

Rethinking the “Nontraditional” Student from a Historical Perspective

State Normal Schools in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

Since the mid-twentieth century, a host of political, economic and societal changes have contributed to the diversification of students in American institutions of higher education. Developments such as the Allied victory in World War II, the decrease in blue-collar jobs, and changing gender attitudes, have encouraged members of minority racial groups, young people with low social-class standing, and women to attend college (Bean & Metzner, 1985). Beginning in the 1960s, governmental and institutional financial-aid and affirmative-action policies explicitly promoted racial, class, and gender diversity for the first time. Not surprisingly, researchers have recently begun to assess the impact of these programs and the implications of an increasingly diverse student body (see Levine & Associates, 1989; Levine & Nidiffer, 1996; London, 1992; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1998; Westbrook & Sedlacek, 1991), using the term “nontraditional” to describe students who are older than typical college students, work because of financial necessity, belong to the first generation in their family to attend college, do not live on campus, attend part-time, or are members of minority racial groups. Bean and Metzner (1985) add, “Nontraditional students are distinguished by the lessened intensity and duration of their interaction

The author thanks D. J. Chandler, Clif Conrad, Linda Eisenmann, Yvonna Lincoln, Ernie Pascarella, and John Thelin for encouragement and comments on earlier versions of this essay. The National Academy of Education and the NAE Spencer Postdoctoral Fellowship Program supported the research for this article.

Christine A. Ogren is Assistant Professor, Division of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies, University of Iowa.

The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 74, No. 6 (November/December 2003)
Copyright © 2003 by The Ohio State University

with the primary agents of socialization (faculty, peers) at the institutions they attend” (p. 488).

The term “nontraditional” implies that these atypical students are new to higher education and that colleges and universities traditionally have not served people like them. While the intention of research on nontraditional students is to better meet their needs, it may also have the unintended consequence of reinforcing the notion that these students are out of place, indirectly discouraging them from interacting with others on campus. One way to soften the effect of this research would be to emphasize atypical students’ rich history in higher education. Indeed, historical research indicates that, even without the encouragement of explicit governmental and institutional policies, students from unsophisticated, lower-social-class backgrounds have a long tradition of attending American colleges and universities (see, for example, Allmendinger, 1975; Nidiffer, 1999). While generations of nontraditional students have attended virtually every type of higher education institution, they were especially prominent at the precursors of many state colleges and regional universities. S. Y. Gillan, who graduated in 1879 from one of these institutions, Illinois State Normal University, reflected that it “was a school of the people existing for and representing the masses and not the classes.”¹

This article focuses on state normal schools, which resulted from nineteenth-century education reformers’ efforts to adapt the German teacher seminary and the French *ecole normale* to train teachers for the growing system of American common schools. Massachusetts established the first state normal schools in 1839, and Connecticut and New York soon followed. By 1870, 39 state normal schools were located in New England, the mid-Atlantic states, the Midwest, and California. During the following decades, southern states established segregated normal schools, and the institutions spread throughout the country and its territories; by 1920, there were more than 180. State normals, which provided elementary-level teacher certification and offered various degrees in pedagogy, were low-status institutions of higher education during a time when the lines between “higher” and “lower” education were blurred (Clifford, 1995, pp. 3–6).

By the end of the nineteenth century, many states began to look to the normals to prepare teachers for burgeoning positions on high-school faculties, which the normals saw as an opportunity to gain prestige. During the 1890s, the schools in Albany, New York, and Ypsilanti, Michigan adopted the name, “normal college.” As other normals began to offer four years of college work and grant bachelor’s degrees, they usually replaced the title “normal school” with “teachers college.” The majority of

state normal schools became teachers colleges during the 1920s and 1930s. In the 1940s, the flood of World-War II veterans seeking all-purpose higher education fueled the normals' quest for status, and they began to drop teacher education as their organizing purpose. As a result, the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s witnessed another flurry of name changes as the former normals added more prestigious programs and became state colleges. By the end of the century, continuing "mission creep" (Selingo, 2000) allowed many to become state universities; institutions that began as normal schools formed the nucleus of state systems from New York to California, and former normals make up the majority of regional universities from Northern Michigan to Southwest Texas.

Although institutions whose roots are nineteenth-century normal schools play a central role in mass higher education at the turn of the twenty-first century, their story is not well known. In their quest for higher status, former normals have tended to bury their history as "an impoverished past thankfully left behind" (Goodlad, 1990, p. 73). Meanwhile, historians of higher education have concentrated on more elite institutions, and historians of teacher education have focused on the normal schools' leaders and official policies. These historiographical approaches virtually ignore normal-school students. (For the few exceptions to this rule, see Burke, 1982; Herbst, 1980; Herbst, 1989; Clifford, 1983; Clifford, 1995; Ogren, 1995; and Schwager, 1987.) Focusing explicitly on the normalites, I conducted extensive historical investigations of more than half of the state institutions that began as normals throughout the United States. I did archival research at seven campuses—in Castleton, Vermont; Geneseo, New York; Florence, Alabama; Pine Bluff, Arkansas; San Marcos, Texas; Oshkosh, Wisconsin; and San Jose, California—and reviewed various sources on close to one hundred other former normal schools. These sources include institutional histories, which I used selectively; like Frederick Rudolph, I "carefully culled episodes and illustrations" (Thelin, 1990, p. xviii) to use as primary material for my own analysis.

This article presents a socio-historical analysis of the students who attended state normal schools and their experiences in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. I profile "normalites" relative to the portrayal of nontraditional students in current literature. Then, I discuss the ways in which the state normal schools provided a meaningful higher education experience. While their official mission was preparing teachers, the characteristics of their student bodies forced the normals to expand their unofficial mission to include welcoming unsophisticated students into an engaging intellectual and public life. Indeed, "it was the normal schools . . . that really brought higher education to the people"

(Herbst, 1989, p. 142; see also Herbst, 1980). Although the normal schools' specific approaches to serving these students were more appropriate for their time than the present, it is important for current researchers to understand that these institutions did serve atypical students effectively. As student bodies continue to diversify in the twenty-first century, it is helpful to take a look through the lens of history at earlier nontraditional students.

Nontraditional Students

My in-depth examination of state normal schools reveals that their students had much in common with today's nontraditional students. Race (Westbrook & Sedlacek, 1991) and socioeconomic status (Lace, 1986) are prominent issues in literature on nontraditional students. Bean and Metzner (1985) acknowledge that these characteristics, along with gender, "might have differentiated traditional and nontraditional students a century ago" (p. 488). A look at the normalites convincingly confirms this hunch. At a time when women were an unwelcome minority on many coeducational campuses, they were a visible majority at state normal schools. A small number of normals, mainly in the South, restricted their enrollment to women only. But most normal schools were coeducational, with enrollments made up increasingly of women with each passing decade. Before the turn of the twentieth century, the enrollments at coeducational normals nationwide were between 25 and 90% female. At coeducational southern normals, only one-quarter to one-half of the students were women. Typical of normals outside the South, the institutions in Cedar Falls, Iowa, and Greeley, Colorado enrolled 70% women. After the turn of the century, throughout the country the percentage of students who were women was consistently well over 50, and occasionally higher than 90%.² The large numbers of female normalites are consistent with the schools' official mission of preparing students for the female-dominated profession of teaching.

In addition to women, state normal schools made higher education available to a significant number of students from minority racial and ethnic groups. Like Arkansas, which established the Branch Normal College at Pine Bluff euphemistically "for the poorer classes," most southern states established segregated normal schools for African-American students. Oklahoma and North Carolina also established segregated normal schools for Native American students.³ In addition, evidence suggests that several northern, majority-white normals served at least a limited number of minority students. In New York, Albany matriculated twenty-six Native American students in the late nineteenth century and

many South-European, Polish, and Jewish immigrants in the early twentieth century, and Oswego graduates of the 1890s remembered “an amiable American Indian girl,” “popular young men from the Hawaii Islands,” “a shy, quiet Negro girl,” and a “much respected” African American man. African American students, many of whom were from the South, had begun appearing at state normals from Westfield, Worcester, and Framingham, Massachusetts, to Normal, Illinois, soon after the Civil War. The normal schools in Pennsylvania welcomed several students from Puerto Rico and South America beginning in the 1890s, and Cecil E. Evans, who began his presidency at Southwest Texas State Normal School in San Marcos in 1911, once noted, “Very few Mexican students ever get high enough in the grades to reach us,” implying that at least a few Mexican students did “reach” the institution.⁴

Regardless of their race or gender, most normalites shared rather low socioeconomic status; they were, for the most part, the daughters and sons of working people, many of whom were struggling financially. Throughout the late nineteenth century, skilled, semiskilled, unskilled, and agricultural workers headed the homes of two-thirds of normalites in Massachusetts. The normal in Worcester reflected the growing industrial city, drawing primarily the children of skilled workers and laborers. During the first decade of the twentieth century, Southwest Texas kept very detailed records of the occupations of its students’ parents. Only 6% engaged in the professions of medicine and law; physicians, lawyers, teachers, ministers, druggists, engineers, editors, “newspapermen,” and architects amounted to only 14%. The parents of San-Marcos students were more likely to work in agriculture than any other trade: 47% were farmers, and ranchers, fruit growers, stockmen and dairymen were another 10%. In fact, farming, which was in economic crisis throughout most of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the United States, shaped the lives of a majority of normalites. During the late nineteenth century, nearly two-thirds of students at Cedar Falls, Iowa, were from farming families. Likewise, in 1889, the parents of 428 of the 639 students at Emporia Kansas, were farmers. Students at Pine Bluff often had to arrive at school late in the fall and leave early in the spring, in order to help their families with harvests and plantings.⁵

The families of many normal-school students could not afford traditional higher education. For example, George Martin graduated as valedictorian of his Massachusetts high-school class in 1855 and was unable to fulfill his plan to attend Amherst College because of a lack of funds. Martin then worked for seven years and was finally able to enter Bridge-water Normal in 1862. Some normalites were from such impoverished backgrounds that the schools gained a reputation for serving the poor. A

Vermont newspaper described the normal in Castleton as catering to the “calico-attired country girl of limited means,” and in Westfield, Massachusetts, where the normal school enrolled an especially high number of children of small farmers, “normal” was a disparaging name for a poor person. Similarly, some residents of Oswego, New York, referred to normalites there as “state paupers.” Pine-Bluff students made light of their reputation in the following lines from a late-1920s school cheer: “State School, State School, yes we are the state school / Nothing new or formal, no Sir! / Our hair is shaggy and our clothes are baggy / But they’ll soon be raggy, Yea!” Throughout the country, many normal-school students could have yelled along.⁶

In addition to being female, minorities, or of low socioeconomic standing, today’s nontraditional students often are older than the typical eighteen to twenty-two years (Bean & Metzner, 1985; Bendixen-Noe, 1998; Lace, 1986; Metzner & Bean, 1987; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1998; Zwerling, 1992). Although Bean and Metzner do not acknowledge it, this is another factor that also differentiated traditional and nontraditional students in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Many normalites—as well as some students at colleges and universities—were mature in age. Throughout the country, most normal-school students were older than the minimum state-stipulated fifteen or sixteen years. Michael Dignam, who graduated in 1882 from Westfield, Massachusetts, remembered, “The pupils were all mature, no one under 20; the ages ranged as high as 26 or 28.” A member of the class of 1888 at Oshkosh, Wisconsin lyrically explained: “In age the class varies all the way from the blushing maiden in her teens, filled with anticipation of the future, and the aspiring youth yearning for independence, to the retrospective and reflective minds of maturer years.” From Oneonta, New York to Greeley, Colorado, normal schools in the late 1880s and early 1890s reported that on average their entering students were more than 20 years old. In 1886, the first class at Tempe averaged 19.4 years in age; at 26 and 30 years old, respectively, Julia A. McDonald and James M. Patterson were among the oldest students. When the all-female state normal in Greensboro, North Carolina opened in 1892, the average age of entering students was close to 20 years. Throughout the 1890s and 1900s, women students at Oneonta continued to enter at an average age of over 20 years, while their male classmates were closer to 22. In 1903, the first class at San Marcos signed in at 20.1 years, with one student who was 38 years old. The normal school in Plattsburgh, New York, had at least a couple of mature students during the 1910s—there were two mother-daughter pairs on campus.⁷

The literature on nontraditional students further characterizes them as

part-time attenders and commuters (Bean & Metzner, 1985; Gilley & Hawkes, 1989; Lace, 1986; Metzner & Bean, 1987; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1998). At West Virginia's normal in West Liberty, some students commuted to campus in an effort to save money. Similarly, many normalites at the Territorial Normal School in Tempe, Arizona, during the decade or so after it opened in 1886, commuted. One male student later explained, "I rode horseback from Mesa to Tempe and returned each day, milked six cows morning and evening, and each morning had to run my horses down before I could go to Tempe. It took nearly 45 minutes to make the distance."⁸ Aside from a few scattered examples, however, commuting from home was rare among normalites whose families didn't happen to live within walking distance of campus; after all, transportation was limited. There is no evidence that any students in attendance at a normal school attended part-time. Looking at the normalites serves as a reminder, though, that attending part-time and commuting are not intrinsic personal characteristics in the way that age, race, class, and gender are. Present-day students attend part-time and commute *because* they cannot afford to attend full-time or live on campus and/or their family or life commitments prohibit them from devoting themselves exclusively to the pursuit of higher education. Normalites clearly shared the personal traits that create the special conditions of attendance for today's nontraditional students, but they lived under different historical conditions. Thus, although most were not commuters, many normalites, like today's nontraditional students, arrived with significant work experience and found it necessary to work while attending normal school.

Many state normal-school students had work experience, usually as teachers, prior to matriculation. As early as the 1840s and early 1850s at Bridgewater, "nearly all" of the students had themselves taught school. Of the 2,500 students who enrolled at Oswego between its opening in the mid-1860s and 1880, more than 1,000 had teaching experience, with an average of three years in the classroom. During the late 1880s, more than half of the students at Farmington, Maine arrived with teaching experience. Outside the Northeast, it was also very common for normalites to have work experience as teachers. At Oshkosh in 1879 as well as in 1884, half of the students had taught, and among them the average time spent in front of a class was 2.6 years. Between 1892 and 1908, the collective student body at Oshkosh averaged one year of experience. In their class histories, students conveyed the same idea a bit more creatively: The class of 1895 taught "more than a thousand months," and the brains of members of the class of 1896 bore "unsightly marks . . . caused by patient efforts to impress the American youth in our rural dis-

tricts with the precept, knowledge is power.” Nearly half of the normalites at Emporia, Kansas, in the late 1880s taught before entering the normal, many for five or more years. Tempe’s Julia McDonald and James Patterson were former teachers, as were more than 34% of the students at Florence, Alabama, around the turn of the century.⁹

Many normalites worked while enrolled, and self-supporting students were not unusual at the state normals. In 1882, President Edwin Hewett of Illinois State Normal University reported, “Many of our students . . . are dependent upon their own exertions for means”; and a decade or so later Principal John Mahelm Berry Sill of the State Normal School in Ypsilanti, Michigan, said, “Our students are working young men and women who earn their little money by the hardest toil.” Just after the turn of the twentieth century, one-third of the students at Florence “earned their own money to pay expenses,” while Oregon’s State Superintendent of Public Instruction expressed concern about the large numbers of “self-supporting” normalites, urging, “Greater precaution must be exercised to prevent the ambitious from overworking than to rouse the sluggards.” Gender often determined the term-time jobs normalites were able to find: in New York, female students at Oneonta worked as babysitters or maids, while male students at Oswego shoveled snow, sold various products, or worked as janitors.¹⁰ Throughout the country, it was common for normalites to take leaves of absence to earn the necessary money to continue their education, an earlier approach to being a part-time student. Most often, they taught in rural schools for one or more terms before returning to normal school. For example, a student at Nebraska’s Peru State Normal School in 1873 soon found himself short of money. He later remembered:

My graduation looked far off to me and my limited means made it necessary to quit school for a while and return to the farm. But Dr. Curry, then principal, learning my predicament found me a country school in Otoe county that enabled me to return again after I had finished my school. This I continued to do, alternating between teaching and going to school until I finally graduated in the spring of 1879.¹¹

Like today’s nontraditional students, normalites found ways to overcome their financial limitations.

Although work experience as well as age must have fostered a certain level of maturity among normal-school students, they were hardly worldly-wise. In fact, socio-historical examination of normalites reveals that many were quite provincial, or lacked sophistication. This significant characteristic is curiously absent from the literature on nontraditional students, but it is unmistakable in accounts of the normal schools. A chronicler of Bridgewater State Normal School observed, “It is hard

for us to conceive how provincial these students were. Most of them had never been far from their own towns. . . ." Sarah A. Dixon, who graduated from Bridgewater in 1885, called herself "a sip of a girl from an isolated shore home." Throughout the country, normalites were predominantly from very small, often very rural, towns and villages. At Arkansas' Branch Normal College for black students, the vast majority of students were from the rural areas surrounding Pine Bluff. Between the 1880s and the 1900s, 23 to 30% of all Oshkosh, Wisconsin, students hailed from Oshkosh, which was a booming lumber town. Another 8% or fewer of the students came from other lumber towns in the area, and only a few hailed from the bigger cities of Milwaukee, Madison, and, occasionally, Chicago. More than half of the students were from much smaller, rural towns. The 1890s football cheer for the normal in Geneseo, New York, included a line that would also have suited most other normals: "We came to the gridiron fresh from verdant farms." Meanwhile, many of the students at California's state normal in Chico were from very remote mountain settlements in the northern part of the state. When they arrived at the normal, Chico was the largest town they had ever seen.¹²

It is hardly surprising that students from such remote areas tended to be unpolished. For many years after the 1868 establishment of the state normal in Peru, the many students there who had lived "isolated lives" tended to be "ignorant of the social ways incident to more thickly settled portions of the country; hence, they sometimes appeared reserved and awkward." A student at Peru in the late nineteenth century remembered, "Girls with brown faces and plain clothing" and "boys with calloused hands." Early in the twentieth century, the principal at Willimantic, Connecticut, complained, "Many of our students are crude. Their manner of talking, their table manners, their actions often show a decided lack of culture."¹³ Sensitive to the implied class prejudice, present-day administrators and researchers would hesitate to make observations such as these. Nontraditional students likely have similar rough edges, however, and a non-pejorative understanding of their provincialism might be an important step toward serving them more effectively. While the normalites' lack of sophistication frustrated Willimantic's principal, it also made them hungry for inspiration. For example, an Oshkosh student declared:

When one for the first time beholds an imposing structure, whether reared by man's stalwart arm or nature's majestic art, impressions are made upon the delicate parchment of the mind which age can not dim nor time obliterate. Such is the character of my first impressions on beholding the Oshkosh Normal. Its architectural symmetry symbolizes the noble educational system in

which it forms an important factor; . . . its spacious assembly room and its commodious recitation rooms silently insinuate to the pupil the possibilities of mental expansion, while each high ceiling proclaims the aphorism, "There is always room at the top."¹⁴

Attendance at state normal schools was a significant departure in the theretofore unsophisticated lives of many students. As the next section explains, the state normals not only accepted students from nontraditional backgrounds, but they also engaged their sense of awe to create an atmosphere that embraced them.

Embracing Nontraditional Students

This examination of state normal-school students has suggested that the types of students now considered to be nontraditional were prominent in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries on state normal-school campuses. A century later, researchers have reported on—and forecasted further—demographic changes in higher education. To meet this challenge, Arthur Levine has called for "better serving the underserved" (Levine & Associates, 1989, p. 172), and much of the literature on nontraditional students is concerned with how to do this (see, for example, Astin, 1993; Gilley & Hawkes, 1989; Lace, 1986; Richardson & Skinner, 1992). It might also be useful for current administrators, as well as researchers, simply to understand that they are not pioneers in their efforts to welcome atypical students to college campuses. State normal schools hardly "underserved" these students, but instead enabled them to take advantage of an engaging intellectual life and to become involved in public life, which encouraged them to move far beyond their humble backgrounds. Normal-school administrators and faculty members' first step, more than a half-century before government programs designed to bring underprivileged students into institutions of higher education, was to ensure that the normals were accessible and affordable for all students.

Admission requirements at state normal schools were fairly loose and somewhat flexible. They did not require matriculants to be high-school graduates until education at that level was attainable by most residents of their states, which generally was not until the early twentieth century. Before they required high-school graduation, normal schools administered admission examinations, but prospective students could present teaching credentials or diplomas instead of sitting for them. Previous years' exams were often published in normal-school catalogues, making them available to students preparing for future admission. In the late 1870s, San Jose, California published questions in arithmetic, grammar,

geography, and spelling for admission to the junior class and additional questions for admission to the “middle” and senior classes. Applicants to Oshkosh, Wisconsin, during the 1880s had to score 70% or better in reading and spelling, arithmetic, grammar, geography, and U.S. history. In Vermont, Castleton’s admission exam in the early 1890s covered spelling, arithmetic, physiology, grammar, geography, Vermont history, U.S. history, and civics.¹⁵ In addition to academic qualifications, other admission requirements were fairly easy to acquire. Applicants had to be 15 or 16 (or 14, at Pine Bluff, Arkansas) years in age, and usually of good “moral character” and health, presumably as prerequisites for being good teachers in the future.¹⁶

In addition to setting fairly easy standards for admission, many state normal schools assured accessibility by providing detailed directions to campus and individual assistance with settling in. Many normal schools did everything short of printing train schedules in their catalogs. For example, an Oshkosh catalog described the “numerous lines of railroad and river steamers entering the city, as well as its favorable location.” Similarly, a bulletin for the normal in Florence, Alabama, explained that the “main line of the Southern Railway from Chattanooga passes through Sheffield, and all passenger trains are met there by electric cars which deliver passengers in Florence in about twenty minutes.”¹⁷ After careful instructions helped many students reach campus, the administration—which often consisted solely of the president or principal—literally reached out to individual new students. During the 1870s, 1880s, and 1890s, Oshkosh’s Principal George Albee helped each new student get situated and plan a course schedule. The 1907–1908 Geneseo, New York, catalog declared, “Students both old and new are urged to consult the Principal freely regarding their work and their plans for the future.” Clark Davis, who attended Ypsilanti State Normal School in Michigan, remembered that upon arrival in Ypsilanti, “I made my first call upon the man whom I had been writing—namely, President Jones. He treated me cordially and courteously, received me at his home, took me to his office, and walked over some of the city streets to show me rooming houses and boarding houses.”¹⁸

While attainable admission requirements and approachable principals eased many students’ adjustment to normal school, probably the most important factor in accessibility was affordability. Most state normal schools charged a modest tuition, which they waived for students who signed a pledge to teach in the state after graduation, usually for no more than a few years. The 1879 catalog for Bridgewater, Massachusetts, explained: “Tuition is free to all who comply with the condition of teaching in the schools of Massachusetts.” Such contracts were in the states’

interest because they increased the teacher supply, but tuition waivers also made a normal-school education affordable for many students. Those who signed pledges to teach had only to buy or rent books, and pay for supplies, transportation, room, board, and perhaps activities fees or music lessons. And at many institutions, financial help from the state was also available for these expenses. The Bridgewater catalog also explained: "The State makes an annual appropriation . . . which is distributed at the close of each term among pupils from Massachusetts who merit and need the aid, in sums varying according to the distance of their residences from Bridgewater."¹⁹ Similarly, during the 1880s the state of Kansas began to reimburse Emporia students three cents per mile for travel beyond one hundred miles; and until 1897, Geneseo students who signed the declaration to teach received reimbursement for travel costs. Ypsilanti's Principal Sill persuaded the state legislature to provide free textbooks, arguing that "the cost of books is often 'the last straw that breaks the camel's back.'" In other states, government officials were directly involved in granting subsidies. Beginning in 1897, each member of the Alabama legislature was able to nominate a student for a two-year normal-school scholarship, which covered tuition and incidental fees; those students appointed by senators also received a grant for boarding costs. Between 1903 and 1909, normalites in Texas could also earn "scholarship appointments," which covered boarding costs, through appointments by their senators, congressmen, or even the governor.²⁰

Increasing numbers of campus scholarships and loan funds helped normal students pay expenses that the state did not cover. As early as 1878, Pine Bluff, Arkansas, had an "honorary scholars" program, which provided scholarships for students who passed an exam. For many years beginning in 1882, the Nashville-based Peabody Fund provided for sixteen annual scholarships at Florence, and additional scholarships at other southern normals. Fairly widespread by the early twentieth century, institution-based scholarships were usually funded by and named for former faculty members or graduating classes.²¹ If all else failed, the personal efforts of principals and faculty members occasionally enabled individual students to overcome remaining financial obstacles. Long-serving principals, such as Edward Sheldon at Oswego, New York (1861–1897), Percy Bugbee at Oneonta, New York (1898–1933), Cecil Evans at San Marcos, Texas (1911–1942), E. E. Smith at Fayetteville, North Carolina (1883–1933), and many others lent their own money to students in distress. Smith and Pine Bluff's Joseph Corbin (1875–1902), both principals of all-black normal schools, were purposely lax in collecting tuition and fees from students they knew to be struggling; Smith also accepted farm products in lieu of currency.²² These individual ef-

forts, which filled some of the cracks between state-sponsored tuition waivers and subsidies, as well as campus scholarships and loan funds, helped to make normal schools affordable—so affordable that, during the early 1910s, Geneseo catalogs included the assurance that “no worthy student ever leaves Geneseo because of lack of funds with which to complete the course.”²³

Beyond assuring that students from atypical backgrounds enjoyed easy access, state normal schools offered an atmosphere in which these students thrived. The literature on today’s nontraditional students stresses “academic integration” (Metzner & Bean, 1987, p. 30), or “incorporation or support of the students’ needs” in “a new, stronger academic community” (Gilley & Hawkes, 1989, p. 34; see also Astin, 1993). Another important issue is scale: the smaller the scale of the institution as a whole or designated programs within it, the higher the comfort level of nontraditional students (Richardson & Skinner, 1992). Most normal schools were small in scale, but size was only one factor in an atmosphere that embraced students from “underserved” backgrounds. Their needs subtly yet ubiquitously shaped these institutions in such a way that serving them was simply intrinsic to the normals’ strong academic community. Without special services or programs aimed at nontraditional students, normal schools offered them a comfortable and inclusive intellectual life and numerous opportunities for leadership and involvement in public life. Indeed, state normal schools played a “total adult socializing” (Bean & Metzner, 1985, p. 488) role in the lives of their students, suggesting an alternative to the notion that nontraditional students are “not greatly influenced by the social environment” (Bean & Metzner, 1985, p. 489) in institutions of higher education.

State normal schools created a lively and challenging intellectual life for all students. The bedrock of a strong academic community, the formal curriculum constructively recognized students’ limited background and helped them reach further. The normal principals and faculties found that many of their students, especially before the turn of the twentieth century, arrived with little more than an elementary-level education. Because they sought to prepare well-rounded teachers, the normals began from where the students’ prior education left off, offering basic and more advanced studies in academic disciplines as well as teaching methods. All students focused on a core of academic studies in mathematics, the sciences, history and civics, and English and language arts. The normals’ approach to teaching these subjects allowed students comfortably to gain a certain amount of high-status knowledge.

Western culture wove its way through the required curriculum. Beginning with Greece and Rome, historical studies covered the highlights of

Western civilization. In 1894, for example, the catalog for Westfield Normal School in Massachusetts explained that the “General History” course included “Europe from the beginning of the Middle Ages to the present time.” Bridgewater imported from London “casts, models, and flat copies” of great art works. The aspect of Western culture that occupied the largest part of the required curriculum was what the normal in Willimantic, Connecticut, called, “The best literary works.” There, according to the 1890 catalog, the English literature course covered “Dickens to Burns” during the second term, “Burns to Bacon” during the third term, and “Bacon to Chaucer” during the fourth term. Shakespeare was ever-present on normal-school reading lists; at Westfield, students read *The Merchant of Venice*, *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet* or *Macbeth*, as well as a comedy. In addition to English literature, students at Bridgewater studied American poets and writers such as Longfellow, Whittier, and Hawthorne. Modern and ancient languages were generally optional studies, but institutions as diverse as Castleton, Pine Bluff, and the Territorial Normal School in Tempe, Arizona, required Latin.²⁴

Through both required and elective subjects, normal-school students also immersed themselves in another passion of the middle and upper classes in the late nineteenth century: the natural sciences. Between the 1870s and the 1900s, virtually all normal students took short courses in physiology, geography, botany, and natural philosophy (called nature study after the turn of the century), as well as at least a few of the following subjects: geology, mineralogy, chemistry, zoology, physics, and astronomy. Together, they performed physical and chemical experiments with rudimentary apparatus, dissected animals, and undertook field expeditions to study local land forms and flora. In keeping with the late-nineteenth-century zeal for scientific collecting, many normal schools amassed sizable collections of mineralogical, geological, physiological, zoological, and even entomological “specimens.” For example, beginning in the 1860s, the state normal in Winona, Minnesota, had a growing collection of fossils and minerals from quarries and railway cuts. In 1875 the school purchased a collection of “minerals, fossils, casts, corals, sponges, and shells,” which also contained “the partial remains of a Mastodon skeleton.” By the 1880s, the normal’s museum of natural history also had a bird collection. Science instruction and collections not only enabled students to study fossils, minerals, and animals, but also invited them to share the passion for science.²⁵

While the normal schools’ formal curriculum established a comfortable academic community, activities outside the classroom strengthened it, intensifying students’ intellectual socialization. By the 1870s and increasingly each year thereafter, normal students founded and partici-

pated in countless societies, clubs, and publications. These organizations contributed to the vibrant campus intellectual life, which enabled students to grow immensely through intense interaction with one another, their professors, and campus visitors. Academic clubs focused on a variety of topics, primarily in the sciences and foreign languages, and tended to be fairly short-lived. Other student organizations, as well as visiting speakers and performers, exposed students to areas of high culture that were generally outside the formal curriculum, especially classical music and art history.

But it was the literary societies, by far the most long-lived, popular, and far-reaching student organizations, that most facilitated the involvement of these nontraditional students in the life of the mind. Societies met weekly or biweekly, usually on Friday or Saturday afternoon or evening, to execute well-planned programs of orations, debates, moderated discussions, skits, and musical entertainment. In San Jose, the State Normal School's 1900 catalog reported, "The purpose of these societies is to acquaint their members with the customs and practices of deliberative bodies, to give an impetus to literary investigation, and to develop a talent for literary pursuits, public speaking, and extemporaneous discussions." Meetings were occasionally open to the public, and "joint meetings" between two societies were quite common; one at San Jose in 1887 drew over 400 spectators. At the state normal in Greeley, Colorado, the two literary societies were great rivals, and competed each spring in oratory, essays, and debate in the town's Opera House before a large audience. In the South and the East, where social mores were generally traditional, literary societies were usually single-sex. In a unique arrangement, New York's normal schools housed branches of statewide societies. Those for women included Clionian, Arethusa, Alpha Delta, and Agonian; and those for men included Delphic and Philalethean. Gender segregation was less rigid in the Midwest and West. The Lyceum, Literati, and Belles-Lettres societies at Emporia were all coeducational, as were the Roosevelt, Sophoclean, and Emersonian societies at New Mexico Normal University in Las Vegas. Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the majority of normalites belonged to literary societies. Beginning in the late 1880s, some normals, such as those in Tempe, Arizona, and Cedar Falls, Iowa, had the added incentive of earning credit for society work. A few normals, such as Illinois Normal University, and Oklahoma's Southwestern State Normal School, required membership.²⁶

Literary societies enabled students to further pursue some of the topics covered in the curriculum. The main focus, of course, was literature; societies regularly studied a variety of British and American authors.

The Browning clubs at Florence and Oshkosh were named for Elizabeth Barrett Browning, a favorite among their members, just as the Shakespeare(n) societies at Cedar Falls, San Jose, and San Marcos were named for the great playwright. Other popular British authors included Charles Dickens, Jane Austin, and Alfred, Lord Tennyson. Studies of the poetry and prose of John Greenleaf Whittier, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Washington Irving, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Mark Twain, deepened students' familiarity with American literary culture. San Marcos' Every Day Society declared Irving its "patron saint," and imitated him in the 1909 yearbook, presenting a supposed "unpublished tale" in which a lost hunter dreamt of "the girls of the land where the sweet peas grow," who were suspiciously similar to Every-Day members. In many literary societies, students also explored great literature by performing it. At Oneonta, for example, various societies staged Tennyson's *The Princess* in 1892, Shakespeare's *As You Like It* and *The Merchant of Venice* in 1901, and Dickens' *Tom Pinch* in 1905.²⁷

Perhaps the most clear illustration of how the normals' academic community allowed students comfortably to broaden their horizons is the societies' vicarious travels throughout the United States and the world. In 1876, members of the Normal School Philologist Society at Westfield enjoyed "an illustrated lecture. . . . An Account of his (Mr. Diller's) Geological Vacation . . . up the Valley in the State of New York." In 1899, "Miss Dopp favored" Oshkosh's Phoenix "society with some of her experiences among the Mormons in Salt Lake City." A decade or so later, a program entitled "Travels in the West" took Florence's Dixie society, figuratively, to Salt Lake City and Yellowstone National Park. Students' vicarious travels also took them to Europe and more foreign locales. In 1880–1881, one literary society at Oshkosh studied Spain and Germany, and in other years both San Marcos' Comenian and Oshkosh's Phoenix studied China. The normal students' world shrank as they acquainted themselves with many distant regions. Together, the literary societies and the formal curriculum created an atmosphere that welcomed normalites into a new intellectual world. Burt N. Timbie, Bridgewater '96, remembered, "These were years of mind and soul awakening. We came to love learning for learning's sake."²⁸

Normalites' socialization was not limited to academic areas; as complete socializing institutions, state normal schools also enabled students to refine the way they carried and presented themselves. The formal curriculum required all students to polish their style of written and oral expression. Rhetoric, composition, and declamation were curricular staples. Through these and other classes, the normals sought to provide "practical training in the correct and effective use of our mother tongue"

and “cultivate the individual student’s powers of expression in both oral and written language.” Students honed their powers of expression through numerous writing assignments, as well as public speaking requirements. Most normal schools required each student to present some sort of schoolwide public declamation at least once, but often on a weekly or monthly basis. For example, “Friday Afternoon Exercises” began at Geneseo in 1877; for the next few decades, classes took turns presenting programs of essays, readings, and recitations. At most normal schools, commencement addresses by all or some of the graduating students, depending on the size of the class, were the culmination of terms of work.²⁹

Literary societies also focused on refining their members’ styles of expression and composition. Students wrote and delivered orations and essays on different subjects from week to week. Several of the all-male groups, such as The Normal Congress at Bridgewater and The Standard Society at Buffalo, focused on parliamentary procedure. A debate was usually the focal point of the literary society meeting; debating fostered poise, precision, and accuracy in oral communication. In the Midwest, statewide and even interstate normal-school debate and oratorical contests were common and attracted large crowds. After Oshkosh’s Elizabeth Shepard won the Wisconsin state contest with her speech on Ulysses S. Grant, her classmates reported, “For Grant when she spoke in electrical tones . . . She made the cold shivers run down our backbones.” Buoyed by the normals’ vibrant academic community, women commonly orated and debated in public in the Midwest and West, and occasionally in the East. When they did so, they ironically gained cultural polish while violating the gender conventions of high society. Society members also refined their writing skills by producing serial newspapers or magazines; many normal-school student publications began in the societies. Typical titles were: *Normal Thought*, published by the Standard Society at Buffalo; *Normal Ray*, published by the Baconian Literary Society at the State Normal School of Troy, Alabama; and *The Students’ Offering*, which was a coordinated effort by all of the literary societies at Cedar Falls.³⁰

Not only did the literary societies increase students’ comfort with public speaking and writing, but they, along with class organizations and organized athletics, also fostered normalites’ self-confidence as leaders and participants in public life. Students took advantage of multiple leadership opportunities. The societies, as well as organizations ranging from academic clubs to YW- and YMCAs all had student officers. By the 1880s, classes elected officers and, beginning in the 1890s, student government associations began to appear. Men served as presidents of coed-

ucational organizations in numbers disproportionately greater than their representation on campus, but women did occasionally serve as president and often occupied other class offices. The constitution of the campuswide self-government association formed at Oshkosh in 1896 stipulated that each class would be represented by one woman and one man. When San Jose's Student Body in 1898 elected Harriet Quilty its first president, *The Normal Pennant* remarked, "Miss Quilty needs no further introduction to our students, her great abilities as a leader are known from Juniors to Seniors." Quilty and other normalites seized the unusual opportunity to serve in a leadership role.³¹

On the athletic fields and basketball courts, normalites gained further experience as public actors in a strong community. Physical activity was a long-standing part of normal life, and by the mid 1890s, athletic competitions were quite prominent. Illinois Normal held its first annual field day in 1895, including running races, shot-put, discus and hammer throws, tennis, and bicycle races. In team sports, men participated in football as well as baseball and basketball, but the relatively small numbers of male students meant a relatively low profile for these intramural and occasional intercollegiate teams. Basketball was really the territory of female normalites, and it soon became wildly popular. Illinois Normal inaugurated intramural competition among women's teams in 1895, as did Ellensburg, Washington, where a local newspaper reported, "The ladies are getting to be splendid players." In 1902 Ellensburg's women players began interscholastic competition. Beginning at the turn of the century, women and men diversified their athletic endeavors to include sports such as tennis and hockey, but women's basketball continued to draw the most spectators. At Oshkosh, the men reported, "They did make plays and no mistake / Those girls in blue and yellow; / And to spur on the lusty crowd / We cheered them to a fellow." Along with improving their level of fitness, these athletes undoubtedly gained poise as they performed in a public setting.³²

Finally, the broader social atmosphere of the normals was remarkably vibrant, prompting one observer to write that San Jose exuded "enthusiasm and mutual confidence." At the most formal level, students attended all sorts of anniversary celebrations and building dedications, which brought a sense of history and grandeur to campus. Usually spanning several days, graduation ceremonies generally included a baccalaureate sermon by a local minister, academic speeches by all graduates or student representatives of the senior class, and speeches by the principal or perhaps a visiting dignitary, as well as the ceremonial conferring of degrees. In addition, students created their own tradition of more- and less-formal events. In end-of-the-year "class day" celebrations, they took the

stage to read the class history and prophesy and make other speeches. At Castleton in the late 1890s, celebrations included addresses to the juniors that offered advice as well as gentle gibes. From week to week, campus life was alive with other student-initiated events; all sorts of receptions and socials provided normalites with opportunities to grow more comfortable as public actors. At one such reception, sponsored by the YWCA at San Jose, a leader announced at regular intervals new conversation topics including “the last book I read,” the weather, and even “women’s sphere.” This gathering, like countless others on normal campuses, was virtually a seminar on the mores of polite society. With so many opportunities to involve oneself in a robust and inclusive academic community, it is hardly surprising that the “sip of a girl from an isolated shore home” in Massachusetts described attending normal school as, “not unlike birth into another world.”³³

Conclusion

State normal schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries not only welcomed women, members of minority groups, and students with other nontypical characteristics, but also included them in a rich intellectual and social community and encouraged them to reach beyond their unprivileged backgrounds. While the official mission of the normal schools was simply teacher preparation, the unofficial mission of serving nontraditional students was integral to these institutions. Reflecting on the later transformation of former normal schools into universities, E. Alden Dunham (1969) observed, “One of the ironies of this movement is that a first-class teachers college may become a third-class university as it grows and changes its function” (p. 1). Thus, in the search for status, the former normals gave up their distinctive identity, including the behind-the-scenes yet ground-breaking mission of serving nontraditional students. More than three decades ago, Dunham (1969) saw the “question of model, of institutional purpose” as “the greatest single problem” facing state colleges and regional universities, because they lost “institutional coherence, warmth, and friendliness” as “the atmosphere” changed “from soft to hard” (pp. 155–156). The new “hard” environment marginalized the needs of nontraditional students. Rethinking the notion of “nontraditional” from the historical perspective of state normal schools is an important reminder not only of atypical students’ rich history in higher education, but also of what higher education institutions and society stand to lose in turning away from the mission—whether official or unofficial—of serving these students.

Notes

¹Gillan quoted in *Semi-centennial history of the Illinois State Normal University, 1857–1907*. Normal, IL: Illinois State Normal University, 1907, p. 202.

²David Sands Wright, *Fifty years at the Teachers College: Historical and personal reminiscences*. Cedar Falls: Iowa State Teachers College, 1926, p. 130; William Frederick Hartman, *The history of Colorado State College of Education: The normal school period, 1890–1911*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College of Education, 1951, p. 153; United States Commissioner/Bureau of Education, *Reports and Bulletins*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1868–1945.

³Most black normal schools later became agricultural and mechanical colleges, then universities. North Carolina established a normal school for Native American students in Pembroke, and Oklahoma established one in Tahlequah.

⁴William Marshall French & Florence Smith French, *College of the Empire State: A Centennial history of The New York State College for Teachers at Albany*. Albany, 1944, pp. 95, 258; Oswego students quoted in Dorothy Rogers, *Fountainhead of teacher education: A century in the Sheldon Tradition*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961, p. 59; Robert T. Brown, *The rise and fall of the people's colleges: The Westfield Normal School, 1839–1914*. Westfield, MA: Institute for Massachusetts Studies, Westfield State College, 1988, pp. 61–62; Robert McGraw, A Century of Service. In Herb Taylor (Ed.), *The first 100 years: Worcester State College*. Worcester, MA: Worcester State College, Office of Community Services, 1974, Section 4 (no page nos.); Louie G. Ramsdell, First hundred years of the first state normal school in America: The State Teachers College at Framingham, Massachusetts—1839–1939. In *First state normal school in America: The State Teachers College at Framingham, Massachusetts*. Framingham, MA: The Alumnae Association of the State Teachers College at Framingham, Massachusetts, 1959, p. 11; Helen E. Marshall, *Grandest of enterprises: Illinois State Normal University, 1857–1957*. Normal, IL: Illinois State Normal University, 1956, p. 133; Elizabeth Tyler Bugaighis, *Blackboard diplomacy: The role of American normal schools in exporting education to Latin America, 1891–1924*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 2000; Tom W. Nichols, *Rugged summit*. San Marcos, TX, 1970, p. 94.

⁵David A. Gould, *Policy and pedagogues: School reform and teacher professionalization in Massachusetts, 1840–1920*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, 1977, p. 87; Brown, *The rise and fall of the people's colleges*, p. 79; Percentages of Southwest Texas parents calculated from data in *Announcement of the Southwest Texas State Normal School for the annual session 1904–1905, 1905–1906, 1906–1907, 1907–1908, 1908–1909, 1909–1910, 1910–1911*. Austin: State Printers, 1903–1910; Irving H. Hart, *The first 75 Years*. Cedar Falls, IA: Iowa State Teachers College, 1951, p. 116; *A history of the State Normal School of Kansas for the first twenty-five years*. Emporia, KS, 1889, p. 45; Elizabeth L. Wheeler, Isaac Fisher: The frustrations of a Negro educator at Branch Normal College, 1902–1911. *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly*, 41 (Spring 1982), 5.

⁶Arthur Clarke Boyden, *Albert Gardner Boyden and the Bridgewater State Normal School: A memorial volume*. Bridgewater, MA: Arthur H. Willis, 1919, p. 30; newspaper quoted in Irene Goldgraben, And the glory of the latter house shall be greater than that of the former. In *And the glory of the latter house shall be greater than that of the former: An informal history of Castleton State College*. Castleton, VT, 1968, p. 19; Brown, *The rise and fall of the people's colleges*, p. 89; Rogers, *Oswego: Fountainhead*, p. 58; cheer quoted in *The Arkansasyer*. Pine Bluff, AR: Faculty of Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, 1 (1928), p. 1. In *Keepers of the spirit: The L. A. Davis, Sr. Historical Collection*, Exhibit, Isaac S. Hathaway-John M. Howard Fine Arts Center, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, Pine Bluff, AR, May 1995.

⁷Dignam quoted in Work Projects Administration in the State of Massachusetts, *The*

State Teachers College at Westfield. Boston: State Department of Education, 1941, p. 53; Class day program, 1888, University of Wisconsin—Oshkosh Archives, Area Research Center, Polk Library, Oshkosh, WI, p. 18; Carey W. Brush, *In honor and good faith: A history of the State University College at Oneonta, New York*. Oneonta, NY: The Faculty-Student Association of State University Teachers College at Oneonta, 1965, pp. 45, 46, 114; Hartman, *The history of Colorado State College of Education*, p. 154; Ernest J. Hopkins & Alfred Thomas, Jr., *The Arizona State University story*. Phoenix: Southwest Publishing Co., 1960, pp. 85–86; Elisabeth Ann Bowles, *A good beginning: The first four decades of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1967, pp. 15–16; ages of San-Marcos students calculated from data in Student Registers, 1903–1910, box 70, series 3, Southwest Texas State University Archives, Special Collections, Alkek Library, San Marcos, TX; Douglas R. Skopp, *Bright with promise: From the normal and training school to SUNY Plattsburg, 1889–1989*. Norfolk, VA: The Donning Company, 1989, pp. 62–63.

⁸Frank T. Reuter, *West Liberty State College: The first 125 years*. West Liberty, WV: West Liberty State College, 1963, p. 121; L. B. Johnson (not Lyndon Baines) quoted in Hopkins and Thomas, *The Arizona State University story* p. 93.

⁹George H. Martin, The Bridgewater Spirit. In *Seventy-fifth anniversary of the state normal school, Bridgewater, Massachusetts, June 19, 1915*. Bridgewater, MA: Arthur H. Willis, 1915, p. 13; Rogers, *Oswego: Fountainhead*, p. 59; Farmington statistics based on information in George C. Purington, *History of the state normal school, Farmington, Maine*. Farmington, ME: Knowlton, McLeary & Co., 1889, pp. 141–174; Oshkosh statistics calculated from *Annual catalogue of the state normal school at Oshkosh, Wis., for the school year 1879–80, 1884–85, 1889–90, 1891–92, 1893–94, 1895–96, 1897–98, 1899–1900, 1901–1902*. Oshkosh, WI, 1880–1902, and *Oshkosh State Normal School Bulletin* (Oshkosh, WI), 1 (June 1904); 3 (June 1906); 5 (June 1908); quotations from Class day programs (Oshkosh), 1895, p. 18; 1896, p. 16; *A history of the State Normal School of Kansas*, p. 43; Hopkins & Thomas, *The Arizona State University story*, 85–86; Florence data calculated using statistics in State Superintendent of Education (Alabama), *Reports, 1899 and 1900*. Montgomery, AL, pp. 31–32; 1901–1902, p. 117.

¹⁰Hewett quoted in Sandra D. Harmon, The voice, pen and influence of our women are abroad in the land: Women and the Illinois State Normal University, 1857–1899. In Catherine Hobbs (Ed.), *Nineteenth-century women learn to write*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1995, p. 95; Egbert R. Isbell, *A history of Eastern Michigan University, 1849–1965*. Ypsilanti, MI: Eastern Michigan University Press, 1971, p. 138; State Superintendent of Education (Alabama), *Report, 1901–1902*, p. 117; Ellis A. Stebbins, *The OCE story*. Monmouth, OR: Oregon College of Education, 1973, p. 46; Brush, *In honor and good faith*, p. 114; Rogers, *Oswego: Fountainhead*, p. 122.

¹¹J. M. McKenzie, *History of Peru State Normal*. Auburn, NE: *The Nemaha County Republican*, 1911, p. 98.

¹²Martin, The Bridgewater spirit, p. 14; Dixon quoted in Boyden, *Albert Gardner Boyden and the Bridgewater State Normal School*, p. 143; State Superintendent of Public Instruction (AR), *Biennial Report, 1905–1906*, p. 70; *Annual Catalogue of the State Normal School at Oshkosh, Wis., for the school year 1879–80, 1884–85, 1889–90, 1894–95, 1899–1900; Oshkosh State Normal School Bulletin* 2 (June 1905); 7 (June 1910); Rosalind R. Fisher, “. . . the stone strength of the past . . .”: *Centennial history of State University College of Arts and Science at Geneseo, New York*. Geneseo, NY, 1971, p. 146; Maxine Ollie Merlino, *A history of the California State Normal Schools—Their origin, growth, and transformation into teachers colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1962, pp. 94–95.

¹³McKenzie, *History of the Peru State Normal*, pp. 22–23, 96; Principal’s annual report, 1910–1911, quoted in Arthur Charles Forst, Jr., *From normal school to state college: The growth and development of Eastern Connecticut State College from 1889 to 1959*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1980, p. 101.

¹⁴Class day program (Oshkosh), 1888, pp. 17–18.

¹⁵*Catalogue and circular of the California State Normal School, San Jose, 1879*. Sacramento, 1879, pp. 47–51; *State Normal School, Castleton, Vermont*, Flier, 1891, Castleton State College Archives, Vermont Room, Coolidge Library, Castleton, VT; Albert Salisbury, *The normal schools of Wisconsin: A souvenir of the meeting of the National Educational Association held at Milwaukee, Wis., July 6–9, 1897* (1897), p. 17.

¹⁶For admission requirements, see catalogues and bulletins of individual normal schools. See also Fisher, “. . . the stone strength of the past . . .,” p. 60; Susan Vaughn, The history of State Teachers College, Florence, Alabama. *Bulletin of the State Teachers College, Florence, Alabama, 18* [1930s?], pp. 15, 25; Fredrick Chambers, *Historical study of Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, 1873–1943*. Unpublished EdD dissertation, Ball State University, 1970, p. 68; Estelle Greathead, *The story of an inspiring past: Historical sketch of San Jose State Teachers College from 1862 to 1928*. San Jose, CA: San Jose State Teachers College, 1928, p. 15; William Herald Herrmann, *The rise of the public normal school system in Wisconsin*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1953, pp. 412–413, 495; John Marvin Smith, The history and growth of Southwest Texas State Teachers College. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Texas–Austin, 1930, p. 53.

¹⁷*Annual catalogue of the State Normal School at Oshkosh, Wis., for the school year 1898–99*. Oshkosh, WI, 1899, p. 111; *Bulletin of the State Normal College, Florence, Alabama, 1* (1912), 9.

¹⁸*The first half century of the Oshkosh Normal School*. Oshkosh, WI: The Faculty of State Normal School, 1921, p. 17; *State Normal School, Geneseo, NY, 1907–1908*, p. 19; Isbell, *A history of Eastern Michigan University*, p. 166.

¹⁹Catalog quoted in *As we were . . . As we are: Bridgewater State College, 1840–1876*. Bridgewater, MA: Alumni Association, Bridgewater State College, 1876, p. 79.

²⁰*A history of the State Normal School of Kansas*, p. 29; Clayton C. Mau, *Brief history of the State University Teachers College, Geneseo, New York*. Geneseo, NY, 1956, p. 6; Isbell, *A history of Eastern Michigan University*, p. 138; *Catalogue of the California State Normal School, San Jose, 1895*. Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1895, p. 9; *1900* (1900), p. 11; Michael Francis Bannon, *A history of State Teachers College, Troy, Alabama*. Unpublished EdD dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1954, p. 47; *Announcement of the Southwest Texas State Normal School for the annual session 1908–1909*, p. 44.

²¹Chambers, *Historical study of Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College*, p. 80; Vaughn, *The history of State Teachers College, Florence*, p. 38; on scholarships, see catalogues and bulletins of individual normal schools.

²²Rogers, *Oswego: Fountainhead*, p. 71; Brush, *In honor and good faith*, pp. 32, 102–103; Nichols, *Rugged summit*, pp. 92–93; E. Louise Murphy, *Origin and development of Fayetteville State Teachers College, 1867–1959—A chapter in the history of the education of negroes in North Carolina*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1960, p. 167; Thomas Rothrock, Joseph Carter Corbin and negro education in the University of Arkansas. *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly*, 30 (Winter 1971), 289.

²³*State Normal School, Geneseo, NY, 1911–1912*, p. 28; *1912–1913*, p. 25.

²⁴Excerpt from Westfield catalog reprinted in Brown, *The rise and fall of the people's colleges*, 134–140; Arthur C. Boyden, *The history of Bridgewater Normal School*. Bridgewater, MA: Bridgewater Normal Alumni Association, 1933, pp. 54, 41–42; Forst, From normal school to state college: *The growth and development of Eastern Connecticut State College*, pp. 68, 70–71; Paul Stoler, Castleton Normal School in the nineteenth century. In Holman D. Jordan (Ed.), *And the glory of the latter house shall be greater than that of the former: An informal history of Castleton State College*. Castleton, VT: Castleton State College, 1968, p. 52; Chambers, *Historical study of Arkansas Agricul-*

tural, Mechanical and Normal College, 1873–1943, pp. 66–68, 143, 188, 218; Hopkins & Thomas, *The Arizona State University story*, p. 89

²⁵School catalogs, bulletins and histories (various); C. O. Ruggles, *Historical sketch and notes: Winona State Normal School, 1860–1910*. Winona, MN: Jones & Kroeger Co., 1910, pp. 143–145.

²⁶School catalogs, bulletins and histories (various); *Catalogue of the California State Normal School, San Jose, 1900*. Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1900, p. 8; *The Normal Index*. San Jose, CA: Students of State Normal School, 3 (Nov. 1887), 32; Hartman, *The history of Colorado State College of Education*, p. 159; Mau, *Brief history of the State University Teachers College, Geneseo*, p. 17; W. Wayne Dedman, *Cherishing this heritage: The centennial history of the State University College at Brockport, New York*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969, p. 124; *A history of the State Normal School of Kansas*, pp. 62–73; Deward Homan Reed, *The history of teachers colleges in New Mexico*. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1948, p. 136; Hopkins & Thomas, *The Arizona State University Story*, pp. 111–112; Wright, *Fifty Years at the teachers college*, p. 116; Melvin Frank Fiegel, *A history of Southwestern State College, 1903–1953*. Unpublished EdD dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1968, p. 27.

²⁷School catalogs, bulletins, and histories (various); Vaughn, *The history of State Teachers College, Florence*, p. 31; *Oshkosh State Teachers College: The first seventy-five years*. Oshkosh, WI: Oshkosh State Teachers College, 1946, p. 68; Wright, *Fifty years at the teachers college*, p. 74; *The Normal Pennant*. San Jose, CA: Students of State Normal School, 4 (June 1901), 18; *The pedagogue*. San Marcos, TX: Students of Southwest Texas State Normal School, 1905, p. 61; Brush, *In honor and good faith*, p. 288.

²⁸Work Projects Administration, *The State Teachers College at Westfield*, p. 72; *The normal advance*. Oshkosh, WI: Students of State Normal School 6 (Oct. 1899), 33; Dixie Club, Roll and minutes of meetings, Oct. 25, 1912, in Organizations, Files, University Collection, Collier Library Archives, University of North Alabama, Florence, AL (no page nos.); Ladies' Literary Society, Minutes, Oct. 8, 1880 and Feb. 4, 1881, in University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Archives, Area Research Center, Polk Library, Oshkosh, WI, pp. 127, 136; *The Normal Star* (San Marcos, TX: Students of Southwest Texas State Normal School) 2 (Feb. 23, 1912), 1; *The Normal Advance*, 18 (Jan. 1912), 128; Boyden, *Albert Gardner Boyden and the Bridgewater State Normal School*, p. 146.

²⁹School catalogs, bulletins, and histories (various); *Catalogue and Circular of the California State Normal School, San Jose, 1890* (Sacramento, 1890), p. 31; *Vermont State Normal Schools, 1909–1910* (Catalog, no publication information provided), p. 11; Fisher, “. . . the stone strength of the past . . .,” pp. 86–87.

³⁰Boyden, *Albert Gardner Boyden and the Bridgewater State Normal School*, pp. 116–117; *New York State Teachers College at Buffalo: A History, 1871–1946*. Buffalo: New York State Teachers College at Buffalo, 1946, pp. 143, 129; *The Normal Advance*, 5 (March 1899), 120–123; Bannon, *A history of State Teachers College, Troy, Alabama, 1954*, p. 41; Hart, *The first 75 years*, p. 148.

³¹School catalogs, bulletins, and histories (various); Class day programs (Oshkosh), 1888; *The first half century of the Oshkosh Normal School*, p. 25; *The Normal Pennant*, 4 (May 1898), 4

³²School catalogs, bulletins, and histories (various); Marshall, *Grandest of enterprises*, pp. 199–200; Samuel R. Mohler, *The first seventy-five years: A history of Central Washington State College*. Ellensburg, WA: Central Washington State College, 1967, p. 97; *The Normal Advance*, 3 (March–April 1897), 78.

³³S. E. Rothery, Some educational institutions: Pilgrimages about San Jose. *The Overland Monthly*, 30 (July 1897), 75; School catalogs, bulletins, and histories (various); Commencement Programs, Castleton State Normal School, 1874–1940, Castleton State College Archives, Vermont Room, Coolidge Library, Castleton, VT; *The Normal Index*, 6 (March 25, 1891), 73; Boyden, *Albert Gardner Boyden and the Bridgewater State Normal School*, p. 143.

References

- Allmendinger, D. F. (1975). *Paupers and scholars: The transformation of student life in nineteenth-century New England*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bean, J. P., & Metzner, B. S. (1985). A conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 485–540.
- Bendixen-Noe, M. K. (1998). Nontraditional students in higher education: Meeting their needs as learners. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 11(2), 27–31.
- Burke, C. B. (1982). *American collegiate populations: A test of the traditional view*. New York: New York University Press.
- Clifford, G. J. (1983). "Shaking dangerous questions from the crease": Gender and American higher education. *Feminist Issues*, 3(2), 3–62.
- Clifford, G. J. (1995). *"Equally in view": The University of California, its women, and the schools*. Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education and Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
- Dunham, E. A. (1969). *Colleges of the forgotten Americans: A profile of state colleges and regional universities*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gilley, J. W., & Hawkes, R. T. (1989). Nontraditional students: A changing student body redefines community. *Educational Record*, 70 (Summer/Fall), 33–35.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Herbst, J. (1980). Nineteenth-century normal schools in the United States: A fresh look. *History of Education*, 9, 219–227.
- Herbst, J. (1989). *And sadly teach: Teacher education and professionalization in American culture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lace, W. W. (1986). A nontraditional approach. *Currents*, 12(5), 8–12.
- Levine, A., & Associates. (1989). *Shaping higher education's future: Demographic realities and opportunities, 1990–2000*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, A., & Nidiffer, J. (1996). *Beating the odds: How the poor get to college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- London, H. B. (1992). Transformations: Cultural challenges faced by first-generation students. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 80(4), 5–11.
- Metzner, B. S., & Bean, J. P. (1987). The estimation of a conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. *Research in Higher Education*, 27, 15–38.
- Nidiffer, J. (1999). Poor historiography: The "poorest" in American higher education. *History of Education Quarterly*, 39, 321–336.
- Ogren, Christine A. (1995). Where coeds were coeducated: Normal schools in Wisconsin, 1870–1920. *History of Education Quarterly*, 35, 1–26.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1998). Studying college students in the 21st century: Meeting new challenges. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21, 151–165.
- Richardson, R. C., & Skinner, E. F. (1992). Helping first-generation minority students achieve degrees. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 80(4), 29–43.
- Schwager, S. (1987). Educating women in America. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 12, 333–372.

- Selingo, J. (2000). Facing new missions and rivals, state colleges seek a makeover. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (November 17), A40–A42.
- Thelin, J. R. (1990). Rudolph rediscovered. In Rudolph, F., *The American college and university: A history*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Westbrook, F. D., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1991). Forty years of using labels to communicate about nontraditional students: Does it help or hurt? *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70 (September–October), 20–28.
- Zwerling, L. S. (1992). First-generation adult students: In search of safe havens. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 80(4), 45–54.

Copyright of Journal of Higher Education is the property of Ohio State University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.