

O. U. in Who's Who

By Dr. Roy Temple House

THE editor of the *Sooner Magazine* has asked me to resume an article of mine entitled *Who's Who in Who's Who* which appeared in the May number of the *University of Chicago Magazine* and to develop a little further the data I have collected on the ranking of the University of Oklahoma in the matter of the representation of her faculty in *Who's Who in America*.

It is true that inclusion in *Who's Who* is, except for men of unmistakable world importance and a few arbitrary classifications, such as college presidents, members of Congress and the higher army officers, very much a matter of hit and miss. If Smith and Jones are two industrious history professors, who have put out two or three good but not brilliant historical studies, in the language of Holy Writ one may be taken and the other left, without any very evident reason. But if Smith's college and Jones's are similar in character, size and policies, and if Smith's has ten per cent of its faculty in *Who's Who* while only five per cent of Jones's are there, the law of averages would support the assumption that Smith's is the higher-grade school.

THE most significant findings reported in the *University of Chicago Magazine* were the following: the old-line humanistic institutions are greatly favored by the compilers of *Who's Who*. Indiana University has one member of her faculty in 8 and 2-3 there, while the excellent Indiana technological institution Purdue University has less than one-fourth of Indiana University's percentage. The University of Oklahoma has one in nine, the Oklahoma A. and M. College one in thirty—and probably the most patriotic of Sooners would scarcely claim quite as overwhelming a superiority over the rival school as those figures come to. At the University of Iowa the proportion is one to 7 and $\frac{1}{4}$, at Iowa State College at Ames it is one to twelve. It is evident that the publishers of *Who's Who* have a weakness for the older disciplines.

The overworked big state universities, with their enormous enrolments and their array of unknown young assistants, show up rather poorly in comparison with the prosperous endowed institutions. Of the very large and ambitious state universities, Wisconsin ranks first and Michigan second. Of the smaller ones, North Carolina appears to lead.



Dr. Roy T. House

For the purpose of a nation-wide comparison, I placed the schools whose student enrolment was below one thousand in a Class B, and the remainder in Class A. A comparison of Haverford College, with 328 students, and New York University, which has much more than one hundred times as many, would be meaningless. On paper the little schools average higher, because, for instance, an English faculty consisting of one capable professor may easily appear in *Who's Who* with a one hundred per cent record, whereas an English department of a hundred teachers, sixty of whom are young assistants, be it as classy as Harvard or California, can't possibly make half as good a showing. It is true that the eminences in the big schools are likely to be more eminent than the *Who's Who* representatives from the little ones; but our *Who's Who* telescope can do no more than find the stars. It can't measure their magnitude.

OUR Class B group includes some brilliantly efficient little schools. The race was spirited, and the winner led by a very short neck. There were knotty questions about the inclusion of emeritus professors, part-time teachers, assistants on temporary tenure, and their evaluation cost time, correspondence and headaches. The winner, close but unquestionable, was the remarkable Congregationalist-Baptist-Epis-

copalian Carleton College of Northfield, Minnesota—a distinction rather more significant than the winning of the Rose Bowl game or the tadpole swallowing contest, even though it was chronicled in smaller type. Runner-up was Middletown, Connecticut's opulent Wesleyan University. Other dangerous competitors, all of them except the first winner, it will be noticed, from the East, were Drew University, Madison, New Jersey; Hobart College, Geneva, New York; Haverford College, Pennsylvania; Amherst College, Massachusetts; Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts.

In Class A the task was easier. There was a big gap between the two winners and the others. The University of Chicago came in handily first (this, the astute reader may surmise, is one reason why the *University of Chicago Magazine* accepted the study so cordially); and the ancient and severely high-grade institution at Princeton, New Jersey, was a strong second.

NOW as to the standing of the University of Oklahoma. When state universities are listed in the order of their expenditures per student, we are nearly or quite at the end of the list, and our poverty has certainly hampered us. Scholars of *Who's Who* caliber have left the University of Oklahoma, and other such scholars have declined offers from here, because our salaries are lower than elsewhere. Without carrying the ranking out so carefully as we did with the national headliners above, the figures show roughly, that a listing of state universities on the basis of *Who's Who* representation will place the University of Oklahoma well above the middle, below Nebraska, Georgia, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, practically tied with Kansas, above Florida, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Colorado, Kentucky, much above Alabama, Tennessee, Louisiana, Mississippi.

And our figures point to one encouraging conclusion. *Who's Who* is issued biennially. The representation of Norman, Oklahoma, including the volume for 1908-9, has run as follows in number of individuals: 2, 3, 6, 8, 7, 9, 11, 16, 19, 23, 29, 29, 28, 33, 36, 35—a gain of 1,750 per cent, as compared with 600 per cent increase in faculty.

There is probably no other state university that can match this *Who's Who* advance.