

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation by Kathleen Rose McKenzie entitled "Creating an Instrument to Aid in the Selection of Ninth-Grade and Tenth-Grade Language Arts Anthologies." 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 Curriculum and Instruction.

Mark A. Christiansen
Dr. Mark Christiansen, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

M. Hipple
J. St. Amand
William H. Brown

Accepted for the Council:

Cowminkel
Associate Vice Chancellor
and the Dean of the Graduate School

CREATING AN INSTRUMENT TO AID IN THE SELECTION OF
NINTH-GRADE AND TENTH-GRADE LANGUAGE ARTS ANTHOLOGIES

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Kathleen Rose McKenzie
December 1994

Copyright Kathleen Rose McKenzie, 1994
All rights reserved

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated

to my husband

Joseph Ray McKenzie

to my children

Joshua Ray McKenzie

Caitlin Rose McKenzie

and to my parents

Helen Elaine Rose

Clarence Ray Rose

Your belief and support have helped me attain this goal.

Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Mark Christiansen, for his guidance, support, and wisdom. The lessons learned from his many courses will continue to influence my teaching for the rest of my life. I would also like to thank the other committee members, Dr. J. Estill Alexander, Dr. Ted Hipple, and Dr. William Shurr, for their comments, assistance, and guidance over the past two years. I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Tom Ryan and Dr. Everett Myer for their humor and support. A sincere thank you is also extended to Dr. Don Dessart for his guidance through the statistical portion of my degree and to Dr. John Ray for his guidance through the statistical portion of this dissertation. I would also like to express my thanks to Dr. Sara Wingard and Dr. James Brewbaker, former professors, for their support and guidance and for planting the seeds which produced fruit--this dissertation. A special thanks goes to my husband, Joe, and children, Joshua and Caitlin, for the quiet time, hugs, kisses, and smiles which made the obstacles surmountable. I would like to thank my parents for their unswerving belief in my ability to succeed and to thank my sister, Charlotte, for lending an ear and a pinch of reality when I needed it. I would also like to thank my special confidante, Jan Miller, for the hours of telephone therapy and trips to campus to handle those "details" which allowed me to graduate on time. Finally, I would like to thank the other members of my family in Georgia: Patricia, David, Patrick, Eric, and Theron.

ABSTRACT

This research attempted to construct an instrument which would be used when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies. Using a Delphi survey of experts in the field of English education and a field test of language arts teachers currently using ninth-grade and/or tenth-grade textbooks, the instrument gives a quantified means of rating those features which should be considered when selecting textbooks.

I examined the literature for recommendations as to what researchers, experts, and teachers considered to be important when selecting an anthology for language arts classes at the ninth-grade and tenth-grade levels. After compiling a list of fifty-five items, the list was examined by a panel of professors. They were asked to make recommendations as to how the list of features could be modified. Following their recommendations, I developed a list of thirty-five items which were then sent to twelve experts of English education. Using a Delphi survey, I asked the experts to comment on the list of features (make recommendations to add, delete, or change) and to give each item a rating as to its importance when selecting textbooks. Two rounds of the Delphi survey were completed before a field test with English teachers was attempted. The field test results showed that there was no conclusive evidence that the instrument was comprehensive; there was no correlation between the ratings and the scoring of the MITS. However, there was some evidence that the scores were similar when comparing the same textbook. Also, regarding the questions of time, training, and involvement of teachers in regard to textbook selection, teachers want more time for evaluation, would appreciate some training (especially for new teachers), and believe they should be very involved with the process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE.....	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	9
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	33
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	43
V. CONSTRUCTION AND FIELD TESTING OF INSTRUMENT.....	71
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	82
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	90
APPENDIXES.....	97
APPENDIX A.....	98
APPENDIX B.....	104
APPENDIX C.....	107
APPENDIX D.....	116
APPENDIX E.....	119
APPENDIX F.....	129
APPENDIX G.....	134
APPENDIX H.....	1136
VITA.....	138

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO CALCULATION OF THE MEAN.....	51
2. ITEMS INCLUDED IN FIELD TEST AND THEIR RANKED VALUES.....	56
3. DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE PHYSICAL FEATURES.....	58
4. DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE LANGUAGE FEATURES	59
5. DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE ASSESSMENT FEATURES.....	59
6. DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE ASSISTANCE FEATURES.....	61
7. DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE SUBJECT-AREA FEATURES.....	62
8. DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO PHYSICAL FEATURES.....	63
9. DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO LANGUAGE FEATURES.....	64
10. DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO ASSESSMENT FEATURES.....	65
11. DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO ASSISTANCE FEATURES.....	66
13. DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO SUBJECT-AREA FEATURES.....	68
13. FIELD TEST RATING RESPONSES.....	74
14. FIELD TEST RESPONSES TO TIME TAKEN FOR EVALUATION.....	77

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Introduction

According to Woodward and Elliott (1992), textbooks are a dominating factor in classrooms. The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (EPIE) surveyed several thousand teachers and discovered that instructional materials take up eighty-nine percent of instructional time (Woodward & Elliott). "Davis, Frimer and Kleingelder (1977)...found...98 percent of instruction was from materials, not teachers "(Jackson, 1981, p. 9). In addition,

the EPIE Institute's 'National Survey and Assessment of Instructional Materials (NSAIM)' (1976) indicates that 95 percent of the classroom instruction and 90 percent of the homework time of children in this nation are structured by materials (p. 9).

Apple (1991) cited 75 percent (for classroom instruction time) and 90 percent (for homework time) based upon Paul Goldstein's Changing the American Schoolbook. While the numbers vary according to the source, it is difficult to argue that textbooks do not play an important role in the classroom. When the school, system, or state determines that it is time to select a new textbook for use in the high school English class, more and more teachers are being asked to serve on the textbook selection committee. According to Squire (1989), "if the good books are to drive the bad from the market, then teachers must learn how better to recognize the good" (p. 21).

As teachers become involved in the selection of textbooks, they need instruments which will make the selection process easier by placing values on

features while rating new materials under consideration.

I undertook this study to develop an instrument which aids ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts teachers in their selection of anthologies. Included in the instrument is the identification of the essential characteristics, important characteristics, and useful characteristics which experts in the field of English education determined should be considered when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies. Also included is a field test with ninth-grade and/or tenth-grade language arts teachers who had one or more years teaching experience. The instrument will allow evaluators the opportunity to measure the design and content of each textbook under consideration.

Statement of the Problem

A review of the literature indicated that there is a need to conduct more research on how to evaluate textbooks. While teachers are involved with the selection process, there has been very little research conducted on how teachers evaluate the textbooks which they will use with their classes. Dole and Osborn (1991) stated that "relatively little is known about the textbook selection process in general or about the selection of other language-arts texts such as English composition texts, literature anthologies or spelling and handwriting textbooks" (p. 521).

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were to identify the characteristics which should be considered when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language

arts anthologies and to construct an instrument which may be used to evaluate these textbooks. Identification of these characteristics was accomplished by examining professional journal articles, related books, and opinions (using the Delphi technique) of experts in the field of English education. The instrument was further refined using the responses of teachers in the field test. Based on these data, an instrument was developed that will assist textbook selection committees and individual evaluators in the selection of these anthologies. This study created an instrument to aid in the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies by examining those features which experts felt are most important in selection.

Previous Research

In 1918 Judd discussed the characteristics of textbooks which could be tabulated and measured. Whipple (1936) reported that Judd stated "scientific studies of books can be made and accurate descriptions of their characteristics can be given along with the books themselves to anyone who is going to use them" (p. 73). Sometimes score cards were used to measure the quality of a textbook and when used, evaluators tended to include more items for evaluation.

In 1991 the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English sponsored the publication of Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts. Included in this book was a chapter which examined how language arts textbooks are selected and used. The authors of this chapter, Janice A. Dole and Jean Osborn, indicated that there had been some recent research on the evaluation of reading textbooks, but very little research had focused on other language-arts texts (p. 521). In addition, several articles from English Journal indicated that the evaluation of

textbooks should be a major concern to educators (Guth, 1989; Squire, 1989; Appleby, Johnson, & Taylor, 1989; 1990a; 1990b; 1991).

Importance of the Study

By providing an instrument for evaluators of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies, this study was designed to provide a means of assistance in the evaluation of those textbooks which meet those qualifications determined to be valuable as a result of a review of the literature and a survey of experts in the field of English education

This instrument was designed to contribute in the evaluation of textbooks by identifying those features of textbooks considered valuable and allowing these features to be quantified. This instrument provided a means for comparing textbooks under consideration, giving evaluators an idea of what items were important, and improving the methods of selection.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the Delphi technique is a method of surveying experts to determine criteria regarding educational programs and that the persons participating were experts in the field of English education who responded honestly to the survey. It was further assumed that the agreement from these experts concerning the inclusion of each characteristic fulfilled the requirements for content validity in this instrument. Finally, it was assumed that the ranges used in the survey and the instrument were of equal measure and that they were continuous.

Limitations

The Delphi technique has a number of recognized limitations relative to reliability, compression of estimates, and interpretation of questionnaire items.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to those experts in English education who agreed to participate in this study. There is no reason to believe that these experts expressed opinions significantly different from those of experts from across the country.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions have been formulated:

Textbook - "...printed instructional material in bound form, the contents of which are properly organized and intended for use in Elementary or High School curricula..." (Warren, 1981, p. 48).

Teacher - Ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts teachers in public schools.

Anthology- A collection of short stories, novels, poetry, drama, and essays, including questions, overviews, and information on this collection.

Teacher's manual- A textbook intended for use by the teacher which includes questions, answers, overviews, suggested activities, and other materials which have been developed for use in the classroom.

Literature- Research and opinion from educational and English

journals and books.

Experts- Those persons in the field of English education and education, such as professors, teachers, writers, and researchers.

Support materials- Those items used in conjunction with the textbook, such as overhead sheets, work sheets, work books, and tests.

Text materials- Those items used as instructional materials in conjunction with the textbook(s) and including teacher's manuals and support materials.

Delphi technique- A poll of the opinions of experts, usually through a sequence of questionnaires (Farrell, 1971, p. 33).

Field testing- An examination of the final results of this study by teachers of ninth-grade and/or tenth-grade language arts to determine usability and content.

Score card- A list of items used to evaluate materials.

Questions

In this study I sought to answer the following questions:

1. What characteristics of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies are essential in the selection process as reported in professional journals and related books?
2. What do experts in the field of English education feel should be considered when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies?
3. What evaluative instruments have been developed quantitatively to select language arts textbooks?
4. If no evaluative instruments exist at this time, can I develop an instrument that will accurately measure the characteristics of ninth-grade

and tenth-grade language arts anthologies as identified in the literature and by the expert opinions of the Delphi panel?

Methods and Procedures

I determined the characteristics which were essential in selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies by completing four phases. The first phase was a thorough review of journal articles and related books. I then assigned these characteristics to categories.

Phase two was the examination of these characteristics by professors of English education. These professors were asked to add, delete, or combine items.

The third phase employed the Delphi technique using experts in the field of English education. Two rounds were used to identify the characteristics essential in selection of these anthologies. These experts were asked to determine the importance of each characteristic (essential, important, useful) in regard to the selection process and whether any characteristics should be eliminated. In round one experts had the opportunity to add characteristics not included in the survey. For analysis each rating was assigned a value according to how the expert viewed the feature. Each panelist was asked to give each feature a rating of "3" if it was essential when selecting a textbook, "2" if it were important, and "1" if it were useful.

Based upon current review of the literature, an objective means of determining the selection of a textbook has not been developed. Therefore, after analyzing the responses from the survey, an evaluative instrument was constructed. After I secured permission from three schools, I conducted the fourth phase of of this study with a field testing of this instrument by nine certified English teachers in East Tennessee and North Georgia with one or

more years experience and who teach ninth-grade and/or tenth-grade language arts. This field testing was done to determine the usability and content of the instrument.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes the introduction and a brief description of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of the literature from professional journals and related books.

Chapter III explains the methods and procedures used in the study.

Chapter IV analyzes the data from the Delphi rounds.

Chapter V presents the construction and field testing of the instrument.

Chapter VI summarizes the study, discusses the conclusions obtained from this study, and offers recommendations for further research.

Time Schedule

The design of the study, to include the review of the literature, the approval to conduct human subject research, the evaluation by the panel, and the consultation of teachers and experts, took place from October, 1993 until May, 1994.

The collecting of data, using the Delphi technique, took place from May until August, 1994. The field testing took place during September and October, 1994.

The analysis of the data and the writing of the report occurred from June until November, 1994.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

There has been a great deal of research to support the belief that textbooks play an important role in society. Although much had been written on the evaluation of textbooks used in schools, there had been little research on how the selection process is completed at the local district level. A review of the literature resulted in this survey of the textbook, the road to its selection, and recommendations for future selections.

Review of the Literature

The importance of which textbook ends up in the classroom may be one of the most overlooked procedures in educational research. However, very little information is available in how local districts make choices in textbooks, in particular for the high school language arts class.

This study examines the role of the textbook in the classroom, the selection process (paying special attention to the secondary language arts materials), and those features which are recommended when considering selection.

The Role of the Textbook

The textbook plays an important role in education. The National Association of Textbook Administrators (NASTA) defined a textbook as "printed instructional material in bound form, the content of which is properly organized and intended for use in Elementary or High School Curricula"

(Warren, p. 43). Their importance is evident in that "...textbooks are the foundation of much of our intellectual life" (Boorstin, 1981, p. ix). Woodward and Elliott reported that

a wide range of studies have confirmed the dominance of the textbook in the classroom, despite the variation that one might expect in textbook use from subject to subject, at different grades levels, and with varying degrees of teacher expertise (p. 177).

This evidence is confirmed by several others (Ornstein, 1992; Tyson-Bernstein & Woodward, 1991; Altbach, 1991). According to English (1980), "the school textbook often becomes the exclusive reading matter for a course for a whole school year....in many cases [it] is also the teacher's lesson plan" (p. 275). Keith (1991) claimed that students are captive audiences. Because "textbooks serve as a means for establishing national educational standards..." (Chall, 1981, p. 26) and because "...textbooks are books chosen for us by somebody else" (Boorstin, p. ix), how a textbook is selected is very important.

The role of textbooks in the classroom can be seen in the amount of time in which they are used and how the teachers use (or choose not to use) them. EPIE surveyed several thousand teachers and discovered that instructional materials take up 89 percent of instructional time (Woodward & Elliott). Muther (1985) indicated that between 70 to 95 percent of the time is spent with the textbook. Woodward and Elliott claimed: "Textbook programs structure as much as 89 percent of instruction through textbooks, teacher's editions, and collections of achievement tests, and other ancillary materials" (p. 177). They claimed that this limits teachers to act as full professionals. Osborn, Jones, and Stein (1985) reported on a study which revealed that students spent at least as much time with materials as with teachers. Woodward and Elliot stated "textbooks are only one of a number of instructional resources that must be used to fulfill goals and objectives" (p. 180).

Researchers cite reasons for teacher dependence on textbooks. "Dependence on the textbook is...linked to a time when the majority of teachers were poorly prepared in subject matter..." (Ornstein, pp. 167-168). Currently, many teachers rely on the textbook because of time limitations and insufficient training (Ornstein).

Wong and Loveless (1991) said that teachers cope with whatever textbook they are given, rarely challenging an adopted text. Examples of such coping strategies included eliminating passages, emphasizing passages, using supplementary materials, or reorganizing the sequence. These strategies are used in order to work within the constraints of time, ability, and competence, and the values of parents, community, and standardized tests (Wong & Loveless). But if teachers are unhappy with the textbook, can it be assumed that they are even using it? Apple and Christian-Smith (1991) said no; they stated that it cannot be assumed that the content of the textbook is taught or that if it is, if it is learned. Others agree. "Teachers have a long history of mediating and transforming text material when they employ it in classrooms" (Woodward & Elliott, p. 179). It is easy to understand why new teachers depend heavily on the textbook. However, there is little justification for the experienced teacher.

Squire (1981) appealed to educators to focus on textbook reform. "Perhaps now the time is ripe to...focus on the basic classroom tool...[M]ost educational publishers would agree...[that] the significance of textbooks and the fact that their development, selection, and use would benefit from extensive research and study" (p. 30).

According to Woodward and Elliott,

If textbooks are such an important component in classroom teaching, their design and the degree to which teachers depend on them should be of great interest to reformers who want to raise the professional

competency of teachers. For the more teachers rely on textbooks and teachers' guides to make instructional decisions (and the more administrators encourage that reliance) the achievement of professional status is significantly weakened. Unfortunately, little consideration has been given to the obstacle textbooks present to teachers and professional growth (p.178).

The Textbook Selection Process

Selection processes are controversial (Keith). In addition, "Selection procedures appear to be an area greatly in need of more objectivity, uniformity, and completeness" (Clary & Smith, 1986, p. 394). Warren said "the textbook selected must be the tool that will best serve the children of the community in which it is to be used" (p. 45).

In addition to Guth's suggestions for adoption committee criteria, (accountability, professional evaluation, teachability, social responsibility), Squire (1989) added training and staff development. Members of adoption committees are usually advisors who are supposed to be experts (English).

Score cards are often used to evaluate materials. Whipple reported that there are various methods of preparing score cards, most which "fail to secure objectivity in scoring. This fact probably explains the lack of validity in score-card standards" (p. 74). Whipple reported that

Judd has criticized [the practice of one school official preparing score cards]... by saying that the list of qualities should 'be made by the whole teaching profession. Such a wholly disinterested list would then become not only a basis of selection, but also a guide for production, for authors would see the necessity of conforming to the combined judgment of teachers' (p. 73).

While those who use and do not use score cards agree in the importance of content and physical makeup, Whittle noted that there were differences in the significance in evaluating aids to instruction and the adaption to specific needs. Also, those who use score cards tended to include more items for evaluation (Whipple).

As early as 1918, Judd pointed out in a discussion of score cards that the characteristics of textbooks could be revealed through scientific studies involving their use:

'Every textbook, whatever its source, has characteristics which can be accurately tabulated and described. Each book has a kind of personality which can be measured no less accurately than the physical characteristics of a man....Scientific studies of books can be made and accurate descriptions of their characteristics can be given along with the books themselves to anyone who is going to use them.' (p. 73).

Hummel (1988) looked at the criteria for selection from the viewpoint of an adult educator. He gave five characteristics of a "good" textbook: format, presentation, language, methodology, and achievement. Crismore (1989) maintained that

Committees of experts from various fields formed to identify ways to improve the quality of textbooks, have suggested better training of textbook reviewers, more involvement of teachers in selecting books, and better communications between educators, researchers, and publishers (p. 133).

The literature available for local district adoption was meager. Reports stated that local agencies have control over most final decisions because even adoption states allow for more than one choice of textbook (see Wong & Loveless; Tulley & Farr, 1985). One study was compiled for the procedures in the state of Indiana by Powell (1985) which concluded that the selection

process was a complex process. Tulley and Farr observed that the activities which "either precede or follow the adoption of a particular textbook (for example, how schools organize for an adoption and how they implement new textbooks in the classroom" (p. 9) have been ignored. They also reported that "Almost half of all school districts have local adoption committees. In statewide adoption states, these local committees are in addition to the state adoption committees" (p. 470). They concluded by observing that

...arguments in favor of local adoption seem compelling.... [because] it removes control of the curriculum from local school districts....local districts need the freedom to select the materials that will allow them to help their students meet their state goals (p. 471).

In 1976, Kunder conducted and reported on a study of local adoption procedures for thirty-three states. Seventeen states were not included because they had specific policies which limited selection. Kunder's study seemed a little dated and would probably benefit from an update which include these seventeen states. Most of the responding school districts (61.1 percent) indicated that they had general criteria for the selection of materials. Several examples of local procedures for selection of materials are included in the study.

The literature offered two opposing viewpoints as to who was responsible for the selection of textbooks at the local level. Squire (1989) declared that

Eighty percent of all adoption decisions today are made by classroom teachers, often with supervisors or administrators limited to little more than advisory roles. In state adoptions, of course, a select small committee involving teachers, administrators, and often parents will list the programs approved for use, but the final purchasing decision in local districts almost always is made by teachers in the classroom (p. 20)

On the other hand, Boynton (1989) claimed that teachers

have no idea what's available in texts, and it wouldn't make much difference if they did because most adoption decisions are made by administrators or school boards, not by teachers. Most teachers have precious little to say about the texts they're expected to use, and most of them wouldn't expect the situation to be any different from what it is (p. 19).

Some educators are standing up and requesting to be counted as professionals. Appleby, Johnson, and Taylor (1990b), in reviewing the Scott, Foresman literature series, stated

we are taking the publishers to task for what appears to be a drive to provide teacher-proof materials. We now take the profession to task by asking whether we, as teachers, are not supporting the publishers in what they are doing by buying their series and the ancillaries as if they are inseparable. Are we not part of the problem as long as we accept the materials and buy them (p. 90)

Lorimer and Keeney (1989) called for teachers and educational professors to be given the opportunity to act as editors and evaluators of textbooks. Hummel recommended to teachers of lifelong education "that those responsible for the choice of textbooks select those textbooks which show such characteristics as described" (p. 120) in his present study of textbooks for lifelong education. The same can be said for those responsible for public school education. Many special interest groups pressure publishers and selection committees. Besides the cries from feminist and minority groups, the conservative right has gained strength in the last couple years as evidenced by the Hawkins County case in Tennessee (Alexander, Rowan, & Heathington, 1989) or other such attempts at censorship (see Wong & Loveless, among others). Because of these

influential groups, publishers have dilemmas in trying to produce good textbooks while meeting the demands of their consumers (FitzGerald, 1981).

Involving teachers in textbook selection was only a part of the movement to increase teacher input throughout the curriculum (Apple & Christian-Smith). Woodward and Elliott suggested that part of the result of restructuring schools will be creating "new roles for teachers in decision-making, curriculum development, and administration" (p. 176). Selection of textbooks has expanded from small committees of teachers and administrators to an "arduous process of analysis" (Squire, 1981, p. 28). While English commented that teachers should be more involved in material selection, Guth argued that most teachers on adoption committees have not seen the new research and analysis of instructional materials in order to fight against books which are mediocre.

At all levels, there was little literature on the selection of the high school language arts textbooks and materials. Many complaints have been lodged against the publishers of these elements in the curriculum, and reviews have been completed on different literature series and composition texts with recommendations for teachers considering selection. Guth claimed that

textbooks that have given generations of teachers (not to mention students, administrators, legislators, and parents) the wrong idea of what English is all about as a subject....They [textbooks] militate against our students' discovering their own powers, using them with growing confidence and skill (p. 15).

The literature anthologies presented an interesting array of materials, yet they have problems in their objectives and content. Zaharias (1989) claimed that the problems in anthologies are related to the tasks which students are asked to perform. The importance of prior knowledge was rarely

addressed, and students are assigned to the role of passive learner. Rather than ask students to climb the ladder to higher thinking skills, Zaharias believed that students are asked to respond with text specific answers and this contributes "to the myth that reading is primarily a passive activity" (p. 23). Sabol (1977) produced a document to be used at all levels to set guidelines for the selection of language arts material. His recommendations covered selecting reviewers; defining the needs of the state, district, or school; considering varying components; making the selection; and following through on materials. Weiner (1979) also offered suggestions to language arts selection committees. Her suggestions included determining needs, surveying materials, and making a selection.

Appleby, et al. (1989, 1990a, 1990b, 1991) evaluated four secondary literature anthologies. These three men addressed issues such as content, cost, and innovations. In the article on the Prentice Hall Literature Series (Appleby, et al., 1989), they reported that almost no attempt was made to include current adolescent literature. In addition, the supplementary materials for the secondary program were organized in flimsy cardboard-suitcases and weighed in around one hundred pounds total. The reviewers stated that they felt "that a textbook should offer suggestions and activities that will help teachers move students....to make aesthetic judgments, raise questions, articulate thoughts, and respect the ideas of other" (p. 79). They believed that Prentice Hall had failed in this regard because they tried to be all things to all people.

In evaluating Holt Rinehart and Winston (HRW), (Appleby, et al., 1990a), the first indication of dissatisfaction was in a review of the authors where not one had had experience teaching high school. In addition, most of the authors in the section on modern literature were now dead. HRW also had a hefty supplementary materials package, weighing around twenty pounds, for the tenth grade series. Their warning was "Let the teacher beware" (p.

94).

Appleby, et al., (1990a) were concerned over the massive amounts of consumables and the questionable quality of such. They recommended that schools not purchase all available materials, even to compensate for poor teaching. With the money saved, they recommended buying classroom sets of adolescent novels and other trade books. Teachers, they said, "can make independent professional decisions...and their own curricular and pedagogical choices" (p. 96).

In reviewing Scott, Foresman, the reviewers (Appleby, et al., 1990b) found that authors were not properly identified and that the references were dated. The teacher's manual was cluttered with marginalia, and students were asked to answer multiple choice questions rather than to write out their own thoughts.

In their fourth evaluation, they (Appleby et al., 1991) reviewed Harcourt Brace Jovanovich's (HBJ) literature series. Their major criticism of authorship was that half of the personnel came from just three states (Texas, California, and Oklahoma). In noting that Texas and California have state-wide adoption procedures, they asked "Does this mean that teachers in these three states govern what the rest of the states have available for literature anthologies?" (p. 93). As with HRW, many authors offered were dead and only Alice Walker was post-World War II. With margins packed with as many as 97 notes for selections, the reviewers wondered if "HBJ think that teachers are this slow ?" (p. 95). They recommended that teachers ignore 90 percent of the marginalia; however, they realized that new teachers (and weak ones) will rely on the notes. They stated "Though it is true that no teacher or student will die from using HBJ's materials, a few might go comatose" (p. 95). They reminded teachers that it is the students who are supposed to need help, not teachers. In addition, HBJ offered worksheets which consisted of two or three

sentences followed by lined paper for students to write. They believe that this was a waste of paper and money. They ended with a list of recommendations to selection committees and the final note: "Teachers are not another ancillary. We must be in charge" (p. 96).

The review of the Scott, Foresman series by Appleby, et al. (1990b), found that some worksheets rarely had students writing more than a couple sentences. Squire and Applebee (1968) reported that observers found that few teachers used the composition text and they raised the question that if this were true, were they worth buying? If the books were purchased because a state or local authority made such demands, Squire and Applebee note, this could "force a teacher to use a book he feels to be inferior to one he might have chosen himself "(p. 128).

Desired Characteristics of Textbooks

In examining the literature I found recommendations for publishers, teachers, and/or evaluators to make adjustments in what to look for when producing and/or selecting textbooks. I divided these recommendations into five categories: Physical, Language, Assessment, Assistance, and Subject-Area.

Physical Features

I placed the information I found regarding the production of the textbook under the category of Physical Features. These features were labeled Illustrations, Durability, Authors (specifically, textbook authors), Copyright, Cost, Typography, and Weight/Size.

One feature mentioned was the relevancy of illustrations (see Waterman, 1952; Chall & Conard, 1991; Squire, 1985; Hall-Quest, 1918; Guthrie,

1981; Osborn, et al.; Tyson-Bernstein & Woodward; Lynch & Evans, 1963; among others). Osborn, et al. stated that while nearly all graphics included in textbooks are attractive, "they may not always be functional and that they occasionally overwhelm and distract from the text (p. 14)." Tulley and Farr stated that one weakness in the textbook is the use of unappealing illustrations.

Durability was another feature. Weiner when recommending which textbook to buy, explained:

Textbook publishers and their manufacturers follow very specific durability standards based on the adoption requirements of a few state committees. These requirements include paper weight, stitching, cover coating, and the paper's glare factor but apply only to hardback textbooks, not to paperbacks and 'trade' books (p. 9)."

She went on and said that while one publisher may guarantee three years, another may guarantee five. Therefore, a suitable durability rating for each local adoption is important since adoption cycles vary from state to state or from school to school and may extend up to ten years between adoptions. The durability rating should match the expected time of usage.

Identification of textbook authors is another feature requested by researchers and educators. While Tyson-Bernstein and Woodward call the current system of using committees to write textbooks just one of the market's realities, Guth calls for accountability of authors, arguing that if he has comments in regards to the content of a textbook, he should be able to confront the author. Approaching this controversy with even more specifics, Appleby, et al. (1989, 1990a, 1990b, 1991) reviewed four series of literature textbooks in a presentation of articles in English Journal. In each article, they addressed publishers' choices of the personnel involved with the production of the textbook. They also recommended that information be supplied as to who is

responsible for the final product and what was the specific contribution of each author. (They mentioned the 1989 NCTE resolution urging publishers to supply this information.) In addition, they called for textbook writers who have high school teaching experience and who come from various regions of the country.

The copyright date was mentioned in several articles dealing with the adoption process (for example Farr & Tulley , 1985; Hall-Quest). Two areas regarding copyright date appeared to be important; first, that the textbook has been recently published and second, that the textbook includes substantiated research. Farr and Tulley reported that

It would not surprise textbook publishers to learn that the only item that was common to...70 criteria sheets we examined was the copyright date of the textbook being considered. It seemed that when a textbook was published serves reviewers as an indication of the currency of the book (p. 470).

Other researchers (among them Osborn & Stein, 1985; Clary & Smith; Appleby, et. al, 1990b; Osborn, et. al; and Woodward, 1986) called for the inclusion of current research in the textbook. Osborn and Stein commented that "even when the research implies reasonable changes in practice publishers are frequently reluctant to incorporate the changes until their customers begin to ask for them" (p. 45).

School systems operate on specified budgets and, for this reason, the cost of the textbook, with and without ancillary materials, should be considered. While Clary and Smith mentioned that the textbook should be cost effective, Hipple (1973) reminded educators that due to the high expense of textbooks,

that a purchase today of a series of textbooks does not so exhaust the budget that appropriate supplementary materials cannot be purchased

tomorrow, and...that the substantial outlay of funds does not bind the school to a program it may wish to change in a few years (pp. 31-32).

Appleby, et al., 1990a, gave a realistic slant to this topic when they "fooled around with the cost of buying [a] series for a hypothetical high school of 1,000 students with ten English teachers....[for a] total first-year cost...[of] just about \$57,000" (p. 95), including ancillary materials. Additional expenditures of approximately \$25,200 would be needed for supplementary materials each year after that.

A sixth feature mentioned in the literature dealt with the presentation of the textbook. Chall and Conard included print size in their survey of criteria in relation to appropriate reading level; Goodman, Olsen, Colvin, and VanderLinde (1966) list print size as an important consideration. In addition, they called for a text with clear and accurate presentation of information.

In 1918, Hall-Quest recommended that the textbook "...should be ...effective...in general arrangement of the contents (p. 120)." Other researchers (for example, Osborn, et al.; and Bernstein, 1985) concur.

According to researchers (including Hummel; Chall & Conard; and Guthrie), the size of the textbook should be considered. In their survey of high school English textbooks, Lynch and Evans cautioned that

...the bulky and often garish volumes with which [English teachers] must contend are uninviting. Why should the student, who has met literature only in the chaos and clutter of the ponderous anthology, feel inclined ever to seek it again? (pp. 23-24).

They recommended reducing the size of the textbook and including only the best. Thus, the amount of material should be appropriate (as defined here to mean adequate but not excessive) for instructional purposes. Hall-Quest also states, "The textbook must be a well-systematized arrangement of a subject so that its formal study may proceed in an orderly sequence (p. 44)."

After carefully examining the features which dealt with the physical composition of textbooks, I determined that these seven categories were incorporated in this feature.

Language Features

To whom the information is intended and how it is communicated was placed under Language Features. The recommendations found in the literature which relate to this area are features which allow evaluators to determine whether the textbook is appropriate for its intended use. I divided these features into four areas: Audience, Style, Purpose, and Coherence.

Osborn, et al. called for a textbook with audience appropriateness while Guth asked that the textbook appeal to minorities and immigrants. Therefore, according to these experts, the textbook should be appropriate for the audience intended, whether that audience includes inner-city students, small town students, minorities, or immigrants. Mehlinger, 1991, (along with Chall & Conard; Bernstein; and Ornstein) indicated that one problem with current textbooks is the use of "mentioning." "Mentioning" is a practice whereby publishers include miscellaneous pieces of information in order to accommodate special interest groups. However, often these pieces detract from the clarity of the writing because they often do not allow the textbook readers the opportunity to connect information with fluidity. Another problem with clarity lies in producing textbooks which meet a specific readability level. Chall and Conard and Bernstein questioned the feasibility of this action. As Chall and Conard put it, using readability formulas to produce textbooks has resulted in materials that are "choppy, incoherent, and in its worst state, 'primerized,' meaning that the written words in no way resemble spoken language (p. 15)." Hall-Quest called for simple and direct language and Honig,

1991, and Squire, 1985, called for quality writing. In regards to the tone of the textbook, Chall and Conard requested that the tone or voice of the book be strong and individual while Tyson-Bernstein (1989) mentioned the style should be clear and accurate.

Second, there was a concern for matching the textbook with the learner and the teacher. First, the textbook must be comprehensible to the learner (Ornstein recommended matching comprehension levels.) Second, the textbook must be teachable (Guth; Squire, 1981).

The third feature was the purpose of the textbook. One expert recommended that evaluators determine if the textbook were to be used as the primary source of knowledge, as a supplement, or as a reference (Guthrie). Osborn, et al., asked for no irrelevant materials while another (Tyson-Bernstein) called for a purpose that is crystal clear.

Finally, Honig, Guthrie, and Osborn, et al., called for a coherent voice. Both Zaharias and Ornstein reported that textbooks should utilize the prior knowledge of students while Osborn, et al., called for textbooks which result in the building of knowledge.

Assessment Features

As with all educational aids in instruction, teachers and researchers are concerned as to the performance of the materials in the classroom in respect to the transfer of knowledge to students. The areas which I entered under this category included self-assessment, examinations, practice, effectiveness, and responses.

Curtis (1993) mentioned the performance of self-assessment as a criterion for the secondary student. Hummel believed that students should be permitted to perform self-assessment during the learning process and

included it in the criteria for textbook selection.

A second area dealt with the examinations included with the textbook. Honig mentioned that the assessment should reflect the intended goals. He went on to add that alternative testing should be available. Appleby, et al., 1990b, called for examinations with no multiple choice testing. While tests that are subjective rather than objective take longer to evaluate, there appeared to be strong feelings that the extra time was worth the effort.

A third area dealt with how students practiced the teachings of the textbook. Guthrie, called for appropriate questions while Bernstein echoed this with a call for high quality and level of questioning. Zaharias said that the reader should construct meaning from the text. Osborn, et al., called for materials which move students to higher levels and invoke metacognition.

Several researchers indicated that it is important that the textbook has been field-tested with good results (Squire, 1985; Osborn, et al.; Farr & Tulley; Tyson-Bernstein, 1989) and the findings are included for review (Clary & Smith). In addition, Weiner and Clary and Smith recommended requesting a Learner Verification Report (LVR), which shows an analysis of the textbook's effectiveness. Jackson even requested that publishers offer teachers demonstrations of materials.

Assistance Features

The features which related to the transfer of knowledge to students and the role of the teacher in this transfer was placed under the category of Assistance Features. These features facilitate learning by students and relate to the presentation of materials by the teacher. I designated twelve areas: reading, composition, students, ancillary materials, flexibility, audience, teacher's manuals, transition, integration, usability, inspiration, and

thinking.

The reading levels assigned and methods incorporated in textbooks are of major concern as evidenced by the multiple remarks on the subject. According to Fry (1988), readability formulas have a great deal of influence in the writing of textbooks. He suggested a method called writeability which asks writers to examine several components (including vocabulary, sentence length, and organization) when aiming writing for a particular level. Zakaluk and Samuels (1988) agreed and said that students do best when the text matches reading level. Frase (1981) added "Readability measures relate to textbook form, not content, because readability formulas only measure surface characteristics of texts" (p. 33). In addition, readable books, according to Guthrie, include known (or explained) vocabulary and coherent sentences. "Studies of the reader-text interaction point clearly to the need for the link between function and form" (p. 556).

Readability ranked second only to copyright date in the number of times it was mentioned on seventy criteria sheets (Farr & Tulley). The readability of a textbook is important in so far that students are reading materials at or slightly above grade level (Hall-Quest), yet Mehlinger explained that this concern has resulted in authors preparing a manuscript that is then followed by editors "concerned about the 'readability' of the text; thus they will reduce complexity in sentences, seek shorter and more familiar words, and so on" (p. 156). This practice appears to be common and often results in texts that are difficult to understand (Osborn, et al.). This area of concern was closely related to the clarity of the textbook. I found three factors mentioned which dealt with what the textbook would address: comprehending meaning (Squire, 1991), locating information, and selecting and evaluating materials (students should be moved toward what Freire called critical literacy Appleby et al., 1989). The literature also reported that advanced organizers are

recommended (Rinehart & Welker, 1992, as well as Osborn, et al. and Zaharias). In addition, the textbook's level of difficulty should offer a reasonable level of challenge for the students (Squire, 1985; Waterman; Chall & Conard) and that a text should be readable (Tyson-Bernstein & Woodward; and Guthrie). Students should be given the focus of the lesson and prereading activities (Zaharias; Appleby, et al., 1989) while being encouraged to ask questions. Students also should be involved with the text by activities, should be aided by prior experiences (Appleby, et al., 1990b; Appleby, et al. 1990a) and should interact with the text (Guthrie; and Ruddell, 1993).

Poor writing is another source of complaints. The textbook has been found to be badly written, rambling, inconsistent, disconnected, and inconsiderate (Woodward & Elliott). Often, the materials are bland and do not address local or community issues (Ornstein). Why are textbooks written so poorly? Unfortunately, the process of mentioning abounded in textbooks because of the various pressure groups and curriculum criteria. Publishers have resorted to adding requested materials because these groups often ask for so much. Publishers, in an attempt to placate these groups, have added short blurps of data to the text which may or may not relate to the chapter or unit. These subjects in textbooks have been covered briefly (Ornstein). Another reason for the poor writing was that readability formulas were used to rewrite materials (Chall).

Composition is another area of concern. Researchers (Honig; Osborn, et al.; and Smith, 1992) generally agree that textbooks should address the writing process. Specifically, the literature suggests that students should be encouraged to use reader-response journals when reading (Zaharias).

Ancillary materials are often offered along with the textbook for an additional cost. The research called for ancillaries that involve students (Appleby et al. 1990b) and provide adequate support (with such materials as

ditto masters and audio-visual aids [Chall & Conard]). Appleby, et al., (1989) warned teachers that one package of supplementary materials for ninth-through twelfth-grades weighed a little less than one hundred pounds; with more and more teachers "floating," this information could play an important role in textbook selection.

The textbook should allow for the omission or change of units and for the addition or substitution of outside resources (such as magazines, newspapers, and trade books). Galda and Cullinan (1991) gave evidence on the benefits of trade books in the classroom while Hall-Quest called for teachers to have the ability to reorganize materials to suit local needs and to insert and supplement new materials. Both McCutcheon (1982) and Woodward offered similar suggestions.

The audience of the textbook is another area experts determined as needing attention. Honig called for textbooks which "dispel erroneous stereotypes" (p. 107). One report called for the awareness of cultural differences (Osborn, et al.). Weiner recommended that the textbook fit educational goals of the state and local systems, while McCutcheon stated that local conditions need consideration. Chall and Conard mentioned that textbooks should include a balance in their social content and gender/ethnic content.

Teacher's manuals often are included as part of the textbook purchase. The literature I examined called for the manual to include review activities (Guthrie). The teacher's manual for the textbook includes instructional guidelines, program-related tests, clearly stated learning outcomes, adequate follow-up activities, and appropriate objectives (Osborn, et al.).

The textbook should allow for ease in teaching. According to Guth, teachability should be a major criterion when selecting textbooks while Zaharias called for differently sized group discussion and collaborative

learning. In addition, teachers "express[ed] concerns over the teachability of pupil materials, the interest-level of content and illustrations and the nature of support materials" (Squire, 1981, p. 29). Finally, the textbook should allow the teacher to lead the class while not being viewed as being teacher-proof (Appleby, et al., 1989; Bernstein).

According to Woodward and Elliott, textbooks can be used to control teachers. "[R]esearchers have found administrators often mandate the use of textbooks and publishers, responding to demands for teacher proof materials, produce elaborate teachers' guides with detailed and precise lesson plans and even scripts from which teachers can read" (pp. 177-178). This, they maintained, is demeaning to professionals. Many teachers that Woodward observed followed the guidelines in the teacher's manual with little variation resulting in lockstep. He claimed that the newer basals contained little discussion on the research and philosophy of the series. "It was as if the authors and editors had decided that either teachers would not take time to read such material or that they were not capable of understanding it" (p. 31). Shannon (1988) maintained "that the reduction of the teachers' role to manager of...materials...degrades teachers..."(p. xv).

Other areas mentioned in the literature included the smooth transition from the textbook used the previous year and to the textbook for the subsequent year, an instructional program emphasizing integrating listening, speaking, and writing, critical thinking skills which force students to think (Tyson-Bernstein) and the teaching of language skills in meaningful contexts (Honig), models provided for the organization of ideas (Appleby, 1990a), and content that would arouse and sustain pupil interest (Hall-Quest) and individual learning styles and interests (McCutcheon). Finally, Guth asked that a textbook should inspire students.

Subject Area Features

These final features dealt with the language arts curriculum in particular. The areas mentioned most fell under the categories of content, authors, vocabulary, literature, novels, and writing.

Guthrie named content as an important element to consider when evaluating textbooks. Hall-Quest asked if the literature in the anthology met education objectives established for the state or district while developing appreciation of good literature. If a textbook does not contain the materials specified by selection committees in such states as Texas and California, it is unlikely to be adopted. According to Osborn, et al., "researchers have found that the more organized and readable a text, the more students will learn from it" (p. 12). Guthrie specified that the content, determined by the book's purpose, should be a first consideration in designing a text.

Several researchers recommended the inclusion of high quality (versus high *quantity*) literature in the anthology. Waterman, Bernstein, and Lynch and Evans all called for quality of selection. Honig desired a "literature-based program that encourages reading" (p. 111).

Honig also called for classical and contemporary authors while Appleby, et. al, (1989) asked for good contemporary literature and the best of adolescent literature. While evaluating one series of textbooks, Appleby, et. al, (1991) noted that in the ninth-grade book, of the twenty short story authors offered, only four were alive..

There were several recommendations for the inclusion of genre in the textbook. These included nonfiction (biography, true stories, essays, and science/technical writing), poetry, drama, novels, legends/fables/myths, and short stories (Appleby, et al., 1991, 1990b; Waterman). Lynch and Evans called for a limit to the total of short stories; specifically, they recommended only

one-fourth of the total pages and one-sixth of total selections be devoted to this genre. They also called for a variety of essays that are worthy of being taught. Poetry, they said, should be chosen for high literary merit first, and that fewer poets should be included. If excerpts are used in poetry, Lynch and Evans recommended natural abridgements; however, they preferred no abridgements or alterations. Lynch and Evans suggested that no fewer than two of Shakespeare's plays should be included in each textbook (with no excerpts) and that other plays be chosen on artistic merit. Honig, along with Lynch and Evans, stated that while few adaptations and abridgements should be included, the number of these should not compromise the quality.

When considering the coverage of the anthology, several researchers (Squire, 1985, 1991; Tyson-Bernstein & Woodward; Bernstein; and Chall & Conard) called for more depth.

Most anthologies are organized according to genre, theme, or chronology. Woodward, along with Lynch and Evans, recommended a thematic order while Woodward added a call for publishers to do away with English and American literature for 11th and 12th grades and to use fewer editorial comments.

Tyson-Bernstein and Woodward and Appleby, et al., (1989, 1990a, 1990b) called for authors that included adolescent writers, current writers, and living writers, with the best materials by minorities and women being represented. Appleby, et al., (1991) even mentioned the inclusion of an author biography.

The vocabulary exercises (according to Guthrie; Appleby, et al., (1989) should link students to prior knowledge. Bernstein called for reinforcement of new vocabulary while Hall-Quest requested textbooks that would enrich vocabulary.

How novels are presented in anthologies was an area of concern. Lynch and Evans recommended omitting the novel and using paperbacks

instead. They also recommended that the novel be discussed as a genre within the textbook. Appleby, et al., (1989) recommended not using excerpts from novels.

Writing exercises received some recommendations also. Researchers indicated that textbooks should include expressive, imaginative, expository, analytical, and writing as a process (Appleby, et al., 1989) as well as personal, imaginative, and expressive styles (Zaharias).

Summary

The selection process is often an overlooked procedure in education. While it plays an important role in determining what will be taught, little research is available as to what constitutes proper selection. Chapter III examines the identification of those features recommended when selecting textbooks and outlines the construction of an instrument to aid in the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify the features used in textbook selection and to construct an instrument that would aid in the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies. While there have been several studies which included the selection process using checklists or score cards, (Waterman; Farr & Tulley; among others), I felt that these studies were too complex and/or vague for use by the classroom teacher. Farr and Tulley reviewed seventy criteria sheets where items ranged from forty-two to one hundred and eighty. Osborn and Stein commented that

An examination of the typical rating forms and checklist formulated reveals two outstanding problems: the level of objectivity seemingly inherent in the process, and the lack of representation of research-based criteria. Courtland and Farr (1983) reported that the evaluation criteria employed by most of the reviewers were based on 'personal interpretations' of the general criteria that were supplied to them (p. 45).

The complexity of the more extensive studies required hours of careful analysis in order to complete the checklist. In addition, although I felt that some items were more important than others, all were treated equally. This observation was met with concurrence by Waterman who stated

It is possible that a particular book might be entirely lacking in some essential feature and yet be so superior on other points as to receive the highest total score. For example, a book that is superior on all other points might have so great a reading difficulty that it would be unusable

in the grade for which it was intended (p. 270).

The identification of those features was accomplished by a careful review of the literature and by a survey of experts using the Delphi method. A field test of the instrument was given to experienced certified English teachers of ninth-graders and /or tenth-graders. The construction of the instrument was accomplished after careful examination of the survey and field test results. I determined that the only way accurately to use these checklists would be if they were assigned a quantitative value for each item. In this way, those items would not be equally measured with other, what I hypothesized might be, more important items.

In order to test my hypothesis--that some items are more important than others when evaluating textbooks for selection--I searched through the literature for features listed that were said by researchers, professors, and teachers to be important when evaluating textbooks for selection. The instrument was constructed to assist teachers, principals, and committees with the selection of anthologies by giving weight to those features found to be more valuable and by providing an instrument that was time efficient.

Reasoning for Use of the Delphi

The Delphi technique was first developed as a part of the Kettering project in 1963 by Helmer (Farrell). The technique is a method whereby expert opinion of a select group in any given field of study is used to forecast the responses for the population as a whole in order to determine a direction for future application.

Since one purpose of this study was to identify features that would aid in the selection of textbooks, I believed that a review of the literature would

result in numerous features but no quantifiable means of measuring the value of each feature. In addition to asking respondents to forecast responses, Weaver (1971) added that they "are also occasionally asked to rate the desirability of the events, should they occur" (p. 267). In order to limit the number of features to a manageable figure and to give each feature a value rating, I determined that the Delphi would be the best technique to use.

Delphi Procedures

Using a series of questionnaires, the Delphi technique solicits the opinions of experts. "[T]he *Delphi technique* polls the opinions of experts, usually though a sequence of questionnaires (Farrell, p. 33)." The technique often involves contact with these experts through a series of rounds where opinions are solicited and evaluated and where subsequent rounds are adjusted according to the proceeding results. The new rounds are then sent off to these same experts for further opinions.

Advantages of Disadvantages of the Delphi Technique

One of the major justifications for using the Delphi technique is that opinions of professionals are given without the influence of others (Weaver). Cyphert and Gant (1971) concurred and credited to Helmer the observation that "with the Delphi Technique an attempt is made to overcome these factors by not bringing the participants together in one place and by not reporting individual opinions" (p. 272). Farrell included such advantages as reflection time, low pressure, and less contamination. Cooter (1983) offered similar advantages and cited Touzel's 1978 study. Cooter listed the three primary reasons for use of the Delphi: (1) allows input from experts nationwide, (2)

allows experts to arrive at a consensus, and (3) reduces the bandwagon effect.

The Delphi technique has a number of recognized disadvantages. Among these are reliability, compression of estimates, and interpretation of questionnaire items. With reliability, there is the possibility of inconsistent responses. In addition to reliability, the compression of estimates is a disadvantage. Weaver indicated that there was little evidence to suggest that the true answer was obtained by a final consensus. The interpretation of the items on the survey presented the most severe limitation. The opinions of each individual may differ according to how they look at the question and by their experience and position (Cyphert & Gant).

After reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of the Delphi technique, along with other survey techniques, I determined that it was the most appropriate method for this study. I determined that slight modifications would be required, but that the Delphi technique provided the best means of obtaining the information required.

Gathering the Data

A careful review of the literature indicated that there are numerous opinions as to what criteria should be employed when selecting a textbook. I compiled these opinions into a list of fifty-five items, and I allocated them into six sections: Physical Features, Assistance Features, Language Features, Research Features, Assessment Features, and Subject-Area Features. I then constructed a three-page overview of the items I wished to include in the survey of experts. I asked three professors of English education and one professor of reading education at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville to examine the overview and to make recommendations on which items might be eliminated or combined in order to condense such a long list. A copy of this

overview and the list of these professors is found in Appendix A.

Based upon their recommendations a survey was constructed which consisted of thirty-five items. Delphi experts were asked to add, delete, or modify features during round one of the survey. In addition, respondents were asked to give a rating for each of the areas.

The experts were chosen from a list of twenty-one members of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). The twenty-one experts were recommended by a committee member and was based upon his knowledge of the interests and expertise of these individuals. Thirteen experts agreed to participate in the survey with one recommending a colleague with expertise in the study of textbooks. This colleague agreed to participate in the survey. Of these fourteen, twelve completed and returned Round One. Of these twelve, all completed and returned Round Two.

The panel represented twelve different educational institutions across the country. No institution had more than one Delphi member. Institutions represented included the University of Georgia, Humboldt State University, the University of Kansas, Virginia Commonwealth University, Clarion University, the University of Akron, Auburn University, and Youngstown State University. Departments represented included Curriculum and Instruction, School of Education, College of Education and Human Services, Secondary Education, Curriculum and Teaching, and Department of English. The experts represented nine states: Florida, Alabama, Virginia, Georgia, California, Kansas, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas.

Procedures of Data Collection and Analysis

In order to identify the features used in textbook selection for ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies, a two-round Delphi probe was used.

Experts were asked to review features which the literature had determined were significant when evaluating textbooks. These experts were then asked to rate the features according to whether the feature was (1) useful, (2) important, or (3) essential when selecting textbooks.

Development of Round One of the Delphi Survey

The purposes of Round One of the Delphi survey were two-fold. First, I wanted to solicit the opinions of experts regarding the importance of certain features used in textbook evaluation and selection by having them eliminate those features thought to be useless, to change any features as necessary, and to add those features not included on the list. Second, I wanted experts to evaluate each feature in terms of its relative importance in textbook selection.

I decided to conduct a review of the literature to determine those features mentioned in journals, books, and unpublished dissertations regarding textbook evaluation and selection. Although occasionally the Delphi is used as a means of collecting such features, I determined that in order to produce a manageable list of features, a review of the literature would give me those features. In addition, by requiring experts to construct all features, they would need to spend their personal time researching materials I had already covered. I offset any prejudices by (1) allowing respondents to add, delete, or change any features and by (2) including even those features mentioned in the literature not conclusively supported by research. Although this last move resulted in some respondents questioning those features, the inclusion of these features were a direct result of the literature review. In most cases, the respondents deleted those items in Round One or Round Two.

The arrangement of features for Round One consisted of three steps. In step one, I reviewed the literature for mention of desired features in textbooks.

Whenever possible, I focused on those anthologies used in the ninth and tenth grades. I then took these items and classified them into six categories.

Step two involved a review by a panel of professors knowledgeable of this study. Three of the four were experts in English education while one was an expert in reading education. This panel was asked to make suggestions as to the moving features (to different categories), combining features, eliminating features, etc. The directions and a sample of the review are included in Appendix A.

Step three was the construction of Round One of the Delphi survey. Based upon the panel's recommendations, I combined the section on research with related features, thus leaving five categories for consideration. Experts were asked to use a rating system of 3-essential when selecting textbooks, 2-important when selecting textbooks, or 1-useful when selecting textbooks. This procedure, using the panel's recommendations, seemed to hold contamination and instrument bias to a minimum. After securing final approval by committee members and by the University's Research Administration, Compliance, the instrument (see Appendix C), accompanied by a letter of introduction(see Appendix B), was distributed to the Delphi panel of experts.

Data Analysis of Round One and Development of Round Two

The purposes of Round One were to solicit opinions regarding importance of certain features through addition, elimination, or modification and to evaluate the importance of each feature when selecting textbooks.

From the fourteen surveys sent, twelve were returned completed during the time allotted for construction of Round Two.

An analysis of the twelve surveys indicated three things. First, the instructions appeared unclear to some of the participants since seven of the twelve did not rate the items they considered mutually exclusive or rated these items without indicating a preference, such as the feature dealing with novels. Second, two items were added as a result of recommendations. Third, eleven items were divided for clarity.

The development of Round Two included a more precise wording for the instruction, a separate categorization (with special instructions) for seemingly mutually exclusive features, the addition of recommendations, and the clarification of selected features.

After preparing a cover letter and the Round Two survey, I presented both to my committee chairperson who gave approval for me to proceed. Round Two surveys and cover letters were mailed to each of the twelve participants who had responded to Round One.

Purpose and Format of the Round Two Delphi Survey

The purposes of the Round Two Delphi survey were to finalize the inclusion of features for the final instrument and to obtain a ranking for each feature. For the first purpose, participants were once again asked, in their professional opinions, to eliminate those features when had no usefulness in assisting with textbook selection. For the second purpose, participants were asked to rank each feature to determine its value. The participants were once again given the choices of 3-essential feature when selecting textbooks, 2-important feature when selecting textbooks, or 1-useful feature when selecting textbooks.

Data Analysis of Round Two

All twelve experts on the Delphi panel returned the surveys within the time allotted. The analysis of the data began with the preparation of a spreadsheet indicating responses for each item matched with each expert. Using each rating as a weighted value, each one of the sixty-one were analyzed. Responses which had been left blank (given no rating) and those marked through (for elimination) were given a weighted value of zero.

Those items with two or more zeros were eliminated from the checklist. After careful analysis of those items given two zeros, I decided to reincorporate two items in the construction of the instrument. This decision was based upon research on textbooks and textbook selection. I decided to allow the teachers who participated in the field test the opportunity to determine if those items had questionable value. I also decided to allow the teachers to evaluate the remaining forty-one items without considering the weighted values given by the experts to determine if there was a need to eliminate additional items.

There were few discrepancies between what the review of the literature recommended and what experts felt would be helpful when selecting textbooks. In order to create an instrument that was not unwieldy, careful evaluation of the responses from the Delphi panelists as well as the literature review was addressed.

Development of the McKenzie Instrument of Textbook Selection (MITS)

After careful review of the data derived from the two rounds of the Delphi survey, an instrument was constructed to aid in the selection of ninth-

grade and tenth-grade anthologies. The construction, scoring, and field testing of this instrument is discussed in Chapter V of this study.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

Through this study, I wanted to answer five questions regarding textbook selection. These questions were the following:

1. What characteristics of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies are essential in the selection process as reported in professional journals and related books?
2. What do experts in the field of English education feel should be considered when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies?
3. What evaluative instruments have been developed to quantitatively select language arts textbooks?
4. If no evaluative instruments exist at this time, can I develop an instrument that will accurately measure the characteristics of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies as identified in the literature and by the expert opinions of the Delphi panel?
5. What do classroom teachers of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts feel should be considered when using this instrument?

I address these questions in this chapter and explain the techniques used to generate and analyze the data gathered.

Characteristics Used in the Selection of
Ninth-Grade and Tenth-Grade Language Arts Anthologies
as Reported in the Literature

Information regarding the characteristics used in the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies as reported in books and professional journals was covered in Chapter II. Based upon my research and the responses from the panel professors, I decided to group the characteristics recommended for consideration when selecting textbooks into five categories: Physical Features, Language Features, Assessment Features, Assistance Features, and Subject-Area Features.

Characteristics Which Should Be Considered When Selecting
Ninth-Grade and Tenth-Grade Language Arts Anthologies
According to Experts of English Education

In order to determine those characteristics which should be considered when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies, I conducted a Delphi probe survey during 1994. Procedures for this survey were discussed in Chapter III. Analysis of the data is explained in this section for the preliminary survey and for each of the two rounds of the Delphi.

Before the preliminary survey, I examined the related literature and compiled a list of items that, according to the authors and researchers, should be considered when selecting language arts anthologies. Whenever possible, specific references to ninth-grade and/or tenth-grade textbooks were included. The list included fifty-five items (see Appendix A). These items were divided into related groups: Physical, Language, Research, Assessment, Assistance, and Subject-Area. Each of these groups was then subdivided into

specific areas.

I asked four professors at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville to examine the list of items. Three of the four professors were experts in the field of English education and the fourth was an expert in reading education. They were asked to (1) make recommendations on the elimination/combination of items; (2) determine whether the categories to which the items had been assigned were appropriate; (3) add items not listed that they felt should be included; and (4) clarify wording when necessary. Their suggestions were then examined and a new list (see Appendix C) was constructed.

The Delphi participants were selected from a list of National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) members. From the list of twenty-one names recommended by one of my committee members who was familiar with several members' interests and areas of expertise, I was to contact not less than six who were willing to participate in order adequately to conduct a Delphi survey. I submitted a request to the Research Administration, Compliance, at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville. After receiving approval, I was able to contact by phone fourteen experts; thirteen who agreed to participate in the Delphi survey and one who recommended a colleague who also agreed to participate. Round One surveys (see Appendix C) were printed and mailed with letters of instruction and stamped, self-addressed priority mail envelopes. Each envelope was numbered and a corresponding number given to each of the fourteen experts.

After four weeks, ten surveys had been returned. I attempted to contact the remaining four experts and received two more surveys within a week. With the approval of committee members and my research consultants, I determined that I could proceed with Round Two.

I considered the suggestions offered by the twelve experts and

constructed the second round. Round Two surveys (see Appendix C) were printed and sent with introductory letters (see Appendix B) and self-addressed stamped envelopes. After five weeks, eleven surveys had been returned. I contacted the only outstanding survey recipient and received that survey within a week. I then began to tabulate the data.

Physical Features Recommendations

In Round One of the survey, experts made two recommendations under the section titled Physical Features. The first recommendation was to include multicultural authors in the area of authors of textbooks. The second was to add an additional area concerning the weight and size of the textbook. Both recommendations were included in Round Two.

In Round Two the only comment was to eliminate the specific weight (three pounds) listed under weight/size.

Language Features Recommendations

Under the Language Features, one item solicited four comments: Style: The text is matched with the learner and the teacher. One expert commented that the item was vague while another eliminated and the teacher from the item. Two other experts questioned whether this feature was even possible in an anthology. Another panelist added "In fact, a purpose of lit is to expand the learners' and teachers' lang[uage]." For the item labeled Purpose, one panelist commented that the "teacher should determine how [the] text is used in [the] classroom."

In Round Two once again one expert recommended eliminating part of the item labeled Style (and the teacher.) Another expert asked if including

teachers in this consideration was possible "considering the multitude of teachers?" Again for this item, two comments were submitted: "Is this really possible?" and, in conjunction with the item covering Audience, "Can we predict this?" Under the item Audience, one expert eliminated "little unnecessary information." For Purpose, one panelist commented that the teacher should determine the use of the textbook.

Assessment Features Recommendations

Three of the four areas listed under this section in Round One received comments. The first area, Self-Assessment, received no comments. Examinations, the second area, received six comments. One expert who had given this item a 2 (meaning that this was an important feature when selecting a textbook) remarked that by removing "subjective" from the item, "...I would give this a 1." Another added that the examinations should "require students to perform with language." One expert commented: "I think teachers should be encouraged and supported in developing their own approp[riate] assess[ments]" while another said that "[t]eacher-made tests should also be used." Another eliminated "reflect the aims stated by state/local authority and...." The third area was Practice. The only comment was to eliminate the portion of the item "while the exercises support the purpose(s) stated." The fourth area, Effectiveness, received only one comment, stating that the information on the Learner Verification Report (LVR) was confusing. A fifth area was recommended, Responses. The panelist defined this as "Students are encouraged to make personal connections with the material in the text." This item was added to the second round.

Under Examinations in Round Two, one expert rated all three items with a "1," then commented to the side "really 0." For the purposes of calculations, I

chose the rating of Q. Another commented that the term objective was meaningless.

Assistance Features Recommendations

In Round One, under the category of Students, one panelist commented that the lesson's focus and prereading activities could be done by teachers who know their students. Under Audience one expert stated that the textbook "needs to be inclusive of all potential audiences" and then asked "can any anthology be all things to all people?" while another stated that the wording was too narrow. Another crossed through the words ditto masters under Ancillary Materials and commented that these were not important. Also under this category, one person questioned the word adequate. One expert questioned the word teachability under Integration. For Inspiration, one panelist asked me to reconsider the language because "it is, as written, virtually meaningless" adding "what does this mean?" and another asked "can a text inspire?" A third person agreed that the textbook should inspire students to learn, but added "I'm not certain that one can tell how wide spread inspiration will be with a textbook." Under Thinking, one expert added that the textbook should encourage multiple interpretations. This was added to Round Two.

In Round Two comments from experts included one panelist who commented under the category of Students that "teachers should be the primary suppliers of" the focus of the lesson and rated it a 1 (meaning useful when selecting textbooks.) Under Audience, one expert questioned using the word mistreatment, asking if misrepresentation would be a better choice. The third item under Audience received one comment asking how the textbook could be appropriate for all potential audiences. One expert commented on the Teacher's Manuals saying, "I think teachers are responsible for [these].

Manuals can provide bibliographies and supplementary information" while another questioned the word appropriate when used with objectives. Under Transition, this person also questioned the word smooth.

Subject-Area Features Recommendations

After crossing through state/local authority in Content, one respondent wrote that the content should be determined by

the society at large. How can any text 'know' every local expectation? Besides, do we cater to those communities who would reject the principles of 'free exchange of ideas' and reading above the lives of those different from those in that locale?

Under Coverage, one expert commented that "the issue of depth vs. breadth is relative to purpose, audience, etc." while another added that breadth of coverage was preferable for ninth and tenth grades. Under Organization, one panelist responded "My inclination here is to strike chronology for ninth and tenth grades, but certain chronological treatment may be appropriate in some situations." One panelist inserted the word appropriate before primary works in the Literature item and added that "[f]or some authors [sic] primary works may not be developmentally appropriate, thus my insert." Regarding Novels, one comment was that "excerpts deprive students of a meaningful literary experience." For Vocabulary exercises linking students to prior knowledge, one person commented that this was not possible really and that it was the role of the teacher, not the text. Under Authors, one respondent asked for author biographies and information about their lives while another added that some canonical selections should be included. Two experts noted that the items for Coverage, Organization, and Novels seemed confusing. They were rewritten for clarity for Round Two.

The second round had few comments. Under Organization and under Writing, one expert claimed "no opinion." For the purposes of calculations, these responses were given no value and were not included for mean calculation. Under Writing, some respondents saw no difference between creative writing and imaginative writing while one said the same about expository writing and analytical writing.

Additional Recommendations

Panelists were asked to give additional recommendations for the survey. For Round One, the comments included the following:

In the last go round of literature books adopted in TX, teachers at middle & high school wanted tons of info from author bios to test question in 1 big teacher edition. At the same time the trend in reading books was to slim down all teacher manual materials. Less was better at elem. but more was better at secondary.

Since I abhor anthologies, this was somewhat difficult. However, in the interest of furthering your research, I responded appropriately as if I were in favor of using anthologies.

The curriculum should not be driven by the textbook. Teachers should feel free to make decisions about what to teach. The anthology could [be] a useful tool--not the primary emphasis in the class.

Literature texts are entirely too large because things keep getting added--nothing is taken away. Another reason for the size is that they're serving as 'methods' texts/planning books for teachers. The

instructional apparatus is out of control. Consequently, literature texts don't look like 'real world' reading. It's possible that literature texts may be the biggest (one of the biggest anyway) drawbacks to students' becoming readers.

I don't particularly like anthologies, so my answers may reflect this bias.

From these comments from the Delphi panel of experts, I discovered that some of these experts do not hold a high opinion of the anthologies used in schools today. This discussion is covered in more detail in Chapter VI.

Ratings of Characteristics of Features Which Should Be Considered When Selecting Textbooks

In each round, respondents rated items on the survey according to how they felt each should be weighted when considering selection. Respondents were asked to give a 3 to items they felt were essential, a 2 to items they felt were important, a 1 to items they felt were useful, and to strike through items they felt were unimportant.

For calculation purposes, items not rated were given a weighted value of zero and were not included in the calculation of the mean. These items are noted by a # in Table 1. Those recommended for elimination were given a weighted value of 0. A checklist of features was prepared and the mean was determined for each item (see Table 1).

I determined that those items receiving two or more zero ratings should be eliminated from the list. I then looked carefully at each of those items which were designated for elimination. Based upon my study of the literature

TABLE 1
DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO
CALCULATION OF THE MEAN

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>PANELISTS' RESPONSES</u>												<u>MEAN</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	
Physical													
Illustrations	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	2.33
Durability	2	3	2	3	1	3	2	1	2	2	1	1	1.92
Authors	3	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	3	3	2.25
Copyright	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2.83
Cost	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2.25
Typography	1	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	2.17
Weight/Size	1	3	1	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	1	2	2.08
Language													
Audience	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.75
Style	2	3	0	3	0	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	2.17
Purpose	2	3	3	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	3	1	2.25
Coherence	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	2.50
Assessment													
Self-Assessment	2	3	2	3	3	3	0	2	3	3	2	3	2.42
Examinations (1)	2	3	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	1.08
Examinations (2)	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	.58
Examinations (3)	3	3	3	1	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	2.58
Practice	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2.67
Effectiveness	3	3	1	3	2	1	2	0	0	2	2	1	1.67
Responses	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.92

TABLE 1 (Continued)

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>PANELISTS' RESPONSES</u>												<u>MEAN</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	
Assistance													
Reading	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2.42
Composition	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.75
Students	2	3	1	3	3	3	1	2	1	3	3	3	2.33
Ancillary Materials (1)	2	3	3	3	2	2	0	1	1	2	2	3	2.00
Ancillary Materials (2)	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	.67
Ancillary Materials (3)	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1.25
Flexibility	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.92
Audience (1)	2	3	0	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	1	2.25
Audience (2)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Audience (3)	2	3	3	3	0	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	2.42
Teacher's Manuals (1)	2	3	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1.33
Teacher's Manuals (2)	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1.00
Teacher's Manuals (3)	2	3	0	3	3	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	1.50
Teacher's Manuals (4)	2	3	0	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1.67
Teacher's Manuals (5)	3	3	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1.50
Transition	2	3	1	2	0	3	0	1	2	1	2	1	1.50
Integration	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.92
Usability	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2.92
Inspiration	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	0	3	3	3	1	2.42
Thinking (1)	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.75
Thinking (2)	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.83

TABLE 1 (Continued)

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>PANELISTS' RESPONSES</u>												<u>MEAN</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	
Subject-Area													
Content(1)	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2.67
Content (2)	2	3	0	3	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	1	1.33
Literature	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2.67
Genre	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	1	1	2	3	2.42
Authors (1)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Authors (2)	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1.58
Vocabulary	2	2	1	3	2	2	0	1	1	3	0	2	1.58
Coverage (1)	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	2	3	0	3	3	1.33
Coverage (2)	2	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1.08
Organization (1)	2	0	0	2	#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	.55
Organization (2)	2	2	3	3	#	3	0	2	2	2	3	3	2.27
Organization (3)	0	0	0	1	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.09
Novels (1)	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	.75
Novels (2)	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	.50
Novels (3)	2	2	3	1	2	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	1.58
Writing (1)	3	0	2	3	#	3	0	3	3	2	2	3	2.18
Writing (2)	3	0	2	3	#	3	0	3	3	2	2	3	2.18
Writing (3)	3	0	3	3	#	3	0	3	3	3	2	3	2.36
Writing (4)	3	0	2	3	#	3	0	3	0	2	2	3	1.91
Writing (5)	2	3	3	3	#	3	0	3	0	2	2	3	2.18
Writing (6)	3	3	2	3	#	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2.82
Writing (7)	3	3	3	3	#	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00

and my teaching experience, I decided that two of the twenty-two items which fell into this category should be included in the field test and look for indications from the field test participants as to whether these items warranted elimination.

In order to determine the value to be assigned for each feature that would be included in the field test, I used a range assignment. Since the means ranged from 1.25 to 3.00, I determined that the possible ranges were 1.75. I divided this figure by the possible rankings (three), and determined that each range should consist of .583. Therefore, items receiving a ranked value of one would fall between 1.24 and 1.823. Items receiving a ranked value of two would be assigned to those falling between 1.824 and 2.417. A ranked value of three would consist of those items falling between 2.418 and 3.001. These ranked values would be used to score the items used on the instrument. A list of those items included in the field test (after elimination) and the ranked value assigned are shown in Table 2. A scoring sheet was prepared in order to evaluate the responses from the field test (see Appendix F).

Physical Features Rating, Round One

The Delphi panelists felt that illustrations and copyright date were the two most important features to consider when selecting a textbook (see Table 3). The typography and textbook authors were also considered important. Of lesser importance was the cost and durability of the textbook. No items were recommended for elimination during this round.

TABLE 2
ITEMS INCLUDED IN FIELD TEST
AND THEIR RANKED VALUES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RANKED VALUE</u>	<u>INSTRUMENT RATING</u>
Physical		
Illustrations	2.33	2
Durability	1.92	2
Authors	2.25	2
Copyright	2.83	3
Cost	2.25	2
Typography	2.17	2
Weight/Size	2.08	2
Language		
Audience	2.75	3
Style	2.17	2
Purpose	2.25	2
Coherence	2.50	3
Assessment		
Self-Assessment	2.42	3
Examinations (3)	2.58	3
Practice	2.67	3
Effectiveness	1.67	1
Responses	2.92	3
Assistance		
Reading	2.42	3
Composition	2.75	3

TABLE 2 (Continued)

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RANKED VALUE</u>	<u>INSTRUMENT RATING</u>
Students	2.33	2
Ancillary Materials (1)	2.00	2
Ancillary Materials (3)	1.25	1
Flexibility	2.92	3
Audience (1)	2.25	2
Audience (2)	3.00	3
Audience (3)	2.42	3
Teacher's Manuals (1)	1.33	1
Teacher's Manuals (4)	1.67	1
Integration	2.92	3
Usability	2.92	3
Inspiration	2.42	3
Thinking (1)	2.75	3
Thinking (2)	2.83	3
Subject-Area		
Content(1)	2.67	3
Literature	2.67	3
Genre	2.42	3
Authors (1)	3.00	3
Authors (2)	1.58	1
Vocabulary	1.58	1
Organization (2)	2.22	2
Writing (6)	2.89	3
Writing (7)	3.00	3

TABLE 3
DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE
PHYSICAL FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Illustrations	6	5	1	0	29
Durability	0	7	5	0	19
Authors	7	1	4	0	27
Copyright	7	3	2	0	29
Cost	0	8	4	0	20
Typography	5	6	1	0	28

Language Features Rating, Round One

Audience was a very important feature to the Delphi experts. Out of a possible weighted score of 36, audience appropriateness was given a score of 34 (see Table 4). Other features--coherence, style, and purpose--were also given high ratings. No items were recommended for elimination in this section during Round One.

Assessment Features Rating, Round One

Eight out of twelve panelists rated self-assessment and practice as essential items to consider when selecting textbooks (see Table 5). The

TABLE 4
DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE
LANGUAGE FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Audience	10	2	0	0	34
Style	6	3	3	0	27
Purpose	4	6	2	0	26
Coherence	6	6	0	0	30

TABLE 5
DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE
ASSESSMENT FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Self-Assessment	8	3	1	0	31
Examinations	0	6	4	2	16
Practice	8	3	1	0	31
Effectiveness	5	1	5	1	22

Effectiveness of the test, as evidenced by field testing and Learner Verification Reports, was given a lower rating while examinations were not seen as an essential feature by any of the experts and was recommended to be eliminated by two panelists.

Assistance Features Ratings, Round One

Of the twelve areas listed under this feature, the experts on the Delphi panel rated usability as an essential feature for textbook selection eleven out of twelve times (see Table 6). Integration, composition, audience, and thinking were rated as essential by ten of the twelve respondents. How the textbook addressed reading and how students are prepared for and involved with the text were also important items according to the experts. Both the flexibility of the textbook and the ability of a textbook to inspire students were given a high rating, but were recommended for elimination by one panelist each. The teacher's manual content, the student transition, and the ancillary materials were all given lower ratings.

Subject-Area Features Ratings, Round One

The only item in Round One to receive ratings of essential from all twelve panelists was the item which mentioned authors (see Table 7). The areas of content, writing, and literature all received high scores with no recommendations for elimination by any of the panelists. While the representation of materials by genre in the anthology received a lower weighted score, six experts rated it as an essential feature and only one recommended elimination. The three areas which were confusing to some of

TABLE 6
DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE
ASSISTANCE FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Reading	8	4	0	0	32
Composition	10	2	0	0	34
Students	8	2	2	0	30
Ancillary Materials	0	3	7	2	13
Flexibility	7	4	0	1	29
Audience	10	2	0	0	34
Teacher's Manuals	1	6	4	1	19
Transition	1	5	2	4	15
Integration	10	2	0	0	34
Usability	11	1	0	0	35
Inspiration	7	3	1	1	28
Thinking	10	2	0	0	34

the panelists--novel inclusion, coverage (breadth versus depth), and organization (by chronology, theme, or genre)--all received lower scores also.

TABLE 7
DELPHI PROBE ROUND ONE
SUBJECT-AREA FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Content	10	2	0	0	34
Literature	8	3	1	1	31
Genre	6	3	2	1	26
Novels	7	3	0	2	27
Vocabulary	3	4	4	1	21
Writing	9	2	1	0	32
Authors	12	0	0	0	36

Physical Features Ratings, Round Two

Once again, copyright received high ratings with ten of the twelve rating this as essential (see Table 8). Illustrations, textbook authors, and cost all scored high with no recommendations for elimination. One feature was added to Round Two under this category: weight and size of the textbook. This feature, along with typography, also scored high and neither one was

recommended for elimination. Durability was given the lowest score (23 out of 36) by the panel, but had no elimination recommendations.

TABLE 8
DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO
PHYSICAL FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Illustrations	5	6	1	0	28
Durability	3	5	4	0	23
Authors	6	3	3	0	27
Copyright	10	2	0	0	34
Cost	3	9	0	0	27
Typography	4	6	2	0	26
Weight/Size	5	3	4	0	25

Language Features Ratings, Round Two

The rating for audience appropriateness once again scored high (see Table 9), but did receive one recommendation for elimination. The areas of coherence and purpose received high ratings also, yet no one recommended these for elimination. Most of the experts considered style as essential (seven out of twelve), but two recommended elimination.

TABLE 9
DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO
LANGUAGE FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Audience	11	0	0	1	33
Style	7	2	1	2	26
Purpose	5	5	2	0	27
Coherence	7	4	1	0	30

Assessment Features Ratings, Round Two

While Round One in this category had only four features, Round Two contained seven (see Table 10). The new category, responses, received eleven essential ratings and one important rating. Practice questions in the textbook requiring the students to use prior knowledge and to determine personal meaning received high ratings also. The area of examinations was broken down into three separate areas to determine if there were more than one element of this feature which experts believed should be rated. The recommendation by one of the panel members to include the requirement that students perform with language received ten out of twelve essential ratings and two recommendations for elimination. The other two areas under examinations received low ratings. Self-assessment received a weighted total of 29 out of 36 with only one expert drawing a line through the item. The effectiveness of the text was given mixed ratings.

TABLE 10
DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO
ASSESSMENT FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Self-Assessment	7	4	0	1	29
Examinations (1)	1	3	3	5	12
Examinations (2)	0	2	2	8	6
Examinations (3)	10	0	0	2	30
Practice	8	4	0	0	32
Effectiveness	3	4	3	1	20
Responses	11	1	0	0	35

Assistance Features Ratings, Round Two

This section grew from twelve areas in Round One to twenty-one areas in Round Two. These additional sections were added to clarify the mixed results regarding the ancillary materials, audience, and teacher's manuals, as well as to add another section under thinking. Consistently, one section under audience which addressed the avoidance of stereotyping and mistreatment of race, sex, and ethnic groups received essential ratings from all of the panelists (see Table 11). Three other items (flexibility, integration, and usability) were rated essential by eleven experts and important by one. All twelve panelists agreed that the items dealing with thinking should be included when considering a textbook, and how the textbook approached student writing using reader responses and process writing was given ten essential ratings.

TABLE 11
DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO
ASSISTANCE FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Reading	7	4	1	0	30
Composition	10	1	1	0	33
Students	7	2	3	0	28
Ancillary Materials (1)	4	5	2	1	24
Ancillary Materials (2)	0	1	6	5	8
Ancillary Materials (3)	0	4	7	1	15
Flexibility	11	1	0	0	35
Audience (1)	6	4	1	1	27
Audience (2)	12	0	0	0	36
Audience (3)	8	2	1	1	29
Teacher's Manuals (1)	1	3	7	1	16
Teacher's Manuals (2)	0	2	8	2	12
Teacher's Manuals (3)	3	2	5	2	18
Teacher's Manuals (4)	3	3	5	1	20
Teacher's Manuals (5)	3	2	5	2	18
Transition	2	4	4	2	18
Integration	11	1	0	0	35
Usability	11	1	0	0	35
Inspiration	8	2	1	1	29
Thinking (1)	9	3	0	0	33
Thinking (2)	10	2	0	0	34

The item dealing with reading was also given high scores. Of slightly less importance were the areas of inspiration, appropriate audience, student involvement, and audience background. The requirement that ancillary materials be adequate but not excessive was given a weighted score of 24 while the items under teacher's manuals and transition all received lower scores as did the ancillary materials dealing with audio-visual aids and ditto masters.

Subject-Area Features Ratings, Round Two

Like the previous category, the Subject-Area Features grew in number from Round One to Round Two in order to clarify some of the results. In Round Two, thirteen categories were added after subdividing the six features found in Round One. Eleven out of twelve panelists gave the selection of authors an essential rating and one gave it a useful rating (see Table 12). The experts generally agreed that writing should focus on creation and revision with only one expert offering no opinion (therefore no rating). All of the panelists agreed that the literature should vary in content and also that all genres be represented (with ratings of either essential or important), while no one eliminated the feature requesting that the selections included be the primary and best works from the authors chosen. As for the inclusion of personal writing exercises, nine felt this was essential. While still receiving high scores, the areas of expressive writing, creative writing, thematic organization, creative writing, analytical writing, expository writing, and vocabulary scored lower. Of the three choices regarding the inclusion of novels in the classroom, the highest score went to the item asking that novels be excluded from the anthology (with a weighted score of 19), while the inclusion of the entire novel (with a score of 12) and the use of novel excerpts (with a score of 3) received less support. All experts felt there was some

TABLE 12
DELPHI PROBE ROUND TWO
SUBJECT-AREA FEATURES

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RESPONSES</u>				<u>WEIGHED TOTAL</u>
	Essential	Important	Useful	Not Rated	
Content (1)	8	4	0	0	32
Content (2)	2	3	4	3	16
Literature	8	3	1	0	31
Genre	8	3	1	0	31
Authors (1)	11	0	1	0	34
Authors (2)	2	2	7	0	17
Vocabulary	3	5	2	1	21
Coverage (1)	3	2	0	7	13
Coverage (2)	3	2	0	7	13
Organization (1)	0	4	0	8	8
Organization (2)	5	4	0	2	23
Organization (3)	0	0	1	10	1
Novels (1)	3	1	1	7	12
Novels (2)	0	0	3	9	3
Novels (3)	8	1	0	3	26
Writing (1)	6	3	0	3	24
Writing (2)	6	2	0	4	22
Writing (3)	8	1	0	3	26
Writing (4)	5	3	0	4	21
Writing (5)	6	2	0	4	22
Writing (6)	9	2	0	1	31
Writing (7)	11	0	0	1	33

value to the addition of author biographies in the textbook while most agreed that the anthology should contain appropriate concepts, ideas, and content, but to varying degrees. The issue of coverage (depth versus breadth) received equal ratings for each choice and thus was not conclusive. The call for a genre organization was eliminated by eight experts while eleven eliminated organization by chronology.

Quantitative Evaluative Instruments

Developed to Aid in the Selection of Ninth-Grade and Tenth-Grade Language Arts Anthologies

In my review of the literature in Chapter II, I was unable to locate a quantitative instrument that was developed to aid in the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies. While there have been criteria sheets and scorecards developed, and some of these ask the evaluators to assign values to each item base, no instrument was found that attempted to assign a quantitative value for each item based upon research.

Development of an Instrument to Aid in the Selection of Ninth-Grade and Tenth-Grade Language Arts Anthologies

Because I determined that there were no quantitative instruments available to aid in the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies, I constructed an instrument based upon a careful review of related literature, the expert opinions of Delphi panel members, and the responses of experienced teachers. The construction of the instrument is

discussed in Chapter V.

Summary

With questions one, two, and three, I sought to identify those characteristics of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies which assist evaluators with textbook selection. After a careful review of the related literature, I compiled a list of those characteristics which researchers had determined should be considered when selecting these textbooks. The list was refined and submitted, with some additions and modifications, to Delphi panel members through two rounds of a Delphi survey. I included the results of the surveys in this chapter (see Tables 1-12, pp. 51-68).

Questions four and five dealt with the existence of a quantitative instrument. Since no such instrument was found, I constructed one.

Chapter V discusses the field testing and construction of this instrument which was based upon the findings of this study.

CHAPTER V

CONSTRUCTION AND FIELD TESTING OF AN INSTRUMENT TO AID IN THE SELECTION OF NINTH-GRADE AND TENTH-GRADE LANGUAGE ARTS ANTHOLOGIES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the construction and field testing of an instrument to aid in the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies based upon a review of the literature and the expert opinions gathered from a Delphi survey.

In Chapter II a review of the literature indicated that there were no quantitative instruments to aid evaluators with the selection of textbooks. I constructed such an instrument using the information gathered from the related literature and the results of the Delphi survey.

Construction of the Instrument

The review of the literature in Chapter II resulted in a list of fifty-five items which researchers considered valuable when selecting textbooks. These fifty-five items were organized into six categories (see Appendix A). Acting upon recommendations from English education and reading education experts, I reorganized and modified these items into five categories containing a total of thirty-five items (see Appendix C).

The basic format of the survey remained constant through Round One and Round Two. The items contained in these surveys were rated by experts on a Delphi panel and their responses resulted in a list of forty-one items.

I determined that the easiest way for evaluators and teachers to use this list was to indicate whether a feature was included in a textbook under consideration. After determining which features were present in the textbook, the evaluators and teachers could then determine the quantitative value of the textbook.

I determined the quantitative value of each item on the instrument by means of assigning a ranked value to each item based upon the responses given by the Delphi panel of experts. This procedure was explained in Chapter IV.

I composed an introduction to the instrument that explained the purposes and limitations associated with its use. A copy of this introduction and of the field test instrument is seen in Appendix F. It is titled the McKenzie Instrument of Textbook Selection (MITS).

Field Testing of the McKenzie Instrument of Textbook Selection (MITS)

I felt that it was important to find out whether the MITS was an appropriate instrument for use by classroom teachers. In order to accomplish this task, I decided to ask experienced, certified teachers of ninth-grade and/or tenth-grade language arts classes to examine the instrument. With this examination, I hoped to learn five things:

1. Is the MITS a comprehensive means of evaluating textbooks?
2. How much time is allotted for textbook selection and is the MITS a time efficient instrument for selection committees, principals, and classroom teachers?
3. What training has been provided to classroom teachers in the area of

textbook selection?

4. What do teachers feel about the selection process?

5. Is there a means of correlating the quantitative value of the textbook based upon the MITS and the overall teacher assessment of the textbook?

With these questions in mind, I requested and received approval from principals to contact English teachers at three rural high schools in East Tennessee and North Georgia. One English teacher at each high school was asked to coordinate the research at that school and was asked to contact all certified ninth- and tenth-grade language arts teachers with at least one year experience and request their participation in this field test. The teacher coordinators would then supervise the collection of data at their school and return the field test materials to me.

I included information sheets for each stage of the field test. For the teacher coordinator, I included a letter of introduction (see Appendix D) and an instruction sheet (see Appendix E). I included an information and cover sheet, a general survey of textbook selection experiences, a cover sheet for the instrument, and a copy of the actual instrument for the field test teachers (see Appendix E). Within three weeks the surveys were returned and an evaluation of the responses began.

From the three schools, nine responses were returned. The years of experience teaching 9th/10th grades varied from five years to twenty-four years with a mean of thirteen years and nine months. The responses from the surveys are described in the next section.

Responses from the Field Test

Ratings and MITS Scores

Based upon the responses given by the field test teachers, there was no conclusive evidence that the MITS is a comprehensive instrument to evaluate textbooks for selection. Of the nine respondents, their responses to the pre-rating and post-rating and MITS scoring of the textbook were as shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13
FIELD TEST RATING RESPONSES

Respondent	Textbook Grade/Publisher	Pre- Rating	Post- Rating	MITS Score
1	Elements of Literature 10 (HRW)	B	C	70
2	Elements of Literature 10 (HRW)	B	C	69
3	Elements of Literature 10 (HRW)	A	A	99
4	Elements of Literature 9 (HRW)	B	B	84
5	Elements of Literature 9 (HRW)	B	A	84
6	Literature and Language 9 (McDL)	A	A	70
7	Adventures in Appreciation 10 (HBJ)	C	C	29
8	Literature and Language 10 (McDL)	B	B	68
9	Globe Literature 10 (GBC)	B	B	97

Publishers of textbooks are as follows:

HRW-Holt, Rinehart, and Winston

McDL-McDougal/Littell

HBJ-Harcourt Brace Jovavich

GBC-Globe Book Company

Based upon these responses, I determined that there was no correlation between the rating given and the scoring on the MITS. However, respondent #3 indicated that the evaluation was "based largely on memory of the above text used last year." No indication was given why a current textbook was not evaluated. Looking at the other responses for the same textbook, I concluded that respondents #1 and #2 had the same ratings for both before and after (B and C, respectively) and similar MITS scores (70 and 69, respectively). In addition, respondents #4 and #5 had the same pre-survey ratings (B) and similar post-survey ratings (B and A, respectively) and had the same MITS scores (84). Taking the comment from respondent #3 into consideration, it was possible for me to conclude that while no correlation existed between rating and scoring, there appeared to be some correlation between ratings and scores.

While I had hoped to discover conclusively whether the MITS was a comprehensive means of evaluating textbooks, I was unable to verify that the MITS could be used to assign a letter grade to a textbook because of the subjectivity involved. However, the responses from the field test gave me more information as to the training, time, involvement, and attitudes regarding textbook selection of the same textbook.

Training

Regarding their feelings about the training given for textbook selection, the responses were very different. While some teachers stated that no training had been provided for them, the general consensus was that they had learned by way of on-the-job experience. Other teachers indicated that training was not necessary for experienced teachers and that inexperienced teachers should not serve on selection committees. While one asked for teacher workshops because these would help in making informed decisions,

another stated that training through workshops was unnecessary. That teacher added that "first year teachers and others may need to prepare or be given guidelines." One teacher admitted that "I need this in order to know how to evaluate texts in terms of general and specific matters regarding practice and philosophy." Another commented that "There is some focus in selected education courses, but not really enough. However, a text can look good, yet when students and teacher try to use that text it does not measure up."

Time

The amount of time spent using the MITS varied from teacher to teacher. The overall mean time was twenty-one minutes and forty seconds. Because the response times might have varied according to the number of years experience the teacher had had with the textbook, I compared these two responses as shown in Table 14.

Once again taking into consideration the previous remark of respondent #3, I concluded that by eliminating the responses of #3, those teachers with one year experience with the textbook spent more time in using the MITS as an evaluative instrument with an overall mean of thirty-three minutes and thirty seconds. Those teachers with three or more years experience with the textbook averaged sixteen minutes and forty-eight seconds. For a teacher using the MITS as a means of evaluating a textbook for selection, I determined that at least thirty-three minutes should be allowed to evaluate each textbook.

When asked to comment on time allotted for textbook selection, once again, answers varied. Three of the nine teachers responded that adequate time was given for textbook selection, but were not specific as to how much time was actually allotted. One teacher responded that ten hours was spent the

last time textbooks were selected but that "I still felt as if I had not spent enough time." Another answered that teachers are expected to spend their

TABLE 14
FIELD TEST RESPONSES TO TIME TAKEN FOR SELECTION

Respondent	Time Spent for Evaluation (in minutes)	Years Experience with Textbook
1	32	1
2	15	5
3	14	1 *
4	35	1
5	23	5
6	30	2
7	20	5
8	15	3
9	11	3

*Indicated that the book evaluation was from memory--for a book used during the 1993-1994 school year.

own time over a period of six weeks. While one answered that "a lengthy period of months should be allotted" another answered that "approximately three months" was allowed at that teacher's school. One teacher recommended that in service time be allotted, while another commented that "staff development credit is offered, but no other compensation/renumeration is available." The response from one teacher seemed to summarize the feelings of the majority: "When I was on the committee for selection earlier, I felt cramped to make valid and wise decisions because I was so involved with my regular school work also."

Involvement

Comments from these teachers as to their feelings about the involvement level of teachers for textbook selection also varied. Some felt this item was aimed at whether teachers should be involved and gave such responses as "the selection should be of group consent by teachers" and "teachers should form the largest percentage of the membership on the selection committee since they are the ones who will use the materials and can benefit from past teaching experiences." Others saw it as an item dealing with the amount of involvement by teachers. "I question 'total' participation of all English teachers in the selection process," stated one respondent. Another disagreed, explaining that "since we buy a complete series and not just a grade level all teachers need to be involved. Most series are good at one level and weak at another." Others tended to agree, saying that teachers know the materials and the classroom and know what will work. One teacher commented that the involvement was high among teachers at that school: "Most of our teachers care and had a voice in selecting what we use now."

When asked to give general comments regarding the selection process,

only six of the nine teachers responded. One teacher offered this opinion: "At best, textbook selection is a difficult job and always is a source of contention between grade level and teachers who disagree on companies and texts. I don't think there is an easy solution." Another observed that "some years are better than others because more input is circulated out of the appointed committee. The last selection was not that well-defined. We were told the samples were in the work area and we should review them by a certain date." One respondent commented on the extra time involved by saying, "I have been involved in the process in the past. My greatest concern is the paperwork, which usually accompanies it." Another teacher observed that "with one school, selection is easy, but before we had three, and ideas varied greatly. I've been in another system, and the problems were the same: teachers resistant to change, some who were too traditional and some who simply wanted to design the course around the order of the book."

Two teachers offered advice for the selection process. One recommended starting the selection process earlier in the year, preferably during the summer months the year before adoption. This teacher added that the selection committee should work during the year on selecting the best book and that the system should give stipends and Staff Development Unit's for the work. The other teacher commented that "new teachers might especially need help in what goes into textbook selection. Also, veteran teachers need to be reminded of how important multi-cultures, pictures, women, lack of stereotypes and prejudices, and so on are in the selection process."

Teachers' Reactions Regarding the MITS

Five of the nine teachers offered comments about the MITS.

Regarding the durability rating, one teacher responded that there was

no way of knowing this information. This teacher also questioned using research substantiated within the last ten years by asking "as related to what?" Features which received comments such as "vague" included self-assessment of students and personal connection with the text materials by students. One teacher questioned whether cost should be a concern. This same teacher eliminated the feature dealing with inspiration. Items needing clarification included matching the text with the learner and the teacher, the Learner Verification Report (LVR), and the term "ancillary." In regard to whether the textbook is appropriate for all potential audiences, one teacher asked if this meant reading levels or ability groups. Two teachers commented that they had no way of knowing whether the book had been field-tested or if a LVR was available. One teacher wanted to know why organization based upon theme was more important than chronological or genre while another was thankful that the book used was organized by genre and not by theme. Finally, two teachers felt that some items should be divided into smaller features.

One teacher added a comment regarding the MITS:

This instrument was not only helpful to me for evaluating this text but also brought into focus desirable, salient, and applicable features of good texts in general. I'm glad you're doing this research.... I hope I have your findings available when selection time comes around next time.

Summary

Based upon a review of related literature and information from a Delphi survey, I constructed an instrument to aid in the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies. I field tested this instrument with nine certified, ninth-grade and/or tenth-grade English teachers with one or

more years of teaching experience during September and October of 1994. Based upon the comments from the teachers, I modified the instrument to address their concerns. A revised instrument is displayed in Appendix F.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify those features which would aid teachers, principals, and committee members in selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies and to construct an instrument which could be used in the selection process.

I sought answers to five questions:

1. What characteristics of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies are essential in the selection process as reported in professional journals and related books?
2. What do experts in the field of English education feel should be considered when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies?
3. What evaluative instruments have been developed to quantitatively select language arts textbooks?
4. If no evaluative instruments exist at this time, can I develop an instrument that will accurately measure the characteristics of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies as identified in the literature and by the expert opinions of the Delphi panel?
5. What do classroom teachers of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts feel should be considered when using this instrument?

I began my investigation by examining the related literature to determine what features were listed which were concerned with selecting the

best textbooks, language arts anthologies, and ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies. This list of features was compiled into a list of fifty-five items and divided into six groups. Following a review by professors in the fields of English education and reading education, the list was rewritten and included thirty-five items divided into five categories.

I then sent the new list of features to experts in the field of English education. I asked these experts to evaluate the list through a Delphi survey in order to determine a consensus of opinions as to which features were most desirable to consider when selecting textbooks. This phase resulted in sixty-one features in five categories; the resulting features are shown in Appendix C.

Since I was unable to locate an instrument which quantitatively measured desired features to consider when selecting textbooks, I used the information gleaned from the survey to construct such an instrument (MITS).

Following the construction of the instrument, I field tested it with experienced teachers of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts. This field testing was completed during September and October of 1994. Nine teachers from three rural high schools in East Tennessee and North Georgia participated in this field testing. Although I was unable conclusively to determine that the MITS could be used to assign a grade to a textbook due to personal opinions of evaluators, I was able to determine that there was a relationship between a specific textbook and the ratings given. In addition, I was able to estimate the amount of time it would take to evaluate a textbook using the MITS. As a result of the responses given by these teachers, the MITS was modified. The resulting instrument may be seen in Appendix F.

Findings

The principal findings in this study were the following:

1. Questions one and two asked what were the characteristics essential in the selection process of ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies as reported by journals, books, and experts in the field of English education. The review of the literature resulted in a list of fifty-five items which were delegated into five categories. Two items were recommended to be added to the list by the panel of experts; no new categories were submitted.

2. Questions three and four concerned whether a quantitative instrument existed which would assist with the selection of textbooks. Since no such instrument was located, one was constructed using the information gathered from the review of the literature and the results of the Delphi panel survey.

3. Question five asked for the opinions of classroom teachers regarding what should be considered when using this instrument for textbook selection. As a result of their input, the instrument was modified. I felt that the instrument was potentially useful for those selecting textbooks as a result of the correlation of ratings for the same book and as a result of the time needed to complete the instrument.

Conclusions

1. Although there was no definitive list of features given in the literature as to what characteristics are desirable when selecting textbooks, a list of recommended features was compiled based upon a review of the literature and the responses by experts in the field of English education.

2. While experts in the field of English education are not unanimous in

their opinions as to what should be considered when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade language arts anthologies, their responses indicated that some features are more desirable than others.

3. Classroom teachers have varying opinions on the training, time, and involvement when faced with textbook selection.

4. The instrument developed provides an acceptable means of evaluating textbooks for the purpose of selection.

Recommendations for Future Research

The conclusions formulated from this study indicate that it is possible that personal opinions and preferences may allow the MITS to be interpreted in different ways. Therefore, further refinement and field testing is recommended. In addition, because this study focused only on ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies, additional research on other grade level anthologies might result in a comprehensive instrument for all anthologies. Therefore, I recommend additional literature review, expert surveys, and field testing that includes administrators and state level committee members. Third, the MITS has not yet been used during an actual selection process at the secondary level. Future research might be conducted on the reactions of selecting personnel and the overall usefulness of the instrument, as well as modifications deemed necessary as a result of this evaluation.

The role of the student should be considered in the textbook selection process. Because some educators believe students should get meaning from the text, the importance of the reader's purpose is gaining ground (Smith). Ruddell reminded teachers to ask students what they like when selecting materials. Respecting student opinions, along with looking at the students as

individuals, will improve success in the classroom. She makes the point "that we need information about the interaction that occurs when reader and text meet in order to have a clear understanding of the usefulness of a given text" (Ruddell, p, 248). Students complain about excessive details, specialized language, length, and impersonal writing styles (Smith). These are all important considerations to make when evaluating textbooks. The students will suffer the most when the textbook is inadequate to their needs; their opinions should matter. Therefore, research is recommended into the role the student plays in the textbook selection process.

Another implication for additional research addresses the failures with the current methods used with the selection process. Muther examined three reasons for failures of the textbook selection process. First, she said, the methods are out-dated. Second, teachers are not trained to evaluate materials. Finally, many districts do not realize that there is a problem. The findings and conclusions of the field test appear to substantiate reasons one and two. In regards to reason three, only through training and education can this problem be addressed. I recommend that further research be completed as to the extent that the teacher has training, time, and involvement when selecting materials.

After a careful evaluation of the results of this study, I determined that the following recommendations be considered when selecting textbooks.

Selections in the future should involve the publishers, educators, and students. In addition, recommendations from communities should be welcome. Boynton claimed that "The only way publishers will change their minds about what they publish is if the market refuses to buy what they publish....The culprits are the schools and districts whose buying habits ensure the glut" (p. 19). Muther agreed when she said publishers will continue to offer great "deals" as long as districts ignore content and look for free materials. Since

publishers are motivated by profit, for that is the reason they are in the business, educators must take a firmer role in guiding the publishers. Guth recommended that as teachers,

we...have to be much more vocal about quality control in textbooks than we have been in the past. Much that is intangible...go into the making of a good book, but a few minimum criteria might help adoption committees withstand the seduction of glossy brochures (p. 15).

Crismore added that teachers should evaluate their current textbooks and have students keep journals recording responses to their textbook. In addition, Crismore offered several suggestions to how teachers can become directly involved in the selection process. They should assist in educating other teachers and administrators in the shortcomings of text materials, redesign textbook evaluation forms, write letters to publishers, editors, and authors of textbooks, and offer to field test new books. Warren reminded us that "Accountability has become a stinging indictment in the educational community..." (p. 44), thus teachers feel the pressure of the responsibility in assuring academic progress of students. In order to achieve these goals, time and training are necessary in order to have teachers adequately evaluate texts (Muther). Because teachers deserve the best tools in the classroom, consumers of textbooks must develop a greater interest in improving textbooks (Osborn, et al.). Goldstein (1978) agreed and said that "teachers influence the content of instructional materials through their participation on selection committees, their advice to state and local officials, and their role as gatekeepers to the classroom" (p. 49).

Communities must be offered involvement in the process of textbook selection. Lest educators and politicians forget, it is from the taxpayers' pockets that educational funding comes. Unlike private organizations, public schools are supported by the public. "The schools and the teachers in them are

servants of the community and of the families that make up the community" (English, p. 378).

Follette (1985) recommended that schools increase their spending for textbooks; however, I am uncertain if additional funds are needed. Instead, I recommend that teachers require high quality materials for the amount spent currently, and teachers take additional funding to spend on trade books and computer software in the classroom. The publishers, said Follette, will change the textbook only after selection committees change the basis of evaluation. I recommend that research be conducted into what is currently being done to change the basis of evaluation of textbooks and how teachers are communicating their needs and desires regarding textbooks to publishers.

Finally, Osborn, et al., encouraged evaluators of textbooks to have the materials field-tested (also found in Clary & Smith). They believed that it is important to improve textbook programs; this improvement should include recent research in reading. In addition to schema theory and metacognition, they point to the implications which instructional design and learning strategies should have on the improvement of materials. Hummel recommended further research into the "characteristics on learning processes, attitudes and skills..." (p. 119). Squire (1989) recommended that the NCTE establishes serious reviews of serious textbooks. As Chall stated, educational achievement can be improved through employing the powerful combined forces of textbooks, teachers, educational researchers, curriculum specialists, and textbook selection committees.

Because of the lack of material found on local procedures for textbook selection and for high school language arts materials, I believe that educational research would benefit from an investigation into these two areas. In addition, I believe that there is a move toward schools taking a firmer stand on the quality of text materials. As reported in by Flanagan (1994), three states

have recently composed anthologies for use in language arts classrooms. McGraw-Hill currently has college textbooks computerized so instructors can order parts of their books rather than several copies of each (Turner, 1989); perhaps a similar procedure can be used in the future for schools that wish to select specific materials for inclusion in the anthology. There is hope for improved textbooks for our schools in the future, but because the production end of publishing takes many years, we, as educators, must begin working today to see the benefits five years from now.

In summary, in the future, publishers and educators must work together to plan textbooks. Both sides need to be fair to the other, yet as consumers, educators have the right to make demands upon the publishing industry. Perhaps educators will never be satisfied, but they must continue attempts to improve the tool used most in their profession. As Guth stated: "If a good teacher is the best curriculum, a bad textbook is the worst" (p. 14).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, J. E., Rowell, C. G., & Heathington, B. S. (1989). Coping with textbook controversies: From policy development to implementation. Book Research Quarterly, 5,(2) 51-64.
- Altbach, P. G., G. P. Kelly, H. G. Petrie, & L. Weis. (Eds.), (1991). Textbooks in American society. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Apple, M. W. (1991), The culture and commerce of the textbook. In M. W. Apple & L. K. Christian-Smith, (Eds.), The politics of the textbook. (pp. 22-40). New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., & L. K. Christian-Smith, (Eds.), (1991). The politics of the textbook New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., & L. K. Christian-Smith, (1991), The politics of the textbook. In M. W. Apple & L. K. Christian-Smith, (Eds.). The politics of the textbook (pp. 1-21). New York: Routledge.
- Appleby, B., Johnson, G. , & Taylor R. M. (1989). A hefty new literature series: Something for everyone? English Journal, 78, (6), 77-80.
- Appleby, B., Johnson, G. , & Taylor R. M. (1990a). Another hefty literature series: Counting the cost. English Journal, 79, (4), 92-96.
- Appleby, B., Johnson, G. , & Taylor R. M. (1990b). An old standard: Scott, Foresman's America Reads series. English Journal, 79 (6), 86-90.
- Appleby, B., Johnson, G. , & Taylor R. M. (1991). Yet another old standard: HBJ's Adventures series. English Journal, 80, (7), 93-97.
- Bernstein, H. T. (1985). The new politics of textbook adoption. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 463-466.
- Boorstin, D J. (1981). Introduction. In J. Y. Cole & T. G. Sticht (Eds.). The textbook in American society (pp.ix-x). Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.
- Boynton,R. (1989). Yes, But... The textbook gap: A teacher-author-publisher dialogue. English Journal, 78, (6), 17-20.
- Chall, J. S. (1981). Middle and secondary school textbooks. In J. Y. Cole & T. G. Sticht (Eds.). The textbook in American society (pp. 24-26). Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.
- Chall, J. S., & Conard, S. S. (with Harris-Sharples, S.) (1991). Should textbooks challenge students?: The case for easier or harder textbooks. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Clary, L. M., & Smith, S. J. (1986). Selecting basal reading series: The need for a validated process. The Reading Teacher, 39, 390-394.
- Cole, J. Y., & Sticht, T. G. (Eds.). (1981). The textbook in American society. Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.
- Cooter, R. B., Jr., (1983). Development of an instrument for the evaluation of secondary reading programs derived from a modified delphi technique. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee. Knoxville.
- Crismore, A. (1989). Rhetorical form, selection and use of textbooks. In S. de Castell, A. Luke, & C. Luke (Eds.). Language, authority, and criticism: Readings on the school textbook (pp. 133-152). London: Falmer Press.
- Curtis, D. (1993). Teaching secondary English. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cyphert, F. R., & Gant, W. L. (1971). The delphi technique: A case study. Phi Delta Kappan, 52, 272-273.
- de Castell, S., Luke, S. A., & Luke, C. (Eds.), (1989). Language, authority, and criticism: Readings on the school textbook. London: Falmer Press.
- Dole, J. A., & Osborn, J. (1991). The selection and use of language arts textbooks. In J. Flood, J. M. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.) Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts (pp. 521-528). New York: Macmillan.
- English, R. (1980). The politics of textbook adoption. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 275-278.
- Farr, R., & Tulley, M. A. (1985). Do adoption committees perpetuate mediocre textbooks? Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 467-471.
- Farrell, E. J. (1971). Deciding the future: A forecast of responsibilities of secondary teachers of English, 1970-2000 AD. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- FitzGerald, F. G. (1981). Textbooks and the publishers. In J. Y. Cole & T. G. Sticht (Eds.). The textbook in American society (pp. 49-52). Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.
- Flanagan, A. (1994). NCTE affiliates find work on anthologies demanding, rewarding. Council Chronicle, 3,(5), 9.
- Flood, J., Jensen, J. M., Lapp, D., & Squire, J. R. (1991). Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts. New York: Macmillan.
- Frase, L. T. (1981). Cognition and the design of textbooks. In J. Y. Cole & T. G. Sticht (Eds.). The textbook in American society (pp. 33-34).

Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.

- Fry, E. B. (1988). Writeability: The principles of writing for increased comprehension. In Zakaluk, B. L. & S. J. Samuels (Eds.). Readability: Its past, present, and future (pp. 77-95). Newark, DE: IRA.
- Galda, L., & B. E. Cullinan. (1991). Literature for literacy: What research says about the benefits of using trade books in the classroom. In J. Flood, J. M. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.). Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts (pp. 529-535). New York: Macmillan.
- Goldstein, P. (1978). Changing the American schoolbook: Law, politics, and technology. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Goodman, K. S., Olsen, Jr., H. C., Colvin, C. M., & VanderLinde, L. F. . (1966). Choosing materials to teach reading. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Guth, H. P. (1989) A plea for better books. The textbook Gap: A teacher-Author-publisher dialogue. English Journal, 78, (6), 14-17.
- Guthrie, J. T. (1981). Forms and functions of textbooks. Journal of Reading, 24, 554-556.
- Hall-Quest, A. L. (1918). The textbook: How to use and judge it. New York: MacMillan.
- Hipple, T. (1973). Teaching English in secondary schools. New York: MacMillan.
- Honig, B. (1991). California's experience with textbook improvement. In P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, H. G. Petrie, & L. Weis (Eds.). Textbooks in American society: Politics, policy, and pedagogy (105-116). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hummel, C. (1988). School textbooks and lifelong education: An analysis of schoolbooks from three countries. Hamburg, Germany: Unesco.
- Jackson, S. A. (1981). About publishers, teachers, and reading achievement. In J. Y. Cole & T. G. Sticht (Eds.). The textbook in American society (pp. 9-11). Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.
- Keith, S. (1991). The determinants of textbook content. In P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, H. G. Petrie, & L. Weis (Eds.). Textbooks in American society: Politics, policy, and pedagogy (pp. 43-60). Albany, NY: University of New York Press.
- Kunder, L. H. (1976). Procedures for textbook and instructional materials selection. Arlington, VA; Educational Research Service, Inc.
- Lorimer, R., & Keeney, R. (1989). Defining the curriculum: The role of the multinational textbook in Canada. In S. de Castell, A. Luke, & C. Luke (Eds.). Language, authority, and criticism: Readings on the school

- textbook (pp. 170-183). London: Falmer Press.
- Lynch, J. J., & B. Evans. (1963). High school English textbooks. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co.
- McCutcheon, G. (1982). Bait: The publishing industry has too much influence on the secondary English curriculum: Pro. English Journal. 71, (7), 16-19.
- Mehlinger, H. D. (1991). American textbook reform: What can we learn from the Soviet experience. In P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, H. G. Petrie, & L. Weis (Eds.). Textbooks in American society: Politics, policy, and pedagogy. (91-104) Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Muther, C. (1985). What every textbook evaluator should know. Educational Leadership. 42,(7), 5-8.
- National Education Association. (1989), Instructional materials: Selected guidelines and resources. Washington, D. C. : National Education Association.
- Ornstein, A. C. (1992). The textbook curriculum. Educational Horizons. 70, (4), 167-169.
- Osborn, J. H, Jones, B. F, & Stein M. (1985) The case for improving textbooks. Educational Leadership. 42, (7), 9-16.
- Osborn, J. H. & M. Stein (1985). Basal reading programs: Development, effectiveness, and selection. Book Research Quarterly. 1, 38-48.
- Powell, D. A. (1985). Selection of reading textbooks at the district level: Is this a rational process? Book Research Quarterly. 1, (3), 23-35.
- Rinehart, S. D. and W. A. Welker, (1992). Effects of advance organizers on level and time of text recall. Reading Research and Instruction. 32, (1), 77-86.
- Ruddell, M. R. (1993). Teaching content reading and writing. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sabol, J. W. (1977). Selecting instructional materials. English Journal. 66, 9-14.
- Shannon, P.(1988). Broken promises:Reading instruction in twentieth-century America. Granby, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, Publishers, Inc.
- Smith, D. J. (1992). Common ground: The connection between reader-response and textbook reading. Journal of Reading. 35 , 630-634.
- Squire, J. R. (1981). Publishers, social pressures, and textbooks. In J. Y. Cole & T. G. Sticht (Eds.). The textbook in American society. (pp. 27-30) Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.
- Squire, J. R. (1985). Textbooks to the forefront. Book Research Quarterly. 1,(2),

12-18.

- Squire, J. R. (1989) For better textbooks . The textbook gap: A teacher-author-publisher dialogue. English Journal. 78, (6), 20-21.
- Squire, J. R. (1991). The history of the profession. In J. Flood, J.M. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.). Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts. (pp. 1-17). New York: Macmillan.
- Squire, J. R., & R. K. Applebee (1968). The national study of high school English programs: High school English instruction today. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Tulley, M. A., & Farr, R. (1985). Textbook adoption: Insight, impact, and potential. Book Research Quarterly. 1, (2), 4-11.
- Turner, J. A. (1989, November 15). With the aid of computers, new ventures allow professors to create customized textbooks. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A19, A22.
- Tyson-Bernstein, H. (1989). America's textbook fiasco--good intentions gone wrong. In National Education Association's Instruction materials: Selected guidelines and resources. (pp.9-23). Washington, D. C.: National Education Association.
- Tyson-Bernstein, H., & A. Woodward. (1991). Nineteenth century policies for twenty-first century practice: The textbook reform dilemma. In P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, H. G. Petrie, & L. Weis (Eds.). Textbooks in American society: Politics, policy, and pedagogy. (pp. 91-104) Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Waterman, I. R. (1952). When you choose a textbook. Phi Delta Kappan. 33, 267-271.
- Warren, C. C. (1981). Adopting textbooks. In J. Y. Cole & T. G. Sticht (Eds.). The textbook in American society. (pp. 43-45) Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.
- Weaver, W. T. (1971). The delphi forecasting method. Phi Delta Kappan. 52, 267-271.
- Weiner, L. (1979). Warning; Textbooks are not make--or used--in heaven. English Journal. 68 , (9), 7-10.
- Whipple, G. (1936) Procedures used in selecting school books. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Wong, K. K., & T. Loveless (1991) The politics of textbook policy: Proposing a framework. In P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, H. G. Petrie, & L. Weis (Eds.). Textbooks in American society Politics, policy, and pedagogy. (pp. 27-42) Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

- Woodward, A. & Elliott, D. L. (1992). Teacher professionalism, school reform, and textbooks. Educational Horizons. 70, (4)176-180.
- Woodward, A. (1986). Over-programmed materials: Taking the teacher out of teaching. American Educator. 10, (1), 26-31.
- Zakaluk, B. L. & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), (1988). Readability: Its past, present, and future. Newark, DE: IRA.
- Zakaluk, B. L. & S. J. Samuels, (1988). Toward a new approach to predicting text comprehensibility. In Zakaluk, L. L. & S. J. Samuels (Eds.). Readability: Its past, present, and future. Newark, DE: IRA. (pp. 121-144).
- Zaharias, J. A. (1989). Literature anthologies in the US: Impediments to good teaching practice. English Journal. 78, (6), 22-28.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
FACSIMILES OF CORRESPONDENCE TO PREVIEW PANEL
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Please look over the following items. According to related literature, the first five sections contain features which should be considered when selecting a textbook. The last section contains features which should be considered when selecting a ninth-grade or tenth-grade anthology for high school English classrooms.

Please indicate that any of the following features should be eliminated by drawing a line through the word(s). If you feel that there are features missing from this list, please add them in the space provided or attach a list to this sheet before returning the survey.

I. PHYSICAL FEATURES

A. Size: The amount of material is appropriate (adequate but not excessive) for the instructional purposes.

B. Illustrations: Illustrations are appropriate (appealing, functional, related to and integrated with text, adequate but not excessive) for the instructional purposes.

C. Durability: The textbook has an adequate durability rating for intended purposes.

D. Authors: The textbook authors are identified and include those with high school teaching experience and those from various sections of the country.

E. Copyright: The copyright date indicates that the textbook has been published within the last five years.

Copyright: The copyright date indicates that the textbook includes research substantiated within the last five years.

F. Cost: The price of the textbook is appropriate with the amount of funds allocated.

G. Presentation: The textbook contains suitable print size and format.

II. ASSISTANCE FEATURES

A. Reading: The textbook addresses comprehending meaning, locating information, and selecting and evaluating materials.

Reading: The textbook uses advanced organizers.

Reading: The level of difficulty offers a reasonable level of challenge for the students.

B. Writing: Students are encouraged to use reader-response journals.

C. Students: Students are given the focus of the lesson and prereading activities.

Students: Students are encouraged to ask questions.

Students: Students are involved with the text by activities and are aided by prior experiences.

D. Examples: Models are provided for the organization of ideas.

E. Ancillary Materials: The ancillary materials are adequate but not excessive and include ditto masters and audio-visual aids.

F. Flexibility: The textbook allows for the omission or exchange of units and for the addition or substitution of outside resources (such as magazines, newspapers, and trade books).

G. Matching: The textbook considers the cultural background of students and reflects the goals, values, and needs of the community while avoiding stereotyping and mistreatment of race, sex, and ethnic groups.

H. Teacher's Manual: The teacher's manual for the textbook includes instructional guidelines, program-related tests, clearly stated learning outcomes, adequate follow-up activities, and appropriate objectives.

I. Publishers: The publishers offer teachers demonstrations of materials.

K. Transition: The textbook is a smooth transition from the textbook used the previous year and to the textbook for the subsequent year.

L. Integration: The instructional program emphasizes integrating listening, speaking, reading, and writing and the teaching of language skills in meaningful contexts.

M. Usability: The textbook is usable in the classroom and facilitates the teaching of literature.

N. Teacher: The textbook allows the teachers to be decision makers and is not viewed as "teacher-proof."

O. Group work: The textbook encourages the use of varying sized groups for different activities.

P. Inspiration: The textbook should inspire students.

III. LANGUAGE FEATURES

A. Audience: The text is appropriate for the audience intended.

B. Style: The text is written with a concern for clarity and quality and includes little unnecessary information, uses modern jargon, and employs a personal writing style.

Style: The text is matched with the learner and the teacher.

C. Purpose: The text has a defined unified purpose for its use in the classroom.

D. Coherence: The text encourages the flow of ideas, movement from old knowledge to new knowledge, and application of prior knowledge.

IV. RESEARCH FEATURES

A. Basis: The materials included in the textbook employ recent (in the last decade) teaching methods supported by research.

B. Reading: The reading exercises encourage the use of reader response. Students are encouraged to use predictions throughout the reading process.

C. Writing: The writing exercises encourage the use of process-oriented writing.

D. Thinking: The exercises encourage the use of critical thinking and problem-solving.

V. ASSESSMENT FEATURES

A. Self-Assessment: The students are allowed to perform self-assessment.

B. Examinations: The examinations supplied reflect the aims stated by state/local authority.

Examinations: The tests to be used with the textbook are subjective rather than objective.

C. Practice: The questions included in the textbook are open-ended, and they require students to use prior knowledge and text and to determine their own meaning.

Practice: The exercises support the purpose(s) stated.

D. Effectiveness: The textbook has been field-tested with good results and the findings are included for review.

Effectiveness: A Learner Verification Report (LVR), which shows an analysis of the textbook's effectiveness, is included for review.

VI. SUBJECT-AREA FEATURES

A. Content: The literature contained in the anthology offers a variety of genres, representation of major populations, special needs (such as language or disabilities), and contains the appropriate concepts, ideas, and content in accordance to those determined by state/local authority.

Content: The amount of literature contained in the anthology supports depth of coverage over breath of coverage OR The amount of literature contained in the anthology supports breath of coverage over depth of coverage.

Content: The organization of the literature is based upon genre OR The organization of the literature is based upon theme OR The organization of the literature is based upon chronology.

B. Literature: The selections included in the anthology are the primary works of the authors and represent the best in writing from these authors.

Literature: The selections included in the anthology include good contemporary literature and the best of adolescent literature.

Literature: The selections are cross-referenced for the student.

Literature: There is a representative proportion in number of pieces and total length of pieces devoted to the genres of nonfiction (biography, true stories, essays, and science/technical writing), poetry, drama, novels, legends/fables/myths, and short stories which meet the curriculum guidelines.

Literature: The number of adaptations and abridgements to the literature do not compromise the quality.

Literature: Novels are printed in their entirety OR Excerpts from novels are used OR Novels are excluded, but reading guides are provided for use with trade books.

C. Vocabulary: Vocabulary exercises link students to prior knowledge.

D. Writing: Writing exercises include the use of creative, imaginative, expressive, expository, analytical, and personal writings and focus on creation and revision or the process-oriented means of instruction.

E. Authors: The authors, poets, and playwrights include adolescent writers, current writers, and living writers and include the best materials by minorities and women.

F. Drama: The dramatics portion of the textbook includes television drama, modern drama, and classical drama.

LIST OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS ON REVIEW PANEL

Dr. J. Estill Alexander
Reading Education Professor
University of Tennessee-Knoxville

Dr. Mark Christiansen
English Education Professor
University of Tennessee-Knoxville

Dr. Ted Hipple
English Education Professor
University of Tennessee-Knoxville

Dr. Tom Ryan
English Education Professor
University of Tennessee-Knoxville

APPENDIX B
FACSIMILES OF CORRESPONDENCE TO
DELPHI PANEL MEMBERS

May 23, 1994

Dear _____,

Thank you for taking time to assist me in conducting research on the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies. This research is for my doctoral dissertation at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville. My committee members are Dr. Mark Christiansen, Dr. Ted Hipple, Dr. J. Estill Alexander, and Dr. William Shurr. As mentioned in our recent telephone conversation, I believe that this study will contribute to the process of textbook selection. In order to conduct this research, I need your assistance.

I am using the Delphi technique to establish a consensus among selected experts in the field of English education regarding the importance of textbook features when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies. You have been identified as one with expertise in this area on the basis of your research and publications in English education and your membership status in NCTE. Because this survey only solicits your opinion, there are no risks or benefits to you.

It is estimated that approximately thirty minutes of your time will be required for each of the rounds. I know that you are extremely busy, but I do hope that you will support this research project. I will see that you get the results of this study which I believe will be of interest to you. The completion of this survey will constitute informed consent. Unless you indicate otherwise, I will be including your name, address, and position in the appendix of my dissertation; however, your individual responses will be kept confidential.

Because I am anxious to move ahead, I would appreciate your early response to the enclosed survey. A priority mail envelope has been provided to expedite the surveying process. Because I am aware that you might have made arrangements for the summer months, I hope to complete your portion of the research by late June. If you have any questions regarding the completion or purpose of this survey, please feel free to contact me in writing at the address below or call me at (615) 974-5037. I greatly appreciate your help in this project and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Kathleen McKenzie
10 Claxton Education Building
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-3400

July 7, 1994

Dear _____,

Thank you once again for taking time to assist me in conducting my doctoral research. This is the second part of the Delphi survey. I have examined the responses to the first survey round and made adjustments when necessary. The results of this second round will be used to construct an instrument that teachers may use when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies.

I am using the Delphi technique to establish a consensus among selected experts in the field of English education regarding the importance of textbook features when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies. You have been identified as one with expertise in this area on the basis of your research and publications in English education and your membership status in NCTE. Because this survey only solicits your opinion, there are no risks or benefits to you.

It is estimated that approximately thirty minutes of your time will be required for this final round. I appreciate your taking time to complete this before you begin your summer break. I hope to complete this portion of my research in the next couple weeks. Because this survey only solicits your opinion, there are no risks or benefits to you. The completion of this survey will constitute informed consent. Unless you indicate otherwise, I will be including your name, address, and position in the appendix of my dissertation; however, your individual responses will be kept confidential.

A self-addressed stamped envelope has been provided to expedite the surveying process. If you have any questions regarding the completion or purpose of this survey, please feel free to contact me in writing at the address below or call me at (615) 974-5037. I greatly appreciate your help in this project and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Kathleen McKenzie
10 Claxton Education Building
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-3400

APPENDIX C
DELPHI PANEL SURVEYS

Round One Delphi Survey

Textbook Selection

Please look over the following items. According to related literature, the first four sections contain features which should be considered when selecting a textbook. The last section contains features which should be considered when selecting a ninth-grade or tenth-grade anthology for high school English classrooms.

Please indicate whether any of the following features should be eliminated by drawing a line through the word(s). If you feel that there are features missing from this list, please add them in the space provided to attach a list to this sheet. After you have completed any additions or deletions, please use the following scale to indicate the importance of each feature. Thank you.

- 3- Essential feature when selecting this textbook.
- 2- Important feature when selecting this textbook.
- 1- Useful feature when selecting this textbook.

I. Physical Features

_____A. Illustrations: Illustrations are appropriate (appealing, functional, related to and integrated with text, adequate but not excessive) for the instructional purposes.

_____B. Durability: The textbook has an adequate durability rating for intended purposes.

_____C. Authors: The textbook authors are identified and known for their expertise and include those with high school teaching experience and those from various sections of the country.

_____D. Copyright: The copyright date indicates that the textbook has been published within the last five years and includes research substantiated within the last ten years.

_____E. Cost: The price of the textbook is within budget.

_____F. Typography: The textbook contains suitable print size and format.

II. Language Features

_____A. Audience: The text is appropriate for the audience intended and is written with a concern for clarity and quality, including contemporary diction, little unnecessary information, and a personal writing style.

_____B. Style: The text is matched with the learner and the teacher.

_____C. Purpose: The text has a defined, unified purpose for its use in the classroom.

_____D. Coherence: The text encourages the flow of ideas, movement from old knowledge to new knowledge, and application of prior knowledge.

III. Assessment Features

_____A. Self-Assessment: The students are encouraged to perform self-assessment.

_____B. Examinations: The examinations supplied reflect the aims stated by state/local authority and are subjective rather than objective.

_____C. Practice: The questions included in the textbook are open-ended, and they require students to use prior knowledge and text and to determine their own meaning while the exercises support the purposes(s) stated.

_____D. Effectiveness: The textbook has been field-tested with good results and these finding as well as a Learner Verification Report (LVR), which shows an analysis of the textbook's effectiveness, is included for review.

IV. Assistance Features

_____A. Reading: The textbook addresses comprehending meaning, locating information, and selecting and evaluating material, and the level of difficulty offers a reasonable level of challenge for the students; students are encouraged to use predictions of ideas through the reading process.

_____B. Compositions: Students are encouraged frequently to write using reader-response journals. The writing exercises encourage the use of process-oriented writing.

_____C. Students: Students are given the focus of the lesson, supplied prereading activities, and encouraged to ask question. Students can become involved with the text using the activities and are aided by prior experiences.

_____D. Ancillary Materials: The ancillary materials are adequate but not excessive and include ditto masters and audio-visual aids.

_____E. Flexibility: The textbook allows for the omission or exchange of units and for the addition or substitution of outside resources (such as magazines,

newspapers, and trade books).

_____F. Audience: The textbook considers the cultural background of students and reflects the goals, values, and needs of the community while avoiding stereotyping and mistreatment of race sex, and ethnic groups; the text is audience appropriate.

_____G. Teacher's Manual: The teacher's manual for the textbook includes instructional guidelines, program-related tests, clearly stated learning outcomes, adequate follow-up activities, and appropriate objectives.

_____H. Transition: The textbook is a smooth transition from the textbook used the previous year and to the textbook for the subsequent year.

_____I. Integration: The instructional program emphasizes integrating listening, speaking, reading, writing, and teachability with the teaching of language skills in meaningful contexts.

_____J. Usability: The textbook facilitates the teaching of literature, allows the teachers to be decision makers (not "teacher-proof") and encourages the use of varying sized groups for various activities.

_____K. Inspiration: The textbook inspires students to learn.

_____L. Thinking: The exercises encourage the use of critical thinking and problem-solving.

V. Subject-area Features

_____A. Content: The literature contained in the anthology offers a variety of genres, representation of major populations, special needs (such as language or disabilities), and contains the appropriate concepts, ideas, and content in accordance with those determined by state/local authority.

_____B. Coverage: The amount of literature contained in the anthology supports depth of coverage over breadth of coverage; OR the amount of literature contained in the anthology supports breadth of coverage over depth of coverage.

_____C. Organization: The organization of the literature is based upon genre; OR the organization of the literature is based upon theme; OR the organization of the literature is based upon chronology.

_____D. Literature: The selections included in the anthology are the primary works of the authors and represent the best in writing from these authors.

_____E. Genre: There is a representative proportion in number of pieces and total length of pieces devoted to the genres of nonfiction (biography, true

stories, science/technical writing, and essays), drama (in various forms), legends/fables/myths, poetry, novels, and short stories which meet the curriculum guidelines.

____F. Novels: Novels are printed in their entirety; *OR* excerpts from novels are used; *OR* novels are excluded, but reading guides are provided for use with trade books.

____G. Vocabulary: Vocabulary exercises link students to prior knowledge.

____H. Writing: Writing exercises include the use of creative, imaginative, expressive, expository, analytical, and personal writings and focus on creation and revision or the process-oriented means of instruction.

____I. Authors: The authors, poets, and playwrights include adolescent writers, current writers, living writers, minorities, and women, and selections included in the anthology include contemporary literature and adolescent literature.

Additional comments:

Thank you.
Kathleen McKenzie
10 Claxton Education Building
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-3400

Round Two Delphi Survey

Textbook Selection

Please look over the following items. According to related literature, the first four sections contain features which should be considered when selecting a textbook. The last section contains features which should be considered when selecting a ninth-grade or tenth-grade anthology for high school English classrooms.

Some features have been modified due to the responses from round one of this survey. Please indicate whether any of the following features should be eliminated by drawing a line through the word(s). Please use the following scale to indicate the importance of each feature. Thank you.

- 3- Essential feature when selecting this textbook.
- 2- Important feature when selecting this textbook.
- 1- Useful feature when selecting this textbook.

I. Physical Features

_____A. Illustrations: Illustrations are appropriate (appealing, functional, related to and integrated with text, adequate but not excessive) for the instructional purposes.

_____B. Durability: The textbook has an adequate durability rating for intended purposes.

_____C. Authors: The textbook authors are identified and known for their expertise and include those with high school teaching experience and those from multi-cultures and various sections of the country.

_____D. Copyright: The copyright date indicates that the textbook has been published within the last five years and includes research substantiated within the last ten years.

_____E. Cost: The price of the textbook is within budget.

_____F. Typography: The textbook contains suitable print size and format.

_____G. Weight/Size: The textbook is manageable, not in excess of three pounds.

II. Language Features

_____A. Audience: The text is appropriate for the audience intended and is written with a concern for clarity and quality, including contemporary diction, little unnecessary information, and a personal writing style.

_____B. Style: The text is matched with the learner and the teacher.

_____C. Purpose: The text has a defined, unified purpose for its use in the classroom.

_____D. Coherence: The text encourages the flow of ideas, movement from old knowledge to new knowledge, and application of prior knowledge.

III. Assessment Features

_____A. Self-Assessment: The students are encouraged to perform self-assessment.

B. Examinations:

_____ The examinations supplied reflect the aims stated by state/local authority.

_____The examinations are objective.

_____The examinations require students to perform with language.

_____C. Practice: The questions included in the textbook are open-ended, and they require students to use prior knowledge and text and to determine their own meaning while the exercises support the purposes(s) stated.

_____D. Effectiveness: The textbook has been field-tested with good results and these finding as well as a Learner Verification Report (LVR), which shows an analysis of the textbook's effectiveness, is included for review.

_____E. Response: Students are encouraged to make personal connections with the material in the text.

IV. Assistance Features

_____A. Reading: The textbook addresses comprehending meaning, locating information, and selecting and evaluating material, and the level of difficulty offers a reasonable level of challenge for the students; students are encouraged to use predictions of ideas through the reading process.

_____B. Compositions: Students are encouraged frequently to write using reader-response journals. The writing exercises encourage the use of process-oriented writing.

_____C. Students: Students are given the focus of the lesson, supplied prereading activities, and encouraged to ask questions. Students can become involved with the text using the activities and are aided by prior experiences.

D. Ancillary Materials:

_____ The ancillary materials are adequate but not excessive.

- _____The ancillary materials include ditto masters.
- _____The ancillary materials include audio-visual aids.

_____E. Flexibility: The textbook allows for the omission or exchange of units and for the addition or substitution of outside resources (such as magazines, newspapers, and trade books).

F. Audience:

- _____The textbook considers the cultural background of students and reflects the goals, values, and needs of the community.
- _____The textbook avoids stereotyping and mistreatment of race, sex, and ethnic groups.
- _____The textbook is appropriate for all potential audiences.

G. Teacher's Manual: The teacher's manual for the textbook includes:

- _____instructional guidelines
- _____program-related test
- _____clearly stated learning outcomes
- _____adequate follow-up activities
- _____appropriate objectives.

_____H. Transition: The textbook is a smooth transition from the textbook used the previous year and to the textbook for the subsequent year.

_____I. Integration: The instructional program emphasizes integrating listening, speaking, reading, writing, and teachability with the teaching of language skills in meaningful contexts.

_____J. Usability: The textbook facilitates the teaching of literature, allows the teachers to be decision makers (not "teacher-proof") and encourages the use of varying sized groups for various activities.

_____K. Inspiration: The textbook inspires students to learn.

L. Thinking:

- _____The exercises encourage the use of critical thinking and problem-solving.
- _____The exercises encourage multiple interpretations.

V. Subject-area Features

A. Content:

- _____The literature contained in the anthology offers a variety of genres, representation of major populations, special needs (such as language or disabilities).
- _____The literature contains the appropriate concepts, ideas, and content in accordance with those determined by state/local authority.

_____B. Literature: The selections included in the anthology are the primary works of the authors and represent the best in writing from these authors.

_____C. Genre: There is a representative proportion in number of pieces and total length of pieces devoted to the genres of nonfiction (biography, true stories, science/technical writing, and essays), drama (in various forms), legends/fables/myths, poetry, novels, and short stories which meet the curriculum guidelines.

D. Authors:

_____The authors, poets, and playwrights include adolescent writers, current writers, living writers, minorities, and women, and selections included in the anthology include contemporary literature, adolescent literature, and some canonical selections.

_____The anthology includes authors' bios and information about their lives.

_____E. Vocabulary: Vocabulary exercises link students to prior knowledge.

Please note that some of the following features are exclusive; therefore, you may wish to eliminate the other choices given.

F. Coverage:

_____The amount of literature contained in the anthology supports depth of coverage over breadth of coverage. OR

_____The amount of literature contained in the anthology supports breadth of coverage over depth of coverage.

G. Organization:

_____The organization of the literature is based upon genre. OR

_____The organization of the literature is based upon theme. OR

_____The organization of the literature is based upon chronology.

H. Novels:

_____Novels are printed in their entirety. OR

_____Excerpts from novels are used. OR

_____Novels are excluded, but reading guides/suggestions are provided for use with trade books.

H. Writing: Writing exercises include the use of

_____ creative writing

_____ imaginative writing

_____ expressive writing

_____ expository writing

_____ analytical writing

_____ personal writing

_____Writing exercises focus on creation and revision or the process-oriented means of instruction.

Thank you.

Kathleen McKenzie
10 Claxton Education Building
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-3400

APPENDIX D
FACSIMILES OF CORRESPONDENCE TO
FIELD TEST TEACHERS

September 12, 1994

Principal

Dear _____,

I appreciate your allowing me to conduct research with your English teachers regarding the selection of textbooks for ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies. As I indicated in our telephone conversation yesterday, I am conducting this research to add data for my dissertation now in progress. I hope to complete this portion of my research in the next couple weeks. The results of this study will be an instrument that will assist teachers, principals, and committees with the selection process.

I am enclosing a letter for the coordinator of this research at _____ High, _____. The letter explains the steps necessary to conduct the survey and accompanies copies of the survey for those teachers who agree to participate in the examination of the instrument (which should take no more than thirty minutes) and those teachers who agree to field test the instrument (which should take no more than one hour).

Because this survey only solicits their opinions, there are no risks or benefits for the teachers. The completion of each survey will constitute informed consent. Unless indicated otherwise, I will be including your name, address, and position, as well as those of your teachers, in the appendix of my dissertation; however, all individual responses will be kept confidential.

If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me at _____. I appreciate your cooperation with regards to my research. I will forward the final results to both you and _____ at the conclusion of my research. Thank you very much for your support of this project.

Sincerely,

Kathleen McKenzie

September 12, 1994

Teacher Coordinator

Dear _____,

I appreciate your taking time to act as the coordinator for this portion of my doctoral dissertation research on the selection of ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies. Your participation and cooperation are necessary in order to conduct a survey and a field test of the instrument constructed.

Please examine the attached instruction sheet for the list of steps to complete this research. It is estimated that the survey will take approximately thirty minutes to complete and the field test will take approximately one hour to complete. I hope to complete this portion of my research in the next couple weeks and hope that you will use the self-addressed, stamped express mail envelope in order to expedite the return of data.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at _____. Your supervision in this survey and field test signifies your informed consent. Because you are acting in only a supervisory role, there are no risks or benefits for you. Unless you indicate otherwise, your name, address, and position will be included in the appendix of my dissertation. Final results will be sent to you and to (principal's name) upon the completion of the research.

Thank you once more for your support and assistance. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Kathleen McKenzie

APPENDIX E
FIELD TEST INSTRUCTIONS

TO THE FIELD TEST COORDINATOR

TEXTBOOK SELECTION INSTRUMENT INSTRUCTION SHEET

1. Please contact all certified English teachers with one or more years experience teaching ninth-grade and/or tenth-grade English. Ask them if they are willing to participate in an opinion survey and/or field test of an instrument constructed to aid in the selection of textbooks. Those who wish to do the field test will need a textbook, teacher's manual, and ancillary materials which they have used before and which is designed for ninth-graders or tenth-graders. If it is possible, attempt to discover which books the teachers will be using for the evaluation and contact the publisher for the following information:

- A Is there a Learner Verification Report (LVR) available for this book?
- B. Has this textbook been field tested and, if so, are the results available?

2. For those willing to participate, please ask them to read the information sheet prior to completion of the survey and/or field test.

3. If it is possible to have all participants complete the research together, please read the information and cover sheet letter aloud. Please ask all participants to complete the survey and/or field test within the next three days so you will be able to return the materials to me. Please attempt to obtain all materials and mail them back to me next week.

4. If you need additional copies of the survey or instrument, please feel free to make copies.

5. Please indicate your willingness to assist me with this research with your signature below. Please indicate if you wish your name, address, and position to be withheld from the appendix of my dissertation.

6. Thank you very much! Have a wonderful school year!

Signature

Teacher Coordinator

TO THE FIELD TEST TEACHERS

TEXTBOOK SELECTION INSTRUMENT INFORMATION AND COVER SHEET FOR FIELD TEST

Thank you for agreeing to assist me with my doctoral dissertation research. The attached instrument is to be used to assist teachers, principals, and committees when selecting ninth-grade and tenth-grade anthologies. It is estimated that approximately thirty minutes of your time will be required for the survey and approximately thirty minutes for the field test. I appreciate your taking time from your busy schedule to complete this. I hope to complete this portion of my research in the next couple weeks, and I am relying on your input. Because this survey and field test only solicit your opinion, there are no risks or benefits to you. The completion of this survey will constitute informed consent. Unless you indicate otherwise, I will be including your name, school, and position in the appendix of my dissertation; however, your individual responses will be kept confidential.

For those who have agreed to do a field test, you will need a textbook with teacher's manual and ancillary materials. Please choose a textbook you have used before and that is designed for ninth-graders or tenth-graders.

1. Complete the form, "Field Test of Textbook Selection Instrument" and assign an overall rating (A=Excellent, B=Good, C=Acceptable, or D=Poor) based upon your experiences with the book. Begin by noting the time you start the instrument.
2. Look over the instrument. Scan the textbook to see which items listed are a part of the book. Place an "X" next to that item.
3. Stop timing. Note the total time on the form.
4. Reevaluate the textbook with a rating of A, B, C, or D.
5. Be sure to staple together all forms completed by you.

NOTE: Some information, such as field testing and the LVR, may be unknown to you. If your coordinator does not have this information, I will contact the publishers for this information.

For those who have agreed to examine the survey, please follow these steps:

1. Please read over the instrument.
2. Highlight or underline terms with which you are unfamiliar or that you feel need defining.
3. Draw a line through items you feel should not be considered when selecting a textbook.
4. Add items or suggestions you feel should be considered when selecting a textbook.
5. Complete the form "Textbook Selection Instrument Survey."
6. Be sure to staple together all forms completed by you.

Thank you very much!!

TO THE FIELD TEST TEACHERS

TEXTBOOK SELECTION INSTRUMENT SURVEY

Name_____School_____

Grade Levels Taught_____ Years Experience_____
(teaching 9th/10th grades)

Position_____

What are your feelings about the following:

Training for textbook selection-

Time allotted for textbook selection-

Involvement level of teachers for textbook selection-

General comments regarding the selection process-

(For additional space, please use the back of this form)

Please indicate your willingness to assist me with this research with your signature below. Please indicate if you wish your name, school, and position to be withheld from the appendix of my dissertation.

Signature

TO THE FIELD TEST TEACHERS

FIELD TEST OF TEXTBOOK SELECTION INSTRUMENT

Name_____School_____

Grade Levels Taught_____ Years Experience_____
(teaching 9th/10th grades)

Position_____

Please indicate your willingness to assist me with this research with your signature below. Please indicate if you wish your name, school, and position to be withheld from the appendix of my dissertation.

Signature

Textbook Title Publisher

Grade/Course Years Experience With Book

Textbook Rating:

Before examining the instrument

Circle one: A B C D

After examining the instrument

Circle one: A B C D

Time: Start_____ Finish _____

Total time _____

TEXTBOOK SELECTION INSTRUMENT (Cover Sheet for Instrument)

Textbook Title

Publisher

Grade/Course

Field test information:

Time: START _____ FINISH _____

Total Time: _____

Textbook Rating: A B C D
(Circle One)

TEXTBOOK SELECTION INSTRUMENT

Textbook Title	Publisher	Grade/Course
----------------	-----------	--------------

INSTRUCTIONS: Place an X next to each item that is included in this textbook.

___1. Illustrations are appropriate (appealing, functional, related to and integrated with text, adequate but not excessive) for the instructional purposes.

___2. The textbook has an adequate durability rating for intended purposes.

___3. The textbook authors are identified and known for their expertise and include those with high school teaching experience and those from multi-cultures and various sections of the country.

___4. The copyright date indicates that the textbook has been published within the last five years and includes research substantiated within the last ten years.

___5. The price of the textbook is within budget.

___6. The textbook contains suitable print size and format.

___7. The textbook is manageable, not in excess of three pounds.

___8. The text is appropriate for the audience intended and is written with a concern for clarity and quality, including contemporary diction, little unnecessary information, and a personal writing style.

___9. The text is matched with the learner and the teacher.

___10. The text has a defined, unified purpose for its use in the classroom.

___11. The text is coherent and encourages the flow of ideas, movement from old knowledge to new knowledge, and application of prior knowledge.

___12. The students are encouraged to perform self-assessment.

___13. The examinations require students to perform with language.

___14. The questions included in the textbook are open-ended, and they require students to use prior knowledge and text and to determine their own meaning while the exercises support the purpose(s) stated.

___15. The textbook has been field-tested with good results and these findings as well as a Learner Verification Report (LVR), which shows an analysis of the textbook's effectiveness are included for review.

___16. Students are encouraged to make personal connections with the material in the text.

___17. The textbook addresses reading with comprehending meaning, locating information, and selecting and evaluating material, and the level of difficulty offers a reasonable level of challenge for the students; students are encouraged to use predictions of ideas throughout the reading process.

___18. Students are encouraged to write, frequently using reader-response journals. The writing exercises encourage the use of process-oriented writing.

___19. Students are given the focus of the lesson, supplied prereading activities, and encouraged to ask questions. Students can become involved with the text with the activities and are aided by prior experiences.

___20. The ancillary materials are adequate but not excessive.

___21. The ancillary materials include audio-visual aids.

___22. The textbook is flexible and allows for the omission or exchange of units and for the addition or substitution of outside resources (such as magazines, newspapers, and trade books).

___23. The textbook considers the cultural background of students and reflects the goals, values, and needs of the community.

___24. The textbook avoids stereotyping and mistreatment of race, sex, and ethnic groups.

___25. The textbook is appropriate for all potential audiences.

___26. The teacher's manual for the textbook includes instructional guidelines.

___27. The teacher's manual for the textbook includes adequate follow-up activities.

___28. The instructional program emphasizes integrating listening, speaking, reading, writing and teachability with the teaching of language skills in meaningful contexts.

___29. The textbook facilitates the teaching of literature, allows the teachers to be decision makers (not "teacher-proof") and encourages the use of varying sized groups for various activities.

___30. The textbook inspires students to learn.

___31. The exercises encourage the use of critical thinking and problem-solving.

___32. The exercises encourage multiple interpretations.

___33. The literature contained in the anthology offers a variety of genres, representation of major populations, special needs (such as language or

disabilities),

___34. The selections included in the anthology are the primary works of the authors and represent the best in writing from these authors.

___35. There is a representative proportion in number of pieces and total length of pieces devoted to the genres of nonfiction (biography, true stories, science/technical writing and essays), drama (in various forms), legends/fables/myths, poetry, novels, and short stories which meet the curriculum guidelines.

___36. The authors, poets, and playwrights include adolescent writers, current writers, living writers, minorities, and women, and the selections included in the anthology include contemporary literature and adolescent literature.

___37. The anthology includes authors' bios and information about their lives.

___38. Vocabulary exercises link students to prior knowledge.

___39. The organization of the literature is based upon theme.

___40. Writing exercises include the use of personal writings.

___41. Writing exercises focus on creation and revision or the process-oriented means of instruction.

APPENDIX F
THE MCKENZIE INSTRUMENT OF TEXTBOOK SELECTION (MITS)

MCKENZIE INSTRUMENT OF TEXTBOOK SELECTION (MITS)

Textbook Title	Publisher	Grade/Course
----------------	-----------	--------------

INSTRUCTIONS: Place an X next to each item that is included in this textbook.

___1. Illustrations are appropriate (appealing, functional, related to and integrated with text, adequate but not excessive) for the instructional purposes.

___2. The textbook has an adequate durability rating for intended purposes.

___3. The textbook authors are identified and known for their expertise and include those with high school teaching experience and those from multi-cultures and various sections of the country.

___4. The copyright date indicates that the textbook has been published within the last five years and includes research substantiated within the last ten years.

___5. The price of the textbook is within budget.

___6. The textbook contains suitable print size and format.

___7. The textbook is manageable, not in excess of three pounds.

___8. The text is appropriate for the audience intended and is written with a concern for clarity and quality, including contemporary diction, little unnecessary information, and a personal writing style.

___9. The text has a defined, unified purpose for its use in the classroom.

___10. The text is coherent and encourages the flow of ideas, movement from old knowledge to new knowledge, and application of prior knowledge.

___11. The students are encouraged to perform self-assessment.

___12. The examinations require students to perform with language.

___13. The questions included in the textbook are open-ended, and they require students to use prior knowledge and text and to determine their own meaning while the exercises support the purpose(s) stated.

___14. The textbook has been field-tested with good results and these findings as well as a Learner Verification Report (LVR), which shows an analysis of the textbook's effectiveness, are included for review.

___15. Students are encouraged to make personal connections with the material in the text.

___16. The textbook addresses reading with comprehending meaning, locating information, and selecting and evaluating material, and the level of difficulty offers a reasonable level of challenge for the students; students are encouraged to use predictions of ideas throughout the reading process.

___17. Students are encouraged to write, frequently using reader-response journals. The writing exercises encourage the use of process-oriented writing.

___18. Students are given the focus of the lesson, supplied prereading activities, and encouraged to ask questions. Students can become involved with the text with the activities and are aided by prior experiences.

___19. The ancillary materials are adequate but not excessive.

___20. The textbook is flexible and allows for the omission or exchange of units and for the addition or substitution of outside resources (such as magazines, newspapers, and trade books).

___21. The textbook considers the cultural background of students and reflects the goals, values, and needs of the community.

___22. The textbook avoids stereotyping and mistreatment of race, sex, and ethnic groups.

___23. The teacher's manual for the textbook includes adequate follow-up activities.

___24. The instructional program emphasizes integrating listening, speaking, reading, writing and teachability with the teaching of language skills in meaningful contexts.

___25. The textbook facilitates the teaching of literature, allows the teachers to be decision makers (not "teacher-proof") and encourages the use of varying sized groups for various activities.

___26. The exercises encourage the use of critical thinking and problem-solving.

___27. The exercises encourage multiple interpretations.

___28. The literature contained in the anthology offers a variety of genres, representation of major populations, special needs (such as language or disabilities),

___29. The selections included in the anthology are the primary works of the authors and represent the best in writing from these authors.

___30. There is a representative proportion in number of pieces and total length of pieces devoted to the genres of nonfiction (biography, true stories, science/technical writing and essays), drama (in various forms), legends/fables/myths, poetry, novels, and short stories which meet the curriculum guidelines.

___31. The authors, poets, and playwrights include adolescent writers, current writers, living writers, minorities, and women, and the selections included in the anthology include contemporary literature and adolescent literature.

___32. The anthology includes authors' bios and information about their lives.

___33. Vocabulary exercises link students to prior knowledge.

___34. The organization of the literature is based upon theme.

___35. Writing exercises include the use of personal writings.

___36. Writing exercises focus on creation and revision or the process-oriented means of instruction.

SCORE SHEET FOR THE
MCKENZIE INSTRUMENT OF TEXTBOOK SELECTION
(MITS)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>INSTRUMENT RATING</u>	<u>CHECKED?</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Illustrations	2	_____	_____
Durability	2	_____	_____
Textbook Authors	2	_____	_____
Copyright	3	_____	_____
Cost	2	_____	_____
Print Size/Format	2	_____	_____
Weight/Size	2	_____	_____
Audience	3	_____	_____
Purpose	2	_____	_____
Coherence	3	_____	_____
Self-Assessment	3	_____	_____
Examinations	3	_____	_____
Questions	3	_____	_____
Field Tested/LVR	1	_____	_____
Personal Connections	3	_____	_____
Reading	3	_____	_____
Composition/Writing	3	_____	_____
Students	2	_____	_____
Ancillary Materials	2	_____	_____
Flexibility	3	_____	_____
Cultural	2	_____	_____
Stereotyping	3	_____	_____
Appropriate	3	_____	_____
Teacher's Manuals	1	_____	_____
Integration	3	_____	_____
Not Teacher-Proof	3	_____	_____
Critical Thinking	3	_____	_____
Multiple Interpretations	3	_____	_____
Literature	3	_____	_____
Primary Works	3	_____	_____
Genre	3	_____	_____
Authors/Poets/Playwrights	3	_____	_____
Author Biographies	1	_____	_____
Vocabulary	1	_____	_____
Organization	2	_____	_____
Writing/Personal	3	_____	_____
Writing/Process	3	_____	_____
		TOTAL SCORE	_____

APPENDIX G
NAMES OF DELPHI PANEL MEMBERS

NAMES OF DELPHI PANEL MEMBERS

Hugh Agee
University of Georgia
125 Alderhold Hall
Athens, GA 30602

Susan Bennett
Department of English
Humboldt State University
Arcata, CA 95521

Leila Christenbury
P. O. Box 842020
School of Education
Virginia Commonwealth Univ.
Richmond, VA 23284-0481

Harold Foster
University of Akron
134 Zook Hall
Department of Secondary Ed.
Akron, OH 44325

Richard Graves
Dept. of Curriculum & Teaching
Auburn University
Auburn, AL 36849

Virginia Monseau
Department of English
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, OH 44555

Richard Abrahamson
Spring, TX 77389

John Bushman
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Bailey Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045

Charles Duke
101 Stevens Hall
Clarion University
Clarion, PA 16214

Jeff Golub
Department of Secondary Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

Patricia Kelly
Salem, VA 24153

Connie Zitlow
Columbus, OH 43220

APPENDIX H
NAMES OF FIELD TEST COORDINATORS AND TEACHERS

NAMES OF FIELD TEST COORDINATORS AND TEACHERS

Coordinators

Janice B. Miller
Seymour High School, TN
English teacher

Nancy Ratcliffe
Gordon Central High School, GA
English teacher/Department Chair

Teachers

Angela Harris
Gordon Central High School, GA
English teacher

Nancy Ratcliffe
Gordon Central High School, GA
English teacher/Department Chair

James E. Shope
Gordon Central High School, GA
English teacher

Christie Temples
Gordon Central High School, GA
English teacher

Judith Wade
Seymour High School, TN
English teacher/Department Chair

Sam R. Williams
Heritage High School, TN
English teacher

VITA

VITA

Kathleen Rose McKenzie was born in Ohio on April 12, 1960. Her family moved to Georgia when she was twelve, and there she attended elementary and high school. She graduated from Gilmer High School in June 1978. In August of 1978, she entered Shorter College, Georgia, and graduated in 1982 with a major in English with a minor in Speech/Drama. In 1983 she began work on her masters degree at Columbus College, Georgia.

She married Joseph Ray McKenzie, an Army officer, in October of 1984 and moved to Texas where she accepted a high school English teaching position with Copperas Cove High School. The military sent the family back to Columbus, Georgia, where Kathleen completed her Master's of Education degree in English education. Their next military assignment was in Hawaii at Schofield Barracks and Fort Shafter. While in Hawaii, Kathleen worked as the coordinator of a basic skills program, a teacher of basic skills programs for the military, and a college professor of English. In 1990 she was appointed the director of a National Workplace Literacy Grant for corrections officers for the State of Hawaii. In 1991 she returned to the classroom as a college professor for the University of Hawaii Community Colleges teaching writing and reading.

In 1992, her husband left active duty and the family returned to the mainland. Kathleen enrolled at the University of Tennessee in January, 1993 as a doctoral student. During this period she published articles on education in an education journal. She received the Doctor of Education degree, with a major in Curriculum and Instruction in English education, in December 1994.

Kathleen is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, the International Reading Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Tennessee Council of the Teachers of English. She is currently employed by Gordon

Central High School in Calhoun, Georgia, where she teaches ninth-grade and tenth-grade English and dramatics.

Kathleen and her husband have two children, Joshua and Caitlin.