Early 20th Century Changes in New Mexico Curriculum and the Emergence of One Progressive Educator

J. Wesley Null and **Matthew D. Davis**
University of Texas at Austin

All curriculum debates have historical roots. To uncover and examine the experiences of our forebears lends insight into current curriculum considerations. Contemporary issues that revolve around curriculum reform, approaches to educational research, bilingual education, and teacher preparation should be viewed from an historical perspective. Especially notable are teachers who make practical curriculum decisions daily. Early 20th Century New Mexico teachers faced difficulties that, in many ways, resemble those of today. Knowledge of past practice avoids a narrow understanding of present situations. Either aware or unaware of their actions, those who make decisions today use history. The proper use of this history for decision-making involves a broad understanding of all the individuals who were prominent in the development of American education.[1]

New Mexico educational history in general and the individuals who played vital roles in its development in particular remain obscured or incompletely understood. Marie Morrison Hughes is but one such example. Most assuredly, she was not the only or even the primary proponent of "new education" in New Mexico during the 1920s and 1930s. However, her contributions were significant, successful, and widely disseminated throughout New Mexico. This paper focuses upon Ms. Hughes' efforts in New Mexico education from her arrival in the mining village of Tyrone in the summer of 1920 to her departure from Albuquerque in July of 1939. The story of this one teacher's contributions opens a passageway to the growth of "progressive"[2] teaching practices in New Mexico. During this nineteen-year span, Hughes' ideas spread to all corners of the "Land of Enchantment".[3] This investigation of Hughes' career elicits the changes in New Mexico curriculum, uncovers the influence that Hughes exhibited, and highlights the importance of her work.[4] A more complete grasp of Hughes' contributions and the changes in curriculum must first be understood in the historical context of education in New Mexico.

Territorial New Mexico Education

When Brigadier-General Stephen Watts Kearny galloped his stallion into Santa Fe on August 18, 1846, and hoisted the United States flag over the Palace of the Governors, he brought into contact two vastly different worlds.[5] In the preceding years, the Anglo force from the east worked its way westward across the plains of Texas to the foothills of New Mexico's rugged Rocky Mountains. With this act, Kearney carved out the territory of New Mexico. Due to numerous factors, but most of all lack of money, New Mexican public schools early in the territorial period were highly unorganized and practically nonexistent. Subsequently, Tom Wiley, in his 1968 book entitled Politics and Purse Strings in New Mexico Schools, described the people's reluctance to support public schooling: "Twenty-five years after General Kearny acquired the territory for the United States, it was reported that there was not the least semblance of a public school-house in the venerable city of Santa Fe".[6] Through a resistance to taxation and a desire for local control, both Anglo and Hispano voters defeated early attempts to establish a common school system in the state. However, in the 1860s and 1870s, New Mexican territorial legislators adopted laws which set forth a county school system based upon principles of local control and taxation.[7] Also, various religious denominations, including Catholics, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists, created schools that were scattered across the state in an unorganized fashion.[8]

During the 1880s and 1890s, the basis for a state-wide public school system began to take shape. An important piece of territorial legislation, passed in 1891, established common schools and created the office of the superintendent of public instruction. Although lawmakers adopted a state-wide school system, "the locus of power from the county level to the territorial government . . . left the funding of schools and supervision of teachers in the hands of local officials".[9] County representatives and local officials held the power to collect taxes, disseminate funds, and make decisions regarding local school issues. At the turn of the century and well into the first few decades of the 1900s, despite the national trend toward centralization and bureaucratic control, schools in New Mexico remained controlled by county and local school officials, who were both Anglo and Hispano.[10]

As common schools slowly developed slowly across New Mexico, tensions between Anglos and Hispanics increased. Eager Anglos fresh from the east espoused a message of individualism and separation of church and state; conversely, native Hispanos[11] stressed the social aspects of schooling and accepted church and state amalgamation. As Anglos continued to settle in territorial New Mexico, the English language became a powerful force that provided one important key to financial and social advancement in the new territory-a territory in which Anglo customs grew increasingly more dominant by the day. New Mexican educators, caught in the conflicting duality between teaching English to Spanish-speaking students and assisting them to maintain their cultural roots, held differing views on instructional policy. Opinions of both Anglos and Hispanos ranged from total English immersion (with no Spanish allowed) to a complete rejection of the English language in favor of Hispano culture. With statehood on the horizon, opinions from state territorial representatives who often accepted Spanish in the schools, frequently differed from federal authorities who strongly advocated English-only instruction.

Education in Early Statehood

As New Mexico gained statehood in 1912, the conflict between state and federal opinions on language instruction

continued. State laws passed during the first world war, 1917-1918, often contradicted or circumvented federal mandates, providing teachers no clear-cut state policy on English or Spanish instruction. Consequently, confusion at higher levels of state government freed teachers and local administrators from restrictions. Likely, this legal uncertainty allowed them the freedom to teach as they wished. Most educators undoubtedly believed, however, that Hispano students needed to learn English. To teach them the new language, New Mexico's school reformers adopted the ideas of educators from other states in the union. The cult of efficiency spread almost uncontrollably, and New Mexico educators, like others across America, searched for the great panacea that they hoped to apply to all of the nation's schools.[12] As scientific educational studies trickled into New Mexico, "at the heart of the debate over the language of instruction was the pedagogical question of how best to teach Spanish-speaking children".[13] The application of science to this pedagogical question was inevitable. The "one best system"[14] for teaching English to Hispanos had to be found. Educational science, to the reformers who addressed the issue, provided the answer. To solve the "problem" of the Spanish-speaking pupil, New Mexicans needed "experts", funds, and a research sample of Spanish-speaking children. With these three criteria met, professional educators, guided by the new educational science, could provide the "answer" to the language instruction question. Endowed by the scientific strain of progressive education, educational reformers in New Mexico established a project, known as San Jose, to address the language instruction issue. A second type of progressive educator, who was not blindly devoted to educational science and efficiency, entered New Mexico in 1920. Her influence heavily impacted New Mexico education for the next 20 years.

The Inception of a Progressive Educator

Eight years after statehood, a slender, red-haired woman thrust herself unknowingly into the debate. Marie Hughes, a native of Michigan who had two years experience of normal school preparation and a short teaching stint in her home state, headed West in search of adventure.[15] With her father's permission, the 20 year-old Hughes accepted a position in the western New Mexico mining town of Tyrone. A rough, dust-filled camp of nearly 7,000, Tyrone has been described as a "ghost town deluxe".[16] Eleven years prior to Hughes' arrival, two wives of Phelps-Dodge Corporation managers (who purchased the copper mine in 1909) pledged to make Tyrone the "ideal mining town". Mrs. Dodge and Mrs. James Douglas spent more than five million dollars constructing various buildings throughout Tyrone, including a one hundred thousand dollar company office, a railroad station, a mercantile store, and a hospital. Inexplicably, they constructed no school building. Until 1917, students in the Tyrone area attended school in nearby Leopold.

However, in 1917, after their community experienced a massive influx of funds due to World War I copper demands, Tyrone residents opened their first school building and abandoned the Leopold school.[17] In this three-year-old desert school, Hughes met her first New Mexico students. The new Tyrone public school, belatedly built as part of the "model mining town", included grades one through twelve, featured thirty-six classrooms, and provided curriculum offerings in home economics, industrial arts, and the traditional academic courses. Hughes fondly remembered those first few years as a new hire of Mr. Rycott, Principal:

> Twelve years ago, I began teaching in New Mexico, where I was hired as a first grade teacher. Imagine my surprise and consternation in meeting my group of forty odd first graders ranging from seven to seventeen years of age. All had been in school at least one year before, and for most of them it was the third year in school.[18]

Most of the students she taught were sons and daughters of Mexican-Americans who earned a living through their work in the copper mines.[19]

Marie Hughes survived her year in Tyrone by telling stories in Spanish and requiring students to act out plays and sing songs.[20] When and how she learned Spanish remains a mystery. However, Hughes likely either had some prior Spanish knowledge before her arrival in New Mexico or learned the language soon thereafter. Unfortunately, no other elaborate accounts of her Tyrone teaching practices exist. Halfway through the year, after experiencing substantial self-satisfying success using these methods to teach English to her students, Hughes described her situation:

> Three months of this kind of work (songs, plays, and stories) and the children began to show interest in reading. At midterm we had become something of a prize room. We could talk and understand English. Discipline, as such, was a thing of the past.[21]

Her stay in Tyrone lasted until the mining community closed and the school enrollment dropped drastically. Thus, after only one year, Hughes moved to the nearby New Mexico town of Hurley. Her teaching situation there, a mining town less than ten miles east of Tyrone, likely was similar to that which she experienced during her first year at Tyrone.

For the next three years, 1921-1924, Hughes taught Spanish-speaking students at a school on the north side of Hurley. During this time, apparently, she refined her methods for teaching English to Spanish-speakers. She also likely developed practical materials to be used in conjunction with her teaching. To be sure, Hughes' experiences in Tyrone and Hurley strongly influenced the curriculum decisions she would make in the upcoming years. Over thirty years later, in the "background" section of her dissertation, Hughes recalled her experiences in Tyrone and Hurley:

> The writer's personal interest in the relationship of the Mexican-American to the English language began with her initial contact with the group in the mining communities of New Mexico where they lived in a certain part of the community and were permitted to go to the show, dance on the plaza, or walk on specific streets only on certain nights (if at all), and even then

were under curfew laws to return to their part of "camp" by a given time.

> As a teacher of the boys and girls from the Mexican-American group, the writer was initially, and never ceased to be, amazed that the children would submit to school year after year when they knew so little English; moreover, how could they go to school and learn so little![22]

During her years in Tyrone and Hurley, Hughes established her identity with Mexican-American students on the frontier. The success she experienced with them in learning English is vital to understanding her future contributions to New Mexico's curriculum.

Teaching in 1920s Dona Ana County

In 1924, Hughes relocated to Las Cruces where she taught in the city schools using the same techniques she had developed in the more western, rural towns of Tyrone and Hurley. Her arrival in Las Cruces coincided with recent changes to the organizational structure of the city's schools. Early in Las Cruces history, the school system was integrated. However, in 1906, a school board ruling prohibited the speaking of Spanish on all school property. In the early 1920s, pressure for segregation increased and Las Cruces' schools remained segregated until the 1950s.[23] After several successful years in the Las Cruces city schools, Hughes received the promotion that would eventually propel her into the state's spotlight. In 1929, K. D. Stoes, County Superintendent, appointed her rural school supervisor in Dona Ana County, home of Las Cruces.[24] As a rural school supervisor, Hughes' responsibilities included assisting rural schoolteachers in their improvement of teaching strategies. This first and most important responsibility certainly involved the teaching of English to Spanish-speaking youngsters. During her tenure as Dona Ana County rural school supervisor, Hughes likely developed a broader view of New Mexico education, and, as a result, her interests in state educational reform strengthened. Armed with a practical, "progressive", and popular method of teaching English to Spanish-speakers, Hughes possessed a rare, marketable commodity much desired throughout New Mexico. No doubt, her first publication, in September of 1930, caught the eye of New Mexico's educational leaders. Entitled *Dona Ana County: A Teacher's Manual*, this short volume attracted attention from one of the state's most energetic and influential leaders, Loyd Tireman. He would figure prominently professionally for the next 20 years in New Mexico. Tireman and Hughes both shared a unique interest in improving education for Hispano children. Their work together changed New Mexico curriculum forever.

Hughes, Tireman, and San Jose

The two likely met, prior to Hughes' arrival, at the November 1st-3rd, 1929, meeting of the New Mexico Education Association (NMEA) in Albuquerque. A consistent attendee and presenter at NMEA's annual meetings for the next nine years, Hughes likely attended her first NMEA Conference in November 1929.25 At the very latest, Dr. Tireman and Ms. Hughes first met on November 6, 1930, at their joint session of the annual NMEA conference. Speaking in the "Rural Section" of the 1930 Conference, Hughes, representing Dona Ana County, presented a paper entitled, appropriately enough, "Rural School Management". Another panel member, Loyd Tireman of the University of New Mexico, spoke on "Problems in Rural Education".[26] This 1930 NMEA Convention, Tireman asserted, featured the first session devoted solely to rural education in the state.[27] One year later, on the same date, November 6th, both Tireman and Hughes participated in the second Rural Section with their presentations of "Rural School and the Community" and "Reading Program in Rural Schools for 5, 6, 7 and 8th Graders", respectively.[28] At this time, Tireman, a powerful force in New Mexico education and the soon to be director of the San Jose Project, was searching the state for any and all authorities on the subject of teaching English to Spanish-speaking children. This 1931 NMEA Convention, held in Santa Fe, likely provided the opportunity for Tireman and Hughes to discuss future plans and the "problem" of the Spanish-speaking pupil.

In November of 1931, Hughes replaced Ellen Arledge, who formerly was "chairman" of the rural section of the NMEA, as President of the rural division of New Mexico's primary educational organization. At this meeting, Hughes represented Dona Ana County for the last time. For all future conventions in the 1930s, she associated herself with either the San Jose Experimental School or the Curriculum Laboratory of the University of New Mexico. As Dr. Tireman scoured the state for successful teachers of Hispano students, Marie Hughes was an easy choice. Through her rural teaching experiences, her supervisor's position in Dona Ana County and subsequent publication of a teacher's manual, and her participation at New Mexico Educational Association Conventions, Hughes' particular knowledge about teaching Hispano children must have made her an ideal candidate for the experiment to be conducted at San Jose.

In 1930, as Hughes revised and disseminated her teaching methods in Las Cruces, Dr. Loyd Tireman, a recently hired professor at the University of New Mexico, organized funding and personnel for a scientific experiment which he hoped would settle the language instruction debate once and for all.[29] Through his graduate preparation at the University of Iowa, Tireman's idea of educational research, like many others of the time, was rooted firmly in scientific, psychological, and statistical methods.[30] Scientific investigations begin with a "problem", problems that scientists state in the form of questions. For his experiment, Tireman viewed the problem without the negative connotation that many would attribute to it today. It consisted of seven parts, two of which Tireman and his associates developed in the following manner:

> Are there certain methods of instruction which are more efficacious than others in dealing with the Spanish-speaking child? To what extent will methods of instruction devised for English-speaking children need to be modified to fit the Spanish-speaking children?[31]

In the initial *San Jose Training School Bulletin*, which the University of New Mexico published prior to opening the school, Tireman alerted readers to his purposes:

> We are sending this Bulletin to public school officials, to Schools of Education, to individual teachers and research workers, in the hope that some will not only be casually interested, but will find the time and inclination to assist us. This assistance can be in the nature of references to teachers who are successfully teaching Spanish-speaking pupils, to theses hidden in university libraries, to other printed investigations, or by direct challenging criticism of our set-up, either negative or positive.[32]

Tireman's intentions with this announcement invited teachers to contribute to the experiment at San Jose.

How Marie Hughes became interested in the San Jose Experimental School[33] remains unknown. Nonetheless, she heard stories about the experiment near Albuquerque, and, apparently, she decided to join. San Jose first opened in September of 1930, and Tireman's staff began the school year with extensive testing of all students.[34] In the fall of its first year of operation, the San Jose staff displayed its demonstration school by inviting rural teachers and supervisors from across the state to Albuquerque. Still working as rural school supervisor in Dona Ana County, Marie Hughes accepted Tireman's offer and visited the school, along with professors of education, other rural supervisors, and county superintendents from across the state, in late 1931.[35] In the fall of the following year, Hughes relocated to Albuquerque to work with Tireman at San Jose.

Rural New Mexico Teachers Receive Assistance

In October, 1932, the State Department of Education and the State Board of Education created the position of Field Worker, at a salary of $140.00 per month, for Marie Hughes.[36] Obviously impressed by her experiences as a teacher and rural school supervisor, state officials publicized her new appointment in the official organ of the state educational association.[37] To be sure, her success as a rural school supervisor and its similarities to that of the field worker position led to confidence in Hughes' abilities to fill the newly created position. As field worker, Hughes' responsibilities included the important follow-up work with those teachers, known as cadets, who had been "trained" at San Jose. The addition of a field worker at San Jose constituted an important position in that Hughes could travel to rural schools across the state and assist the often lonely and unsupported one-room schoolteachers.[38] In a letter to Edna Rousseau, State Supervisor of Rural Schools, Zuni rural schoolteacher Fay Heath expressed the difficulties of rural teaching in 1932:

> When I went to look at the school house to see what I needed, I found that it had been used for the chicken house and I wish you could have seen the desks. They had been the chicken roosts so you know how they look. The building still smells like a chicken house. We may all get mites before long. This sounds rather bad but by the time I had moved out the girls had cleaned the schoolhouse as best they could and we are having a new school house built about a mile away, so in the future I will have to walk a mile to my school . . . I have nine children and they all belong to two families. I have 6 grades. There is no 5th grade or 7th grade.
>
> I never get through in a day. I wish you were here so you could come right over to see me for there is a great deal that I ought to know about a rural school. I don't have time enough and I can't keep everybody busy at the right time. I never sat down once the first day. I have one little first grader and to tell you the truth I really don't know what to do with him. He draws quite well and he can count and he is beginning to add, but I have no charts to teach him to read and so far I haven't had time to make any. I get up at 5 in the morning and work until 10 but still I have not getting anywhere. I don't know whether I can keep this job or not. I don't feel that I am teaching them anything. My hands are like rasps but since I have straightened some of my house around I can do more.
>
> The children are very good but just won't answer if they don't know. If you ask them if they understand you, they always say yes, but you can tell they have no idea what you are talking about so I hardly know what to do with them. Saturday I am going in to see the county superintendent. Then maybe I can clear up some of these problems . . . The children don't all have their books and that makes the work much harder too. I hope I can stay because I like the location so well. If you were over here, I could ask you a million questions about Rural Methods![39]

Ms. Heath's letter which Ms. Rousseau received in September no doubt contributed to the appointment of Hughes as the first, and only, San Jose Field Worker the following month. Rousseau either hired Hughes or heavily influenced the creation of her Field Worker position.

An important first step, most likely developed by Hughes, included a selection of "key schools" throughout the state in which cadets, the rural schoolteachers from all over New Mexico who had been "trained" at San Jose, could meet with her to review the methods they had learned while at San Jose. San Jose's cadet teachers, prior to returning to their home schools, worked with the numerous professors and teachers involved at San Jose. To help assist the cadets in their transition back to their rural schools, Hughes established two of the first key schools in Mora and San Miguel Counties.[40] Key schools served to organize the work of the Field Worker by reducing the number of schools she had to visit. They also permitted the congregation of cadets from rural schools across the various counties. The specific activities in which Hughes and the cadets engaged during their key school meetings remain vague. However, these meetings likely included demonstrations, consultations, and discussions of problems and successes of rural

school teaching. Despite her minimal exposure to San Jose methods prior to her travels throughout the state, the ideas she discussed with cadets quite possibly corresponded with the techniques they had learned at San Jose. However, Hughes' teaching methods were not always congruent with those of San Jose's director, Loyd Tireman.

Developmentalist Meets Social Efficiency Educator

Marie Hughes' initial reaction to the teaching methods she observed at San Jose in the fall of 1932 was not positive. In fact, she expressed that the teachers at San Jose were doing everything completely wrong.[41] Thus, she and Tireman began their stormy and complex relationship.[42] Both extremely motivated and gifted educators, Tireman and Hughes worked closely together for the next eight years. To be sure, relations between them fluctuated anywhere from positive to negative to many points in between. To understand more fully the different, yet similar philosophical views of Hughes and Tireman, two of Herbert Kliebard's four "interest groups" which vied for control over the American curriculum in the first half of this century may be employed.[43] Developmentalists, according to Kliebard, "proceeded basically from the assumption that the natural order of development in the child was the most significant and scientifically defensible basis for determining what should be taught".[44] During the time in which Hughes and Tireman worked, John Dewey and William Heard Kilpatrick embodied and advanced a developmentalist approach.[45] One *New Mexico School Review* article, published in December of 1932 and presented at the 1932 NMEA Convention held in Roswell, evidenced the infiltration of Kilpatrick's ideas from New York's Teachers College, Columbia University to New Mexico's rural schools. Written by Harlan Sininger, principal of San Jose, "Activities in Primary Education", extolled the virtues of activity curriculum. It noted the value of the development of social and character values in children. Obviously well aware of curriculum debates across the country, Sininger expressed the importance of convincing teachers to employ activity methods:

> If we do not, from the very first years of school, give to our pupils daily opportunities to talk over group problems, reason them out, and decide for themselves instead of having the teacher make all decisions for them as she used to do in the old conventional school, how can we expect them as men and women to be able to meet with others to decide important issues of business and government? . . . Without activities these standards have to be ushered in by some side door where they must of necessity lose part of their vitality and meaningfulness.[46]

Sininger's knowledge of nation-wide curriculum discourse and his views, which corresponded in some ways both with Hughes and Tireman, likely helped to bridge the gap between the two.[47] A second article, by Donald W. MacKay, the Supervisor of Rural Education and soon to be president of Eastern New Mexico Junior College, lauded the use of activity curriculum and encouraged all of New Mexico's rural teachers to change from the "passive, formal, traditional teacher to the new type".[48]

Kliebard labeled another of his four interest groups the "social efficiency educators". To him, "It was social efficiency that, for most people, held out the promise of social stability in the face of cries for massive social change, and that doctrine claimed the new potent backing of science in order to insure it".[49] Close inspection of their philosophical views strongly suggests the identification of Hughes with developmentalist tendencies and Tireman as one who resembled a social efficiency educator. Kliebard's description of the relationship between these two larger groups of educators rings true in the microcosm of Hughes and Tireman at San Jose:

> The social efficiency educators and the developmentalists ultimately were as far apart from one another as they were from their common enemy. Their bitter battles would be reflected in their professional writings, in their open debates at professional meetings, and in colleges and universities as curriculum issues and problems gained academic respectability and were formalized into courses and degree programs.[50]

At certain times at San Jose, the "bitter battles" between the two interest groups most definitely took form in the ideological struggles between Hughes and Tireman. Sininger's position between the two of them perhaps provided a link that allowed the two to work together closely for a number of years.

Hughes' Teaching Philosophy and Professional Growth

As 1932 ended, Marie Hughes realized that the year had been highly successful for her. It was important due to her recent appointment as Field Worker and the further solidification of her philosophy on teaching English to non-speakers. Teaching a Standard English Vocabulary with Initial Reading Instruction offered us a clear picture of her educational philosophy. No doubt highly developed since her beginning days in Tyrone, her teaching techniques resembled the developmentalist perspective in many ways. In her rejection of traditional methods, Hughes envisioned a classroom in which learning English might be considered "life-like".[51] She believed in placing non-English speaking students in situations in which they were encouraged and expected to use the English language. In her own words, the purpose of the school was to provide:

> Meaningful concepts of things about which the child will read, a motive for learning a useful speaking vocabulary, problems and activities which require facility in the use of ideas and information gained in past experience, sufficient practice in speaking to insure habits of clear enunciation and accurate pronunciation, and acquaintance with books so that a genuine desire for reading may be aroused.[52]

In practice, Hughes advocated the use of what many would term "units" today. Examples of her units included the home, the farm, and the community. In each unit, students learned specific English vocabulary words that related directly to that unit. For example, in activities during the "home" unit, students

completed such tasks as the building of a house, the furnishing of the house, washing and ironing, and setting the table. During this activity, she introduced English words such as bake, comb, eggs, and garden. Each unit proceeded in a similar fashion.

Another important aspect of her philosophy involved the use of "charts" to be created after students had participated in "excursions", which some teachers might term field trips today. Hughes strongly believed that Spanish-speaking students needed to hear English words and phrases in as many situations as possible. In the following excerpt, she provided a distinct example of her philosophy:

> Milk-Ideally, the child would see the cow milked, then drink the milk, drinking from both a glass and a cup. He would see the milk bottled for delivery in town. He would assist in delivery of the bottles. Also, he would see the milk put into large cans, and visit the larger dairy, etc. This will probably be impossible for all of us, but the presentation chart can show the cow being milked; children drinking milk; children eating cereal with milk; milk in a bottle; cup and glass from which we drink the milk. Some of the children may bring milk to school. This will provide first hand experience".[53]

Her charts depicted pictures of the objects the children observed while on their excursions. Beside each picture, Hughes placed the English words for the various objects. Each of these units drew upon the prior knowledge of Hispano students. She viewed students' prior knowledge, which included their language, as a tool and not a handicap. In the debate over bilingual instruction, Hughes vehemently opposed the punishment of students for speaking their native language. Her opposition to English-only instruction at this time suggests that she respected the Spanish language and culture, yet she wanted her students to learn English.

Her ideas on language instruction were destined to impact the experiment at San Jose. Five years following the commencement of the project, Loyd Tireman and his staff published the first report on the "problem" which they intended to solve. Pictures on page two of the report illustrated students engaged in both a dairy unit and a first grade pet show. Both pictures showed students involved in activities that had roots in the developmentalist philosophy that Hughes advocated. Certainly, she was not the only San Jose teacher during this period who espoused what were termed as "progressive" activities. However, the ideas she brought forth from Tyrone, Hurley, and Las Cruces heavily impacted the "experiments" conducted at San Jose.

As Hughes' prominence in New Mexico education grew, so did her ambitions to further her own education. Despite heavy advertisement and recruitment by New Mexico institutions in the New Mexico School Review and elsewhere, Hughes by-passed all New Mexico institutions and elected to work toward a Master's Degree at the University of Chicago. Records are unclear about when she began her Master's work, but she likely first traveled to Chicago in either summer 1933 or 1934. Interestingly enough, her ability and penchant for critiquing the teaching activities of those around her were demonstrated in the intriguing title of her October 1933 New Mexico Educational Association Convention presentation. After serving as Field Worker for approximately one year, she spoke on "Deficiencies in the Teacher Training Program as Seen By a Field Worker".[54] She attempted to ameliorate the "deficiencies" she saw in the training program by the publication of her San Jose Recommended Program in the December 1933 issue of the *New Mexico School Review (NMSR*). Her printed program of instruction in the NMSR, now backed and endorsed officially with reference to the San Jose experiment, remarkably resembled the program that she first described in 1932. A second important step in her growth as a New Mexico educator was a second article published also in the *NMSR*. [55] In the piece, entitled "Reading to Learn to Read", Hughes stressed the importance of reading instruction and suggested a list of books which rural schoolteachers should purchase for their classrooms. New Mexico teachers now received her message of progressive teaching practices, for the first time, all across the state.

Hughes' capacity as Field Worker was extended in January of 1934 to include the months of April, May, and June. Originally, she planned to depart Albuquerque in early April for Chicago to pursue her Master's degree. The State Board of Education extended her contract and enticed her to stay through mid-summer.[56] In June,1934, she no doubt left for Chicago to commence graduate study. Her activity in New Mexico, as evidenced by articles in the NMSR, dropped suddenly. From June 1934 through summer 1935, her name was absent. Perhaps she remained in Chicago through summer 1934, fall 1934, spring 1935, and summer 1935 to complete her degree. During this time in Chicago, she wrote her Master's thesis, "The Acquisition of English-speaking Ability by Spanish-speaking Children". In this study, she attempted to determine statistically how well Mexican-American children learned English.[57] The statistical nature of her study points to the slight scientific side of her philosophy and the nature of the studies being conducted in Chicago at this time.

In fall of 1935, she appeared back on the New Mexico education scene as Principal of San Jose.[58] As a replacement to Harlan Sininger, one of Hughes' first responsibilities as Principal, in conjunction with the NMEA's Annual meeting, involved the organization of visits to San Jose by teachers and administrators who traveled to Albuquerque's NMEA Convention. With three different presentations, entitled "Present Status of Reading Instruction in Elementary Education", "Realistic Stories With Children", and "Need of General Education in Teacher Training", her prominence not only at the meeting, but also throughout the state had certainly grown since her arrival in 1920.

The Decline of San Jose

With depleting funds and waning interest, San Jose as an experimental school endured only through the 1936-37 school year when it was returned to the auspices of the county school board.[59] Four possible reasons for the reformers' de-emphasis of the San Jose experiment include the transience of the student population, the increasing popularity of the school with parents

(which led to an explosion in enrollment), the Depression era's effects on one of the Project's primary contributors--the General Education Board (GEB) of New York City, and the shift of the state's priorities to state-wide curriculum revision as opposed to only San Jose. Most likely, the first two reasons, student transiency and increasing enrollment, so threatened the validity of the experiment's findings that Tireman and his associates found their conclusions less than "provable" by scientific standards. The original San Jose plan called for only five years; plus, a new program for New Mexico was on the horizon. Tireman and Simon P. Nanninga, the University of New Mexico's College of Education Dean, met with GEB officials in February, 1936, to inform them that the San Jose experiment would be discontinued.[60] In summer and fall of 1936, Loyd Tireman's interests grew away from San Jose and toward the emerging State Program for the Improvement of Instruction. A program which was most certainly influenced by the instructional ideas encouraged at San Jose.

Origins of the State Program for the Improvement of Instruction

In the spring and fall of 1936, state education officials, including Professor Loyd Tireman, directed their energies toward New Mexico's first state-wide curriculum revision program.[61] The first official meeting devoted to curriculum revision occurred on March 9, 1936. Meeting in Santa Fe, representatives from schools throughout the state discussed procedures for commencing the state-wide initiative. In coordination with the Division of Field Studies at the George Peabody College for Teachers, those present at the meeting formed the Curriculum Survey Commission. The twenty members of the committee included Loyd Tireman who was later named director of the program. The committee members agreed to "make a thorough study of the curriculum needs of the elementary and secondary public schools of New Mexico and bring a report to this Board at the end of approximately one year of study".[62] In an elaboration of the committee's plans, Tireman described two main thrusts of the program. In the first phase, he required a statewide move to organize teachers, assistant directors, and county directors in order to oversee study groups and discussions between the county's teachers. Tireman and his assistant, Donald W. MacKay, subsequently prepared a study bulletin for use by teachers and county directors in their discussion groups. During these meetings, county administrators encouraged teachers to submit accounts of their teaching that described the new methods they practiced in their classrooms. In the second phase of the project, which quite possibly occurred concurrently with the first, Tireman portrayed strong confidence in Marie Hughes with his appointment of her as Associate Director of a Curriculum Laboratory to be housed at the University of New Mexico.[63] As a major portion of the curriculum revision program, a center was necessary for the collection and dissemination of curriculum materials.

Curriculum Laboratory as a Segment of the State Program for the Improvement of Instruction

Hughes' work at the Curriculum Laboratory afforded her the opportunity to not only disseminate her ideas across the state, but also to read, evaluate, and share descriptions of activities from hundreds of teachers. As its name implied, its focus was now curriculum reform and development for all of New Mexico's students-not just those at San Jose. The ideas that Hughes had developed with Mexican-American children in Tyrone and Hurley would now affect all of New Mexico's pupils. One of the first major publications by the Curriculum Laboratory consisted of an outline of instructions for rural schoolteachers to follow.64 As they implemented the State Program for the Improvement of Instruction, teachers could follow Hughes' guidelines in the development of their materials. Assisted by Mary Watson and Laura Atkinson65, Hughes suggested activities for study groups, requested articles for the *NMSR*, and listed questions to be addressed by county representatives. The response to Hughes' *NMSR* request must have been overwhelming. Subsequent issues of the *NMSR* abounded with articles from teachers who taught in all sections of the state. One such article, published just one month following the request, focused on discipline:

> I shall take up first the problem of discipline. I have found it much harder to keep discipline teaching the Primary grades than teaching the upper grades, probably because I believe that the children in the Primary grades must be allowed to make a certain amount of noise if they are to get accustomed to the schoolroom easily and if they are to show progress soon.[66]

Many other individuals, such as Mariamne Geyer, Director of Santa Fe County, and W. E. Kerr, Superintendent of the Artesia Public Schools, submitted articles which outlined the steps they had taken toward curriculum revision.[67]

Hughes served as director of the Curriculum Laboratory for the three years prior to her departure from the state in 1939. As she and Watson received reports from the state's teachers, they revised, catalogued, and made available all these descriptions of activities and programs to teachers statewide. M. E. Linton, Superintendent of Schools from the southwestern New Mexico town of Hatch, expressed the specific functions of the Curriculum Laboratory in 1938:

> The Laboratory maintains a file of published instructional material (books, maps, pamphlets, workbooks, etc.) for use in the first eight grades. This library is open to teachers and administrators of the state who may wish to secure firsthand information in regard to such learning materials . . . The Laboratory maintains a professional library which includes research reports of various national committees . . . The Laboratory maintains a complete file of standard text materials . . . The Laboratory initiates and carries forward those studies which appear to be distinctly useful to school people of the state . . . The Laboratory seeks to report those practices and experiments carried on in different school systems of New Mexico . . . The Laboratory serves as a coordinating agency with other

service institutions in the state.[68]

Hughes and Watson sent a message of progressive curriculum to countless New Mexico teachers, a message which most always encouraged a more student-centered, developmentalist approach. The ideas behind their work, while not changing the practices of all of New Mexico's teachers, most certainly influenced the curriculum offerings to thousands of New Mexico's pupils.

During her tenure as director of the Curriculum Laboratory, Hughes' presentations at the yearly NMEA Convention increased. She not only traveled less, but she also read widely regarding the practices of teachers in the state. At the November 1937 Convention, Hughes spoke on the "Social Education of the Child". A possible clue and an important precursor to her upcoming move to California were listed in the 1937 NMEA program. Dr. Madilene Veverka, Supervisor of Elementary Curriculum from the Los Angeles County Schools, addressed the Rural School Section of the Convention. Possibly, Hughes discussed with Veverka her planned move to Los Angeles. These two female educational leaders surely must have discussed educational opportunities and the numerous similarities between the education of Spanish-speaking students in New Mexico and California.[69]

From State to National Prominence

By this time, Hughes had become a teacher educator. During the summer sessions from 1936 to 1939, UNM employed Hughes as an Instructor in Education at the salary of $325.00 per summer session.[70] With direct experience teaching adults, Hughes' educational vision spread further than New Mexico. In November, 1938, she reflected on the time she had spent in New Mexico. With a definite hint of "moving on" in her writing, she articulated the curriculum changes that she had observed in her 18 years in New Mexico:

> This is a personal note, but perhaps it is none the less important because of that fact. It is nine years ago this month since I made my first step outside the county in which I was working to assist in the work of another school system. My last trip was made the week of October 6, 1938 . . . During these years it has been my privilege to work intimately with teachers . . . We have lived and worked with children and, we hope, guided them to more effective and socially useful ways of doing things . . . Have the nine years brought about discernible differences? The answer is an emphatic, YES . . . These changes are indicative of growth in a desirable direction; however, not one seems as significant and important to me as the changes within the teachers themselves. Our teachers are now actively working to improve their ways of dealing with children . . . This change in teacher attitude is one that I believe to have greatest significance for the future of education in New Mexico.[71]

After she finished teaching her summer course at UNM on July 29, 1939, Marie Hughes, accepted the position of Elementary Coordinator with the Los Angeles County Schools, resigned from her university appointment, and began to relocate to Southern California. Obviously, the instructional emphases and methods that grew out of her early Tyrone and Hurley experiences were useful not only in New Mexico but also throughout the southwest. Upon her departure from New Mexico in 1939, Hughes spent a number of years in California, Utah, and Arizona. In each state, her work focused on reading education with a particular emphasis on non-English speaking students. In 1952, while still in California and before she left for Utah, she completed her doctorate at Stanford with a dissertation entitled "The English Language Facility of Mexican-American Children Living and Attending School in a Segregated Community".[72] Through her beginning with Mexican-American students near Silver City, she became a major figure in progressive teaching practices throughout the southwest.

Hughes and the Progressive Impact on New Mexico Curriculum

In the 1920s and 1930s, Hughes made great contributions to the fields of curriculum reform, educational research, bilingual education, and teacher preparation. No longer obscured in the historical memory, her experiences and techniques should serve as luminaries for those who continue to work in any of the fields to which she contributed. Without doubt, countless teachers throughout New Mexico and the southwest currently practice the ideas that Hughes, and certainly others, began to advance in the early 1920s. In addition, she served as a facilitator for teachers' ideas in her capacity as director of the state's Curriculum Laboratory. As a field worker with San Jose and an instructor with the University of New Mexico, she contributed significantly to the proliferation of "new education" in New Mexico. She raised the level of importance placed upon the offering of an excellent curriculum, which in her view meant "progressive", to all of New Mexico's students. Through her teaching methods, she involved herself heavily in both the language instruction and the curriculum reform debates that emerged in 1920s and 1930s New Mexico. Today, both debates continue.

With such issues, historical perspectives on the curriculum provide guideposts for those who face practical decisions. In the words of Larry Cuban and David Tyack:

> History provides a whole storehouse of experiments on dead people. Studying such experiments is cheap . . . and it does not use people (often the poor) as live guinea pigs. Many educational problems have deep roots in the past, and many solutions have been tried before. If some "new" ideas have already been tried, and many have, why not see how they fared in the past?[73]

Because all curriculum debates have historical roots, contemporary educational scholars should uncover the experiences of their predecessors. Although the practical decisions faced by today's educators do not equate precisely with those of the past, neither should the similarities be ignored. The efforts of Hughes and other progressive New Mexico educators

impacted the actions of early 20th century New Mexico teachers. To some extent, these practices likely have been passed down to contemporary classroom teachers. A broader understanding of the growth of progressive teaching practices in New Mexico encourages more enlightened decision-making without mandating specific techniques for reform. Those who face practical decisions on a daily basis should possess this broader understanding.

Notes

1 For a detailed discussion of history and decision-making, see Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, *Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision-Makers* (New York: The Free Press, 1986).

[2] For purposes of this paper, the use of the term "progressive" toward Hughes' philosophy should be equated with that of the "developmentalists" as described by Herbert Kliebard in *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958* (London: Routledge, 1995). See also, Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Vantage Books, 1961).

[3] Many people refer to New Mexico as the "Land of Enchantment" both because of its rich ethnic and cultural heritage and its splendid geography.

[4] I have made no attempt to judge the effects, positive or negative, of progressive teaching practices on New Mexico education. My purpose was to tell a particular story, not to estimate the values of progressive and traditional teaching approaches.

[5] Mary Ellen Jenkins and Albert H. Schroeder, *A Brief History of New Mexico* (Albuquerque, NM: The University of New Mexico Press, 1974), p. 33. For a brief discussion of New Mexico education during the colonial period and prior to Mexican conquest, see Bernardo P. Gallegos, *Literacy, Education, and Society in New Mexico, 1693-1821* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1992).

[6] Tom Wiley, *Politics and Purse Strings in New Mexico's Public Schools* (Albuquerque, NM: The University of New Mexico Press, 1968), p. 30.

[7] For a more complete description of Territorial Education in New Mexico, see Lynne Marie Getz, *Schools of Their Own: The Education of Hispanos in New Mexico, 1850-1940* (Albuquerque, NM: The University of New Mexico Press, 1997).

[8] For a study which focused specifically on women, religion, and the attempts by Protestant women missionaries to convert the Hispano-Catholic population, see Susan M. Yohn, *A Contest of Faiths: Missionary Women and Pluralism in the American Southwest* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995).

[9] Getz, *Schools of Their Own*, p. 17.

[10] Benjamin M. Reed, *A History of Education in New Mexico* (Santa Fe, NM: The New Mexican Printing Company, 1911), p. 17-19.

[11] Following Getz, the term *Hispano* is used to refer to Hispanic individuals whose line of descent in New Mexico can be traced back to the colonial era.

[12] See Raymond E. Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 65-94.

[13] Getz, *Schools of Their Own*, p. 32.

[14] See David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974).

[15] Personal Interview with Marie Hughes' close personal friend and confidant, Halene Weaver. Conducted at Ms. Weaver's home on December 22, 1998.

[16] Mary Ann Kinsey, "Schools and the Ghost Towns of New Mexico," (Master's Thesis, June 1963), p. 139.

[17] Mary Ann Kinsey, "Schools and the Ghost Towns of New Mexico," p. 141. See also Philip Varney, *New Mexico's Best Ghost Towns* (Flagstaff, AZ: Northland Press, 1981), p. 119-122.

[18] Marie Morrison Hughes, *Teaching a Standard English Vocabulary with Initial Reading Instruction* (Las Cruces, NM: Bronson Printing Company, 1932), Preface.

[19] Philip Varney, *New Mexico's Best Ghost Towns* (Flagstaff, AZ: Northland Press, 1981), p. 119-122.

[20] Marie M. Hughes, *Teaching a Standard English Vocabulary,* Preface.

[21] Marie M. Hughes, *Teaching a Standard English Vocabulary,* Preface.

[22] Marie Morrison Hughes, "The English Language Facility of Mexican-American Children Living and Attending School in a Segregated Community," (Ed.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1952), p. 14.

[23] Linda G. Harris, *Las Cruces: An Illustrated History* (Las Cruces, NM: Arroyo Press, 1993), p. 98-99.

[24] Marie Morrison Hughes, *Dona Ana County: A Teacher's*

Manual (Las Cruces, NM: Unpublished County document, 1930), Foreword.

[25] Issues of the *New Mexico School Review* from 1920-1929 show no records of Hughes' attendance at New Mexico Educational Association Conventions prior to 1930. However, her professional stature in the state had grown by 1929, and the N.M.E.A. Convention offered several sections in its 1929 program which would have piqued Hughes' interest.

[26] New Mexico Education Association Convention Program, *New Mexico School Review* 10 (September 1930): 30.

[27] L. S. Tireman, "Comments on the Rural Section of the N.M.E.A.," *New Mexico School Review* 10 (December 1930): 5. Dr. Tireman was "shocked" that to date no "rural section" of the NMEA Convention had been established.

[28] New Mexico Educational Association Convention Program, *New Mexico School Review* 11 (October 1931): 46-47.

[29] David L. Bachelor, *Educational Reform in New Mexico: Tireman, San Jose, and Nambe* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1991), p. 11-12.

[30] David L. Bachelor, *Educational Reform in New Mexico: Tireman, San Jose, and Nambe* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1991), p. 7.

[31] "The San Jose Training School," *The University of New Mexico Bulletin*, Training School Series 1 (October 1930): 8.

[32] Loyd S. Tireman, "The San Jose Training School," *The University of New Mexico Bulletin*, Training School Series 1 (October 1930): 4-5.

[33] Staff workers at San Jose attributed three different names, often used interchangeably and given to the school in no particular order, to the school which existed at San Jose. School officials throughout the state referred to the school as the San Jose Experimental School, the San Jose Demonstration School, and the San Jose Training School. Each name depicted a specific function which the school served. As an "Experimental School", San Jose could be differentiated from its two "Control School" counterparts, known as Santa Barbara and Atrisco. As a "Demonstration School", San Jose was to demonstrate the scientific teaching techniques which the investigators uncovered through their work. Finally, as a "Training School", the leaders envisioned an institution in which rural teachers of Spanish-speaking pupils could be brought in and trained in the latest techniques. From henceforth, the school at San Jose will be referred to simply as San Jose. For a more specific description of San Jose in its experimental school capacity, see Harlan Sininger, "An Age-Grade Study of the San Jose Training School and Its Two Control Schools," *The University of New Mexico Bulletin*, Training School Series 1 (March 1931): 3-10.

[34] The San Jose Experimental School, *We Learn English: A Preliminary Report of the Achievement of Spanish-Speaking Pupils in New Mexico* (Albuquerque, NM: The University of New Mexico Press, July 1936), p. 5-7.

[35] "Rural School Supervisors Hold Session at Albuquerque," *New Mexico School Review* 11 (January 1932): 28.

[36] *Center for Southwest Research*, faculty contracts from the University of New Mexico Archives, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Reference Number 077-1.

[37] "Rural Education: Specialized Supervision," *New Mexico School Review* 12 (October 1932): 27.

[38] For similar experiences in California, see Kathleen Weiler, *Country Schoolwomen: Teaching in Rural California, 1850-1950* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).

[39] *Center for Southwest Research*, The University of New Mexico, Collections 573, Box 2, Folder 1, Letter dated September 8, 1932.

[40] "Rural Education," *New Mexico School Review* 12 (October 1932): 7.

[41] Personal interview with Frank Angel, a rural school teacher during the time of San Jose and later at Nambe and a retired professor of education from the University of New Mexico. Angel knew both Hughes and Tireman very well; plus, he worked in the late 1930s and early 1940s as a rural teacher at Nambe Community School under Principal Loyd Tireman. Interview conducted at Professor Angel's home on December 21, 1998.

[42] A detailed study of the contradictions and similarities between Hughes' and Tireman's educational philosophies will be explored at a later date.

[43] Specific categorization of past curriculum scholars remains elusive and, in some ways, a hindrance. However, the use of Kliebard's interest groups assists in understanding the dominant beliefs of those who are studied. The labeling of Hughes as developmentalist and Tireman as a social efficiency educator, as helpful as it may be, limits understanding of their contributions. Although they certainly evidenced the dominant ideas of these two groups, they each displayed characteristics of another of Kliebard's groups—the social meliorists. Perhaps they were both a mixture, in varying amounts, of these three groups. I wish to acknowledge Peter Hlebowitsh's contribution to understanding Hughes and Tireman through his comments at the 1999 Annual Meeting of the *Society for the Study of Curriculum History* conference in Montreal, Canada.

[44] Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 11.

[45] For a valuable biography of William Heard Kilpatrick, which includes detailed accounts of his relationship with John Dewey, see John A. Beineke, *And There Were Giants in the Land: The Life of William Heard Kilpatrick* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998).

[46] Harlan Sininger, "Activities in Primary Education," *New Mexico School Review* 12 (December 1932): 10.

[47] Personal Interview with Frank Angel, December 21, 1998.

[48] Donald W. Mackay, "Rural Education," *New Mexico School Review* 13 (March 1934): 23-26.

[49] Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, p. 77.

[50] Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, p. 21.

[51] For a discussion of the rejection of traditional teaching practices by progressive educators, see Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, p. 35-50.

[52] Marie Morrison Hughes, *Teaching a Standard English Vocabulary with Initial Reading Instruction* (Las Cruces, NM: Bronson Printing Company, 1932), p. 10.

[53] Hughes, *Teaching A Standard English Vocabulary With Initial Reading Instruction*, p. 31.

[54] New Mexico Educational Association Convention Program, *New Mexico School Review* 13 (September 1933): 43.

[55] Marie Morrison Hughes, "Reading to Learn to Read," *New Mexico School Review* 13 (January 1934): 25.

[56] Donald MacKay, "Rural Education," *New Mexico School Review* 13 (April 1934): 15.

[57] Marie M. Hughes, "The Acquisition of English-speaking Ability by Spanish-speaking Children," (Master's Thesis, University of Chicago, 1935).

[58] "Visit to San Jose School," *New Mexico School Review* 15 (October 1935): 30.

[59] Getz, *Schools of Their Own*, p. 82.

[60] Bachelor, *Educational Reform in New Mexico*, p. 55-62.

[61] With the current emphasis on standards, accountability, and curriculum revision, decision-makers could use a full-length study of New Mexico's first ever curriculum revision program. This initiative was very similar to those in other states around the same time. Much needed is a complete study of the program, its implications, and its relatedness to those of other states. No such study exists today.

[62] "State Curriculum Revision," *New Mexico School Review* 14 (April 1935): 3.

[63] L. S. Tireman, "The State Program for the Improvement of Instruction," *New Mexico School Review* 16 (September 1936): 6.

[64] "With the State Department of Education," *New Mexico School Review* 16 (March 1937): 13.

[65] Historians of New Mexico education should also conduct studies of both Mary Watson and Laura Atkinson. Their contributions to early New Mexico education were varied and substantial.

[66] Ernestine Duran, "Teaching in a Rural School," *New Mexico School Review* 16 (April 1937): 18.

[67] Mariamne Geyer, "The Program for the Improvement of Instruction Reports From the Counties," *New Mexico School Review* 16 (March 1937): 32; See also W. E. Kerr "State Program for the Improvement of Instruction: The Instructional Assembly in the Elementary School," *New Mexico School Review* 18 (March 1938): 16.

[68] M. E. Linton, "The New Mexico Curriculum Program," *New Mexico School Review* 18 (November 1938): 7.

[69] New Mexico Educational Association Convention Program, *New Mexico School Review* 17 (October 1937): 37.

[70] *Center for Southwest Research*, faculty contracts from the University of New Mexico Archives, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Reference Number 077-1.

[71] Marie M. Hughes, "Notes On Progress In New Mexico Schools," *New Mexico School Review* 18 (November 1938): 13-14.

[72] Marie Morrison Hughes, "The English Language Facility of Mexican-American Children Living and Attending School in a Segregated Community," (Ed.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1952).

[73] David Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), p. 6.