

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Honor Lectures

Lectures

10-8-1985

Visible and Invisible Women in Land-Grant Colleges, 1890-1940

Alison Comish Thorne

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/honor_lectures



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thorne, Alison Comish, "Visible and Invisible Women in Land-Grant Colleges, 1890-1940" (1985). *Faculty Honor Lectures*. Paper 2.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/honor_lectures/2

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by the Lectures at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Honor Lectures by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



**Visible and Invisible
Women in Land-Grant Colleges,
1890-1940**

by
Professor
Alison Comish Thorne



by
Professor
Alison Comish Thorne



SEVENTY-SECOND HONOR LECTURE DELIVERED AT THE UNIVERSITY

A basic objective of the Faculty Association of Utah State University is, in the words of its constitution,

To encourage intellectual growth and development of its members by sponsoring and arranging for the publication of two Annual Faculty Honor Lectures in (a) the biological and physical sciences, including engineering, called the Annual Faculty Honor Lecture in the Natural Sciences; and (b) the humanities and social sciences, including education, family life, and business administration, called the Annual Faculty Honor Lecture in the Humanities.

The administration of the University is sympathetic with these aims and shares, through the Scholarly Publications Committee, the costs of publishing and distributing these lectures.

Lecturers are chosen by a standing committee of the Faculty Association. According to the Faculty Constitution:

in choosing the lecturers, the committee shall take into consideration the achievements of faculty members in all the various areas of learning represented by the teaching and research of the Institution. Among the factors to be considered shall be biological and physical sciences, including engineering, called the Annual Faculty Honor Lecture in the Natural Sciences; and (b) the humanities and social sciences, including education, family life, and business administration, called the Annual Faculty Honor Lecture in the Humanities.

The administration of the University is sympathetic with these aims and shares, through the Scholarly Publications Committee, the costs of publishing and distributing these lectures.

Lecturers are chosen by a standing committee of the Faculty Association. According to the Faculty Constitution:

in choosing the lecturers, the committee shall take into consideration the achievements of faculty members in all the various areas of learning represented by the teaching and research of the Institution. Among the factors to be considered shall be outstanding achievement in one or more of the following: (1) creative activity in the field of the proposed lecture; (2) publication of research through recognized channels in the field of the proposed lecture.

Alison Comish Thorne was selected by the committee to deliver the Annual Faculty Honor Lecture in the Humanities. On behalf of the members of the Association, we are happy to present Professor Thorne's paper.



Utah State University
UMC 95
Logan, Utah 84322
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

10 October 1985

Lee H. Burke
Secretary to Council
UMC 14
Campus

Dear Lee H. Burke:

Utah State University Press is pleased to present you with a complimentary copy of the Seventy-Second Faculty Honor Lecture.

Dr. Alison Thorne's presentation entitled "Visible and Invisible Women in Land Grant Colleges" was well received. We trust that you will find the monograph informative.

Sincerely,

Linda E. Speth
Linda E. Speth
Director

LES/1e

Visible and Invisible Women in Land-Grant Colleges, 1890-1940

**by
Alison Comish Thorne**

Alison Comish Thorne

**72nd Faculty Honor Lecture
October 8, 1985
Faculty Association
and**

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the Faculty Association of Utah State University for this opportunity to present the Seventy-Second Faculty Honor Lecture. My late husband, Wynne Thorne, and I attended the First Lecture, presented in 1942 by Physics Professor Willard Gardner. In fact, we attended nearly all the Lectures in the years that followed. In 1951, Wynne Thorne gave the Tenth Lecture, entitled "The Desert Shall Blossom as the Rose." It was about irrigation agriculture. My subject, of course, is different from his, but both of our Lectures reflect the land-grant college tradition of Utah State University.

This Lecture is a family affair, for an early draft was read by my daughters Barrie Thorne, Avril Thorne, and Sandra Thorne-Brown, who circulated it among their colleagues. Barrie, in particular, sent me pertinent books and went over my manuscript with great care.

I wish also to express my appreciation to A. J. Simmonds and Anne Buttars of USU Special Archives who brought to my attention important historical items and who taught me how to find my way among the early materials of Utah Agricultural College.

I gave an early draft of this Lecture to Ann Leffler, sociologist on our campus, and am appreciative that she used it as a background paper in the proposal to establish a Women and Gender Research Institute at USU. I wish also to express appreciation to Anne Wilde for getting this Lecture into the word processor and for putting in my stream of revisions. And finally, it is a pleasure to recognize my debt to Linda Speth, Director of the University Press, who edited the manuscript with great wisdom and sensitivity.

To all of the above, plus many unnamed, my hearty thanks for helping to make this Lecture a reality!

Visible and Invisible Women in Land-Grant Colleges, 1890-1940

**by
Alison Comish Thorne***

Introduction

The role and status of women in land-grant colleges has not really been studied. As many of these institutions have approached their centennials and have reflected on their past achievements, the lack of research about women faculty, women students, women staff, and faculty wives has been astounding. In part, our misperceptions or ignorance concerning women in this institutional setting is understandable. Like many women in other historical milieus, women at land-grant institutions have been invisible. Because they were rarely administrators, because they composed such a small part of the faculty, and often because of the discipline in which they taught, their contributions have been obscured. They left few clear traces of their roles and achievements in the institutional records. This Lecture is an attempt to redress that balance and reclaim the details of women's experiences with land-grant institutions.

Land-grant colleges began in a variety of settings. Michigan's began very early, in a forest. The Kansas college was four stone buildings and a president's house, set on a prairie with buffalo bones bleaching in the sun.¹ Utah's college was placed on a sagebrush benchland with a canyon behind it, the source of stiff morning winds and of irrigation water.

Land-grant colleges were authorized under the Morrill Act signed by Abraham Lincoln in 1862, an act which would provide federal support to these colleges,

...where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the Legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.²

Some states did not create a separate agricultural college but incorporated the land-grant function into their existing state-supported university. The University of Minnesota is an example. However, nineteen states established a

*Professor Emeritus, Department of Home Economics and Consumer Education

land-grant agricultural college separate from the "liberal arts" university. At these agricultural colleges the students came to refer to themselves as Aggies, and although the liberal arts universities spoke deprecatingly of "cow colleges," the Aggies had confidence in their own brand of education.

Female students came to be called "coeds" because most of these colleges were coeducational. The land-grant colleges were for the laboring classes. The mandate had said "classes" not "men," and in keeping with the democratic tradition within which the Morrill Act was framed, women gained acceptance. Strong women and sympathetic men pushed for equal educational opportunities, and state legislatures could see economies in not having to establish separate facilities for women. The few women who attended the land-grant colleges in those earliest years took the same courses that men did.

This paper deals primarily with Utah Agricultural College (UAC) at Logan (founded in 1888) and Oregon Agricultural College (OAC) at Corvallis (founded twenty years earlier in 1868), with occasional mention of land-grant institutions of other states. This paper is based on written historical sources, on oral interviews, and on my experiences and those of family. It covers the period between 1890 and 1940.

The Morrill Act had required courses related to agriculture and mechanic arts and also required courses in military tactics in the form of ROTC (Reserve Officers' Training Corps). The Civil War in which the country was embroiled when Lincoln signed the act left its impact in the ROTC requirement. The men at these colleges wore cadet uniforms. It is surprising to realize that women students also took ROTC. Photographs of women at drill at the agricultural colleges of Oregon, Utah, and Iowa before 1900 show them in dark dresses with long skirts. According to the catalog of the Utah college for 1890-91:

This Department of instruction [Military Science] has become very popular in college life. It takes the place in many colleges of Calisthenics, and is found to be a most valuable method of securing physical culture, and habits of discipline and order. The influence of military drill is seen on those taking it.

The marked advantage of this practice to young men has led several colleges to extend it to young women with the most happy results. The spear, light rifle, or some other light weapon is usually carried. The young women of this college will have the advantages of this feature of college instruction.³

However, women's enthusiasm for military drill had declined by the early 1900s and they ceased taking it, an option apparently open to women but not to men.

The Rise of Home Economics

Although the Morrill Act spoke specifically of agriculture, mechanic arts, and military tactics, by the mid-1870s the land-grant colleges of Kansas, Iowa, and Illinois were offering domestic arts or household economy, later called home economics, a field that became one of the hallmarks of coeducational agricultural colleges. Oregon Agricultural College had been in existence for twenty years before it offered its first course in household economy. In those twenty years more than twenty-five women had graduated with bachelor's degrees. These women had taken the same courses that men took. Some became teachers, one was a farmer, and one was a typewriter, which was the early term for a typist. Most had married.

Then in 1889 Dr. Margaret Snell, who held a degree in medicine from Boston University, was hired to teach household economy and hygiene to women students. The Board of Regents had hesitated over appointing her because she did not have a certificate from a school of cookery, but finally decided her physician's qualifications outweighed this lack. Dr. Snell, by the way, did not wear the fashionable wasp waist and corsets of the time, but wore loose dresses and flat-heeled shoes. Her laboratory included "a small wood-burning stove, a few saucepans, and a sewing machine or two."⁴

I grew up in Corvallis in the shadow of Oregon Agricultural College because my father, Newel H. Comish, had joined the OAC faculty in 1915. When I was a high school student, I had a foods class from Lura Keiser who had trained under Dr. Snell at OAC. She told us that in the early days of the college, the shape of each saucepan was painted on the wall of the cooking laboratory showing where the pan was to be hung. Also, we learned from Miss Keiser that most women students were so poor they owned only two dresses. Consequently, they wore one dress all week to class, and each evening they changed to the second dress for dinner because it was proper to change. Then the following week, they reversed the order of dress wear.

At the turn of the century, Dr. Snell taught hygiene as well as household economy. Calisthenics and hygiene were especially important for women because they were the future mothers of the race, and educators believed that too much intellectual effort would cause a woman's uterus to atrophy, an attitude which affected the curricula for women in most educational institutions across the country. Dr. Edward Clarke, who was widely listened to, explicitly linked the physiological demands of an academic education to the reproductive impairment of the nation's future mothers. He believed that young women should study one-third less than young men and not at all during menstruation.⁵

To keep women's intellects from weakening their female organs, educators advocated exercise, and the gymnasium came to be almost as important as the academic classroom. Old photographs of the early 1900s show women in voluminous black bloomers in the gym.

Whereas the Oregon college had employed a woman M.D. as its first household economy professor, the Utah college employed Miss Abbie L. Marlatt of Kansas Agricultural College as its first professor of domestic economy. Miss Marlatt, together with Mrs. Sarah Goodwin who taught music, were the only women on the first faculty of nine when the Utah college opened its doors in 1890.

Domestic Arts at UAC was a curriculum offered to women students, with the same prescribed courses that men had to take: "English (grammar, rhetoric, literature); Mathematics (including Trigonometry); Chemistry; Physics; Book-keeping; Geology (including minerology); Botany; Zoology; Physiology; Entomology; Civil Government; Moral Science; the first year, Languages." After that languages were an elective, but a persuasive elective. French was recommended for women because it was "the diplomatic language of Europe and that of fashionable circles." Furthermore, French terms were used in the domestic affairs of women more than any other language. German, on the other hand, was a men's course because Germany was the home of agricultural science.⁶

Besides the above courses for Domestic Arts, there were required courses in cutting and sewing, and in cookery including nutrition. Dairy practice (described as the fine art of butter and cheese making) was given only for women. Horticulture, the study of house plants and gardens, was also prescribed. The optional courses in Domestic Arts were reading, elocution, mechanical drawing, photography, fancy work, music, and painting.

I have taken much of the above summary of courses at UAC from Joel E. Ricks's fifty-year history of the college and also from a study of early catalogs done in 1958 by Mrs. David A. Burgoyne (Allie Peterson Burgoyne). She wrote, "Through all those early catalogs, the write ups of courses for women, seemed—I do not know just how to express it, should I say—torn between training a woman to be a Victorian Lady and a practical housewife."

The catalog for the first year (1890-91) lists studies that provided technical proficiency for young women and also studies that tended to adorn life in the sphere in which they lived, Belles Lettres being such a study, "a special course of instruction in what is known as polite literature, including elocution."

At Utah Agricultural College until 1894, women had taken such courses as shopwork and trigonometry alongside men. But now the domestic arts curriculum required women to take sewing and dressmaking in place of shopwork; lectures on cooking in place of trigonometry; laboratory practice in cooking in place of electricity and magnetism; science of nutrition in place of mechanics and surveying; and practice in cooking in place of field work in surveying.⁷

This was gender segregation in the curriculum. The courses that women gave up were basic to engineering, a field which would be almost totally male-dominated during much of our own century. A paradox of domestic arts was that it opened doors for women to attend college while fitting in with the expected womanly roles of society, but at the same time its very expansion was one influence in keeping other occupations closed to women.

Another paradox of domestic arts (which by 1908 was called home economics) was that home economists were teaching about homemaking but did not themselves have husbands and children. I used to wonder about this as I was growing up in the 1920s in Corvallis. With few exceptions, this lack of husbands and children was true across the country, according to a survey of land-grant institutions done in the 1920s by the U.S. Office of Education and issued as a ponderous two-volume tome (Bulletin No. 9, 1930). I shall refer to this report, done at the request of the land-grant colleges, as the Land-Grant Survey.

The section on home economics indicated that only 25 of the 43 reporting institutions had any married persons on their home economics staff. Among 697 home economists, 72 were married and 39 widowed or divorced. Between 1923 and 1928, 260 women left their home economics positions, and nearly a fourth of these did so in order to marry.⁸ The committee of deans of home economics who wrote this section for the Land-Grant Survey then said,

It is desirable that institutional and State restrictions upon employment of married women be removed wherever they exist and that an adjustment of home economics instruction especially be made in order that women actually responsible for their own home may more easily be employed upon a part-time basis.⁹

This recommendation got nowhere.

In looking at the entire faculties of the land-grant institutions, one finds that they numbered 12,032 in 1927-28, with 18.6 percent being women, mostly in home economics. There were also women who taught such subjects as English, foreign languages, librarianship, and physical education for women, but these were relatively few. Almost 80 percent of all men faculty were married, while only 10 percent of all women were.¹⁰

There were few women with advanced degrees, and few women in the higher ranks. Men were much more likely than women to have received higher degrees from outside the state. And as one would expect, women's salaries tended to be lower than men's. But what we may not realize is that even men's salaries were often insufficient for family support and so they had other, supplementary work. Of the men who taught undergraduate classes in agriculture, almost a fifth were operating farms as well as teaching.¹¹ One can't help wondering whether their wives and daughters were doing some of that farm work. The report is silent on this matter.

In 1921 the American Association of University Professors issued a report on the status of women in higher education. Other colleges and universities as well as the land-grant institutions were included and there was overall concern regarding women's lack of academic opportunity, their low rank, and their low pay.¹²

The next decade brought the Great Depression and legislation prohibiting local and state governments, as well as school boards, from hiring a married woman if the husband had a job. The National Economy Act, Section 213, set a

federal precedent that affected the land-grant colleges, as did the state acts. Sophonisba Breckinridge, a pioneer in social work and professor of social economy at the University of Chicago, who had fought for rights of immigrants and of employed women, was appalled at such legislation. In 1933 she wrote in the American Association of University Women (AAUW) *Journal*, "Two great land-grant colleges are denying the right of married women to continue in employment or the right of the academic woman to round out her experience by marriage."¹³ Soon all land-grant colleges were dismissing employed wives. Breckinridge went on to say that a dean of women (married) who was replaced by an unmarried one had appealed to the AAUW of her state because there was no League of Women Voters or Women's Party. This statement indicates that these major women's organizations had some mechanism for trying to battle discrimination, but they lacked real authority and this was long before Affirmative Action as we know it today. By 1937 pressure from women's groups and women leaders across the country had helped repeal Section 213 of the National Economy Act,¹⁴ but antinepotism rulings lingered on in the academic world for another thirty years.

Relative Scarcity of Women Students

Women were no more than a third of the total student body at the agricultural colleges. In some courses there were no women at all, and in others there might be only one or two of the fair sex. (Men were called the sterner sex.)

However, Utah Agricultural College conferred its first degree in commerce and business in 1894, and early photographs show an equal number of men and women doing bookkeeping in class. Other agricultural colleges did not establish such a curriculum until after 1900.¹⁵

Women students were not plentiful in agriculture. A picture taken at OAC in 1901 shows an animal science class out in a field taking notes on a prize sheep, which they are observing.¹⁶ There is only one female student. She wears a long dark dress and a white narrow-brimmed, flat-topped straw hat with black ribbon around the crown. She observes as well as the men, and holds her notebook in the same ready position. The male teacher wears a dark suit and derby hat. The nineteen men students wear cadet uniforms and caps. Uniforms were required on drill days, but many students found it economical to wear them on other days as well.

The Land-Grant Survey indicates that from 1920 to 1928 between 2.3 and 6 percent of the graduating classes in agriculture were women.¹⁷ But Cornell's graduating class in agriculture in 1923 was 25 percent women. It is paradoxical that Cornell's plant breeding department, in which genetics was taught, refused to let women become graduate students. Barbara McClintock had to register as a graduate student in botany, and then proceeded to take the genetics and cytology

offered in agriculture. Her lifetime work on the genetics of maize won her membership in the National Academy of Science and a Nobel Prize, but she never had a real place in the academic world.¹⁸

Prior to 1920 many women scientists with advanced degrees in physiological chemistry and botany found that they could not get academic appointments except in home economics and in women's colleges. In fact one reason Ellen H. Richards, a sanitary chemist, professionalized home economics was to create academic employment otherwise closed to women. There was gender-typing in science. Human nutrition was accepted as a proper field for women and frequently was lodged in home economics, but animal nutrition belonged to men.¹⁹ As already noted, engineering also belonged to men.

In the early 1920s arts and science was the curriculum in which most women took their first degree in the nineteen land-grant colleges that were separate from the state universities. Actually the colleges had faced conflicts in trying to expand their arts and science offerings, but even so home economics and education were a poor second and third in popularity among women students. However, there were some exceptions. At Iowa State College, which was considered a highly technical institution, 82 percent of the women students majored in home economics in 1927-28, while at the colleges of Utah and Oregon the percentages were 40 and 39.²⁰

As for the 1930s, I can describe my own experience as a graduate student in economics at Iowa State College. I had equal access with men to the classes that I needed. The advanced economics classes were filled with men, most of them majoring in agricultural economics. I was a major in the new field of consumption economics and received the first Ph.D. in that field to be awarded at Iowa State. In fact, I was the only woman to receive a Ph.D. out of the fifteen conferred at the December 1938 commencement, but this was a higher percentage than at the June 1936 commencement when there were no women among the twenty-eight who received Ph.D.'s.

It's interesting to look over the Iowa State commencement program of June 1936. Although no woman received a Ph.D., one out of three master's degrees went to women, all in areas related to home economics. Not only the master's, but also the bachelor's degrees going to women were overwhelmingly in home economics. For example, in economics *per se* there were twenty-one men and five women who received bachelor's degrees.

All Iowa State undergraduates were expected to take a three-course sequence of introductory economics. The division of home economics offered a separate listing of these economic courses for its own students. I helped teach these classes as a way of earning my fellowship money. Because two economists, Elizabeth E. Hoyt and Margaret G. Reid (who were my major professors), were in charge of these courses and were themselves members of the economics department, such an arrangement was possible. My fellowship was paid by the economics department.

Looking back, I recognize that putting home economics students into their own economics classes was gender segregation and discrimination. However, I think Hoyt and Reid would have denied it was discrimination because their courses were as rigorous as those offered elsewhere on campus. In addition, their course content included consumption economics, the new field in which Hoyt and Reid were pioneers. I believe that working with home economics provided a much wider enrollment for consumption economics than would otherwise have been possible at Iowa State College at that time.²¹

There was no gender segregation in the classes that I took as a graduate student in the 1930s, whether advanced economics, history, or statistics. Women as well as men took those classes, though there were never many women. George S. Snedecor taught the statistics classes we all took, and his examples dealt overwhelmingly with corn and hogs, matters congenial to students of rural origin.

The Agricultural Surround

Snedecor's examples of corn and hogs in his statistics classes were in keeping with the agricultural aura of all land-grant colleges. There were the orderly experimental farm plots, the damp smell of growing things in greenhouses, the soils lab with the inevitable dusty smell and look, and the barns for horses, cows, sheep, and other livestock.

The college dairy sold ice cream and butter, and there was free buttermilk from a spigot, which proved a nutritional help to poverty-stricken students trying to get through college on a shoestring. And it seemed that most students were poor. I remember seeing the free buttermilk spigot at the dairy buildings of the agricultural colleges of Oregon, Utah, and Wisconsin, and I assumed all college dairies that made butter had such a spigot. In the fall ag students made and sold cider, real cider which if kept a few days became hard—we called it apple jack—a transformation impossible with the insipid pasteurized apple juice that was later introduced.

As already indicated, at the turn of the century women students took dairy practice (butter and cheese making) and horticulture (house plants and gardening). The Utah college catalog said of horticulture "...this refined field of agriculture warrants the devotion of some time on the part of young women to the principles and practices of at least a restricted field in agriculture."²²

There is a picture taken about 1890 of a women's horticultural class at the Oregon college, which shows seven women students hoeing a garden in front of the College Building. They are a dignified lot, wearing narrow-brimmed straw hats and long dark dresses with cinched-in waists. One young woman wears a light-colored dress and her hat is of light straw with a broader brim than the others. Professor George Coote, with dark suit, derby hat, and a white beard is supervising them.²³

Professor Coote appears in another picture taken at the turn of the century in which thirteen women students are learning to prune a tree. His male assistant is high in the large, leafless tree. Lower down, four women in their long dresses are perched in various parts of the tree, but they are hatless as are most of the other women, who, on the ground, hold poles, handsaws, rakes, and a couple of textbooks.²⁴

Dairy practice had been a woman's course in the first years of UAC, but in 1894-95 it became a requirement for all seniors in domestic arts and in agriculture. This meant that men took it. Some time in the early 1900s dairy science became predominantly a men's course and women's enrollment declined. Why did this happen? Did new technologies attract men more than women? Were there any deliberate pressures to change the gender ratio of these classes? Did the state of the economy have an influence, or events such as war? One wonders, for example, how the Women's Land Army of the First World War, which augmented agricultural production, was associated with the agricultural colleges.²⁵

Furthering agricultural production was a major goal of the colleges, but sometimes conflicts of interest arose. Ava B. Milam, dean of home economics at Oregon Agricultural College, was approached by a group of men in the school of agriculture who wanted her to ban Henry C. Sherman's text, *Chemistry of Food and Nutrition*, from the nutrition classes. The men explained that they had met with a group of county agricultural agents and had decided that what Sherman said about the use of milk, fruit, and vegetables in place of meat in the diet was injurious to the animal industry of the state. Dean Milam listened with interest, concern, and amusement, and refused. Later, she brought Sherman to the campus as a visiting professor.²⁶

Federal Mandate to Teach, Research, Serve

By federal mandate the land-grant colleges had three major functions: resident instruction, research through the experiment station, and service through extension. Other sections of this paper deal with resident instruction so here we will consider research and extension, beginning with extension because it was, geographically, such a widespread endeavor.

The extension service made the land-grant colleges unique because they were charged with carrying learning to farmers and their families. Early in this century most states had farmers' institutes or movable schools that were community groups of farm men and women who met for study under the leadership of one of their number, with the agricultural college providing information and loaning lantern slides and equipment. Under the auspices of extension, there were some early boys' and girls' agricultural clubs. Boys' potato clubs and corn clubs were among the first. Boys and girls were sometimes in such clubs together, as well as in pig clubs and poultry clubs. There came to be solely girls' clubs in such projects

as gardening, canning, and poultry. Later, under extension, many of these clubs became 4-H clubs.

The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 for the first time provided matching federal funds for cooperative agricultural extension work. Although men extension agents continued to outnumber women agents, the Secretary of Agriculture could write in 1915:

Already many of the colleges have appointed women as extension experts in home economics and others are planning to do so. In nearly all the Southern States women county agents are already at work. They enroll women in home demonstration work and will continue to conduct girls' clubs. They will have the women demonstrate the preparation and use of products from canning clubs, poultry clubs, pig clubs and winter gardens.²⁷

The women agents were called home demonstration agents.

Approval of the Smith-Lever Act occurred on May 8, 1914. By October of that year the Secretary of Agriculture had mailed out a letter to "the housewives of 55,000 crop correspondents" inquiring how the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) could better meet the needs of farm housewives. He had initiated this inquiry, he said, because "the farm woman has been the most neglected factor in the rural problem..." and indicated that he had taken those words from a letter "written not by a woman, but by a broad-minded man so thoroughly in touch with agricultural and domestic needs of the country that his opinions have great weight."²⁸ Does one sense male domination here? Would the Secretary have undertaken this inquiry if just women had suggested it?

Only 2,241 replies were received to the 55,000 letters sent out. Some answers were painstakingly written on scraps of wrapping paper; some were written on the margins of the Secretary's letter. Women and some men replied. Excerpts from the letters were classified by geographical region and by subject, and there was sufficient content to make four reports—"Social and Labor Needs of Farm Women"; "Domestic Needs of Farm Women"; "Educational Needs of Farm Women"; and "Economic Needs of Farm Women."²⁹

Many comments showed a life of long, hard hours of work, resentment at the way city people and newspapers made the farmer the butt of jokes and subject of cartoons, and concern that schools for their children were so poor. The roads were poor. Income was very low; farmers were debt-ridden. Women worked long hours at farm and domestic chores and had to carry water for household use. It is impossible to do justice to the letters here, but they certainly deserve critical study. At the conclusion of each report is appended a list of publications available from USDA, some free and some for five cents each. The Secretary assumed that women would be interested in a far-ranging list of topics, including organizing agricultural clubs for children, agricultural education and nature

study, elementary forestry, bees, birds, dairying, farm buildings, farm conveniences, farm management, farm bookkeeping, foods and preparation, fruit culture, home gardens, paints and whitewashes, sanitation and hygiene, poultry, roads, and vegetables.³⁰ One suspects that few women took advantage of the Secretary's offer if so few responded to his initial letter.

The action seemed to be more at the state than at the federal level. For example, Utah Agricultural College in the 1920s held an annual farmers' encampment on campus. Entire families came and lived in tents set up just east of the quad, where the library building is today. There is a wonderful picture taken in 1924, with orderly rows of tents to the east, and Ford Model T cars parked diagonally along the south border of the quad. My husband, Wynne Thorne, who was a boy at the time, tells of his family coming to encampment. There were programs for all ages and the families went home rejuvenated with learning and recreation.³¹

In each county as canning season approached, the home demonstration agent tested pressure cookers to prevent accidents of exploding glass jars in people's kitchens. She helped organize 4-H clubs and oversaw their entries in the county fair. She had a committee of local women who worked with her and who helped identify local women leaders across the state to be invited to an annual leadership conference on campus.

Rural girls saw what the home demonstration agent was doing and often took her as their ideal—the term, role model, was not yet in use. Perhaps they too could go on to college and become part of the extension service. Many 4-H girls did go on to college, but many could not afford it.

There may have been an increasing gap between agriculture and home economics, beginning in the 1920s, according to Frances Hill, a political scientist writing today. She says that as farm women were urged to improve their home management, the home economists did not also suggest that they seek more efficiency in the farm chores that they were doing.³²

Did farm wives who kept books on the farm receive any bookkeeping help from the extension service? Did they get help with poultry problems? Were they invited to attend field days with their husbands, and if invited, did they attend? Did some women own farms and operate them? If so, did they get as much extension help as men did? A study of extension records could help us answer these questions, and such a study should be made. In developing countries today, farm women who want agricultural help do not have access to extension services equal to that of men.³³

Director of Extension William Peterson at the Utah Agricultural College wrote in 1941 that "women are vitally interested in the soil, in soil and water relationships, in use and care of the range, in livestock breeding and feeding, in conservation of natural resources, as well as in rearing children and making comfortable, convenient and happy homes."³⁴ However, this was written as the nation entered the Second World War and was intended to encourage greater agricultural production.

Sometimes farm families seemed to prefer a gap between home economics and agriculture. For example, in 1932 Margaret Hansen, a seventeen year old, entered her animal, Bess, who had been a prize-winning calf the year before, into the Utah State Fair. Bess became Grand Champion and won for her owner the Union Pacific Fellowship. Yet at this time parents of 4-H girls considered stock shows to be unladylike. Fern Shipley Kelly, a leader in extension, proceeded to make girls' attendance at stock shows "more culturally oriented and better chaperoned and [had] the girls stay at nice hotels. This seemed to please everyone."³⁵

Now for the matter of research at the land-grant colleges. Federal funds for agricultural research became available through the Hatch Act of 1887, which led to the establishment of agricultural experiment stations, with research in the early years focused primarily on improving crop production. There were scant funds for home economists, but nevertheless they attempted some research with part-time effort. For example, in 1915 home economists at Oregon Agricultural College tested varieties of apples in five different food products. Home economists at Utah Agricultural College in 1919 sought to develop a test for determining suitability of milks from various sources for use of infants and invalids.³⁶

I find it significant that the first woman to give the Faculty Honor Lecture at Utah Agricultural College was a research scientist, Almeda Perry Brown. She gave the Third Lecture in 1944, entitled "Nutritional Status of Some Utah Population Groups." At that time she was research associate professor of home economics and acting dean. However, she is invisible in that she is not listed among the faculty members of the institution in Ricks's *A History of Fifty Years*, although she joined the faculty in 1926. Fortunately, the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station includes Almeda Perry Brown in their list of staff members.³⁷

The Purnell Act of 1925 authorized "economic and sociological investigations of the rural home and rural life" and provided some funding for home economics research. At the Oregon college Maud Wilson was the first full-time home economics researcher, and she undertook studies of farm homes and also a study of use of time by Oregon farm homemakers. In the time-use study she compared the farm women with town women. Among those who participated were wives of some of the teachers at Oregon Agricultural College.³⁸

The Purnell Act led to a surge of studies by agricultural economists and rural sociologists, a few of whom were women. But studies of farm family conditions, whether done by men or women, were of great potential interest to farm women and farm families.

Regional farm housing surveys were conducted in the 1930s. At Iowa State in 1934, Margaret Reid, economist, published such a survey. She found, for example, that only one in five Iowa farms had a bathroom, only one in four had electricity, and three-fourths of the families carried water an average of ninety-four feet. We have already noted that in 1915 farm women complained to the

Secretary of Agriculture about carrying water great distances. They were still lugging water in the 1930s.

It is significant that Reid's study was published by both the agricultural economics and the home economics sections of the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station, in cooperation with the Iowa Extension Service, and the Bureau of Home Economics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Furthermore, funds for collecting and tabulating the data were provided by the Federal Civil Works Administration, one of the depression agencies initiated at the behest of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Times were hard and money was hard to come by, whether for fixing up farm houses or gathering facts about them.³⁹

Women as Support to Students and College

Women relatives often formed a support system to help students get through college. These are among the invisible women in the history of land-grant colleges. College men mailed their laundry home in cardboard suitcases; their mothers washed, ironed, and mailed it back. Women college students, however, did their own. Mothers and sisters canned and preserved food, some of which their college student took back to school, particularly if he was "batching." Women students doing their own cooking with food from home were said to be keeping house for themselves. They did not batch.

Both my father (around 1910) and my husband (around 1932) batched while attending Utah Agricultural College. They knew how to boil potatoes and fry eggs, and they ate lots of bottled peaches and preserves brought from home. Ava B. Milam at Oregon Agricultural College in 1912-13 taught a cooking class for college boys who were batching and also one for unmarried farmers and orchardists. These were night classes and became very large.⁴⁰ Here one might ask whether such classes were phased out over time, and if so, why?

In college towns women took in roomers and boarders who were college students, and often did the men's laundry too. Many women deliberately moved to college towns so they could do this and help put their children through college. There were also women who earned money by typing theses and dissertations for students. This was before xerox and word processors. The graduate office wanted a perfect first copy with three very readable carbon copies, all on really good paper.

In the early days not many men students were married, but when they were, their wives sometimes typed for them, went out and got a job, took in boarders, or took in other people's children to tend. It was after 1940 that Ph.T. (Putting Hubby Through) ceremonies were invented.

I know that in the 1930s at Iowa State, the college administration worried over the influx of Utah male graduate students (who tended to be married) because graduate fellowships paid only \$50 or \$60 a month and the minimum amount on which a couple could survive was \$75. There were not enough campus

jobs to hire the wives. I was a single graduate student with a fellowship and so was Wynne Thorne, and we were warned that if we married one of us would lose our stipend, so we postponed marriage.

Another group of women, not quite so invisible as the aforementioned women relatives, were those hired directly by the college who, while they did not have the prestige of the faculty, rendered services that were vital to the functioning of the college. These were the assistants, secretaries, clerks, switchboard operators, matrons (custodians), and cooks. Some were single, a few were married (but not to faculty), and some were widows. For several years Utah Agricultural College hired widows of faculty onto the library staff, though they lacked training, a gesture of goodwill since there was no adequate system of retirement and other benefits for faculty.

In the history of UAC, Vera Carlson, secretary to President E. G. Peterson (1916-45), was held in high regard by both campus and town folks. She was unmarried but had numerous nieces and nephews who spoke of the college as "Aunt Vera's college." They had almost a proprietary air about it and of course most of them did go on to college.⁴¹ We get a brief glimpse of the life of cooks and matrons in Walter Koch's mention of his wife Marie working at the college, but we need a fuller account.⁴²

Faculty Wives

Faculty wives had a formal organization that included women faculty and sometimes other women as well. William Jasper Kerr was president of UAC from 1900 to 1907. His wife, Leonora Hamilton Kerr, created the Utah Agricultural College Women's League in 1904. It included "all lady students as well as lady members of the faculty, and wives of instructors and wives of students." The annual fee to belong was twenty-five cents. In 1910 its name was changed to the UAC Faculty Women's League, and "each faculty wife and lady faculty member" had a list of "seven lady students to whom she was to be patroness."

However, Mrs. Kerr did not stick around until 1910 to see these changes. Her husband had become president of Oregon Agricultural College in 1907, and once they were settled in Corvallis she created the College Folk Club, which again included all women connected with the college. But there was tension between the college and town women.

The Folk Club became the envy of town women, who were not eligible to join. So much pressure was brought to include the wives of ministers, and then the wives of public school officials, that it threatened to get out of hand. Mrs. Kerr's ingenuity came to the fore again. She suggested to some of those clamoring for admission that they form a city Women's Club. This separate-but-equal idea did not appeal to them at first, and they came back with the suggestion that the Folk Club disband

and join in forming an all-city club. This looked like defeating an original purpose of the College Folk Club, which was to foster an esprit de corps on campus... . Eventually, the Women's Club was formed, and many of the older women connected with the college, who had lived in the town long enough to feel part of it, became active members.⁴³

My mother, Louise Larson Comish, belonged to both the College Folk Club and the Women's Club and I remember her going off to meetings in her best dress with hat and gloves, little dreaming that in 1937 I would begin doing the same thing at Texas A&M College, and then from 1939 onward in Logan. In my case, the hat and gloves disappeared in short order, but my membership in Faculty Women's League continues today.

Faculty wives were always listed in the yearbook by their husbands' names, as Mrs. without their own first names being given. Although I had a Ph.D. and had done some college teaching, I was Mrs. D. Wynne Thorne in the yearbook.⁴⁴ Women faculty were listed by their own names.

As late as 1958 when Allie Burgoyne, a faculty wife, made her study of the early years of Utah Agricultural College she listed her authorship as Mrs. David A. Burgoyne. It is a splendid piece of historical research done as a Faculty Women's League program, but neither the history department nor anyone else ever suggested that it be published.

What faculty wives did on their own was not considered intellectually professional. Not long before her death, Phebe Nebeker Peterson, wife of the sixth president of UAC, wrote *Remembering E. G. Peterson: His Life and Our Story*. In describing the National Summer School of 1924 she names as one of the distinguished visiting lecturers Dr. Elmer V. McCollum, biochemist with the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health, and modestly puts into a footnote the following:

Dr. McCollum gave invaluable health suggestions to our family throughout the years. Being interested in nutrition and health and considered the family nurse, it was most interesting to discuss such things with him. I was naturally pleased to have him tell me I had a research type of mind and that my observations were good.⁴⁵

It was a strange relationship, that between faculty wife and college. Faculty wives must support the college, not reveal matters their husbands told them in confidence, show proper respect to college authorities and their wives (as if we were really capable of disrespect), and do good deeds for students and student wives. League membership was dropped by just not paying the annual dues. This was done so quietly that no one knew whether the dropouts were outright rebels or were just overworked in their lives and did not have time for League.

Some faculty wives were doing a great deal of church and community work. Those with young children had plenty of work to do caring for their families and

keeping their households going. Earlier in this century, and in some cases today, there were large gardens and summer canning. Considering the agricultural interests of many of the faculty, some kept chickens and even a cow. But wives put on a proper appearance for faculty wives' meetings.

Because of low pay and a lack of amenities, it was hard to entice easterners to become faculty in the West. Therefore, administrators sent their western men out for advanced training, assuming they would return, which they usually did, at least for a time before going elsewhere. There were some well-trained faculty men at the early land-grant colleges, with advanced degrees from Harvard, Cornell, and the larger midwest institutions. Some faculty had taken their wives with them when they went off to graduate work, and on their return the wives compared social experiences that involved faculty wives' organizations.

The faculty expected the college experience to take the rough edges off the students from rural areas,⁴⁶ but apparently women students arrived with, and acquired more polish than males. Around 1920 my parents used to be invited to dinner at sororities and fraternities at Oregon Agricultural College and would observe on their return from such an evening that while the fraternities had the most food, the sororities had the best china and silver but not really enough food.

Besides all the domestic work at home, and putting on a good social front in public, faculty wives sometimes helped their husbands with their college work. They graded student papers, typed and edited their husbands' manuscripts, checked bibliographies, read galley proofs, and sometimes even did their husbands' research. At Cornell, for example, four botany professors were married to Wellesley graduates in botany, who all remained active scientists, working in their husbands' labs.⁴⁷

In 1920 at my father's suggestion my mother took a class in economics from him, and also took a class in typewriting. Then with a portable Remington typewriter perched on her lap she typed the manuscripts of the articles and books that he wrote. She sometimes helped him make charts for classroom use because she had a steady hand with the primitive print set which they had purchased.

So obviously faculty wives labored, but it was invisible work. How does one describe in a concise term what they did? Thorstein Veblen's terms "conspicuous consumption" and "conspicuous leisure"⁴⁸ do not fit because most faculty were relatively poor, and the wives had too much work to do. A more recent term, "vicarious achievement," is Jean Lipman-Blumen's term which contrasts with independent achievement on one's own.⁴⁹ Yet the faculty wives I knew in those early years looked at the situation as a partnership, with husband and wife doing what seemed wisest toward the best use of resources in rearing a good family and in making the husband a success in his professional career. One must realize that as late as 1939, divorce among the faculty of agricultural colleges was rare and most wives anticipated a fairly secure future, not munificent, but secure.

A more appropriate concept may be "family status production," which Hanna Papanek uses in describing situations where paid work by all family members is not necessary for family survival, and where the family's social

standing is enhanced by the wife's activities such as upkeep of suitable work clothes, entertainment of colleagues, and secretarial or editorial work at home for family members.⁵⁰ The wife's work remains unacknowledged or unrewarded in any *direct* sense. It has occurred to me that there are rewards such as travel with one's husband and meeting stimulating people, but these are indirect rewards. Is getting to sit at the head table at official functions a reward? More likely a mixed blessing.

The training of children is also part of the family's status maintenance, signaling the family's present as well as future aspirations. Papanek points out that much status work cannot be delegated to others. The "woman of the house" must do it. Papanek speaks in broad terms, making her concept applicable to various times and classes of society. But I can see the importance of her analysis for trying to understand the work that faculty wives did in the early agricultural college situation.

Papanek says that where the labor force is highly segregated by gender and only a few occupations are open to women whose families are concerned with status and social mobility, status production is likely to be important and highly elaborated at certain class levels. I am wondering if this statement explains why faculty wives' organizations were much more ritualized and better attended in early days than today when many wives have become earners in their own right and do not even bother to join such organizations, unless their husbands happen to be in administration, in which case status maintenance remains important.

There is evidence that women faculty appreciated faculty wives. Certainly Dean Ava B. Milam of OAC expressed such appreciation in her book, *Adventures of a Home Economist*. In addition, close friendships occurred between faculty wives and women faculty. My mother was good friends with many women faculty of OAC, most of whom she had come to know at College Folk Club and from attending occasional demonstrations and lectures.

And yet there must have been some hidden tensions. One could analyze the lists of faculty and the faculty women's yearbooks to find out if all women faculty did choose to join, and to what extent they served as officers and on committees. All was not sweetness and light. I was aware at one point that women extension faculty resented the director's wife taking over the planning of certain events they felt were their prerogative.

At the Utah Agricultural College in the early 1930s, there were only two faculty members who also happened to be faculty wives. They were abruptly terminated in 1936 because they had husbands on the faculty. They were Allie Burgoyne, assistant registrar, and O. Blanche Condit Pittman, clerk for the experiment station. Allie Burgoyne had begun in 1930, and O. Blanche Condit Pittman in 1916 when she arrived from out of state, apparently with a background that insisted one's maiden name was important even after marriage.⁵¹ Their husbands, David A. Burgoyne and Don Pittman, remained on the faculty until retirement. After losing their positions, these women turned to unpaid community work of various sorts, remained loyal to the college, were especially

active in the faculty wives' organization, and did not openly criticize the anti-nepotism ruling.⁵²

It is obvious that land-grant colleges did not tolerate the idea that a faculty wife might be a faculty member. Faculty wives who sought professional intellectual fulfillment found the door to academic employment closed. They might enter the academic world as wives at college functions, but they were not welcomed as professional colleagues.

Summary and Conclusions

From 1890 to 1940 the most visible women at the land-grant colleges were students and faculty. Women students were fewer than men and were likely to be majoring in arts and science, home economics, and education. Although dairying and horticulture were women's courses to start with, after a time they became dominated by males. This transition needs further study. Engineering particularly was a male-dominated field.

Far fewer women than men were on the teaching faculty. Even in extension, which had a considerable number of women agents, men dominated. Women faculty were more likely to be in home economics than in any other area. In research, women were rare.

Because of the traditional assumption that wife-and-motherhood was a full-time career, only 10 percent of women faculty were married. If a single woman married, she usually left employment. Women faculty had less advanced education than men, tended to be in lower ranks, and received less pay. It was extremely rare that a faculty wife was also a faculty member, a reality reinforced by the antinepotism rulings of the depression, effects of which lingered on for thirty more years.

Then there were the women employees of the college such as secretaries, switchboard operators, matrons, and cooks. College records could give some information on them, but nobody seems to have bothered to research their working conditions, wages, or relationships to other categories of women.

The most invisible were the women relatives and other women in the community who gave support to college students, particularly in doing laundry, providing food, and typing. Student wives were among these.

Nor should we overlook the farm women across the state who were supposed to be among the recipients of knowledge generated by research and disseminated by extension. Did they have as much access as men? Was women's access only in home economics or was it also in farming methods if they wanted such help?

Faculty wives made themselves visible through the annual yearbook of their own college organization to which women faculty also belonged. Are these yearbooks in college archives and have they been studied? Faculty wives did invisible work in "fostering an interest in the needs and aims of the college" and in

rearing their families and seeking to further their husbands' careers. This work can be called "status maintenance" and deserves further study.

Hanna Papanek has written:

Understanding women's work and its worth is difficult—it is less visible, less clearly rewarded in concrete terms, than the work of men, and it is more likely to be seen simply as a source of private comfort and welfare. Its broader social and economic implications need to be brought out of hiding.⁵³

In my analysis I have emphasized ways in which people got along together, an emphasis internalized in my youth and reinforced by what was expected of faculty wives. One could take the subject matter of this paper and analyze it in other configurations; for example, tensions and conflict between producers and consumers of farm products, between the liberal arts university and the land-grant college, between town and gown, between faculty wives and women faculty, between men and women. The whole subject of women in the history of land-grant colleges needs a great deal more research to emerge into full visibility.

NOTES

1. David Fairchild, *The World Was My Garden: Travels of a Plant Explorer* (New York: Scribners, 1938) describes the early Michigan and Kansas agricultural colleges. See pp. 3, 7-8.
2. Joel Edward Ricks, *The Utah State Agricultural College: A History of Fifty Years, 1888-1938* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1938), p. 15.
3. *Annual Catalogue of the Agricultural College of Utah, 1890-91*, p. 23. See also p. 7 of a study of the early catalogs of UAC, "Our University as I Know It." Talk prepared by Mrs. David A. Burgoyne for the Utah State University Faculty Women's League Program, November 7, 1958, unpublished. Also see Ricks, pp. 42-43.
4. This information about Dr. Margaret Snell is from Ava Milam Clark and J. Kenneth Munford, *Adventures of a Home Economist* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 1969). See especially chapter 4 and p. 39.
5. See Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), chapter 1 and especially p. 10.
6. *Annual Catalogue of the Agricultural College of Utah, 1891-92*, pp. 32-33. Quoted by Burgoyne, p. 6 and Ricks, p. 42.
7. Burgoyne, p. 6; *Annual Catalogue, 1890-91*, p. 21; *Annual Catalogue, 1894-95*, p. 22.
8. U.S. Office of Education, *Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities*, Bulletin No. 9, 1930, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office). See 1:869-70, 888. I recall that it was a widow on the home economics faculty of OAC who built up the quality of its work in child development. Sara Prentiss began in 1917 as instructor in domestic science, but by 1926 had become professor of child development and parent education. She had two sons (I was in the same class as her son Donald while going through grade school) and since she was a mother herself this gave people confidence in her. She did advanced study at distinguished institutions and was extremely competent. See Clark and Munford, pp. 120-21.
9. *Land-Grant Survey*, 1:870. In the 1920s in Utah there seems to have been a law or a precedent against married women teaching in the public schools. At the Whittier Elementary School in Logan, Desie Aldrich Johnson (Mrs. C. R.) and Retta Webb Jennings (Mrs. David S.) were terminated in 1924 because they were married. Their husbands also happened to be on the UAC faculty and this may have been a contributing factor. Interview with Grace Jennings Smith, daughter of Mrs. Jennings, January 27 and February 28, 1985.
10. *Land-Grant Survey*, 1:585.
11. *Land-Grant Survey*, 1:735.
12. In 1921 the American Association of University Professors published a preliminary report of the status of women on college and university faculties, covering most of the 176 institutions represented by its members. See *Biennial Survey, 1920-22*, 1. See also *Report of the American Association of University Professors, Bulletin*, Oct. 1921, No. 6, vol. 7. For a quick summary of the findings with regard to women professors, see Thomas Woody, *A History of Women's Education in the United States* (New

York: Octagon Books, 1966), 2:329. Woody's two-volume work was first published in 1929 by Science Press and is excellent.

13. Sophonisba Breckinridge, "University Women in the New Order," *AAUW Journal* 26(1933):198. I knew Breckinridge when I did graduate work at the University of Chicago in 1935-36. I lived at Green Hall and so did she. As honorary head of the Hall she brought her friends to dinner and we had an opportunity to meet them. Quite frequent visitors were Marion Talbot and Grace and Edith Abbott, who, with Breckinridge had built social work into a profession. Frances Perkins also came for a visit. She was then serving as Secretary of Labor under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Biographies of these women can be found in *Notable American Women, 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary*, 3 vols., 1971, and *Modern Period* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap, 1980).
14. *AAUW Journal* 31(1937):45.
15. *Land-Grant Survey*, 2:69.
16. *Oregon Stater*, April 1983.
17. *Land-Grant Survey*, 1:778.
18. Evelyn Fox Keller, *A Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock* (New York: Freeman, 1983), pp. 29-30, 35, 53.
19. Margaret W. Rossiter, "Women Scientists in America before 1920," *American Scientist* 62(1974):312-23. See especially p. 314.
20. *Land-Grant Survey*, 2:20, 1:968.
21. Iowa Agricultural College had a very strong home economics program with its freshmen (all women) taking chemistry under Dr. Nettie May Naylor. An excellent teacher, she also supervised graduate theses and all her graduate students were women. "What is striking today is the sex segregation that went unquestioned at the time." *The Iowa Stater*, March 1985, p. 9.
22. Burgoyne, p. 6.
23. *Oregon Stater*, April 1983.
24. Margy Bare, "Oregon Agricultural College," *Pioneers!* N.p., n.d.
25. *UAC Annual Catalogue 1894-95*, p. 29; E. M. Calvin, "Another Women's Land Army?" *Independent Woman* (April 1942):102-4. This reference is in Collette Moser and Deborah Johnson, *Rural Women Workers in the 20th Century: An Annotated Bibliography*, Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs, Special Paper No. 15 (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1973), p. 54.
26. Clark and Munford, p. 129.
27. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary, *Social and Labor Needs of Farm Women*, Report No. 103:89 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1915).
28. USDA Report No. 103:7.

29. These USDA reports are numbers 103, 104, 105, 106; all published in 1915.
30. See Appendix C of Report No. 103.
31. On the summer encampments, see p. 100 of Mrs. E. G. Peterson, *Remembering E. G. Peterson* (Logan, Utah: Old Main Society, 1974).
32. Frances Hill, "Women in Agriculture: American Farm Women in Global Perspective," in Barbara C. Lewis, (ed.), *Invisible Farmers: Women and the Crisis in Agriculture* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Women in Development, USAID, April 1981), pp. 132-36.
33. Boserup was the first to point out that in the developing world women who farm are bypassed by agricultural extension and other agencies. See Ester Boserup, *Woman's Role in Economic Development* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970). Staudt later found the same pattern. Kathleen Staudt, "Administrative Resources, Political Patrons and Redressing Sex Inequities: A Case from Western Kenya," *Journal of Developing Areas* 12(1978):399-414.
34. William Peterson, *Annual Report of Director, Extension Service, Utah, 141*, p. 2. Utah State University Archives, E. G. Peterson Box 158, Folder 9.
35. Donald A. John, "Utah 4-H, a Dynamic Youth Program," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 51(1983): 176, 178.
36. Benjamin R. Andrews has summarized the growth of home economics research projects in "Home Economics, 1848-1948." *Journal of Home Economics* 40 (1948):281-82. The Oregon Agricultural College experience is summarized in chapter 14 of Clark and Munford. The Utah Agricultural College summary appears in Utah Agricultural Experiment Station, *Pioneering in Western Agriculture: A Resume of the First Half Century of Research 1888-1938*, Bulletin 282:89-91 (Logan, 1938).
37. Almeda Perry Brown, "Nutritional Status of Some Utah Population Groups." Third Annual Faculty Research Lecture. (Logan: The Faculty Association, Utah State Agricultural College, 1944). For the list of faculty that includes her name, see "Staff Members Utah Agricultural Experiment Station 1888-1963" (Logan: Utah State University), p. 7. Almeda Perry Brown received her B.S. from UAC in 1901 and her M.A. from Columbia in 1915. She was assistant professor of foods and nutrition 1926-27, associate professor 1937-44, acting dean of home economics 1943-45, and professor 1944-45.
38. Maud Wilson, *Use of Time by Oregon Farm Home-Makers*, Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 256 (Corvallis, 1929).
39. Margaret G. Reid, *Status of Farm Housing In Iowa*, Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 174 (Ames, 1934).
40. Clark and Munford, p. 84.
41. Interview with Virginia Carlson Parker regarding "Aunt Vera's college," January 27, 1985.
42. Walter Koch says of Marie that for nine years "she worked as a pastry cook in the university cafeteria, many times ten to 12 hours a day, then for seven years as a

matron in the custodial department." Walter Koch, "We All Worked," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 52(1984):393-95.

43. Clark and Munford, pp. 56-57. A somewhat similar situation seems to have occurred in Logan. The original organization, the Utah Agricultural College Women's Club, came to include socially elite town women. This club withdrew from campus and became a select group of 25 members, some of them town women and some faculty-related women, still in existence today as the A.C. Women's Club. I joined the on campus Faculty Women's League in 1939, and by then eligibility rules were quite strict. Wives of minor employees could not belong, nor could secretaries. Even the wives of federal collaborators were slated to be ousted until I gathered up support of the Newcomers, through their chairman, Grace Jennings Smith, and we outvoted the opposition and kept the federal collaborators' wives in. My high school friend Helen Kammerer Niederhauser told me that at Orono, Maine, there was a similar struggle and the federal collaborators' wives lost their membership. It all seems a tempest in a teapot today when membership in many traditional women's organizations is declining due to women's increasing employment and their other interests.
44. Presidents' wives identified themselves closely with their husbands. When Mrs. E. G. Peterson, wife of the man who served Utah Agricultural College as president from 1916 to 1945, wrote the story of his life, she listed her authorship as Mrs. E. G. Peterson. Only by reading the book does one learn that she was Phebe Nebeker before her marriage. See Mrs. E. G. Peterson, *Remembering E. G. Peterson: His Life and Our Story* (Logan, Utah: Old Main Society, 1974). The wife of a president who came later, Daryl Chase (1954-68), wrote a delightful little book about the president's home, which had been designed as a model farm home when the college was founded. She listed her authorship as Alice Chase, but the book gives no indication of her family name before marriage. See Alice Chase, *The Story of a House: The President's Home, Utah State University, Logan, Utah*. Privately published, n.d.
45. Mrs. E. G. Peterson, p. 82. In the early years of the 1900s there is an occasional instance of a wife entering the professional sphere. For example, Leah D. Widstoe, wife of the fifth president of UAC, authored a publication *Labor Saving Devices for the Farm Home*, Utah Agricultural College Experiment Station, Extension Services. Circular No. 6, June 1912. She had written this for and read it before the First International Congress of Farm Women, Colorado Springs, Oct., 17-21, 1911. Another instance occurred at Michigan Agricultural College where Mrs. Marshall was in charge of the music department for six years; she was the wife of Professor C. E. Marshall, head of the bacteriology department. See Maude Gilchrist, *The First Three Decades of Home Economics at Michigan State College* (East Lansing, School of Home Economics, 1947), p. 18.
46. Frank Russell Arnold, professor of modern languages (1904-38) became legendary at UAC for smoothing rough edges off rural youth. He was proud of being from New England. "Fussy" Arnold, as he was known, "loved the niceties of life. He would give unusual gifts to favored friends and invite them to fancy teas (with a bunch of violets for each lady).... Or he could say scathing things in class that infuriated boys, and too frequently, had a girl in tears. Yet he would go to any length to help a student he considered worth it." Mrs. E. G. Peterson, p. 8.
47. Keller, p. 53. Contemporary sociologist, Arlie Russell Hochschild, has shown forcefully that helpful wives are essential to men's professional success and that single career women have suffered from this competition. See her article, "Inside the

Clockwork of Male Careers," pp. 47-80 in *Women and the Power to Change*, ed. Florence Howe (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975). I am indebted to Barrie Thorne for bringing this reference to my attention.

48. Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (New York: MacMillan, 1899), chapters 3 and 4.
49. Jean Lipman-Blumen, "How Ideology Shapes Women's Lives," *Scientific American* (January 1972):34-42.
50. Hanna Papanek, "Family Status Production: The 'Work' and 'Non-Work' of Women," *Signs, Journal of Women in Culture and Society* (1979):775-81. Some years earlier, before she evolved the term, "family status maintenance," Papanek was puzzling over this kind of women's work and discussed the situation of American corporate executives' wives, military wives, and academic wives. See her article, "Men, Women, and Work: Reflections on the Two-Person Career," *American Journal of Sociology* 78(1973):852-72.
51. A listing of all UAC faculty between 1890 and 1938 appears in Ricks, with Allie Burgoyne and Blanche Pittman being listed on p. 174 and p. 180. Neither of these women had children so the general prejudice against employment of women with children was not a factor in their dismissal.
52. Both women were very active in the American Association of University Women (AAUW), as were most women faculty. To belong to AAUW one had to have graduated from an approved listing of colleges and universities. Faculty wives who were not eligible for AAUW were sometimes wistful, sometimes resentful, but sometimes they began taking college courses on a piecemeal basis and completed their degrees. Marion Talbot was a principal founder of AAUW in 1881, and was still active in it in 1935-36 as were Sophonisba Breckinridge and the Abbott sisters. See note 13 above.
53. Papanek (1979), p. 581.

