

**Learning to Teach in the Countryside:
Marion Gee (1928-2015)**

Steve Grineski

Minnesota State University Moorhead

The central U.S. states have more rural students and schools than any other region. A graduate of a teacher education program who wants to teach in a rural school faces a number of challenges, especially when compared with educational conditions in urban areas: smaller salaries, more than one grade or subject matter assignment, less opportunity for socialization and work with colleagues, and limited knowledge of rural schools and communities.* The professional experiences described in this paper mitigate these challenges. The biography of Marion Gee (1928-2015) traces her early education in a one-room school, moves to her coursework and student teaching in a nationally recognized rural teacher education program at Moorhead State Teachers College, and explores her engagement in rural Oak Mound School and the community in which the school was located. Her experiences are useful for teacher educators who want to develop better programs for aspiring rural teachers.

—Ed.

“Marion Francis [Taus] Gee, 86, Fargo[,] ND, died at her home, Tuesday, July 28th 2015.”¹ So begins the obituary of Marion Gee (1928–2015). In 1953 she married Melton Gee, who in 1923 had belonged to the first class of students completing the tenth grade at Oak Mound School in Minnesota. The couple were long-time residents of the Minnesota village, Marion Gee serving as organist for the Oak Mound Congregational Church for forty-six years.²

Marion Gee was a 1947 graduate of a program in the nationally recognized Department of Rural Education at the Moorhead State Teachers College (MSTC), Minnesota.³ In addition to finishing the two-year program of study, she completed student teaching at Oak Mound School, served as the supervising teacher for grades one through four for four years, and was principal for one additional year. Her experiences illustrate how a teacher preparation program and

relationships among affiliated rural school supervisors and student teachers can contribute significantly to a teacher's professional development. Although twenty percent of American kindergarten through grade twelve students are enrolled in rural public schools, few teacher preparation programs focus on rural schoolteaching.⁴ Those who aspire to develop programs for today's rural teachers should examine the life of Marion Gee, whose professional development offers a model of the best of mid-century country schoolteacher education.

Oak Mound School was a modern, two-story brick multi-room school located on four acres of wooded land ten miles from the college campus (Figure 1). It was established in 1913 by consolidating three neighboring one-room schools. Marion Gee fondly remembered her introduction to the village and its school:

Well, it was the most delightful experience, and of course I was sent to Oak Mound School to student teach. On our way from my home town of Angus, Minnesota, we'd ride the Greyhound bus. And the bus would swing into this little bitty place called Kragnes. And then especially in the evening, it was kind of pretty to look across the landscape towards the trees and river. And I'd think to myself, "I wonder what these poor people do around here," not knowing that in the group of trees to the west was this beautiful school in this wonderful community. And so I was assigned there [to student teach] and I found what it was like. And it was so fun. The community was so great. But the school, of course, held the community together. It was just the best experience.⁵



Figure 1: Oak Mound School; all photos in the article courtesy of the author.

While Marion Gee was student teaching in 1947, a faculty member told her that "she must be a part of the community, that's what the school board want[ed;] she was not to be a suitcase student."⁶ She took these words to heart. Because of her positive experience while student teaching at Oak Mound School, she desired to teach and live in the community. She thought that if she took a difficult job in a small country school and was successful, the experience would position her favorably to return to Oak Mound School. Indeed it did, and the following year she was hired to teach there.⁷

Rural Living and Schooling in Angus, Minnesota

Marion Gee's family roots run deep in northwestern Minnesota beginning with the family of Frank Taus, who settled there in 1894.⁸ Marion Gee's life began in 1928 on the wind-swept, rich farmland of the Red River Valley that borders Minnesota and North Dakota. Her family's farm was located near the small prairie town of Angus, Minnesota. Angus is situated in Polk County about one hundred fifty miles south of Minnesota's northern border and about three hundred miles north of Minnesota's southern border.⁹ Marion Gee was the middle child of five siblings. Most likely due to collapsing farm prices, her family moved to town and began running a service station in 1930.

Marion Gee attended District No. 59 School from 1934 to 1941. This one-room school for grades one through eight was built in 1890 and expanded in 1908 to a two-room building.¹⁰ These years witnessed relatively steady rural school numbers. During the eight years of Gee's District 59 schooling, about one-half of all students living in the middle section of the nation attended schools similar to Gee's. In 1930, about 150,000 rural schools populated the nation's countryside, but by 1948 this number had decreased by almost 50 percent.¹¹

Marion Gee and her siblings were bused eight miles north to Warren, Minnesota to complete grades nine through twelve. Busing was a common practice because many small towns lacked the necessary funds to provide secondary education programs. An interview with Marion Gee's 63-year-old son, Jerry Gee, reveals much about his mother's experiences with her family and her teachers.¹² Life in her family, like that of many of the nation's families, was strained due to the Great Depression. Her parents told her "she had to make her own money and be self-sufficient."¹³ To help reduce the family's financial insecurity, she worked at the family's service station and the local rural telephone company. Along with her classmates, she was released from school to harvest the world-famous Red River Valley potato crop during World War II. Jerry Gee said that because of her upbringing, she developed a positive attitude that influenced her throughout her many years as a student, teacher, spouse, mother, and grandmother.¹⁴

Marion Gee aspired to teach for several reasons. She admired the teachers who influenced her to think about teaching as a career. The limited occupational choices for women during this time certainly contributed to her thinking. A value she held dear was her love of learning. Jerry Gee recalled that "she wanted to learn everything about everything." She loved poetry, literature, music, and art, and wanted to share that love with students.¹⁵

In the fall of 1945, Marion Gee traveled eighty miles south to Moorhead State Teachers College to begin her dream of becoming a teacher. Her son later recalled that she loved her schoolwork and undergraduate life on the Moorhead campus. Some of her teachers and peers became her friends and later lifelong colleagues. As a result, she did not often go home during this time or while teaching at Oak Mound School. In Jerry Gee's words, "She just thrived on [Moorhead's] campus and . . . relished the atmosphere of learning."¹⁶ The next year her younger sister, Mickey, who also wanted to teach, joined her sister at the college.

A New Vision of Country Schooling

Thirty-four years before Marion Gee enrolled at MSTC, President Theodore Roosevelt issued the *Report of the Commission on Country Life*, a document that detailed a comprehensive vision for country living, working, and schooling.¹⁷ The report asserted that across the nation's countryside, rural life demanded revitalization. The data revealed a host of problems such as rural out-migration, inadequate social systems, and ineffective farming practices. The root cause for these problems, the report stated, was the dismal state of many rural schools. These schools had too few or too many students and were underfunded and staffed by poorly trained and ill-supervised teachers. Many schoolhouses suffered from great disrepair, inadequate heating, and poor lighting. A lack of rural-focused curricula compounded these problems and was believed to push rural students to the city.¹⁸

Comprehensive reform was seen as the solution. President Roosevelt called for a "new kind of school in the country" with the goal of creating a new class of teachers capable of transforming rural schools and their communities.¹⁹ The report envisioned bountiful living and effective working conditions for rural families. It predicted that engaged country churches and rural-focused schools would stimulate open-country villages to take cooperative actions to create an attractive rural way of life that was highly social.²⁰ Although contemporary scholars have conflicting interpretations of the report and its intentions, a new vision certainly emerged for rural teacher preparation, teaching, and schooling.²¹

Mabel Carney, a leading rural teacher educator in the early twentieth century, advocated for the kind of change posited in the *Report of the Commission on Country Life*. She proposed, in her 1912 seminal text on rural schooling, *Country Life and the Country School*,²² a plan for transforming rural teacher preparation, rural teaching, and rural schooling.²³ As espoused by

Mabel Carney, meaningful and engaging curriculum and instruction would frame holistic and relational ways to strengthen rural teaching and school-community partnerships. She believed that carefully planned and focused teacher preparation programs were needed to develop teachers capable of adjusting instruction to the needs and interests of rural students and practicing effective leadership in rural communities. This kind of intentional training began as early as 1902 on the campus of Indiana State Normal School at Terre Haute, Indiana.²⁴

In the year Mabel Carney's influential text appeared, Moorhead offered a course called Rural School Methods that marked the beginning of the college's focus on rural teacher preparation.²⁵ Four years later, Frank Weld, Moorhead's president, recognized that rural teachers needed more specialized study, so the Department of Rural Education was established. The administrative structure included the appointment of a department director and a supervisor of rural schools.²⁶ Preparing teachers was central to the mission of this small university located in northwestern Minnesota. Between 1916 and 1951, eighteen hundred Moorhead students completed specialized rural courses, student taught in one- and two-room rural schools affiliated with MSTC, and lived in rural communities.²⁷ Among the thirteen schools partnering with MSTC, Oak Mound School enjoyed the longest running affiliation (1925 to 1951).²⁸ By 1928, 83 percent of the nation's normal schools and state teachers colleges offered similar coursework.²⁹ Most, if not all, of the nation's rural education programs relied heavily on Mabel Carney's text for program development.³⁰ Her progressive ideas were evident in Moorhead's Rural School Methods course, the Department of Rural Education, and another initiative called the Affiliated Rural School Program.³¹

Like other teacher education students, Marion Gee took content-area courses such as Music, Physical Education, Art, and Children's Literature—each adapted for rural school teaching. Her coursework also included Agriculture, Rural Home Economics, Rural Sociology, Rural School Methods, Rural School Observation, and Rural School Management. In Rural Home Economics, students assisted a hired cook and housekeeper with cooking and serving hot lunches. The Rural Sociology course was designed to provide students with insights into how to adjust teaching to the needs of rural students and the communities in which they lived. In Rural Management, students studied rural community life and home-school relations and learned how to establish boys and girls clubs.³² Marion Gee later recalled that her courses were enriched by Mabel Carney's programmatic ideas of providing specialized, rural-focused curriculum and instruction

adapted to rural students' needs and equipping teachers to serve as transformative community leaders.³³

Marion Gee was particularly impressed by Mabel Carney's recommendation that teacher preparation programs require students to live in rural communities while completing student teaching in model rural schools.³⁴ Student teaching, which marked the conclusion of the two-year program of study, occurred in partnership or "affiliations" with thirteen rural schools located within fifteen miles of the college campus. Affiliation was conceptualized as professional relationships characterized by high degrees of interdependence and reciprocity. To be selected for an affiliation, rural schools had to demonstrate "progressive" educational programs, available and appropriate housing, state accreditation, and district boards that agreed to affiliate with the Department of Rural Education. These schools would then serve as student teaching centers, demonstration and experimental sites, and locales where supervisory skills were developed.³⁵

In keeping with its innovative philosophy, Moorhead offered a course called Supervising Rural Teaching designed to provide the knowledge and skills needed to effectively supervise future student teachers. The faculty also offered continuing education courses for the supervisors beginning in 1925 and continuing until 1951. The goals of this innovative in-service program were building community among supervisors and extending the instruction begun in the initial supervising course. These courses were offered evenings and weekends, much like post-Bachelor of Science degree offerings today. Additionally, supervisors were invited to be guests of the college for campus events such as plays and informal coffee get-togethers. Taken as a whole, the program sought to provide specialized preparation for effective rural teaching and opportunities for community building. Marion Gee later recalled that she felt well prepared for student teaching, teaching grades one through four, and supervising student teachers at Oak Mound School³⁶ (Figure 2, 3).



Figure 2: Marion Gee third from left talking about teaching with students and MSTC faculty.



Figure 3: Marion Gee playing the piano for her students.

Between 1925 and 1951, over four hundred students completed practice teaching at Oak Mound School. MSTC's affiliated rural school student teaching numbers increased from 35 in 1934 to 125 in 1942. In 1947, when Marion Gee student taught at Oak Mound School, 43 of her classmates were also student teaching in the Affiliated Rural School Program.³⁷ They not only planned and taught lessons but learned to live, participate, and lead in the Oak Mound community under the mentoring eyes of thirty-five supervising teachers. Supervisors held faculty status and were recognized as some of MSTC's finest graduates. Like Marion Gee, they were key stakeholders who provided all-important links between the school and the community, the student teachers, and the college faculty.³⁸

Bette Haring, a 1950 student teacher, stressed the importance of community connections and relationship-building when she said that it saddened her to see teachers from a local school drive away from the school and its community on their way home after a day of teaching. She wondered, "How can they teach the students when they don't know about their neighborhoods and communities?"³⁹ When she student taught at Oak Mound School under Marion Gee's supervision, Bette Haring had a very different experience. Haring, her fellow student teachers, and the supervising teachers were a "community" since they lived together. Many times, they worshiped at the nearby Oak Mound Church and interacted with community members on the school's grounds.⁴⁰

Strong community relationships were a driving force behind Marion Gee's devotion to Oak Mound School. The school kept its doors open after school and on weekends, thereby providing

access to community members whenever they wanted to gather. During Marion Gee's career at Oak Mound School, over thirty-five different community groups congregated in the school. She recalled the community's response to a power outage from a powerful winter storm.

[The] Oak Mound School district installed a powerful generator to use when the electricity failed, which often happened during winter storms and spring ice storms. One winter, the electricity was off for many days. This affected the entire community. But with the [school's] community kitchen that had been installed on the second floor, many of the [Oak Mound] residents came to the school to have meals together and even card parties. Also the school had a very heavy and sturdy stage. Occasionally this was brought down for Christmas programs. During the time of the power outage, the community residents came to the school and we gave one-act plays, then had lunch in the community kitchen. We had electricity from the generator and water for the bathroom.⁴¹

Developing positive relationships and instilling a strong sense of community were goals set through the student teaching/supervising model in the MSTC Affiliated Rural School Program. This model captured current progressive thinking through a communal vision of teacher preparation and rural schooling. Values such as collegiality, interdependence, reciprocity, and shared decision-making anchored these relationships. Demonstrating these values, department directors negotiated student teaching contracts and living arrangements with local boards and community members invited faculty to their homes for dinners.⁴²

The MSTC student teachers assigned to Oak Mound School and their supervisors lived in the teacherage, a dorm-like space on the third floor of the schoolhouse. During each six-week teaching period, four student teachers lived in a room furnished by the college while their two supervisors lived in an adjacent room. Rent and meals totaled twelve dollars a week. Two student teachers and one supervisor taught about eight subjects daily in two classrooms (grades one through four and grades five through eight). Thus, they had many lessons to prepare.⁴³

Carol Drummond, a student teacher supervised by Marion Gee, recalled, "It was a pleasurable and supportive learning experience because of the close relationships developed between the student teachers and supervising teachers. . . . Teaching, living, and playing with the supervising teachers [were real assets] in learning about teaching. . . . [This] was our big focus."⁴⁴ Her student teaching mate, Marcella Gulsvig, said, "What a unique situation to live in the school, eat there, and teach there. . . . The people were wonderful." Drummond recalled, with a smile, the water fights between the student teachers and supervising teachers that were usually

started by the supervisors. This play occurred inside the teacherage as well as in the school yard. Like Drummond, Gulsvig enjoyed informal interactions with her supervisors. She remembered playing practical jokes on each other and having a great time doing it. Many of these relationships were long lasting, as noted by Drummond: “The girl I taught with I went to high school with . . . she’s coming to our sixtieth class reunion this summer . . . and later we taught at Mahnomen, Minnesota . . . and she was my maid of honor at my wedding.”⁴⁵

Bette Haring recalled not minding the lack of privacy in the teacherage because it was so much fun to live with three other student teachers. “I think we were all having a pretty good time. I don’t think you could interest women today to do that sort of thing.” Lois Bergeson also relished teacherage living because of the close relationships between student and supervising teachers. Haring remembered that caretaking duties were completed by the cook and housemother, Dagny, who prepared delicious meals. Both women recalled being “appreciated and treated in a liberal way” by their supervisors.⁴⁶

Comparable demographics among student and supervising teachers were likely to have enhanced their relationships. These women had all grown up in midwestern rural communities, attended rural schools, and enrolled in the same teacher preparation program. They were single females in their late teens to early twenties who were sharing the same working, living, and playing spaces.

Having student taught and supervised at Oak Mound School over a period of several years, Marion Gee fondly remembered both the work and the play.

After our evening meal and before we started working with lesson plans, we would have our fun time. Sometimes we would play basketball; there was one hoop in the game room. We would organize our teams at the beginning of each six-week period, then play through this time and end with a tournament before we would begin the process over again with a new batch of student teachers. One year we had some tall gals on one team and on the other team were the short ones. We called ourselves the “Tall Johns” and the “Short Joes.” Then we called our scores into Fargo television station WDAY Sports Director Bill Weaver. He took the information willingly, then pondered a moment and said, “The Tall Johns and Short Joes from Oak Mound School would be an intramural team, and so sorry it won’t make the news tonight.” We had a good laugh.⁴⁷

During Marion Gee’s tenure, these basketball games were repeated several times each year. It is easy to imagine how these kinds of informal social experiences resulted in meaningful friendships and positive working relationships. Not only did these ties speak to the powerful

connections these young women made while teaching, but also the opportunities the program intentionally helped them develop.

Marion Gee also recalled community-building events such as the annual music festivals and play days that were cooperatively planned and conducted by Department of Rural Education faculty, student teachers, and supervising teachers. Typically these large-scale events were held on the college campus with children and adults bused from the affiliated schools. Marion Gee enjoyed planning these events with the faculty, teaching her students the selected songs and games, and performing on the Moorhead campus before a large crowd.⁴⁸

Just as important were the day-to-day relationships that developed among the student teachers, supervising teachers, and college faculty. Much-needed assistance and encouragement were products of these relationships. Time and time again the people interviewed for this study spoke of the positive difference this support made. Whether it was student teachers learning the craft of teaching from their supervising teachers, supervising teachers solving living arrangement concerns, student teachers discussing the day's lessons, or college supervisors mentoring supervising teachers, ongoing support created a comprehensive student teaching program.

World War II affected both student teachers and supervisors during Marion Gee's Oak Mound School tenure. She and the student teachers she supervised interacted with parents and students from racial and ethnic groups different from their own. For example, three relocated Japanese families, following their release from internment in California, worked on the Hank Peterson farm near Oak Mound School. A Hispanic family settled in the Oak Mound School area and worked the same farm as the Japanese families.⁴⁹ Marion Gee taught the children from both families.

Due to the demands of World War II, it became more difficult to stay focused on the mission of improving the nation's rural schools. The war decimated the ranks of rural teachers and college enrollments plummeted when practicing and potential teachers entered the military or took jobs to support this effort. As a result, fewer teachers were available to work in rural schools, and fewer rural teacher education departments were needed to educate teachers. Furthermore, with an ever-increasing number of rural citizens entering the military, many rural communities nationwide lost population or vanished altogether along with their schools.⁵⁰ As a whole, the country experienced a severe teacher shortage. The only reason some rural schools remained open was the fact that over seventy thousand teachers were employed using emergency

certificates.⁵¹ MSTC-affiliated rural schools, including Oak Mound, were caught up in these developments. Ongoing school consolidation and farm-to-city migration accelerated this change. The last cohort of MSTC student teachers to complete the Department of Rural Education studies finished during the spring quarter of 1951, after which the program ended with differentiated teacher education replacing specialized rural teacher education.

Conclusion

The period in which Marion Gee lived was transformative for schools and their purposes. Schooling for a select few changed to schooling for a larger percentage of the population. The purposes of schooling grew, as did the expectations for formalized teacher preparation. The problem of securing adequately prepared teachers for rural schools eased during the early decades of the 1900s when over two hundred normal schools in forty-six states offered rural teacher education programs.⁵² Championing the progressive ideology of the Commission on Country Life were professors such as Mabel Carney, who contributed to the reforms by outlining specific plans for improving the preparation of rural teachers.

Progressive rural teacher preparation on the Moorhead campus began in 1916. The program prepared teachers for rural schools through a system of support and advocacy that emphasized curriculum designed to meet the demands of rural teaching. Moorhead's Affiliated Rural School Program captured current progressive thinking about relational teaching, living, and working through a shared vision of teacher preparation and rural schooling.

The teacher education program that engaged Marion Gee used cohort groups and residential living with an emphasis on collaboration, community-building, and effective university-community partnerships. This also held true for similar programs across the nation.⁵³ These efforts contributed to our body of knowledge about how to prepare teachers. It is ironic that this knowledge has had little impact on current practice.⁵⁴ The neglect of rural teacher training in many programs has resulted in a call for leaders in higher education to once again establish specialized rural training programs, create collaborative partnerships between teacher educators and rural schools, and develop off-campus centers for training purposes. However, this call remains unanswered. The situation is troubling given that one-half of all public school districts and one-third of all American public schools are located in rural areas, enrolling twenty percent of all American students.⁵⁵

Marion Gee made important connections between the college and the rural community, as well as with the student teachers who were learning the craft of rural teaching. Her brief biography focuses on only one stage of her life—when she completed her student teaching at Oak Mound School, then served as a supervising teacher for grades one through four for four years, and finally as principal. Her experiences illustrate how a teacher preparation program and relationships among affiliated rural school supervisors and student teachers can contribute positively to teachers' professional development.

*“Status of Education in Rural America,” National Center for Education Statistics, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007040>.



Steve Grineski, Ed.D., is a professor emeritus of education, Minnesota State University Moorhead (MSUM). He taught in public schools for ten years, then served for thirty-two years in various roles: MSUM department chairperson, graduate program coordinator, college dean, and professor. He also served as a liaison between the Teacher Education Department and local alternative education programs. His recent books include *Baby Dragons: The Story of the Moorhead's Campus School, 1888-1972*; and with Julie Landsman and Robert Simmons, *Talking about Race: Alleviating the Fear*. His biography of Marion Gee is adapted from his book *“We Were Pretty Darn Good”: A History of Rural Education in America* (Palisades, NY: History Publishing Company, 2013). He can be contacted at grineski@mnstate.edu.

Notes

¹ INFORUM, www.in-forum.com/obituaries/marion%20gee/. Marion's name at birth was Marion Francis Taus. Her married name was Gee. All subsequent references to Marion Taus Gee will be shortened to Marion Gee.

² For an example of exemplary rural teacher education program, see California State University—Chico: www.csuchico.edu/soe/advanced/education/rtr.

³ Beginning as a normal school in 1888, the institution transitioned to a state teachers college (1921), a state college (1957), and then a state university (1975). For a discussion of Moorhead's national reputation for its Department of Rural Education, see Mabel Carney, *The Education of Rural Teachers in the United States: A Backward Look; Education of Teachers for Rural America: Yearbook of the Department of Rural Education* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1946), 13-19.

⁴ Of the 120 higher education institutions offering teacher preparation in the seven state central region of the nation, only seventeen provide an emphasis on some type of rural preparation. See Zoe Barley and Nancy Brigham, *Preparing Teachers To Teach in Rural Schools, Issues & Answers*, REL 2008 - No. 045 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Educational Services, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory at Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning).

⁵ Marion Gee, interview by Steve Grineski, March 26, 2009.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ *Bicentennial History of Polk County, Minnesota* (Dallas, TX: Taylor Publishing Company, 1976).

⁹ Driving Distance, accessed January 11, 2016, www.distance-cities.com/distances-angus-mnhttp.

¹⁰ *Pioneers of the Valley* (Dallas, TX: Taylor Publishing Company, 1976).

¹¹ Wayne Fuller, *The Old Country School: The Story of Rural Education in the Middle West* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982); Amy Genevieve Nelson, "Rural School Affiliation" (MA thesis, Moorhead State College, 1967); Antoinette Henderson, "A Survey of the Personnel and Status of the Rural Teachers in Otter Tail County" (MA thesis, University of Minnesota, 1937); Michael Nelson and Howard Dawson, *Handbook on Rural Education* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1961).

¹² Jerry Gee, interview by Steve Grineski, February 1, 2016.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid. For a discussion about the Red River Valley's potato crop, see Hiram Drache, *Beyond the Furrow: Some Keys to Successful Farming in the Twentieth Century* (Danville, IL: Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., 1976). During World War II, when Marion and her classmates were released from school to pick potatoes, Red River Valley production levels nearly reached the proportions of the nineteenth-century wheat farms.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ L.H. (Liberty Hyde) Bailey, 1858-1954, *Report of the Commission on Country Life with an Introduction by Theodore Roosevelt* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina, 1911).

¹⁸ *The Professional Preparation of Teachers* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, No. 6, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1928).

¹⁹ *Report of the Commission on Country Life*, 121-125.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education: 1867-1957* (New York: Vintage, 1961). For a discussion regarding a critical interpretation of the *Report of the Commission on Country Life*, see David Danbom, *The Resisted Revolution* (Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press, 1979).

²² Mabel Carney, *Country Life and the Country School* (Chicago: Row, Peterson and Company, 1912). Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, 84.

²³ Carney, *Country Life and the Country School*, v, vi.

²⁴ Kate Wofford, *A History of the State and Training of Elementary Rural Teachers of the United States, 1860-1930* (Pittsburgh, PA: Thomas Siviter and Company Press, 1935). The Indiana State Normal School students enrolled in specialized rural coursework and completed structured observations and weekly student teaching opportunities at Glen School. In addition, students were intimately involved with the study of rural problems as experienced by the school's patrons.

²⁵ Nelson, "Rural School Affiliation," 56.

²⁶ Ibid., 28.

²⁷ Clarence Glasrud, *The Moorhead State Teachers College* (Moorhead, MN: Moorhead State University, 1990).

²⁸ Nelson, *Rural School Affiliation*, 100.

²⁹ Carney, *Country Life and the Country School*, 276-280.

³⁰ Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, 84.

³¹ Glasrud, *The Moorhead State Teachers College*, 53.

³² Nelson, *Rural School Affiliation*, 54-58.

³³ Oak Mound School Records, Boxes 1 and 2.

³⁴ Carney, *Country Life and the Country School*.

³⁵ Nelson, *Rural School Affiliation*, 193. For a discussion of the defining characteristics of progressive practice in rural schools (e.g., using community as a resource and viewing the teacher as curriculum-maker), see David Leo-Nyquist, "Recovering a Tradition of Rural Progressivism in American Public Education," *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 17 (2001), 27-40.

³⁶ Nelson, *Rural School Affiliation*, 63; Marion Gee, interview by Steve Grineski, March 26, 2009.

³⁷ Nelson, *Rural School Affiliation*, 170.

³⁸ Ibid, 64.

³⁹ Bette Haring, interview by Steve Grineski, September 11, 2008.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Marion Gee, interview by Steve Grineski, March 26, 2009.

⁴² Nelson, *Rural School Affiliation*, 175.

⁴³ Oak Mound School Records, Boxes 1 and 2.

⁴⁴ Carol Drummond, interview by Steve Grineski, April 16, 2009.

⁴⁵ Carol Drummond and Marcella Gulsvig, interview by Steve Grineski, October 10, 2008.

⁴⁶ Bette Haring and Lois Bergeson, interview by Steve Grineski, September 11, 2008.

⁴⁷ Marion Gee, interview by Steve Grineski, March 26, 2009.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Oak Mound School Records, Boxes 1 and 2.

⁵⁰ *The Bulletin*, Moorhead State Teachers College. See also *Teacher Education in Wartime: The Teacher Shortage and Sources of Supply* (Moorhead, MN: Minnesota State University Archives).

⁵¹ Mable Carney, *Education of Rural Teachers*, 26.

⁵² Wofford, *Status and Training of Elementary Rural Teachers*, 110-117.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ See, for example, Evert Meier and Ellen Edington, "Research Synthesis: Teacher Preparation for Rural Schools," *Research in Rural Education*, 2 (1983): 3-8.

⁵⁵ Steven Prorasnik, Angelina Kewalramani, Lauren Gilbertson, Will Herring, and Qingsh Xie, *Status of Education in Rural America* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, <http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubresearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007040>).