To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by David Lee Arnold entitled "The Stone the Builders Rejected: An Initial Inquiry Into the Role of the Textbook in the Professional Culture of the Higher Education Faculty." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Frederick P. Venditti, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Provost
and Dean of the Graduate
School

THE STONE THE BUILDERS REJECTED: AN INITIAL INQUIRY INTO THE ROLE OF THE TEXTBOOK IN THE PROFESSIONAL CULTURE OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

David Lee Arnold

May 1989

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife Rose and to my children Ellen, Klinton, and James for their understanding and support throughout the effort. It is also dedicated to the late Winfield Holt, Colonel, United States Army Regular Infantry. He told me I would do this someday.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the assistance of the one hundred and twelve members of the faculty of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville who contributed their time and insight to the development of this study. Many of them gave far more time and effort than I could possibly have asked of them. Without their interest and cooperation this dissertation could not have been attempted. I hope that any who read this work will find that I have represented their opinions fairly and accurately.

I also wish to thank Dr. Arnold Wilson, editor of the journal Teaching Philosophy, for his kind permission to use the direct quotation found on pages 313 to 314 which required the identification of his journal.

ABSTRACT

The college or university textbook is authored by scholars, published within a national and international system of presses, and evaluated by both scholarly and market mechanisms. Despite this cosmopolitan framework of scholarly authoring and publishing activities, little is known about the place of the textbook in the context of scholarly activities within the faculty. This inquiry addressed three basic questions: "How does the faculty learn about textbooks in the marketplace?" "How does the faculty evaluate and select textbooks?" and "How does the faculty evaluate the authoring of textbooks and related works as an element of scholarly productivity?"

The inquiry was framed as an institutional culture study. Questions were examined on a cross-disciplinary basis among seven disciplinary groups and on a multi-level basis among faculty members, department heads, and editors of ranking journals. The inquiry involved structured interviews with 84 faculty members and 28 department heads at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. A survey was mailed to the editors of 157 ranking scholarly journals. Ten major marketing mechanisms, a four-part model of textbook selection, and four areas of scholarly engagement were examined along with supporting questions.

Non-parametric and descriptive analysis resulted in numerous conclusions. The textbook market revolves around direct access to copies of the books. Critical reviews of textbooks are isolated from the mainstream and play only a secondary role. There are definable disciplinary differences in criteria for selecting textbooks. A strong pattern of support for the scholarship of authoring textbooks is shown. There is a much lower expectation of utility in terms of scholarly reward. Opinions regarding the scholarship of authoring textbooks split along epistemological grounds. Expectation of utility is formed more by institutional and managerial factors. Engineering and educational disciplines express the highest degree of support for actual authoring activities. Department heads tend to express positions with less uncertainty. Generally textbooks are perceived as being non-competitive with the more rapid routes to reputation and financial gain represented by publication in refereed journals and grant development.

Based on the findings and conclusions a series of collective institutional and disciplinary actions are proposed for further investigation. These areas may offer ways to enhance the role of textbook authoring as an expression of pedagogical scholarship. A basic taxonomy of research questions tying textbooks to student, faculty, structural, and managerial concerns is proposed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE ORIGINS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM....1
Introduction: A Matter of Balance....1
Cosmopolitan Structures and the Valuation of Teaching Activities Within the Faculty....4
The Question of the College Textbook....11

II. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS....17
The Three Basic Inquiries....17
Assumptions....21
Definitions....24
Delimitations of the Study....27
The Survey Groups....28

III. A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE....39
Defining the Textbook and Its Place In Scholarly Publishing....39
The Literature of Textbook Evaluation....44
Department Heads and Textbooks....53
Textbooks and Learned Journals....59
The Textbook Publishing Industry....66

IV. THE FIELD INSTRUMENTS AND THE CONDUCT OF THE RESEARCH....76
Introduction....76
The Interview Worksheets....77
The Journal Editor Questionnaire....85
Conduct of the Research....86
Analysis and Reporting....92

V. SOURCES OF INFORMATION IN THE TEXTBOOK MARKET PLACE....97
Faculty Practices....97
Department Head Practices....113
Comparing Faculty and Department Head Responses....124
Textbook Reviewing Practices in Responding Journals....132

VI. TEXTBOOK SELECTION CRITIERIA....151
The Four Part Model in the Inquiry....151
Faculty Ranking Within the Four Part Model...152
Selection Criteria: Faculty Discussion....184
Price and Textbook Selection In the Faculty....200

Faculty Selection of Self-Authored and Locally Authored Books.....207
Department Heads and Textbook Selection.....213
Price Sensitivity Among Department Heads.....222
Departmental Procedures in Textbook Selection.....224
Journal Editors and the Four-Part Model.....231
Textbook Selection Criteria Compared.....233

VII. ASSESSING SCHOLARLY REGARD FOR THE TEXTBOOK.....238
Faculty Response Data.....238
Faculty Discussion.....252
Department Head Response Data.....267
Department Head Narratives.....277
Journal Editor Response Data.....285
Assessing the Scholarly Regard for the Textbook: Summary.....287

VIII. SUPPORTING FINDINGS.....300
Introduction.....300
Scholarship of Supporting Activities.....300
Estimates of Peer Opinions.....307
Collective Actions and Strategies.....308
Quality in the Textbook Market.....316

IX. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....325
Introduction.....325
Conclusions.....326
Collective Actions.....334
Directions for Future Research.....338
Afterword.....341

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....342

APPENDICES.....349

APPENDIX A: Structured Interview Questions.....350

APPENDIX B: Journal Editor Survey.....363

VITA.....367

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
2.1.	Number of departments eligible for inclusion in the survey by disciplinary area	33
3.1	The source of information leading to most recent scholarly book purchase by faculty members as reported by the National Enquiry Into Scholarly Communications	51
4.1.	Initial test series of interviews	88
4.2.	Number and completion of journal editor survey returns shown by disciplinary group	91
5.1.	Faculty ranking of market information sources with scores by disciplinary group	99
5.2.	Faculty ranking of market information sources with ranks by disciplinary group	100
5.3.	Number and percent of faculty responding "very useful" to various market information sources by disciplinary group	101
5.4.	Number and percent of faculty responding "not useful" to various market information sources by disciplinary group	102
5.5.	Faculty description of quality of textbook reviewing practice in scholarly journals	105
5.6.	Faculty utilization of critical reviews of textbooks	107
5.7.	Department head ranking of market information sources with scores by disciplinary groups	114
5.8.	Department head ranking of market information sources with ranks within disciplinary groups	115
5.9.	Number and percent of department heads responding "very useful"to various market information sources	117
5.10.	Number and percent of department heads responding "not useful" to various market information sources	118

5.11. Department head description of quality of textbook reviewing practice in scholarly journals in order of favorable responses.....120

5.12. Department head utilization of critical reviews of textbooks.....121

5.13. Occurrence of critical reviews of textbooks in responding journals by disciplinary group.....134

5.14. Editors' estimates of annual volume of reviews in journals reporting publication of textbook reviews.....135

5.15. Acceptance of textbook advertisements in responding journals..... 137

5.16. Reported criteria for selecting a textbook for review noting criteria selected by a majority of responding editors.....138

5.17. Reported criteria for selecting textbook review authors noting criteria selected by a majority of the responding journals.....140

5.18. Journal editors' estimates of the usefulness of textbook reviews for the higher education faculty.....143

5.19. Journal editors' of non-teaching journals estimates of the usefulness of textbook reviews shown by disciplinary group.....145

6.1. Total scores and ranks of the elements of the four-part textbook selection model by discipline group: faculty self-described responses.....154

6.2. Total scores and rank of responses which distinguish upper-division books in the four-part textbook selection model: faculty self-described data.....155

6.3. Total scores and rank of responses which distinguish lower-division books in the four-part textbook selection model: faculty self-described data.....156

6.4. Total scores and ranks of the elements of the four-part textbook selection model by discipline group: faculty developed description.....159

6.5. Friedman's ANOVA applied to the overall developed rankings of the elements of the four-part model.....161

6.6. Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: social science...162

6.7. Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: business.....163

6.8. Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: education.....164

6.9. Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: engineering.....165

6.10. Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: humanities.....166

6.11. Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: life sciences....167

6.12. Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within disciplines: physical sciences.....168

6.13. Comparisons of self-described and developed faculty rankings of elements of the four-part model.....170

6.14. Faculty patterns in the four-part model.....171

6.15. Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: social sciences.....174

6.16. Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: business.....175

6.17. Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: education.....176

6.18. Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: engineering.....177

6.19. Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: humanities.....178

6.20. Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: life sciences.....179

6.21. Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: physical sciences.....180

6.22. Items scoring above the median in four or more disciplines in the four-part model.....181

6.23. Items scoring below the median in four or more disciplines in the four-part model.....182

6.24. Extract from faculty ranking of item 13, ethical concerns, in the four-part model.....189

6.25. Extract of faculty response to item 21, price, in the four-part model.....201

6.26. Faculty perception of price of textbooks as a separate selection consideration and cited resistance price levels.....203

6.27. Faculty use of self-authored textbooks.....209

6.28. Faculty willingness to use textbooks authored within their own departments.....210

6.29. Total scores and ranks of the elements of the four-part textbook selection model by discipline group: department head responses.....215

6.30. Total scores and rank of responses which distinguish lower-division books in the four-part textbook selection model: department head responses.....216

6.31. Total scores and rank of responses which distinguish upper-division books in the four-part textbook selection model: department head responses.....217

6.32. Department head recognition of price as a distinctly separate selection consideration.....223

6.33. Are department heads systematically informed about textbooks in use.....225

6.34. Occurrence of formal departmental mechanisms to evaluate and select textbooks.....227

6.35. Occurrence of departmental procedures to designate textbooks as unacceptable for use.....230

6.36. Journal editors's scores and rankings of the elements of the four-part model in a critical textbook review.....232

6.37. Journal editors' acceptance of role in influencing textbook marketplace.....234

7.1. Faculty response by discipline and book level to question "Do you consider authoring or co-authoring a textbook to be a scholarly activity?".....240

7.2. Number and type of textbook authoring projects encountered and total number of faculty in the survey group by discipline who have actively authored textbook projects.....241

7.3. Comparison between having engaged in a textbook authoring project and stated opinion of textbook authorship as a scholarly activity.....243

7.4. Faculty estimates of impact of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion decisions....245

7.5. Faculty agreement with the proposition that financial gain influences the intellectual character of the task of textbook authoring.....248

7.6. Faculty discipline groups ranked according to the ratio of positive to negative responses to the scholarship of authoring textbooks.....249

7.7. Faculty estimates of impact of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion weighted and ranked by discipline..... 250

7.8. Department head responses by discipline group to question "Do you consider authoring or co-authoring a textbook to be a scholarly activity?".....268

7.9. Department head estimates of impact of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion decisions.....271

7.10. Department head agreement with the proposition that financial gain influences the intellectual character of the task of textbook authorship....273

7.11. Department head discipline groups ranked according to the ratio of positive to negative responses to the scholarship of authoring textbooks.....274

7.12. Department head estimates of impact of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion decisions weighted and ranked by discipline.....275

7.13. Journal editors' ranking of the scholarship of authoring textbooks compared to authoring articles in refereed journals.....286

7.14. Faculty and department head estimates of value of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion decisions.....289

7.15. Faculty and department head agreement with the proposition that financial gain influences the intellectual character of the task of authoring textbooks.....295

8.1. Faculty assessment of the scholarship of the three major supporting activities examined.....302

8.2. Department head assessment of the scholarship of the three major supporting activities examined.....303

8.3. Faculty and department head support for innovative textbook review publication.....311

8.4. Faculty assessment of the quality of textbooks available in their disciplinary areas with categorization by level of text.....317

8.5. Department head assessment of the quality of textbooks available in their disciplinary areas with categorization by level of text.....318

8.6. Faculty agreement with the formative role of textbooks within a discipline.....320

8.7. Department head agreement with the formative role of textbooks within a discipline.....321

8.8. Journal editor agreement with the formative role of textbooks within a discipline.....322

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE PAGE

1.1. Rice's statements descriptive of professional norms in the higher education faculty.....6

2.1. Departments selected for the interview plan listed by disciplinary group.....35

3.1. Funk's hierarchy of scholarly publications.....41

3.2. Smith's textbook selection criteria.....58

4.1. Alignment and subject of questions from the faculty interview worksheet.....78

4.2. Alignment and subject of questions from the department head interview worksheet.....79

4.3. Market information mechanisms provided to respondents for ranking.....80

4.4. Notional statements representing content value...82

4.5. Notional statements representing pedagogical value.....82

4.6. Notional statements representing reputational value.....83

4.7. Notional statements representing production value.....83

5.1. Comparison of faculty and department head approval of various market information sources..126

5.2. Comparison of ranking of information sources for textbooks and scholarly books.....127

5.3. Qualitative comparison of faculty and department head support for textbook reviewing practices...130

5.4. Qualitative comparison of level of reading and utilization of textbook reviews among faculty and department heads.....130

6.1. Decision triads: major disciplinary patterns in ranking of textbook selection criteria.....183

7.1. Faculty and department head disciplinary groups in order of support for the scholarly nature of authoring textbooks.....288

7.2. Faculty and department head disciplinary groups in order of estimation of value of authoring textbooks for tenure and promotion.....289

9.1. A proposed taxonomy of research notions concerning textbooks in higher education.....339

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGINS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

1. INTRODUCTION: A MATTER OF BALANCE

One of the more interesting aspects of American higher education and its institutions in the 1980's is the renewal of the debate on the proper character of the composition and activities of the faculty. American higher educational institutions have in large measure accepted the assumption that the triad of teaching, research, and service undergirds their mission. The faculty, however, has not for the most part been conceived as being made up of members with differentiated roles; for example a teaching faculty distinct from the research faculty. The result is a constant need to define, either actively or by default, what it is that the faculty does and what it is to be rewarded for. Teaching, research, service, consulting, entrepreneurial activities, political advocacy, religious vocation, authorship, administrative duties and a host of other possible activities compete for priority in the allocation of resources and rewards for the individual and collective faculty.

A major continuing theme in this debate is the resolution of the relationship between teaching or

pedagogical scholarship and research scholarship. On the one hand stands this powerfully evocative, historical articulation of the ideal of the teacher-scholar from a Davidson College handbook:

> Ideally, the college professor would be a widely respected scholar excited about learning and capable of communicating this excitement to others, a teacher deeply concerned with the welfare of his students and eager to have them learn and grow, one who teaches imaginatively both by books and personal example, a demanding person who respects their potential for growth. (Rice, 1986, p. 13)

In competition with this model stands the American interpretation of the German research university. Founded in the epistemological triumph of the scientific method and the social triumph of professionalization, the newer faculty model produces the expectation that:

> The typical professor now resembles the scientist more than the gentleman scholar of an earlier time. As a result of the process of professionalization, achievement criteria are now given the highest priorities, reputations are established in national and international forums rather than locally defined, and the center of gravity has shifted to the graduate faculties and their newly professionalized large-scale research function. (Rice, 1986, p. 13)

The tension between these two views in the institutional culture of higher education and the degree to which the value assigned to teaching and research affect resource allocations remains a major concern for both faculties and administrations.

Much of the discussion surrounding this balance frankly argues that there has been a serious decline in

the state and value of college teaching. Schuster and Bowen (1985) examine the debilitating effects of major value splits in the faculty that often lie along seniority and teaching versus research lines. They decry the "stampede toward publishable research and scholarship, or what sometimes passes for scholarship" (Schuster and Bowen, 1985, p. 16). Boyer (1987), writing for the Carnegie Foundation, finds undergraduate teaching fragmented and ineffective. Cahn (1986) questions the underlying understanding of teaching ethics among the faculty. Bloom (1987) seems to have struck a major national nerve when he questions the ability of the modern university to deliver through its teaching any notion of an examined or deliberate life to young people.

State commissions publish lengthy documents on reform in higher education; universities engage in self-studies; debates about faculty development programs examine whether or not teaching can be taught; and the rising demand for outcome measures and accountability strikes to the heart of the role of teaching. In a local example, a University of Tennessee report concluded ruefully that the faculty in some departments is divided into "hostile teaching v. research camps," deeply split over the worth of each others' activities (University of Tennessee, 1987, p. 5). The discussions, ranging from inconsequential to apocryphal, are consistently marked by an increasing

sense that perhaps the system is out of balance and ill-prepared for the future.

This inquiry shall proceed with some sense of trepidation into this debated ground. It quite unabashedly owes its genesis to three articles published in the January, 1986 issue of The Journal of Teaching Sociology: R. Eugene Rice's "The Academic Profession in Transition: Toward a New Social Fiction;" "Teaching Within Institutional Values and Structures," by Hans O. Mauksch; and Paul J. Baker's "The Helter-Skelter Relationship Between Teaching and Research: A Cluster of Problems and Small Wins."

2. COSMOPOLITAN STRUCTURES AND THE VALUATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE FACULTY

The term scholarship and the resulting concept of scholarly activity has invoked numerous cultural images in academic and intellectual communities since the emergence of the concept of a scholastic philosophy. The most salient feature of scholastic philosophy in the world of the middle ages and the protean university was the belief that "all truths of whatever kind form into one large body of Truth, by virtue of the consistency between one truth and another" (Newman, 1906, p. 189). For the medieval scholar, scholarship required both teaching and inquiry

within the bounds of an ordered universe. For the English college and its colonial heirs in America it was the activity of the teacher-scholar in pursuit of the development of the "whole man." For the research scholar of the newer model it would become the free pursuit of new knowledge by means of the ascendant model of the scientific method. Each model, until relatively recently, presupposed that scholarship was an attitude which might be extended to both inquiry and teaching; to the clarification or discovery of knowledge and to its transmission to the succeeding generation.

But in the post World War II period of American higher education the empirical research model of inquiry in the university has become dominant in a new fashion. Rice (1986) argues that due to a variety of forces scholarship has come to mean research, and those activities centered around teaching have been relegated to a derivative status. He contends that the normative description of the modern faculty is based on seven major assumptions which are shown in Figure 1-1.

None of Rice's statements mention teaching. Teaching is generally defined in the modern faculty only in the unproven syllogism that the most knowledgeable make the best teachers; research is the best proof of knowledge and expertise; therefore the best researchers make the best teachers. This notion is a considerable truncation of

1. Research is the central professional endeavor and the focus of academic life.

2. Quality in the profession is maintained by peer review and professional autonomy.

3. Knowledge is pursued for its own sake.

4. The pursuit of knowledge is best organized according to discipline (i.e., according to discipline based departments.)

5. Reputations are established through national and international professional associations.

6. The distinctive task of the academic professional is the pursuit of cognitive truth (or cognitive reality.)

7. Professional rewards and mobility accrue to those who persistently accentuate their specialty.

Figure 1-1: Rice's statements descriptive of professional norms in the higher education faculty.

Source: R. Eugene Rice, "The Academic Profession in Transition: Toward a New Social Fiction." The Journal of Teaching Sociology, 14 (1), January, 1986. p. 14.

Gillman's original dictum for Johns Hopkins University that the best teachers will be those who undertake original research, and that the "best investigators are usually those who have also the responsibility of instruction" (Cordesco, 1973, p. 82).

Rice questions this modern view, not to argue any illegitimacy of research notions, but to question imbalance. He fears that it has produced an artificial, "one-dimensional view of the academic career" (Rice, 1986, p. 13). Baker also argues that the growing power of the research model as expressed in faculty behavior has come at the expense of teaching:

> ...research has become an integral part of higher education and has moved ahead with increased vigor as an instrument capable of promoting scholarship. Teaching seems to be lagging behind in a period of drift and uncertainty. (Baker, 1986, p. 34)

Mauksch (1986) argues strongly that much of the power of the research model of faculty activity derives from social notions of professional reward and recognition structures. For Mauksch the professional discipline and the department dominate the faculty, and those disciplines have "primarily promoted knowledge production (i.e. research) and left teaching responsibilities in the hands of institutional control systems" (Mauksch, 1986, p. 46).

Mauksch (1986) proposes that in the contemporary professional context research is seen as having "cosmopolitan" attributes, but teaching is viewed as a

"local" activity. Cosmopolitan attributes basically can lay claim to specific, external validation beyond the local or personal level. Local attributes are those which are seen as unlearned or unachieved; the attributes inherent to the person or the situation and not subject to external validation. And, Mauksch argues, "Western society is generally more inclined to reward achieved capabilities than ascribed capabilities" (1986, p. 43).

Teaching, of all faculty activities, has the least access to cosmopolitan measures and symbols. Research is portrayed in the arenas of the learned society and journals, national recognition, and professional power. Success in research lessens the control of the local institution over the faculty member.

> Research activities are generally accepted as the consequence of specifically developed, technically learned skills, which give the researcher claims to specific and delimited areas of competence. (Mauksch, 1986, p. 43)

Teaching, on the other hand, is viewed as a local activity, conducted autonomously behind the classroom door, and often considered to be an attribute of personality. Where it receives the attention of control or reward, its very recognition often effectively increases the power of the institution over the individual. It is viewed as an ascribed skill by professional disciplines.

> The social images surrounding teaching are profoundly different [from research] and, not withstanding their romantic nature, actually function to lower the value of

> teaching and diminish the significance of whatever quality is obtained. The quality of teaching is felt to be primarily the function of innate talents. (Mauksch, 1986, p. 43)

Baker extends this argument in his examination of the divergence between teaching and research roles. Research has an "extensive and rigorous technical culture," whereas teaching is seen to have "little or no technical culture" (Baker, 1986, p. 55). Research has a national and international "system of collaboration and criticism" compared to the "cellular system of social isolation in teaching" (Baker, 1986, p. 55). Research is based in "universalism, collaboration, and disinterestedness;" teaching in "particularism, privatism, and personalism" (Baker, 1886, p. 55). In his research he finds that

> faculty members at a public regional university who had a primary commitment to teaching as a single professional role were "most likely to be isolated from both local and cosmopolitan networks." (Baker, 1986, p. 62)

Rice, Mauksch, and Baker, and others who have considered the current state of teaching all argue that, not withstanding the intrinsic rewards of teaching, the cosmopolitan and extrinsic reward structures within the professional discipline have become so skewed toward research as to sap the vitality from college teaching.

But the research model may not, in fact, portray the activities of the typical professor; only the dominant social fiction by which they and their peers measure

themselves (Rice, 1866). While they legitimately fear that they will not be rewarded for teaching, the majority of faculty spend their primary time teaching and are convinced that it should be a "primary career goal...rewarded ahead of research" (Schuster and Bowen, 1985, p. 51). Mauksch (1986) refers to interviews with members of tenure committees regarding their view of the worth of research compared to teaching. In these interviews, 60% to 70% of the members believed that teaching was of equal or greater import than research but would not vote that way because they

> believed that their views were in the minority and that the rest of the faculty and administration expected them to vote in support of publication criteria. (Mauksch, 1986, p. 48)

For Rice, Baker, and Mauksch it is largely the power of the perceived cosmopolitan norms of professionalization over the local nature of teaching that drives the decline of teaching. Ironically, these norms are formed not by epistemological conceptions of the nature of higher education but by the social construct of professionalism.

Baker argues that since the power of these forces is rooted in social norms beyond the university, they may not be subject to radical and sudden change within the academy. He rejects strident calls for universal attempts to redress the balance between teaching and research. He supports the notion of the "small win."

> The teaching-research dyad is not one big problem looking for an equally big solution. It is a cluster of minor problematic relationships that allows for numerous small wins. (Baker, 1986, p. 52)

The term "small win" has the implication of searching out those aspects of a problem which present feasible points of attack within the nature of the resources available and the goals in view. It resembles closely the recognition of the limitations of power and the effectiveness of persistence in academic leadership advanced by Cohen and Marsh (1986).

Baker believes that teaching does have effective cosmopolitan aspects. By searching them out in the college and university environment and by rewarding excellence in them in similar fashion as the cosmopolitan aspects of research are rewarded, teaching can be advanced within the institutional culture of contemporary higher education. For Baker, the key question becomes "Can scholarship related to teaching be fostered in a similar fashion to research?" (Baker, 1986, p. 59).

3. THE QUESTION OF THE COLLEGE TEXTBOOK

Examining college teaching for cosmopolitan expressions, Baker (1986) calls attention to the textbook as a common, nearly universal technical artifact. The textbook is widespread in use, produced in a national

system of publication, subject to review and criticism within the literature of its discipline, and basic to a discipline's expression of itself to the next generation. Baker (1986) contends that despite these cosmopolitan considerations textbooks are seldom actually subject to professional review or accountability and garner little or no professional reward for those who are engaged with them as a scholarly activity.

Other authors support the notion of the invisibility of the textbook within the academic profession. Apple finds that

> even given the ubiquitous character of textbooks, it is one of the things we know least about. While the text dominates the curriculum at...even college levels, very little critical attention has been paid to the ideological, political, and economic sources of its production, distribution, and reception. (Apple, 1985, p. 149)

Sticht finds that "studies of [the] text-teacher-student trilogy" of teaching, publishing, and authoring are "virtually non-existent" (Sticht, 1981, p. 31). McGee (1986), commenting on Baker's work, concludes that textbooks are of declining quality and that their review and accountability are ignored by the disciplines and their journals.

Baker proposes a specific inquiry to respond to his problem identification.

> Can teacher-scholars devise institutional means to assure professional visibility of textbooks and other instructional literature? (Baker, 1986, p. 60)

He sees the textbook, its authorship, and its review as combining structural features of teaching, research, and publication. He calls for new and vigorous review mechanisms, formal recognition of both good and bad textbooks, and institutional reward strategies keyed to textbook authorship and research. He argues that such new institutional strategies, structured and rewarded in cosmopolitan frameworks, would both improve the quality of textbooks and reduce the social isolation of teaching.

However, there may be more basic questions to be asked before attempts can be made to design the type of systems Baker and McGee envision. Before calling for such institutional review and evaluation mechanisms, it might be necessary to have a view of how the faculty individually evaluates and selects textbooks. Before attacking the alleged invisibility of the textbook as a consideration of faculty professional concern, it would be necessary to confirm or refute this invisibility on more than an anecdotal basis. Prior to establishing professional and scholarly reward notions about textbooks, it should be necessary to examine what attitudes the faculty currently holds toward textbooks as a scholarly activity.

A detailed review of the literature, discussed at length in Chapter III, supports the contention that these areas are largely unexplored in higher education in any

systematic sense. However, that same literature does provide adequate guidance to begin to frame the structure of such an exploration.

Such an inquiry or group of inquiries would clearly seem to fall into the realm of organizational culture studies. Their intent would be to examine the textbook as an artifact within the realm of the professional culture of higher education and the faculty rather than to conduct an educational experiment with or about textbooks. An experiment of the latter type might typically seek to confirm a hypothesis such as "Type A textbooks are more effective than Type B textbooks in a certain situation." An organizational culture inquiry has a significantly different purpose. It seeks to examine through inquiry, thick description, and such analytical tools as are appropriate, the web of beliefs and associations that determine the sense of what is appropriate within an organization. It is in this sense that Schein argues that the study of organizational culture involves examining

> the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization...that define in a basic "taken for granted" fashion an organization's view of itself and its environment. (Schein, 1986, p. 8)

Such an inquiry, particularly a preliminary one, proceeds in the direction of disclosure rather than proof and of managerial description rather than parametric statistical generalization.

Such disclosures and descriptions are in themselves powerful tools for management and direction within an organization or institution. They illuminate the underlying structures that shape decisions, power, and reward. They clarify the basis for actions and the elements of successful strategies. They provide the rationale for discussing and creating the purposive character of the organization. There are reasons to believe, both from intuition and the literature, that inquiries into the textbook in the sense of its role in the professional or organizational culture of the higher education faculty could, in the long term, lead in useful directions. There is the contention that a clearer understanding and valuation of the textbook will enhance the ability to describe and recognize scholarship that treats teaching as a primary activity rather than a derivative activity. Such recognition may both improve the status of teaching in cosmopolitan frameworks and directly improve the rationality and understanding of scholarly reward systems. Clarified understandings of attitudes toward textbooks as an element of scholarly productivity might lead toward an improvement in the authorship of textbooks. Finally, there is reason to believe that the textbook publishing industry and market is an extremely sensitive one, and that a more directed and deliberate recognition and consideration of textbooks

by the faculty might lead to the ability to wield a very real and deliberate power in that market.

In summation, it is argued that the valuation of teaching as a scholarly activity has declined in the collective faculty, becoming derivative of research. Further, this decline does not necessarily grow from individually held philosophical notions of the worth of teaching and the nature of the university, but rather springs from the effective power of cosmopolitan social norms in the professional structure of disciplines that characterizes higher education today. This situation is of concern because it creates imbalanced, narrow expressions of higher education and scholarship. Efforts to restore the balance will be more successful as they concentrate on "small wins" that can achieve progress within current norms rather than attempting to overturn them. Attempts should be made to locate cosmopolitan aspects of the technical culture of teaching scholarship which can generate activities and rewards similar to those of research scholarship. One such cosmopolitan aspect of teaching scholarship is the college textbook. An initial inquiry into textbook as an artifact of professional faculty culture is proposed with the goal of expanding the understanding of the place of the textbook in the scheme of scholarly activities and laying the foundations for an expanding cycle of both research and action in the future.

CHAPTER II

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS

1. THE THREE BASIC INQUIRIES

Introduction.

In the course of developing the structure of an inquiry into textbooks within the faculty, an extensive literature review was undertaken. A detailed consideration of this review is presented in Chapter III. Briefly, this survey supports several notions. First, the textbook is definable and can be located within a comprehensive taxonomy of scholarly publication activity. Characteristics can be identified which distinguish the textbook publishing realm from other aspects of scholarly publishing. As a result, the textbook can be discussed as a distinct entity in cosmopolitan terms. Further, while there is some scholarly work which considers various discrete aspects of textbooks and their evaluation, there is no cumulative discussion of how the faculty evaluates textbooks for use. Finally, there is no deliberate discussion of attitudes regarding scholarly engagement with textbook authorship as a professional activity in the higher education faculty.

The literature also supports the notions of cosmopolitan, disciplinary structures suggested in the works cited above. Specifically, there is support for an inquiry which addresses three role levels within the disciplinary structure of the faculty: the line faculty, the department head, and the editors of learned journals.

In the light of the literature search and the concept of the textbook as a cosmopolitan artifact of college teaching as discussed in Chapter I, three areas of inquiry were proposed. They consider the visibility of textbooks within the marketplace, evaluation and selection of textbooks, and the perceptions of scholarship regarding the authorship of textbooks and related works.

How Is Information Regarding Textbooks Spread in the Academic Community?

The literature suggests that the textbook market is highly competitive and that textbook publishing is somewhat different from other areas of scholarly publishing. The market is also controlled by the professorate which adopts textbooks rather than by the ultimate consumer of the textbooks, the students. Scholarly literature exists which describes the way in which scholarly literature itself is disseminated in the academic community. This literature does not address textbooks despite the textbook's widespread presence in

colleges and universities. The following questions regarding the textbook market are proposed:

1. What mechanisms in the academic marketplace and in scholarly activities generate visibility and information for the faculty regarding textbooks?

2. How are these mechanisms ranked by the faculty, department chairpersons, and journal editors?

3. Are there differences in these rankings when the respondents are grouped by academic discipline?

4. Is there support for any additional, tailored mechanisms?

What Major Criteria Are Used To Evaluate and Select Textbooks for Instructional Use?

There is a body of literature which undertakes review or evaluation of textbooks from various perspectives. While this literature is highly fragmented, it suggests that there are four general areas of recurring concern in the consideration of the textbook by the higher education faculty: concerns of content value, concerns of pedagogical value, concerns of reputational value, and concerns of production value. Aspects of these concerns are usually discussed as discreet issues by various authors. There is no literature which would suggest any attempt to develop a cumulative view of the relative influence of these areas in comparison to each other. By

combining these areas into a new four-part model of textbook evaluation, the following questions may be asked.

1. When presented with elements of a four-part model of textbook selection criteria, how do faculty members, department heads, and journal editors rank the four value areas?

2. Are there any differences in the rankings between the three role groups of respondents?

3. Are there any differences in the rankings when the respondents are compared by academic discipline?

How Does the Faculty Regard the Merit of Engagement With the Authorship of Textbooks as an Element of Scholarly Productivity.

The literature supports the notion that there are structural similarities between engagement with textbooks and engagement with other forms of publishable scholarly productivity. Four general types of engagement were initially identified: authoring or co-authoring textbooks; authoring or co-authoring critical reviews of a textbooks; authoring or co-authoring comparative reviews or studies concerning a group of textbooks; and authoring or co-authoring a research inquiry into some aspect of the nature or use of textbooks. The following questions concerning these activities can be stated.

1. Do faculty members, department heads, and journal editors regard involvement in these four areas as legitimate scholarly activities?

2. Are there identifiable differences in the perceived scholarly merit of these activities when the respondents are considered by role?

3. Are there identifiable differences in the perceived scholarly merit of these activities when the respondents are considered by academic disciplinary groups?

2. ASSUMPTIONS

Assumptions Concerning Institutional Culture.

Inquiries into organizational culture involve the examination of the web of associations and beliefs that characterize the sense of what is appropriate within an organization. Most of the literature of organizational culture addresses individual organizational settings. This inquiry utilizes three assumptions regarding the study of organizational culture. First, it assumes that there may well be an intermediate level between organizational culture and national culture which can be termed "Institutional Culture." In this sense an "institution" is considered as an identifiable entity which is pervasive to some degree throughout a society. It consists of numerous organizations or centers of

greater or lesser autonomy which are still possessed of a recognizable common identity and linkage. With this usage it is possible to speak of the institution of the military, the profession of architecture, the institution of the Anglican Church, or of the institution of higher education. This construct is not often addressed in management literature, but it is necessary before one can speak to the sort of institutional or professional norms that Baker and Mauksch and this study address.

It is further assumed that a specific aspect of an institutional culture can be studied independently; recognized as part of a web yet considered as a discreet element. Thus, attitudes toward textbooks and scholarship can be examined separately while maintaining the hope that the results of the examination can contribute to the total understanding of the fabric.

For purposes of this exploratory inquiry, the members of a typical discrete organization within the general institution can be treated as being illustrative of the institution. (This is not to say generalized in the statistical sense.) The implications of this assumption will be treated in more detail in the discussion of methodology and data.

An Assumption Concerning the Data.

It is assumed that the data generated in this inquiry are restricted to nominal and ordinal formats. The responses sought clearly involve individual experience, individual perceptions and values, or individual notions of institutional culture. These responses are generally subjective in nature. Even those which call for a clear statement of fact, for example, "Have you ever written a textbook?" are based on individual experience rather than natural phenomenon. While this study, even at an extremely exploratory level, is clearly replicable there is as yet no basis to assume that it is repeatable or can be generalized.

In this context, it is also recalled that this study is not an experiment. It is an exploratory inquiry in an attempt to determine if certain situations can be described and rendered more accessible to more detailed analysis or to actions based on ends-in-view. These two considerations, the non-parametric nature of the data and the exploratory character of the study, will shape the methodology and the choice of analytical tools.

Bearing these considerations in mind, the ends of the study are assumed to be exploratory and descriptive in nature rather than generalized in the sense applied to parametric statistical analysis. In regard to the choice

of analysis and display techniques for exploratory studies, Ferguson remarks:

> Exploratory data analysis is descriptive, involving simple data manipulations, summary methods, and graphic descriptors. Its purpose is to make the nature and structure of the data understandable to the investigator. (Ferguson, 1981, pp. 15-16)

Such statistical tools as may be used within the study must clearly be non-parametric in nature. Such techniques allow operation in situations where it is not possible to assume normal populations with homogeneous variances, where small samples ($N < 10$) would preclude reliability of most parametric tools, or where discrete samples from parent populations of similar shape must be relied on.

An Assumption Concerning Participation

Both interviews and survey instruments will be utilized in the course of the inquiry. It is assumed that respondents will participate willingly and will reply to the best of their ability and without ulterior motive.

3. DEFINITIONS

The following definitions are established for use in this inquiry.

Textbook: A printed work, usually bound, which is purposefully authored, co-authored, or edited to be an

element of study or instructional use in some portion of a college or university curriculum and is intended for publication or distribution beyond the local needs of the author(s).

Scholarship/Scholarly: Used in this study as a word of art, freed from exclusive association with empirical research or scientistic methodologies. It is intended to indicate the attributes of a professional academic activity or effort which would earn praise or reward within the normative values of the institutional culture of the higher education faculty. In assigning such a definition, one can consider Gillman's call for the university to establish a scholar's

> mastery of his subject, his powers of independent thought as well as of careful research, and of his ability to express, in a clear and systematic order, and in appropriate language, the results of his study. (Cordesco, 1973, p. 88)

Faculty (1): Used collectively in the sense of the total community of persons involved in the implementation of the functions of teaching, research, and service in higher education which directly further the acquisition, preservation, and dissemination of knowledge.

Faculty (2): When used specifically, the term faculty member refers to individuals identified as belonging to the

teaching faculty of an academic department of a college or university.

Department Head: A person identified as being the head, acting head, chairperson, director, or coordinator of an academic department of a college or university.

Journal Editor: A person identified as the editor, managing editor, or submissions editor of an academic journal. The editor is not necessarily a referee as used in the academic sense but is the person who controls the scheduling, content, and production of the journal.

Content Value: A term used in regard to individual evaluation of textbooks. The term includes such factors as factual accuracy of the content, the range of coverage, the methodologies selected, and the timeliness of the content.

Pedagogical Value: A term used in regard to individual evaluation of textbooks. The term includes such factors as challenge to student; instructional format; reading level; quality of exercises; quizzes or workbooks; and freedom from irrelevant biases.

Reputational Value: A term used in regard to individual evaluation of textbooks. The term includes such factors as the reputation of the author, historic stature in the field, recommendations of published reviews, citations, and the reputation of the publisher.

Production Value: A term used in regard to individual evaluation of textbooks. The term includes such factors as graphic quality, proofreading, size, price, and quality of peripheral materials.

4. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The nature of the inquiry and the supporting literature suggest certain specific, detailed delimitations.

1. For reasons discussed in Chapter III, the study will not utilize K-12 data nor seek comparisons to K-12 studies or data.

2. As an independent inquiry, the study will not utilize commercial marketing data nor involve any tie with any publishing agency.

3. The study is intended to address the role of the textbook in the institution of the faculty. As such, it will not consider student evaluation of textbooks.

4. The study will concentrate on mainstream faculty experience in comprehensive institutions. Two year and community colleges will not be considered.

5. The study will not treat institutional type as a variable.

6. The study will not attempt to be inclusive of all disciplines, and certain faculties which may be held to rely heavily on clinical or studio paradigms such as law, medical disciplines or studio arts will not be considered.

5. THE SURVEY GROUPS

Selecting an Institutional Base.

The long range goal of this inquiry would ideally be a nationally based examination of the questions involved. However, this was deemed impractical for two major reasons. The first was purely logistical; the resources for such a national effort were simply beyond what was available. The second was the more fundamental consideration that as an initial inquiry within the limitations posed above such an effort would be premature. Prior to a broadly based effort the basic conceptual validity of an inquiry into textbooks in the higher education faculty must be verified.

The major task involved in defining a survey or inquiry group was to approach a segment of the higher education community which was logistically feasible yet represented a broad range of relevant experience. The group required two major elements; faculty, including department heads, and learned journals as represented by their editors. The level of journal was selected to represent the cosmopolitan structure of disciplines for reasons fully discussed in the consideration of Funk's (1979a) scholarly publishing taxonomy in Chapter III.

The first consideration for the identification of faculty and department heads was that they represent a "main-stream" of experience. In examining the status of a technical artifact of teaching such as the textbook it could be readily hypothesized that differences might be found between the faculties of highly specialized institutions. For example, it might be proposed that the faculties of the University of the South, of William and Mary, and of The University of Chicago might be widely divergent. However, this study was not intended to examine inter-institutional differences but to explore the feasibility of establishing a base-line for future inquiry. It appeared that centrally positioned, comprehensive institutions would be the most logical choice.

The next problem was to determine how many institutions to select. Selecting several institutions would have the obvious advantage of defeating arguments that the study was too localized. However, there were two other problems. The first was how many is enough? Other than logistics and cost there appeared to be no immediate logic for deciding between two institutions and two hundred if it was determined that all universities could not or should not be considered at this time. The second problem was one of quality and verification. A multiple-institution base would force the inquiry to be conducted by survey. Since this was to be a prototype effort, no validated instrument existed.

The creation of a whole-cloth survey instrument for an exploratory effort created two major conceptual problems regarding the quality of the responses. The first was the inability to ask "Why?" in the face of any given response. This was particularly telling in regard to those items which might involve value-based or subjective responses. The discussion of the underlying reasons for the answers would have been foreclosed. The second was the matter of definition. Considerable effort went into arriving at definitions of terms for this inquiry that match the existing literature concerning textbooks. However, there was no assurance that those definitions would be shared by the survey group, particularly where questions relied on

highly debatable or subjective concept areas such as "pedagogical" or "scholarly."

In this light, it seemed arguable that one comprehensive institution would present a more responsive inquiry base for an exploratory study than several institutions. This was because one institution allowed the use of a structured interview approach. Direct interview methodology encompassed the use of a basic list of questions, a confirmation that the terminology of the inquiry can be commonly expressed, and the exploration of the reasoning behind the answers. This combination supported the gathering of the data corresponding to the initially defined questions; validation of the common vocabulary employed; and, most importantly, identification of questions which were improperly framed or which had not been identified from the literature.

It was proposed that the faculty and department head portion of the inquiry be conducted by direct interview at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. The University is a comprehensive, research, and land-grant institution which can be seen as broadly representative of main-stream higher education institutions. Further, its immediate proximity would support the feasibility of scheduling and executing the number of field interviews envisioned.

The Faculty and Department Head Groups.

The current catalog of the institution was reviewed for departmental structure and faculty. The Colleges of Agriculture, Law, Architecture, Human Ecology, Communications, and Veterinarian Science were eliminated due to their specialized or clinical nature. Academic groupings which were not identified as departments, had no department head, or which were composed on an interdisciplinary basis or with rotating faculty were also eliminated. This review identified 44 eligible academic departments.

These 44 departments were then organized into eight major disciplinary groupings to facilitate study and comparison. The resulting distribution of the eligible departments is shown in Table 2-1. It is recognized that this grouping is, in effect, an *a priori* assumption that certain departments resemble each other more than they do others. For the purposes of an initial inquiry such as this study such a usage seems supportable on two grounds. First, there is long historical precedent for grouping academic disciplines into larger groupings. That Romance Languages are somehow felt to be more similar to English than to Physics and Astronomy is more than just an administrative convenience, but rather a reflection of enduring concepts. Also, the groupings allow for larger cells in the data as well as provide some measure of

Table 2-1: Number of departments eligible for inclusion in the survey by disciplinary area.

Discipline Category	Number of Academic Departments
Behavioral and Social Sciences	4
Business and Economics	4
Education	10
Engineering and Applied Sciences	9
Humanities	7
Life Sciences	4
Mathematics	2
Physical Sciences	4
Total	44

anonymity for the respondents. The reference "a department head in humanities" is somewhat less specific than "the head of the English department."

This listing of departments comprised a total of 44 department heads and a tentative count of some 700 Professors and Associate Professors based on university catalog listings. The ranks of Professor and Associate Professor were chosen on the basis that they are the most likely to be experienced, tenured, and representative of on-going norms within their disciplines.

If it had been desired to conduct a survey which could be statistically generalized in regards to the entire faculty of this specific group of departments, a sample size of approximately 278 would be required (Huaskin, 1963, p. 3). This was somewhat larger than feasible for the interview method proposed. However, as discussed above, there was no requirement to achieve a sample based on generalized results. Rather, the study would proceed in the direction of a discreet sample chosen for illustrative purposes as long as risks of such as interviewer selection bias could be avoided.

The Figure 2-1 displays the four largest departments in seven of the eight disciplinary groups. The mathematics grouping, with only two departments will be discussed separately. Interviews were projected with each of the twenty-eight department heads identified

Behavioral and Social Sciences (SocS) Anthropology, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology
Business and Economics (Busn) Economics, Finance, Management, Marketing and Transportation
Education (Educ) Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Counseling and Psychology, Physical Education, Special Education
Engineering and Applied Sciences (Engr) Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Materiel Sciences and Engineering, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Humanities (Humn) English, History, Philosophy, Romance Languages
Life Sciences (Life) Bio-chemistry, Botany, Micro-biology, Zoology
Physical Sciences (Phys) Chemistry, Geography, Geology, Physics

Figure 2-1: Departments selected for the interview plan listed by disciplinary group.

in this group. A target of 3 faculty members per department was projected. This plan resulted in a projected 28 department head interviews and 84 faculty interviews. This compared favorably with the total of 60 faculty members utilized by Axlerod in his exemplary organizational culture study of faculty teaching styles published in 1973.

It should be noted that the selection of four departments and three faculty from each of the department also aimed at equal cell size in the data. This is useful for descriptive comparison purposes. It also allows the possibility of using non-parametric ANOVA techniques to sort data internally. Further, two-way ANOVA techniques are generally insensitive to violation of assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance in the presence of equal cell size.

The disciplinary category Mathematics only contained two departments, thus eliminating it from the four-department cells. It was projected that trial interviews could be conducted in these two departments to test the suitability of the interview instruments under field conditions.

The Journal Editor Group.

Journal editors were not, unfortunately, available for direct interviews. Selection of journals was planned on a

combination of factors including discipline affiliation; intended audience; impact as defined by the bibliometric analysis in the ISI Social Sciences Citation Index, Sciences Citation Index, and Arts and Humanities Citation Index; circulation in excess of 1000; and at least quarterly publication. Circulation, audience, and publication schedules would be as noted in the Marquis Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Journals and Periodicals and Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory, both standard open indexes of periodicals. Within these criteria a selection was projected of approximately 112 journals or a target of 4 highly ranked journals per discipline. In addition, journals with a deliberate orientation toward college teaching within a discipline would be targeted. These journals, such as The Journal of Teaching Sociology and The Journal of Economic Education are discussed in Chapter III.

This overall method of selecting journals was intended to garner a group of journals which represented a level of prestige and influence within the disciplines. This approach was deliberately chosen rather than seeking out a group which was pre-selected based on a history of reviewing textbooks. While it is an aim of the inquiry to examine the structure of critical reviews of textbooks, the question of their presence in that portion of the scholarly journal press which represents measures of

external prestige is the more fundamental first question. The utilization of this approach to journal selection allowed both questions to be approached.

The specific development of the interview worksheets, handouts, and survey instruments flowed from the material developed in the literature survey referred to earlier. Prior to discussing the details of these instruments, the proposed data analysis, and the actual conduct of the field work, it is necessary to consider that literature review.

CHAPTER III

A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

1. DEFINING THE TEXTBOOK AND ITS PLACE IN SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

The problems of teaching in higher education have connections to a virtually unlimited range of literature concerning the practices of higher education and the nature of its institutions. However, upon focusing attention on the textbook itself the situation changes rapidly. As might be suspected from previous discussion, literature discussing the college textbook and its place in the scheme of the faculty's pursuits is sparse.

The first problem is to establish a working definition for the term textbook and then to draw some picture of where it fits in the scheme of scholarly publications. Clapp, in a 1960 and 1965 bibliographic study of college texts identified over 25,000 books in use in college courses. Her definition of textbook appears to have included any book assigned within a course. Her listing included not only clearly identifiable conventional textbooks but also dictionaries, anthologies, translations, source books, novels, encyclopedias, and the

like. This is obviously a broader definition than either Baker's (1986) original query or this study implies.

The National Association of Textbook Administrators (NASTA) has used the following definition in its programs:

> The term "textbook" as used herein shall mean printed instructional material in bound form which is properly organized for use in elementary or high school curricula. (Warren, 1981, p. 43)

This definition is unsatisfactory for this inquiry for two reasons. First, it is an elementary or secondary education definition. (A brief discussion of the general relevancy of the literature concerning the textbook in the public schools will be found later in this chapter.) Also, the use of the term "properly" is problematic. Is a textbook that is not "properly organized" not a textbook, or is it an unsatisfactory textbook? None-the-less, the phrase "printed instructional material in bound form" rings true.

Funk (1979a), in a powerful discussion of scholarly publishing, proposes that scholarly publishing has a distinct internal taxonomy. Funk's scheme goes well beyond the traditional categories of learned journals and scholarly books to include a hierarchy of pre-publication, journals, monographs, scholarly books, and encyclopedic works. This taxonomy is shown in Figure 3-1 with Funk's original numbering.

			5.0 Reference Works		
			4.0 Scholarly Works		
3.1	Monographs	3.2	Study Aids	3.3	Research Tools
	Monographs		Reprints		Compendia
	Symposia		Translations		Translations
	Collected Essays		Textbooks		Critical Editions
			2.0 Journals		
			1.0 Pre-publication		

Figure 3-1: Funk's hierarchy of scholarly publications.

Source: Funk, Robert W. "Issues in Scholarly Publishing, Part I," Scholarly Publishing: A Journal for Authors and Publishers. vol. 9, no. 1 (Oct. 1979) p. 5.

This clear location and inclusion of the textbook in a developed description of scholarly publishing appears to be unique. Powell (1985) provides a classification of the academic press into trade houses, textbook publishers, and scholarly presses, but such a scheme is more oriented toward production firms than toward authors.

In addition to supporting a general contention that textbooks are of scholarly interest, Funk's (1979a) taxonomy allows further definition of the textbook. The textbook is ranked as a study aid. It is in a general grouping that allows both authoring and editing and includes original, collected, or synthesized works. It is at a level of more finished consideration than that of the open inquiry and debate of pre-publication and journal articles Yet it is not so finished as the mature statements about a discipline found in scholarly books or reference books.

By replacing the word "properly" with the more informative term "purposefully" and substituting the higher education realm for the elementary and secondary realm, the NASTA definition and Funk's taxonomy can be combined to produce the following definition:

> A textbook, as used herein, shall be taken to be a printed work, usually bound, which is purposefully authored or edited to be an element of study or instructional aid in some portion of the higher educational curricula and is intended for publication, reproduction, or use beyond the immediate needs of the authors.

This definition allows consideration of both traditional instructional works and edited collections or anthologies. It would not seem to allow source material such as A Tale of Two Cities in a course on the novels of Dickens or a standard reference work such as a book of logarithmic tables.

Beyond this point, the literature is not helpful in attempting further definitions of textbooks or the nature of textbooks as a scholarly publishing activity. In 1979, the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communications issued a 169 page report which was the result of a year long study by a substantial group of scholars, publishers, editors, librarians, and others. Funk (1979b) has argued that the report was seriously flawed by the failure to consider the institutional characteristics of universities in the formation of scholarly communications. For this study it can be noted that nowhere in the entire report is there a single mention of the textbook or authorship of textbooks as an element of scholarly writing, publishing, or productivity. Boorstin (1978, p. x) may be on target when he comments that "to be a textbook author is considered to be below the status and competence of many scholars."

2. THE LITERATURE OF TEXTBOOK EVALUATION

Articles and Research Evaluating Textbooks.

While the literature that defines textbooks and their place in scholarly productivity is sparse, there is some literature that discusses and evaluates specific features of textbooks. The literature which addresses the evaluation of textbooks in higher education generally does so in terms of a specific discipline or issue. Considerations often take the form of a content analysis of interest to the discipline. Other articles may consider some specific design aspect such as reading level or ethnic/sexual biases. Articles may approach a single book or they may compare several like books. A computerized search of the ERIC data base and back-up manual searches disclosed numerous works of this type. A brief list of recent titles in this area will provide an indication of the nature of these works:

"A Survey of Ten Money and Banking Textbooks," Amsler, 1986.

"The Treatment of Industrial/Organizational Psychology in Introductory Psychology Textbooks," Carlson and Millard, 1984.

"What's Wrong With Economics Textbooks?" Cuyler, 1985.

"A Survey of Textbooks for Industrial Organization and Public Policy," Fletcher, 1986.

"A Survey of Intermediate Micro-Economic Textbooks," Goulet, 1986.

"Teaching Psychology in the 1980's: A Content Analysis of Introductory Psychology Textbooks," Harari and Jacobson, 1984.

"Estimates of Reading Level of College Textbooks in Meteorology," Ruscher, 1984.

Trends in Introductory Physical Geography Textbooks," Scott, 1984.

"What Psychology Students are Learning About Individual Psychology: A Study of Textbooks," Silverman, 1986.

This type of article may provide some clue as to both the scholarly estimate of textbooks and to the identification of evaluation criteria for textbooks.

The frequency of this type of specific article may indicate some countering evidence to Baker's (1986) contention that textbooks are invisible. It appears that the analysis of textbooks against some design or content criteria may be an accepted mode of scholarly inquiry. This function is clearly not the same as writing a textbook, and it is somewhat different than reviewing a textbook. This implies that any inquiry into engagement with textbooks should distinguish between writing textbooks and analyzing them. Further, since a book review has a different intent and structure than a research inquiry, three categories of publishable activity concerning textbooks can be identified: writing textbooks, reviewing textbooks, and conducting analytical or bibliometric research regarding textbooks. Further, it may be that reviews can be categorized as single text

reviews or comparative reviews of the type urged by Baker (1986) and McGee (1986).

It is also possible to examine these articles from the standpoint of their common methodologies. One feature often encountered is to rank books considered by the intended level of audience or course. In the articles cited above, Goulet (1986) distinguishes between introductory and intermediate texts. Harari and Jacobson (1984), Scott (1984) and others concentrate on introductory textbooks. Fletcher (1986) categorizes books for advanced courses for juniors and seniors, intermediate courses requiring pre-requisites, and introductory courses at the basic principles level. Freeman (1985) identifies textbooks as being either introductory or advanced. Baker (1986) separates upper division, general interest, and introductory realms. This literature indicates that discussions regarding textbooks may often be modified by considerations of course level.

Identification of consistent evaluation models for textbooks in this literature is chancy at best. Many of the works that undertake evaluation do so deliberately from the standpoint of a single issue. Korn (1984) addresses the specific issue of the coverage of research ethics in introductory texts. His work is exemplary of this type of analysis. It presents a clear set of

questions regarding the method and content of ethical presentations and selects a group of current, reputable textbooks. It then evaluates each text as to its coverage of the issues. Clear conclusions are stated with a minimum of statistical posturing. Fletcher's (1986) survey of industrial organization coverage takes a similar approach by selecting a series of specific content criteria and evaluating the emphasis and approach of eleven textbooks. The comparative analysis of textbooks with regard to some selected range of content is an established form of inquiry.

A second major approach is to evaluate some pedagogical feature of one or more texts. Goulet's survey of economic textbooks finds that "the content of all of these books is very similar; the topical coverage is almost standard" (1986, p. 231). As a result, her attention focuses on issues of method, quantity and quality of examples, writing style, organization, and level of abstraction. Another popular pedagogical concern has been reading level. Grabbun (1981) cites concern with the growing inability or unwillingness of college students to read as a major concern in textbook selection. Goulet also introduces direct attention to format, quality of illustrations, and other production quality issues. These considerations suggest that in addition to content, evaluation of textbooks by pedagogical concerns and

production concerns can also be identified in literature addressing textbooks.

Very few articles exist which attempt to provide general guidelines for faculty members to consider in evaluating or selecting a textbook for use. Quereshi finds that, despite the possibility that the textbook is "the single most pervasive influence, other than the instructor" in college instruction (Quereshi, 1981, p. 143), most textbook selection is haphazard at best. He urges his discipline to consider the need for a "system of rules, with illustrative examples, for selecting a suitable general psychology textbook" (Quereshi, 1981, p. 143). Unfortunately, his attempt becomes bogged down in an excessive statistical display involving the analysis of over 2800 key words, page counts, and "empirical human interest scores." The resulting 32 rule strategy for evaluating books is so complex that it is doubtful that the general ability of the psychology faculty to evaluate textbooks has been improved; particularly since the rules were not published in the article.

Redei (1984) takes a more informal approach to selecting textbooks for college science classes. He considers five major areas including course strategy and tactics, point of view, accuracy of the content, currency of the content, and packaging information. He offers 45 notional statements of the general style "Does the

text...?" which he suggests will aid in the evaluation or comparison of textbooks. His attention to packaging and production issues helps to confirm that production value is an evaluation criteria. While some of his categories tend to blend together, issues of content value, pedagogical value, and production value can all be clearly identified. His use of notional statements also provides and interesting approach to evoking consideration of the concerns present in the evaluation of textbooks.

Additionally, Redei's (1984) statements introduce an area which can be called "reputational value." He mentions both the author's background and the currency or timeliness of the material. Grabbun also raises this criteria when he says that "for long term adoption, a books reputation is the most important factor" (Grabbun, 1981, p. 73). With this addition, four general areas of exploration can now be identified in the admittedly limited literature of textbook evaluation: content value, pedagogical value, production value, and reputational value.

These works provide only an indirect indication of how faculty members might actually go about evaluating and selecting textbooks in their normal practice. This survey has not disclosed any literature which asks the overall questions of what criteria do the faculty use to evaluate and select textbooks, what priorities do they apply to

these criteria, and what, if any, variations exist among the various disciplines?

Textbook Market Information.

It might be argued that there could be some tie between selecting a textbook and being aware of its existence in the first place. Grabbun (1981) provides the personalized observation that faculty members learn about books for their courses through book reviews, gratis copies, advertisements in learned journals, brochures and catalogs, sales representatives, bookstores, and conventions. The commission on scholarly communications cited earlier provided a different but related survey when it asked faculty members to describe the source of information that lead to their last book purchase. The answers, shown in table 3-1, are similar to Grabbun's observations about textbooks.

It is intriguing to note the degree of emphasis the faculty gives to advertising and catalogs, a total of 54%. Catalogs and brochures can hardly be considered objective or critical sources. Ads in learned journals are also non-critical in nature, but it is possible that their presence in trusted journals gives them an extra if non-warranted gloss of credibility. The next three categories; book reviews, colleague recommendation, and citations all represent factors that fall into the

Table 3-1: The source of information leading to most recent scholarly book purchase by faculty members as reported by the National Enquiry Into Scholarly Communications.

Information Source	Percent of Faculty Citing
Publisher's announcement or catalog.	34%
Ad in learned journal.	20%
Book Review.	18%
Colleague recommendation.	15%
Citation.	12%
Browsing in bookstore.	4%
Browsing in library.	6%

Source: The National Enquiry Into Scholarly Communications (1979). Scholarly Communications; The Report of the National Enquiry, p. 90.

reputational category. They total a competitive 45% of the responses.

The weight given to reviews, recommendations, and citations lends credence to the role of reputation in a model of book selection. It is also interesting to note the relative degree of similarity between this listing and Grabbun's (1981) informal remarks, although Grabbun makes no attempt to rank or quantify the relative usefulness of the various sources of information.

Primary and Secondary Textbook Literature.

Finally, it should be noted that there is an extensive body of recent literature describing textbook selection and evaluation in primary and secondary education. It might be tempting to utilize this base of study in the examination of the post-secondary textbook. However, there are significant differences in the two realms. Public schooling and its processes are largely community controlled. The faculty is essentially not autonomous in the same sense that the college and university faculty is; either as a group or as individuals. A major portion of the literature of textbook selection in public schooling deals with issues of centralized selection, community standards, and censorship. Also, primary and secondary schools do not have a tradition of research scholarship which might give

rise to ambivalent feelings toward textbooks. The professional concerns of the two faculties are simply not congruent. Finally, using such literature would force the inquiry to essentially become one of "Does the higher education faculty do X or Y in the same way as the primary or secondary faculties do X or Y?" This is a considerably different approach than the more direct question of "How does the higher education faculty do X or Y?" For these reasons, this search will not venture into the realm of the literature of the elementary or secondary textbook.

3. DEPARTMENT HEADS AND TEXTBOOKS

The literature of the role of the department and the department head is well established in the study of higher education. Rice (1986) notes the centrality of the discipline based department in his normative model cited above. The department, its nature, its role, and its leadership plays a significant role in discussions of academic governance, university administration, faculty affairs, and the institutional culture of higher education.

The department is the normal starting point for faculty hiring decisions, tenure and promotion activities, course and duty assignments, resource allocation, and inter-disciplinary debate within an institution. The

collective opinion of the department may have a powerful role in determining the prevalent conception of scholarly productivity in any given place. The role of the department is so firmly fixed in the discussion of American higher education and the faculty that it is not necessary to engage in an extensive argument to justify the inclusion of the department or its leadership in any vertical study of the faculty. Indeed, it would take a convincing demonstration to justify omitting it from such a study.

Literature addressing textbooks in terms of departmental functions and decisions is virtually non-existent. An extensive search disclosed only one relevant work, a 1981 Doctoral Dissertation from the University of Pittsburgh entitled "A Study of Textbook Selection Processes in English Departments of Twenty-Five Selected Colleges and Universities" by William H. Smith. Because it is unique in the field, applicable to this inquiry, and is flawed in some ways, this work merits somewhat detailed examination here.

Smith's 1981 study established a list of 25 institutions for examination. The list was designed to provide a broad cross-section of institutional types. Five major measures were used in selecting the study schools: size, governance, affiliation, location, and student body characteristics. The choice of English

departments as the field of study was apparently based on the author's own background as a member of the English faculty at the University of Pittsburgh.

The study's major research questions were unclear in their presentation, but the principal direction of the inquiry was concern with manesfestations of external control or censorship. Smith states:

> A crucial issue of this study is the differentiation between a faculty member's responsibility to select textbooks for use in college classrooms and the process of censorship. (Smith, 1981, p. 8)

The department head was identified as both a locus of control and as an intermediary between the faculty and potential sources of external control or intervention.

The study's review of the literature also concluded that there were no useful references concerning a link between department heads and textbook policy or procedures. An interview methodology was selected, and the inquiry was conducted utilizing 15 standard questions. Seven of the questions approach issues which are related to the present inquiry. A brief summary of the findings is presented below.

Smith (1981) reported that none of the 25 departments utilized written procedures for selecting textbooks, although one department was developing them. Of the 25 departments, 19 indicated that the department head had at least technical veto over textbook selection.

Intervention by department heads in textbook selection was reported by 14 of the departments over the size and price of books, by 3 over concerns about cognitive level, and by 2 over unacceptable content (Smith, 1981, pp. 46-47).

All departments reported that faculty members selected the texts for their own courses. Instances were noted of collaboration on introductory courses. Some form of established faculty committee function for large, multi-section classes was reported in 8 of the 25 departments (Smith, 1981, pp. 34, 49-50). No schools reported departmental lists of prohibited books. Some departments reported that texts were specified for part-time or evening faculty (Smith, 1981, pp. 56, 83). No departments reported student participation in textbook selection except in cases of "choose from" style reading lists (Smith, 1981, pp. 66-67).

Textbooks had been authored by members of 5 of the departments. Only 2 of these 5 departments reported substantial use of the textbooks within the department. Textbook projects were underway in 2 additional departments. No indication was given of the size of the faculty pool represented by the 25 departments (Smith, 1981, p. 69).

All 25 department heads responded that publisher's sales persons were not particularly helpful. However, further discussion qualified these answers. Smith

reported that 9 department heads said such sales representatives could be "helpful normally," 8 said that they were "moderately helpful," and 8 said that they were a "waste of time" (Smith, 1981, pp. 69-70).

These findings seem to indicate the absence of written or binding procedures for textbook selection. At the same time they indicate the existence of some deliberate collective mechanisms and the possibility of intervention by the department head. The appearance of size and price as a key intervention trigger is of interest. This supports the notion of production or market characteristics as being an evaluation factor in textbook selection.

The findings also tend to suggest the idea that textbook evaluation and selection is primarily a faculty function. The findings and Smith's discussion provide little information as to the nature of the processes the faculty might actually call upon to select a text. Early in his discussion he offers the supposition that "nearly every faculty member" chooses textbooks based on seven factors (Smith, 1918, p. 9). These factors are shown in Figure 3-2. They appear to be offered on an anecdotal basis from Smith's own experience and are not followed up in the inquiry.

Smith's overall study is sharply limited and in some ways flawed. His major concentration is on intervention

1. Accuracy of factual material.

2. Logic of argument.

3. Interest factor of presentation.

4. Reputation of author or editor.

5. Correlation between objectives of the course and materials presented in the text.

6. Whether or not the text will be used as the principal source of information or is supplemental.

7. Date of book's original composition and publication and any revisions made in recent editions.

Figure 3-2: Smith's textbook selection criteria.

Source: Smith, Williman Howard, "A Study of Textbook Selection Processes in English Departments of Twenty-five Selected Colleges and Universities." The University of Pittsburg, 1981. p. 81.

mechanisms more than on selection mechanisms. This leads him to investigate many questions from perspectives which are based more in public school models than in higher education models. This results in the type of problems previously discussed. His study never directly approaches the underlying question of the basis of textbook selection. Nor does it concern itself with the place of textbooks in conceptions of scholarly activity.

None-the-less, the study does support two ideas. First, department heads may well play some role in textbook selection They may be aware of the textbooks in use in their departments, and they may be aware of faculty activities in authoring textbooks. Second, each of the selection criteria examined or mentioned in an anecdotal way in the study continue to fit into the concept of a model of textbook selection driven by the four areas of content value, pedagogical value, reputational value, and production value.

4. TEXTBOOKS AND LEARNED JOURNALS

The Role and Power of Journals.

Recalling the arguments of Rice (1986) and Mauksch (1986), faculty reputations are seen as established within the contexts of specialization, peer review, and national and international associations. Mauksch then contends

that "very few disciplinary associations go beyond lip service and ritualistic gestures in support of teaching," (1986, p. 46) leaving it to be a merely local issue. Baker (1986) and McGee (1986) point to the power of the learned association journal and also argue that, on the whole, they seriously slight the textbook. This neglect further weakens the scholarly position of the textbook.

In order to pursue this argument in the literature it is necessary to look for some confirmation of the power of the learned journals and account for that power. Then instances may be sought which might tend to confirm or reject the notion that journals slight textbooks.

Funk (1979a) establishes a five-part cycle or hierarchy in scholarly publishing: pre-publication, journals, monographs, scholarly books, and reference works. He argues that levels 4 and 5, scholarly books and reference works, are the traditional mature statements of scholarly work. However, through the 1970's a combination of the growth of the academic faculty, severe inflation, and increased reliance by publishers on marketing concerns placed severe pressures and limitations on these two levels. As a result, Funk contends, major portions of scholarly publishing activities have been shifted into the lower levels, particularly pre-publication and journals.

Pre-publication and journals are the realm of the learned society. Pre-publication represents the work of individuals and groups of individuals preparing work for consideration and debate. Papers, position papers, faculty working papers, and public presentations are placed in this category (Funk, 1979a, pp. 14-15). In the last decade learned societies have made major accommodations in the formats of meetings, symposia, and other forums to expand opportunities to air pre-publication work. Increased publication of student papers and dissertations and the increased use of pre-printed papers at society forums have also expanded the visibility of pre-publication work.

Despite the growth of the pre-publication role, Funk (1979a) views the learned journal as having extensive powers and influence. The journal is the first major publication for most scholars. It functions, in theory, as a major open ground for debate and validation of ideas and results. Further, it serves as a principal vehicle in the discipline to present critical materials, reviews, bibliographic studies, opinion papers, and similar works.

Funk (1979a) also points out that the limitations in publishing scholarly books and reference works have tended, in combination, to make the journals even more powerful. It has become more likely that the learned journal will become not only the first level of

publication for scholars but also the ultimate level for most. The learned journal is increasingly likely to present finished work for approbation rather than initial work for debate. For Funk, the "most significant general sorting" (1979a, p. 15) of scholarly work occurs in the learned journal. Further, while referees provide the nominal validation mechanism that justifies the journal structure, it is the editor who determines what readers see and when and where work is ultimately presented.

> The editor by and large still holds the power of the keys: he whom the journal editor blesses is blest, and he whom the journal editor curses is cursed. (Funk, 1979a, p. 15)

The learned journal also represents a major portion of the faculty members' view of their discipline. The National Enquiry on Scholarly Communications reported that an average scholar scans 7 journals per week and reads 4 to 5 journals regularly (NESC, 1979, p. 43). The average scholar also subscribes to 3 journals, 2 of which are the result of membership in learned societies (NESC, 1979, p. 43). Thus the learned journal represents both a major reading activity and a direct access to a faculty member's specialized affiliations.

This same report contends that most scholars are satisfied with the scholarly publishing system including journals, but that they worry about several features, notably hidden gatekeeping and lengthy delays in

publication (NESC, 1979, p. 4). Grabbun acknowledges both the role of the journal in book selection and the frustration of delays in the appearance of materials when he says that "many of us read only the review sections of our journals" despite the long delays in their publication (Grabbun, 1981, p. 77). These remarks lead to the consideration of textbook reviews in learned journals.

Reviews in Learned Journals.

There is little evidence of any specifically targeted examination of textbook reviewing practices in learned journals. There have been some more general examinations of book reviewing practices. Budd (1981) presented an extensive consideration of reviewing practices in 65 humanities journals. He reported an average of 56 books reviewed per year with the low range from 8 to 10 and the high range from 190 to 270 reviews annually (Budd, 1981, p. 367-368). Books were selected for review by the editors and sent to reviewers on the journal's list. Most editors indicated a reluctance to utilize unsolicited reviews. The average delay from the time of receipt of a review by the journal until its publication was reported to be 7 months (Budd, 1981, p. 368).

Budd's study did not differentiate textbooks, but two factors appear if it is proposed that textbook review mechanisms are consistent with these general review

practices. The power of the editor is again substantiated. The editor selects the book, selects the reviewer and chooses the publication context. The second factor is the matter of timeliness. If it is optimistically argued that as little a six months elapse between the publication of a textbook and the receipt of a finished review at the journal, then this delay plus the seven month average delay between receipt and publication could well add up to a year elapsing from a book's publication until critical reviews begin to appear. It will be demonstrated in the next section that the average life of a textbook (or edition) is around three years. It would therefore be necessary to argue for a powerful set of coincidences or else extreme notoriety of the text to hope for any effective base of critical reviews during the useful life of a textbook.

Journals Oriented Toward Teaching.

It should be noted that there are some journals which may be exceptions to the general field in these areas. These are journals with a deliberate orientation to teaching within a discipline. Examples of this genre include Journal of Teaching Sociology, Journal of Teaching Chemistry, and The Journal of Economic Education. These journals would require clear segregation in this inquiry. It remains to be seen if their existence argues against

the contention that textbooks are invisible by providing a reputable forum, or if, to the contrary, they simply provide another example of tokenism and isolation in the treatment of pedagogical scholarship.

Summary

This brief examination of the literature concerning the scholarly journal suggests two major themes for this inquiry. First, the journal is a powerful arbiter of publication and visibility within a discipline. Further, while pre-publication formats have become increasingly powerful, their forums are ephemeral. The organization, players, and agendas of such meetings and groups shift constantly. On the other hand, journals and their editorial policies are more stable. Therefore they are both more influential over time and more accessible for study. Second, reviews can and should be considered as a separate category of both authorship and editorial policy in the scheme of scholarly publishing as previously suggested. Questions of both procedures and the content of reviews are of concern to the visibility of the textbook within the academic community.

5. THE TEXTBOOK PUBLISHING INDUSTRY

Publishers and Editors.

The internal workings and economics of the textbook industry are not a direct concern of this inquiry. However, an overview of the industry will contribute to a clearer discussion of faculty attitudes and practices regarding textbooks. The literature that deals with academic publishing activities does indicate clear differences between the textbook publishing industry and the practices of what is normally termed the "scholarly press" as exemplified by the scholarly book or monograph.

The textbook sector of the publishing industry is large, competitive, and costly. The average textbook or edition has a market life of approximately 3 to 4 years before it is overtaken by time or used book sales (Freeman, 1985). Most publishing houses consider a market potential of 5000 to 7000 copies necessary to consider undertaking an upper level, specialized textbook. A market of 20,000 or more may be necessary to make launching an introductory textbook economically feasible (Freeman, 1985). An introductory undergraduate textbook may represent an investment of over $250,000 dollars before the first adoption is secured (Powell, 1985).

The textbook industry is profitable and increasingly centralized. Powell (1985) cites figures from the

American Association of Publishers that indicate a 20.4% profit margin in textbook publishing, the highest in the publishing industry. The centralization of the industry is striking. Prentice Hall, McGraw Hill, CBS Group, and Scott Foresman account for about 40% of the textbook market (Apple, 1985). The ten largest houses account for 75%, and a listing of the top twenty houses would account for a full 90% of the market (Apple, 1985). Since college textbook publishers all compete in the same limited market, this combination of profitability and centralization leads to fierce competition.

This competitiveness and its economics in turn leads to a distinct difference in style between textbook editors and scholarly press editors. An immediate distinction is the concern with profitability. Powell cites survey figures indicating that approximately 60% of textbook editors believed that profitability was "critical compared to only 33% of trade book editors and less than 20% of scholarly editors (Powell, 1985, p. 184). Further, textbook editors may differ in background and behavior compared to scholarly press editors. Textbook editors are the least diverse of all editor groups. As a group they are 75% white, male, and usually middle aged (Powell, 1985, p. 29). About 75% of them began their publishing careers in sales or marketing positions (Apple, 1985, p. 153). When compared to scholarly press

editors they are less well read, are less likely to have an advanced degree, and are the least likely of any group of editors to have themselves written a published work (Powell, 1985, p. 29). Textbook editors have the least autonomy in publishing projects of all types of editors. The entire decision to pursue a textbook project, particularly a large volume introductory text, is more often a marketing decision than an editorial decision (Powell, 1985; Topkins, 1985).

Finally, textbook editors are far less likely to be engaged with the subject of the work than are scholarly editors. Scholarly editors often have an extensive preparation in a discipline and an abiding, deliberate interest in works in that field. Textbook editors are more likely to consider themselves as generalists. They tend to view their skill as that of "textbook editing" and conceive of it as interchangeable among disciplines or levels (Powell, 1985).

Sales and Royalties.

Textbooks are potentially lucrative for their authors. Textbooks and textbook contracts are generally royalty situations for their authors. Subventions, such as page fees found in journals, are not commonly encountered. Reported royalties range from a low of around 7 1/2% of the net price to an extreme high of 15%

of the list price. The most common range is 10 1/2% to 12% of the net price (Freeman, 1985). Contracts often include step increases in royalty rates tied to high volume sales, and royalties continue to accrue for subsequent editions and reprints.

Textbooks are generally sold to college bookstores at 20% discount from list, resulting in a net price of 80% of the publisher's list (Freeman, 1985). Given a 11% of net royalty contract, a $35.00 textbook represents a $3.08 royalty to the author. While recent tax law changes, the growth of bootleg text copying, and used book sales all bite into royalties this is still a healthy figure. It is particularly healthy when compared to situations in the scholarly press where subventions such as page charges and subsidy grants are often required from the author in order to fund publication.

In the 1950's and 1960's, textbook publishing houses were often involved in a wide range of scholarly publishing projects. Since the 1970's the major houses have increasingly concentrated on only large volume, introductory texts. An older mode of interest, involvement, and direct contact between authors and editors has been increasingly replaced by the a more bureacratic marketing style. In some cases authoring has been subordinated to editorial designing. Powell (1985) reports an increasing degree of editorial and marketing

involvement in the direct preparation of the textbook. Textbooks are

> no longer just written. They are carefully designed packages, heavily illustrated and accompanied by manuals, test banks, and other paraphernalia. (Powell, 1985, p. 28)

The use of the managed text approach in which the production is designed by the publishing house, ghost written by a technical writer, and one or more well known academic figures are retained as "advisors" appears to be on the rise in college textbooks (Apple, 1985). This mode is common in primary and secondary textbooks, but it is a relatively new development in college texts.

This brief review of the textbook publishing industry suggests two themes for the current inquiry. It supports the idea that production factors such as design and peripheral products may be important characteristics of textbooks and therefore significant as selection criteria. It also suggests that the relationship between a textbook author and his editor and publisher may be different than for other types of scholarly works. If that is the case, then that relationship with its financial underpinings and the faculty's perception of it may color the faculty's view of authoring textbooks.

The Durability of the Textbook.

Before leaving the consideration of the textbook publishing system, one more concept must be addressed. That is the durability of the textbook and its market. Two concerns might give rise to questions about the long range existence of textbooks in higher education. One is the tendency to distrust or denigrate textbooks as being somehow educationally invalid in the modern arena. The second is the dispersal of publishing capacity and activities in the form of electronic communication, copying machines, and desktop publishing systems.

O'Neil attempts to refute the relativist argument of a colleague that textbooks are contemptible of themselves, and that "only materials arising out of the experience of a group are valid for it" (O'Neil, 1982, p. 105). O'Neil responds with four arguments that go beyond simply acknowledging Boorstin's definition that "textbooks...are points of departure" (Boorstin, 1981, p. ix). First, O'Neil contends, textbooks may and do contain material relevant to the group and its specific needs. In his example of language instruction, all students attempting to learn a language will need certain grammars and vocabularies regardless of the origin of their need. Textbooks are useful repositories of such basics. The "grammar and vocabulary" analogy could be extended to other areas than language. Secondly, the use

of a textbook allows the student to extend the temporal dimension of their instruction. They can look ahead in the material or look back at material already covered independent of the instructor's presence. O'Neil also argues that textbooks can present a quality and range of content that is beyond the capability of most local production. The sense on the part of students that they are being presented with quality materials in a worthwhile subject is enhanced. The instructor gains access to material that could not otherwise be afforded in its original form or locally reproduced. Finally, he argues that by providing a base line for reference the textbook can free the instructor for improvisation and excursions rather than limiting the range of the class. O'Neil's presentation argues strongly for the continuation of the textbook as a pedagogical device and for a more considered view of its stature and origin.

A different argument is presented by Perrucci (1982). He contends that textbooks are too important to be left to mere publishing houses and their marketing strategies. For Perrucci, content analysis of textbooks in sociology demonstrates that marketing concerns, excessive catering to student interest and reading level, and writing for mass lecture formats has lead to the existence of a generation of inadequate if not destructive textbooks. He calls on the faculty to invoke the power of duplication

machines and self-publishing systems to write and publish their own textbooks tailored to local usages and goals.

This is an appealing and powerful notion on the surface, but there are two flies in the ointment. First, local publishing is not necessarily a bargain. Duplication and desk-top publishing normally generate higher per-page costs than buying a book. This is particularly true if it is desired to approach anything near the finished quality of a bound, illustrated textbook. As O'Neil (1982) argues, textbooks may seem expensive, but on attempt to gain the same production quality locally it rapidly becomes apparent that they can be viewed as a genuine bargain. There are distinct roles for this type of local system for producing materials in unique community based educational structures (Arnold, 1987). Producing materials for use in collegiate instruction in an established, comprehensive subject area may be a different matter. Perrucci (1892) is proposing an expensive, time consuming process that should be approached with great care.

The second problem with this approach is implied in the original notion of this study as it involves cosmopolitan as opposed to local structures in teaching. Perrucci's (1982) argument does require some measure of acceptance of the notion that teaching and teaching materials are simply local constructs. Rather than

seeking more effective control over the nature of the textbook and its production and a more effective utilization of the textbook, Perrucci's argument simply opts out. Appearing to be concerned with the quality of textbooks, he is in fact proposing that quality cannot be maintained or fostered collectively. As a result everyone must simply proceed on their own. If such a course were popularly supported, particularly given the cost, it might stand as a final proof of the contention that teaching materials are in fact invisible to the cosmopolitan structure of the discipline.

Summary.

Two arguments emerge from a consideration of the literature of textbook publishing. It can be argued that the cultural nature of the academic faculty and that of the editorial community of the textbook houses are in very real ways at loggerheads. The existence of real differences between the two groups may be one of the forces which acts to set the realm of the textbook distinctly apart from the realm of the scholarly book. If this is true, its most apparent symptom may be in the considerations surrounding the financial structure of the textbook market and rewards for textbook authors.

Secondly, the literature suggests that the textbook market is tightly managed, highly centralized, and

sensitive to sales. It is bound to a market which is not defined by the ultimate user, the student, but by the professors who select the textbooks for classroom use. It then follows that a visible increase in concern over the nature of textbooks on the part of the faculty, an increase in the scholarly prestige of authoring textbooks, or an increase in the vigor and visibility of textbook evaluation would be responded to very rapidly by the publishing industry. An immense power over the publishing process may reside in the faculty if its exercise is made desirable.

CHAPTER IV

THE FIELD INSTRUMENTS AND THE CONDUCT OF THE RESEARCH

1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter II considered the research questions for this inquiry and certain methodological factors. This chapter will examine the actual methodology and conduct of the inquiry. The findings in this study are largely based on the results of person to person interviews. These interviews were conducted utilizing original worksheets and survey instruments which were constructed on the basis of the literature search and, in some cases, modified following an initial series of interviews. This chapter will discuss the construction of those worksheets and instruments and the construction of the mail survey for journal editors. It will also describe the conduct of the interviews and the scale of the returns from journal editors. The concluding portion of the chapter will describe the analytical scheme of the findings chapters and the conventions adopted for reporting narrative material from the interviews.

2. THE INTERVIEW WORKSHEETS

Two structured worksheets were developed for use in the on-campus interviews; one for faculty members and one for department heads. These worksheets were developed from the material obtained in the literature search. The questions used in these worksheets are shown in full at Appendix A. The two worksheets generally paralleled each other. The questions fell into four areas: market information sources for textbooks, textbook selection, the scholarship of authoring textbooks and related material, and exploratory questions. Figures 4-1 and 4-2 detail the alignment of the questions and their general subject. The question numbers are as listed in Appendix A.

Two major areas were addressed in considering sources of information. The first asked both faculty members and department heads about their estimates of the quality and usefulness of critical reviews of textbooks in today's scholarly journals. Open market sources were then examined through the use of an instrument which asked for a rating of the usefulness of ten sources of information in the textbook market. The list was based on the list from the National Enquiry on Scholarly Communications (1979) discussed in Chapter III as modified to fit the textbook market. The market sources list is shown at Figure 4-3.

Sources of Information:

13. Quality and use of textbook reviews.

Textbook Selection:

1. Self-described ranking of the four-part model elements.
2. Selection of self-authored textbooks.
3. Selection of locally authored textbooks

Scholarship:

2. Opinion of scholarly merit of various aspects.
3. Estimate of faculty regard for scholarly merit of various aspects.
4. Tenure and promotion.
5. Background of authoring textbooks or related work.
6. Background of authoring and location of publication.
10. Effect of royalties.
11. Open-ended comments.

Exploratory:

9. Writing course packets; Innovative forms.
12. Quality of textbooks.
14. Innovative review forums.
15. Innovative review forums.
16. Innovative review forums.
17. Intellectual effect of textbooks.
18. Open-ended comments.

Figure 4-1: Alignment and subject of questions from the faculty interview worksheet.

Sources of Information:

15. Quality and use of textbook reviews.

Selection:

1. Self-described rankings of the four-part model elements.
2. Estimate of faculty rankings of the four-part model elements.
3. Open ended comments.
4. Departmental procedures.
5. Departmental procedures.
6. Departmental procedures.
7. Departmental procedures.
8. Departmental procedures.

Scholarship:

9. Opinion of scholarly merit of various aspects.
10. Estimates of faculty opinion of scholarly merit of various aspects.
11. Tenure and promotion.
12. Effect of royalties.
13. Open-ended comments.

Exploratory:

16. Innovative review forums.
17. Innovative review forums.
18. Intellectual effect of textbooks.
19. Innovative publishers.
20. Open-ended comments.

Figure 4-2: Alignment and subject of questions from the department head interview worksheet.

Scale: 1 = Not Useful 2 = Useful 3 = Very Useful			
Publishers' catalogs and brochures.	1	2	3
Colleagues' recommendations.	1	2	3
Browsing in the library.	1	2	3
Publishers' complimentary copies.	1	2	3
Advertisements in scholarly journals.	1	2	3
Publishers' booths at conventions.	1	2	3
Published critical reviews.	1	2	3
Browsing in bookstores.	1	2	3
Citations in other works.	1	2	3
Publishers' representatives.	1	2	3

Figure 4-3: Market information mechanisms provided to respondents for ranking.

Textbook evaluation and selection were addressed in terms of the four-part model identified in the literature search. This model proposes that textbook selection criteria and practice can be described in terms of attention given to concerns of content value, pedagogical value, reputational value and production value. Respondents were provided with a handout defining each of the four areas and brief oral description of the background literature search. In addition to the self-described rankings and comments, a detailed instrument was used in the faculty interviews to further develop information concerning faculty ranking of the four elements.

This instrument provided the respondents with 28 notional statements describing attributes of textbooks. Each of the four value areas in the model was represented by 7 statements. The content of the statements was derived from the sources and practices described in the survey of the literature. They are, of course, intended to be representative rather than exhaustive. These statements, sorted into their major groups, are shown in Figures 4-4 to 4-7. The form provided to the respondents presented the statements in a scrambled order with no reference to the four value groups. A ranking of each statement was requested using a four part scale labeled

Content Value

Timeliness or currency of material.

Basic factual accuracy.

Range or aspects of subject covered.

Presence of deliberate interdisciplinary content.

Treatment of ethical concerns inherent in subject.

Portrayal of contrasting methods, positions, or interpretations.

Methodology used by author.

Figure 4-4: Notional statements representing content value.

Pedagogy

Freedom from racial or ethnic bias.

Reading level.

Instructional design/format.

Freedom from sex bias.

Student interest or acceptance.

Challenge to students.

Quality of exercises, workbooks, quizzes, or other peripherals.

Figure 4-5: Notional statements representing pedagogical value.

Reputation.

Historical stature of text in field.

Reputation of publisher.

Information in published reviews.

Scholarly reputation of author.

Recommendation of colleagues.

Citations in other books or articles.

Direct acquaintance with author.

Figure 4-6: Notional statements representing reputational value.

Production.

Overall graphic design quality.

Quality or appropriateness of illustrations.

Physical size.

Quality or appropriateness of graphic data displays.

Price

Quality of proofreading

Overall workmanship

Figure 4-7: Notional statements representing production value.

"Critical Importance," "Considerable Importance," "Secondary Importance," and "Not Important."

These forms were not provided to the department heads. Instead, additional questions for the department heads concentrated on departmental level procedures. Respondents were questioned regarding formal procedures for textbook selection, formal procedures for disqualification of a textbook, and personal awareness of textbooks in use within the departments.

Both the faculty members and the department heads were asked a series of questions which attempted to uncover their attitudes toward engagement with authoring of textbooks and related works as an element of scholarly activity. Four areas of activity were addressed: writing textbooks, writing reviews, reading textbooks for publishers in pre-publication evaluation, and conducting research concerning textbooks. Originally a distinction was made between critical reviews and comparative reviews (one or more textbooks), but this proved unworkable in the initial series of interviews. At the same time, the category of reading for publishers was added based on interest in both faculty and department head interviews. This function was missed during the literature search. It is somewhat analogous to acting as a referee for a journal, but is usually done on a paid basis for the publisher. The addition of this activity and the related

findings set the stage for one of the more interesting results of the inquiry.

Several questions of a strictly exploratory nature were asked. Respondents were asked about their reaction to the idea of an innovative review forum for textbooks of the type implied by the discussions of Baker (1986) and McGee (1986). A question was asked which attempted to assess the respondents' overall characterization of the quality of the current textbook market. A second question was asked which attempted to determine a sense of the faculty's agreement with the idea that textbooks act as carriers of the intellectual core of a discipline and as such have an impact on the future characteristics of the discipline. Another question explored the degree of utilization of local "course packets." This question approaches the idea of locally authored works advanced by Perruci (1982).

3. THE JOURNAL EDITOR QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire sent to the selected journal editors was constructed along similar lines to the interview worksheets, but was considerably shorter. The questions from this instrument are shown at Appendix B. Editors were asked whether or not their journals published textbook reviews. For those which did, follow up

questions were provided regarding frequency, publication lead times, and the methods of selecting both books and reviewers.

All respondents, regardless of whether or not their journals published textbooks, were then asked a series of questions about the construction and purpose of such reviews. Respondents were provided with descriptive statements of the elements of the four-part model and asked to rank their importance in writing a "well constructed" critical review of a textbook. Editors were asked their opinion of the role of journals and the usefulness of reviews in the textbook market. They were asked a series of questions which explored their assessment of the scholarship of textbook authorship in comparison to publications in their own arena of refereed journals. The questionnaire was concluded with the same question regarding the intellectual impact of textbooks as was asked of the faculty and department heads and an open-ended request for comments.

4. CONDUCT OF THE RESEARCH

Permission.

Permission to conduct research involving human subjects was requested through university channels on

March 26, 1988. Permission was received for all three inquiry groups on April 12, 1988.

Field Interviews.

Updated department head lists were obtained from the University of Tennessee Provost Office. Faculty listings of Professors and Associate Professors were prepared for each department based on the information in the 1988-89 University of Tennessee at Knoxville Graduate Catalog. The faculty lists were prepared in alphabetical order without regard to rank. Last names only were used in order to remove possible identification by sex from the list. A random number table was used to select a group of three faculty members and one alternate from each department. In some cases, the names proved to be no longer active in the subject department. In these cases or other situations such as sabbaticals, health problems, or the occasional refusal to participate further random selections were made until three eligible faculty members had been scheduled from each department.

The total number of interviews conducted was 28 department head interviews and 84 faculty interviews. This represented the entire interview plan as originally projected. Scheduling proved to be extremely difficult, but participation was open and well engaged. Considerable

interest was shown in the project by many of the participants.

The initial plan to conduct a separate test sequence in the two mathematics departments proved excessively cumbersome due to scheduling problems in the departments. Initial indications were that a minimum delay of three weeks or more would be encountered before the interviews could be completed. The test sequence (Table 4-1) was compressed into a one week series consisting of rehearsals with each interview form, two test interviews in the math departments, and an initial series of 8 active interviews.

Table 4-1: Intial test series of interviews.

Category	Department Heads	Faculty	Total / %
Total record interviews	28	84	112 / 100%
Test interviews (Not included in record interviews)	1	1	2 / 1.7%
Intial series of record interviews	4	4	8 / 7.1%

This initial sequence served to confirm the basic interview format. It also lead to some changes in the details of the questions. Two preliminary questions

regarding classroom use of textbooks proved highly distracting in that they shifted attention away from faculty issues and toward student issues. They were eliminated. Considerations of course level proved much more pervasive than anticipated, and answer formats were changed on the worksheets to make recording responses easier. The distinction between critical reviews and comparative reviews anticipated from the literature search proved to be too fine-grained. However, as mentioned above, the activity of reading textbook manuscripts for publishers appeared immediately and was added to the interviews. The four-part model proved to be cumbersome to deal with verbally. The handout which listed definitions for each of the value areas was added as a result. Two different versions were used to preclude having the handout influence the order of replies.

Both the information sources instrument and the four-part model detail instrument proved easy to utilize and were well received. The were used throughout the interview sequence without alteration.

The interviews averaged approximately 40 to 45 minutes in length. The minimum time to conduct an interview was 30 minutes, and some interviews stretched to an hour or more. The longest was 1 1/2 hours with a humanities department head. The degree of engagement and enthusiasm on the part of the participants in the

interviews were remarkable. This level of involvement in some ways represents a finding in its own right although it is obviously quite subjective.

Journal Mailings.

A final total of 157 journal mailings were made. Responses were received from 80 of these or 51%. Unfortunately, not all of the responses were complete. Numerous instances were received in which the respondent, having indicated that the journal did not review textbooks, did not go on to complete the general questions dealing with scholarship and the textbook market despite the clear instructions on the form. The total return pattern is shown in Table 4-2.

The journals were selected based on a combination of one or more factors including citation "impact factor," circulation, publication frequency, and affiliation with a disciplinary body or university. Citation "impact factor" is a bibliometric measure used in assessing the yearly frequency of citations for the average article in a given journal (Garfield, 1987). This combination of factors was intended to produce a list of journals representative of a high level of prestige and visibility. No attempt was made to pre-select journals which were known to review textbooks. This point was apparently misunderstood by a number of editors despite the explanation of the

Table 4-2: Number and completion of journal editor survey returns shown by disciplinary group.

Disciplinary Group	Mailed	Responses	Complete Responses
Social Sciences	19	10	7
		53%	37%
Business	19	7	5
		45%	26%
Education	20	9	6
		45%	30%
Humanities	20	11	10
		55%	50%
Life Sciences	20	10	3
		50%	16%
Physical Sciences	20	8	8
		40%	40%
Teaching Journals	20	13	11
		65%	55%
Totals	157	80	59
		51%	37%

research in the cover letter (See Appendix B). Some of these editors protested that the research should have been directed to "appropriate" journals.

The variability in return rate by discipline and the further variability in the number of fully completed replies had one particularly unfortunate result. It eliminated any practical ability to examine disciplinary variation in the journal replies. Instead, the journals will be characterized as follows: "all journals responding," "journals reviewing textbooks," "journals not reviewing textbooks," "disciplinary or non-teaching journals," and "teaching or pedagogical journals." Only in a few selected cases will reference be made to disciplinary characteristics in the journal data.

5. ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Major Variables.

There are two major variables in the respondent groups. The first is faculty role. This inquiry treats faculty role in terms of a three-tiered structure of faculty members, department heads, and journal editors. It is possible that any given individual may have held or still hold more than one of these roles. For example, many department heads teach. However, these roles are intended to stand for cosmopolitan mechanisms within a

discipline, and the inquiry was addressed to individuals in terms specific to the appropriate role level. A comparison of the results among the three levels was undertaken to search for recognizable differences in perceptions or practice.

The next major variable is discipline group. In the faculty and department heads the teaching departments were placed into the 7 major disciplinary groups previously shown. The journal survey group was originally constructed along the same lines plus the category of pedagogical journals. The response pattern in the replies defeated this structure, and the alternative structure discussed in this chapter was adopted. The findings were examined for recognizable patterns based in disciplinary differences.

Statistical Treatments.

The majority of the statistical treatments in the presentation and analysis of findings in this inquiry are limited to tabular displays of the results, percentage calculations, and rank ordering. This is dictated by the assumptions concerning the nature of the data base as discussed in Chapter II.

The most complex statistical treatment is in the consideration of the rankings of the elements of the four-part model as developed from the ranking of the 28

notional statements by the faculty respondents. This data set was deliberately constructed to allow the use of a non-parametric, equal-cell ANOVA technique to examine the differences in the ranking. Friedman's ANOVA was utilized. A simple item analysis involving scoring above and below the median within each disciplinary group was also applied to the rankings of the 28 statements to point up ranking and selection within disciplines.

Narrative Findings.

Much of the analysis in this inquiry rests not on the tabular data but upon the content of the extended discussions that took place during the interviews. A "thick description" of these discussions is essential to portraying and understanding the results of the interviews. There are many ways to present records of such discussions. In the following presentation the narrative information will generally be presented following the tabular data in each section. An attempt has been made to characterize major trends within the discussion. Since the interviews were separate events, and the respondents did not compare notes, it is obviously a subjective judgement to some extent to claim that one participant's remarks resemble or support another's. Judgments of this type are the heart of an organizational culture study, and they are made without apology. It is

possible that there are other interpretations or that another interviewer might have elicited different responses. The views presented and the voices chosen to represent those views seem to be the most powerful.

Taped transcripts were not made of the interviews. The interviews are preserved in the 112 worksheet packages. Many of the replies were recorded in tabular or multiple choice form in these worksheets. These answers form the basis of most of the tables. The discussion was preserved in the form of both notes and verbatim written records.

Remarks by faculty members and department heads will often be presented as quotes in this study with such attributions as "a professor of humanities," or "a physical sciences department head." This form, as well as the uniform use of masculine pronouns, is adopted to preserve the anonymity promised to participants in the consent statement. Such quotations are intended to represent as nearly as possible the actual words of the participants, but it is recognized that some error in exact phrasing may well occur. With this in mind, these quotes should be read in the sense of the legal formula, "The subject made the following statement or words to that effect."

The findings are presented in four chapters dealing with market information (Chapter V), textbook selection

(Chapter VI), scholarship (Chapter VII), and supporting findings (Chapter VIII). Following the presentation of the findings, the final chapter will address conclusions and speculation on the import of this study in suggesting further research and action.

CHAPTER V

SOURCES OF INFORMATION IN THE TEXTBOOK MARKET PLACE

1. FACULTY PRACTICES

Introduction.

The general purpose of this section is to address the question: "Where do faculty members obtain information regarding textbooks in the market place?" Two major subdivisions in this area can be readily identified: a direct examination of marketing mechanisms and a more subjective inquiry into the faculty's regard for critical reviews of textbooks in scholarly journals.

Marketing Mechanisms.

All faculty members were provided a list of ten major mechanisms which might serve to make one aware of the existence of a textbook in the market. They were asked to rank each mechanism on a three step scale consisting of "not useful," "useful," and "very useful." Respondents were asked to consider their answers in regard to becoming aware of a book rather than final selection criteria. They were also told that the response "not useful" might be interpreted as "not applicable" if that seemed

appropriate. Table 5-1 shows the resulting scores where the following values are assigned: Not Useful = 1, Useful = 2, and Very Useful = 3.

Table 5-2 utilizes the same assigned scoring values to rank the mechanisms within each disciplinary group. This picture is clouded slightly by the increased number of ties. However, the unanimous selection of the publisher's complimentary copy as the first ranked mechanism can be noted. There is also a strong indication of consensus regarding browsing in libraries and bookstores. All disciplinary groups ranked these two categories as the least useful of all sources of information.

Table 5-3 below shows the number and percentage of faculty responding "very useful" to each mechanism. Table 5-4 shows the inverse; the number of faculty responding "not useful" to each market source. The strongest agreement shown is toward the approval of direct access to publisher's complimentary copies with 81% of the faculty responding "very useful." This is bolstered by noting that only 4% of the faculty responded "not useful" to this category. Even this 4% is suspect in terms of expressing disapproval. Several faculty members expressed dissatisfaction with the increasing difficulty of obtaining complimentary copies. One engineering faculty member who responded "not useful" made broad criticisms about the usefulness of the entire textbook market. None

Table 5-1: Faculty ranking of market information sources with scores by disciplinary group.

Sources	Rank	Scores: SocS	Busn	Educ	Engr	Humn	Life	Phys	Total Score
Publishers' Copies	1	32	33	33	32	34	33	35	232
Colleagues' Recommendations	2	30	28	29	32	32	30	29	210
Publishers' Catalogs	3	30	25	31	32	28	28	28	202
Publishers' Booths	4	27	27	31	20	25	29	28	187
Critical Reviews	5	27	22	31	20	25	29	28	187
Publishers' Representatives	6.5	20	24	26	26	25	18	22	161
Journal Ads	6.5	18	23	26	23	25	23	23	161
Citations	8	22	17	28	19	17	18	21	142
Bookstores	9	18	15	22	19	17	17	17	125
Libraries	10	18	14	22	20	15	15	20	125

Table 5-2: Faculty ranking of market information sources with ranks by disciplinary group.

Sources	Overall Rank	Ranks by Discipline: SocS	Busn	Educ	Engr	Humn	Life	Phys
Publishers' Copies	1	1	1	1	2	1.5	1	1
Colleagues' Recommendations	2	2.5	2	4.5	2	3	2	2
Publishers' Catalogs	3	2.5	4	2.5	2	4	3.5	3.5
Publishers' Booths	4	4.5	3	2.5	7.5	5.5	3.5	3.5
Critical Reviews	5	4.5	7	4.5	6	7	5	5
Publishers' Representatives	6.5	7	5	7.5	4	1.5	7.5	7
Journal Ads	6.5	9	6	7.5	5	5.5	6	6
Citations	8	6	8	6	9.5	8.5	7.5	8
Bookstores	9	9	9	9.5	9.5	8.5	9	10
Libraries	10	9	10	9.5	7.5	10	10	9

Table 5-3: Number and percent of faculty responding "very useful" to various market information sources by disciplinary group.

Sources in Rank Order	Number of Responses: SocS	Busn	Educ	Engr	Humn	Life	Phys	Total / %
Publishers' Copies	9	9	10	9	10	11	11	68 / 81%
Colleagues' Recommendations	6	6	7	8	8	6	6	47 / 56%
Publishers' Catalogs	7	2	7	8	6	6	5	41 / 49%
Publishers' Booths	5	4	7	2	2	6	5	31 / 37%
Critical Reviews	6	2	6	0	2	4	3	23 / 27%
Publishers' Representatives	2	2	5	4	2	1	1	17 / 20%
Journal Ads	1	2	3	2	2	1	4	15 / 18%
Citations	2	0	6	1	0	1	1	11 / 13%
Bookstores	2	0	3	1	0	2	1	9 / 11%
Libraries	2	0	3	1	1	3	2	12 / 14%

Table 5-4: Number and percent of faculty responding "not useful" to various market information sources by disciplinary group.

Sources in Rank Order	Number of Responses: SocS	Busn	Educ	Engr	Humn	Life	Phys	Total / %
Publishers' Copies	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3 / 4%
Colleagues' Recommendations	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	6 / 7%
Publishers' Catalogs	1	1	0	0	2	2	3	9 / 11%
Publishers' Booths	2	3	0	6	1	3	1	16 / 19%
Critical Reviews	3	4	1	2	7	5	2	26 / 32%
Publishers' Representatives	6	2	3	2	1	7	4	25 / 31%
Journal Ads	7	3	1	3	1	6	5	26 / 32%
Citations	4	7	2	6	7	7	4	37 / 44%
Bookstores	8	9	5	6	7	9	8	52 / 62%
Libraries	8	10	5	5	10	9	6	53 / 63%

of the negative responses seemed to be ruling out "hands-on" access to textbooks as a very useful mechanism.

The category "publishers' booths at conventions" displays considerable variation in rank by discipline. It also falls surprisingly below publishers' copies if both are seen as direct access mechanisms. This category is most likely affected directly by an external variable, the travel budget. It seems likely that variations here might well reflect more about access to travel money than access to textbooks.

The two lowest ranked mechanisms are also both potential hands-on mechanism at first consideration. The rejection of these two browsing opportunities would seem to reflect that most textbooks are purchased for inventory or library acquisition only after a faculty initiative. The most common reaction to these two mechanisms was to note that one would not really expect to find a new textbook in a bookstore or library.

A further examination of tables 5-3 and 5-4 indicates that Category 5, critical reviews, shows the narrowest gap between favorable and unfavorable with only a 5% difference. This possible ambiguous reaction to critical reviews of textbooks sets the stage for an examination of faculty responses to questions which directly consider this activity within the realm of scholarly journals.

Faculty Attitudes Toward Critical Reviews.

Faculty assessment and utilization of critical reviews of textbooks was directly addressed through two questions. The first question asked the respondents to characterize the general quality of textbook reviewing practice in scholarly journals. Responses of "excellent," "adequate," "marginal," "inadequate," and "not of concern" were used. A second question asked respondents if they read or utilized such reviews. Responses of "yes," "occasionally," and "no" were used. The results will be considered in terms of the direct responses and then the supporting discussions that took place.

Table 5-5 shows the faculty response to the quality of textbook reviewing practices. An overall reading of this table shows a rather soft level of support. If "excellent" and "adequate" are characterized as favorable and "marginal," "inadequate," and "not of concern" are characterized as unfavorable, then only 39% of faculty respondents held favorable opinions of textbook reviewing practices as currently encountered.

There is some evidence of a disciplinary pattern. The social sciences, education, and business faculties each report 50% or greater favorable responses. The traditional core of the liberal arts: humanities, life sciences, and physical sciences, report much lower satisfaction with only 16%, 25% and 41% respectively.

Table 5-5: Faculty description of quality of textbook reviewing practice in scholarly journals.

Discipline Group	(N)	Excellent	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate	Not of Concern
Education	12	1	6	4	0	1
Social Sciences	12	1	6	2	1	2
Business	12	0	6	2	2	2
Physical Science	12	0	5	4	0	3
Life Science	11	1	2	5	1	2
Humanities	12	1	1	1	2	7
Engineering	12	0	2	3	3	4
Totals	84	4	28	21	9	21
		5%	34%	25%	11%	25%
			32		51	
			39%		61%	

They are joined by engineering with a 16% favorable response. The position of the life science group in this table is at question due to having only 11 responses. One faculty member declined to make a "generalized" response.

The "not of concern" response is indicative of a view that scholarly journals are not an appropriate forum for textbook reviews. The humanities faculty most clearly expressed this view with 58% of their responses falling into this category. Engineering and physical sciences also showed this response more strongly than the mode level. The education group showed the least tendency to reject journals as an appropriate forum for reviews.

Faculty response to the question of reading and utilizing reviews is shown in Table 5-6. It will be noticed that the "no" response of 37% compares closely to the 36% total response obtained for "inadequate" and "not of concern" in the quality question. Further, the 24% for "occasionally" compares to the 25% for "marginal" in quality, and the 39% "yes" response is in line with the 39% obtained for "excellent" and "adequate" quality responses totalled. The engineering and the humanities groups fall at the low end of the scale again, and the education group remains at the top. The social sciences group is short two responses due to the addition of the specific phrasing of this question after the interviews had started.

Table 5-6: Faculty utilization of critical reviews of textbooks.

Discipline Group	N	Yes	Occasionally	No
Education	12	7	3	2
Life Science	12	5	4	3
Business	12	5	3	4
Physical Science	12	5	3	4
Social Science	10	5	3	2
Engineering	12	3	2	7
Humanities	12	2	2	8
Total	82	32	20	30
		39%	24%	37%
			52	30
			63%	37%

Textbook Reviews: Faculty Discussion.

As was the case in many areas in this inquiry, the discussion of the questions went beyond the set answers and displays a complexity not always reflected in the face display of the data. Two distinctive areas appeared in the discussion of reviewing practices: the discussion of journals as forums for reviews and the quite separate discussion of the quality and utility of the reviews themselves.

As can be seen from the 21% "not of concern" response, there was a substantial portion of the faculty group that simply rejected textbook reviews as a matter of concern in scholarly journals. There was also a more subtle concern that the utility of textbook reviews is diminished by an isolation from the mainstream of scholarly journals. A physical sciences faculty member remarked that "reviews are good, but not enough journals run them," and they are usually "only in tailored journals." An education faculty member was critical of reviews being located "only in pedagogical journals" and the "uncertain identity of the reviewers." A physical sciences faculty member placed reviews in the general discussion of teaching, arguing conventionally that the "discipline as a whole has not adequately addressed teaching." A humanities faculty member made a more summary rejection of an isolated review forum when he

stated: "There are journals that do reviews, but I don't read those. Journals I read do not review textbooks."

There is a separate articulation of the limits of textbook reviews as a functional tool within pedagogical decision making. It will be recalled that the data above clearly suggested a preference for "hands-on" mechanisms for obtaining knowledge about textbooks in the market. One of the most noticeable features of the discussion surrounding reviews was an interest on the part of the faculty in spontaneously describing the lack of utility of textbook reviews as an informative tool in decision making. This lowered utility appears to be directly related to the preference for autonomous, direct access to hard copies of the textbooks.

Thirty-nine of the faculty interviewed (46%) made clear reference during the discussion of reviews to some limitation of reviews when compared to hands-on mechanisms. The most common position was that reviews could, at best, only act as a "flagging mechanism." A faculty member in education, a disciplinary group favorable to reviews, said: "Reviews mainly play a role in the decision to consider a book." An engineering faculty member stated: "I don't really get that much out of the contents themselves." A faculty in member business agreed that reviews may serve as a flagging mechanism

but beyond that "no one pays the slightest attention to them." Another business faculty member who does not read reviews compared them to movie reviews, saying "I must make up my own mind." A faculty member in the life sciences concluded that books considered are basically those that "I have on my shelf or what my colleagues have on their shelves."

A second aspect of the discounting of textbook reviews is doubt about the quality of the reviews themselves. Here the pattern is much less clear. A faculty member in business complained that reviews are too "snide;" that there seems to be "an obligation to find something wrong." A life sciences faculty member echoed that sentiment when he said, "It has become de riguer to find out what is wrong with a book in a snide, insider's sort of way." On the other hand, a social sciences faculty member argued that reviews have become "too nice; too mushy. They read like an old boys' network with everyone being nice." Phrases such as "too personal," "love letters," "not as critical as they could be," and "superficial" occurred in the discussions. In yet another contrast, one faculty member in business argued that current reviews do not provide adequate descriptions of the books and their content while another complained that current reviews are basically "only descriptive; not serious critiques."

Finally, it is interesting to note two other results. In the ranking of market mechanisms discussed above, the category "colleagues' recommendations" was the second most popular marketing awareness tool. It might be argued logically that a review is simply a colleague's recommendation removed in time and printed. If this were so, one might have expected a much closer positioning of the two. Yet this does not happen. The recommendation of a colleague in the sense of a face-to-face exchange is clearly differentiated from published reviews.

Second, and perhaps more intriguing, is the relation of critical reviews to publishers' catalogs. Every disciplinary group without exception ranked the advertising media of publishers' catalogs as more useful than the scholarly publication of critical reviews. Two mechanisms may be in operation to cause this result. One is sheer volume; there are more brochures and catalogs than reviews, and the targeting of brochures and catalogs is highly specific. The second is autonomy of judgement. A catalog or brochure may be seen by the faculty as clearly partisan in its attempt to influence judgement, while a review may be seen as an attempt to advance a specific judgement. A preference for autonomy might clearly accept the former and reject the latter.

Summary.

Faculty members expressed a clear preference for hands-on marketing and information tools. This is clearly demonstrated by the unanimous support for publishers' complimentary copies and colleagues' recommendation as the most useful information sources. Mechanisms which rely on indirect access are much less useful, while those that are perceived as offering no access, libraries and bookstores, are rejected.

Critical reviews of textbooks occupy an ambiguous position. They rank below both direct access and publishers' literature. There are indications of disciplinary variations in the regard for the quality of current textbook reviewing practices in scholarly journals and in the use of reviews. The effect of these variations is unclear. There is a substantial portion of the survey group which rejects the notion of textbook review as an element of scholarly journal functions. There are clear indications of a perceived limitation of the utility of critical reviews as decision tools. These limitations are apparently related to the preference for autonomous access and selection tools.

2. DEPARTMENT HEAD PRACTICES

Market Mechanisms.

This section will address the utility of market sources of information as perceived by department heads. Each department head was presented with the list of ten information sources regarding textbooks in the marketplace and asked to rank them as "not useful," "useful," and "very useful." Scores of +1, +2, and +3 were assigned respectively for ranking purposes. Table 5-7 shows the resulting scores and ranks. Table 5-8 utilizes the same scoring values to rank marketing sources within each discipline. At 28 the group is considerably smaller than the faculty group. There are 4 members in each disciplinary group.

Agreement can be seen developing in regard to hands-on mechanisms. Publishers' copies remain the number one ranked method, though there is not complete unanimity. Colleagues' recommendations, which might be assumed to include hands-on access, remain in second rank.

Two initial comments can be made. In the two disciplines where the complimentary copy slipped from first rank it was replaced by the publisher's booth which is in itself often a complimentary copy source. Next, the upward shift of the publisher's booth over the publisher's catalog compared to the faculty ranking

Table 5-7: Department head ranking of market information sources with scores by disciplinary group.

Sources	Rank (R)	Scores: SocS	Busn	Educ	Engr	Humn	Life	Phys	Total Score
Publishers' Copies	1	9	11	10	12	10	12	12	76
Colleagues' Recommendations	2	10	10	10	11	10	9	10	70
Publishers' Booths	3	11	7	11	6	10	11	10	66
Publishers' Catalogs	4	8	9	8	11	8	9	9	62
Publishers' Representatives	5	9	8	9	10	9	8	8	61
Critical Reviews	6	10	7	10	8	7	9	8	59
Journal Ads	7	7	7	8	8	9	10	6	55
Citations	8	6	8	9	7	10	5	5	50
Bookstores	9	9	4	7	4	7	5	7	43
Libraries	10	5	5	7	5	6	4	6	38

Table 5-8: Department head rankings of market information sources with ranks within disciplinary groups.

Sources	Overall Rank	Ranks Within Groups: SocS	Busn	Educ	Engr	Humn	Life	Phys
Publishers' Copies	1	5	1	3	1	2.5	1	1
Colleagues' Recommendations	2	2.5	2	3	2.5	2.5	5	2.5
Publishers' Booths	3	1	7	1	8	2.5	2	2.5
Publishers' Catalogs	4	7	3	7.5	2.5	7	5	4
Publishers' Representatives	5	5	4.5	5.5	3	5.5	7	5.5
Critical Reviews	6	2.5	7	3	5.5	8.5	5	5.5
Journal Ads	7	8	7	7.5	5.5	5.5	3	8.5
Citations	8	9	4.5	5.5	7	2.5	8.5	10
Bookstores	9	10	7	9.5	10	8.5	8.5	7
Libraries	10	9	6	9.5	9	10	10	8.5

may reflect a difference in the allocation of travel resources and therefore the likelihood of exposure to publisher's booths. In any case, the direct access to a copy of the textbook remains the most powerful marketing information approach.

As with the faculty, this sense of agreement can be examined by considering the distribution of "not useful" and "very useful" replies. These are shown in Tables 5-9 and 5-10. A majority selection of "very useful" appears in three categories: publisher's booth, 50%; colleagues' recommendation, 50%; and publishers' copies, 75%. These are all mechanisms which allow direct access as the basis of action. A majority selection of "not useful" occurs in bookstores (51%) and libraries (64%).

Critical reviews slipped lower in the department head rankings, reversing their position with publishers' representatives despite the fact that a somewhat greater percentage of the department heads rank critical reviews as "very useful." The relatively low rank of critical reviews, again below publishers' catalogs as was the case with the faculty, bears continued scrutiny.

Department Heads and Critical Reviews.

Department heads were asked to characterize the quality of textbook reviewing practices with responses of "excellent," "adequate," "marginal," "inadequate," and

Table 5-9: Number and percent of department heads responding "very useful" to various market information sources.

Sources in Rank Order	Number of Responses Within Groups: SocS	Busn	Educ	Engr	Humn	Life	Phys	Total / %
Publishers' Copies	1	3	2	4	3	4	4	21 / 75%
Colleagues' Recommendations	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	14 / 50%
Publishers' Booths	3	0	3	0	2	3	3	14 / 50%
Publishers' Catalogs	0	1	0	3	0	1	1	6 / 21%
Publishers' Representatives	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	7 / 25%
Critical Reviews	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	9 / 32%
Journal Ads	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	5 / 18%
Citations	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	7 / 25%
Bookstores	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3 / 11%
Libraries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 / 0%

Table 5-10: Number and percent of department heads responding "not useful" to various market information sources.

Sources in Rank Order	Responses Within Groups: SocS	Busn	Educ	Engr	Humn	Life	Phys	Total / %
Publishers' Copies	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1 / 04%
Colleagues' Recommendations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 / 0%
Publishers' Booths	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	4 / 14%
Publishers' Catalogs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 / 0%
Publishers' Representatives	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3 / 11%
Critical Reviews	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4 / 14%
Journal Ads	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	6 / 21%
Citations	2	1	0	2	0	3	3	11 / 39%
Bookstores	1	4	1	4	1	3	2	16 / 57%
Libraries	3	3	1	3	2	4	2	18 / 64%

"not of concern." The resulting responses are shown in Table 5-11. If "excellent" and "adequate" are again categorized as "favorable," while "marginal," "inadequate," and "not of concern" are characterized as "unfavorable," an indication of support for current textbook reviewing practice emerges. Reviewing practices receive a 61% favorable response as compared to a 39% unfavorable response. Within this structure, a majority of 54% made the specific reply "adequate."

The department heads were asked if they read and utilized textbook reviews. Responses of "yes," "occasionally," and "no" were used. The results are shown in Table 5-12 in order of favorable responses. The distribution among the three answers is relatively even, and a total of 71% of the respondents indicated that they read and utilize textbook reviews at least occasionally. Twenty nine percent (29%) of the respondents stated that they do not read or utilize textbook reviews. This compares to the 25% of the respondents who said that textbook reviewing practices are inadequate or not of concern. The 71% of responses which indicated some habit of reading the reviews compares roughly to the 75% of responses giving qualitative rankings of excellent, adequate, or marginal.

Table 5-11: Department head description of quality of textbook reviewing practice in scholarly journals in order of favorable responses.

Discipline Group	Group N	Excellent	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate	Not of Concern
Humanities	4	0	4	0	0	0
Business	4	0	3	0	1	0
Life Science	4	0	3	0	0	1
Physical Science	4	2	0	1	1	1
Education	4	0	2	2	0	0
Social Science	4	0	2	0	2	0
Engineering	4	0	1	1	1	1
Totals	28	2	15	4	4	3
		7%	54%	14%	14%	11%
		17		11		
		61%		39%		

Table 5-12: Department head utilization of critical reviews of textbooks.

Discipline Group	Group N	Yes	Occasionally	No
Business	4	3	1	0
Humanities	4	1	3	0
Physical Science	4	3	0	1
Education	4	1	2	1
Life Science	4	2	0	2
Engineering	4	1	1	2
Social Science	4	0	2	2
Total	28	11	9	8
		39%	32%	29%
			20	8
			71%	29%

Critical Reviews: Discussion by Department Heads.

Again, a consideration of the character of the discussion of textbook reviews provides some insight beyond the face of the data. Favorable estimates of textbook reviews and reviewing practices were more forcefully articulated among department heads than in the faculty. The perceived limitation of reviews to an alerting mechanism prior to an autonomous selection process was again present. The notion of a possible isolation of textbook reviews also appears.

A physical sciences head characterized the state of textbook reviews as "excellent," but clearly limited their role to being "where one sets a first impression." Another physical sciences head who also characterized reviews as excellent agreed and cited a lack of comprehensive coverage of the field and information about the reviewers as major limitations. A humanities department head felt that journals which speak to teaching do a good job with textbook reviews but contended that the selection must ultimately be independent and that reviews would always "have a hard time addressing departmental issues." A life sciences head stated that reviews appear in "appropriate journals." A business head characterized the volume of reviews as "adequate," but faulted the general climate of journal reviews as often "political and brutal." A life sciences head raised the movie or theater

critic analogy, but rather than using it as a basis for rejecting reviews as happened in the faculty member use of the analogy, said that "after a while you know which ones (journals/reviewers) to trust." This is an expression which sees reviews as bolstering autonomous judgement rather than competing with it.

The opposite pole was also clearly expressed. An engineering department head argued that reviews are not of concern because, "I really want to see the book myself." A life sciences head who expressed a clear orientation toward research scholarship stated, "I do not really care about reviews anyway." He said that he maintains a strict hands-on selection view within the department, preferring to rely on complimentary copies which are "always available." These rejections clearly reflect a preference for autonomous access and judgement.

Considerations beyond individual practice also occurred in the department head interviews. An education head who characterized reviews as adequate conceded that he thought "few faculty pay any attention to them." A physical science head echoed this when he characterizes reviews as "somewhat marginal" because "perhaps journals feel their readership does not pay too much attention to reviews." A business head expressed a discipline wide perspective when he argued that journals "do not pay enough attention to reviews. Thirty years ago it was an

important function of major journals." He speculated: "If we did, there might be more pressure to produce better ones (textbooks.)"

Summary.

Department heads expressed a clear preference for hands-on access mechanisms for information regarding textbooks in the marketplace. Publishers' complimentary copies and colleagues' recommendations were the top ranked sources. Libraries and bookstores, both browsing situations, were rejected.

As a marketing information source, textbook reviews clearly were a secondary mechanism. They ranked behind both direct access mechanisms and publishers' literature. However, department heads characterized textbook reviews relatively more favorably than the faculty respondents. Some disciplinary differences were indicated, but the pattern is tentative.

3. COMPARING FACULTY AND DEPARTMENT HEAD RESPONSES

One of the notions in this inquiry is that of comparison between levels as expressed by the divisions of line faculty, department heads, and journal editors. Certain comparisons can be drawn at this point before turning to journal editors and editorial practice.

A comparison of the overall rankings of market information sources as expressed by the faculty and by department heads is shown in Figure 5-1. There is an apparent unanimity in the upper range of approval and in the extremes of disapproval. It can be noted from previous tables that there is more internal variation in the rank order by disciplinary group in the department head study group than in the faculty group. However, size of the department head group is much smaller, making individual positioning much more influential. Despite these variations, both the faculty and the department heads believed that hands-on access to hard copies of textbooks is the most effective information source.

Figure 5-2 shows a comparison between the rank order found in this inquiry to that found by the National Enquiry on Scolarly Communications. The lists are quite different, but there are some interesting comparisons. Publishers' initiatives in the form of copies, reviews, and booths dominate the textbook list except for colleagues' recommendation. Publishers' initiative are also powerful in the scholarly book selection process, but they are more limited. Reviews move ahead of colleagues' recommendations. The simplest interpretation, which this inquiry did not address, is that reviews of scholarly books are in fact more effective and influential than reviews of textbooks. This makes sense if textbook

Approval	Faculty	Department Heads
Majority Approval "Very Useful"	Publishers' Complimentary Copies	Publishers' Complimentary Copies
	Colleagues' Recommendations	Colleagues' Recommendations
		Publishers' Booths
No Majority	Publishers' Catalogs	Publishers' Catalogs
	Publishers' Booths	Publishers' Representatives
	Critical Reviews	Critical Reviews
	Publishers' Representatives	Journal Ads
		Citations
	Journal Ads	
	Citations	
Majority Disapproval "Not Useful"	Browsing in Bookstores	Browsing in Bookstores
	Browsing in Library	Browsing in Library

Figure 5-1: Comparison of faculty and department head approval of various market information sources.

Textbooks	Scholarly Books
Publishers' Copies	Publishers' catalogs
Colleagues' Recommendations	Ads in Learned Journals
Publishers' Catalogs	Book Reviews
Publishers's Booths	Colleagues' Recommendation
Critical Reviews	Citations
Publishers' Representatives	Browsing: Bookstore
Ads in Learned Journals	Browsing: Library
Citations	Publishers' Booths
Browsing: Bookstores	
Browsing: Libraries	

Figure 5-2: Comparison of faculty ranking of information sources for textbooks and scholarly books.

selection is viewed as a local process for individuals and groups of colleagues, while scholarly book selections are made in the context of the ongoing concerns of the discipline at large.

Variations within the central group of information sources are too small to encourage speculation on detailed differences. The possibility of a travel resource variable has already been mentioned in regard to the position of the publisher's booth. The repetition of the weak position of critical reviews in scholarly journals, ranking below publishers' advertising media in both groups, supports doubt about the power of critical reviews of textbooks within the faculty community.

When questioned as to their overall perception of the quality of reviewing practice in the journals that support their disciplines, a sharp distinction appears between department heads and faculty. As previously characterized, 39% of the faculty members interviewed gave reviewing practices "favorable" responses and 61% gave "unfavorable" responses. In contrast, 61% of the department heads gave "favorable" responses while only 39% gave "unfavorable" responses. It can be argued that the numerical exactitude of this inversion is an coincidental artifact of the group sizes but, the scale of the inversion does not seem to be coincidental. The major migration in responses in the department heads seems

to be away from the "not of concern" category (faculty = 21%, DH = 11%) and the "marginal" category (faculty = 21, DH = 14%) and into the "adequate" category (faculty = 28%, DH = 54%).

There is also a distinction in the disciplinary ranking of support for textbook reviewing practices which can be seen in Figure 5-3 below. The most intriguing aspect of this comparison is the complete reversal of the humanities from the lowest support rank in the faculty to the highest in the department heads study group.

The distinctions between the two groups in the tendency to read and utilize textbook reviews is less sharp but observable. Previous tables indicate that sixty-three percent (63%) of the faculty report that they read or occasionally read textbook reviews compared to seventy-one percent (71%) of the department heads interviewed. This similarity of usage is interesting in light of the sharp difference in evaluation of quality noted above. It suggests that the faculty's lower opinion of quality may be a result of their more frequent involvement in actual text selection. If so, then the lower quality rating given by the faculty may be the more accurate reflection of the impact of the reviews.

Figure 5-4 compares faculty groups to department head groups in terms of reported reading and use of reviews. The drastic difference in the position of the humanities

Support Level	Faculty	Department Heads
Highest Support	Education	Humanities
	Life Science	
Lowest Support	Engineering	Social Science
	Humanities	Engineering

Figure 5-3: Qualitative comparison of faculty and department head support for textbook reviewing practices.

Support	Faculty	Department Heads
Highest Support	Education	Business
	Life Science	Hunanities
Lowest Support	Engineering	Engineering
	Humanities	Social Science

Figure 5-4: Qualitative comparison of level of reading and utilization of textbook reviews among faculty and department heads.

groups can again be noticed as well as the drop of the education group away from the top in the department head group as also occurred in the quality comparison.

Both groups, the faculty and the department heads, spontaneously expressed reservations as to the utility of textbook reviews as a decision or evaluation tool. This reservation seems to arise from a common preference for autonomous access and ultimately autonomous judgement in approaching the textbook as a pedagogical artifact. There were present in both groups reservations as to the quality of textbook reviews including their content, style, selection of reviewers, and selection of texts. There was also an indication on the part of some respondents that reviews are perceived as being isolated, whether properly or improperly, into a particular range of pedagogically oriented journals. However, it does not seem to be possible to establish a pattern to specific concerns of poor quality or isolation based on the data so far. At this point in the discussion of the data it is necessary to begin to look at the results from the survey of journal editors in order to further define the situation in regard to textbook reviewing practices.

4. TEXTBOOK REVIEWING PRACTICES IN RESPONDING JOURNALS

Introduction.

This portion of the findings will address textbook reviewing practices as described by the editors responding to the survey inquiry. The presence and annual volume of textbook reviews, textbook selection, reviewer selection, and editorial perceptions as to the utility of textbook reviews will be considered. The data will help to define more clearly the nature of the critical review of textbooks as currently conducted in scholarly journals. The selection of journals and the overall response pattern were discussed in Chapter IV. As indicated, the response pattern by discipline groups does not appear to support reliable inter-disciplinary comparisons. Most comparisons will be drawn among categories of journals. Because all survey forms were not filled out with equal completeness, the number of responses in any given category may vary from question to question.

Prevalence of Textbook Reviews.

All respondents were asked if their journals published critical reviews of textbooks. Replies of "yes, regularly," "yes, occasionally," and "no" were offered. Usable responses were provided by 67 disciplinary

(non-teaching) journals and 13 teaching journals. As shown in Table 5-13, a total of 32% of the non-teaching journals indicated some textbook review history with only 7% indicating that such reviews were run with some regularity. In the category of teaching journal, 54% of the journals reported some textbook review history with 23% citing reviews as a regular feature.

It can be noted that in only one group of non-teaching journals, the physical sciences, did a majority of the responding editors indicate some history of publishing critical reviews. In the other six categories, a majority of the editors reported no history of textbook reviewing. Even in the pedagogical journals the majority was slim, and fewer than one-quarter of these journals considered textbook reviews a regular feature.

Respondents who indicated a history of textbook reviews were asked to estimate the number of such reviews published annually in their journals. All appropriate respondents provided an answer, although four provided adjectives rather than a numerical answer. Table 5-14 shows the results of this question with additional interpretive remarks.

The non-teaching journals show the relatively low volumes of reviews that might be considering the data shown in Table 5-13 with the three exceptions noted. It might be anticipated that a review journal such as that

Table 5-13: Occurrence of critical reviews of textbooks in responding journals by disciplinary grouping.

Disciplinary Group	N	Yes, Regularly	Yes, Occasionally	No
Social Sciences	10	1	1	8
Business	7	0	0	7
Education	9	0	4	5
Engineering	12	1	2	9
Humanities	11	2	3	6
Life Sciences	10	0	2	8
Physical Sciences	8	1	5	2
Non-teaching Journals	67	5 (7%)	17 (25%)	45 (68%)
Teaching Journals	13	3 (23%)	4 (31%)	6 (46%)
All Journals Responding	80	8 (10%)	21 (26%)	51 (64%)

Table 5-14: Editors' estimates of annual volume of reviews in journals reporting publication of textbook reviews.

Disciplinary Group	N	Cited Annual Volume of Reviews
Social Sciences	2	1/2, "very few"
Business	0	
Education	4	2, 3, 5, "very rare"
Engineering	3	6 - 7, 12, 3 - 4
Humanities	5	6, 35, 25, 3, 2 - 3
Life Sciences	2	2 -5, 4
Physical Sciences	8	100[a], 8 - 12, 2 - 3, 3, "unk," "irregular"
Teaching Journals	7	3 - 4, 6, 6 - 8, 80 - 100, 70, 10 - 12
Range: Non-Teaching Journals		1/2 - 100
Teaching Journals		3 -100
Mode: Non-Teaching Journals		3
Teaching Journals		6, 80

[a] A reviews journal.

encountered in the physical sciences group would logically show this higher volume of textbook reviews. Such is not always the case as will be demonstrated later in this section. The mode and median figures for each group are based upon the data in expanded form, i.e., a reply of 10-12 would be treated as 10, 11, 12.

Respondents were asked if their journals accepted advertisements from textbook publishers. Sixty-five respondents answered this question. The data, shown in Table 5-15, would appear to rule out any supposition that the responding editors were influenced in their decisions whether or not to run textbook reviews by advertising revenue.

Selection of Texts for Review.

Respondents who published textbook reviews were asked to indicate from a list of ten possibilities those reasons which might lead to the selection of a textbook for review. Usable replies were provided by 22 non-teaching disciplinary journals and 6 teaching journals. Table 5-16 summarizes the results. Some interesting things come to light in this data. The first is the reappearance of the publisher's complimentary copy as the single most powerful tool in placing a textbook into a position of visibility. Second, it can be noted that only three items achieved a 50% majority selection in non-teaching journals. These

Table 5-15: Acceptance of textbook advertisements in responding journals.

Journal Category	Advertisements Accepted		Total
	Yes	No	
Journals Reviewing Textbooks	19	10	29
	66%	34%	
Journals Not Reviewing Textbooks	22	14	36
	61%	39%	
All Journals Responding to Question	41	24	65
	63%	37%	

Table 5-16: Reported criteria for selecting a textbook for review noting criteria selected by a majority of responding editors.

Criteria	Disciplinary Journals		Teaching Journals	
	No.	Rank	No.	Rank
Responding Journals	22		6	
Copies Submitted By Publishers	19 (86%)	1	6 (100%)	1
Subject Area of Textbook	15 (68%)	2	3 (50%)	3
Interest of Editors and Staff	13 (59%)	3	4 (66%)	2
Scholarly Reputation of Author	8	4	2	4
Publishers' Catalogs	8	4	3 (50%)	3
Unsolicited Reviews	7	5	4 (66%)	2
Requests from Subscribers	4	6	0	6
Committee of Experts	1	7	0	6
Reputation of Author as a Textbook Author	1	7	3 (50%)	3
Teaching Reputation of Author	0	8	1	5

three categories could be viewed as having a somewhat synergistic relation which could be briefly expressed as: "I am interested in the subject of the book that just came in the mail."

By contrast, six areas achieved majority selection in the non-teaching replies. Of particular interest is "reputation of author as a textbook author" and "unsolicited review submissions." Given that this is a very small group, this level of agreement could still be an initial hint of a common editorial frame and of an entry route to publication and visibility in these journals based upon pedagogical scholarship.

Selection of Textbook Reviewers.

This picture is complicated by the complimentary question regarding the selection of reviewers. Respondents were presented with eight possible reasons for selecting a reviewer and again asked to select all appropriate choices. Table 5-17 presents the responses. Sharp distinctions appear in some aspects of these data. One hundred percent (100%) of the responding editors in non-teaching journals selected "scholarly reputation" as a basis for selecting textbook reviewers. Only three editors, a bare 50% majority, of teaching journals selected this response. Nor is the difference picked up in teaching journals by the category "reputation for teaching"

Table 5-17: Reported criteria for selecting textbook review authors noting criteria selected by a majority of the responding editors.

Criteria	Disciplinary Journals		Teaching Journals	
	No.	Rank	No.	Rank
Responding Journals	22		6	
Scholarly Reputation	22 (100%)	1	3 (50%)	2
Personal Knowledge of Editors and Staff	15 (68%)	2	5 (83%)	1
Quality of Prior Reviews	10	3	2	3
Overall Publication Record	7	4	1	5
Authors of Similar Textbooks	6	5	2	4
By Application	4	6	3 (50%)	2
Reputation for Teaching	3	7	1	5
Vita Review	1	8	3 (50%)	2

which garners only one selection or "textbook authorship" which is selected only twice. From this aspect alone it would appear that non-teaching journals have a clearer view of cosmopolitan reputation as a basis for selecting reviewers.

However, this may not be the case. The category "scholarly reputation" was not bolstered through the selection by non-teaching journal editors of categories which might be seen as traditional measures of cosmopolitan scholarship. Publication record, prior review authorship, and vita review all fail to achieve majority support. The only supporting agreement was "personal knowledge of the editor/staff." Similarly, the strongest agreement in the teaching journal editors was "personal knowledge of editor/staff." "By application" also achieved a 50% selection in teaching journals. This can be seen as related to the 66% selection of "unsolicited reviews" as noted above.

Constantly keeping in mind the extremely small groups involved, it is possible that what appeared as a sharp division may conceal an underlying similarity. Simply put, reviewers appear to be selected from a primary population of authors whom the editors already know and recognize. The non-teaching journals, with their longer tenure and more established constituencies, articulate that recognition as "scholarly reputation" but do not

delve into detail to explain it. The teaching journals, newer and more uncertain as to their constituencies and mission, also rely on editorial recognition but may be more open to adding to the body of recognizable authors through unsolicited application. In neither group do reputation for pedagogical practice or authorship stand as major criteria for selecting reviewers of textbooks.

The Usefulness of Reviews.

All responding editors were asked to speculate as to how useful the faculty at large found textbook reviews. This questions corresponds to the inquiry into textbook review quality and utilization made with the faculty and department head groups. Responses of "not useful," "useful," and "very useful" were provided. Sixty-two usable responses were obtained. This responses are portrayed in Table 5-18.

There are two interesting notions expressed in this table. First is the large percentage of journals which do not publish textbook reviews yet conceded that the faculty may consider them "useful." This would suggest that some mechanism beyond a basic regard for textbook reviewing as a scholarly process is at work. The second is the high rate of selection for "not useful" (20%) in teaching journals; particularly when considered along with the very low rate of selection for "very useful." At first this

Table 5-18: Journal editors' estimates of the usefulness of textbook reviews for the higher education faculty.

Journal Category	Total Responses	Not Useful	Useful	Very Useful
Journals Reviewing Textbooks	29	4 (14%)	17 (59%)	8 (27%)
Journals Not Reviewing Textbooks	33	9 (27%)	23 (70%)	1 (3%)
Non-Teaching Disciplinary Journals	49	10 (20%)	31 (64%)	8 (16%)
Teaching Journals	13	3 (23%)	9 (69%)	1 (8%)
All Responding Journals	62	13 (21%)	40 (65%)	9 (14%)

seems paradoxical; non teaching journal editors seem to support textbook reviewing more than those of teaching journals. However, this may be simply a more accurate assessment of the previously noted pedagogical predisposition in the faculty to insist on autonomous judgement in textbook selection. The editors of teaching journals may know the territory a little better.

Forty-nine non-teaching journals replied to this question. If these journals are sorted by discipline group, the results shown in Table 5-19 are obtained. Interpreting "useful" and "very useful" as favorable responses and "not useful" as unfavorable, an 80% favorable estimate of the usefulness of textbook reviews emerged in this group of editors. Generally considered, the pattern here would appear to more closely resemble the department head view of textbook reviews than that of the faculty. If anything, it is perhaps slightly more supportive than even the department head position.

Discussion by Editors.

While the journal inquiry was conducted by survey, a number of supplementary remarks were provided by respondents. The largest number of comments received and the most interesting attempted to explain why journals chose not to publish textbook reviews.

Table 5-19: Journal editors' of non-teaching journals estimates of the usefulness of textbook reviews shown by disciplinary group.

Disciplinary Category	Total Reponses	Not Useful	Useful	Very Useful
Social Sciences	7	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	1 (14%)
Business	6	2 (33%)	4 (67%	0
Education	6	1 (17%)	4 (66%)	1 (17%)
Engineering	9	1 (11%)	7 (78%)	1 (11%)
Humanities	10	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)
Life Sciences	3	3 (100%)	0	0
Physical Sciences	8	2 (25%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)
Totals	49	10 (20%)	31 (64%)	8 (16%)

Several editors felt that textbook reviews were simply inappropriate; at least for their journals. A social sciences editor noted that "professional journals" rather than "scholarly journals" are the place for textbook reviews. A life sciences editor said that textbook reviews are published only in "a disciplinary newsletter." An editor in engineering said that the issue should be properly referred to a magazine which is "intended for students within the discipline." Another engineering editor stated, "I think reviews would be helpful, but there is a policy bias against them." An education editor segregated textbooks along with other pedagogical concerns and said, "This journal does not address teaching materials and techniques per se." A social sciences editor cited a teaching journal in the discipline as the proper place for textbook reviews.

Three rather longer comments deserve further notice. The first, from a physical sciences editor, is a clear articulation of positive editorial action which defines reviewing practices within the context of the journal's resources. The second, from a business and economics editor, is a direct articulation of the autonomous selection notion. The third, also from a business and economics editor, is a remarkable statement of an issue which will be considered in more depth in Chapter VII;

the influence of the economic nature of the textbook marketplace on pedagogical scholarship.

A Physical Sciences Editor

> When _____ was launched in 1980, we undertook to review textbooks and monographs. After two to three years however, we considered the space too valuable and abandoned reviews but initiated an occasional review article of a subfield as reflected in several newly published textbooks.

A Business and Economics Editor:

> We have a long term policy and practice of not reviewing textbooks. Teachers in this field must make their own decisions about what to use in the classroom.

A Business and Economics Editor:

> This journal does not publish reviews of college level textbooks, or, indeed, of any textbooks.
>
> Since the (journal name) is an organ of the (society), we fear that critical reviews would quickly involve the Association in serious disputes and perhaps legal proceeding brought by authors or publishers claiming damages for injury to valuable or potentially valuable properties.

It should be noted that this last argument is all the more interesting since it is from a major, ranked review journal which publishes 35 or more lengthy reviews of scholarly work per issue. Compare this to the review journal in the physical sciences noted in Table 5-14. Clearly, this editor is articulating an attitude based on a perception of textbooks, not a perception of critical reviews.

Four editors provided comments about the selection of books for review. A physical sciences editor limited selections to books aimed at upper level or graduate courses. This distinction will become an important aspect of subsequent discussions. An education editor said that most books reviewed "are not textbooks per se, but may find themselves used in college classes." A social sciences editor selected only books which have a "promise of making significant independent contributions to an area of study." Finally a life sciences editor separated textbooks from the normal arena of classroom pedagogy in his basis for selection:

> The reason my journal publishes reviews of textbooks is only because of interest (of faculty) in information about fields peripheral to their own, i.e., they are published because their value in presenting material to scientists and not for classroom teaching purposes.

Summary.

The data from the responding journal editors show a noticeably higher rate of publication of textbook reviews in journals oriented toward teaching than in non-teaching disciplinary journals. Fifty-four percent of the responding teaching journals indicated a history of publishing textbook reviews compared to 31% of the non-teaching journals. Of the non-teaching journal groups, only in the physical sciences group did a majority of

responding editors indicate a history of publishing textbook reviews. Volume of reviews published annually in teaching journals were also much higher than in non-teaching journals.

Examination of the responses to the inquiry into how textbooks are chosen for review found that the publishers' complimentary copies are the most powerful means of gaining visibility. Beyond that, it seems that the teaching journal editors are somewhat more open in their selection methods, particularly in accepting unsolicited reviews. Personal knowledge of the editors plays a major role in the selection of reviewers in both non-teaching and teaching journals, although the teaching journals may be somewhat more open to unsolicited application.

Journal editors responding had a somewhat higher estimate of the usefulness of textbook reviews than either the faculty or the department head survey groups. The editors of journals with no history of textbook reviewing were the least likely to rate reviews as "very useful," but a full 70% of them did select "useful." Only 8% of editors of teaching journals rated reviews as "very useful" compared to 16% of editors of non-teaching journals. This may reflect a better understanding of the faculty tendency to discount reviews on the part of the editors of teaching journals.

The reasons for not reviewing textbooks clearly indicate that two major mechanisms are at work. One is editorial decisions concerning focus within resource constraints. The second is a clear expression of the idea that textbook reviews are not run because they are inappropriate of themselves or should be confined to certain selected forums. The statements of editors provide the strongest support for the supposition that epistemological views of textbooks do operate to delimit the field of textbook reviewing in the scholarly press.

CHAPTER VI

TEXTBOOK SELECTION CRITERIA

1. THE FOUR PART MODEL IN THE INQUIRY

The second major area of inquiry in this study is an examination of selection criteria for textbooks as perceived by faculty, department heads, and journal editors. It will be recalled from the literature survey that evidence was presented which defined four major areas of concern: content value, pedagogical value, reputational value, and production value. A series of 28 notional statements were assembled from the literature and used to indicate a range of issues for each of these areas. The findings in this section were developed through using a combination of four descriptive statements based on the definition of each value area as shown in Chapter II, a scrambled version of the list of 28 notional statements, and supporting narrative discussions. The rankings obtained by use of the definitions on the handout will be referred to as "self-described" in this discussion. Rankings obtained by the instrument containing the 28 notional statments will be referred to as "developed."

2. FACULTY RANKING WITHIN THE FOUR PART MODEL

Self-described Rankings.

Each faculty member was given an oral description of the four-part model and its origins and a handout showing the four value areas and descriptive statement of each. They were asked to rank the four areas from most important (1) to least important (4) in selecting a textbook for instructional use. As described in Chapter IV, the possibility of differentiating responses by course level was previously acknowledged as a possible discriminator in the introduction to the interview.

Within the responses obtained, 47 faculty members chose to respond with a single, undifferentiated response. A distinctly separate upper-division or graduate oriented response was given by 30 respondents. A response distinguishing lower-division textbooks was given by 27 faculty members. This is a total of 104 responses, larger than the total of 84 faculty members interviewed since some respondents gave more than one response, for example providing one ranking for upper-division texts and a second for lower-division texts. The responses were scored by assigning the ranks 1 through 4 as the scores. As a result, the tables present the data in order of the lowest numeric score equals the highest rank assignment.

The result of summing all 104 responses regardless of differentiation is shown in Table 6-1. The table shows the summed score and resulting ranks by discipline group and for the total study group. The overall results established a rank order of content value, pedagogical value, reputational value, and production value. There is an initial disciplinary distinction. The overall order was supported by social sciences, business, education, and the humanities. In engineering, life sciences, and physical sciences production values moved upward and overtake or tie reputational values.

Responses which distinguished upper- or graduate-level books are shown in Table 6-2. The disciplinary patterns are less clear here because of the variety of responses. It is noticeable that the category "reputational value" moved upward sharply in considerations for upper-division books, occupying second place ahead of pedagogical concerns.

Responses separating lower-division textbooks are shown in Table 6-3. A different result can be seen. For lower-division books, an area generally encompassing 1000 level, 2000 level, and various "survey" or "service" courses, reputation fell to a distant last place. This was further accentuated by the upward movement of pedagogical concerns into a tie with content concerns for first rank.

Table 6-1: Total scores and ranks of the elements of the four-part textbook selection model by discipline group: faculty self-described data.

Discipline Group	N	Content Σ....R_c	Pedagogy Σ.....R_p	Reputation Σ.....R_r	Production Σ.....R_d
Social Sciences	12	18....1	37....2	45....3	49....4
Business	12	19....1	31....2	51....3	63....4
Education	12	17....1	27....2	39....3	50....4
Engineering	12	13....1	24....2	42....4	37....3
Humanities	12	26....1	35....2	44....3	58....4
Life Sciences	12	19....1	36....2	45....3	45....3
Physical Sciences	12	24....1	34....2	56....4	53....3
Total	84	136....1	224....2	322....3	355....4

Table 6-2: Total and rank of responses which distinquish upper-division books in the four-part textbook selection model: faculty self-described data.

Discipline Group	N	Content ∠....R_c	Pedagogy ∠.....R_p	Reputation ∠.....R_r	Production ∠.....R_d
Social Sciences	3	4....1	9....3	5....2	12....4
Business	5	5....1	10....2	14....3	17....4
Education	2	3....1	4....2	3....1	7....3
Engineering	0				
Humanities	8	10....1	19....3	14....2	26....4
Life Sciences	7	8....1	21....3	16....2	22....4
Physical Science	7	7....1	11....2	13....3	17....4
Total	30	37....1	74.....3	65....2	101....4

Table 6-3: Total and rank of responses which distinquish lower-division books in the four-part textbook selection model: faculty self-described data.

Discipline Group	N	Content £....R_c	Pedagogy £.....R_p	Reputation £.....R_r	Production £.....R_d
Social Sciences	3	5....1	6....2	9....3	10....4
Business	4	5....1	5....1	13....3	11....2
Education	3	4....1	4....1	9....2	13....3
Engineering	1	1....1	2....2	3....3	4....4
Humanities	7	12....2	10....1	21....3	21....3
Life Sciences	3	6....2	3....1	12....4	9....3
Physical Science	6	9....1	12....2	21....4	18....3
Total	27	42....1	42.....1	100....3	86....2

As an aside, it appears that the course areas occupying the core of the liberal arts curriculum, i.e., humanities, life sciences, and physical sciences, were more likely to distinguish between upper- and lower-division courses than were departments with more roots in professional traditions. This suggests areas of future inquiry into faculty development and differential staffing patterns that are beyond the scope of this inquiry.

The wide variation in response patterns argues against the application of more rigorous quantitative treatment of these self-described rankings in an attempt to force patterning or correlations. At this point, the answers stand as a tentative self-description by the respondents of their priorities.

Developed Ranking in the Four-Part Model.

The specifics of the four-part model were again presented to the faculty respondents at the end of the interview in the form of a scrambled list of the 28 notional statements which were shown in Chapter IV. The respondents were asked to rank the importance of each statement in selecting a textbook. Response options of "not important," "secondary importance," "considerable importance," and "critical importance" were provided. Respondents were told that "not important" could be taken to mean "not applicable" also. For ranking purposes

scores of 1 through 4 were assigned to "not important" through "critical importance" respectively. As a result, in tables dealing with this form, higher scores will equal higher rank assignments.

Respondents were asked to consider the items from the standpoint of their own personal practice for the level of course at which the predominant amount of their teaching occurred. The scope of this inquiry precluded attempts to follow up on all possible selection situations such as graduate, undergraduate, committee processes, team teaching, or other situations. The responses in this section therefore stand for the respondents' perception of their most likely or normal practice.

In scoring the responses, the items were unscrambled and returned to their proper groupings of content, pedagogy, reputation, and production, and the scores assigned by the respondents totaled for each disciplinary group. Table 6-4 shows the overall results of this ranking scheme.

Prior to further analytical discussion of these results, it is necessary to attempt to solidify the notion that they may portray real differences among the respondents. While retaining the assumption that these data are non-parametric and therefore statistically limited to the survey group, it was possible to utilize

Table 6-4: Total scores and ranks of the elements of the four-part textbook selection model by discipline group: faculty developed description.

Discipline Group	N	Content Σ....R_c	Pedagogy Σ.....R_p	Reputation Σ.....R_r	Production Σ.....R_d
Social Sciences	12	264....1	217....2	185....3	176....4
Business	12	269....1	246....2	160....4	196....3
Education	12	278....1	238....2	206....3	204....4
Engineering	12	240....1	205....3	164....4	213....3
Humanities	12	266....1	253....2	179....3	170....4
Life Sciences	12	262....1	209.5....3	162....4	223....2
Physical Science	12	246....1	225....2	167....4	223....3
Total	84	1825....1	1593.5....2	1223....4	1405....3

Friedman's ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that for the scores obtained:

H_o : Median Content = Median Pedagogy = Median Reputation = Median Production

If this hypothesis is supported, then it must be concluded that the apparent differences disclosed within this survey group are not supportable. If the hypothesis is rejected, then there is increased evidence that the differences disclosed are real. This test was applied to the differences in the total survey group and for the difference in each disciplinary group at a confidence level of .05. These tests are described in tables 6-5 through 6-12. The convention Content = C, Pedagogy = P, Reputation = R, and Production = D is adopted for clarity.

These tests in each case indicated that the null hypothesis may be rejected. While not supporting generalized parametric statements, the tests indicate that the differences disclosed can be discussed for the study group with some confidence.

Table 6-4 displays two trends. The overall status of the items in the production value category shifted upward when ranked by the detailed development, moving to third in overall ranking. In an inter-disciplinary trend, the engineering, life sciences, and physical sciences group still assigned the highest scores to production items both in total and in comparison to pedagogy and reputation.

Table 6-5: Freidman's ANOVA applied to the overall developed faculty rankings of the elements of the four-part model.

Discipline Group	Content $\Sigma....R_c$	Pedagogy $\Sigma.....R_p$	Reputation $\Sigma.....R_r$	Production $\Sigma.....R_d$
Social Sciences	264....4	217....3	185....2	176....1
Business	269....4	246....3	160....1	196....2
Education	278....4	238....3	206....2	204....1
Engineering	240....4	205....2	164....1	213....3
Humanities	266....4	253....3	179....2	170....1
Life Sciences	262....4	209.5....2	162....1	223....3
Physical Science	246....4	225....3	167....1	223....2
Total of Ranks	28	19	10	13
n for group	7	7	7	7

H_o = Median C = Median P = Median R = Median D

Confidence Level = .05 df = 3 x^2 = 7.82 Calculated x^2 = 16.2

Reject H_o : There are real differences in the medians.

Table 6-6: Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: social sciences.

Faculty Member	Content Σ... R_C	Pedagogy Σ.....R_P	Reputation Σ.....R_R	Production Σ.....R_D
01	22....4	17....3	13....2	10....1
02	21....4	11....1	17....3	13....2
03	18....4	13....2	15....3	10....1
04	17..3.5	17..3.5	14....1	16....2
05	26....4	19....3	17....2	16....1
06	24....4	16....3	13....1	15....2
07	24..3.5	24..3.5	13....1	16....2
08	21....4	20....3	12....1	14....2
09	20....3	21....4	17....2	16....1
10	23....4	21....3	15....1	20....2
11	24....4	20....3	15....1	16....2
12	24....3	18....2	24....3	14....1
Total R	45	34	21	19
(n)	12	12	12	12

H_o : Median C = Median R = Median R = Median D

Confidence level = .05 df = 3 χ^2 = 7.82

Calculated χ^2 = 19.15

Reject H_o : There are real differences among the medians.

Table 6-7: Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: business.

Faculty Member	Content Σ... R_C	Pedagogy Σ.....R_P	Reputation Σ.....R_R	Production Σ.....R_D
01	22....3	23....4	15....1	19....2
02	26....3	27....4	12....1	20....2
03	23....4	22....3	14....1	16....2
04	22....4	15....2	18....3	12....1
05	24....4	23....3	16....2	15....1
06	22....4	19....3	12....1	16....2
07	26....4	19....3	16....1	18....2
08	21....4	20....3	10....1	14....2
09	22....4	18....3	15....2	14....1
10	18..3.5	13..3.5	7....1	14....2
11	19....4	19..3.5	11....1	17....2
12	22....3	23....4	14....1	21....2
Total R	44	39	16	21
(n)	12	12	12	12

H_o : Median C = Median R = Median R = Median D

Confidence level = .05 df = 3 χ^2 = 7.82

Calculated χ^2 = 27.98

Reject H_o : There are real differences among the medians.

Table 6-8: Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: education.

Faculty Member	Content ΣR_C	Pedagogy ΣR_P	Reputation ΣR_R	Production ΣR_D
01	27....4	19....3	14....1	18....2
02	22....4	18....3	16....2	14....1
03	22....4	13....1	14....2	18....3
04	24....3	27....4	13....1	15....2
05	25..3.5	25..3.5	16....1	17....2
06	22..3.5	19....2	22..3.5	11....1
07	25....4	23....3	15....1	21....2
08	23....4	17..1.5	19....3	17..1.5
09	21....4	20..2.5	20..2.5	14....1
10	23..3.5	20....2	23..3.5	18....1
11	18..3.5	14....1	16....2	18..3.5
12	26....4	23..2.5	18....1	23..2.5
Total R	45	29	23.5	22.5
(n)	12	12	12	12

H_o : Median C = Median R = Median R = Median D

Confidence level = .05 df = 3 χ^2 = 7.82

Calculated χ^2 = 16.23

Reject H_o : There are real differences among the medians.

Table 6-9: Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: engineering.

Faculty Member	Content Σ... R_C	Pedagogy Σ.....R_P	Reputation Σ.....R_R	Production Σ.....R_D
01	19....4	16....3	13....1	14....2
02	21....4	16....2	12....1	17....3
03	20....4	19....3	13....1	18....2
04	21....4	15....2	10....1	20....3
05	18....3	16....2	14....1	23....4
06	23....4	18....2	15....1	20....3
07	20....4	17....1	18....2	19....3
08	19....3	21....4	15....1	18....2
09	20..2.5	20..2.5	18....1	21....4
10	20....4	15....2	11....1	16....3
11	20....4	17....3	08....1	11....2
12	19....4	15....1	17....3	16....2
Total R	44.5	27.5	15	33
(n)	12	12	12	12

H_o : Median C = Median R = Median R = Median D

Confidence level = .05 df = 3 χ^2 = 7.82

Calculated χ^2 = 22.53

Reject H_o : There are real differences among the medians.

Table 6-10: Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: humanities.

Faculty Member	Content $\Sigma \ldots R_C$	Pedagogy $\Sigma \ldots R_P$	Reputation $\Sigma \ldots R_R$	Production $\Sigma \ldots R_D$
01	25....4	21....3	20....2	13....1
02	21..2.5	16....4	21..2.5	14....1
03	22..3.5	22..3.5	09....1	10....2
04	22....4	20....2	11....1	17....3
05	22....4	19....3	13....1	17....2
06	19..3.5	19..3.5	10....1	15....2
07	25....4	20....3	15....1	16....2
08	19....3	23....4	16..1.5	16..1.5
09	24....3	28....4	13..1.5	13..1.5
10	17....4	14....2	16....3	08....1
11	25....4	24....3	18....2	11....1
12	25....4	21....3	17....1	20....2
Total R	43.5	38	18.5	19
(n)	12	12	12	12

H_o : Median C = Median R = Median R = Median D

Confidence level = .05 df = 3 χ^2 = 7.82

Calculated χ^2 = 25.82

Reject H_o : There are real differences among the medians.

Table 6-11: Friedman's ANOVA applied to ranking of the four-part model within discipline: life sciences.

Faculty Member	Content ∠... R_C	Pedagogy ∠.....R_P	Reputation ∠.....R_R	Production ∠.....R_D
01	22....4	16....2	08....1	19....3
02	25....4	19....1	20....2	23....3
03	22....3	24....4	15....1	21....2
04	20....4	17....3	12....1	15....2
05	17....4	07....1	13....3	12....2
06	21....3	17....2	09....1	22....4
07	21....4	16....1	17....2	19....3
08	22....4	17.5..3	14....1	17....2
09	21....4	16....3	14....1	15....2
10	21....4	16....2	14....1	20....3
11	27....4	26....3	16....1	21....2
12	23....4	18....2	10....1	19....3
Total R	46	27	18	31
(n)	12	12	12	12

H_o : Median C = Median R = Median R = Median D

Confidence level = .05 df = 3 χ^2 = 7.82

Calculated χ^2 = 22.8

Reject H_o : There are real differences among the medians.

Table 6-12: Friedman's ANOVA applied to Ranking of the four-part model within discipline: physical sciences.

Faculty Member	Content Σ... R_C	Pedagogy Σ.....R_P	Reputation Σ.....R_R	Production Σ.....R_D
01	20..2.5	21....4	15....1	20..2.5
02	19....3	15....2	13....1	21....4
03	19..3.5	16....1	19..3.5	18....2
04	18....2	21....4	16....1	20....2
05	23....3	27....4	14....1	22....2
06	21....4	18..2.5	14....1	18..2.5
07	24....4	23....3	10....1	20....2
08	22....4	17....2	20....3	16....1
09	16....2	19....4	12....1	17....3
10	21....4	16....2	13....1	17....3
11	21....4	15..2.5	08....1	15..2.5
12	22....4	17....2	13....1	19....3
Total R	40	33	16.5	30.5
(n)	12	12	12	12

H_o : Median C = Median R = Median R = Median D

Confidence level = .05 df = 3 χ^2 = 7.82

Calculated χ^2 = 14.58

Reject H_o : There are real differences among the medians.

Production value ranked second in engineering and life sciences, and missed second place in the physical science group by only 2 points out of a possible 336 points.

A comparison of the self-described rankings and the developed rankings which is shown in Table 6-13 highlights these shifts. Three disciplinary groups shifted order of ranking: business, engineering, and life sciences. In each case this shift was due to an upward movement in production value items. The shifts were shown numerically in Table 6-4. In life sciences the tie between production and reputation was resolved conclusively with a 59 point differential. In engineering production value slightly overtook pedagogical concerns. The 36 point differential between production and reputation in the business group was noticeable but still less than the same differential in engineering, life sciences, or physical sciences.

There is not a rigorous non-parametric test to determine the significance of individual differences within the data field in the manner that a test such as Newman-Keuls would function for parametric analysis. However, a descriptive examination of the numerical differences in scores by disciplinary groups disclosed an interesting pattern. Table 6-14 displays the scores in rank order for each value group in each disciplinary group and the step differences for each. The median difference is 32 points.

Table 6-13: Comparison of self-described and developed faculty rankings of elements of the four-part model.

Discipline Group		Content	Pedagogy	Reputation	Production
SocS	Self	1	2	3	4
	Developed	1	2	3	4
Busn	Self	1	2	3	4
	Developed	1	2	4	3
Educ	Self	1	2	3	4
	Developed	1	2	3	4
Engr	Self	1	2	4	3
	Developed	1	3	4	2
Humn	Self	1	2	3	4
	Developed	1	2	3	4
Life	Self	1	2	3	3
	Developed	1	3	4	2
Phys	Self	1	2	4	3
	Developed	1	2	4	3

Table 6-14: Faculty patterns in the four-part model.

Engr	Content	Production	Pedagogy	Reputation
Score	240	213	205	164
Step	37	8	41	
Life	Content	Production	Pedagogy	Reputation
Score	262	223	209.5	162
Step	39	13.5	47.5	
Phys	Content	Pedagogy	Production	Reputation
Score	256	225	223	167
Step	21	2	56	
Socs	Content	Pedagogy	Reputation	Production
Score	264	217	185	176
Step	47	32	9	
Educ	Content	Pedagogy	Reputation	Production
Score	278	238	206	204
Step	40	32	2	
Humn	Content	Pedagogy	Reputation	Production
Score	266	253	179	170
Step	13	74	9	
Busn	Content	Pedagogy	Production	Reputation
Score	269	246	196	160
Step	23	50	36	

If it is argued that differences in rank which are below the median difference are less likely to indicate a real difference than those which are above the median difference, a further indication of the disciplinary pattern emerges. The line struck under adjacent value groups in Table 6-14 indicates those groups whose differentiation is less than the median separation and is therefore suspect. For social sciences, education, and humanities the production value group and reputation value group blend together and as a set occupy a weak last place. For engineering, life sciences, and the physical sciences production issues move sharply upward and blend with pedagogical issues to form a set occupying second place with reputation value issues remaining isolated in last place. The business group breaks out of the pattern. A sub-pattern emerges in which business, humanities, and the physical sciences all show a closure between content and pedagogy. Taken together, this pattern of spread in ranks is another element in arguing that the displayed differences are real and exist along disciplinary lines.

Remarks on Specific Criteria.

To this point the examination has looked only at patterns established for the four value areas in the model without attempting to examine the specific notional statements which faculty members were asked to consider.

Tables 6-15 through 6-21 show a simple item analysis for each disciplinary group. The item number, value area, and score of each item which scored above the median score for each disciplinary group is displayed in order of assigned score. Tables 6-22 and 6-23 list the specific items which ranked above and below the median score in 4 or more disciplinary groups. A comparison of this distribution to the information in Table 6-14 continues to support both the internal ranking structures by discipline and the emerging disciplinary patterns.

Figure 6-1 summarizes the two basic patterns that appeared within the faculty survey group in ranking textbook selection criteria as utilized in the four-part model. These patterns are supported in the self-described rankings, the developed rankings, and the item analysis. The results suggest the existence of a major pair of decision triads in textbook selection criteria. In one pattern, production values as defined within the model fall away into a distinctly secondary role unrelated to pedagogical concerns. In the second, concerns of pedagogical value and production value are clearly related and of major importance. The patterns separate those disciplines with clear roots in the "hard sciences" from those with roots in the social sciences and humanities. There is also a moderate convergence of pedagogy and content in the physical sciences which is of interest in

Table 6-15: Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: social sciences.

Item		Area	Score
17.	Timeliness/currency of material	C	46
8.	Basic factual accuracy	C	45
5.	Range or aspects of subject covered	C	43
23.	Portrayal of contrasting methods, positions, or interpretations	C	38
4.	Freedom from racial/ethnic bias	P	38
16.	Scholarly reputation of author	R	36
15.	Freedom from sex bias	P	35
26.	Methodology used by author	C	34
20.	Challenge to students	P	33
19.	Recommendations from colleagues	R	32
7.	Reading level	P	32
18.	Student interest or acceptance	P	31
21.	Price	D	31
11.	Reputation of publisher	R	30

Content: 5 items

Pedagogy: 5 items

Reputation: 3 items

Production: 1 item

Table 6-16: Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: business.

Item		Area	Score
5.	Range or aspects of subject covered	C	47
8.	Basic factual accuracy	C	47
17.	Timeliness/currency of material	C	47
18.	Student interest or acceptance	P	42
20.	Challenge to students	P	40
7.	Reading level	P	39
9.	Quality/appropriateness of graphic data display	D	35
13.	Treatment of ethical concerns	C	35
26.	Methodolgy used by author	C	35
4.	Freedom from racial/ethnic bias	P	33
25.	Quality of proof reading	D	33
23.	Portrayal of contrasting methods, positions, or interpretations	C	32
28.	Quality of exercises, workbooks, quizzes, and peripherals	P	32
19.	Recommendation of colleagues	R	32

Content: 6 items

Pedagogy: 5 items

Reputation: 1 item

Production: 2 items

Table 6-17: Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: education.

Item		Area	Score
8.	Basic factual accuracy	C	47
17.	Timeliness/currency of material	C	46
5.	Range or aspects of subject covered	C	39
23.	Portrayal of contrasting methods, positions, or interpretations	C	39
20.	Challenge to students	P	39
16.	Scholarly reputation of author	R	38
26.	Methodology used by author	C	36
4.	Freedom from racial/ethnic bias	P	36
9.	Quality or appropriateness of graphic data displays	D	36
13.	Treatment of ethical concerns	C	35
12.	Instructional design/format	P	35
15.	Freedom from sex bias	P	34
18.	Student interest or acceptance	P	34

Content: 6 items

Pedagogy: 6 items

Reputation: 1 item

Production: 1 item

Table 6-18: Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: engineering.

Item		Area	Score
8.	Basic factual accuracy	C	47
5.	Range or aspects of subject covered	C	44
17.	Timeliness/currency of material	C	43
28.	Quality of exercises, workbooks, quizzes, or other peripherals	P	39
20.	Challenge to student	P	38
26.	Methodology used by author	C	26
9.	Quality or appropriateness of graphic data displays	D	36
27.	Overall workmanship	D	35
3.	Quality or appropriateness of illustrations	D	35
7.	Reading level	P	33
18.	Student interest or acceptance	P	33
12.	Instructional design/format	P	32
19.	Recommendations of colleagues	R	31
21.	Price	D	21

Content: 4 items

Pedagogy: 5 items

Reputation: 1 item

Production: 4 items

Table 6-19: Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: humanities.

Item		Area	Score
8.	Basic factual accuracy	C	47
5.	Range or aspect of subject covered	C	45
17.	Timeliness/currency of material	C	41
20.	Challenge to students	P	41
4.	Freedom from racial/ethnic bias	P	39
18.	Student interest or acceptance	P	39
26.	Methodology used by author	C	38
15.	Freedom from sex bias	P	38
23.	Portrayal of contrasting positions, methods, or interpretations	C	37
19.	Recommendations of colleagues	R	37
7.	Reading level	P	36
12.	Instructional design/format	P	31
16.	Scholarly reputation of author	R	31
27.	Overall workmanship	D	30

Content: 5 items

Pedagogy: 6 items

Reputation: 2 items

Production: 1 item

Table 6-20: Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: life sciences.

Item		Area	Score
8.	Basic factual accuracy	C	48
5.	Range or aspects of subject covered	C	45
17.	Timeliness or currency of material	C	42
18.	Student interest or acceptance	P	38
10.	Presence of deliberate inter-disciplinary material	C	37
20.	Challenge to students	P	20
9.	Quality or appropriateness of graphic data displays	D	37
27.	Overall workmanship	D	36.5
3.	Quality or appropriateness of illustrations	D	36
7.	Reading level	P	35
26.	Methodology used by author	C	34.5
23.	Portrayal of contrasting methods, positions, or interpretations	C	32.5
25.	Quality of proofreading	D	32
19.	Recommendations of colleagues	R	31

Content: 6 items

Pedagogy: 3 items

Reputation: 1 item

Production: 4 items

Table 6-21: Items scoring above the median in the four-part model: physical sciences.

Item		Area	Score
8.	Basic factual accuracy	C	47
5.	Range or aspects of subject covered	C	45
18.	Student interest or acceptance	P	41
17.	Timeliness/currency of material	C	40
7.	Reading level	P	38
20.	Challenge to students	P	38
3.	Quality or appropriateness of illustrations	D	38
9.	Quality or appropriateness of graphic displays	D	38
27.	Overall workmanship	D	36
26.	Methodology used by author	C	35
19.	Recommendation of colleagues	R	34
12.	Instructional design/format	P	32
28.	Quality of exercises, workbooks, quizzes, or peripherals	P	32
21.	Price	D	32

Content: 4 items

Pedagogy: 5 items

Reputation: 1 item

Production: 4 items

Table 6-22: Items scoring above the median in four or more disciplines in the four-part model.

Area Item	Number of Groups
Content	
5. Range or aspects of subject covered	7
8. Basic factual accuracy	7
17. Timeliness/currency of material	7
23. Portrayal of contrasting methods, positions, or interpretations	5
26. Methodology used by author	7
Pedagogy	
4. Freedom from racial/ethnic bias	4
7. Reading level	7
12. Instructional design/format	4
18. Student interest or acceptance	7
20. Challenge to students	7
Reputation	
19. Recommendation of colleagues	6
Production	
9. Quality or appropriateness of graphic displays	5
27. Overall workmanship	4

Table 6-23: Items scoring below the median in four or more disciplines in the four-part model.

Area Item	Number of Groups
Content	
10. Presence of interdisciplinary content	6
13. Treatment of ethical concerns inherent in subject	5
Pedagogy	
15. Freedom from sex bias	4
28. Quality of exercises, workbooks, quizzes, or peripherals	4
Reputation	
2. Historical stature of text in field	7
11. Reputation of publisher	6
14. Information in published reviews	7
16. Scholarly reputation of author	4
22. Citations in other books or articles	7
24. Direct acquaintance with author	7
Production	
1. Overall graphic quality	7
3. Quality or appropriateness of illustrations	4
6. Physical size	7
21. Price	4
25. Quality of proofreading	5

PATTERN 1: Social Sciences, Education, Humanities

High Range	Mid Range	Low Range
Content	Pedagogy	Reputation Production

PATTERN 2: Engineering, Life Sciences, Physical Sciences

High Range	Mid Range	Low Range
Content	Pedagogy Production	Reputation

Figure 6-1: Decision triads: major disciplinary patterns in ranking of textbook selection criteria.

itself, although it does not appear to break the overall pattern. At this point it is necessary to turn to the supporting information found in the narrative answers provided by faculty respondents concerning these and supporting issues.

3. SELECTION CRITERIA: FACULTY DISCUSSION

Introduction.

Faculty discussion of the four-part model illuminated the attitudes that shape the character of faculty decisions about textbook selection. This report of that discussion will consider comments about the four areas of the selection model, the separate issue of price, and supporting questions concerning utilizing self-authored and locally-authored textbooks.

Considerations of Content Value.

The most consistently powerful segment of the model is the content value area. Since textbooks traditionally are carriers of content, it is not surprising to see this area ranking first. Internally, faculty discussion revealed two distinct approaches to content. The first approach essentially says that content is derivative of requirements of the course. The second approach says that

content is derivative of some corpus of the discipline and should be considered in terms beyond the immediate needs of the course.

The first approach was widely held. A business faculty member said "the match of content to course objectives is the overwhelming consideration." An engineering faculty member agreed, saying that he tries "to find a book that covers the material we want first." In this approach the timeliness of the material becomes a key measure. An education faculty member said, "Updating the content is the number one reason to change a textbook." "Timeliness of presentation gets the predisposition for selection," according to a humanities professor. Numerous faculty members mentioned the importance of up-to-date editions. A life sciences professor who perceived his field as rapidly evolving combined autonomy, content, and currency when he said that he asks first of a text, "Does it agree with the way I see the field evolving?"

The second view argues that a textbook must have some merit beyond its immediate match to the syllabus. The textbook must also be a reference book. An engineering professor argued, "A textbook serves as a lifetime resource book... it survives beyond the needs of the classroom." A life sciences faculty member said that the "reference work perspective is a primary perspective" in

selecting a text. Another engineering professor held that a book should "have more content than just the course" and should be "an addition to a professional library."

This concept of a textbook as a reference work for a professional library appeared spontaneously in many interviews. A count of worksheets shows at least 20 faculty members (24%) agreeing with the idea that a textbook should have lasting value in a professional library. This position was encountered in social sciences, business, education, engineering, life sciences, and physical sciences. However, it first appeared in the engineering faculty and was most strongly expressed in the engineering and physical science faculties. It was a common experience during interviews in these two faculties to have respondents take a textbook from a shelf and point out that they had used the book when they were students, still used it, and often had students refer to it. (They also were likely to remark that it was out of print.) This did not seem to reflect a static attitude but rather a belief that there was an essential and complex factual core to the discipline which must be mastered and which would remain a foundation for the student's future practice.

It is interesting to note that many of these same faculty members were also disturbed by a perceived lack

of student understanding of this issue. An engineering faculty member who subscribed to the idea conceded, "I don't think students are building professional libraries." Another said he was sure that they are not and suggested that a survey of used book sales to the bookstore would prove that students are not building such libraries.

Faculty members are also concerned with the adequacy and rigor of content in modern textbooks. An education faculty member complained that books have become "cookbooks, written for to large a populace." A social sciences professor contented that "encyclopedic length" caused by trying to cover everything results in nothing being covered well. A life sciences professor displayed a textbook over 1000 pages long and argued that the urge to cover everything for everybody was producing unusable books which lack rigor. Another life sciences faculty member worried that the drive to cover everything in a rapidly evolving discipline meant the sacrifice of the "historical structure and basic content of the discipline." Finally, another life science faculty respondent concluded:

> At the lower level many books are published which are just awful, just plain wrong. You must find the one with the fewest mistakes.

It is necessary to note one final aspect of the discussion of textbook content: the rather soft support for the areas of interdisciplinary content and coverage of

ethical concerns. These areas were represented by items 10 and 13 on the instrument. Interdisciplinary content was a major factor only in the life sciences; a disciplinary area characterized by rapid growth and blurring of traditional boundaries. All six other discipline groups reject this concern. (See Table 6-23) The term "interdisciplinary" was clearly understood and specifically rejected. This is demonstrated by the unanimous approval (above median in 7 of 7 groups) of the issue "portrayal of contrasting methodologies, interpretations, or positions." This rejection is a clear reflection of the fragmented and specialized nature of the faculty and the curriculum along external, disciplinary lines.

"Treatment of ethical concerns inherent in the subject" appeared as an above the median issue in only two discipline groups: business and education. The actual number of respondents who rated this issue as "very important" or "critically important" is shown in Table 6-24. That ethical concerns should be of importance in pedagogical materials for business and education is not surprising. Their relatively low to non-existent standing in other disciplines is more difficult to explain. Initial reactions such as "cantilevered beams don't have ethics" seem truncated and inadequate. This is an

Table 6-24: Extract from faculty ranking of item 13, ethical concerns, in the four-part model.

Discipline Group	N	Critical Importance	Considerable Importance
SocS	12	0	7
Busn	12	3	5
Educ	12	4	4
Engr	12	0	0
Humn	12	3	3
Life	12	1	1
Phys	12	1	0
Total	84	12	20
		14%	24%

area that would seem to call for serious research in both faculty attitudes and textbook development.

Pedagogical Concerns.

The major pedagogical concerns in textbook selection were clearly those which revolved around accessibility and challenge. An engineering faculty member argued that "the manner of presentation, writing, and use of math conventions" are major factors in student comprehension. These concerns are found across the board. "How well is the book written?" asks a life sciences faculty member. A physical sciences faculty member said that "wide variation in student preparation" makes pedagogical and accessibility questions a key concern. An engineering professor said that reading level is a major concern in his discipline. In humanities, where both English and foreign grammars and literature are involved, reading level logically drifts toward the status of a content concern in its own right.

Some respondents felt that these areas act as disqualifiers because of the preparation of modern students, preventing the selection of a book that might otherwise be choosen. A humanities professor stated, "There is a sea-change in the audience; these are non-readers." A life sciences professor said, somewhat sharply, "Books which challenge students (at the

introductory level) are a failure every time." However, this did not appear to be a majority perception; at least not one which faculty members were willing to openly express.

Two pedagogical items did not achieve strong overall support: quality of exercises, workbooks, and quizzes and design for instructional format. The peripheral products of exercises, workbooks and quizzes achieved majority selection in the disciplinary groups of business, engineering, and physical sciences where case study or problem solving courses are common. An engineering professor remarked that the quality of exercises should be raised to a major element of content. Another said that the obsolescence of exercises and the eventual accumulation of "crib files" among students are major motivations to change a textbook even though the content has remained stable.

In the countering position, a social sciences professor said succinctly that exercises and the like are "a waste of time" and represent an acknowledgement that the faculty users are "not qualified to teach the course themselves." As might be suspected from the degree of concern for autonomous judgement in the discussion, there was little interest in quiz or test item data banks. A physical sciences professor distinguished these from exercise sets and said he has "no respect" for users of

prewritten quizzes. In all of the discussion of peripherals not one instance of expressed support for test banks was encountered.

The item "instructional design or format" proved slightly problematical. This item was intended to represent the degree to which the overall design of the book supported or influenced a pedagogical approach or style. Issues of content sequence, coverage, use of illustrations and sidebars, and similar ideas were confused with this. Notions such as "Does this book facilitate a Socratic approach?" or "This book is easy to use with group discussion" were not encountered. However, two intriguing conjectures did appear spontaneously. The first concerned an affect of textbook design on student learning. It was advanced by a life sciences professor who observed that:

> We have reached the point where textbooks are similar to T.V. ... concern with format, white space, color and such ... has reduced the extent to which students take notes. They write in the margins except where they are concerned with resale value of the book.

The second conjecture proposed that textbooks are in some fashion formative of pedagogical behavior rather than derivative for individual faculty. A humanities professor, in an extremely engaged interview, offered the comment that, "I would speculate that most faculty are using textbooks as crutches. Lectures and textbooks both serve

as a covering mechanism for complexity." This comment was paralleled by a life science faculty member who suggested that, "Most faculty adopt a mood that is very similar to the mood of the text." The use of a textbook, he argued, "generates a feedback loop" that informs the style of the faculty member. The related notions that textbooks are chosen as a crutch in the face of complexity and that they themselves then function to shape pedagogical behavior open a realm of possible research questions about the faculty which are somehow the equivalent of more conventional research about how pedagogical materials effect leaning style among students.

Finally, it is necessary to address the apparently weak showing of the categories of racial/ethnic bias and sexual bias as pedagogical concerns. The rankings are perhaps not as weak as they appear at first. The major factor suppressing these two areas is a simple perception of applicability. Almost without exception respondents in the areas of engineering and the sciences found these concerns to be "not applicable." This is not to say that the faculty members were insensitive to the issues. Most respondents in these disciplines would stop at these two items and spontaneously defend their low rank on the detail form. The basic argument was, "I would reject a book that had such biases, but I have not seen one. I don't understand how you would write one." That the study

of the design of a cantilever beam is not racially or sexually sensitive is perhaps more supportable than the notion that it is not ethically sensitive. The lower ranking of sexual bias in the business discipline group is more problematical and might call for more detailed consideration.

It must also be noted that there is some counter or inverse reaction these issues disguised in the numbers. A humanities professor objected to the "sanitized" approach of modern textbooks. A social sciences professor said that he values the deliberate, recognized exploration of biases of all sorts and does not care for the "non-biased fakery of modern educational writing." A second social sciences faculty member objected to "contrived freedom from bias." He felt that where an original scholarly "sin" was to alter data to preserve a bias, the current sin is to "alter data to hide the existence of biases."

Overall, pedagogical concerns comprise the area in the model most sensitive to perceptions of difference as to the level of course. Table 6-3 above indicated a sharp upward shift in the placement of pedagogical concerns in the evaluation of books for lower-division courses in every discipline group except physical sciences where it was already in second place. Seen in light of the concerns with readability, accessibility, student comprehension, and similar issues this is a logical pattern.

Reputational Value.

The consideration of the power of reputational value in textbook selection is important to the underlying idea of cosmopolitan recognition of textbook authorship that this inquiry pursues. In this regard, the third place overall position of reputation in the self-described rankings and its lower fourth place in the developed ranks are important. The discussion of reputation with the respondents involved a book's reputation among colleagues, the reputation of the authors of textbooks, and the reputation of the content of textbooks.

Only one of the notions attached to reputation achieved a majority support: colleagues' recommendations. This is a direct extension of the ideas of autonomy and direct access explored in the consideration of information sources. This function was normally quite localized within departments. A physical sciences professor, heavily engaged in selecting introductory course textbooks, did state that he routinely "spoke to departments in other universities" about experience with various books which were being considered. This seems to be the exception, not the common practice. Beyond the attention to the recommendation of colleagues the picture concerning cosmopolitan reputation is much less clear.

There were certainly faculty members who held that the reputation of the author is an important element in

textbook selection. A social sciences professor, objecting to "manufactured" or assembled textbooks, felt that the reputation of an identifiable author is very important. An education professor said, "There are certain authors and publishers I prefer." An engineering faculty member, pointing to a certain book, said, "I know the author; I like his point of view."

It was often the subject matter expertise that is being considered at this point rather than a specific pedagogical expertise. A physical sciences professor said he will "seriously consider books written by an expert." A life science professor displayed three major textbooks in his discipline with Nobel Laureates as authors. But a humanities professor felt that this is mainly a publisher's device. "Publishers try to have a scholar of moment associated with the book" for purposes of recognition and marketing.

Other faculty members are not sure. "The reputation of the author is an important trigger; not proof," according to an engineering professor. "Big names do not often write textbooks," said a physical sciences faculty member. Another felt that textbooks are too different. "Prior reputation does not always carry forward to (writing) textbooks." A life sciences faculty member recounted that he has chosen textbooks based on a "notable author" and that it has not always been successful.

Faculty members often expressed the opinion that many first-rate textbooks are written by people who are relatively unknown in terms of research scholarship and that this makes relatively little difference. "I never pay attention; I would just as soon not know who wrote it," concluded a social sciences professor.

But what of books that reach "classic" status in a field; books like Odum in ecology and Samuelson in economics? That there are classic textbooks is a recognized possibility. "There are classics in (this field); standards by which others are judged," said a business professor. An engineering professor said there are "classic texts which stood the test for fifty years." An education professor called attention to "classic textbooks within the field that endure." However, it is not clear that this reputation necessarily accrues to the author. A business professor argued, "Textbooks gain a reputation; their authors do not." Others often note that the number of editions a book has gone through is a clear measure of success; but revisions and updates are quite commonly done by persons other than the original author. This relatively uncertain visibility of the author of texts in selection criteria echoes the finding in the responses of journal editors that the author of the text plays a relatively minor role in the selection of textbooks for review.

Another major variation on reputation revolves around the content of the book. This mechanism is largely behind the rise in reputational value in the upper levels. A social sciences professor said that certain books are chosen because there are "thinkers I want to expose the students to." A humanities professor said that, at the graduate level, "You cannot ignore certain persons." This pressure operates powerfully in the humanities and social sciences where anthologies are common. A humanities professor believed that while certain publishers of anthologies "hold the high ground," it is the clearly separate issue of the reputation of the included authors, not of the editors, that makes the difference. Another agreed, saying that the reputation of the included authors becomes in effect part of content and that the reputation of the editors is subordinate.

At this point, the role of reputation remains difficult to assess fully. Only two notions emerge with any clarity. The first is a clear cut reinforcement of the direct access and colleague recommendation mechanisms disclosed in the examination of sources of information. The second is a negative one to an extent; the possibility that the book or its contents accrue reputation value but that the authors do not. This aspect will be re-examined in discussion of the scholarly rewards of authoring textbooks. For the present the inquiry is left hanging

as typified by the business professor (0604) who remarked uncomfortably that he had "a gut feel that it (reputation) plays more of a role than is reflected in faculty conversation."

Production Value.

The area of production values shows the clearest and most directly understandable results. In the social sciences/education/humanities pattern production fell into the low range group with the lowest scores. In the engineering/sciences pattern it fell into the mid-range group and challenged pedagogy for second scores in some cases. The difference in the numbers and the conversation was stark. Issues of production played almost no role in the conversations of the faculty in the social sciences/education/humanities groups. Where they did, it was in normally in negative terms. The references were to "bells and whistles," unnecessary embellishments to disguise a lack of merit.

For the engineering/sciences groups the situation is exactly the opposite. Production values contain "truly important virtues" as an engineering professor described them. The change revolved most directly around the role of illustrations and graphic data display. A life sciences professor pointed out that "the quality of figures and illustrations overlap into content" when he said that

the "choice of electron micrographs" is a major factor in selecting a textbook for him. A physical sciences professor said, "Displays, illustrations, and graphics become part of the content."

A second related pattern also appeared in the engineering, life sciences, and physical sciences groups. The area of overall workmanship appeared above the median selection line in all three discipline groups. An engineering professor explained this when he related the durability of a book to its value as an addition to a lifetime library. The regard for a book as a resource beyond the needs of a quarter or semester calls into play concerns for its quality as a physical artifact as well as an intellectual one. But durability, quality illustrations, and effective graphics are often expensive virtues in today's market. This thought leads to an separate examination of the role of price in the selection of textbooks.

4. PRICE AND TEXTBOOK SELECTION IN THE FACULTY

In the discussion of production issues in textbook selection the faculty respondents were asked about price pressures. In the detail questionnaire this was item 21, and the responses are shown in Table 6-25. During the

Table 6-25: Extract of faculty response to item 21, price, in the four-part model.

Discipline Group	Total Score N=12 (Possible Score = 48)	Mode Response
Physical Science	32	Considerable Importance
Social Science	31	Considerable Importance
Engineering	29	Considerable Importance
Education	28	Secondary Importance
Life Science	24.5	Secondary Importance Not Important
Humanities	22	Not Important
Business	21	Secondary Importance Not Important

discussion each respondent was asked, "Has the price of textbooks become a serious enough pressure to become a separate consideration?" Table 6-26 displays the narrative responses when characterized as yes or affirmative, no or negative, and no response or opinion. This table shows a somewhat sharper picture than table 6-25. From a disciplinary standpoint the only major inference is a possible lack of concern with price on the part of the business and humanities faculty members suggested by the low rankings in each table. It is not disciplinary variations that stand out in the narrative discussions but rather individual opinions.

Affirmative and negative responses were found in all of the groups, and they strongly resembled each other across disciplinary lines. Affirmative responses generally ranged from those who were aware of concerns over price but have made no response to those who have made some modifications in textbook selection to those who considered price a primary disqualifying factor in the market. The negative responses fell into two categories. First there was a group of faculty members who recognized price levels but saw no addressable problem due to market uniformity. Then there were those who felt from a pedagogical standpoint that price is simply not a proper concern.

Table 6-26: Faculty perception of price of textbooks as a separate selection consideration and cited resistance price levels.

Discipline Group	Yes	No	No Response	Resistance Price Level Range Cited
Social Science	9	1	2	$30 - $50
Business	3	7	2	$40
Education	10	2	0	$50
Engineering	7	5	0	$50 - $90
Humanities	4	7	1	None cited
Life Sciences	7	4	1	$40 - $80
Physical Sciences	7	3	2	$40 - $85
Total	47	29	8	
	56%	34%	10%	

Those who feel that price is a significant criteria spoke quite strongly. "I cringe," said a social sciences faculty member. "It is a dominant factor. I have picked second choice books," said a business professor. An education faculty member stated that he is "embarrassed by books that are prohibitive" and acknowledges that price alone can be a "killer." An engineering professor relates price to the professional library issue when he says that not only have prices "become prohibitive," but that engineering students are starting to sell their books. (It should be noted that another faculty member in engineering countered with the remark, "I'm somewhat of two minds about that; bitching about books while driving a Trans-AM.") "They charge a sinful price for books," concluded one engineering professor who showed a key textbook that he has dropped due to its $87.00 price tag.

In addition to these responses, there was another more subtle result of price. The most commonly expressed influence of price was that high prices were causing faculty members to stop using multiple texts. Respondents in all disciplines reported that they had either stopped using multiple texts or were increasingly hesitant to do so. Textbooks are "inordinately expensive. I've abandoned multiple texts," said an education professor A humanities professor reported that he now uses anthologies rather than multiple texts. An education

professor said that price is "enough of an irritant" that he is considering eliminating textbooks and going with a reproduced course package. An education professor most clearly articulated the faculty discomfort with this situation when he makes the comment that this curtailment of diversity would ultimately "limit the freedom of both students and authors."

There was also a range of faculty members who are still considering the issue. "I'm in tune to that," offered an education professor who said he was "not sure of actual prices, but now I'm curious." A humanities professor avoids the issue by using mainly mass market paperbacks. "Price is a consideration only if all else is equal," said an education professor. A physical sciences faculty member who had not considered price before reported that it is becoming a concern, particularly in the text review for semester transition.

On the other side of the fence, a social sciences professor said that price is not a discriminator because prices are "generally uniform." This was a common response among those who discount price as an issue. Prices "are not often a factor, they are too uniform," said a business professor who added, "But they are awful." A life sciences faculty member remarked, "They (prices) are not very variable." These respondents may or may not be aware of actual price levels. They may or may not decide

to take action in the future. The more interesting and influential negative replies were from those who rejected price as an appropriate concern or criteria.

"I try not to let that be a factor. I don't want to know or be influenced by a short-term factor," stated a business faculty member. Another member in the same department said, "It is not apparent to me that it is much of a factor. I don't think that professors generally know the price." A humanities professor stated, "Price is no object. Given all the other intangibles there is no room to worry about it." (He did later admit that he had been "shocked" to discover that a paperback for a course carried a $25.00 price.) A physical sciences professor considered that "very few books are out of reason" and argues that "value returned" is the proper criteria, not purchase price.

The most commonly expressed resistance price level was 50 dollars. Actual rejections were cited in the 50 to 90 dollar price range. The general character of the responses was that of an individual decision made autonomously with no departmental or disciplinary input. There was virtually no recognition of any corporate power within the faculty on an institutional or disciplinary basis to influence the market in any fashion. In only one instance, an engineering discipline, did a disciplinary or collective strategy appear. In this case the faculty

member reported using a book buying list of a disciplinary association which allowed as much as a 50% savings to the students compared to bookstore channels. Difficulty in obtaining price information from catalogs and from publishers' representatives was also cited. The bookstore was criticized for excessive lead times, high pressure remainder or buy-back policies that curtailed selection freedom, and in one case failure to honor a publisher's discount that had been negotiated by the department. But it must be emphasized that there was no useful evidence of any sense on the part of the faculty that they might influence the price situation in either the market or the institution in any way. The only response seems to be to curtail their own range of action. A humanities professor unwittingly summed up this passive air when he said:

> I don't notice price as much as I should. I'm often not aware of the price; although I complain about doctors who don't know the price of medicine.

5. FACULTY SELECTION OF SELF-AUTHORED AND LOCALLY AUTHORED TEXTBOOKS

Faculty respondents were presented with two supplementary questions regarding textbook selection as related to authorship. The first was "If you have ever authored or co-authored a textbook(s), have you used one or more of them in your own courses?" This question was

asked only of those respondents who had indicated that they had authored/co-authored a published textbook. The second question was "Would you use a textbook authored by a member of your own department?" The first question allows for consideration of motivational aspects of textbook authorship and dangers of conflict of interest as related to text selection. The second question involves perceptions of classroom autonomy and dangers of conflict of interest in textbook selection.

Table 6-27 presents the data collected for the first question. This table shows a relatively high percentage (31 of 84 for 37%) of the faculty respondents who reported that they have authored a published textbook. This finding will be expanded in subsequent discussion of the scholarly aspects of textbook authorship. Sixty-five percent (65%) of these respondents stated that they have utilized their own textbooks for instructional purposes.

There were three separate positions represented within the answers to this question. The first is the simple affirmative. An education professor expressed this answer when he states, "Textbooks are written based on your own priorities, so one would certainly expect to use it." His argument was that an author's textbook reflects his sense of "what ought to be." A social sciences professor who has published an upper-division book agreed, saying that since his book was written to

Table 6-27: Faculty use of self-authored textbooks.

Discipline Group	N	Yes	No
Social Science	6	3	3
Business	4	3	1
Education	8	5	3
Engineering	3	3	0
Humanities	7	5	2
Life Science	1	0	1
Physical Science	2	1	1
Totals	31	20	11

"incorporate a new theoretical base and a pedagogical structure" it was "the best book; the only book."

The negative position actually contained two positions. The first was incompatibility with current teaching activities. An engineering professor who does not use his own book said it was simply because, "It doesn't match my actual teaching load." A physical sciences professor said that he did not use his book since it was not in his course area, but that it was used within the department. The second reason given for not using one's own book was the recognition of a conflict of interest issue. A social sciences professor said that he is uncomfortable with the "moral dilemma of requiring students to use my own book." An engineering professor who does not use his own book because it is written at the freshman level where he does not teach still said that he tends to "think it is a bad idea" because of conflict of interest; particularly in large courses. He also said that he does not use his own research publications in graduate seminars.

While it would appear that within the sample the most common reason for not selecting a self-authored text was simple mismatch to course load, there was a clear recognition of a possible conflict of interest. This recognition does not appear to override the faculty's willingness to use self-authored books where those books

were generated with a clear theoretical or pedagogical intent in the mind of the author.

Table 6-28 shows the responses to the second question. Here the face of the data is clear. One hundred percent of the respondents stated that they would be willing to use a textbook authored by a member of their own department. (Some did state that it was a purely hypothetical question, since no one else in their department was qualified to write a text in the areas they taught.) Again, the surface results conceal a complex set of underlying expressions.

Nine respondents indicated that there might be need for extra caution due to possible conflict of interest. A humanities professor called it a "sticky issue," but cited a major precedent at the University of Tennessee, the Harbrace College Handbook. An education professor who indicated that it now presented no problem mentioned that he was involved in a difficult situation in another institution in a "pre-tenure" status. An engineering professor believed that it "has been an area of conflict" in his department. Other respondents also indicated histories of departmental level debate. As in the self-authored book discussion, the possibility that the question changes with the size of the course was present. A business professor and a humanities professor both

Table 6-28: Faculty willingness to use textbooks authored within their own departments.

Discipline Group	Yes	No
Social Sciences	12	0
Business	12	0
Education	12	0
Engineering	12	0
Humanities	12	0
Life Sciences	12	0
Physical Sciences	12	0
Total	84	0

speculated that, "Course size could raise the conflict of interest issue."

Concern over the conflict of interest issue does appear to be a minority position. One life sciences professor aggressively rejected it, saying that a such arguments amount to "impugning my ethical standards." Fourteen respondents stated that they are currently using or have previously used books authored within the department. Three other respondents indicated that they would prefer to use such a book if applicable. A business professor said he "might automatically place one at the top of the list." The clear majority of the respondents simply indicated that a book authored by another member of their own department would compete in the marketplace. The expressed feeling was "no automatic exclusion; no automatic advantage." While the faculty may be "sensitive to the issue" as a business professor said, it does not appear to be an overriding mechanism for or against a book.

6. DEPARTMENT HEADS AND TEXTBOOK SELECTION

Introduction.

Department heads were provided with the descriptive statements of the elements of the four-part model. After

an explanation of the origins of the model in the literature, they were asked to rank the four elements of the model in importance in selecting a textbook. They were asked to consider not only their own teaching practice but also their concept of what was most appropriate for the mission of their department. They were then asked a series of questions concerning textbook selection procedures at the departmental level. The purpose of this pattern of questions was not to replicate the faculty data but to garner some view of the influence of department heads in textbook selection.

The Four Part Model.

In considering the self-described rankings of the elements of the four part model, three types of responses were again encountered: a single overall ranking, responses regarding upper-division books, and responses regarding lower-division books. As in the faculty data, these responses are shown in three tables. The first, Table 6-29, shows the combined scores and ranks of all responses scored from highest = 1 to lowest = 4. Table 6-30 shows those responses which differentiated lower level books, and Table 6-31 shows those differentiating upper-level. There were 4 respondents per group. One respondent could have given more than one response.

Table 6-29: Total scores and ranks of the elements of the four-part textbook selection model by discipline group: department head responses

Discipline Group	Content Σ....R_c	Pedagogy Σ.....R_p	Reputation Σ.....R_r	Production Σ.....R_d
Social Sciences	7....1	15....2	18....3	20....4
Business	7....1	14....2	19....3	20....4
Education	6....1	13....3	12....2	19....4
Engineering	6....1	7....2	13....3	14....4
Humanities	10....1	14....2	16....3	27....4
Life Science	7....1	10....2	21....4	20....3
Physical Science	12....2	11....1	18....3	19....4
Total	55....1	84....2	117....3	139....4

Table 6-30: Total scores and rank of responses which distinquish lower-division books in the four-part textbook selection model: department head responses.

Discipline Group	Content Σ....R_c	Pedagogy Σ.....R_p	Reputation Σ.....R_r	Production Σ.....R_d
Social Sciences	2....1	4....2	7....3	7....3
Business	2....1	4....2	8....4	6....3
Education	2....1	2....1	3....2	4....3
Engineering	0	0	0	0
Humanities	4....1	5....2	9....3	12....4
Life Science	3....2	2....1	7....3	7....3
Physical Science	6....2	2....1	6....3	6....2
Total	19....1	19....1	40....2	42....3

Table 6-31: Total scores and rank of responses which distinquish upper-division books in the four-part textbook selection model: department head responses.

Discipline Group	Content Σ....R_c	Pedagogy Σ.....R_p	Reputation Σ.....R_r	Production Σ.....R_d
Social Sciences	2....1	8....4	4....2	6....3
Business	3....1	9....3	7....2	11....4
Education	1....1	2....2	3....3	4....4
Engineering	0	0	0	0
Humanities	5....2	7....3	4....1	11....4
Life Science	3....1	5....2	10....3	11....4
Physical Science	3....1	6....3	5....2	6....3
Total	16....1	34....3	31....2	45....4

The variation in the patterns of the response and the highly subjective nature of self-description argues against excessive statistical treatment of these data, but certain things may be suggested by these results. Content again was the most important element. Pedagogy, reputation, and production were ranked second, third, and fourth respectively. There seems to be far less variability than for the faculty. Within the lower-division books, pedagogy again closed with content and the two were separated from reputation by a wide margin. Within the upper-division realm, pedagogy slipped away from content and reputation closed with pedagogy, actually taking second place. This would seem to be in line with the sense expressed in the faculty that exposure to certain thinkers becomes an element of purpose in the upper divisions.

The narrative discussions provided three separate views of content. The first expressed content in terms of match to the course syllabus and intent. An engineering head looked at whether a book is "congruent with the course we intend to teach." A humanities head said that content and pedagogy "flip back and forth" based on the course involved. The view of content as derivative of corpus of disciplinary knowledge was also present. A life sciences head talked about his rapidly changing

discipline and said that textbooks can only survive for about two years until they require a "full revision."

A third view of content appeared in the engineering group. An engineering head who ranked content third said that content is essentially equal among books and therefore not a discriminator because it is "driven by accrediting standards." Another engineering head agreed, arguing that the content structures of texts and textbook choices in his discipline are "heavily shaped by accreditation requirements." This view of an outside force shaping textbook content and selection is an interesting counter to the autonomous views held in the faculty and did not appear openly in the engineering faculty itself.

Pedagogical peripherals such as workbooks and exercises were well supported in the engineering and sciences groups. A life sciences head said that pedagogical elements are a "virtual tie" with content at the lower levels. "Problem sets are a first order consideration," said an engineering head who also added that they are often a "major failure." Again, there was no expressed interest in quizzes and test item banks. Finally, in one of the few direct discussions of textbooks as carriers of a pedagogical vision, a physical sciences head stated the belief that, "A well authored text...should display an educational philosophy, inherent and visible in

display an educational philosophy, inherent and visible in the book."

As was the case in the faculty, there were no discussions of the ethical considerations of a subject or discipline as presented by textbooks. Nor were there active discussions of racial and sexual biases except where those biases might be considered as content considerations such as in selections in anthologies, demographic studies, or the like.

Reputational value again moved upward in the upper- and graduate-level textbooks. A humanities head echoed the faculty when he cited the "need to consider certain individuals" at the graduate level. A social sciences head believed that reputation of the text and author becomes "very important" in large schools and graduate programs.

Additionally, there was more apparent recognition of the reputation of the author of the text. An education head said that the identity of the author is a "trigger." A humanities head said that there are "names to conjure with" and that in his "conservative department" textbooks "tend to have an established reputation before we consider them." An engineering head said, "A young author can do a good text and build a reputation." A physical sciences head said, "A successful textbook will add a thousand times more to your reputation than a hundred

paltry articles." These arguments border on questions of scholarly activity, but they indicate a sense of name recognition in the authorship of textbooks. There is some disagreement. An education head who has written textbooks still felt that "the ultimate audience is not necessarily interested in the author," but this remark also included the sense of the student audience as well as the faculty.

The department heads also spoke more actively to the reputation of publishers. An engineering head who said that the market for his area is relatively small said that publishers who "don't do junk" are remembered. A physical sciences head noted that the "orientation and history" of publishers are known, and that there are "publishers with a very poor reputation." A social sciences head believed that "the book salesman or saleswoman has a major influence beyond the interior of the book" and that the "traveller and continuity of support may overwhelm all other things." This was the strongest statement of support for publishers' representatives encountered in the entire interview process. It indicates that even though publishers' representatives were not generally placed very high in the rankings, quality personal marketing efforts can still influence departments.

Production concerns were again clear-cut in the narratives. The engineering and science discipline department heads spoke consistently of the need for

quality figures, illustrations, photographs, and data displays. A physical sciences head, himself involved in a textbook project, said, "Production and illustration are important; (this discipline) requires three dimensional thinking."

7. PRICE SENSITIVITY AMONG DEPARTMENT HEADS

Discussion of textbook price also figured in the department heads' consideration of production value. Using the same categorization as employed the price discussion in the faculty, Table 6-32 indicates that 50% of the department heads felt that price had become a separate issue for consideration. For some it had clearly reached the level of a discriminator. However, in only one instance did a department head indicate a direct intervention role. In that case the head stated that he has sent a memo alerting faculty to the need for caution in text selection in the face of price increases.

The negative responses were again split between the perception that prices are uniform and therefore cannot be a discriminator regardless of the level and the philosophical position that price is not a legitimate concern. A business head reiterated this position by calling textbook price "a marginal cost that is trivial compared to the cost of education." The business groups

Table 6-32: Department head recognition of price as a distinctly separate selection consideration.

Discipline Group	Yes	No	No Response
Social Sciences	3	1	0
Business	0	3	1
Education	3	1	0
Engineering	3	0	1
Humanities	2	1	1
Life Science	1	3	0
Physical Science	2	1	1
Total	14	10	4
	50%	36%	14%

generally did not express much concern over price, nor did the life sciences groups. In the case of the life sciences groups it appeared that the concern for currency in a rapidly changing area was strong enough to make higher prices relatively unimportant.

8. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES IN TEXTBOOK SELECTION

Department head respondents were asked three distinct questions about departmental level procedures in selecting textbooks. The first was, "Are you systematically informed as to what textbooks are used for instructional purposes within your department?" An interesting finding emerges here as shown in Table 6-33. The base-line result for this question might have been expected to be "yes," since University of Tennessee procedures call for department head review and approval of purchase orders, including textbook orders through the bookstore. Still, 10 department heads did not consider that they were routinely or systematically informed regarding the textbooks in use.

Given the administrative requirements cited, this can only represent an active delegation. This delegation was of two types. In one variety, the department level function was actively delegated to formal instructional divisions or major committees within the department. In

Table 6-33: Are department heads systematically informed about textbooks in use?

Discipline Group	Yes	Informal	No
Social Science	3	0	1
Business	3	0	1
Education	1	0	3
Engineeering	4	0	0
Humanities	1	2	1
Life Science	1	1	2
Physical Science	2	0	2
Totals	15	3	10
	54%	10%	36%

this situation the delegation of authority and the resulting information base was clearly along some pedagogical line. This situation was identified in only two of the ten departments. In the other eight the delegation is more administrativve. "The secretary has ordering authority; I'm not sure if she signs," said an education head. There is a "high degree of delegation" in the department said a life sciences head who "trusts his faculty" in the matter without a clear notion of what has actually been ordered.

Of the 18 department heads who are informed formally or informally, five clearly stated that they feel their information is strictly administrative and is derived simply from signing the purchase orders. Three department heads were closely involved. These three maintained desk copies of all books in use and were aware of all major changes. The remaining ten heads tracked textbooks occasionally; watching for problems, consulting with committees on request, and the like.

Department heads were then asked "Does your department maintain a formal review mechanism to evaluate and select textbooks for departmental courses?" Six departments from six different discipline groups replied "no" as shown in Table 6-34. This answer represents total autonomy in textbook selection at the faculty level including multi-section/multi-instructor courses and

Table 6-34: Occurrence of formal departmental mechanisms to evaluate and select textbooks.

Discipline Group	Control Mechanism Indicated: 1	2	3	4	5
Social Sciences	0	0	3	0	1
Business	0	1	2	1	1
Education	0	2	2	1	1
Engineering	1	3	2	1	0
Humanities	0	2	2	0	1
Life Science	0	2	3	0	1
Physical Sciences	0	1	3	2	1
Totals	1	11	17	5	6

Mechanisms:
1 = Yes, across the board.
2 = Yes, for courses taught by adjunct or part time instructors.
3 = Yes, for multiple section/multiple instructor courses.
4 = Yes, other.
5 = No.

prerequisite course situations. One department head in business indicated that this total autonomy was a new policy and that he did not know what the outcome would be.

The most common control mechanism found was for courses with multiple sections or instructors. This control ranged from informal agreement among instructors to formalized voting structures. The degree of formality seemed to be a deliberate decision. As one humanities department head said, "Our committees are not pro-forma." In most cases the selection committee was composed of the faculty teaching the course at the time a change in books was initiated.

The second most common control was for adjunct or part-time instructors or graduate teaching assistants. This control was uniformly informal in nature and mainly expressed through the mechanism of the instructor "inheriting" a book already in use. A life sciences department head pointed out that this was true because the length of time necessary to order books was much longer than the time frame used to select an adjunct faculty member or teaching assistant for any given course.

The most common reason for answer four, "other," was a departmental overhaul for the semester transition. While this was an interesting situation, it speaks more to managing an organizational event than to standing policy and procedure.

Only one department head, in an engineering department, reported "Yes, Overall." In this case there was a formal requirement that the textbook be incorporated in the course syllabus. Further, because of a tight pattern of prerequisite coordination, syllabus development was not independent. This department head felt that at the undergraduate level faculty members did not "autonomously change" textbooks. This was the tightest instance of departmental control encountered.

Finally, each department head was asked "Does your department have a procedure to designate a textbook as unacceptable for use?" Table 6-35 shows that only four department heads felt that authority of this sort existed. One social science head said that the "departmental by-laws" provided him with such authority. The three other department heads saw that authority in the purchase order review function. None of the four had ever used the authority. Other department heads rejected the notion even though aware of the purchase order control situation. An education head said, "I don't need to get into that; it might be seen as high-handed administration." A social sciences head simply said, "Very dangerous." Among department heads who said a book might be questioned, price was cited as a reason twice, a lack of tie to syllabus and prerequisites three times, and

Table 6-35: Occurrence of departmental procedures to designate textbooks as unacceptable for use.

Discipline Group	Yes	No
Social Sciences	2	2
Business	1	3
Education	0	4
Engineering	1	3
Humanities	0	4
Life Science	0	4
Physical Science	0	4
Total	4	24

"appropriateness to the level the students are expected to achieve" once.

The overall impression gained through the discussion of departmental procedures is one of a relatively non-interventionist posture among department heads. While "lax" would be too strong a word, there is no reason to doubt that department heads accept and subscribe to the faculty's view that as both individuals or committees they make autonomous decisions regarding textbook selection.

9. JOURNAL EDITORS AND THE FOUR-PART MODEL

Journal editors were also presented with the elements of the four-part model. They were asked to rank the importance of the four elements from highest (1) to lowest (4) in writing a "well constructed review of a college or university textbook." The results obtained are shown in Table 6-36.

When the respondents are sorted between the 28 journals which do review textbooks and the 31 which do not, the rankings are the same. Content, pedagogy, reputation, and production are chosen in that order. When those journals which are deliberately oriented to teaching are sorted out, they display a different pattern. The order changed to pedagogy, content, reputation, and production. There was also a more distinct polarization

Table 6-36: Journal editors' scores and rankings of the importance of the elements of the four-part model in a critical textbook review.

Journal Category	N	Content Σ....R_c	Pedagogy Σ....R_p	Reputation Σ....R_r	Production Σ....R_d
All Journals Responding	59	85...1	119...2	181...3	196...4
All Journals Reviewing Textbooks	28	37...1	54...2	88...3	93...4
All Journals Not Reviewing Textbooks	31	48...1	65...2	93...3	103...4
Teaching Journals	11	20...2	18...1	36...3	37...4
Non-teaching Journals	48	65...1	101...2	145...3	159...4

between the pedagogy/content grouping and the reputation/production grouping.

Journal editors were also asked if they felt that learned journals and societies had a role to play in influencing the textbook market place. A total of 62 responses to this question were received, 29 from journals reviewing textbooks and 34 from journals not reviewing textbooks. There were 13 teaching journals included. Table 6-37 shows a surprisingly high percentage of the editors in all three categories expressing the belief that journals and societies should actively influence the textbook market. This is particularly noteworthy in light of the rather passive position that the faculty seems to take in regard to deliberate collective action in the marketplace. This is an area that clearly calls for further consideration as regards specific action modes and their effectiveness and acceptability.

10. TEXTBOOK SELECTION CRITERIA COMPARED

The responses collected allow an initial comparison of expressions of ranking of elements of the four-part section criteria model among the groups of respondents. The most common scheme was the order content, pedagogy, reputation, and production. In the social sciences/education/humanities faculty pattern this order is

Table 6-37: Journal editors' acceptance of role in influencing textbook marketplace.

Journal Category	N	Yes	Undecided	No
All Journals Responding	62	45 73%	9 14%	8 13%
Journals Reviewing Textbooks	29	24 83%	4 14%	1 3%
Journals Not Reviewing Textbooks	33	21 64%	5 15%	7 21%
Teaching Journals	13	10 77%	2 15%	1 8%
Non-Teaching Journals	49	35 72%	7 14%	7 14%

abbreviated into a three part model with reputation and production compressed into third place. In the engineering/sciences faculty pattern a different three part model emerges. Here, production moves up and is compressed with pedagogy to form a new central group. Department heads and journal editors show less disciplinary variation than the faculty (in part due to the smaller group size), and conform more closely to the general pattern.

It does not appear initially that journal editors in the engineering/sciences areas recognized the shift in importance that the faculty places on production issues, although this is a very tentative finding. A two part scheme is indicated among the editors of teaching oriented journals. In this scheme pedagogy and content combined as important while reputation and production were relatively unimportant. This pattern may be a minor variant on the social sciences/education/humanities pattern rather than a separate model. This would make intuitive sense given the general orientation one might presume in persons who both held editorial positions and were oriented toward pedagogical issues.

Department heads were asked to estimate how they believed the faculty at large in their discipline would rank the elements of the four-part model. This question proved very difficult to manage. The variations in

response along lines of levels of texts, types of institutions, local (own department) versus cosmopolitan, as well as a frequent reluctance of the participants to speculate all combined to defeat the collection of a useful body of responses.

Overall sensitivity to the issue of price appeared to be about the same between the department head group and the faculty group. It would appear however, based on the narratives and the ability of many faculty members to cite price resistance levels, that the faculty may have curtailed or altered textbook selection to a greater extent than the department heads realize. Both groups had strong advocates for the position that price should not be a determinant. Both groups also appeared to be relatively passive regarding any notion of collective action in response to this or any other aspect of the textbook publishing market. That journals and societies may be becoming more willing to take pro-active stances was indicated both by responses to the question dealing with market influence and by the specific collective actions which will be described in Chapter VIII.

While there was some sensitivity to the possible issue of conflict of interest, neither department heads nor faculty members ruled out the use of textbooks authored within their own departments. Interestingly enough, this issue figures in a case study in ethical problems in

teaching that has been developed by Philip Pecorino for a series of reports in the journal Teaching Philosophy (Griffin, 1988). The case involves the mandatory use of a text authored by a senior professor who also heads the departmental textbook selection committee. Faculty results regarding this case in the Teaching Philosophy series do not seem to have been published yet. The responses in the current inquiry suggest that the issue regarding possible conflict of interest for the faculty in this sort of situation may well be the notion of mandatory use rather than the local authorship.

CHAPTER VII

ASSESSING SCHOLARLY REGARD FOR THE TEXTBOOK

1. FACULTY RESPONSE DATA

Introduction

The most difficult aspect of this inquiry and the aspect which most clearly breaks new ground is the attempt to make some assessment of the faculty's opinion of the worth of engagement with authoring textbooks and related works as a scholarly activity. As in previous chapters the findings here will be presented in the order of faculty, department heads, and journal editors and will be divided between tablular presentations and accounts of narrative responses from the interviews. The supporting areas of reviews, readings, and textbook oriented research will be addressed in Chapter VIII.

Is Authoring Textbooks Scholarly?

Faculty respondents were asked "Would you consider authoring or co-authoring a textbook to be a scholarly activity?" The respondents were asked to attempt a yes or no answer to the best of their ability. Some respondents replied with an overall answer, some gave separate answers for upper- and lower-division books, and some gave an

overall answer but made some further distinction by level. Table 7-1 shows the responses received by discipline group. This table shows a total of 98 positive responses from all categories and 18 negative responses. Within this pattern, only 10 faculty members (12% of the survey group) gave a totally negative response. The remaining 74 faculty members (88%) were willing to grant that some aspect of textbook authorship was within the range of "scholarly activities." Each respondent was provided with the working definition of scholarly used as a baseline for this inquiry, but these responses must be seen as ultimately relating to each faculty member's concept of scholarly.

Participation in Textbook Authorship.

As mentioned in an earlier chapter, participants were asked if they had ever authored or co-authored a textbook. Books already published and book projects underway but not yet in print were both recognized. An additional category of authorship, that of contributing chapters to a textbook project undertaken by someone else, was identified during the course of the inquiry. This function implies deliberate participation as opposed to simply allowing one's work to appear in an anthology. Table 7-2 shows the full history of participation in textbook authoring encountered in the study group. The

Table 7-1: Faculty response by discipline and book level to the question, "Do you consider authoring or co-authoring a textbook to be a scholarly activity?"

Discipline Group		Single Response	Upper-Level Books	Lower-Level Books
SocS	Yes	10	2	1
	No	1	0	2
Busn	Yes	5	1	0
	No	6	0	1
Educ	Yes	10	3	2
	No	1	0	1
Engr	Yes	12	1	1
	No	0	0	0
Humn	Yes	10	3	3
	No	1	1	1
Life	Yes	10	5	4
	No	1	0	1
Phys	Yes	11	3	1
	No	0	0	1
Total	Yes	68	18	12
	No	10	1	7

Table 7-2: Number and type of textbook authoring projects encountered and total number of faculty in the survey group by discipline who have actively authored textbook projects.

Discipline Group	Published Textbook	Contributed Chapters	Book in Process	Total Active Authors
SocS	5	2	2	7 (58%)
Busn	3	0	2	4 (33%)
Educ	7	3	5	10 (83%)
Engr	2	2	2	4 (33%)
Humn	7	0	4	7 (58%)
Life	2	4	0	5 (42%)
Phys	2	1	1	3 (33%)
Total	28	12	16	40 (48%)

high level (48%) of participation encountered was one of the more surprising findings in the inquiry. No effort was made to deliberately seek out authors in the design of the research.

The next logical question is to ask if a faculty member's opinion of the scholarly nature of textbook authorship is simply a function of whether or not the respondent has written a textbook. If this were the case, then the data might not indicate perceptions of scholarship but rather some more self-serving argument. Table 7-3 addresses this question. Clearly, respondents who have authored a textbook project were likely to regard that activity as scholarly. However, the inverse does not seem to be supported. It was not necessary to have written a textbook order to hold that textbook authorship is scholarly. Faculty members who have not authored a textbook did not necessarily feel that to do so would be unscholarly. It does appear that a more complex set of considerations are present than self-congratulation.

Textbook Authorship and Tenure and Promotion.

The working definition of scholarship in this project includes the realm of reward. In the faculty, measures of reward are strongly entwined with tenure and promotion. The faculty respondents were asked to speculate on the

Table 7-3: Comparison of having engaged in a textbook authoring project and stated opinion of textbook authorship as a scholarly activity.

		Is Authoring Textbooks Scholarly?	
		YES[a]	NO[b]
Authored Textbook?	YES	39	1
	NO	35	9

[a] Indicates that respondent acknowledged at least one circumstance in which writing a textbook would be a scholarly activity.

[b] Indicates that respondent gave absolutely no favorable response to scholarship of textbook authoring in any category.

weight which authoring a textbook would have in tenure and promotion decisions. This question was posed in an open-ended manner, with no attempts to force the responses into a predetermined scale.

A review of the 84 responses revealed that the answers fell into 6 general categories as shown in Table 7-4. At the high end of the favorable range were those respondents who rated the impact of authoring textbooks as very high; equal to or above refereed journal articles or other scholarly books. Moving down the scale were those respondents who gave textbook authorship a positive value but one clearly lower or subordinate to more conventional research publication or grant activities. The next group rated textbook authorship as very low; recognized but held to be unimportant. The lowest support was from those respondents who held that textbook authorship would not be recognized at all or might actually be harmful in assessing performance for tenure or promotion.

Two other response groups were also encountered. In one, the respondents said that the weight would depend upon the quality of the work and the person or situation involved. This answer is similar to "very high" in that it would allow equal consideration, but it is certainly a less positive expression. The final response was to specifically categorize textbooks as a teaching activity not to be considered in the same realm as other

Table 7-4: Faculty estimates of impact of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion decisions.

Discipline Group	Very High	Depends on Situation	Positive But Lower	Very Low	No, Does Not Count	Teaching Activity
SocS	3	2	4	2	1	0
Busn	1	0	3	4	2	2
Educ	6	2	4	0	0	0
Engr	6	2	4	0	0	0
Humn	2	0	6	2	1	1
Life	1	1	6	3	1	0
Phys	2	6	1	0	3	0
Total	21	13	28	11	8	3
	40%		33%	23%		4%

publications. This response, due to its qualitative difference and relationship to the terms of this inquiry is shown separately. It was the rarest response.

The very high range response together with the situation dependent response were encountered in 40% of the faculty. An additional 33% of the total group felt that textbook authorship would be a positive contribution although automatically less important than published research or grants. The size of this 73% majority support was unexpected based on the tenor of the material in the literature survey. It must be noted that the consideration of the narrative discussion will show a strong distinction between pre-tenure and post-tenure activities in many responses.

The Influence of Financial Reward.

One of the features that might set textbooks apart from other forms of scholarly authorship and publishing in the opinion of the faculty is the nature of the marketplace and the royalty structure. This market was considered in some detail in Chapter III. Participants were asked to what extent they might agree with the proposition that the profit oriented nature of the textbook market and the payment of royalties would create an essential intellectual difference between writing textbooks and other forms of scholarly publications. A

five stage response scale of "strongly agree," "agree," "no opinion," "disagree," and "strongly disagree" was employed. The resulting responses are shown in Table 7-5. This table shows a rather sharply divided faculty, and the review of the narrative discussion will disclose considerable underlying complexity in these replies.

Disciplinary Comparisons.

This section of the inquiry involves the most subjective responses and poses the most risks when drawing comparisons. However, when the data are compared to earlier discussions, some patterns are suggested. Table 7-6 reduces the positive and negative responses regarding scholarship and textbook authoring as shown in Table 7-3 to a ratio expression and ranks the replies by discipline. Note that the physical sciences, life sciences, engineering, and education groups appear at or above the median in expressed favorable regard for textbook scholarship. The humanities and social science groups fall below the median in relatively close order. The business group is a distant last with an overall negative posture. This is a similar alignment of disciplinary groups to those encountered in earlier chapters.

Table 7-7 ranks the expectation of reward for textbook authorship based on the information in Table 7-4. A new pattern emerges in this table. The education and

Table 7-5: Faculty agreement with the proposition that financial gain influences the intellectual character of the task of textbook authoring.

Discipline Group	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SocS	3	5	2	2	0
Busn	2	6	1	3	0
Educ	0	7	1	3	1
Engr	1	3	2	4	2
Humn	0	5	1	4	2
Life	1	2	3	6	0
Phys	1	3	5	2	1
Totals	8	31	15	24	6
	9%	37%	18%	29%	7%
	46%		18%	36%	

Table 7-6: Faculty discipline groups ranked according to the ratio of positive to negative responses to the scholarship of authoring textbooks.

Discipline Group	Ratio of Positive to Negative Responses
Physical Sciences	15.0 : 1
Life Sciences	9.5 : 1
Engineering	7.5 : 1
Education	7.5 : 1
Humanities	5.3 : 1
Social Sciences	4.3 : 1
Business	.85 : 1

Table 7-7: Faculty estimates of impact of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion decisions weighted and ranked by discipline.

Discipline Group	Very High	Depends on Situation	Positive But Lower	Very Low	No, Does Not Count	Total Score
	+3	+2	+1	-2	-3	
Educ	18	4	4	0	0	26
Engr	18	4	4	0	0	26
SocS	9	6	4	-4	-3	11
Phys	6	12	2	0	-9	11
Humn	6	0	6	-4	-3	5
Life	3	2	6	-6	-3	2
Busn	3	0	3	-8	-6	-8

engineering groups clearly support the highest expectation of reward for engagement in textbook authorship. The liberal arts core occupies a somewhat ambiguous center ground. The business faculty again drops off the chart with a strongly negative score. It should be noted that the humanities group and the business group apparently loose power in this table by the elimination of the answer "a teaching activity." Even if these replies were added back to these two disciplines as "very high," the relative order in the table would not change.

It would appear that the most congenial ground for authoring a textbook would be in a discipline whose history and scholarship involve distinct elements of practice in a recognized professional ethos. It does not appear that the business departments fall into this category. It is possible to speculate that education and engineering resemble each other in the sense of an established professional service ethos in the public realm whereas the business disciplines are essentially private and entrepreneurial in their origins.

The final column in Tables 7-6 and 7-7 indicate the active textbook authors in each discipline group. There is apparently a more complex set of motivations in force than either regard of scholarship or expectation of professional reward since the distribution of authoring history matches neither table in any useful manner.

2. FACULTY DISCUSSION

Is Authoring Textbooks Scholarly?

Some of the faculty who rejected the possibility that authoring textbooks is a scholarly activity did so in a harsh manner. A business professor snapped, "Absolutely not! It's just a way to make money." A humanities professor called writing textbooks "just drudge work." Introductory textbooks came under particular fire in some cases. A social sciences professor singled them out as "mere entrepreneurship," and a business professor considered them "just a grind."

This degree of harshness was in the minority. Most of those who ranked textbook authoring as non-scholarly or of very low scholarly worth did so on more carefully chosen grounds. These arguments essentially centered around a conception that "scholarly" somehow involves as a prerequisite "original" or "creative," and that textbooks fail this litmus test. "I see scholarly as more creative," argued an education professor, "the author is the source of the idea." A business professor who stated that he had always argued against recognition of textbooks felt that, "To be scholarly, work must have more than a new way to present material. It must have new material." A physical sciences professor worried that in textbook authorship "the originality lies in the presentation, not

in discovery of new items in the discipline." A humanities professor argued that the author of a textbook would always face pressure to "set aside" or "diminish" his scholarship due to three pressures: the pressure to write for students rather than peers, the quest for synthesis rather than originality, and the need for balance rather than pursuit of a hypothesis or position. These arguments did not tend to belittle the authorship of textbooks as the harsher positions did. Rather, they held with a life sciences professor who said, "Putting in a lot of work is not the same thing as creativity."

It is these epistemological arguments and their institutional policy expressions that largely shape the positions which denigrate textbook authorship in tenure and promotion discussions. A humanities professor said that textbooks were "very often clearly differentiated as distinct from scholarly research." A life sciences professor conceded that, "My evaluation would not be of equal weight to research even though it (writing a textbook) is more difficult and a good textbook can be more valuable to the field." Another life sciences professor said that he had the "distinct feeling that for most situations the journal article and citation structure is the arbiter."

The negative view of textbooks in reward situations was sometimes modified by citing the level of the book or by more clearly separating pre-tenure activities from post-tenure promotion. An education professor felt that textbooks at upper levels that make "philosophical or state-of-the-art contributions will make more difference." A life sciences professor who said that in pre-tenure activities writing a textbook would be "almost impossible to imagine" believed that it would count for promotion and that "a higher level book will have more weight than a lower one." A physical science professor said that textbooks "would not be a good junior faculty task; you must establish your own research program." This same professor did speculate that, "In a non-doctoral institution it might be a highly appropriate task." A humanities professor noted the difference in pre- and post-tenure reward but concluded ruefully that authoring textbooks was "not advisable" for tenure and "probably does not count" for promotion.

Not all of the respondents who ranked the role of textbook authorship in the low ranges did so out of an expression of their own beliefs. A life sciences professor who stated that textbook authorship would not rank very highly at all and that he "would not recommend it at all in tenure track development," added that he felt this lack of status was a "misguided

judgement in my opinion." These respondents couch their replies in terms of institutional pressures. "The pressure is to write funded, original research," stated another life sciences professor. "There is no institutionalized recognition or funding of textbook authorship." An engineering professor who believes "there is truly scholarly work in key texts" argues that, "Administrative structures and immediate requirements like work units, publication counts, and grant pressures have destroyed processes requiring sustained efforts." A social sciences professor felt that textbook authorship would be "quite clearly low, particularly here" in the face of the "rhetoric of reputation" of refereed journal articles. A physical sciences professor said, "In-house authors get no credit. Only research publications get credit. That's a very selfish perspective in my opinion." And an education professor offered, "I've been told by the Dean that it (writing a textbook) would not rank high. However, in general I think it would rank very high."

Two professors made more lengthy remarks that are worth considering. A life sciences professor talked about an institutional chill in regard to textbooks.

> That's a good question. Until recently teaching was assiduously promoted as being co-equal with research. That has subsided in the University, the College, and the Department, and research is now the activity which is to set this university apart. There is a magic or mythology around the search for new information. This has a chilling effect on textbook

> authors. A textbook project must be carefully negotiated. They are not now treated as heavily as research.

A humanities professor with experience in the college promotion and tenure committee stated that textbooks were considered under publications rather than teaching but that:

> They are not considered the same as a scholarly work. For a textbook market success is considered. There are often evaluations or reviews (of textbooks) specially commissioned for the tenure or promotion process. The same does not happen for a scholarly work or refereed journal article; for example citations are not pursued.

Both the power of the institutional resistance and the hostility such resistance could generate were intriguing findings in terms of further research or collective strategies.

The type of synergistic scholarship rejected by the respondents who give textbook authoring a poor rating is firmly embraced by those who are enthusiastic in their support of textbook authorship. Textbooks require a "tremendously creative" authorship said a humanities professor, with a complete "thinking through of the field." An engineering professor who noted that journals are not oriented to long duration efforts felt that textbook authoring "appears to be representative of a much greater dedication to long-term learning experiences." A business faculty member noted that writing a textbook required "the ability to focus on the

forest beyond the trees," and in an opinion rare in his area stated that such a view "may be more scholarly than the research focus." A humanities professor summed up his opinion by saying, "I have a profound reverence for a well put together text."

While these respondents recognized the value and worth of presentation skills, they were also often making clear statements about the disciplinary knowledge necessary to write a good textbook. "Introductory texts are very hard, they take a very deep knowledge," stated a life sciences faculty member. Textbooks require "deep involvement with research and the discipline," according to an engineering professor. A physical sciences faculty member summed this view by stating that the ability of a textbook author was "the ability to explain more elegantly, more simply. Not that his English is better, but that his science is better."

The distinction of books by course level does appear in the responses of those who support textbook authorship. "Most authors are quite scholarly," felt a life sciences professor who felt that lower-level books were marked by "presentation skills" while upper-level books were based in "disciplinary skills." An engineering faculty member notes that "the higher the level (of the book), the higher the scholarship; the more new information that must be synthesized and the more scholarship required."

As seen in the tabular data, a number of the respondents felt that textbook authorship would stand very high in promotion and tenure consideration. Many of these responses were clearly individual expressions that might well reflect positions which the respondents would act on. An engineering professor felt that a textbook should count as "a number of journal articles." Likewise, an education faculty member thought writing a textbook "should be given greater weight than an article; it requires diligence and sensitivity." Another education faculty member said textbooks would be weighed "just like anything else--based on merit and position on the front edge." An engineering faculty member held a similar view that a textbook "would carry significant weight; however it would depend upon the level of the text, the amount of original insight, and fore-front positioning."

Institutional support notions were also discussed. An engineering faculty member who was not a textbook author himself felt that in the College of Engineering a textbook would be "ranked extremely high; one of the highest contributions you can make." Another engineering faculty member was not as certain. He felt that professional societies rewarded textbook authorship well, but that the university lagged. He pointed out that not only was support hard to obtain, but that in previous employment at NASA "each chapter of a textbook was counted

as the equivalent of one journal publication." An education professor put textbook authorship into an institutionally recognized continuum of effort.

> It (a textbook) is just below pre-requisite; very high. I have been carefully advised of the need to generate research longitudinally. That's an article or two annually, then after ten years or so there should be a cumulative event; a book or a textbook. Promotion is contingent on that sort of history.

A business faculty member looked at textbooks in a way that raised a problem of institutional generalizations.

> textbooks tend to get lumped together as a generic. We would never do that with research articles or monographs. Textbooks also vary along a teaching-research continuum, and we need a ranking notion.

It is this matter of a ranking notion that dominates the middle ground which is so evident in the data in the tables. A great many faculty respondents were not willing to take an unqualified position regarding either the scholarly nature of textbook authorship or of its role in tenure and promotion decisions. They looked for some expression which would qualify their answers. "Certainly that is a scholarly and difficult activity," a physical sciences professor said, "but there is a surfeit of textbooks. You must ask 'Why this one?' There must be some special reason to write this textbook." Another physical sciences faculty member said textbooks were "no different than authoring papers; there are good papers and lousy papers." The question of originality appears in these answers. "If it includes some original work or

contribution, it may become scholarly," said an education faculty member. A social sciences member said scholarship would "depend on intent; does it break new ground?" Factors such as the "quality" of the book, the marketing success of the book, the level of the book, quality of reviews of the book, and the uniqueness of the book were all cited in attempts to express some sort of ranking requirements.

The idea that textbook authorship is more closely aligned with teaching than with publications also grows out of this effort to place textbooks into some sort of proper niche. A humanities professor said, "I would consider it under quality of teaching rather than research." A social sciences professor considered authoring a textbook to be "an effort at integrating, condensing, and making manageable; teaching scholarship but not scholarship in the sense of research."

The teaching idea was not always a favorable one. A business faculty member, speaking of tenure and promotion, said, "I don't think it would count much toward an area of scholarly activity, though it could be a positive element in teaching." Another was more succinct; a textbook would rank "on par with teaching performance-- low." Although no faculty member specifically articulated the idea that textbooks might stand to teaching as research publications

do to research, a business faculty member (0803) did put forward the idea that a textbook might somehow be

> a natural extension of excellence as a teacher. If one were to excel in teaching, you could expect such an original contribution.

The central range of answers ultimately expressed the position of the same business faculty member when he said, "There is not an overall consensus." Similarly, a life sciences faculty member who acknowledged that textbooks are "probably more difficult to write than a review or research article" still finds the creation of textbooks as very difficult to assess in "the kind of disciplinary community in which I live." This uncertainty expressed by so many of the faculty may ultimately be one of the factors leading to the expression of the engineering faculty member who said of authoring textbooks "Oh, yes; it is scholarly, but I would not touch it with a ten foot pole."

The Effect of Financial Reward.

Some of the harshest remarks made about textbooks were those that, as a physical sciences faculty member said, "look down our noses at people who write textbooks" because they are perceived of as being somehow tainted by money. Beyond simple cynicism, market forces and royalties are an acknowledged aspect of textbook authorship. A business professor felt financial gain

"is a factor, though some authors attempt to transcend it." A textbook author in engineering acknowledged that "it is enticing, it is in the back of your mind." A social sciences professor believed that it "depends on the author, but most would not write without some expected reward." An author in engineering agreed that the "royalty structure in textbooks is different from scholarly books. I have made seven times the money on textbooks as scholarly works." A humanities professor described his own financial motives.

> My own motive was more or less to make money. I was willing to be guided by more external forces than with a scholarly work. ... A scholarly work has a kind of integrity about it.

However, this same faculty member also acknowledged that his own continued insistence on standards that have incurred high permission fees in his project have almost guaranteed that the book will not be profitable.

In point of fact, one of the more conclusive results of the narrative discussions is the distinct impression that those who have devoted the most consideration to the financial aspect of textbook authorship ultimately reject the concern that textbooks are tainted in comparison to other scholarly activities by the power of royalties. There are two basic foundations for this rejection. The first is the realistic assessment of the likelihood of any real payoff. The second is the argument that the hope of

financial gain is just as powerful if not more so in other scholarly activities.

A social sciences faculty member argued that, "Most people have no idea of the actual payoff. They think it is way too high." An engineering professor was more specific: "One should never hope to get financial renumeration. Twenty cents an hour is optimistic." Another engineering professor stated that he "consciously avoided textbooks. Everyone I know who has written one says it is a very poor way to make money." "Non-realistic," "expect to loose money," "anybody in it for the money is in the wrong field," and "non-existent," were common reactions to the question of financial gain from authors. Textbook authors are clearly aware that there are very few "block-buster best-sellers" in the textbook market. While they know that some few do make substantial amounts of money there is little evidence of self-delusion about the chances of actually writing one.

Nor were the ideas of market influence and financial payment regarded by all as a negative influence anyway. "That's not a negative idea; the market should drive the publication of textbooks," argued a social sciences professor. The market, in this view, is in fact a peer review process of itself. "I have nothing against people writing textbooks and making money--more power to them," a life sciences professor said. "The real issue is how to

spend one's time. Money does not enter into the picture in competent, published work." Further, it may be that the payment is justified. Speaking about the time and effort a textbook takes in comparison to the reward, a social sciences faculty member said, "No sane person would undertake to write an introductory textbook now...you ought to get paid for it."

The most revealing discussions of this issue of financial gain and entrepreneurial activity were those that said in effect "so what?" "That's a 'holier-than-thou view," said a social science professor. "Grants are the same; there is salary and pay motivation in all areas." An education faculty member stated, "There are people who are paid handsomely for articles and everything else." This was echoed by a life sciences faculty member who noted that, "One is invited to symposia with costs paid and honoraria; one is paid for consulting, one is paid for research contracts."

In fact, there were strong suggestions that there are individual and institutional financial arguments which are strong disincentives to writing textbooks. "Consulting is much more lucrative," a life sciences faculty member stated. A physical sciences professor argued, "In the nine month salary structure the pressure to produce grant money is very strong; textbooks cannot compete here." An engineering professor commented, "With research and the

like you are expected to bring in money (to the department); that is not possible with textbooks."

A physical sciences faculty member who has been involved in a textbook writing project for three years tried to catch the flavor of the conflicting strains of the financial and reputational aspects of textbook authorship in a discussion of his own work.

> No one ever does it for the money. You can make more money writing papers and establishing a consulting reputation....There is more money in summer salary and research grants. There is an enormous sacrifice involved, but how the hell are we going to teach if no one does?
>
> Textbooks make a contribution to the reputation, prestige, and abilities of the department and the university; more than one or two papers certainly. But there is a conflict of interest; one which is apparent though not real. I am doing my own project at home. First because of just the time and logistics of it. But also because I do not want to be vulnerable to the criticism of others.
>
> I can make a lot of money consulting. I'm writing a textbook instead.

The Motivation to Write a Textbook.

The exploration of authors' motivations was not a stated objective of this inquiry. However, the discussion of the impact of financial influence on intellectual performance and motivation lead inevitably to countering discussions of other motivations. Some of these remarks do bear directly on the cosmopolitan reach of textbooks and their authorship. Professional recognition is a

strong motivation for some authors. An engineering professor argued that professional visibility, not money, was his motivation to write. "One textbook is the equivalent of 50 journal articles." With his book on the market for one year he attributes "major professional opportunities" to the visibility generated by the book. "I have become a recognized authority," he said. An education professor agreed that "royalties are not a primary factor...the incentive is professional regard and recognition." A business faculty member working on a co-authoring project stated that his major motivation was the chance to "work with the co-author; he is a major player."

A sense of the ability to make a statement within the discipline was also a powerful motivator. A social sciences author said that he "wrote the book to make a statement for which research papers were not the best forum." An education professor stated that, "Frustration with current offerings and one's own sense of the appropriate remain the primary motivators." Another education professor simply said,

> I just enjoy it. If you have something to say, you should say it. It is a prestige effort with some sense of contribution and some money--about 25 cents an hour.

3. DEPARTMENT HEAD RESPONSE DATA

Introduction.

Similar questions regarding the valuation of textbook scholarship were put to department heads. Questions regarding the scholarship authoring activities, weight in tenure and promotion decisions, and the influence of the marketplace on the character of the intellectual activity were all posed. While heads were not deliberately asked about their own history of textbook authoring, 6 of the 28 heads interviewed (21%) volunteered the information that they had written textbooks.

Assessment of Scholarship

Department heads were asked if they considered authoring or co-authoring a textbook to be a scholarly activity. As with the faculty members, responses fell into categories of overall, upper division, and lower division books. Table 7-8 presents the responses by discipline groups. The number of respondents in each group was 4. The number of responses varies depending on the specific replies offered.

At this point it can be observed that the lowest positive response seems to reside in the business group with a ratio of positive to negative replies of .66 to 1. Only 1 of the 4 department heads (25%) in the business

Table 7-8: Department head responses by discipline group to question "Do you consider authoring or co-authoring a textbook to be a scholarly activity?"

Discipline Group		Single Response	Upper Level Books	Lower Level Books
SocS	Yes	3	0	0
	No	1	0	0
Busn	Yes	1	1	0
	No	2	0	1
Educ	Yes	4	1	1
	No	0	0	0
Engr	Yes	3	1	1
	No	0	0	0
Humn	Yes	4	0	0
	No	0	0	0
Life	Yes	3	3	2
	No	1	0	0
Phys	Yes	4	2	3
	No	0	0	0
Total	Yes	22	8	7
	No	4	0	1

group gave an unqualified supportive answer. Department heads in the education, engineering, physical sciences and, interestingly, the humanities gave no negative responses.

Logistical Support for Textbook Authorship.

As mentioned above, 6 department heads identified themselves as textbook authors. Another indication of actual operative support for textbook authorship was identified during the interviews; the question of whether or not a faculty member could expect to receive logistical support during a textbook authoring project. Of the 28 department heads, 9 (32%) stated that a faculty member could expect some level of active support. This question developed spontaneously late in the survey period. As a result, it cannot be stated conclusively that these 9 are the only department heads in the survey group who might offer support. Positive logistical support availability was encountered in every disciplinary group except business. In the business group an instance of active opposition was encountered. The types of support that might be expected were generally described as typing, copy support, graphics, time allowances, and similar resources. Support was normally specified as being on a space available basis, and was considered the equivalent of what would be offered any scholarly book written on contract.

Such support would not be available in instances where a publisher provided identical support or cash advances in lieu of support. This occurrence of willingness to support textbook authors is an extremely interesting finding. It is a powerful indicator that department heads who express support for the scholarly nature of textbook authoring may well be willing to act on that support in the administration of their departments.

Tenure and Promotion.

Department heads were asked where they felt authoring a textbook would stand in questions of tenure and promotion decisions. The question was posed in an open-ended manner. Table 7-9 displays a summary of the responses using the same categorization scheme as shown in the faulty data in Table 7-4. In the department head group 57% of the respondents ranked the value of textbooks very high or allowed that they compete as dictated by the situation and quality of the book. A solid 21% of the respondents rejected textbooks, excluding them from promotion and tenure discussion. Two department heads categorized textbooks and their authorship as a teaching issue.

Table 7-9: Department head estimates of impact of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion decisions.

Discipline Group	Very High	Depends on Situation	Positive But Lower	Very Low	No, Does Not Count	Teaching Activity
SocS	2	0	0	0	1	1
Busn	0	1	0	0	3	0
Educ	2	1	1	0	0	0
Engr	3	0	1	0	0	0
Humn	2	1	1	0	0	0
Life	1	1	0	0	2	0
Phys	0	2	0	1	0	1
Totals	10	6	3	1	6	2
	57%		11%	25%		7%

The Influence of Financial Reward.

Department heads were asked the degree to which they would agree that the profit oriented nature of the textbook market and the payment of royalties influenced the intellectual character of textbook authorship. The five-part response scale of "strongly agree," "agree," "neutral," "disagree," and "strongly disagree" was used. Table 7-10 shows the responses. The table shows a sharply divided pattern of responses. As with the faculty discussion, the character of the narratives is somewhat more complex than the yes-no split the table indicates on its face.

Disciplinary Comparisons.

Table 7-11 lists department head groups ranked according to the ratio of positive to negative responses regarding the scholarship of textbooks as shown in Table 7-8. In four disciplinary groups the responses were unanimously positive. Unanimity did not occur in any faculty discipline group. As in the faculty, the business group displays an overall negative posture.

Table 7-12 ranks department head groups according to estimated value of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion. It can again be noted that the two professionally oriented groups of engineering and education place the highest value on textbook authorship.

Table 7-10: Department head agreement with the proposition that financial gain influences the intellectual character of the task of textbook authoring.

Discipline Group	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SocS	0	2	1	1	0
Busn	0	3	1	0	0
Educ	1	1	0	2	0
Engr	0	0	0	3	1
Humn	0	2	1	1	0
Life	0	2	1	1	0
Phys	0	2	0	1	1
Totals	1	12	4	9	2
	4%	43%	14%	32%	7%
	47%		14%	39%	

Table 7-11: Department head discipline groups ranked according to the ratio of positive to negative responses to the scholarship of authoring textbooks.

Disciplinary Group	Ratio of Positive to Negative Replies	
Physical Sciences	9 : 0	Unanimous
Education	6 : 0	Unanimous
Engineering	5 : 0	Unanimous
Humanities	4 : 0	Unanimous
Life Sciences	8 : 1	Mixed
Social Sciences	3 : 1	Mixed
Business	.66 : 1	Negative

Table 7-12: Department head estimates of impact of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion decisions weighted and ranked by discipline.

Discipline Group	Very High	Depends on Situation	Positive But Lower	Very Low	No, Does Not Count	Total Score
	+3	+2	1	-2	-3	
Engr	9	0	1	0	0	10
Educ	6	2	1	0	0	9
Humn	6	2	1	0	0	9
SocS	6	0	0	0	-3	median 3
Life	3	2	0	0	-3	2
Phys	0	4	0	-2	0	2
Busn	0	2	0	0	-9	-7

The humanities group also moves upward sharply in the department head groups. Interestingly enough, there is some indication in the narrative discussion that this level of support in education and the humanities is maintained in the face of some opposition at the College level. The upward movement in the humanities seems to be due mainly to pressure in the English and Languages departments. Both of these departments have clear faculty sectors devoted to rhetoric and pedagogy. Department head sensitivity to the needs of these distinctly differentiated faculty structures increases the number of situations in which textbook authorship might be appropriately rewarded.

The physical sciences group, which unanimously supported the scholarly nature of authoring textbooks, is much less optimistic about the utility of writing one. Physical sciences heads are realistic about disciplinary and institutional pressures to produce reputationally powerful journal articles and garner grant support despite their esteem for textbook authors. The business group retains its consistently negative posture in the rankings. Because of the smaller groups involved these inter-disciplinary rankings are not as distinctive as in the faculty. It is most accurate to speak of them as divided into unanimously supportive, mixed, and negative.

4. DEPARTMENT HEAD NARRATIVES

Is Authoring Textbooks Scholarly?

Department heads who expressed opposition to authoring textbooks as a scholarly activity were often somewhat ambiguous and uncomfortable with the question. A business department head said, "No; the single reason for doing it is money. It's an economic adventure." Yet he then went on to say that perhaps upper level books which were "trying to move the discipline forward" could be scholarly. A department head in the humanities stated, "I'm troubled by the issue. We have not sorted out where it should fit in the department or the faculty." He also mentioned having discouraged a faculty member's textbook project on advice from his Dean. Another expression of internal debate came from an education head who said that textbooks were "very respected within the discipline," but that writing one would be "much shakier here."

There was also concern about the pressure of external forces acting on the faculty and about the lack of selectivity on the part of textbook publishers. A humanities head described the "tremendous pressure on the faculty to write textbooks" from publishers. A business head, who was quite firm in opposition to textbook authoring activities, said, "Anyone can write a textbook and get it published within the discipline." This concern

with a lack of selectivity of authors, implying a lack of a peer review gate, appears in various forms in the discussion of tenure and promotion. It often appeared in the form of tying a book's worth to its sales success or adoptions in a kind of post-publication peer review.

Expressions of support for textbook authoring as a scholarly activity were much stronger. An engineering head firmly stated that textbooks represented "the highest order of scholarly activity." An education head contended that a textbook author

> must read, digest, and reorganize information. That's one of the two areas that scholarly activity is about; creating information and interpreting information.

A business head stated that compared to research based articles a textbook is a "monumental effort." A physical sciences head said his view had changed after having written a textbook. "My estimate of both the work and the merit have gone up." Introductory texts, having received a pounding in the faculty did better. A physical sciences head said, "People who write introductory textbooks require a broader range of knowledge about the discipline than does the specialist." A life sciences head said, "Introductory texts are the hardest kind to write."

Expressions of the textbook as a teaching activity were often more positive than those in the faculty. A social sciences head said, "Textbook authorship would fall under both scholarship and teaching," and that textbooks

attempted to represent a "kind of hypothesis about what kind of material should be forwarded" within a discipline. Another social sciences head felt comfortable with what he saw as a positive agreement within the department that authoring textbooks and teaching materials was a teaching activity "which could be evaluated in teaching channels." An engineering head recognized the uncertain border between teaching and publications.

> The audience are not yet scholars, therefore there is a different order of purpose. It is not the highest form of scholarly communication, but it is difficult. I don't know what you call that...

As mentioned earlier, a number of department heads were clearly willing to act on their regard for textbook authorship with logistic support. A humanities head most clearly articulated the basis for this support. "A textbook is a scholarly pursuit of sufficient connection to receive the same support as available for any other publication." An education head said that his department currently had three members working on textbook projects and that they received computer and scheduling support. Most department heads expressing this type of support noted that it was understood to be on an "as available" basis. This was felt to be the same as any other situation involving a scholarly book on contract.

Tenure and Promotion.

Negative comments concerning textbooks as a factor in promotion and tenure ranged from chilling to ambiguous. A department head in business took the position that writing a textbook would be actively discouraged in pre-tenure situations and would "have no weight one way or another" in promotion. Further, it would "count against raises since the primary motivation is to make money." A life sciences head who felt that textbook authorship was scholarly, still said,

> People who write textbooks must be in no-research or high-time environments. We cannot afford that here. It would be almost a negative; an admission that you are no longer able to do what you were hired for.

A humanities head said no to tenure and promotion value "except where the major responsibilities of the position are in fact the development of pedagogy within the discipline." A physical sciences head said that text authorship "does not rank very high, that is the reality," but went on to disparage the alternative as merely "articles in journals, churned out and then called research."

One of the most intriguing situations encountered was in a business department that had invested considerable time in the discussion of authorship of textbooks. The head generally discounted textbooks as economically motivated. He reported that he had "actively discouraged"

textbooks, at least in pre-tenure faculty. An apparently divisive departmental debate over the "outside economic nature" of authoring textbooks and conflict of interest in classroom use and work time was still unsettled. Yet the department was collectively and officially engaged in a major effort to develop and commercially market a software simulation game with apparent pedagogical utility. The package was to be university-owned and licensed with the royalties going to the university and the department. There was no expressed recognition that this project might, other than the choice of media, very closely resemble writing a textbook. The results of the choice of media, the similarity between authoring pedagogical software and pedagogical "pageware," and the effect of collective or institutional ownership of pedagogical products all present fertile ground for further inquiry.

Some expressions of unreserved support for textbook authorship in promotion and tenure were encountered. An engineering head ranked textbooks as "the highest possible document activity...equal to a truly original piece of research." "The equal of a (scholarly) book for promotion," stated an education head. A social sciences head ranked textbooks as high; representing "a scholar's comprehensive understanding of a discipline." He also acknowledged that textbooks were generally post-tenure activities since "the pressure to publish prevents the

luxury of working on grander scales" prior to tenure. The notion that textbooks would likely be a late career activity was common among the respondents with a favorable view of textbook authorship. This view grew not only from the perception that a textbook required a certain breadth of experience but also from the recognition of the "Herculean" nature of the task.

The most commonly held reservation about textbooks in promotion and tenure discussions with the department heads was the belief that, despite the enormous knowledge and commitment required, textbooks could stand alone as a career focus only in very rare circumstances. A life sciences head recounted an example of a person whose advanced career development rested on "a strong individual reputation for teaching and text writing," but acknowledged it to be a very rare situation. Most department heads would side with the two physical sciences heads who said that textbook writing must be "balanced with evidence of original research" and that in a research environment one could not "accept textbook writing alone as evidence of scholarly activity."

The Influence of Financial Reward.

A particularly harsh view of the effect of financial reward in textbook authorship was discussed above. Again, this seems to be the minority opinion. The department

heads generally expressed the shallowness of this type of view in both logical and quantitative terms. "Scholarly books make money too. What's the difference?" asked a humanities head. An engineering head argued that in the generalist scholarly press "a lot of things are done on a break even basis; books are sold to libraries with the hope of breaking into the textbook market." In this view the textbook market becomes both a prop and a hidden agenda for the scholarly press. Another engineering head noted, "People receive pay for journal articles in the form of grants." A physical sciences head said, "There is a financial motivation in primary research in the form of consulting and grants."

Some heads were clearly aware of the low financial return common in textbooks. A department head in physical sciences who had authored what he regarded as a successful book in his field estimated that he had made 25 cents an hour. Another in the business area said he had dropped a project when he decided that "six cents an hour was not adequate."

Department heads were sensitive to questions of appearances due to financial reward, but they were generally unsympathetic to those who worried about them. "That's just professor bashing," said an education head "The faculty probably resents successful textbook authors," speculated a social sciences head, "but not on

money. It is on the ability to write." He added, "Where there is large money there is large resentment, but it is the same for large grants." The same education head also commented on marketing books.

> Huckstering a book is not very palatable, but it's more honest than seeking lowest publishable units and multiple conference presentations for the same research.

The Motivation to Write.

Department heads who had written textbooks generally expressed non-monetary, discipline-oriented motivations. A social sciences head, discussing a specific project, spoke of a desire to "produce a work with more primary source structure." A physical sciences head said, "The future of the discipline is shifting and available textbooks do not match that future." Dissatisfaction with some aspects of current products was a common specific motivation. Finally, an education head spoke of a conviction that shaped his attitude toward writing textbooks as an element of a faculty member's accomplishments.

> College professors should add to the body of knowledge, the practice, and the legacy of a discipline in their career.

5. JOURNAL EDITOR RESPONSE DATA

Journal editors were asked "Compared to a published research article in a refereed journal, the authorship of a textbook would be a) of greater scholarly merit, b) of equal scholarly merit, c) of less scholarly merit, or d) undecided. This was the only question in the entire inquiry to specifically compare textbook authorship with authorship of research in refereed forumns. The results, shown in Table 7-13, are intriquing.

Of all journals responding, 28% of the editors felt that textbooks were of equal or greater scholarly merit than articles in their own refereed journal arena. If the category "undecided" is seen to allow the possibility that such might be the case, then the support for textbooks becomes somewhat stronger. Both the support for the textbook and the polarization was strongest in the teaching-oriented journals. As was the case with the support for the usefulness of textbook reviews, the support for authorship of textbooks was slightly higher in journals not reviewing textbooks than those which do. However, despite the level of support shown, the majority of responding editors in all categorizations except teaching journals felt that authoring a textbook within a discipline was somehow less scholarly than producing an article in a refereed journal.

Table 7-13: Journal editors' ranking of the scholarship of authoring textbooks compared to authoring articles for refereed journals.

Journal Category	More Scholarly	Equally Scholarly	Less Scholarly	Undecided	N
All Journals Responding	6	12	38	8	64
	9%	19%	59%	13%	
Disciplinary Journals	2	9	33	7	51
	4%	9%	64%	14%	
Teaching Journals	4	3	5	1	13
	31%	23%	38%	8%	
Journals Reviewing Textbooks	3	4	18	4	29
	10%	14%	62%	14%	
Journals Not Reviewing Textbooks	3	8	20	4	35
	9%	23%	57%	11%	

6. ASSESSING THE SCHOLARLY REGARD FOR THE TEXTBOOK: SUMMARY

Scholarly Activities and Tenure.

Figures 7-1 and 7-2 compare the faculty and department head survey groups in ordering of support for the scholarly nature of textbook authoring and the expectation of value regarding tenure and promotion. Three areas of consistency seem to emerge. The first, and most visible, is a negative pattern; the consistently unfavorable view of textbook authoring held in the business disciplines. That there are some inconsistencies in this posture has already been noted, but there does seem to be a powerfully negative response to textbooks in these disciplines.

Based on the comments of respondents throughout the business groups, two speculative rationales can be offered for this situation. Both are based on external pressures. The first is the highly competitive, graduate-oriented nature of the business sector of higher education. The pressure to establish highly visible, competitive, external reputations for both the faculty and the departments may be particularly intense in these areas. Textbooks are perhaps neither the most timely nor most rewarding way of establishing such reputations in a volatile area. The second area is the intense accrediting

Faculty	Department Heads
Physical Sciences	Physical Sciences
Life Sciences	Education
Engineering	Engineering
Education	Humanities
Humanities	Life Sciences
Social Sciences	Social Sciences
Business	Business

Figure 7-1: Faculty and department head disciplinary groups in order of support for the scholarly nature of authoring textbooks.

Faculty	Department Heads
Education	Education
Engineering	Engineering
	Humanities
Social Science	Social Science
Physical Science	Life Science
Humanities	Physical Science
Life Science	
Business	Business

Figure 7-2: Faculty and department head disciplinary groups in order of estimation of value of authoring textbooks for tenure and promotion.

pressures faced by business departments. These pressures may force orientation toward short-term strategies for compliance with externally constructed and often changing pedagogical visions. This would leave little time for departments and faculty such as those found at the University of Tennessee to engage in long-term analysis and articulation of their own pedagogical visions.

A second pattern appears in the area of scholarly value. The upper end of the scale in this issue is occupied by two types of discipline groups. The first is comprised of those disciplines having traditional professional roots. Here these are represented by engineering and education. In both of these groups the external traditions of practice and accreditation are perhaps firmer and less volatile than in the business discipline sector. Further, the education area obtains a benefit as a result of the textbook being not only a tool of internal pedagogy and continuity but also a product of external professional practice and expertise.

The second type of discipline involved are those which conceive of themselves as having a relatively immutable body of fundamental knowledge which must be mastered at the college level. These disciplines are represented here by the physical sciences, the engineering disciplines again, and life sciences. This is particularly visible in the faculty. In these

disciplines, the responses seem to indicate a reservoir of high regard for the ability of a scholar to engage in broadly based interpretive and expository scholarship and to examine what was earlier called the "hypothesis of what to carry forward" in the discipline. In these disciplines constructing this hypothesis may be seen as a disciplinary task involving the ability to articulate and convey the agreed "matter of the discipline" rather than advancing a particular agenda. A physical sciences faculty member commented that such scholarship represented not merely better English but also better science. Social sciences faculty members spoke of making a statement or of the sense of what ought to be. These may be significantly different perspectives.

In the department head group the humanities moved up the scale somewhat in this issue, but for a distinctly different reason. Differentiated faculties have begun to appear in these areas. Portions of these faculties are clearly conceived of as having a professional orientation toward the development and spread of pedagogical materials, techniques, and literature. This development seems to generate a distinctly more varied set of requirements and opinions in the department heads involved.

The pattern shifts noticeably when the question of expected reward is considered. Here only the professional

discipline faculties clearly expect that writing a textbook will have utility. The professional department heads share that opinion and are joined by that portion of the humanities administration that is directly concerned with pedagogical faculties. In the physical and life sciences the esteem for textbooks is set aside in the face of the pursuit, whether legitimate or stylized, of the conduct and publication of original research.

Another comparison can be noted in Table 7-14 between the attitudes of the faculty and department heads toward expected reward. The central position of "positive but lower" is very prevalent in the faculty. This ambiguous position of "It's OK, but it doesn't count as much as research publications, and I don't know exactly how much it does count" is an individual expression of uncertainty over a difficult issue. It is not a common expression among department heads who speak as department heads. The center is not filled, and the responses largely move to the "very high" or flat "no" responses at the ends of the scale. Department heads do seem to be expressing their views of what is collectively wise and appropriate for their departments. This generates a greater tendency to articulate a position and act upon it. The question is no longer one of individual scholarly preference but rather one of the appropriate allocation of effort and resources from a collective perspective.

Table 7-14: Faculty and department head estimates of value of textbook authorship in tenure and promotion decisions.

Group	Very High	Depends on Situation	Positive But Lower	Very Low	No, Does Not Count
Faculty	25%	15%	33%	13%	10%
	40%		33%	23%	
Department Heads	36%	21%	11%	4%	21%
	57%		11%	25%	

The Rejection of the Financial Argument.

The exploration of the perceptions of the role of profit and royalties in textbook authorship present some of the more interesting findings in this chapter. This question essentially implied, and was taken to mean by most of the respondents, something to the effect of "Is writing textbooks somehow tainted by money? Does one in some fashion stop being a scholar and become the tool of snake-oil salesmen?" Two things appear in the findings. The first is the relative uniformity of response between the faculty and department heads. The second is the degree of rejection of the proposition and the ground for that rejection.

Table 7-15 compares faculty and department head responses in this issue. This is possibly the single best match of responses in the study. Underlying this similarity in distribution is a similarity in character formed by two major response patterns. The first pattern can be summed up as "So what?" The second can be paraphrased as "Twenty-five cents an hour and three years work isn't going to buy anybody." A powerful section of the respondents, even among those who pick "agree," clearly articulated the position that hope of financial gain is a powerful force in many scholarly activities including research and refereed publications. The establishment of individual and departmental reputations

Table 7-15: Faculty and department head agreement with the proposition that financial gain influences the intellectual character of the task of textbook authoring.

Group	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Faculty	8	31	15	24	6
	9%	37%	18%	29%	7%
Department	1	12	4	9	2
	4%	43%	14%	32%	7%

in such a way as to create access to consulting, grants, contracts, and professional mobility is a major force in the faculty. Textbook authorship, to the extent that it is driven by financial concerns, is generally seen as simply a part of this process rather than as something unique. Further, many respondents who have thought actively about the issue or who have engaged in textbook authorship themselves feel that textbooks are a generally ineffective way to obtain financial reward or create opportunity. Those who do see it as rewarding generally speak in terms of improved access to other more lucrative arenas. Grants, consulting, summer school teaching, contracts, and even software are all perceived as being far more useful to both individuals and departments than textbook authorship. In fact, the idea clearly appears that textbooks would be avoided because they are not lucrative. The opinion that textbooks are actually "unworthy" because they are "entrepreneurial" appeared in some cases, but it seems to be a minority view and may even cover a hidden or unconscious agenda that they are not lucrative enough.

The Common Discriminators: Originality and Time.

A review of these interviews leaves little doubt that there are powerful legitimate disencentives to authoring textbooks within the higher education faculty as

represented by this study group. There are two major categories of disincentives; the first epistemological and the second logistical.

Stripped of both intentional and unintentional "publish or perish" cynicism, there still remains a sincerely held belief on the part of an articulate sector of the faculty that modern scholarship holds as prerequisite both originality and the search for new knowledge for its own sake. This view inevitably relegates the type of synthesis, interpretation, and presentation skills involved in textbook authorship to an inferior or derivative position. It may recognize the scope of the effort, but, as in arguments between "artists" and "artisans," it cannot recognize its equality. Surprisingly enough, this view does not appear to be a sole property or even a dominant perspective of the research sciences disciplines. If anything, the impression left is that the natural sciences, with their emphasis on the continuity of disciplinary knowledge may be more respectful of the scholarly character of the textbook task than some of the social sciences and certainly more so than the business groups.

However, this epistemological position does not seem to account for the actual resistance to textbook authorship as an activity. The most common disincentive that was cited was the enormous commitment of time, and

often expense, necessary to write a textbook when compared to other forms of publication; particularly the refereed journal article. Expressions such as monumental, Herculean, multi-year, and unmanageable were common in reference to writing a textbook. This is not to say that there was a perception that there was no reward to writing a textbook. Reputational and professional rewards were cited; particularly in the engineering and educational disciplines. But the research publication remained the dominant arena for activity.

This dominance is founded in two logistical situations. The first was the clear perception that research, as epitomized in the refereed journal article, was in some logistical fashion easier, more comprehensible due to its sharply limited scope in any given situation, faster, and certainly more rewarding ultimately. The second was that in most instances engagement with textbooks was not considered sufficient to stand alone as the focus of a scholarly career. As a result, the impression was given that if one wrote textbooks it was still necessary to conduct research and publish the results. But if one conducts and publishes research there is no equivalent pressure to write a textbook in order to establish a reputation. Obviously, many faculty members faced with these interlocking pressures will choose to pursue research as a simple time management

choice without ever facing any more complex epistemological debate.

It is these logistical limits that create paradoxes for the faculty and department heads who support the synergistic scholarship of interpretive and pedagogical authorship as being co-equal with that of research scholarship. They recognize that this mode of scholarship does not have the ability to produce lucrative products at a pace sufficient to compete in the reputational arena that generates students, grants, contracts, and promotions. On the other hand, they also recognize the problem of "How the hell are we going to teach?" if nobody can make the commitment of time and expertise necessary to write textbooks that truly stand at the forward edge of their disciplinary territory. As a department head in the life sciences said: "Everyone has ambivalent feelings. You want good textbooks, but you don't want you or your faculty doing it."

CHAPTER VIII

SUPPORTING FINDINGS

1. INTRODUCTION

The three main inquiries proposed for this project have been addressed in Chapters V, VI, and VII. However, the nature of the questionnaire utilized and the interview process itself established that there would be several supporting areas covered. Four of these areas will be considered in this chapter: Scholarship of Supporting Activities, Estimates of Peer Opinion, Collective Actions, and Quality of the Textbook Market.

2. SCHOLARSHIP OF SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES

It was proposed that in addition to actually writing textbooks there are at least three other activities that could represent scholarly engagement with textbooks in the faculty. In their final form these areas were writing critical reviews, reading textbook manuscripts for publishers, and conducting research oriented toward some question regarding textbooks. Both the faculty and department head groups were asked if they would consider each of these functions to be a scholarly activity. The

responses are summarized in Table 8-1 for the faculty and 8-2 for the department heads.

Both Table 8-1 and 8-2 are arranged in rough order of positive support for the activities expressed by the participants in each disciplinary group. Some caution is due in regard to this ordering due to the variation in the number of respondents. In the category of reading for publishers this difference is due to the late introduction of the question as discussed in Chapter IV. In the case of textbook oriented research, the variation is due to some participants not offering a response. This situation generally arose when respondents indicated that having never considered such research they were unwilling to speculate on its worth.

The most interesting finding in this section is the degree of support given to the function of reading textbooks in draft for publishers. Of the faculty respondents, 51% rated this function as a scholarly activity. Of all the activities examined, this one perhaps most closely resembles a contractual consulting task. The typical format is for a publisher to send a textbook manuscript or portions of one to a faculty member and request a reading and comments for accuracy, structure, content, and the like. The reading and report is generally anonymous. The most commonly reported fee for the function was around $100.

Table 8-1: Faculty assessment of the scholarlship of the three major supporting activities examined.

Textbook Reviews			Reading for Publisher			Textbook Research		
Group	Yes	No	Group	Yes	No	Group	Yes	No
Humn	10	2	Humn	9	3	Educ	12	0
Educ	9	3	SocS	6	4	SocS	11	1
SocS	8	4	Life	7	5	Engr	11	1
Life	8	4	Phys	7	5	Life	10	1
Phys	8	4	Educ	6	6	Phys	10	1
Engr	7	5	Engr	4	8	Humn	9	3
Busn	4	8	Busn	2	9	Busn	8	4
Totals	54	30		41	40		71	11
	64%	36%		51%	50%		87%	23%

Table 8-2: Department head assessment of the scholarship of the three major supporting activities examined.

Textbook Reviews			Reading for Publisher			Textbook Research		
Group	Yes	No	Group	Yes	No	Group	Yes	No
Humn	4	0	Engr	2	1	SocS	4	0
Life	4	0	Educ	2	2	Educ	4	0
Engr	4	0	Humn	2	2	Engr	4	0
SocS	3	1	SocS	1	1	Humn	4	0
Busn	3	1	Life	1	3	Phys	3	1
Educ	3	1	Phys	1	3	Busn	3	1
Phys	2	2	Busn	1	3	Life	1	3
Totals	23	5		10	15		23	5
	82%	18%		40%	60%		82%	18%

As might be expected, there were objections to this activity that were similar to objections to writing textbooks. A social sciences professor who said it was not scholarly added, "People even get paid for that!" A business professor argued that if textbooks are only "distillations of known material," then this reading became merely "editing and checking."

This type of objection was not surprising. The strength of expression in the supporting opinions was. A social sciences professor who rated writing critical reviews of very low importance stated that the reading function was "an essential notion to the educational expertise in the discipline." A humanities professor who said textbooks were "drudgery" said that reading them (in the sense of this discussion) was scholarly and could "trip over into a useful contribution." An engineering professor said that it was extremely important "due to the confidential nature and direct input opportunity." Several faculty members compared the task to acting as a journal referee, although the journal task was seen as more "fine-grained" and prestigious.

Department head support was somewhat lower at 40% of the answering respondents. Expressions of support were similar to those of the faculty in terms of individual activities. The support was perhaps lower overall due to the perception that the activity was so anonymous and

individualized that little or no recognition would accrue to the reputation and strength of the department. The overall impression left by both the faculty and the department head groups is a one of a surprising respect for a very detailed activity whose scholarship, according to an education faculty member, exists

> in the sense that you are evaluating whether the text is an accurate presentation of the received knowledge of a discipline.

Discussions regarding the authorship of critical reviews and of textbook oriented research followed rather conventional lines. Textbook reviews were seen as an auxiliary activity which combined both scholarship and service functions. There was a clear pattern, even among those who said reviews were scholarly, that they were subordinate to original writing activities. It was often indicated that they would be separated on a faculty member's vita if they were listed at all. There were indications that being selected to write reviews was a measure of professional recognition, but the faculty also recognized that it was matter of the editor's recognition of who would be willing to write a review. The general sense was that reviews were, despite their commonality and established nature, perhaps the least effective of all of the modes of engagement discussed. This is not unexpected given the rather low utility of reviews indicated in Chapter V.

The discussion of textbook oriented research was supportive of the idea but unfamiliar with its execution. An engineering professor said, "That sounds like a good idea. I wish we had some of it." Most faculty members and certainly the majority of department heads who said that it was scholarly also said that it was unlikely that one could build a research program around it in a non-educational discipline. Expressions of the type that said "Yes, you could get that published" were common; indicating that the function would be viewed as successful or unsuccessful in conventional, refereed journal terms. It also was recognized that there were journals that specialized in pedagogical works in which such works might be more appropriate. There was little expressed interest in such works or, for that matter, in authoring textbook reviews. Only 14 faculty respondents (17%) reported that they had ever written a research piece oriented toward some question regarding textbooks. Authorship of a published critical review of a textbook was reported by 28 faculty members (33%). These numbers compare to the 40 faculty members who reported engagement in an actual textbook project as discussed in Chapter VII.

3. ESTIMATES OF PEER OPINIONS

Chapter I cited a speculation by Mauksch (1986) that the value of teaching in tenure decisions was perhaps suppressed in active voting situations by faculty members' estimates of how everyone else was going to vote. An attempt was made in this inquiry to gain a sense of this idea of the faculty's perception of what everyone else thinks in regard to textbooks. The faculty and department heads were asked to estimate how the faculty at large would rank the scholarship of engagement in the four textbook activities identified. Department heads were asked to estimate the factors that went into faculty decisions in regard to selecting textbooks.

Frankly, these questions were unsuccessful. In retrospect, they required too much subjective judgement for the conditions of the interview. Both the newness of the idea of codifying the discussion of textbooks and the shortness of the time precluded the extension of the discussion to considerations of what other people might think. It was difficult enough getting to the matter of what the participants thought. Some responses were obtained, but the lack of consistent understanding of the questions and the uncertain approaches to them seems to destroy any confidence in reporting those responses as actually indicative of faculty perceptions.

This is not to say that ultimately the faculty was uninterested in collective opinions within their disciplines or institution. Only that the questions were inadequately or prematurely framed. Numerous faculty members and department heads requested abstracts of findings of the study, indicating an interest in both the topic and in any collective sense that might be revealed. The reactions to the results, the estimate of the opinions and actions of others, and identification of possible influences that such information might have appear now to be second or third stage questions rather than part of an initial inquiry.

4. COLLECTIVE ACTIONS AND STRATEGIES

Introduction.

One of the implications of this inquiry is ultimately the consideration of the possibility of various collective actions in regard to textbook authorship, scholarship, and accountability. While this study was principally oriented toward underlying support factors which might be precursors to collective action, some indications of such actions were encountered.

Market Mechanisms.

The simplest collective actions in regard to marketing mechanisms were those taken expressly to bypass the existing sales structure; particularly the university bookstore system. The bookstore system came under criticism for long-lead times, rigid pricing policy, and inflexible buy-back and return policies. Members of a humanities department mentioned the resort to direct purchase of books for students in order to bypass the store. An engineering faculty member discussed the practice of purchasing books for students from a professional association with resulting discounts of up to 50% of the potential bookstore price. This particular discipline evidenced an elaborate publishing and purchasing system for scholarly works, reference works, textbooks, and on-line computer training programs and instructional graphics of significant complexity.

A disciplinary initiative with a considerably different thrust was reported by a journal editor. Division II of the American Psychological Association (The Division on the Teaching of Psychology) is in the process of developing an association policy and statement opposing practices of "kickback" on the part of some publishing houses in the marketing of textbooks and audio-visual materials. Such policies would, presumably, attempt to differentiate between unethical actions and legitimate

marketing strategies such as including audio-visual support packages in the price of the textbook. This project does seem to represent an attempt by a cosmopolitan discipline to establish a collective standard and to wield effective power in a matter directly involved with textbooks and their marketing.

Reviews, Accountability, and Authorship.

Both faculty members and department heads were asked if they felt that a publication or review journal which concentrated directly on timely reviews and comparative reviews of textbooks would be a useful library holding for the university. This question was suggested by the proposals of Baker (1986) and McGee (1986) for improved review forums. The initial responses were requested in the format of "yes," "possibly," and "no." The basic response data are shown in Table 8-3. As is the case in this inquiry, the narrative responses are somewhat more complex.

The table shows that 22% of the faculty group and 18% of the department heads reject the idea of such a forum outright. This rejection is usually on the grounds of autonomy of selection previously noted in the discussion of textbook reviews. A social sciences professor stated this quite unequivocally, "I must ultimately make the decision myself. No review...could

Table 8-3: Faculty and department head support for an innovative textbook review publication.

Discipline Group	Faculty			Department Heads		
	Yes	Poss	No	Yes	Poss	No
Social Science	9	1	2	2	0	2
Business	5	3	4	3	1	0
Education	5	5	1	3	1	0
Engineering	3	2	5	3	1	0
Humanities	4	5	2	2	2	0
Life Sciences	4	5	3	1	1	2
Physical Science	4	7	1	1	2	1
Total	34	28	18	15	28	5
	43%	35%	22%	54%	28%	18%

ever reach this level." Others questioned the ability to generate comparative reviews of any meaning. "Pie in the sky," said one education professor. Another education professor said: "Nobody has the ability or guts to do it."

The aspect of autonomy and a consideration of the existing market characterized the "possibly" replies also. Faculty members were uncertain that such a publication would be able to penetrate the hands-on selection of texts. An education professor doubted that even a dedicated publication could be timely enough to meet real ordering lead-times and other administrative pressures. A business professor felt that publishers provided fully adequate advanced information. Other faculty members and department heads agreed, citing the ready availabililty of publisher's complimentary copies.

There was support for some forum of this type as evidenced by the 43% of the faculty and 54% of the department heads who answered yes. A social sciences department head speculated that there would be "a great thirst for it, particularly in introductory texts." However, many of those supporting the idea did so while at the same time changing the product or forum described. The comparative review notion was dismissed for the sort of reasons discussed above. What was substituted was a cross between a "books-in-print" and a "current contents" approach.

A business professor said such a publication should concentrate on "short digests" and the "scope and organization of the book" rather than reviews. An engineering professor suggested a books-in-print format with catalog data and keyword indexing. A life sciences faculty member drew a direct comparison to "current contents" format publications in research. One business faculty member, intrigued by the notion, sketched out a format plan in which he called for the publication to be monthly, published in loose leaf form, and include a synopsis, the book's table of contents, the most recent revision, and a listing of all adoptions of the text. (This latter feature was a particularly interesting idea as it advances a notion of looking at the judgments of other faculties which is quite different from a review.) In the face of the autonomous nature of the textbook selection process the interest was not in reviews and evaluation but of improved cataloging and access.

One extensive reply regarding disciplinary approach and attention to review and accountability in textbooks was received from a journal editor. Because of the detail articulated in this reply it is here presented in full with the permission of the original respondent.

> TEACHING PHILOSOPHY is the only journal in philosophy to publish a significant number of textbook reviews (and we are the only journal to review A-V materials in philosophy). Although the journal is young (having just completed its tenth volume), it has done a great

> deal to raise the discipline's perception of its teaching. It has done this by making the teaching of philosophy have all the trappings of a regular scholarly pursuit, by publishing the best papers to be found in a high quality scholarly format. And it has become the major source for textbook reviews. The effect has been to make text writing a bit more important because there are now available reviews of many books that were not formerly reviewed. These are timely, objective reviews by reviewers of repute. Given the availabililty of these reviews, they are thus used by authors when seeking reappointment, promotion, other scholarly assignments from publishers, etc. And the book reviewers seem proud to include their TP credits with other efforts on their vitae. (Book reviews in philosophy journals are listed in The Philosopher's Index, the discipline's only English-language abstract journal--lending some measure of importance to reviewing.
>
> A recent informal-logic conference had a series of "meet-the-author" sessions where about 6 textbook authors met with groups teaching with their texts. These were in addition to the usual paper sessions. This is an novel idea for philosophers, but was well received and likely to be imitated.

This reply evidences most of the major themes inherent in Baker's (1986) original "small win" argument. The "trappings" of research scholarship, the visibility of reviews at a disciplinary level, and the professional visibility of authors within the discipline are all advanced. While it is impossible to determine the effect of this journal initiative or its depth of support without a detailed inquiry, it is at least interesting to find such an attempt in operation. As a test-bed for further research, a detailed longitudinal inquiry among the journal's readership and the participant's in such conference experiences might prove fruitful.

One further example of a disciplinary level initiative was encountered. A life sciences faculty member reported that he was involved with an ad hoc group within a professional association whose interest was the exploration of deliberate ways to improve textbooks within the discipline. Citing a shortage of adequate textbooks and the lack of focus in the market, this group is exploring the development of content and coverage guidelines or suggestions for various levels of texts. More innovatively, they are exploring the possibility of actually producing textbooks based on those guidelines on a multiple-author, centrally edited basis. This approach might involve bypassing textbook house editorial channels. this is clearly a cosmopolitan, disciplinary effort rather than simply a local self-publishing project.

The only evidence of a collective authorship strategy at the department level which was encountered was the previously discussed business simulation package. While the difference between a training software package and a textbook may be mainly in the eye of the beholder the specifics of this project fall outside the original definitions of the study. The project does stand as an indicator that departments can undertake collective authoring efforts in areas of disciplinary interest.

5. QUALITY IN THE TEXTBOOK MARKET

It is not the intent of this inquiry to attempt to produce a definitive study of faculty opinions of the current crop of textbooks or to define concepts of the purpose and uses of textbooks. On the other hand, some concept of the attitudes toward textbooks among the survey groups may help to clarify their answers in other areas. With this in mind, faculty respondents and department heads were asked to assess the general quality of textbooks in their disciplinary area. Responses of "excellent," " adequate," " marginal," " inadequate," and "not an area of concern" were offered. In a second question, all respondents were asked their reaction to the following statement:

> The quality of textbooks available and utilized in college instruction has a significant influence on the future intellectual vitality of a discipline.

The response scale of "strongly agree," "agree," "no opinion," "disagree," and "strongly disagree" was again used.

Table 8-5 and Table 8-6 display the responses obtained regarding the assessment of the textbooks currently available. As in other similar questions in this study responses were encountered that indicated an overall opinion while others differentiated by the target level of the textbooks. Faculty members were again more

Table 8-4: Faculty assessment of the quality of textbooks available in their disciplinary areas with categorization by level of text.

Discipline Group	Excellent			Adequate			Marginal			Inadequate			Not of Concern
	O	U	L	O	U	L	O	U	L	O	U	L	
SocS	0	0	2	8	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Busn	4	0	1	4	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Educ	1	2	0	6	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
Engr	3	0	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Humn	5	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Life	6	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Phys	3	0	0	4	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	0	0
Total	21	2	4	39	4	5	10	4	1	3	0	0	0
	29%			51%			16%			3%			1%

O = Overall response, no categorization by level.

U = Response categorized by upper-division textbook.

L = Response categorized by lower-division textbook.

Table 8-5: Department head assessment of the quality of textbooks available in their disciplinary areas with categorization by level of text.

Discipline Group	Excellent			Adequate			Marginal			Inadequate			Not of Concern
	O	U	L	O	U	L	O	U	L	O	U	L	
SocS	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Busn	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educ	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engr	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Humn	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Life	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Phys	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	1	1	11	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
	41%			47%			12%			0%			0%

O = Overall response, no categorization by level.

U = Response categorized by upper-division textbook.

L = Response categorized by lower-division textbook.

inclined to differentiate between upper- and lower-divisions in their answers than the department heads. Presumably this is due to being closer to the line and more inclined to think in specifics, whereas department heads tended to take more of a view of the overall process. Taken against the overall number of responses, the faculty was slightly less approving of the quality of the current textbook offerings than the department heads. Twenty percent (20%) of the faculty responses fall in the marginal or lower categories against only 12% of the department head responses. No department head answered "inadequate." There do not appear to be any readily identifiable patterns in these tables by discipline. They would appear to be based largely in individual experience.

The second question in this set essentially asked whether or not textbooks played a major role in recruiting students into the discipline and conveying to them the paradigms and content of the discipline. This is the idea previously noted in some responses about the scholarship of textbooks that textbooks represent a hypothesis of what to "put forward" within a discipline. Tables 8-6, 8-7, and 8-8 display the responses obtained.

The tables are arranged in by discipline group in the order of agreement with the proposition, and they show some surprises. "Strongly agree" and "agree" are considered to be supportive answers. It can be seen that

Table 8-6: Faculty agreement with the formative role of textbooks within a discipline.

Discipline Group	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Busn	4	7	0	1	0
Life	5	5	1	1	0
Phys	4	6	1	1	0
Engr	3	6	0	3	0
Educ	3	6	0	3	0
Humn	4	4	1	3	0
SocS	1	4	1	5	1
Total	23	39	5	5	1
	27%	47%	6%	19%	1%
	74%		6%	20%	

Table 8-7: Department head agreement with the formative role of textbooks within a discipline.

Discipline Group	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Engr	3	1	0	0	0
Phys	2	2	0	0	0
SocS	0	4	0	0	0
Humn	1	2	1	1	0
Busn	1	2	0	1	0
Life	0	3	0	1	0
Educ	0	2	1	1	0
Total	7	16	2	3	0
	25%	57%	7%	11%	0%
	92%		7%	11%	

Table 8-8: Journal editor agreement with the formative role of textbooks within a discipline.

Journal Category	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Disciplinary Journals (N = 49)	13	20	11	3	2
	67%		22%	11%	
Teaching Journals (N = 13)	5	5	1	1	1
	77%		8%	15%	
Journals Reviewing Textbooks (N = 28)	10	11	4	1	2
	75%		14%	11%	
Journals Not Reviewing Textbooks (N = 34)	8	14	8	3	1
	65%		23%	12%	
All Journals Responding (N = 62)	18	25	12	4	3
	69%		19%	12%	

74% of the faculty express agreement compared to a much higher 92% in the department group. The comments obtained would indicate that this question is, to an extent, slightly threatening in the faculty group. The faculty members were much more likely to object (20% disagreement) based on the position that the ability and effectiveness of the instructor filled the role proposed. The most interesting aspect of the responses is the sudden reordering of the disciplinary groups in the faculty. The business group, which placed in negative positions in virtually every category regarding textbooks in this inquiry appeared at the top of the chart in support of the role of the textbook as an operative force in shaping the future of the discipline. No immediate explanation of this paradox is apparent.

The journal editor responses are consistent with their responses in other categories. More clearly than the other groups, the journal editors may be able to separate their response to this question about future effect of textbooks from their assessment of the scholarship of writing a textbook. The argument would seem to be that textbooks affect the future intellectual character, but the ongoing nature of that intellectual character is constantly displayed by the vitality of research. Research is represented to the editors by the type of material they publish. Therefore there would be no

paradox between a 60% favorable rating in this category while at the same time 59% of the same group says textbooks are less scholarly than journal articles.

As might be expected, a considerable body of narrative discussion took place in regard to these two questions. The discussion of the quality of the current market offerings displays information of considerable complexity regarding failures and unanswered needs within the market. This sort of information would be directly applicable to the process of authoring a textbook. The discussion regarding the assessment of the role of textbooks in forwarding a discipline would suggest several potential directions for anyone undertaking a study of how the faculty actually use textbooks in classroom situations. Both of these areas, authoring parameters and classroom use are beyond the scope of this initial inquiry. For the purposes of this study these responses will be allowed to stand with no further exploration.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

This inquiry set out to explore three basic questions regarding textbooks in the context of the professional culture of the higher education faculty. The articles and other literature which generated the inquiry tended to leave the impression that the textbook would be overlooked in this context; a stepchild in which the faculty had little interest despite its constant presence. This has not been the case. The faculty members and department heads who participated in the project engaged seriously in the project. Many of them had given the questions previous thought, even if they had not engaged in collective articulations of the ideas and problems contained. Likewise, strong replies were received from many of the editors in the journal survey although the engagement with a mail survey is less easy to judge than the participation in the interviews. What was found was a rich field of inquiry; strongly suggestive of definable characteristics, fully connected to the entire spectrum of scholarly publishing, and supportive of both further action and research.

2. CONCLUSIONS

Market Information Sources.

Visibility in the textbook marketplace is absolutely dominated by the direct access mechanism of the complimentary copy. It is the most valued source of information for both faculty members and department heads. Further, it is the most likely way for a book to obtain review coverage in journals. This situation is not simply an expression of approval of a faculty "perk." It is a result of a distinct preference for autonomous judgement in the textbook selection process.

The recommendation of colleagues is the second most influential source of information. This source is not truly separate from the hands-on copy since there is a good chance that those recommendations are based on hard-copy access. Interestingly, colleagues' recommendations are not conceptually linked to published critical reviews.

Critical reviews of textbooks, as currently encountered, are a secondary source. They are clearly perceived as being of marginal utility at best. There is substantial indication that they are limited and isolated in the scholarly press by both resource and epistemological considerations.

The authoring of critical reviews is recognized as a traditional faculty activity, but it is clearly regarded

as a subordinate activity. It is seen as related more to service activities than to either research or pedagogy. Access to such authorship is mainly through established reputation and visibility to editors. It does not seem to be seen as particularly enhancing to faculty reputation. There is an apparent exception to this in the arena of pedagogically oriented journals where editors are more likely to encourage entrance by untried or new authors.

There are indications of disciplinary patterns in the regard for reviews, but they do not seem to be particularly powerful. There is a more powerful pattern related to level. The further away from the teaching line, the more favorable the view of critical reviews and their utility is likely to be. Department heads are more supportive than faculty. Journal editors are more supportive than department heads. Editors of non-pedagogical journals are more supportive than editors of pedagogical journals even though pedagogical journals clearly run more critical reviews of textbooks.

These conclusions suggest that critical reviews of textbooks, at least as currently structured, do not represent a forum for increasing either accountability in textbook authoring and publishing or the visibility and prestige of authoring textbooks.

Selection Criteria.

The four-part model proved successful in describing criteria brought to bear in selecting textbooks within the faculty group. It was capable of describing both real differences in priorities and variations among disciplines.

Content value questions are the first area of concern in selecting a textbook in all disciplinary groups and levels. Beyond content, there are two clearly different triadic patterns of selection according to discipline area (Figure 6-1). In the first, found in the social sciences, humanities, and education groups, concerns of production fall away and pedagogical concerns stand alone in the mid-range. In the second, present in the engineering and sciences disciplines, production values merge with pedagogy in the mid-range. The difference is apparently based in the conception that engineering and the sciences involve relatively immutable, complex cores whose transmission is enhanced by accurate, sophisticated graphic and mathematical displays. Further, textbooks are often seen as reference works in these disciplines. This raises the importance of its overall durability and workmanship. For the disciplines rooted in the social sciences and humanities textbooks may serve more as a precursor to interpretation and presentation by the instructor. The type of interpretive displays and visual

presentations valued in the natural sciences often become "bells and whistles" in these groups.

Selection criteria does not seem to vary by faculty level, although they do by course level. The full effect of this variability cannot be assessed from this inquiry, but shifts in the power of reputation values are suggested strongly. There is some indication that journal editors in the sciences and engineering do not recognize the concern with production quality in those faculties. Also, pedagogical journals are apparently more likely to stress pedagogical concerns in reviews as might be expected.

Price.

Price has become a factor in textbook selection, limiting the perceived freedom of many faculty members in their choice of textbooks. This impact is more extensive than most department heads seem to realize. Further, by curtailing selection in the market, price escalation may well drive a negative feedback loop in the production sector, further limiting selection and diversity. The faculty is largely passive in regard to conceptions of power over the market and price structure. The most prevalent reaction is to curtail or abandon textbook selection. Journal editors, perhaps because they are in some measure disciplinary activists, are more willing to

consider the notion of actively influencing the marketplace.

Ethical Concerns.

There is a curious lacuna regarding ethics in textbooks. The consideration or portrayal of ethical concerns inherent in subject matter plays a very secondary role in the selection of textbooks by the faculty.

Departmental Procedures.

Smith's (1981) findings are largely substantiated in this study group. Textbook selection is not generally viewed as a department level operation. It is left largely to individual faculty members or to groups of faculty members. These groups are often formally established, but they are independent in authority. The most common actual controls are oriented toward insuring coverage of prerequisites or course commonality. Adjunct faculty members and graduate teaching assistants generally do not select their own texts. This comes about more due to administrative lead-time than any other reason. Department heads do not see themselves in an active control or intervention role. Both department heads and faculty members are aware of the possibility of the appearance of conflict of interest situations in textbook

selections, but they do not generally believe that such concerns drive actual selection.

The Scholarship of Textbook Authoring.

The concept of authoring textbooks as a scholarly activity enjoys wide support among faculty and department heads. This support is based on a belief in the value of the type of cumulative, interpretive scholarship necessary in writing a textbook. Support for the scholarly worth of textbooks is not simply rooted in having written one. There is a segment of the faculty and department heads who do not accept textbooks as scholarly for epistemological reasons. This view holds that true scholarship absolutely requires pursuit of new knowledge, not new presentation. This view, to the extent of excluding textbooks from the scholarly cannon, is in the minority.

The perceived utility of actually writing textbooks is a different situation. Both faculty and department heads are somewhat less likely to believe that authoring a textbook will be rewarded than they are to believe that it is worthwhile. Department heads have a more favorable view than the faculty. There is also evidence that department heads are willing to actively support textbook authors within their departments, perhaps more than the faculty realizes. Department heads are more likely to take a firm position regarding engagement with writing a

textbook than faculty members. Both groups clearly feel that writing a textbook would be very unlikely as a pre-tenure activity.

There is strong evidence of disciplinary patterns in this area. The scholarship of textbooks is most likely to receive the highest respect in the sciences, engineering, and education groups. The utility of writing textbooks is most likely to be supported in the professional disciplines of engineering and education. The business group ranked both the scholarship and utility as extremely low by comparison to the other disciplines. There is mixed reaction to the power of textbooks in establishing a scholarly reputation. Most respondents seemed to feel that the reputation of a book did not truly result in name recognition for authors. However, respondents in the engineering and education groups spoke more positively of the value to the individual author's reputation.

There are expressions of opposition to writing textbooks because they are "entrepreneurial." This view is powerful to those who hold it, but it is an isolated minority view. The faculty and the department heads do recognize that financial concerns influence the textbook market and authors. They reject the notion that this is particularly important or damaging. It is seen as being an element in a range of financially involved activities including research, grants, consulting, summer salaries,

and scholarly press publications. In fact, it is apparent that the financial reward structure for textbooks is perceived as being non-competitive. Faculty members are more likely to reject writing a textbook because of its lack of financial reward than to pursue one in hope of gain.

It can be concluded that there is strong support for the concept of writing textbooks but less expectation of utility. Both support for writing books and expected utility vary along disciplinary grounds. They are also likely to vary by role with department heads tending to be less ambiguous in their position. The forces which act to suppress textbook authorship are not epistemological but institutional and managerial. The faculty, department heads, and journal editors do not in large measure believe that they have the option of engaging in the long-term, multi-year effort involved in writing a textbook and keeping it up-to-date in subsequent editions. This view, coupled with the potential for curtailment described in concerns over price, bodes ill for continued diversity and vision in the textbook market.

3. COLLECTIVE ACTIONS

Review Mechanisms.

The first idea concerning collective action which is suggested by this inquiry is that Baker (1986) and Mcgee (1986) were wrong in their suggestion that textbook accountability and prestige could be increased through more extensive reviews and comparative reviews in the scholarly press or a possible reviews journal. Reviews of textbooks earn a remarkably low confidence in the faculty. Further, they are in direct opposition to the underlying demand for direct access and autonomy that characterizes faculty selection processes.

Two other mechanisms are suggested however. The first is a modification of the review journal concept. There does seem to be support for greatly improved visibility of textbooks in the form of cataloging and content information. One or more periodical publications, possibly centered at disciplinary associations, which concentrated on cataloging the textbook market, describing contents, and reporting textbook adoptions might well be well received. Such a publication might increase visibility and access. The reporting of adoptions, a kind of peer review measure, might significantly increase the visibility of authors.

The second mechanism is grounded in the surprising power of the function of reading textbooks for publishers. This function seems to be perceived as much more influential than after-the-fact reviews. Journals and disciplinary associations have standards and guidelines for publications and referees. These are procedural and quality control guidelines, not content specifications. It is conceivable that careful consideration could result in similar guidelines for the analogous function of "refereeing" textbooks. Such guidelines and recognition could both improve disciplinary involvement in textbook quality. A possible extension of this notion, and probably a controversial one, would be the establishment of rotating boards of referees by associations or publishers which would be analogous to boards of referees associated with journals. This notion certainly has dangers, but it is a logical parallel to the similar structure in the research based press.

Action at the Disciplinary Level.

The existence of various disciplinary patterns in the findings suggest that the various academic disciplinary structures may well be appropriate and effective forums for other collective actions. This is bolstered by the willingness of journal editors to accept a pro-active role

in the market. Some possible courses of action that are suggested by the findings in this inquiry include:

Active establishment of textbook buying services and cataloging periodicals within the discipline.

Active investigation of marketing practices and establishment of ethical standards.

Establishment of organizational sub-elements devoted to textbook authorship as a disciplinary specialty.

Formation of editorial groups, authoring projects, and disciplinary presses or publishing initiatives in disciplines or specialties that are not adequately supported by the mass market.

Special conference vehicles for textbook authors distinctly separated from publishing house publicity.

Continued support of journals oriented toward pedagogical issues within disciplines.

Departmental and Institutional Action.

The conceptual support given to authoring textbooks and the presence of apparent willingness to support such projects by department heads suggests the possibility of more developed collective notions at the departmental, college, or university level. The main disincentives are the issue of time management and the uncertainty as to the actual range and place of pedagogical authorship. Possible actions suggested by the findings of this inquiry include:

Clarification and equalization of support guidelines for all authoring projects involving publication contracts.

Increased recognition of textbook authoring in work unit guidelines and other standards such as publication listings. The NASA standard of one chapter equals one publication cited earlier provides an indication of how such recognition might be managed.

Departmental examination and cataloging of efforts currently devoted to production of pedagogical materials in order to more clearly assess their place in activities of the department.

University, college, or departmental insistence on accurate, advanced pricing information from publishers prior to consideration of any textbook adoption.

University, college, or departmental insistence on the ability to utilize alternative purchasing sources and negotiate legitimate discounts.

Departmental level authoring or editing projects, particularly in conjunction with university presses. University or departmental level ownership of royalty rights in such projects might serve as a mechanism for establishing a clear rationale for internal time and resource allocations necessary to support such projects. Such projects might well be major publishing initiatives in faculties which are not heavily committed to research and doctoral paradigms.

Investigation of possible initiatives in alternative media or publication formats. The software project encountered in this inquiry provides a possible example. A wide range of other possibilities are inherent in the growth of electronic media and dispersed publication systems.

Establishment of research projects oriented to the textbook in higher education. Precedents for such programs exist not only in the study of textbooks in other levels of schooling but also in the existence of elaborate programs which study instructional audio-visual materials and media.

4. DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The engagement and the variety of material disclosed in this survey supports the contention that there is scope for productive research in the textbook in higher education as a vehicle to increase the understanding of the practice of teaching in college and university settings. Numerous specific questions have been proposed during the course of this report. Rather than reiterate each of these it is perhaps possible at this point to propose a taxonomy of research notions textbooks and the scholarship of pedagogical authoring. This taxonomy is shown in Figure 9-1.

The first segment of this taxonomy includes traditional research into the affect on learning outcomes and future performance of textbooks and other pedagogical media. This is a well established realm of educational research. The second portion is somewhat different. It examines faculty usages and outcomes. Questions of authorship, textbook selection, manner of use in instruction, and individual scholarship and methodology would fall into this category. The notions of the effect of textbooks on faculty practices that were raised by participants in this study would fall into this area. The third category, structural considerations, examines the internal stucture and content of textbooks and pedagogical

A TAXONOMY OF RESEARCH NOTIONS:

TEXTBOOKS AND THE SCHOLARSHIP OF PEDAGOGICAL AUTHORING

1.0 Learning Concerns	2.0 Faculty Concerns	3.0 Stuctural Concerns	4.0 Managerial Concerns
Learning strategies	Authoring	Content analysis	Publishing and marketing
Learning outcomes	Selection	Pedagogical design	Faculty development
Student usages	Classroom practice	Production quality	Institutional strategies
	Faculty development	Disciplinary needs	Disciplinary strategies
	Scholarly practice and reputation	Future configurations	

Figure 9-1: A proposed taxonomy of research notions concerning textbooks in higher education.

media. Much of the current research and content analysis currently conducted regarding textbooks would fit into this category. The final category examines textbooks and related efforts from an institutional and managerial standpoint with the ultimate goal of activating strategies which will facilitate the continued viability and diversity of instructional materials.

As was stated in the opening chapters of this study, research into the nature of textbooks in higher education participates in the genre of "small win" studies. Such research will not solve all of the difficulties attendent upon balancing faculty activities. Nor is it likely to provide revolutionary break throughs in our understanding of pedagogy in higher education. Such research may, however, illuminate details and increase the scope of practice.

All of the areas in the proposed taxonomy suggest possible direction to the interested researcher. This study itself would seem to suggest four areas of some priority. The first is a continued inquiry into the stature of ethical content in pedagogical materials. There are deeply troulbling implications in this area. The next is a deeper examination of the motivation to write textbooks and the experiences of their authors. The third area is further examination of disciplinary differences in the assessment of quality and selection

criteria in textbooks. Finally; individuals, departments, and institution should continue with experimentation and development in the realm of managerial actions that have been suggested in this chapter. It is only by attempting them that their value and feasibility can actually be judged.

5. AFTERWORD

This study has clearly accomplished its central objective of demonstrating that textbooks can be discussed in commonly recognized terms as an aspect of the activities of the higher education faculty and the "sense of the appropriate" that resides in that faculty. That "sense of the appropriate" in regards to the authorship of textbooks certainly involves controversy, ambiguity, uncertain execution, and even risk. That is to be expected. The study did not set out to find participants or environments predisposed toward authoring textbooks. The most remarkable finding was not the extent of the uncertainty but the prevalence of action on the part of those who have continued to craft a principal tool of their profession in the face of that uncertainty. Whether enough faculty members will continue in these endeavors in the future remains to be seen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PUBLISHED WORKS AND MONOGRAPHS

American Council on Education (1987) American Colleges and Universities, 13 ed. New York, New York : Author.

Apple, Michael W. (1986) Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations. New York, New York : Rutledge & Kegan Paul.

Axelrod, Joseph (1973) The University Teacher as Artist. San Francisco, California : Jossey Bass.

Bloom, Alan (1987) The Closing of the American Mind. New York, New York : Simon and Schuster.

Boorstin, Daniel (1981) "Preface" in Cole and Sicht, ed. The Textbook in American Society. Washington, D.C : The Library of Congress.

Boyer, Ernest L. (1987) College: The Undergraduate Experience in America. New York, New York : Harper and Row.

Cahn, Steven H. (1986) Saints and Scamps: Ethics in Academia. Totowa, New Jersey : Rowan and Littlefield.

Clark, Burton R. (1987) The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds. Princeton, New Jersey : The Princeton University Press.

Clapp, Jane (1960) College Textbooks: A Classified Listing, with Supplement One, 1965. New York, New York : Scarecrow Press.

Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March (1986) Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard Business School Press.

Cole, John Y. and Thomas G. Sicht, ed. (1981) The Textbook in American Society: A Volume Based on a Conference at the Library of Congress on May 2 - 3, 1979. Washington, D.C. : The Library of Congress.

Cordasco, Francesco (1973) The Shaping of American Graduate Education: Daniel Coit Gillman and the Protean Ph.D. Totowa, New Jersey : Rowan and Littlefield.

Cronbach, Lee Joseph (1955) Text Materials in Modern Education: A Comprehensive Theory and Platform for Research. Urbana, Illinois : The University of Illinois Press.

Dunkel, Harold B. (1972) "Wanted: New Paradigms and a Normative Base for Research," in Thomas, Lawrence G. ed., Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research: The Seventy First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago, Illinois : The University of Chicago Press.

Ferguson, George A. (1981) Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York, New York : McGraw Hill.

Fox, Mary Frank, ed. (1985) Scholarly Writing and Publishing: Issues, Problems, and Solutions. Boulder, Colorado : Westview Press.

Freeman, Jo (1985) "Publishing a College Textbook," in Fox, ed., Scholarly Writing and Publishing: Issues, Problems, and Solutions. Boulder, Colorado : Westview Press.

Haskins, Charles Homer (1984) The Rise of the Universities. Ithaca, New York : Cornell University Press.

Langbis, Ethel G., ed. (1981) Scholarly Publishing in and Era of Change: Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Society for Scholarly Publishing. Minneapolis, Minnesota : Society for Scholarly Publishing.

Lindsey, Duncan (1978) The Scholarly Publication System in the Social Sciences. San Francisco, California : Jossey Bass.

National Enquiry Into Scholarly Communication (1979) Scholarly Communications: The Report of the National Enquiry. New York, New York : Johns Hopkins Press.

Newman, Cardinal John Henry (1906) Selections From the Prose Writings of John Henry Cardinal Newman. New York, New York : Charles E. Merril.

Powell, Walter W. (1985) Getting Into Print: The Decision Making Process in Scholarly Publishing. Chicago, Illinois : The University of Chicago Press.

Schein, Edgar (1985) Organizational Culture. San Francisco, California : Jossey Bass.

Sicht, Thomas (1981) "The Learning Process and the Text in Use," in Cole and Sicht, ed. The Textbook in American Society. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress.

Topkins, Mary (1985) "Book Publishing: An Editor's Eye View," in Fox, ed., Scholarly Writing and Publishing: Issues, Problems, and Solutions. Boulder, Colorado : Westview Press.

Warren, Claude C. (1981) "Adopting Textbooks," in Cole and Sicht, eds., The Textbook in American Society. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress.

_____ (1979) Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Journals and Periodicals, 4th ed. Chicago, Illinois : Marquis Academic Media.

_____ (1987) Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory, 1987 - 1988. New York, New York : R.R. Bowker.

_____ (1987) Arts and Humanities Citation Index: 1986 Annual, 6 vol. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania : Institute for Scientific Information.

_____ (1987) Science Citation Index: 1986 Annual, 15 vol. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania : Institute for Scientific Information.

_____ (1987) Social Sciences Citation Index: 1986 Annual, 7 vol. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania : Institute for Scientific Information.

JOURNAL AND PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Amsler, C. E. (1986) "A Survey of Ten Money and Banking Textbooks." Journal of Economic Education, 16 (4), pp. 313-318.

Apple, Michael W. (1985) "The Culture and Commerce of Textbooks." The Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17 (2), pp. 147 - 162.

Baker, Paul J. (1986) "The Helter-Skelter Relationship Between Teaching and Research: A Cluster of Small Wins." Teaching Sociology, 14 (1), pp. 50 - 66.

Bonner, Thomas N. (1986) "The Unintended Revolution in American Higher Education Since 1940," Change, (Sept-Oct 86), pp. 44 - 51.

Budd, John (1982) "Book Reviewing Practices of Journals in the Humanities." Scholarly Publishing, 13 (4), pp. 363 - 371.

Carlson, Stephen and Richard J. Millard (1984) "The Treatment of Industrial / Organizational Psychology in Introductory Psychology Textbooks." Teaching Psychology, 11 (4), pp. 243 - 244.

Cuyler, A. J. (1985) "What's Wrong With Economic Textbooks?" Economics, 21 (89), pp. 15 - 17.

Fletcher, D. O. (1986) "A Survey of Textbooks for Industrial Organization and Public Policy." Journal of Economic Education, 17 (2), pp. 141-151.

Freeman, Jo (1984) "Negotiating a College Contract." PS, 17 (1), pp. 41 - 48.

Fruge', August (1978) "Beyond Publishing: A System of Scholarly Writing and Reading." Scholarly Publishing, 9 (4), pp. 313 - 333.

Funk, Robert W. (1979) "Issues in Scholarly Publishing, Part I." Scholarly Publishing, 9 (1), pp. 3 - 17.

Funk, Robert W. (1979) "Issues in Scholarly Publishing, Part II." Scholarly Publishing, 9 (2), pp. 115 - 130.

Grabbun, Nelson H. H. (1981) "University Press Books in the Classroom." Scholarly Publishing, 13 (1), pp. 70 - 78.

Goulet, J. C. (1986) "A Survey of Intermediate Micro-Economic Textbooks." Journal of Economic Education, 17 (3), pp. 229 - 233.

Harari, Herbert and Adela Jacobsen (1984) "Teaching Psychology in the 1980's: A Content Analysis of Introductory Psychology Textbooks." Teaching Psychology, 11 (4), pp. 236 - 237.

Hauskin, Chester A. (1963) "Estimating Sample Size." The Journal of Research Services, 3 (1), p. 3.

Kinloch, G. C. (1985) "The Changing Evaluation of Knowledge: A Study of Introductory Textbook Reviews." Sociological Spectrum, 5 (4), pp. 347 - 360.

Korn, James H. (1984) "Coverage of Research Ethics in Introductory and Social Psychology Textbooks." Teaching Psychology, 11 (3), pp. 146 - 149.

Masland, Andrew T. (1985) "Organizational Culture in the Study of Higher Education." Review of Higher Education, 8 (2), pp. 157 - 168.

Mauksch, Hans O. (1986) "Teaching Within Institutional Value Structures." Teaching Sociology, 14 (1), pp. 40 - 49.

McGee, Reece (1986) "Discussion and Commentary on the Professor as a Teacher." Teaching Sociology, 14 (1), pp. 67 - 72.

O'Neil, Robert (1982) "Why Use Textbooks?" English Language Teaching Journal, 36 (2), pp. 104 - 111.

Quereshi, M. Y. (1981) "Analytic Procedures for Selecting a General Psychology Textbook." Teaching Psychology, 8 (3), pp. 144 - 149.

Redie, G. P. (1984) "What To Look For in Selecting College Textbooks." Journal of College Science Teaching, 14 (2), pp. 103 - 105.

Rice, Eugene (1986) "The Academic Profession in Transition: Toward a New Social Fiction." Teaching Sociology, 14 (1), pp. 12 - 23.

Ruscher, P. H. (1984) "Estimates of Reading Levels of College Textbooks in Meteorology." Bulletin of American Meteorology, 65 (5), pp. 464 - 470.

Scott, Ralph (1984) "Trends in Introductory Physical Geography Textbooks." Journal of Geography, 83 (6), pp. 269 - 272.

Schuster, Jack H. and Howard R. Bowen (1985) "The Faculty at Risk." Change, (Sept-Oct 1985), pp. 13-21.

Silverman, N. N. (1986) "What Psychology Students are Learning About Individual Psychology: A Study of Textbooks." Individual Psychology, 42 (1) pp. 96 - 106.

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS AND DISSERTATIONS

Arnold, David L. (1987) "Desktop Publishing and Experiential Literature Materials." Paper presented at the First Annual Conference on Adult Literacy and Technology, Penn State University, June, 1987.

Perruci, Robert. (1982) "The Failure of Excellence in Texts." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, California, September, 1982.

Smith, William Howard (1982) "A Study of Textbook Selection Processes in English Departments of Twenty-Five Selected Colleges and Universities." A Dissertation Presented at the University of Pittsburgh.

University of Tennessee (1987) "The Joint Faculty Senate - Provost Committee for the Improvement of Teaching," (Draft) Dated 3 November, 1987.

Thompson, Patricia J. (1982) "The Textbook's Place in the Ecology of Education: The Cronbach Study After 25 Years." A Dissertation Presented at Columbia University Teachers' College.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A: STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. THE INTERVIEW WORKSHEET INTRODUCTION

The following statement was used as an introduction to each interview. Respondents were encouraged to ask for clarification, to expand on any question, or add questions or interpretations of their own at any point during the interview. Respondents were also encouraged to make distinctions by course level or purpose at any point they felt necessary in order to answer a question.

> I AM DOING A STUDY THAT IS ATTEMPTING TO TAKE AN INTRODUCTORY LOOK AT THREE QUESTIONS REGARDING TEXTBOOKS IN THE CONTEXT OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION. BASICALLY THE QUESTIONS ARE HOW DOES THE FACULTY EVALUATE AND SELECT TEXTBOOKS?, WHAT MECHANISMS SERVE TO DISTRIBUTE INFORMATION ABOUT TEXTBOOKS?, AND HOW DOES THE FACULTY REGARD THE SCHOLARLY MERIT OF ENGAGING IN PUBLISHABLE ACTIVITIES CONCERNING TEXTBOOKS? IT WOULD SEEM THAT, GIVEN THE WIDESPREAD USE OF TEXTBOOKS IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTION, THESE QUESTIONS WOULD HAVE BEEN WIDELY CONSIDERED. HOWEVER, THAT IS NOT THE CASE, AND VERY LITTLE IS KNOWN IN OPEN LITERATURE ABOUT HOW THE FACULTY APPROACHES TEXTBOOKS. THIS IS TRUE EITHER IN CONSIDERING THE FACULTY AS A WHOLE OR WITHIN DISCIPLINARY GROUPINGS.
>
> THIS INQUIRY IS BEING CONDUCTED IN 28 DEPARTMENTS AT UT. YOU AND THE OTHER FACULTY MEMBERS BEING INTERVIEWED HAVE BEEN SELECTED AT RANDOM. YOUR NAME WILL NOT BE CONNECTED WITH THE STUDY, AND YOUR DEPARTMENTAL AFFILIATION WILL BE GROUPED, FOR EXAMPLE, FACULTY MEMBERS IN THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES. THE RESEARCH HAS BEEN CLEARED THROUGH UNIVERSITY CHANNELS. I APPRECIATE YOUR WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE AND SHARE YOUR TIME WITH ME.

DURING THIS INTERVIEW, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES OF STRUCTURED QUESTIONS AS WELL AS A GROUP OF OPEN ENDED ONES. PLEASE INTERRUPT OR COMMENT AT ANY TIME.

FOLLOWING THESE QUESTIONS, I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE YOU TWO QUESTIONS TO ANSWER ON PAPER. I AM GIVING YOU THESE TWO ON PAPER BECAUSE THE RESPONSE LIST IS SIMPLY TOO LONG TO READ OUT LOUD.

DURING THE COURSE OF THE INTERVIEW, I WILL USE THE TERM TEXTBOOK IN THE FOLLOWING SENSE:

A PRINTED WORK, USUALLY BOUND, WHICH IS PURPOSEFULLY AUTHORED, CO-AUTHORED, OR EDITED TO BE USED AS AN ELEMENT OF STUDY IN SOME PORTION OF A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM AND WHICH IS INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION, REPRODUCTION, AND DISTRIBUTION BEYOND THE IMMEDIATE CLASSROOM NEEDS OF THE AUTHORS.

THIS TERMINOLOGY WOULD ALLOW TRADITIONAL TEXTBOOKS, ANTHOLOGIES, AND COLLECTIONS. IT WOULD NOT ALLOW SOURCE MATERIAL, SUCH AS A TALE OF TWO CITIES IN A COURSE ON THE NOVELS OF DICKENS. IT ALSO DOES NOT ALLOW LOCALLY REPRODUCED "COURSE PACKETS" WHICH ARE ASSEMBLED BY A FACULTY MEMBER AND INTENDED ONLY FOR USE IN ONE CLASSROOM OR COURSE.

2. THE FACULTY WORKSHEET QUESTIONS

The following questions were included in the faculty interview worksheet. Space for written comments provided on the original worksheets has been deleted here for the sake of clarity. The questions are reproduced with their narrative introductions where appropriate.

1. I would like to show you four terms relating to the evaluation of textbooks. Then I would like for you to rank these terms in regard to your own estimation of their importance in selecting a textbook for instructional use

and then perhaps expand on the reasons behind your rankings.

1.1 Content Value.

Overall:_____ Upper:_____ Lower:_____

1.2 Pedagogical Value.

Overall:_____ Upper:_____ Lower:_____

1.3 Reputational Value.

Overall:_____ Upper:_____ Lower:_____

1.4 Production Value.

Overall:_____ Upper:_____ Lower:_____

The next group of questions deals with the textbook in the context of scholarly activity. I want to start with the word scholarly used as a word of art in the following sense: the higher education faculty engages in and rewards scholarly activity. Attempt a yes or no answer if possible, then amplify if necessary. For example, we might agree that "good research" is scholarly and "bad research" or "unethical research" is not scholarly. But first we would have to establish that the notion of research fits within the general notion of scholarly.

2. Do you consider the following to be a scholarly activity? Please feel free to make any comments which might expand your answer.

2.1 Authoring or co-authoring a college textbook.

Overall Yes No

Upper Yes No

Lower Yes No

2.2 Authoring or co-authoring a critical review of a college textbook.

(Same response options)

2.3 Reading a college level textbook for a publisher for pre-publication evaluation.

(Same response options)

2.4 Authoring or co-authoring a research inquiry into some aspect of textbooks within your discipline.

(Same response options)

3. Do you believe that your colleagues in your department/college would consider the following to be a scholarly activity? Please elaborate if you wish.

3.1 Authoring or co-authoring a college textbook.

Yes Do Not Know No

3.2 Authoring or co-authoring a critical review of a college level textbook.

(Same response options)

3.3 Reading a textbook for a publisher for pre-publication evaluation.

(Same response options)

3.4 Authoring or co-authoring a research inquiry into some aspect of textbooks in your discipline.

(Same response options)

4. How do you feel that authoring a textbook would rank in a question of tenure or promotions evaluation?

5. Have you ever authored or co-authored one of the following?

5.1 A college textbook that has been accepted for publication.

5.2 A college textbook that has not yet been accepted for publication.

5.3 A critical review of a college textbook.

5.4 A research article concerning some aspects of textbooks.

6. If yes to other than textbook, where was the work presented?

6.1 _____ A refereed journal

6.2 _____ A non-refereed professional periodical

6.3 _____ A general interest periodical

6.4 _____ A meeting of a learned society

6.5 _____ A report of a funded study

6.6 _____ An internal department/college report

6.7 _____ Unpublished/unpresented

6.8 _____ Other

7. If you have authored or co-authored a textbook(s), have you ever used one or more of them in your own courses?

8. Would you use a textbook authored by a member of your own department?

9 (a). Have you ever assembled a course package, set of readings, or supplementary text which you have had locally reproduced for use by students in a particular course? If YES, then why?

9 (b). Have you ever been approached, are you aware of, or have you ever proposed any innovative publishing initiatives such as on-demand content, electronic media, or the like?

10. What is your reaction to the following statement?

The profit oriented nature of the textbook market and the payment of royalties to textbook authors create an

essential intellectual difference between writing textbooks and other forms of scholarly publications.

Strongly agree

Agree

No opinion

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

11. What other factors might set writing textbooks apart from other forms of scholarly writing?

12. Do you consider the college textbooks available within your disciplinary area to be generally:

Excellent.

Adequate.

Marginal.

Inadequate.

Not an issue of concern.

The next series of questions deals with how you obtain information regarding textbooks.

13 (a). How would you characterize the attention paid to the review and discussion of college textbooks by learned journals within your discipline?

Excellent.

Adequate.

Marginal.

Inadequate.

Not an area of concern.

13 (b). Do you read and utilize such reviews?

Yes Occasionally No

14. Many of the concerns expressed about the quality of textbook reviews concern the issue of timeliness. If there was an independent publication or data bank concentrating on providing timely reviews by competent scholars of published textbooks, do you think the library should subscribe?

Yes Possibly No

15. Would you consider authoring or co-authoring reviews for such a publication?

Yes Possibly No

16. Do you think that your department/college would encourage authoring or co-authoring reviews for such a publication?

Yes Do No Know No

17. What is your reaction to the following statement?

The quality of textbooks available and utilized in college instruction has a significant influence on the future intellectual vitality of a discipline.

Strongly agree.

Agree.

No opinion.

Disagree.

Strongly disagree.

18. Other comments or reaction to this questionnaire or to the nature of textbooks in higher education and your discipline.

3. DEPARTMENT HEAD WORKSHEET QUESTIONS

1. I am going to show you four terms with brief definitions. From your position as a department head, considering not only your teaching experience, but also your view of the mission of your department, rank these areas according to their importance in evaluation and selection of college textbooks.

1.1 Content Value.

Overall:_____ Upper:_____ Lower:_____

1.2 Pedagogical Value.

Overall:_____ Upper:_____ Lower:_____

1.3 Reputational Value.

Overall:_____ Upper:_____ Lower:_____

1.4 Production Value.

Overall:_____ Upper:_____ Lower:_____

2. Considering the same four factors, what ranking would you believe that higher education faculty members in general would assign to these factors in evaluating and selecting textbooks?

2.1 Content Value.

2.2 Pedagogy Value.

2.3 Reputation Value.

2.4 Production Value.

3. In regard to these two questions, what principal concerns would drive your answer and differences in your answers?

The next group of questions deal with department level procedures.

4. Are you systematically informed of what textbooks are used for instructional purposes in your department?

Yes Yes, Informally No

5. Does your department maintain a formal review mechanism to evaluate and select textbooks for departmental courses?

Yes, across the board.

Yes, for courses taught by adjunct or part-time instructors.

Yes, for multiple section/multiple instructor courses.

Yes, other

No

6. Does your department have a procedure to designate a textbook as unacceptable for use?

Yes No

7. If you answered yes to question number 6, what considerations might generate grounds for such a designation? (Recall the definitions from question 1.)

Considerations of Content Value

Considerations of Pedagogical Value

Considerations of Reputational Value

Considerations of Production Value

8. Are there any other comments on these or other aspects of departmental policy in regard to textbooks?

The next group of questions deal with the textbook in the context of scholarly productivity. I would like to initially use the word scholarly as a word of art in the sense that the higher education faculty engages in and is

rewarded for scholarly activity. Attempt a yes or no answer if possible and then amplify as necessary.

9. As a department head, do you consider the following to be a scholarly activity?

9.1 Authoring or co-authoring a college textbook.

Overall: Yes No

Upper: Yes No

Lower: Yes No

9.2 Authoring a critical review of a college textbook.

(Same response set)

9.3 Reviewing a textbook for a publisher in pre-publication evaluation.

(Same response set)

9.4 Authoring or co-authoring a research inquiry into some aspect of the college textbook in your discipline.

(Same response set)

10. Do you believe that the faculty at large in your general discipline would consider the following to be a scholarly activity?

10.1 Authoring or co-authoring a college textbook.

Yes Do Not Know No

10.2 Authoring a critical review of a college textbook.

(Same response set)

10.3 Reviewing a textbook for a publisher in a prepublication evaluation.

(Same response set)

10.4 Authoring or co-authoring a research inquiry into some aspect of the college textbook in your discipline.

(Same response set)

11. How do you feel that authoring a textbook would rank in a question of tenure or promotion evaluation?

12. To what extent would you agree with the following statement?

The profit oriented nature of the textbook market and the payment of royalties to textbook authors create an essential intellectual difference between writing textbooks and other forms of scholarly publications.

Strongly Agree

Agree

No Opinion

Disagree

Strongly Agree

13. What other factors might set writing textbooks apart from other forms of scholarly activity?

14. Do you consider that the college textbooks available within your disciplinary area are generally:

Excellent.

Adequate.

Marginal.

Inadequate.

Not an issue of concern.

15 (a). How would you characterize the attention paid to the review and discussion of college textbooks by learned journals within your discipline?

Excellent.

Adequate.

Marginal.

Inadequate.

Not an issue of concern

15 (b). Do you read and utilize these reviews?

Yes Occasionally No

16. If there was an independent publication or data bank concentrating on providing timely critical or comparative reviews by competent scholars of published college textbooks, would you recommend that the library subscribe?

Yes Possibly No

17. Would you encourage members of your department to participate in such a publication or service as reviewers?

Yes Possibly No

18. To what extent would you agree with the following statement?

The quality of textbooks available and utilized in college instruction has a significant influence on the future intellectual vitality of a discipline.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

19. Have you ever been approached in regard to, been made aware of, or initiated a proposal to a publisher regarding an innovative textbook publishing initiative such a s on-demand publishing, electronic media, or the like?

20. Other comments or reactions to this questionnaire.

APPENDIX B: JOURNAL EDITOR SURVEY

Dr. ...
Editor
Selected Journal

Dear Dr....

The textbook in higher educatioon is one of the most visible and pervasive artifacts of pedagogical scholarship. Yet we know little about the textbook in the context of faculty decisions and productivity. Michael Apple, in "The Culture and Commerce of Textbooks, " (1985) suggests that it is one of the elements of education that we know the least about. Thomas Sticht arues in "The Learning Process and the Text in Use, " (1979) that there is a serious neglect of studies of the textbook trilogy of teaching, publishing, and authoring.

The enclosed survey is part of my dissertation project, "An Initial Inquiry Into the Role of the Textbook in the Professional Culture of the Higher Education Faculty." This descriptive study involves in-depth interviews with one hundred and tweve faculty and administrators in seven disciplinary groupings and surveys to over one hundred and forty journal editors. The study will examine questions of how faculty members obtain information regarding textbooks, what criteria are brought to bear in selecting a textbook, and where the authorship of textbooks and related works fits in notions of scholarly productivity.

Your journal has been selected for this survey based on standing in citations indexes, area of disciplinary interest, circulation, and publishing frequency. The use of the data is explained on the consent form attached to the survey. I would request that you take a few moments and complete this form and return it in the prepaid envelope provided. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

(Signed)

David L. Arnold
(615) 690-8446

A SURVEY OF TEXTBOOK REVIEWING PRACTICES IN SELECTED JOURNALS

1. **Does your journal publish critical reviews of college level textbooks?**

   _____ NO _____ YES, OCCASIONALLY _____ YES, REGULARLY

   IF YOU SELECT NO, PLEASE SKIP DIRECTLY TO QUESTION NUMBER EIGHT.

2. **If you answered yes, approximately how many textbooks might be reviewed per year?**

   _____

3. **Does your journal maintain separate review guidelines for textbooks as opposed to other books or monographs of scholarly interest?**

   _____ NO _____ YES

4. **A critical review of a textbook for your journal would be evaluated by:**

   _____ EDITORS/STAFF. _____ INDEPENDENT READERS/REFEREES.

5. **What would you estimate to be the average time in months from the publication of a new textbook until a review of it might appear in your journal?**

   _____ (MONTHS)

6. **How are textbooks selected for review?** (Check all appropriate answers.)

   a. _____ Copies submitted by publishers.
   b. _____ Scholarly reputation of author.
   c. _____ Subject/area of the textbook.
   d. _____ Unsolicited review submissions.
   e. _____ Teaching reputation of author.
   f. _____ Publishers' catalogs.
   g. _____ Recommendations or requests from subscribers.
   h. _____ Interest of editors/staff.
   i. _____ Committee of experts.
   j. _____ Reputation of author as a textbook author.

   i. OTHER:_____

7. **How are textbook reviewers selected?** (Check all appropriate answers.)

   a. _____ Scholarly reputation.
   b. _____ Vita review.
   c. _____ Reputation for college teaching.
   d. _____ Overall publication record.
   e. _____ Authors of similar textbooks.
   f. _____ Personal knowledge of editor/staff.
   g. _____ Quality of prior published book reviews.
   h. _____ From applications by potential reviewers.

   i. OTHER: _____

8. **Rank the importance of the consideration of the following four areas to a well constructed critical review of a college or university level textbook.**

(1 = HIGHEST, 4 = LOWEST)

____ PEDAGOGICAL VALUE. Includes such factors as the format; challenge to the student; reading level; quality of exercises, workbooks or quizzes provided; and freedom from irrelevant biases.

____ CONTENT VALUE. Includes such factors as the factual accuracy of the basic content, the range or aspects of the subject covered, the methodologies portrayed, and the timeliness of the material.

____ PRODUCTION VALUE. Includes such factors as the price, size, workmanship, quality of figures or illustrations, and proofreading accuracy.

____ REPUTATIONAL VALUE. Includes such factors as the scholarly reputation of the author/s, the historic stature of the text in the field, reputation of the publisher, and citations of the text or the authors in other reviews or works.

9. **Do you believe that scholarly journals and learned societies have a role to play in influencing the textbook publishing industry and marketplace?**

_____ NO _____ UNDECIDED _____ YES

10. **Do you think that the higher education faculty within your discipline finds critical reviews of textbooks to be generally:**

_____NOT USEFUL _____ USEFUL _____ VERY USEFUL

11. **Does your journal accept advertisements for textbooks from publishers?**

_____ NO _____ YES

12. **Does your journal consider pieces which conduct comparative reviews, content analysis, or other pedagogical examination of textbooks within your discipline?**

_____ NO _____ YES _____ ONLY FOR SPECIAL ISSUES OR PURPOSES

13. **Would such a comparative study of several textbooks be considered:**

a. _____ Original research

b. _____ An essay or position paper.

c. _____ A bibliographic review or literature survey.

d. _____ A book review.

e. _____ Would require individual consideration of each piece.

14. **Compared to a published research article in a refereed journal, the authorship of a college or university textbook is generally:**

a. _____ Of greater scholarly merit.

b. _____ Of equal scholarly merit.

c. _____ Of less scholarly merit.

d. _____ Undecided.

15. **The quality of textbooks available and utilized in college instruction has a significant influence on the future intellectual vitality of a discipline.**

_____Strongly Agree _____Agree _____Neutral _____Disagree _____Strongly Disagree

16. **Please add any comments you might have in regard to this questionnaire or the the subject of college textbooks within your discipline:**

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. PLEASE READ AND SIGN THE FOLLOWING CONSENT STATEMENT AS REQUIRED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE HUMAN SUBJECTS OFFICE:

The purpose of this research is to describe textbook reviewing practices in scholarly journals in seven disciplinary categories. This inquiry is part of a broader study to examine the role of the textbook in the professional culture of the higher education faculty. The research is being conducted as part of an approved dissertation study at the University of Tennessee College of Education, Educational Leadership Department.

No names of respondents will appear in any completed work. The original returns will be available only to the principal researcher and the doctoral committeee. Responses will be grouped by disciplinary category; for example, "editors of journals in the life sciences," or "journals of psychology." Approximately 150 journals are being queried. The names of participants can be inferred from a list of surveyed journals, but not reasonalbly linked to specific responses. There is no known risk to respondents.

The completion and return of this survey and consent will be assumed to grant consent for the use of the information as described in both the original dissertation and any subsequent publications.

I have read the above statement and consent to the use of the information in the completed survey as described.

_____
Signed

_____
Date

VITA

David Lee Arnold is a native of Kingsport, Tennessee. He graduated from North Carolina State University in 1969 with the degree of Bachelor of Science in Product Design and a Commission in the United States Army Ordnance Corps.

He served on active duty from 1969 until 1985. During this period he held numerous command and staff positions in logistics and training environments including Senior Instructor, United States Army Ordnance Center and School; Commander, Ober Ramstadt Depot Activity, Germany; and Assistant Professor of Military Science, the University of Vermont. He earned a Master of Arts degree in Management and Supervision from Central Michigan University in 1977.

He left active duty in 1985 with the rank of Major to pursue advanced studies in higher education administration. His major research interests include institutional culture of higher education, the academic press, and university-community relations.