

THE SELECTION OF TEXTBOOKS FOR STATE ADOPTION

by

ROLAND E. GUNN

A. B., College of Emporia, 1930

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1937

Monument
LD
2668
T4
1937
G81
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.	1
THE GENERAL STATUS OF TEXTBOOK SELECTION.	3
EFFECTIVE TECHNIQUE OF TEXTBOOK SELECTION	13
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KANSAS.	55
CONCLUSIONS	60
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.	62
LITERATURE CITED.	62
APPENDIX.	65

INTRODUCTION

At the time this subject was selected for a thesis study the selection of textbooks in Kansas was in a chaotic condition. Since then, state legislation has abolished the old textbook commission and placed the duty in the hands of the State Board of Education, a body well constituted to perform this function effectively. It still remains, however, for the board to set up most of the machinery for effective performance. Accordingly, while conditions have changed radically in the state since the beginning of this study, it is felt that the chance for it to be of service has not disappeared.

Several factors emphasize the importance of most careful selection of textbooks. Perhaps the first of these is the large number of inexperienced and untrained teachers. According to Maxwell (16), "The teaching corps in the United States is still relatively untrained and a majority of our teachers have not had sufficient training in basic subject materials to be independent of the textbook. In school systems where adequate provision has not been made for supervision by trained people, teachers rely on the textbook rather than the course of study. This is also true in some cities where elaborate courses of study are planned. Probably a larger number of courses of study in the schools of

the country are based upon particular textbooks then have been elaborated independently."

Cubberly (10) also says that next to the teacher, the textbook is the most important part of the educational system in our schools today. In fact, wherever one reads, this seems to be the emphasis among educators who have considered the problem. With particular force do these arguments apply to Kansas.

A second consideration which emphasizes the importance of the problem is the flood of textbooks now available. In the earlier days when the field of selection was narrow, the job was comparatively easy, but now with the confusing array to select from the problem becomes complex. That good textbooks are available we well know. Cubberly (10) comments that, "The American school textbooks are far ahead of European textbooks. They are unusually fine pieces of workmanship, distinguished for their excellence in typography, paper, illustrations, binding, and general make-up, and are at the same time sold at a comparatively low price. As a result, the textbooks written and printed in the United States are sold all over the English speaking world." Because a high quality of textbooks is available, however, does not mean that they will be selected. Many of those available are out of date, written from a viewpoint foreign

to the local situation, or not in keeping with the technique of modern educational procedure.

It is our hope that this study may bring together the essential considerations and effective techniques that may be used in dealing with the problem it raises in Kansas.

THE GENERAL STATUS OF TEXTBOOK SELECTION

Three general sources of information bearing on the problem of textbook selection have been used: (1) the general literature available, (2) a questionnaire sent to states and cities in which adoption is effective, (3) bulletins and other materials secured in response to the questionnaire.

A careful survey of available literature revealed much significant information and at the same time made it evident that extensive additional sources must be sought. With the background provided by this reading a questionnaire (see appendix) was formulated and sent to the states having state-adopted textbooks and to a number of large cities.

It was necessary to include a number of items in the questionnaire to secure material that was not available from any other source. At the same time it was desirable to keep the number of questions as small as possible. The number of questions was reduced to 21, some of which included the elementary school, the junior high, and the

senior high.

On July 29, 1936, the questionnaire was mailed to the state superintendents of the 25 states having state-adopted textbooks and to the District of Columbia. The same questionnaire was mailed to the city superintendents in ten cities on October 22, 1936. As this questionnaire did not prove altogether satisfactory for cities, the questions were slightly revised and sent to 15 other cities. This time ten replies were received. The questionnaire was not changed greatly for the cities. The word "state" was changed to "city" in an attempt to assure a higher percentage of replies. One question was added, question two. This changed number three to number four, number four to number five, etc. The number of replies received was 21 from the states and 15 from the cities, making a total of 36 returns.

The questionnaire was sent to all the 25 states having state-adopted textbooks. They are: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Utah, and West Virginia. The questionnaire was filled out and returned by 21 states; Alabama, Connecticut, Oklahoma, and Oregon did not return the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was mailed to 25 cities selected at random over the United States. The following cities filled out and returned questionnaires: St. Louis, Missouri; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Cleveland, Ohio; Des Moines, Iowa; Denver, Colorado; Detroit, Michigan; Los Angeles, California; St. Paul, Minnesota; Atlanta, Georgia; San Francisco, California; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Lincoln, Nebraska; Austin, Texas; and Cincinnati, Ohio. The questionnaire was also sent to the following cities but was not returned: Kansas City, Missouri; Portland, Oregon; Tulsa, Oklahoma; Dallas, Texas; Boston, Massachusetts; Flint, Michigan; Gary, Indiana; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Seattle, Washington; and Providence, Rhode Island.

The returns sent in show (Table 1) all 21 states using state-adopted textbooks in their elementary schools, and that 12 states have state-adopted texts for the junior high and 11 for the senior high. From these returns it is apparent that the elementary schools are restricted more than the junior or senior high schools. One reason for the greater restriction of the elementary schools is that in the grade schools the individual differences of the students are not so apparent, or at least they can be cared for by the teacher in a more efficient manner. Another reason is

Table 1. States having state-adopted textbooks. El., Elementary schools; J. H., Junior High; S. H., Senior High.

		Yes	No	Not Answered
State-adopted textbooks	<u>El.</u>	21	0	0
	<u>J.H.</u>	12	4	5
	<u>S.H.</u>	11	7	2
Select multiple list of textbooks	<u>El.</u>	7	10	4
	<u>J.H.</u>	6	4	11
	<u>S.H.</u>	6	5	10
Schools required to use adopted textbooks	<u>El.</u>	19	1	1
	<u>J.H.</u>	9		12
	<u>S.H.</u>	12		9

the high school teachers usually are better qualified and more capable of selecting the textbooks they are to use than are the elementary school teachers.

Fifteen cities were brought into the study, and it was found that five have state-adopted texts in the elementary and junior high schools and that four use state-adopted texts in the senior high school (Table 2).

The desirability of state-adopted textbooks is a widely discussed question today. There are a number of arguments for state-adopted textbooks as well as arguments against them. Maxwell (17) advances three advantages of state adopted textbooks: (1) Textbooks will be uniform for the entire state so that a pupil who moves from one section

to another will have no difficulty in entering any school in the state. (2) The cost will be decreased. (3) State adoption means that books are selected by more competent authorities. We might add to this list that state adoption permits the use of a minimum course of study.

Table 2. The method of adopting textbooks in cities.
El., Elementary schools; J. H., Junior High;
S. H., Senior High.

		Yes	No	Not Answered
State-adopted textbooks	<u>El.</u>	5	10	1
	<u>J.H.</u>	5	9	1
	<u>S.H.</u>	4	10	1
City-adopted textbooks		7		3
Select multiple list of textbooks	<u>El.</u>	2	5	3
	<u>J.H.</u>	3	4	2
	<u>S.H.</u>	2	5	3
Schools required to use city adopted textbooks	<u>El.</u>	6		4
	<u>J.H.</u>	6	1	3
	<u>S.H.</u>	6	1	3

In response to the argument that state adoption provides lower prices, we may say that no publisher can legally quote to one state the price of a textbook which is lower than the price publicly announced in another state. The assumption that in state adoption we have a more competent selecting group is untrue in some states as will be taken up under the heading "Selecting Body". There may be instances in which these arguments for state adoption

are true, but they are not generally true.

Nyström (20) states, "In Kansas this principle is not followed. Only three of the seven members (referring to the previous status) of the selecting agency are teachers or administrators. There is no definite or consistent policy of giving teachers a voice in the selection of textbooks. The provision in the law for making laboratory tests to determine the best books has never been attempted and is not practicable unless a research division is established for the administration and supervision of such a plan."

The opponents of state adoption make, apparently, just as strong an argument. They hold that, as conditions in different schools and parts of the state vary, so should the textbooks vary. The fact that the textbook commission selects the texts to be used by the entire state rather than by some particular city or county adds greater importance to the problem. In Kansas and in many other states the textbooks are selected for use throughout the state. However, in the larger cities the local schools are usually permitted to select their own textbooks. We are well aware of the fact that conditions in localities differ, making some texts more suitable for one particular part of the state, while other textbooks may be best suited to another section. Let us take texts in arithmetic for example.

Problems concerning farm situations are entirely out of place for the city youth. This would likewise be true in giving city problems to the farm youth. Coffey (4) makes this statement: "The methods of teaching must be considered in selecting a textbook. For example, if the school system believes that arithmetic should be a tool to help one's children to adjust one's social environment, it is necessary to select books not only from the adequacy of drill material, but their content should also illustrate the social situation that will be met by the children in life experiences." From these and like comments of other educators, it is quite apparent that the persons selecting the textbooks should be persons who are aware of the problems and best fitted to meet them. Lawyers are most familiar with the field of law, doctors with the field of medicine; then certainly school people are best fitted to select texts for use in our schools.

Another argument against state adoption of textbooks is that the textbook commissions are not competent to perform this work. The state-adoption plan may actually operate against the "best textbooks". Such would be the case if the author of a book decides to incorporate in his text some definite improvement in content or method of presentation, and the improved book becomes at once available to territory

open to its sale. However, the publisher does not dare to offer it in the state where the earlier edition was adopted, since the improved book is not legally the adopted book. It would be impossible under this situation for a certain textbook to be improved a month or so after it has been adopted by a certain state. However, that state will, for the remainder of the adoption period, be required to use the less effective textbook.

There are arguments on both sides of the question of course, but most authorities do not favor the state as the adopting unit. They favor, rather, some smaller unit such as the city or supervisory unit. This small unit is beyond question the most satisfactory for most states.

The questionnaire attempted to secure information on the selection of a multiple list of texts. State adoption of textbooks does not necessarily mean that one text is selected and that all the schools in the state must use this one textbook. It may indicate that several textbooks are approved and that the actual selection of one or more textbooks is left up to the individual school. This is commonly referred to as selecting a "multiple list" of textbooks.

Table 1 shows seven states adopting several textbooks for the elementary schools. The individual school may then

select its own text or texts from this approved list. In ten instances, the state adopts one text which its elementary schools must use. For the junior and senior high schools, six states indicate they adopt more than one textbook and three adopt only one text.

Another question on which it was necessary to collect information was the possibility of all the schools in the state being required to use the state-adopted textbooks when they are adopted. The larger municipalities or districts are permitted to select their own texts in most cases. The reason is that they are better fitted to select their own textbooks than are small cities or rural districts. Table 1 shows that in 21 states elementary schools are required to use the state-adopted textbooks, while in nine states the junior high and in 12 states the senior high schools are required to use state-selected ones. In some cases it was noted that high schools were required to use a part of the texts adopted, for example, the algebra, geometry, and American history, while in some other subjects the high schools are permitted to choose the books they use. Here again we have greater restriction upon the elementary schools than upon the high schools. Some of the possible reasons for this have already been mentioned.

Table 2 deals with the status of textbooks in 15

larger cities. The first question on the questionnaire was, "Do you have state-adopted texts in your schools?" To this question five cities answered "yes" for elementary schools; five for junior and four for senior high replied likewise. Ten answered "no" for elementary, nine answered "no" for junior high, and ten "no" for senior high schools. Not quite all the questions were answered.

In reply to the next question (table 2) seven cities stated that they had city-adopted textbooks and three of the cities did not reply. To the question, "If you have city-adopted textbooks, are several chosen and is the actual selection left up to the individual schools?" two cities replied "yes" for elementary, three replied "yes" for junior high, and two replied "yes" for senior high schools. To this same question, five schools replied that they did not have a multiple list of textbooks. Four schools answered "no" for junior high schools. Three did not answer any of these questions. Six cities indicated that their public schools are required to use the city-adopted texts in all branches of their schools. Four did not answer for elementary, and three did not answer for junior and senior high schools. One city replied that it did not have a multiple list of adopted textbooks for the junior and senior high schools.

EFFECTIVE TECHNIQUE OF TEXTBOOK SELECTION

There are many phases to be considered in effective and efficient methods of selecting textbooks today. Some of the phases deal with selection in a direct way, and some of them in a more or less indirect manner. To get a well-rounded picture of the entire situation, information was collected on the following items: (1) selecting body, (2) advisory body, (3) length of adoption period, (4) adequacy of present system, (5) course of study and adoption of textbooks, (6) evaluation of textbooks selected, (7) politics and textbook adoption, (8) the part of state teachers associations in the selection of textbooks, (9) procedure for textbook selection. These various phases of the subject will be discussed in the order mentioned above.

The Selecting Body

The selection of textbooks for state adoption, as is shown in Table 3, is done entirely by two types of agencies in the various states. The state board of education selects the textbooks for adoption in 12 states. In at least four cases the state board chooses the textbooks to be adopted from a list recommended by a special committee set up for the specific purpose of recommending textbooks to the state board for adoption. It is entirely possible that there are other states doing the same thing, but that it was not

indicated on the returned questionnaires. In nine states the commission is made up of all or a part of the state board of education. In seven states the group or agency which selects the textbooks is made up of the state board of education. In nine states the selecting group or agency is made up of educators, and the state superintendent is a member in seven states. In six states a part of the

Table 5. The textbook selecting body for 20 states.

	State board of education	State school book commission	Committees recommend to State Board	Laymen	Educators	State superintendent of public instruction	Governor	Lieutenant governor	Governor and his cabinet	State board appoints	Governor appoints	Governor with senate consent	Elects by the people
Group selecting textbook	13	9	4										
Composition of group				6	9	7	4	1	3				
Positions secured										3	15	2	9

selecting agency must be laymen. In four states the governor is a member of the group, and in one state the lieutenant governor is a member. It will be noticed in Table 3 that there is considerable overlapping in these results. This cannot be avoided since the results are listed just as they were stated on the returned questionnaires.

In 13 states the members of the selecting agency get their positions by appointment from the governor. In two states these appointments must be confirmed by the state senate. Of course, when the governor, lieutenant governor, state superintendent, or other state officials are on the board, they usually are elected by the people. It is probably true, in some states at least, that these persons are merely figure-heads in the selection of textbooks, which is probably a desirable situation. The state board of education appoints an advisory body in three states.

It is the writer's opinion that the states in which the selecting group is appointed by the state board should have a more efficient group than have those under any of the other arrangements. It seems reasonable and logical that the state board of education should be in a better position to know those who are capable of acting on the selecting committee. It is possible that the governor, who has so many other appointments on his hands, and is, in many cases

indebted to some political group for his election, may be influenced, at least in part, in making his appointments by those affiliations coming out of his election. It would be a rare case in which appointments made by a governor were on a non-partisan basis.

For the above reasons Table 3 seems to be an extremely important one. It gives the composition of the selecting agency and the method used by the agency or group which is responsible for the adopting of textbooks in the states which have state-adopted textbooks. It seems obvious to the writer that the group which chooses the textbooks is the most important cog in the whole system of textbook selection. We cannot expect to get the best textbooks for our students if this group is made up of laymen, who are not qualified, or persons who are so politically situated as to be unable to make a free and unbiased selection.

This point is so important that the Committee on Education (9), chosen to study the textbook situation, in summarizing its study makes this point, "The choice of textbooks is so important an educational task that the study of approved methods and standards for selection should be emphasized in the professional preparation of teachers."

If the selection of textbooks is so extremely vital that it requires previous training, then surely it needs to

be in the hands of competent persons. Cook (7) makes this comment: "Only persons in active educational work as teachers and administrators should be permitted on selecting committees---a qualification which many of the state boards of education, charged with adoption, cannot satisfy."

There are many different phases to be considered in selecting textbooks such as content, binding, paper, type, illustrations, interesting approaches, quality of material, summaries, exercises, supervised study material, attractiveness to students, pupil interest, and many other items. Well-qualified and active teachers and administrators are better able to do the work of selecting textbooks than are business men, farmers, or lawyers, who are busy with their own numerous tasks and interests. Business men are quite likely to let a small difference in price greatly influence their choice of a "reasonably good book" over one that is sound, practical, and excellent in every respect.

On this Butcher (3) writes: "The difference in cost between a good book and an inferior one sometimes amounts to the difference between a child's walking to school on a certain morning and riding on a street car or bus, or the cost of one visit to a picture show, or one cigar that the child's father smokes. The saving to the entire state may amount to some thousands of dollars during the life of a

contract."

E. P. Gubberly (11) points out that, "The cost of the textbook is a relatively small amount, 1.5 per cent of the total cost of education. But the textbook is next to the teacher in importance in the educational system."

The state board of education should not attempt to select the textbooks but should choose competent committees to do this work. In commenting on this phase of the subject Goffey (5) says, "When the state board of education is the adopting body, it is important that it act only on the advice of its committees and especially appointed proof readers. When the state board of education begins to act independently, or still worse, to ignore educational advice and follow personal or political motives in making adoptions, trouble is just around the corner, and uniformity of textbooks is then opposed and ought to be resented by the superintendent and teachers of the state."

The agency which selects the textbooks for cities is listed under several different headings as is shown in Table 4. There are special committees appointed for the selection of textbooks in five cities. In two cities the board of education selects the textbook upon the recommendation of the superintendent. The superintendent in all probability delegates some special committee to help select the texts

that he recommends to the board for adoption. In one state the supervisors select the textbooks. It is quite likely that here also the supervisors act on committees to choose books or appoint committees to do this work. This is probably true if for no other reason than that these superintendents and supervisors have so much other work to do that they must have the selecting work done by some of the people in the field.

Table 4. The textbook selecting group for ten¹ cities.

	Supervisors	Special committees	City board upon recommendation	Supervisors, principals	Laymen	Superintendent or supervisor appoints	Not answered
Group selecting	1	5	2				2
Composition of group				6	1		3
Positions of group secured						5	5

¹Only ten cities in this table since the other five replies were directed to states.

In six cities the committee for selecting textbooks are made up of supervisors, principals, and teachers. In only one city does this committee include laymen.

The members of this agency got their positions in practically all cases through appointment by the superintendents or supervisors.

It is quite likely, as has been mentioned before, owing to the closer relationship and more strict supervision in the city systems, that cities do more efficient work in selecting textbooks than the states are able to do. In relation to this Gubberly (10) says, "An application to county and state of textbook technique worked out by our cities would improve both the method and the character of the state adoptions." Many state boards of education have already benefited greatly from the experiences which the cities have had in selecting textbooks, but there is much more that the states can copy from the city book selection methods and benefit thereby.

The Textbook Advisory Body

In some states there is an advisory body to the group which adopts the textbooks. The function of this advisory body is to study the available textbooks and submit one or several books to the state board or adopting agency for adoption. This advisory body, as we shall refer to it, is

composed of different groups of persons. It is usually made up of educators, teachers, principals, supervisors, or superintendents. The best functioning advisory body is probably made up of a combination of these groups of educators. Coffey (6) makes this statement in regard to the selection of textbooks: "The selection of textbooks is the joint responsibility of the administrators and competent teachers."

The Committee on Education (9) comments that, "Teachers as users of textbooks should have a voice in their selection, but effective participation on the part of the teacher requires special competency."

The advisory body is usually appointed by the governor or the state superintendent or the city superintendent. It usually consists of teachers and supervisors or principals. Great care should be exercised in choosing this committee which is to select the textbooks. The teachers on these committees should be in the specific subject field. They also should be teachers that are especially competent and teachers with experience. This advisory committee should be given ample time to study the problem and select the texts. The committee should also enlist the help of other teachers in making its final decision. As these teachers should

work only in their subject fields, it will be necessary to select a number of committees, for example, one committee for readers, one committee for arithmetics, one committee for algebras, one for home economics texts, etc. This will place better qualified teachers on committees and at the same time will not over-work any one group of teachers.

The power of these committees should be to recommend the books to the adopting body. This will put the actual content making and legal questions involved in the hands of a group better qualified to do this part of the work.

The number of states which have these advisory bodies, the qualifications of these groups, and the powers of them are all taken up in Table 5. In the seventh question, as it is shown in this table, we note that there is an advisory body for the group adopting the textbooks in seven states for the elementary schools, and in five states for the junior and senior high schools. We also notice that 13 states replied that they did not have advisory committees for the elementary school, and that in the junior and senior high schools eight states replied "no" to this question. Probably attention should again be called to the fact that in some instances the persons filling out the questionnaire did not reply for all three schools, that is, the elementary, the junior high, and the senior high.

It is possible that those persons intended the same reply to be used for all three schools, but it is not so construed in compiling the figures on this table, the idea, of course being that true research is based upon fact and not upon assumption.

In three states the body is appointed by the state board of education, in three other states by the state superintendent and the governor, and in one state by the state superintendent of public instruction.

Those who replied to the question dealing with the legal qualifications of this group indicated that in four states the advisory body must be made up of school people, in two states of outstanding educators, and in three states there are no legal qualifications.

Apparently the only power that this group has is to recommend books to the state adopting board. At least, the eight states listing a reply to this question indicated that the group has only the power to recommend. It was cited in several cases that this group recommends two or three books to the state adopting body. The advisory body to the group which adopts the textbooks for cities is shown in Table 6. As the results for elementary, junior, and senior high schools are identical, they will all be treated as one unit. It is quite possible that the meaning of the question was

Table G. The textbook advisory body for 16 cities. El., Elementary School; J. H., Junior High; S. H., Senior High.

		Yes	No	Superintendent or Assistant Appoints	Subject or Classroom Teachers	School People	Recommend	Not Answered
Required by law	<u>El.</u>	3	6					7
	<u>J. H.</u>	3	6					7
	<u>S. H.</u>	3	6					7
Selection	<u>El.</u>			3				9
	<u>J. H.</u>			6				9
	<u>S. H.</u>			6				9
Qualifications	<u>El.</u>				3	5		7
	<u>J. H.</u>				3	5		7
	<u>S. H.</u>				3	5		7
Power							7	8

not clear and that comparatively few replies were received for that reason.

In Table 6 the first question covered was, "Is there required by law an advisory body to the board which adopts the textbooks for use in your city?" In reply to this three cities answered "yes", and five answered "no". The advisory body is appointed by the city superintendent or deputy superintendent with the aid of others in five cases for elementary schools, and in six for junior and senior high schools.

The qualifications for the advisory body vary slightly, but in all cases the groups are made up of school people. In five cases the group is made up of teachers, principals, supervisors, and superintendents, and in three cases the group is composed of classroom teachers only. Of course, from the question asked, the work of the group is apparent. In the replies from seven cities it was stated that the power of this group was to recommend from one to three books to the adopting body.

Length of Adoption Period

The length of time for which textbooks are adopted varies among states and cities. The importance of this problem is in some cases overlooked. In some cases it may also be over-emphasized. Judd (14) has this to

say on the length of time for which textbooks are adopted:

"I am told that the ordinary school book cannot be sold after it is five years old unless the publisher at least professes to have revised it. There are, I am sure, units of instruction that do not need to be revised every five years. Revision is, of course, necessary whenever new ideas appear. The new ideas usually supplement rather than destroy older ideas. Why not put the additions to a subject in the form of small units and thus keep the school library up to date rather than continue the pernicious and wasteful habit of overhauling a whole collection of topics every five years for the purpose of fooling people with the idea that one is publishing a new book?" This is the opinion of some other prominent educators also. It may be true, then, that we have been placing too much stress on a five-year or any definite adoption period. It is entirely possible that we have been putting some good books out of use merely because we have used them four, five, or six years.

At the same time it is undoubtedly true that were it not for a definite period of adoption, it would be difficult to make the needed changes at the end of four, five, or six years. Also it would be difficult to prevent changes from being made in some instances after one or two years of use. It is entirely possible that changes may be made because of

a whim or fancy of some one person or some one group of persons for some educational fad that may last for only a very short time. It may mean that the text would be reprinted exchanging the word "unit" for "chapter" to catch the fanciful eye of some group.

A definite period of adoption should also be provided in order to get rid of very poor books that, even with the best methods of selection, are likely to be adopted occasionally. It should further provide that any textbook can be withdrawn from the adopted list by a three-fourths or five-sixths vote of the adopting body.

A number of states and cities make it possible for textbooks to be readopted after the adoption period expires. According to Whipple (23), "After the period of adoption has expired, a text may be readopted or continued in use."

A compilation of returns in Table 7 shows that nine states use the five-year period, which seems to be the most popular length of time for text adoption. The other two most frequent occurring periods are six year, which occurs four times, and four years, which two states use as their adoption periods. The periods range from three to eight years, with one state writing contracts with no definite date of termination.

Table 7. Frequency of mention of adoption period for states.

Period of adoption	Number reporting
3-year period	1
4	2
5	9
6	4
8	1
1 to 6-year period	1
6 to 8-year period	1
5 years with possible 2-year extension	1
No definite period	1

The period of adoption for cities as is shown by Table 8 seems to be similar to that for the states. Six out of the nine cities reported that they adopt their textbooks for a five-year period. One city adopts its texts for a period of one to six years, one for not less than three years, and one city for as long as the board may determine. Both the cities and states reporting agree on the point that the period of adoption probably should be about five years.

Table 8. Frequency of mention of adoption period for cities.

Period of Adoption	Number Reporting
5 years	6
1 to 6 years	1
Not less than 3 years	1
As each board determines	1

Adequacy of Present Systems

Table 9 shows the length of time during which the present systems of adoption have been in use. The time varies from two to 85 years. Apparently most of the laws concerning textbook adoption have not been made in recent years, for the average length of time for which the textbook laws have been in use is approximately 24 years.

Table 9. Age of present systems of adopting textbooks and the adequacy of the systems now in use in states.

Number of years present system has been used	Number Reporting	Is present system adequate?	
		Yes	No
2	1	1	
6	1	1	
7	1	1	
15	2	1	1
17	3	2	1
18	1	1	
19	1		1
20	2	2	
22	1	1	
23	1	1	
25	1	1	
37	1		1
70	1		1
85	1	1	
Many	2	1	

In all the states except four it was the belief of the persons filling out the questionnaire that the present system is adequate. No reasons were given for these

opinions. It must be borne in mind that these are mere opinions of the persons filling in the report and do not necessarily represent the facts in the matter.

There were not enough reports from cities, as shown in Table 10 on the length of time that the present systems have been in use, to make them of any particular value.

Table 10. Age of present systems of adopting textbooks and the adequacy of systems now in use in cities.

Number of years present system has been in use	Number Reporting	Is present system adequate?		
		Yes	No	Partially
4	1	1		
6	1	1		
12	1			1
over 15	1	1		
18	1			1
Many	3	2	1	1

One city reported that its system had been in use four years in the elementary school and junior high, and for six years in the senior high. Another reported that its system had been in use 12 years in the elementary school and the junior high, and for 18 years in the senior high. The others reporting were: one school which had used its system for over 15 years, and three cities which reported they had used theirs "many years". There were eight cities which answered the question, "Is your present system adequate?" It was the opinion of five of those replying

that their present systems were adequate, and of two that theirs were not entirely adequate. One city stated that its system was inadequate. It is interesting to note that in this particular city, state-adopted textbooks are used.

Courses of Study and Adoption of Textbooks

In Kansas the recent legislation has placed the selection of textbooks in the hands of the same group that is responsible for the course of study. It is believed that if the same group is responsible for both the course of study and the selection of textbooks, we shall get a better correlation between the two. It is also believed that the textbooks which would be adopted under this plan could be more easily used with the course of study; then the same material that would be covered in the textbook would be provided for, so far as possible, in the course of study. The report of the Committee on Education for 1932 (8) states, "The educational unit preparing the course of study is the logical unit for adoption of textbooks; in that way the textbook will fit the course of study."

The frequency of mention of the body responsible for the determining of the course of study is shown in Table 11. Here again, while the questionnaire called for answers from the elementary schools, the junior high, and the senior

high schools, the results are so nearly identical and the replies so interwoven that it is practically impossible to separate the returns into these three divisions. They will be treated as one unit in this discussion.

Table 11. Body responsible for course of study for states.

Name of Group	Number
State board of education	12
State superintendent through special committees	4
State superintendent	1
State board of education and board of special districts	1
Elementary school commission	1
High school commission	1
State board upon recommendations	1

We find in table 11 that the state board of education is responsible for determining the course of study in 12 states, and the state superintendent is responsible through special committees in four states. The following groups are responsible for determining the course of study in one state each: state board and special districts, state superintendent, elementary school commission, high school commission, and the state board of education upon recommendation of the state textbook commission, the state superintendent, and special committees. Attention should be called to the fact that the state board of education alone apparently is responsible in 12 states. The state board

has at least a part of the responsibility in two other cases already cited. Likewise while the state superintendent is directly responsible in only one state, he is, in all probability, a part of the board of education in most states and is directly or indirectly responsible in many states for the course of study.

Table 12 is similar to Table 11 except that it deals with cities, while Table 11 deals with states. Table 12 covers the frequency of mention of the body responsible for determining the course of study.

Table 12. Body responsible for the course of study for cities.

Name of Group	Number
State board of education	3
Local board of education	2
Local school district	1
Local school district under state laws	1
State board of education, use not required	1
Division of instruction--supervisors	1
Elementary curriculum section	1
Secondary curriculum section	1
Local board approves superintendent's recommendations	1
State board and local authorities	1
Committees appointed by superintendent	1

The state board of education determines the course of study in three cities, and the local board of education is the determining body in two cities. The others, as

mentioned below, were named once as the agency determining the city course of study: local district, local board seting under state laws, state board of education, but no district is required to use the course recommended, division of instruction made up of supervisors, committees appointed by superintendent, elementary curriculum section, the secondary curriculum section, the board of education approves as the state superintendent recommends, state board of education and local authorities.

It is obvious from these replies that both the local boards and superintendents are responsible in more cities than are indicated directly. That is, for example, no doubt true of the statement that the board of education is responsible as the superintendent recommends, or committees appointed by the superintendent. From these returns it is apparent that the city superintendent is responsible, directly or indirectly, for the adoption of textbooks and determining the course of study in at least seven of the 16 cities.

Two questions were directed at this same phase discussed in Tables 11 and 12. The question was, "Does the group which is responsible for the course of study select the textbooks?" It is interesting to note that in ten states the group which adopts the textbooks determines the

courses of study. In ten states one group does not do both, and one state did not reply to this question. This is shown in Table 13.

The second question in table 13 is, "If the same group does not select both the textbooks and the course of study, do the separate agencies cooperate?" In reply to this question, six states said that the cooperation was good, and two replied, "Fair cooperation". Thirteen states did not reply to this question.

Table 13. Course of study and textbook selection for states.

	Yes	No	Cooperation Good Fair	Not Answered
Is the group which selects the textbooks responsible for the course of study?	10	10		1
If the same group does not select both the textbooks and the course of study, do the separate agencies cooperate?			6 2	13

Table 14 takes up the same questions for cities that Table 13 does for the states. Four cities reported that the group responsible for the course of study did select the textbooks. Eight cities reported that different groups did this work. Only three cities replied to the question of cooperation between these two groups. Two

cities reported that the group selecting the courses of study cooperates with the one adopting the textbooks, and one city reported poor cooperation.

Table 14. Course of study and textbook selection for cities.

	Yes	No	Cooperation Good	Poor	Not Answered
Is the group which selects the textbooks responsible for the course of study?	8	4			3
If the same group does not select both the textbooks and the course of study, do the separate agencies cooperate?			2	1	12

It seems probable that even though these two groups cooperate in selecting textbooks and determining the course of study, still better results could be obtained if one group were responsible for both duties.

Evaluation of Textbooks to be Selected

The question of having a clearly formulated system of evaluating textbooks is one of the most controversial issues in this entire study. In the first part of Table 15 this question is covered, "Is there a clearly formulated system for evaluating textbooks in your elementary schools, junior high schools, and senior high schools?" To this question five states replied in the affirmative for their

elementary schools and three in the affirmative for the junior and senior high schools. To this same question 12 states replied that they did not have clearly formulated systems of evaluating texts for the elementary schools.

Table 15. Evaluating system, political influence, and part of teacher associations in selection of textbooks for state. El., Elementary schools; J.H., Junior High; S.H., Senior High.

Question :	Yes	No	Partially	Not Answered
Do you have a clearly: <u>El.</u>	5	12		4
formulated system for: <u>J.H.</u>	3	5		13
evaluating textbooks? <u>S.H.</u>	3	6		12
In your estimation :				
has your system been :				
a "political foot- :				
ball"? :	2	14	2	3
Does your state :				
teachers association :				
play any part in the :				
selection of text- :				
books? :		10	2	1

Five gave the same reply for the junior high, and six replied "no" for the senior high. This question was not answered for elementary schools in four states, junior high schools in 13, and senior high schools in 12. Again let us keep in mind that because of the way these three branches of our schools were listed on the questionnaire, it is possible that the one reply for the elementary schools may have been intended to include the other two branches,

namely, junior and senior high.

One reason for the poor selection of textbooks in the past has undoubtedly been the lack of justifiable standards for selection. It is not easy to determine a basis for selecting textbooks that meets our educational needs today. The particular method we should use is not to be found in any one state school system or in any one city school system, but if it is to be found at all, it will be found through scientific experimentation and research. The schools today are beginning to appreciate the need for having standards to evaluate subject matter and the selecting procedures. Already a great deal has been done in this field, but there still is much room for improvement. There is need for carrying out experimentation and research into the field of textbook selection.

Few of our teachers today have had training or instruction on the desirable procedures to be followed in selecting school books. This is probably one reason that there has not been more vigorous protest against the methods of selection now employed. If the teachers had realized in the past that the methods of selecting textbooks were so inefficient, they undoubtedly would not have accepted the selections in such a complacent manner.

Many of our schools today have set up certain standards

which are used in the selection of teachers. Teachers are required to have a certain amount of preliminary training and a reasonably high scholastic standing. They must also have reached a certain age and have fulfilled other requirements. Yet these same schools do not have set standards of any sort for textbooks, the teacher's most valuable tools. Even worse than this, schools have in some instances selected a certain text because of political pressure brought on by its backers.

An exhaustive examination of a text should be made by a competent committee before it is adopted. According to Maxwell (19), "The selection of textbooks by a hit-and-miss method is no more in line with the scientific development of education than would be the equipping of an army with staves, or looking at an individual and stating what risk should be assumed by an insurance company..... The selection of textbooks is, of course, not so objective, but it does not mean it is any less disastrous."

A mere cursory examination of a book is not enough; neither does a hasty examination give one an adequate basis for either selection or rejection. To be sure, there are a few books that may be rejected on short consideration. This is the exception rather than the rule, however. Most books are not particularly distinctive. They are written to meet

wide and varying needs, and particular aspects of the book are not apparent. A careful and minute examination is required, in such cases, to decide which text emphasizes especially the largest number of the most important elements.

A competent committee investigating textbooks will make a better selection if it has a definite guide. Most of the textbook rating devices include the following general items: (1) mechanics, (2) content, (3) ease in use of, (4) publication of book, and (5) use of book. Let us consider first the mechanical features of the book.

One of the most obvious features of any book is its appearance, whether or not we like the look of the book. It should be viewed from the standpoint of attractiveness to the student who is going to use it. An attractive cover adds much to the first impression. Also, the cover should be of substantial material so that it will stand abuse. The binding is of particular importance in viewing the durability of textbooks. The size and shape of the book, that is, the number of pages and the size of the page should be considered. Most books can have a standard size except the geography which, because of maps, may need to be larger than other textbooks. The length of the lines and the size of margins may make the book more attractive to the

student. The paper the book is printed upon adds to the reading hygiene of a book. Paper that is glossy will reflect too much light and cause eye strain.

The type used should be suitable to the grade in which the text is to be used. The lower grades should have a larger type, of course, but it should not be excessively large even for the younger pupils. The type should be distinct and clear, not too fine nor too heavy. Letters, words, lines, and paragraphs should be spaced properly to aid the user, to make the book attractive, and to help sustain pupil interest.

The content of the book is given the greatest consideration by all authorities. From 60 to 70 per cent of the total value of the book is usually given over to content. The St. Louis, Missouri, city rating sheet for textbooks (22) lists the following items under content: (1) per cent of book devoted to standard material of known value, 15, (2) per cent of book devoted to new material considered valuable, 15, (3) proportionate amount of book allotted to assignment of work for the various quarters it is designed to cover, 10, (4) quality of material in textbook, including conciseness, description, and narration in colorful and action words, adaptable to the child's experience, word difficulty, and illustrative material, 30 per cent. Most

other score sheets stress these same items under a little different phrasing.

The aids to the use of the text should be considered in selecting a textbook, that is, such items as table of contents, index, bibliography, notes, headings, summaries, suggestions for study, and illustrative material. Every teachers knows that these devices add greatly to the value of a textbook. Much of the value of the content may be lost without them. These aids should be of such a nature that the student may readily understand and be able to use them.

The group of standards taken up under publication may be given too much stress by some selecting groups. Nevertheless, it is important and must be considered. The author of the textbook and his reputation should have some bearing upon the selection. The fact that the author is a prominent man, however, does not mean that he can write a good textbook for use in our schools.

There are other possibilities in connection with the author's name that is printed on the book. Henry (16) made the following statement in regard to the authorship of textbooks: "Very often a well advertised university professor politician will allow his name to go on a book as a joint author when he has not done one hour of work on the manuscript other than to read it over.....Often college

Professors have been known to boast that they simply allowed their names to go on the books though they have had nothing to do with them."

The publisher's reputation may be given some consideration in choosing a book. The title may have considerable effect on the first impression one has of a book. The date of copyright may not be so important if no changes have taken place in the field the text covers.

Bellou (1) makes this comment: "The fact is that a fresh copyright date may properly be regarded by a selection committee as an item in favor of a given textbook, only provided the subject matter in which important advances have been made recently, and only provided the book incorporated these advances without exhibiting inferiority to older competing books in other respects. To suppose a book must be better than other books solely because it is hot off the press is just nonsense."

Most assuredly the item of use should enter into the selection of textbooks, that is, the grade level and the adaptability to the course of study. A good textbook may meet much opposition from teachers if it cannot be easily used with the course of study. Whether the book is to be used as a basic text, as reference material, as a supplementary text, or as a teachers' manual is, of course, an

important consideration to keep in mind in selecting textbooks.

Score Cards and Score Sheets for Textbooks

In considering a score card or score sheet for textbooks, the question arises: Is it desirable to arrange the list of standardized items on a card, to systematize them, to assign numerical values to them, to show relative importance, and thus to create a score card?

Apparently those who have used cards favor them with qualifications. Whipple (24) qualified the use of score cards in this way, "The score card helps to keep before you the points to be observed; it enables you to compare your judgments with those of another person and perhaps thus to correct the meaning that each is attaching to criteria. On the other hand the score card may give an appearance of exactitude where exactitude is not present or not possible or not wanted. Again, the scorers may not agree at all on the weighing of different items. Again, the score card may not be flexible enough to balance off credits and debits as the scorer would like to do. I think on the whole I would favor a simple score card."

It is entirely possible that the score cards themselves may be put out by some publishers who have some trap on the score card to catch a competitor's wares. The

Committee on Education (9) states:

"The use of a score card for the evaluation of textbooks has certain obvious advantages in directing attention systematically to various items that should receive consideration. On the other hand, seeming numerical precision may be misleading, in that the qualitative whole is seldom to be measured by the sum of the parts. Score cards devised in terms of a particular book should not be used in the selection of textbooks." The fact that it is difficult to measure content, saying that it should be 45 per cent of the total value of one book and 50 per cent of the total value of another is an opinion at the best.

Some ways of getting around the weaknesses of score cards have been devised which may make these cards more helpful. One method is by comparing the scores of the cards for the books under consideration, and if any one item is omitted, the book is dropped from the list. For example, if the total score of one book is higher than the scores for the others and that one book has been given no points at all under mechanics, then that book should be rejected. Another variation of the same plan is to have all the individual items measure up to a certain per cent of the total points allowed for each particular item. That is,

if the necessary per cent were to be set at 60, and on the score card 200 points allowed for publication, then each book must score 120 points on publication or be rejected. Either of these two methods may be of some value, but they still tend to measure the texts with an exactness that is difficult to attain.

Probably a good solution to this matter would be to use a simplified form of score card and use it as a guide rather than as a positive standard for evaluation. It seems advisable to list two score cards of widely varying nature so the reader may get some idea of the difference between the score sheets in use. Let us look first at one with a few major points, a simple and brief card listed by Graves (12).

(a) factor of interest.	200
(b) factor of comprehension	250
(c) permanent methods of study.	200
(d) permanent value of content.	250
(e) mechanical construction	100
	<u>1,000</u>

In contrast to this let us now look at a more detailed score sheet as prepared by Burr (3).

I. General or constant factors.....	300
A. Authorship and general considerations.....	150
1. Author's scholarship in this special subject.	
2. Author's familiarity with scientific investigations.	
(a) In this particular subject field.	

- (b) In reading (which is involved in all texts).
 - (c) In word lists (which are involved in all texts).
 - (d) In technique of textbook construction.
- 3. Author's classroom experience.
- 4. Is the text in the language and style best suited for pupils who will use it?
- 5. Is the copyright date a recent one?
- 6. Does this text correlate positively with our general school objectives?
- B. Mechanical features and make-up.....150
 - 1. Appearance and color of binding, including cover design.
 - 2. Durability of binding.
 - 3. Quality, finish, and color of paper.
 - 4. Size, clearness, and attractiveness of type.
 - 5. Size, clearness, and attractiveness of page.
 - 6. Attractiveness, appropriateness, and usefulness of illustrations.
 - 7. Accuracy and usefulness of diagrams, charts, or maps.
 - 8. Dependability and usability.
 - 9. Freedom from errors.
- II. Factors which vary with the situation.....700
 - A. Subject matter and technique.....450
 - 1. Selection of subject matter.....150
 - (a) Scientific grading of material.
 - (b) Adaptability of material to class needs.
 - (c) Adaptability of material to community needs.
 - (d) Relative value of material.
 - (e) Variety of practical application to life situations.
 - (f) Abundance and grading of material to meet individual and group abilities and needs.
 - (g) Sufficiency of detail in presenting material.
 - 2. Organization and presentation of subject matter.....150
 - (a) Adaptable to activities

	program.	
	(b) Psychological sequence.	
	(c) Possibility of omissions, without destroying sequence.	
	(d) Degree of emphasis on topics.	
	(e) Plan for problem solution.	
	(f) Systematic development of reasoning power.	
	(g) Distribution, amount, and balance of drill.	
	(h) Variety and effectiveness of diagnostic testing.	
3.	Technique.....	150
	(a) Attractive to teacher and pupil.	
	(b) Recognize present day psychology.	
	(c) Provision for meeting individual differences.	
	(d) Natural life situations for motivation.	
	(e) Use of games, play, and projects.	
B.	Teaching helps and aids to instruction....	250
1.	A preface of information for the teacher.	
2.	Teacher's manual or guide book.	
3.	Adequacy of table of contents.	
4.	Adequacy of index.	
5.	Adequacy of glossary.	
6.	Adequacy of appendices.	
7.	Adequacy of illustrations and charts or maps.	
8.	Effectiveness and appeal of illustrations.	
9.	Summaries and reviews.	
10.	Study helps for pupils.	
11.	Norms for tests.	
12.	Norms recognize ability grouping.	
13.	Suitable and adequate accompanying forms.	
XII.	Total possible valuation.....	1,000

Politics and Textbook Adoption

Much has been said about the political influence entering into the selection of textbooks. In fact, most of the articles and books written on this subject imply some political connection or some "deplorable political backing" of a certain book or a certain group. However, there is very little said about the actual political situations that are to be found in cities and states. The writer is not trying to deny such political situations and influence, far be it from him to do that. The political pressure brought to bear upon some groups selecting textbooks is a disgrace to democratic society. Political pressure is undoubtedly the reason for many inferior books being placed upon adopted lists.

In the replies to the question, "In your estimation has your system of adopting textbooks been a 'political football'?" few cities or states indicate that their systems have been such (Table 15). Two states reported that their systems were, and 14 states that theirs were not political footballs. As indicated in Table 16, only one city replied that its system was a political football, while 11 reported their systems were not. We must remember that these replies are only opinions of those reporting. The reader may wonder if political pressure may not have been the

reason for these answers.

Table 16. Evaluating system, political influence, and part of teacher associations in selection of textbooks for cities. El., Elementary schools; J. H., Junior High; S. H., Senior High.

Question	Yes	No	Not Answered
Do you have a clearly formulated system for adopting textbooks?			
<u>El.</u>	5	5	5
<u>J.H.</u>	5	5	5
<u>S.H.</u>	5	5	5
In your estimation has your system been a "Political football"?	1	11	3
Does your state teachers association play any part in the selection of textbooks?		12	3

The State Teachers Association and Textbook Selection

The state teachers association as an organization apparently does not play much of a part in the selection of textbooks. No state or city reported its teachers association as playing any part in this matter. This is indicated in Table 15 for states and Table 16 for cities. The teachers in most states and cities play an important part in the selection of textbooks, and undoubtedly many of these teachers are members of the state teachers association. This, of course, is an indirect manner of participation and does not speak for the state teachers association as an

organization.

Suggested Procedures for the Textbook Selecting Body

Let us look further into some specific practices and actual procedures in use today in selecting textbooks for adoption. There are a number of methods in current use. Probably all of them can be classified in the three following types: (1) selection by no definite method of procedure; (2) selection based on individual study by some of the members of the committee or selecting group; (3) selection based upon procedures outlined by the commission or selecting group.

Let us first note the method in which no definite procedure is followed. This method which seems to be a hit-and-miss affair at best, as carried on in one state, is somewhat as follows: The textbook commission meets as a whole to hear the reports of publishers' representatives, and selects the texts which must follow the state course of study. One can readily see that the adoption of a text in this manner is likely to be on the basis of the best salesmanship rather than on the merits of the book. Other procedures followed by selecting groups using this same method are somewhat similar in nature. None of them are based on any sound or scientific practice.

In the second method of procedure listed above, selec-

tion is based on individual study by some of the members of the committee or selecting group. Certain members of the commission or the committee members spend weeks or even months before the current textbook contract expires, examining the books. Still others make no study at all. In evaluating books some members make personal inspections, while others secure the evaluation of school officials. In such a case as this, a city superintendent may ask the advice of elementary school teachers, or the state superintendent may ask for the judgment of his staff. This second type is used in a large number of the state school systems. While some political influence may enter into this method of adoption, it is not as likely to do so as in the first procedure mentioned. It is quite obvious that the intelligent selection in this case depends upon the nature of the examination given by the advisors.

In the third method, the selection is based upon procedures outlined by the commission or selecting group. The studies undertaken include such steps as examining publisher's briefs, analyzing texts (by score card method or by similar procedure), determining the judgment of school officials, trying out texts in the classroom, or evaluating them in the light of the course of study. When this method is used, committees are sometimes appointed to adopt the

textbooks.

According to Jensen (13) the committees should be made up of approximately the following constituents: 50 per cent teachers, 25 per cent principals, 15 per cent supervisors, and ten per cent superintendent's staff. It is obvious that these committees cannot be divided exactly into these percentages, but this general idea may be of some value in appointing the committees. These committees ask groups of teachers to score the books and to report the results. The original committee then makes its recommendations to the adopting body on the basis of the findings of the groups of teachers.

In this case the criteria for evaluating the textbooks may be set up either by the appointed committee or the group of teachers examining the textbooks. In all probability this method has more of the scientific approach to selecting the textbooks than either of the other methods mentioned above, namely, selection based on no definite method of procedure, and selection based upon study by some members of the commission or selecting groups.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KANSAS

1. The Kansas State Board of Education under the provisions of Senate Bill No. 268 (21) should appoint separate committees to select textbooks for each subject for the elementary schools, the junior high schools, and the senior high schools of the state. Committees should be appointed to select the textbooks for specific subjects in these departments: reading, spelling, and writing; arithmetic; social studies; language; science; music and art for the elementary schools. Separate committees should be appointed to select textbooks for junior high school subjects, namely, English, spelling, and writing; mathematics; social science; commercial subjects; science; music and art. Separate committees should also be appointed to select textbooks for the following senior high school fields: English; social science; mathematics; science; foreign language; commerce; home economics; industrial arts; and fine arts.

2. In section three of Senate Bill No. 268 (21) we find that, "All textbooks adopted by the state board of education shall be selected from the lists of texts recommended to said board of education by a textbook advisory committee or committees. Such advisory committee or committees shall be designated by said board of education and a majority of whom shall be supervisors, principals,

superintendents or teachers in the high and elementary schools, or public schools of grades one to twelve inclusive: Provided, that the total membership of said advisory committee shall not be in excess of nine, and said members shall be so selected as to represent all types of schools in which the books so to be adopted are to be used."

The persons formulating this law intended that:

A. The committee should be composed of two classes of members

(a) Educators actually working in all of the various types of public schools in which the texts adopted are to be used.

(b) Laymen.

B. The several committees should do a large part of the actual studying on the texts themselves rather than delegating the responsibility to fellow teachers and administrators. The members of the committee may ask the opinion of others, but they should do the major part of the work themselves.

The bill as it was passed originally by the senate specified that the committees should be composed of a majority of laymen. This fact is not generally known, but it shows the opinion of some of our legislators on the matter. It would be well for the state board of education

to give consideration to this point of view in making appointments to the advisory committee.

The groups of educators to be represented on these committees are: (1) rural district schools; (2) elementary schools from first, second, and third class cities; (3) rural high schools; (4) junior and senior high schools of first, second, and third class cities; (5) community high schools. These committees should also include superintendents, supervisors, principals, and county superintendents. There should be a minority of capable laymen on these committees. The laymen should be chosen on an absolutely non-partisan basis.

3. In so far as possible the chairman of each committee should have served on the same committee or on a similar committee for making previous selections.

4. The state board of education should exercise the utmost care in selecting the advisory committees which are to recommend textbooks to the state board for adoption. These committees should be chosen from a list of educators on file in the office of the textbook secretary of the board of education. This list should be compiled by sending a questionnaire to each city superintendent, county superintendent, rural high school principal, and community high school principal. This questionnaire should request

the superintendents and principals to list the one teacher in their systems who is best qualified to help select the texts which are to be adopted within two years following the circulation of the questionnaire. A blank calling for detailed information about each person so recommended should be prepared by the state board and placed in the file of the person receiving the recommendations. The board should attempt to balance the selection of committees from the first, second, and third class city schools; community high schools; rural high schools and rural districts; county superintendents; and laymen.

5. The committee members should be appointed and informed of their appointment 12 months in advance of the date of selection of the textbooks they are to choose.

6. The state board of education should make up a definite schedule of texts to be adopted. This must comply with Senate Bill No. 268 (21) in that one-fifth of the total value of all textbooks are to be adopted each year. At the present time books should be adopted each year which have a total value of approximately \$300,000.00.

7. The committees appointed should be free to set up their own rules for selecting texts, but the state board should encourage the use of some definite procedure. The committees should use a score card or score sheet as a

check list in selecting books, but in no case should the selection of texts be based entirely on numerical totals of the score card or score sheet used.

8. Senate Bill No. 268 (21) provides that the textbook secretary to the state board of education shall inform by letter all publishers editing the texts to be adopted of the books to be selected seven months before the date of expiration of the existing contracts with full details necessary for intelligent bidding.

9. The state board of education should adopt a multiple list of books for use in the junior and senior high schools of the state; said multiple list should include not fewer than three nor more than five textbooks. Any school district or any school adopting one book for use in its school system should continue to use that book for the entire adoption period. The adoption of the multiple list of textbooks is not practical for books printed by the state printing plant, but it is a goal to work toward.

10. The colleges in the state of Kansas should place greater emphasis on the approved methods and standards for selecting textbooks in their courses in education.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The state is not a desirable unit for adoption of textbooks. A smaller unit, preferably the supervisory unit is the best.

2. Where state-adopted textbooks are used, a multiple list should be selected. This is especially important for the secondary schools.

3. In the school systems of today the selection of textbooks is second only in importance to the selection of teachers.

4. The agency or group which selects the textbooks should be made up of capable and representative educators. This group should include teachers who are actively engaged in teaching in the particular field in which the textbook is to be used.

5. If the textbooks are adopted by the state board of education, this group should base the adoption largely upon the recommendations of especially appointed committees. The committees will be most efficient if they have from three to seven members.

6. Some of the larger cities have better methods of selecting textbooks than have many states.

7. The term of adoption for a textbook should usually be five years, but this period should be sufficiently

books should adopt a policy to protect themselves and their actions against selfish interests and unjust criticism.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express his most sincere appreciation to Dr. V. L. Strickland, professor of education, for the many helpful and timely suggestions in planning and writing this thesis; and to Dr. W. E. Sheffer, superintendent of the Manhattan, Kansas, city schools, for his suggestions and consultations in making this study.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Bellou, Frank W.
Textbook committees. Public schools of Dist. of Col. Supt. Cir. 15. 8 p. Oct. 10, 1935.
2. Barr, Samuel Eagle.
The textbooks and the use of rating scales. The Am. School Bd. Jour. 79:130-134. Aug. 1929.
3. Butcher, Thomas W.
Some difficulties attending the work of a textbook commission. Elem. School Jour. 19:500-505. March 1919.
4. Coffey, W. L.
Standards for evaluating proposed textbook legislation. In Natl. Soc. for the Study of Educ. 30th yearbook. Pt. 2. Bloomington, Ill. Public School Pub. Co. p. 291-303. 1931.
5. Coffey, W. L.
Judicial opinions of textbook selection. In Natl. Soc. for the Study of Educ. 30th yearbook. Pt. 2. Bloomington, Ill. Public School Pub. Co. p. 275-289. 1931.

6. Coffey, W. L.
Legal adopting authorities in the several states. In
Natl. Soc. for the Study of Educ. 30th yearbook. Pt.
2. Bloomington, Ill. Public School Pub. Co. p. 291-
299. 1931.
7. Cook, William A.
Federal and state school administration. New York.
Thomas Y. Crowell. 373 p. 1927.
8. Committee on Education.
Recommendations of Natl. Advisory Committee on Educ.
School Rev. 15:8-10. Jan. 1932.
9. Committee on Education.
Report on 30th yearbook of Natl. Soc. for the Study
of Educ. Developing and selecting textbooks. Natl.
Educ. Jour. 21:50. Feb. 1932.
10. Cubberly, Ellwood P.
State school administration. Boston. Houghton-
Mifflin. 773 p. 1927.
11. Cubberly, Ellwood P.
The state publication of textbooks. In Natl. Soc.
for the Study of Educ. 30th yearbook. Pt. 2.
Bloomington, Ill. Public School Pub. Co. p. 235-
248. 1931.
12. Graves, Frank Pierpont.
The administration of American education. New York.
Macmillan. 631 p. 1932.
13. Jansen, Frank A.
Current practices in selecting textbooks for elemen-
tary schools. In Natl. Soc. for the Study of Educ.
30th yearbook. Pt. 2. Bloomington, Ill. Public
School Pub. Co. p. 79-92. 1931.
14. Judd, Charles H.
The significance for textbook making of the newer
concepts of education. Elem. School Jour. 36:575-
582. Apr. 1936.
15. Stacey, W. A.
Kansas School Laws. revised. Topeka. State Supt.
of Pub. Inst. 323 p. 1933.

16. Henry, Nelson B.
The problem of publishers in marketing textbooks: a symposium. In Natl. Soc. for the Study of Educ. 30th yearbook. Pt. 2. Bloomington, Ill. Public School Pub. Co. p. 175-198. 1931.
17. Maxwell, C. R.
Choosing the best textbook. School Executive, 51: 343-345. Apr. 1932.
18. Maxwell, C. R.
The state publication of textbooks. In Natl. Soc. for the Study of Educ. 30th yearbook. Pt. 2. Bloomington Public School Pub. Co. p. 143-172. 1931.
19. Maxwell, C. R.
Selection of textbooks. Boston. Houghton-Mifflin. 138 p. 1921.
20. Nystrom, Wendell C.
The selection and provision of textbooks. Published by the author. 175 p. 1937.
21. Senate Bill No. 368. Laws of Kansas. Session of 1937. Topeka. 4 p.
22. Rating sheet for textbooks. St. Louis, Mo., City Schools. 5 p. 1935.
23. Whipple, Gertrude.
Procedure used in selecting school books. Chicago. Univ. Chicago Press. 175 p. 1936.
24. Whipple, Guy M.
The selection of textbooks. Am. School Bd. Jour. 80:51-53, 153. May, 1930.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

1. Do you have state-adopted textbooks for your public schools?
 Elementary School Yes___ No___ Senior High Yes___ No___
 Junior High Yes___ No___
2. If you have state-adopted textbooks, are several chosen and is the actual selection left up to the individual school?
 Elementary School Yes___ No___ Senior High Yes___ No___
 Junior High Yes___ No___
3. Are the public schools in all communities required to use these state-adopted texts?
 Elementary School Yes___ No___ Senior High Yes___ No___
 Junior High Yes___ No___
4. What is the agency or group called that selects the state textbooks for:
 Elementary School? _____
 Junior High? _____
 Senior High? _____
5. Of whom is the above agency or group composed for the selection of textbooks for
 Elementary School? _____
 Junior High? _____
 Senior High? _____
6. How do the members of the above group get their positions for selecting textbooks for
 Elementary School? _____
 Junior High? _____
 Senior High? _____
7. Is there, required by law, an advisory body to the board which adopts the texts for
 Elementary School? Yes___ No___ Senior High? Yes___ No___
 Junior High? Yes___ No___
8. How is the advisory body selected?
 Elementary School _____
 Junior High _____
 Senior High _____

9. What are the legal qualifications of the members of the advisory body for
 Elementary School? _____
 Junior High? _____
 Senior High? _____
10. What powers does the advisory body possess as to text-book selection for
 Elementary School? _____
 Junior High? _____
 Senior High? _____
11. What is the length of term for which books are adopted?
 Elementary School _____
 Junior High _____
 Senior High _____
12. How long have you had your present system of selecting textbooks for
 Elementary School? _____
 Junior High? _____
 Senior High? _____
13. If you do not have state-adopted texts now, did you ever have them for
 Elementary School? Yes ___ No ___ Senior High? Yes ___ No ___
 Junior High? Yes ___ No ___
14. If you did have a system of state adoption, why was it discontinued and when?
 Elementary School _____
 Junior High _____
 Senior High _____
15. Do you consider your present system adequate?
 Elementary School Yes ___ No ___ Senior High Yes ___ No ___
 Junior High Yes ___ No ___
16. Who, or what body, has the authority for determining the course of study for
 Elementary School? _____
 Junior High? _____
 Senior High? _____

17. Is this group (in 16) the same as the one which selects the textbooks?
 Elementary School _____
 Junior High _____
 Senior High _____
18. If this is not the same group (in 16), do the two separate groups cooperate thoroughly in carrying out their work?
 Elementary School _____
 Junior High _____
 Senior High _____
19. Is there any clearly formulated system of evaluating the textbooks selected for
 Elementary School? Yes ___ No ___ Senior High? Yes ___ No ___
 Junior High? Yes ___ No ___
20. In your estimation has this system been a "political football"? Yes ___ No ___
21. Does your organized state teachers association play any part in the selection of textbooks? Yes ___ No ___

N.B. I shall appreciate having copies of any reports or other printed or duplicated materials bearing on the general subject of textbook adoption.

The First Four Questions as Revised for Cities

1. Do you have state-adopted textbooks for your public schools?
 Elementary Schools Yes ___ No ___ Senior High Yes ___ No ___
 Junior High Yes ___ No ___
2. Do you have textbooks for use throughout your city?
3. If you have city-adopted textbooks, are several chosen and is the actual selection left up to the individual school?
 Elementary School Yes ___ No ___ Senior High Yes ___ No ___
 Junior High Yes ___ No ___

4. Are all the public schools in the city required to use these texts?

Elementary Schools	Yes ☐ No ☐	Senior High	Yes ☐ No ☐
Junior High	Yes ☐ No ☐		