with Brief Analysis of Facts and Figures in Support of the Budget Estimaties: Prepared for the Information of the Governor and Legislature.* Norman: University Arwchive, Board of Regents, Record Group 02, Location, 11203, Box 6, Folder 1, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma.
n.d. "Registration Bulletin, The University of Oklahoma, University Bulletins." Vol. 173. Norman, Oklahoma: University Archive Record Group 10, Admissions and Records, Location 12937, Box 2, Folder 2, Publications 1919-1988 Western History Collections University of Oklahoma.
n.d. "Retention of Undergraduate Students - Fall 2017."
Thelin, John R. 2004. *A History of American Education.*
Tyack, David. 1974. *The One Best System A History of American Urban Education.* Cambridge: Harvard Press.
n.d. "Unnamed Bill." Norman: University Archives, University of Oklahoma Board of Regents, Location 11195, Box 1, Folder 1 Western History Collections University of Oklahoma.