

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



129 490

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE
THIRTIETH YEARBOOK

OF THE
NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY
OF EDUCATION

PART II

The Textbook in American Education

Prepared by the Society's Committee on the Textbook

W. C. BAGLEY, B. R. BUCKINGHAM, G. T. BUSWELL, W. L. COFFEY,
N. B. HENRY, F. A. JENSEN, C. R. MAXWELL, RALEIGH
SCHORLING, and J. B. EDMONSON (*Chairman*)

Assisted by the Following Members of the Society

ELLWOOD P. CUBBERLEY AND HERMAN G. RICHEY

Edited by

GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE

THIS PART OF THE YEARBOOK WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE DETROIT
MEETING OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY, SATURDAY,
FEBRUARY 21, 1931, 8:00 P. M.

PUBLIC SCHOOL PUBLISHING COMPANY
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS

1931

•

AGENTS
PUBLIC SCHOOL PUBLISHING COMPANY
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS
PUBLISHERS OF ALL THE YEARBOOKS OF THE SOCIETY

COPYRIGHT, 1931, BY
GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE
SECRETARY OF THE SOCIETY

No part of this Yearbook may be reproduced in any form without
written permission from the Secretary of the Society

Published February, 1931
First Printing, 6,000 copies

Printed by the
PUBLIC SCHOOL PUBLISHING COMPANY
Bloomington, Illinois

•

•

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY
for 1930-31

Board of Directors

(Term of office expires March 1st of the year indicated)

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY (1934)*
Columbia University, New York City

WERRETT W. CHARTERS (1932)
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

M. E. HAGGERTY (1934)†
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

FRANK N. FREEMAN (1932)
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

ERNEST HORN (1933)
State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

CHARLES H. JUDD (1931)
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

LEONARD V. KOOS, *Chairman* (1933)
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE (*Ex-officio*)
Danvers, Massachusetts

Secretary-Treasurer

GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE (1932)
Danvers, Massachusetts

* Re-elected for three years beginning March, 1931.

† Elected for three years beginning March, 1931.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
MEMBERSHIP OF THE SOCIETY'S COMMITTEE ON THE TEXTBOOK	vi
ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY ASSISTING THE COMMITTEE	vi
EDITOR'S PREFACE	vii
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE TEXTBOOK AND METHODS OF TEACHING	7
WILLIAM C. BAGLEY, Columbia University, New York City	
III. THE TECHNIQUES OF TEXTBOOK AUTHORS	27
RALEIGH SCHORLING AND J. B. EDMONSON, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan	
IV. THE PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF TEXTBOOK AUTHORS	67
HERMAN G. RICHEY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	
V. THE SELECTION OF MANUSCRIPTS BY PUBLISHERS	79
FRANK A. JENSEN, Rockford, Illinois	
VI. NEW DATA ON THE TYPOGRAPHY OF TEXTBOOKS	93
B. R. BUCKINGHAM, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts	
VII. CURRENT PRACTICES IN SELECTING TEXTBOOKS FOR THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	127
FRANK A. JENSEN, Rockford, Illinois	
VIII. THE USE OF SCORE CARDS IN EVALUATING TEXTBOOKS	143
C. R. MAXWELL, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming	
IX. THE POLICIES OF PUBLISHERS IN MARKETING TEXTBOOKS	163
FRANK A. JENSEN, Rockford, Illinois	
X. THE PROBLEMS OF PUBLISHERS IN MAKING AND MARKETING TEXTBOOKS	175
NELSON B. HENRY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	
XI. THE ETHICS OF MARKETING AND SELECTING TEXTBOOKS	199
J. B. EDMONSON, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan	
XII. THE COST OF TEXTBOOKS	221
NELSON B. HENRY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	

CHAP.	PAGE
XIII. THE STATE PUBLICATION OF TEXTBOOKS.....	235
ELLWOOD P. CUBBERLEY, Stanford University, California	
XIV. LEGISLATIVE AGENCIES FOR TEXTBOOK SELECTION.....	249
W. L. COFFEY, College of the City of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan	
XV. JUDICIAL OPINION ON TEXTBOOK SELECTION.....	275
W. L. COFFEY, College of the City of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan	
XVI. STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING PROPOSED TEXTBOOK LEGIS- LATION	291
W. L. COFFEY, College of the City of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan	
XVII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE	305
XVIII. A SELECTED AND ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LITERA- TURE RELATING TO TEXTBOOKS.....	309
G. T. BUSWELL, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	
Constitution of the National Society for the Study of Education	325
Minutes of the Atlantic City Meeting of the Society.....	328
Synopsis of the Proceedings of the Board of Directors During 1930	332
Yearbooks in Preparation by Members of the Society.....	336
Report of the Treasurer of the Society for 1929.....	337
List of Honorary and Active Members of the Society.....	339
Information Concerning the Society.....	361
List of the Publications of the Society.....	362

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SOCIETY'S YEARBOOK
COMMITTEE ON THE TEXTBOOK

- W. C. BAGLEY, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
- B. R. BUCKINGHAM, Lecturer, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- G. T. BUSWELL, Professor of Educational Psychology, School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- W. L. COFFEY, Dean, College of the City of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan.
- J. B. EDMONSON (*Chairman*), Dean, School of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- N. B. HENRY, Assistant Professor of Education, School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- F. A. JENSEN, Superintendent of Schools, Rockford, Illinois.
- C. R. MAXWELL, Dean, College of Education, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.
- RALEIGH SCHORLING, Professor of Education, School of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY ASSISTING
THE COMMITTEE ON THE TEXTBOOK

- E. P. CUBBERLEY, Dean, School of Education, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, California.
- H. G. RICHEY, School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

EDITOR'S PREFACE

Credit for calling the attention of the Board of Directors to the desirability of producing a yearbook dealing with the textbook should go to Professor J. Howard Stoutemyer, then of Kearney, Nebraska, whose suggestion was considered by the Board at its February, 1925, meeting. The discussion of this suggestion led to tentative plans for a yearbook that should deal not only with the making of textbooks, as Professor Stoutemyer had suggested, but also with the conditions under which textbooks were selected for use in the public schools.

At the fall meeting of the same year, 1925, J. B. Edmonson, of the University of Michigan, who had meantime accepted the chairmanship of the Committee on the Textbook, submitted in person an outline of the proposed work of the Committee, which then comprised Messrs. Buckingham, Buswell, Maxwell, and himself, and arranged for an appropriation to cover its expenses. At this time it was proposed to pay particular attention to the seeming deficiencies of score cards and to suggest methods for the analysis of textbooks that would be superior to the stereotyped analysis of the score card.

At the Dallas meeting of the Board, February, 1927, the program of the Textbook Committee was again discussed at some length and suggestions were made for the further extension of the undertaking to include such topics as problems of reading difficulty and vocabulary, the techniques for selecting materials and arranging them within textbooks, the place of illustrations, questions, exercises, etc.

A later report of progress from the Textbook Committee was printed on page 367 of the *Twenty-Seventh Yearbook*, Part II, and need not be repeated here.

At its Cleveland meeting, February, 1929, the Board approved of the addition to the Textbook Committee of Professors W. C. Bagley and Raleigh Schorling.

At its Atlantic City meeting, February, 1930, the Board approved of the further enlargement of the Committee by the addition of Dean W. L. Coffey, Professor N. B. Henry, and Superintendent F. A. Jensen, making nine members in all. The Board also voted to publish the report of the Textbook Committee as one part of the *Thirtieth Yearbook*. It urged the Committee to complete its work, if possible,

in time to permit the inclusion in the Yearbook of a brief reviewing chapter reflecting the interests of various educational groups toward the construction and the use of textbooks in American schools. This arrangement unfortunately could not be effected.

The Textbook Committee, during its five years of activity has had placed at its disposal \$1900, of which approximately \$1500 has been used to defray the expenses of its meetings and of certain printing and clerical undertakings. In addition the Board made a special grant of \$200 toward the investigation of the typographical problems described in Chapter VI, with the understanding that the results should be published in full in this Yearbook and that the remainder of the expense, approximately two thousand dollars, should be borne by the three Boston publishers (Ginn & Co., D. C. Heath & Co., and Houghton Mifflin Co.) who volunteered to undertake the investigation jointly.

Like every undertaking of this kind, the preparation of the Yearbook on the Textbook has turned out to be more time-consuming and more difficult than had been supposed, so that even after these five years of effort the Committee has not been able to carry out all the rather ambitious hopes of the Board of Directors. On the other hand, the Committee has been able to include in its report other aspects of the textbook problem that had not been contemplated in the original plan, so that its contribution is particularly welcome on that ground. Attention may be called to the democratic manner in which the Committee, in its survey of the production and distribution of textbooks, has conferred with publishers as well as schoolmen, to the interesting outcome of the classroom observations on the relation of textbooks to methods of teaching, to the even more interesting outcome of the typographic investigation, to the careful scrutiny of score cards, to the comprehensive reports on textbook legislation, to the annotated bibliography, to the appraisal of numerous ethical issues in the textbook business, and to the stimulating series of conclusions and recommendations that have grown out of the Committee's deliberations.

G. M. W.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS IMPORTANCE

The significant position of textbooks in the program of American education is so generally recognized that the Society seems to be fully justified in sponsoring a yearbook on the theme "The Textbook." It is the textbook that in thousands of classrooms determines the content of instruction as well as the teaching procedures. This statement may not be in accord with the usual theory, but it is supported by the facts reported by supervisors and state inspectors of schools. In view, therefore, of the important place of the textbook in our educational practice, the preparation and the selection of textbooks is a problem of major importance.

The textbook occupies a more important position in our educational system than it does in the systems of many foreign countries. One writer,¹ in a recent comparison of instructional procedures in German and American schools, declares:

Whereas in America the textbook is the focus of class attention, and the teacher functions as an aid and witness to its assimilation (a 'fellow student,' as some of them like to be called and most of them are), in German classes the teacher completely fills the stage. He presents all new material directly as though it were original with him. . . . Notebook may not obtrude: the pupil must think, understand, and remember. Aside from meager outlines, there are no textbooks to fall back on.

Other writers on foreign school systems have stressed similar facts regarding the dependence of our teachers and pupils on textbooks.

The explanation of the development of the textbook in America, as well as its unique place in our educational system, has been explained by Cubberley,² who says:

¹ Learned, W. S. *Quality of the Educational Process in the United States and Europe*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin No. 20, 1927, pp. 13-14.

² Cubberley, E. P. *The Textbook Problem*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company (1927), p. 4.

Partly because of the peculiar teaching needs we have had to meet, partly because of the absence here of any European type of standardization and uniformity of instruction and instructional tools, and partly because of the resulting open competition in the preparation and production of textbooks, the business of preparing textbooks for use in the schools has become a great American business, of a type unknown in any other land. . . .

In no country are there more teachers engaged in the work of textbook-making, and nowhere are textbooks in preparation subjected to such a severe trying-out process before publication. In no country, moreover, are the textbooks in use revised more frequently to keep them abreast of the progress in knowledge and the best educational thought.

In no other land does the beginning teacher have so many aids in the form of textbooks to help her get started in the work of teaching, and nowhere does the experienced and capable teacher have so many supplementary texts to put into the hands of her pupils as do the teachers of the United States. The excellent character of the American school textbook, then, is one of the important forces that have enabled us, in spite of difficulties as to teaching force not experienced in older European lands, to create the type of schools we have.

In view, then, of the importance of the textbook in our scheme of education, it is apparent that one of the most effective ways for improving the content and method of instruction is to place better textbooks in the hands of teachers and pupils. To do this, we must not only encourage the preparation of textbooks of superior quality, but also develop, in the selection of textbooks, procedures that will tend to insure in our schools the use of these superior books. This Yearbook represents an effort to contribute to the preparation and selection of better textbooks for American schools.

II. THE SCOPE OF THE YEARBOOK

In the preparation of this Yearbook there has been no effort to provide a treatment of all phases of the textbook problem, for such a study would require more than one volume. The choice of topics was made largely in terms of the special interests of contributors, although the Committee sought and secured contributions on certain aspects of the problem. A review of the chapters will make it evident that, whatever topics may have been omitted, the Committee has studied a number of difficult and, to some extent, controversial phases of the textbook problem.

In the discussion of "The Textbook and Methods," by Dr. Bagley, there are adequate data to show that the textbook has such a marked influence on methods of instruction that great care should be taken in the selection of textbooks. Attention is also called to an unsolved problem in our training of teachers with respect to the intelligent use of textbooks as tools in instruction. It is encouraging to find that there is a decline in the formal use of textbooks and a decreasing reliance on a single textbook.

In the chapter entitled "The Techniques of Textbook Authors," Dr. Schorling and the Chairman have discussed some of the good and some of the doubtful practices of authors in the preparation of manuscripts. The value of this chapter is enhanced by the many contributions from experienced authors. The plan used in the preparation of this chapter will doubtless be of interest to many readers. An account of this plan will be found in the chapter. The authors of the chapter hope that it will be helpful to editors in the evaluation of manuscripts, and that it will also serve to encourage authors to prepare their manuscripts with more consideration of certain commendable techniques of organization and selection of materials.

There is much interest in the question, "Who Writes Our Textbooks?" In all probability many laymen would answer this question with the assertion that the textbooks are written by a few college professors. The facts collected by Mr. Richey and reported in the chapter, "The Professional Status of Textbook Authors," indicate that the authors of textbooks are drawn from all levels of teaching in our schools. His findings are an effective answer to the suspicion apparently entertained by some persons that a few dominating individuals in higher institutions determine what is taught in the public and private schools of America.

Publishers make a noteworthy contribution to the improvement of textbooks through their refusal of many manuscripts. The extent to which publishers decline to place on the market certain manuscripts offered for publication will doubtless surprise many readers of the chapter entitled "The Selection of Manuscripts by Publishers." In the preparation of this chapter Dr. Jensen had the coöperation of many of the leading publishers.

In planning the Yearbook the Committee desired to make some significant contribution to the improvement of the mechanical aspects

of textbook-making and in particular to investigate the validity of certain generally accepted standards relating to the type page. Dr. Buckingham was therefore requested to seek the coöperation of publishing firms in the study of the problem treated in the chapter concerned with "New Data on the Typography of Textbooks." It is hoped that this chapter will lead publishers to engage in coöperative research on problems relating to the mechanical aspects of textbook-making and will lead those who select textbooks to be somewhat less inclined to accept mere opinions as criteria for judging the proper size and arrangement of type for children's books.

Superintendent Jensen has presented an interesting discussion of the topic, "Current Practices in Selecting Textbooks for the Elementary Schools." A careful examination of this chapter by school officials should lead to the abandoning of certain doubtful practices and to the adoption of better ones.

In recent years there has been a growing interest in the use of mechanical aids in the analysis of textbooks. As a result of this interest a large number of score cards has been developed. Dean Maxwell discusses "The Use of Score Cards in Evaluating Textbooks." This chapter should be of much practical help to selecting committees.

There are persistent criticisms relating to the making and marketing of textbooks. In Chapters IX, X, and XI there is presented a treatment of certain of these criticisms. These chapters should be of interest to publishers as well as to selecting agencies. Superintendent Jensen discusses "The Policies of Publishers in Marketing Textbooks," and Dr. Henry presents a symposium entitled "The Problems of Publishers in Making and Marketing Textbooks." In Chapter XI the chairman gives the findings he secured by a questionnaire relating to "The Ethics of Marketing and Selecting Textbooks." These three chapters define some of the difficulties involved in the making and marketing of textbooks. It is hoped that a study of these chapters by interested parties will tend to safeguard commendable practices and to lead to further improvement. There is an optimistic note in these chapters indicating that substantial progress in the solving of problems is being made.

Among laymen there appears to prevail a notion that enormous sums of money are expended annually for the purchase of textbooks.

The Committee therefore invited Dr. Henry to study this problem. His findings are reported under the title "The Cost of Textbooks." It is interesting to note that, while the total amount expended for textbooks makes a large figure, it represents a negligible fraction of the total cost of public education. In view of the value of good textbooks in the hands of the pupils, our profession seems justified in urging that adequate instructional materials be secured even at a greater expenditure of money.

In the chapter entitled "The State Publication of Textbooks," Dean Cubberley presents a most interesting analysis of the various factors involved in a policy of state publication. His presentation of the situation gives no encouragement to the advocates of state publication of textbooks.

The textbook problem has led to the enactment of many state laws; no study of the problem would be complete without some attention to them. Dean Coffey has accordingly prepared three chapters: "Legislative Agencies for Textbook Selection"; "Judicial Opinion on Textbook Selection"; "Standards for Evaluating Proposed Textbook Legislation." In preparing these chapters Dean Coffey had the advantage of previous legal training and of experience in the State Department of Public Instruction of Michigan. The important features of textbook legislation and the fundamental principles in the judicial decisions are summarized in his chapters. One of the most valuable of Dean Coffey's contributions relates to the standards for evaluating textbook legislation. It is hoped that these standards will help to protect the schools against unwise and ill-considered legislation.

In Chapter XVII the Committee has presented its conclusions and recommendations on certain questions. In presenting this chapter the Committee anticipates a critical reaction from many readers. So be it. The conclusions are intentionally specific and positive. If they arouse discussion, that may very well lead to an earlier solution of some of the perplexing issues in the making and marketing of textbooks.

In the final chapter Dr. Buswell presents an annotated bibliography of some of the quantitative and critical writings relating to the textbook problem. This bibliography is designed to guide the reading of those who wish to make a more intensive study of this problem than is possible in this Yearbook.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE YEARBOOK

As has been said, the Committee does not lay claim to completeness of treatment. It is recognized that the value of this Yearbook would be increased by chapters on such problems as: (1) The Historical Development of the American Textbook; (2) The Textbook and the Curriculum; (3) An Appraisal of State Uniformity of Textbooks; (4) An Appraisal of County Uniformity of Textbooks; (5) The Place and Value of Workbooks and Other Newer Forms of Instructional Materials; (6) The Development of Textbooks in College Fields. These are some of the topics for investigation which from time to time have been considered by the committee. Certain aspects of most of these topics have been treated as parts of certain chapters; but the Committee recognizes that all these topics are important enough to warrant more adequate consideration. If the interest in this Yearbook is sufficient to warrant it, it is possible that the Society may wish to sponsor a second volume on the textbook to treat some of these and similar subjects.

J. B. EDMONSON, *Chairman,*
For the Committee.

•

CHAPTER II

THE TEXTBOOK AND METHODS OF TEACHING

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY
Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

I. THE PROBLEM

There is a general impression that the textbook very largely dominates classroom instruction in American schools. This impression remains in spite of the wide and increasing vogue of an educational theory which lays a minimum of emphasis upon the systematic mastery of knowledge and a maximum of emphasis upon the all-round growth and development of the individual, especially through meeting and solving the problems that arise in the course of his daily life. With the increasing acceptance of this theory, one would expect a lessening of the time given to the study and recitation of textbook materials and an increasing prevalence of activities, projects, laboratory work, and the like. In the mastery of such items of knowledge and skill as are still regarded as essential, one would expect that assignments and recitations based on textbook materials would by this time be giving place to one or another of the various types of self-instruction; and in subjects of instruction that lend themselves to group study and discussion, one would expect the class exercises to take with increasing frequency the form of the socialized recitation.

Whether these expectations are in the direction of progress is a question which this paper will touch, if at all, only indirectly. Its primary concern is with the extent to which the textbook still dominates instruction in American schools. The investigation has followed two principal lines: (1) an examination of the reports of school surveys; and (2) observers' reports concerning more than five hundred classroom exercises, presumably a random sampling, representing elementary and high schools in cities, towns, villages, and the open country, and representing also thirty states and all sections of the country.

II. TYPICAL STATEMENTS IN SCHOOL SURVEYS

The earlier school surveys found a general adherence to the textbook as a medium of instruction, but they also reported efforts upon the part of individual teachers to broaden the scope of instruction and to give to the learner larger opportunities for independent thinking. It is characteristic of the earlier survey reports that they tended very clearly to charge the inadequacies of textbook instruction against the school system and the requirements imposed by the authorities rather than against the teachers. The Report of the Educational Commission of the City of Chicago, published in 1898, contains the following statement:¹

The rigid requirement of certain textbooks for all grades unduly hampers the individual teacher, who has a definite problem of accomplishing certain educational results with a given number of pupils during a given period. In so far as the teacher lacks ability or is deficient in preparation for his work, close adherence to a good textbook may be necessary. Our Chicago teachers have, however, furnished no better proof of increasing efficiency than by manifesting their desire to be in a measure freed from such restrictions and to be allowed more liberty in working out in each case the specific problem of the particular grade and school.

That close dependence upon the textbook has been not always the fault of the teacher is indicated also by the following extract from the report of the Denver survey of 1916:²

The facts of a standard text are to be learned in the course of a single year. Whatever the teacher's ideas as to the purposes of the work, the methods to be employed, the things to be read, etc., practically only one course is left open to her; she must teach the textbook. . . . It is not the teachers who bear the major part of the blame, but rather those responsible for the conditions under which the teachers work.

Similar testimony came from the report of the Leavenworth Survey of 1915:³

Unfortunately the grade teacher in Kansas is bound down to a state text which she is expected to teach. This is not the fault of the

¹ *Report of the Educational Commission of the City of Chicago, 1898, p. 144.*

² Bobbitt, F.: *Report of the School Survey of the School District of Denver, Colorado, 1916, pp. 77f.*

³ *Report of the Public Schools of Leavenworth, Kansas. Topeka: State Printing Plant, 1915, p. 101.*

Leavenworth teachers. . . The textbook should be merely a guide and the teachers should work with the pupils in studying history rather than having them recite history.

And from the Gary survey of 1918:⁴

The official course of study is not intended to limit the teacher's personality or freedom, and teachers are expressly enjoined to adapt their instruction to the needs of their particular schools and communities. On the other hand, the state prescribes a uniform series of textbooks . . . the fact remains that the legally designated text may hamper a competent and progressive teacher.

From Delaware, in 1919, came the charge⁵ that the lack of competent supervision was primarily responsible for the too exclusive dependence upon textbooks:

They [the teachers] need guidance and supervision and this the present system does not supply. The result is that prescribed textbooks, literally followed, constitute the course of study in the elementary schools of Delaware.

In the later survey reports there is a continuing criticism of the schools for the overemphasis of textbook instruction. A few citations will indicate how apparently prevalent, even in recent years, has been the formal mastery of textbook materials:

If good citizenship is accepted as a desirable outcome of school life, then the procedure of the classroom must be such as will require thinking, not memory alone. . . In Lynn, almost no situations were found [in the geography classes] of the type in which thinking was demanded. Instead, the class gave back to the teacher the information found in the book. Texts were followed almost slavishly; the curiosity of the pupils was seldom aroused; rarely was an inquiring spirit stimulated by the teacher.⁶

Much of the textbook material is of no vital concern to the child. Dead, cold, formal, and pedantic.⁷

⁴ Flexner, A., and Bachman, F. P.: *The Gary Schools*. New York: The General Education Board, 1918, pp. 48f.

⁵ *Public Education in Delaware*. New York: General Education Board, 1919, p. 48.

⁶ Strayer, G. D.: *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Lynn, Massachusetts*. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1927, p. 243. In the discussion of reading, however, the following comment is made: "On the favorable side, there was evidence of a breaking away from the very early use of textbooks, and the substitution of more natural approaches to reading."

⁷ O'Shea, M. V.: *Public Education in Mississippi*. Jackson: Published by the State, 1926, p. 118.

A parallel defect of quite general prevalence is excessive reliance upon textbook methods of instruction. This defect derives in part from poor formulation of objectives, and in part from inadequate preparation of teachers. It is especially reprehensible when employed with the less usual or more recently introduced subjects, such as civics, general science, and agriculture.⁸

In Missouri schools, as in most American schools, textbooks are an important part of the machinery of instruction. To a considerable extent they determine both the content and the method of instruction. This is of necessity true when teachers are not well trained; when competent professional supervision is generally lacking; and when reference materials are scarce, unsuitable, and inadequate. In practice the textbook is the course of study in most Missouri schools.⁹

Far too many memorized statements were called for. More questions should have been asked which would have required thinking on the part of the pupils.¹⁰

Methods of instruction used in Tampa represent too frequently a slavish memorization of the textbooks. Confronted on the one hand by the compulsory use of specified texts and on the other by a course of study which, though enunciating ideals, fails to show in detail how to put them into practice, the classroom teacher adopts the obvious course of action and forces a memorization . . . of the facts in the texts. . . The remedy for this situation consists for the present in doing for the entire course of study what has been done . . . in certain cases; namely, amplifying the method side of the course.¹¹

The teachers in the small rural schools are very deficient in training and educational outlook. The blind dependence of the teachers upon textbooks is generally evident.¹²

These excerpts are fairly typical of what the more recent survey reports have to say about the use of textbooks in the schools. One who studies such reports over a series of years can scarcely escape the conclusion that the work of the typical American classroom, whether on

⁸ O'Shea, M. V., *op. cit.*, p. 136, under the heading, "What are still the outstanding defects of American secondary education?"

⁹ Strayer, G. D., and Engelhardt, N. L. (Directors of the Survey): *A Preliminary Report of the Survey of the Public Schools and Higher Institutions in the State of Missouri*, 1929, p. 110.

¹⁰ Monroe, W. S.: *A Survey of the Schools of Marion, Illinois*. Urbana: Published by the University of Illinois, 1924, p. 38.

¹¹ Strayer, G. D. (Director of Survey): *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Tampa, Florida*. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1926, p. 141.

¹² *Official Report of the Educational Survey Commission, State of Florida, 1929, p. 44.*

the elementary or the secondary level, has been and still is characterized by a lifeless and perfunctory study and recitation of assigned textbook materials. Is such a conclusion justified, or do the survey reports, in general, tend to bring the outstanding weaknesses of the schools into sharp relief, giving less emphasis to the measure in which generally approved practices prevail?

III. REPORTS OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

1. Method of Collecting the Data

When I was asked to prepare a chapter dealing with the influence of the textbook on methods of teaching, a direct investigation through extensive classroom visiting did not seem practicable in view of the limited time at my disposal and in view, too, of the fact that there was no available fund from which the expense of such visits could be met. I hesitated to ask for reports from supervisors, inspectors, and other persons who visit classrooms as part of the day's work because of the difficulty of insuring uniformity in the identification of different methods of teaching. After conference with other members of the Yearbook Committee, however, it seemed well to supplement the study of the survey reports by such an investigation in spite of its limitations. A check-list, reproduced herewith, was prepared with the assistance of other members of the Committee. This check-list was sent (1) to a group of university high-school visitors selected by Dean J. B. Edmonson; (2) to a group of inspectors and supervisors attached to the state education departments, the names of whom were taken from the Educational Directory issued by the Federal Office of Education; and (3) to a group of local supervisors, principals, assistant superintendents, and county superintendents most of whom were selected by Professor J. F. Hosie from the membership of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association. Accompanying the check-list was a letter stating the importance of having the returns constitute as far as possible a random sampling and to this end requesting that the observer report on the first ten classrooms visited after the receipt of the list, with the provision that no class exercise be reported unless the observer remained in the room during at least half of the class period.

Name of person reporting..... Position.....

Please check the DOMINANT method characterizing each class observed

	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:
1. Recitation largely reproduction of assignment from a single textbook					
2. Recitation largely reproduction of assignment from two or more textbooks					
3. Class discussion of text assignment rather than mere reproduction (single text)					
4. Class discussion of text assignment rather than mere reproduction (two or more texts or reference books)					
5. Oral presentation by teacher					
6. Individual reports based on individual assignments					
7. Group or committee reports based on group assignments					
8. Directed study major part of time					
9. Undirected study major part of time					
10. Laboratory work based on manual or text					
11. Laboratory work not based on manual or text					
12. Demonstration by teacher					

	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:
13. Demonstration by pupils					
14. Demonstration by pupils and teacher					
15. Individual project work					
16. Group project work					
17. Self-instruction on Dalton Plan					
18. Self-instruction on Winnetka Plan					
19. Morrison's "Mastery" Method (please indicate phase)					
20. Drill lesson					
Combination of above (indicate by number)					
Others:					

THE TEXTBOOK IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:	SUBJECT: GRADE:
If textbook was used, to what extent, in your judgment, did it determine method of teaching?	None Little Largely Wholly	None Little Largely Wholly	None Little Largely Wholly	None Little Largely Wholly	None Little Largely Wholly
If textbook was used, to what extent did it determine content of instruction?	None Little Largely Wholly	None Little Largely Wholly	None Little Largely Wholly	None Little Largely Wholly	None Little Largely Wholly
Experience of teacher (check)	Beginner 2-5 yrs. 5 yr. and over	Beginner 2-5 yrs. 5 yr. and over	Beginner 2-5 yrs. 5 yr. and over	Beginner 2-5 yrs. 5 yr. and over	Beginner 2-5 yrs. 5 yr. and over
Preparation of teacher (check)	Less than High School? H. S. grad. H. S. + 1 yr. H. S. + 2 yrs. H. S. + 3 yrs. H. S. + 4 yrs. More	Less than High School H. S. grad. H. S. + 1 yr. H. S. + 2 yrs. H. S. + 3 yrs. H. S. + 4 yrs. More	Less than High School H. S. grad. H. S. + 1 yr. H. S. + 2 yrs. H. S. + 3 yrs. H. S. + 4 yrs. More	Less than High School H. S. grad. H. S. + 1 yr. H. S. + 2 yrs. H. S. + 3 yrs. H. S. + 4 yrs. More	Less than High School H. S. grad. H. S. + 1 yr. H. S. + 2 yrs. H. S. + 3 yrs. H. S. + 4 yrs. More
Type of school (check)	One Teacher Rural Village Elem. Village High Town or City Elem. Town or City High Other	One Teacher Rural Village Elem. Village High Town or City Elem. Town or City High Other	One Teacher Rural Village Elem. Village High Town or City Elem. Town or City High Other	One Teacher Rural Village Elem. Village High Town or City Elem. Town or City High Other	One Teacher Rural Village Elem. Village High Town or City Elem. Town or City High Other

TABLE I.—GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SCHOOL EXERCISES OBSERVED AND REPORTED ON

State	No. of Exercises Reported On	State	No. of Exercises Reported On
Maine.....	10	Ohio.....	25
Rhode Island.....	10	Illinois.....	35
Connecticut.....	20	Michigan.....	40
New York.....	40	Wisconsin.....	10
New Jersey.....	10	Minnesota.....	11
Pennsylvania.....	20	Iowa.....	10
Delaware.....	20	Missouri.....	20
Maryland.....	30	Nebraska.....	20
District of Columbia.....	10	Kansas.....	19
Virginia.....	10	Utah.....	9
South Carolina.....	10	New Mexico.....	10
Florida.....	30	California.....	30
Alabama.....	20	Washington.....	10
Tennessee.....	10	Total.....	539
Kentucky.....	10		
Louisiana.....	10		
Texas.....	20		

2. Validity of the Data

Unfortunately the lists were not ready for distribution until early in May. By this time many if not most of the university visitors and state inspectors had completed their field work for the year. A fairly large proportion of the lists sent to the local supervisors, however, were filled out and returned. In order to secure a larger representation from the state inspectors, lists were sent about mid-September to a number of such officials, and reports on 104 school exercises were received in time to be included in the tabulations.

Although the returns from the spring and the fall distribution represent thirty states and all sections of the country, they cannot, of course, be regarded as thoroughly typical of the work that is going on in the classrooms of American public schools. All in all we have reports of 539 lessons observed. While the returns from the fall distribution revealed about the same per cents of frequency of mention for the several methods as did the returns from the spring distribution to the same group, there were one or two significant differences. There is another reason, however, for not regarding our re-

turns as trustworthy sampling: the reports from the open-country and village schools are far too few to be significant.

3. Method of Treating the Data

In treating the returns it was found necessary to take as the principal basis of determining frequencies the total number of times that a given method was checked as in evidence in the classwork observed. Many of the exercises could not be satisfactorily classified by checking a single method. Thus in a unit of classwork, both recitation of textbook materials and oral presentation by the teacher may be equally in evidence. Several observers found three or more methods in evidence during a single class period.¹³

4. The Situation Revealed

In discussing the findings of the study, we shall assume that Method 1 ("Recitation largely reproduction of assignment from a single textbook") will be recognized (among the "methods" listed) as the one most clearly inconsistent with generally accepted educational standards. A high frequency in the checking of this method by the observers would consequently be expected if (as is often maintained) these standards, while strongly approved by educational theory, have not affected practice to any great extent.

From an inspection of the data set forth in Table II, it will be noted that, among the town and city supervisors, principals, and assistant superintendents, approximately one-tenth of the methods checked are of this type. The university visitors and state inspectors, on the other hand, check one method in every five as of this type. When the total number of lessons observed is taken as a base (Table VIII), it is seen that varying amounts of 'straight' textbook recitation were reported in somewhat more than one-fourth of the cases; but fewer than one-seventh (13 percent) of the lessons observed in town and city elementary schools showed even a trace of this very formal textbook procedure (Method 1). In both instances the proportion is far below that which students of education would probably give as an

¹³ While the state inspectors made these multiple checkings more frequently than did the city supervisors, this fact does not seem to disturb whatever degree of reliability our findings may otherwise represent. The distributions of Tables VI and VII, made on a single-checking basis, are thoroughly consistent with the distributions of Tables IV and V, in which were included multiple-checked data.

TABLE II.—DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES, IN PERCENTAGES, WITH WHICH DIFFERENT TYPES OF CLASSWORK APPEARED IN THE REPORTS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS OF OBSERVERS

	County Superintendents	Town and City Principals	Assistant and District Superintendents	State and Univ. Inspectors	City Supervisors	All Groups
Total No. class exercises observed.....	20	45	66	205	204	539
Total No. "methods" reported.....	31	114	167	422	280	1,014
Method						
1. Recitation, single text.....	22.5	10.5	9.0	19.2	10.3	13.1
2. Recitation, 2 or more texts.....		3.5	3.0	3.5	1.4	2.8
3. Discussion, single text.....	3.1	3.5	7.7	10.7	8.2	8.5
4. Discussion, 2 or more texts.....	3.1	7.0	9.5	5.9	5.3	6.4
5. Oral presentation by teacher.....	6.4	8.7	10.8	7.6	6.7	7.9
6. Individual reports.....		11.4	10.8	6.9	4.6	7.2
7. Group or committee reports.....		8.7	8.4	2.6	2.8	4.2
8. Directed study major part or time....	9.6	7.9	12.0	5.7	15.0	9.7
9. Undirected study major part of time		1.6	1.1	3.8	1.4	2.4
10. Laboratory work using manual or text		1.6	1.1	4.0	2.5	2.8
11. Laboratory work not using manual or text.....		0.8	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.9
12. Demonstration by teacher.....	6.4	3.5	1.1	1.9	1.0	1.9
13. Demonstration by pupils.....	6.4	7.0	3.6	4.9	2.5	4.3
14. Demonstration by pupils and teacher.....	3.1	4.3	2.5	2.0	0.7	2.1
15. Individual project work.....		3.5	3.0	3.1	2.5	2.9
16. Group project work.....		8.7	5.9	3.1	9.6	5.9
17. Self-instruction (Dalton plan).....		0.8	0.6	1.2	0.3	0.8
18. Self-instruction (Winnetka plan).....				0.2	0.7	0.3
19. Morrison's "Mastery" method.....	9.6	0.8	0.6	2.8	0.3	1.8
20. Drill lesson.....	22.5	5.2	5.9	5.9	15.0	8.9
Other.....	6.4		1.7	3.8	7.8	4.2

offhand estimate¹⁴ and the discrepancy is so wide as to appear quite significant.

It has been suggested that the reports may reflect a subconscious tendency upon the part of the observers to have the schools make as

¹⁴ I asked two of my colleagues, both of whom have observed classroom work at frequent intervals in connection with school surveys, to make an estimate of the proportion in which the method in question (a more or less literal reproduction of assigned textbook materials) would be the dominant method in one hundred observations made at random in the public schools. The first answered without hesitation, "Eighty percent." The second qualified his answer in this way: "Fifty percent in elementary schools; seventy percent in high schools."

good a showing as possible in the light of contemporary ideals. The city supervisors, principals, and assistant superintendents undoubtedly made most if not all of their observations in schools for the work of which they were in part responsible. They may have had a natural tendency to interpret what they saw as conforming closely with generally accepted standards. While this tendency doubtless accounts for a fraction of the discrepancy, I do not think that it injects a serious error into the findings. The state and university inspectors, it is true, report a significantly higher percentage of formal practices than do the city supervisors—and the state and university inspectors were not responsible in the same measure for the work observed. The observations of this group, however, were mainly confined to high-school classes, and when the city supervisors observed high-school classes their reports also show a higher percentage of formal practices than do their reports of elementary-school classwork.

It seems fairly probable that the discrepancy between our findings and the current opinion regarding the prevalence of formal textbook work in the schools is due primarily to two facts: (1) the paucity of returns representing the work of rural schools; and (2) the changes that have been brought about in recent years by the more extended training of teachers and more generous provisions for supervision. These changes have obviously been much more profound in the urban schools than in the schools of the villages and the open country.

Table III confirms the inference that a formal type of textbook work is more prevalent in the high schools than in the elementary schools. We have selected Method 1 and Method 2 as representing the most formal types of textbook instruction, and with these we have contrasted Methods 6, 7, 15, and 16 (reflecting the socialized recitation and the project method), which we assume to be representative of the more generally approved practices.¹⁵

Tables IV and V reveal certain internal consistencies which suggest that our findings may have a fair measure of validity. One may

¹⁵ Tables III, IV, and V are based on the total number of methods checked. The relative frequency with which formal and informal methods appear is more clearly shown when the total number of lessons observed is taken as the base. Of the 539 lessons observed, 26.9 percent revealed one or more forms of the socialized-recitation and project methods, or almost the same as the proportion (28 percent) in which 'straight' textbook recitation (Method 1) was reported. In the city elementary schools, however, 36.6 percent of the lessons revealed one or more forms of the socialized-recitation and project methods, or nearly three times the proportion (13 percent) in which Method 1 was checked.

TABLE III.—DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES, IN PERCENTAGES, WITH WHICH THE FORMAL TEXTBOOK RECITATION, THE SOCIALIZED RECITATION, AND THE PROJECT METHOD WERE CHECKED IN REPORTS FROM DIFFERENT TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Method	Rural	Village Elemen- tary	Village High	City Elemen- tary	City High	Other Types
1. Textbook recitation, single text.....	12.1	13.4	24.4	8.7	18.7	23.5
2. Textbook recitation, 2 or more texts..	6.3	3.2	4.4	1.7	3.8
Total formal textbook.....	18.4	16.6	28.8	10.4	22.5	23.5
6. Individual reports.....	8.3	6.4	10.0	7.7	5.5	5.8
7. Group or committee reports.....	6.3	4.5	1.1	5.2	3.1
15. Individual projects.....	3.2	2.2	3.2	3.4
16. Group projects.....	10.4	5.8	3.3	9.0	2.6
Total socialized recitation and projects.....	25.0	19.9	16.6	25.1	14.6	5.8
Total number of lessons observed in each type of school.....	40	68	61	234	122	13

well expect the beginning teachers (Table IV) to lean more heavily on formal methods than the experienced teachers. That teachers with five years or more of experience show the least dependence upon formal methods and the most frequent use of the more highly ap-

TABLE IV.—THE RELATION BETWEEN LENGTH OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND THE FREQUENCIES, IN PERCENTAGES, WITH WHICH CERTAIN METHODS OF TEACHING ARE REPORTED

Method	Teaching Experience of Teachers Observed		
	Beginners	2-5 years	5 years or more
1. Recitation, single text.....	27.3	16.0	11.7
2. Recitation, 2 or more texts.....	2.6	3.8	2.6
Total formal textbook reproduction....	29.9	19.8	14.3
6. Individual reports.....	5.2	6.7	7.3
7. Group or committee reports.....	1.3	3.2	5.5
15. Individual projects.....	1.3	4.3	3.1
16. Group projects.....	6.5	4.7	6.8
Total socialized recitation and projects	14.3	18.9	22.7
Total number of teachers in each group ..	42	187	282

proved methods may be a bit surprising to some who believe that teachers tend toward formalism as they acquire age and experience. There is, however, a possible explanation of the fact to be derived from Table V.

TABLE V.—THE RELATION BETWEEN THE EXTENT OF TEACHERS' PREPARATION AND THE FREQUENCIES, IN PERCENTAGES, WITH WHICH CERTAIN METHODS OF TEACHING ARE REPORTED

Method	Extent of Teachers' Preparation						
	Less than H.S. grad.	H. S. grad.	H. S. plus 1 yr.	H. S. plus 2 yrs.	H. S. plus 3 yrs.	H. S. plus 4 yrs.	H. S. plus more than 4 yrs.
1. Recitation, single text.	25.0	23.1	27.2	14.9	7.2	17.5	8.5
2. Recitation, 2 or more texts.	25.0	2.3	2.9	3.3	3.0
Total formal textbook reproduction.	50.0	23.1	27.2	17.2	10.1	20.8	11.5
6. Individual reports.	3.4	8.1	8.7	4.6	8.1
7. Group or committee reports.	3.2	6.5	2.3	7.6
15. Individual projects.	7.6	3.4	2.6	.7	3.0	3.5
16. Group projects.	7.1	10.1	4.6	5.5
Total socialized recitation and projects.	7.6	6.8	21.0	26.0	14.5	24.7
Total number of teachers in each group.	1	2	19	194	57	162	81

Relation to Teaching Experience.—As regards the principal question at issue, the first two columns of Table V mean nothing, of course, and the third column very little, because of the small number of cases. They are inserted in the table to indicate how very few untrained and undertrained teachers are represented in this study. Even though few observations were made in rural schools, it is noteworthy that what was presumably a random sampling of town and city classrooms in thirty states discovered so small a number of teachers with less than 'standard' training (high-school graduation plus two years) and so high a proportion (nearly 47 percent) with four years or more of post-high-school education to their credit. It is apparent that during the past few years the standards of training for teachers in the urban schools have been advanced very substantially.

Relation to Preparation for Teaching.—As with the data set forth in Table IV, so, too, in Table V, a general tendency is noted toward the less frequent use of formal methods and a more frequent use of currently approved methods as the period of preparation for teaching is extended. The exception to this rule is the “high-school-plus-four-years” group, which tends rather strongly toward the textbook-recitation method, and uses somewhat sparingly the socialized-recitation and project methods. Most of the members of this group are undoubtedly college graduates teaching in the high schools—and we have already found the formal methods to be more prevalent in the high schools than in the elementary schools.

The findings with respect to the “high-school-plus-more-than-four-years” group are especially interesting and apparently significant. Most of these we may assume to be teachers who have accumulated credits beyond the bachelor’s degree by attendance upon summer-session or extension courses, among which, in many cases undoubtedly, were courses in education. This may account for the differences between this group and the “high-school-plus-four-years” group. Those who report two years and three years of training beyond the high school are presumably graduates of normal schools and teachers’ colleges. If these assumptions are valid, one may be justified in the inference that the *type* of training plays an important part in determining whether a teacher will use more frequently the textbook-recitation method or the socialized-recitation and project methods. In other words, the actual effect of instruction in educational theory upon school practice may be reflected in these findings.¹⁶

The general trends indicated by the preceding tables are quite consistent with the findings set forth in Table VI and Table VII. On the check-list for each exercise observed there appeared the question: “If a textbook was used, to what extent, in your judgment, did it determine the method of teaching?” The observer was asked to check one of the following words: “None,” “Little,” “Largely,” “Wholly.”

¹⁶ It is interesting to note that P. G. Chandler’s study of methods of teaching in six representative state teachers’ colleges found the textbook-recitation and textbook-discussion methods to prevail almost to the total exclusion of other methods. (Chandler, P. G.: *Some Methods of Teaching in Six Representative State Teachers Colleges in the United States*. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1930, ch. v.) It seems possible, through using the textbook-recitation method, to teach students not to use it in their own teaching!

TABLE VI.—RELATION OF LENGTH OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE TO THE DEGREE IN WHICH THE TEXTBOOK IS JUDGED TO INFLUENCE THE METHODS USED BY TEACHERS

Degree in Which Textbook is Judged to Influence Method	Length of Teachers' Experience		
	Beginners	2-5 years	5 years or more
None.....	11.1%	19.8%	36.1%
Little.....	33.3	35.2	28.9
Largely.....	27.7	32.1	22.2
Wholly.....	27.7	12.0	12.7
"None" plus "Little".....	44.4	55.0	65.0
"Largely" plus "Wholly".....	55.4	44.1	34.9
Total number of teachers.....	42	187	282

Again the "high-school-plus-four-years" group is consistent in its discrepancy. As we have suggested, these are chiefly college graduates teaching in high schools. Otherwise, freedom from textbook domination increases with extent of preparation, just as it increases very markedly (at least up to a certain point) with maturity and experience.

Relation to Section of the Country.—Are there significant differences in the frequency with which formal methods are reported from schools in different parts of the country? Taking Method 1 as most clearly representative of such methods, the data set forth in Table

TABLE VII.—RELATION OF EXTENT OF TEACHERS' PREPARATION TO THE DEGREE IN WHICH THE TEXTBOOK IS JUDGED TO INFLUENCE THE METHODS USED BY TEACHERS

Degree in Which Textbook is Judged to Influence Method	Extent of Teachers' Preparation				
	H. S. plus 1 year	H. S. plus 2 years	H. S. plus 3 years	H. S. plus 4 years	High School plus more than 4 years
None.....	6.6%	32.5%	28.8%	26.3%	34.2%
Little.....	20.0	24.0	35.6	35.8	36.6
Largely.....	26.6	27.9	27.1	24.3	21.5
Wholly.....	46.6	16.2	8.5	14.2	7.6
"None" plus "Little".....	26.6	56.5	64.4	62.1	70.8
"Largely" plus "Wholly"....	73.2	44.1	35.6	38.5	29.1
Total number of teachers.....	19	194	57	162	81

VIII might show such differences, were it not for the fact that the discrepant sections, New England and the Pacific Coast, are represented by relatively few reports.

TABLE VIII.—DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES, IN PERCENTAGES, WITH WHICH THE FORMAL TYPE OF TEXTBOOK RECITATION APPEARS IN REPORTS FROM DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Section	No. of School Exercises Observed	Percent that Checks of Method 1 Are of Total Number of School Exercises Observed
New England.....	40	17.3
Middle Atlantic States.....	130	28.4
South Atlantic and South Central States....	120	31.6
North Central States.....	190	32.5
Mountain States.....	19	26.3
Pacific Coast States.....	40	7.5
All Sections.....	539	28.0

The item "Drill lessons" was checked for different types of schools in the proportions indicated in Table IX. No consistent differences seem to be revealed here. It is noteworthy that in the public-school groups (all except "Other") fewer than ten percent of all methods reported were classified as drill lessons. The notion that a large part of the work of the public schools consists of formal drills may need correction.

TABLE IX.—DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES, IN PERCENTAGES, WITH WHICH DRILL LESSONS APPEAR IN THE REPORTS OF OBSERVATIONS FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Types of Schools	Percent That Checks of "Drill Lessons" Are of All Methods Checked for Each Type
Rural schools.....	8.3
Village elementary schools.....	9.6
Village high schools.....	4.4
City elementary schools.....	9.7
City high schools.....	5.7
Other schools.....	23.5

IV. SUMMARY

Neither the time nor the space at the writer's disposal will permit the presentation of further comparisons and contrasts. The findings of the study may be summarized as follows:

1. There is a prevailing opinion among American students of education that the classwork of our public schools is still characterized by the formal mastery and reproduction of textbook materials. The reports of school surveys tend in some measure to confirm this opinion in that even the more recent reports complain of the prevalence of the textbook-recitation method.¹⁷

2. Reports of observations of 539 class exercises, made by city and county supervisors, principals, and assistant superintendents, and by state and university inspectors and visitors, suggest that the prevailing opinion may be in need of revision, particularly as applied to the elementary schools of towns and cities. One or another form of the socialized-recitation and project methods appeared approximately as frequently in these lessons as did the 'straight' recitation from the single textbook. In the city elementary schools, the former methods were noted in more than one-third of all the lessons observed and nearly three times as frequently as the straight textbook recita-

¹⁷ Two 'surveys' of American education of a type somewhat different from the school survey as we usually know it have recently appeared. Both of these are by European observers.

Erich Hylla's *Die Schule der Demokratie* (Langensalza: Julius Betz, 1928) is an extended account of American education based on a coast-to-coast series of observations. Hylla discusses the textbook method at some length (pp. 141f). He refers to the wide use of textbooks, and the total dependence of many teachers upon textbook materials. These phenomena he traces chiefly to lack of training. For the many women teachers without educational preparation who go directly from the high schools into teaching, he says, the only method of teaching is to have the pupils learn the textbook page by page and recite the materials during the following lesson. "It is very significant that in place of our word, 'instruction-hour,' almost always the term, 'recitation-period,' is used." Hylla points out, however, that with the increase of better trained teachers the formal type of recitation is giving place especially to the socialized recitation based on reference readings and to self-instruction based on workbooks. He finds no tendency toward the method of direct oral instruction so characteristic of European schools.

Jan Uher's *On American Education*. (The English-Speaking World Series, No. 3. Prague: printed by Politka, 1930.) This is an excellent brief account of the principal characteristics of American education. In a section on "Educational Practice," Uher pays his respect to the textbook in no uncertain terms. "As far as methods are concerned, we can see the spreading of new tendencies, but this is far from being so general as many believe. The American school in this respect is rather below the average. A badly prepared teacher is dependent upon the textbook. This explains the long-windedness of many American textbooks and the array of details contained therein...but there is constant progress." (P. 64).

tion. In the high schools, both village and city, the textbook-recitation method is much more common; in 42.8 percent of the lessons observed this method was noted; one or more forms of the socialized-recitation and project methods appeared in 20 percent of the lessons. It should be noted that the methods selected for comparison with the formal textbook-recitation method do not exhaust the procedures that reflect the teachings of the dominant school of American educational theory. Although the items did not appear on the check-list, such terms as "pupil-activities," "creative activities," and "child-centered activities" were added by some of the observers. Contemporary educational theory seems to be affecting elementary-school practice in a fairly profound fashion, and it is apparently not without its influence upon the secondary school.

3. Whether a teacher will tend toward the use of the more formal textbook methods or toward the use of the methods more highly approved by contemporary educational theory would seem to depend in part upon his training. In general, the longer the training, the greater the likelihood that he will follow the latter tendency. There is a suggestion in our findings, however, that the *type* as well as the *extent* of the training has some influence here, and that the degree in which he will depart from the more formal types of teaching will depend in some measure upon whether he has been instructed in educational theory.

4. The beginning teacher, whatever his training, seems more likely to depend upon formal textbook methods than do teachers of from two to five years' experience. Teachers with more than five years' experience revealed, in our study, the least dependence upon such methods; among them, too, the methods approved by contemporary educational theory prevail in the highest proportions.

5. Drill lessons ranged from 4.4 percent to 23.5 percent of all methods reported; the former figure is for the village high schools, the latter for non-public schools. For the city high schools the figure is 5.5 percent; for the village elementary schools, 9.6 percent; for the rural schools, 8.3 percent. As would be expected, the strictly drill lesson is less in evidence in the high school than in the elementary school. How often it *should* be in evidence in either type of school, no one knows—although as is usual in such instances many persons express violent opinions. It is perhaps significant that no one of the five groups of public schools represented in our study reveals the

drill lesson as constituting as much as one-tenth of the total number of methods checked by the observers in a presumably random sampling of school exercises.

6. The rural schools are not adequately represented in this study, hence our findings should be interpreted with reference only to town and city schools and mainly to the latter. Even in this restricted field, however, it is significant that less than five percent (4.2%) of the teachers observed, selected presumably at random, had had less than two years of post-high-school education, that forty-seven percent had had four years or more of post-high-school education, and that more than fifteen percent had apparently had work in advance of the bachelor's degree.

•

CHAPTER III

THE TECHNIQUES OF TEXTBOOK AUTHORS

RALEIGH SCHOELING
Professor of Education,
and

J. B. EDMONSON
Dean of the School of Education,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

The Committee found in the prefaces and advertising materials for textbooks in various elementary-school subjects the claim that scientific techniques had been systematically applied in creating the textbooks. It seemed desirable to gather information about the methods and procedures which authors of textbooks in spelling, mathematics, reading, and the social studies designate as scientific.

PRELIMINARY STEPS IN THE STUDY

On June 5, 1929, a brief questionnaire was mailed to all members of this Society and of the American Educational Research Association. On August 30, 1929, a questionnaire was mailed to all the book companies consulted by Dr. Jensen. The purpose of these two documents was to establish a list of textbooks in the subjects mentioned, to be used as the basis for this study. It seemed to us that a sampling of authors chosen from these two national organizations would include those most probably attempting to use scientific techniques in designing and constructing textbooks. However, the letter sent to the book companies did not limit the authors to members of these organizations.

To the first questionnaire 373 responses were returned. Of these, 48 were authors of textbooks claiming to have used scientific techniques. The list of books¹ thus established included 10 in spelling, 17 in reading, 10 in mathematics, and 7 in the social studies.

¹ Some books had more than one author and some authors had books in different fields. A set of books in a given field for different grades was considered a unit.

As the material for the study accumulated, it became evident that one subject would have to be omitted, and the Committee voted to omit reading.

THE TECHNIQUE FOR MAKING THIS STUDY

The study was carried forward by means of the following procedures: Data were collected by (1) examining the prefaces and introductions of the 27 sets of books; (2) examining magazine articles written by the authors; (3) studying the sources listed by the authors or cited in letters received from the publishers; and (4) examining the teachers' manuals and other supplementary aids to the textbooks which were investigated.

The group of textbooks for each field was treated separately. The results are presented in what follows, for spelling, for arithmetic, and for the social studies in the order named. By reading these three sections, a good understanding can be gotten of the characteristic problems and the characteristic methods of meeting these problems that are reported by writers of modern textbooks in certain aspects of elementary-school education.

A. *Scientific Techniques Used in the Field of Spelling*

An author of a spelling book obviously faces four problems: the choice of words, grade placement, items of organization (e.g., cycling and distribution of drill), and the necessity for making decisions relating to method. It appears that much effort has been spent in securing a desirable solution to the first of those problems. The material on the other three problems is less satisfactory, but the following presentation will show that these problems are not untouched.

I. THE CHOICE OF WORDS

In the main, word lists have been checked against two sources: words written by adults and words written by children. To the extent that authors have used reading vocabularies, they have relied largely on Thorndike (47),² *The Teacher's Word Book*, and this list has been used by some authors in grade placement. *The Teacher's Word Book* furnishes data on reading from which a comparison can be made with spelling to reveal overlapping of the vocabularies of

² Numbers in parentheses refer to the list of references at the end of the chapter.

reading and spelling. Some writers of spelling textbooks also check against *A Reading Vocabulary for the Primary Grades*, by Gates (17). It would be helpful for the textbook maker to know the words most used in the work which children in typical primary grades now do in and out of school, but no list pretends to furnish these data.

1. Investigations to Establish Lists of Words Written by Adults

Some authors of spelling books have secured their word lists by using the findings, or some modification of the findings, of such investigations as those reported by Anderson (1), Ayres (4, 5), Clarke (15), Cook and O'Shea (16), Crowder (23), Horn (24, 25), Houser (28), Nicholson (41), Warning (23), and others. These investigations cover personal and business letters of various kinds, as for example: letters by literary and business men, letters of application and recommendation, contributions of laymen to newspapers and magazines, minutes of organizations, resolutions and reports of committees, excuses written by parents to teachers, and the like. Some authors have conducted unpublished studies of their own as a partial basis for their spelling word lists.

2. Investigations to Determine Lists of Words Written by Children

Investigations by Barthelmess (7), Bauer (8), Boston Public Schools (45) French (36), Jones (31), Kansas City Schools (43), McKee (38), Studley and Ware (23), and Tidyman (49) furnish a basis for lists of words commonly written by children. These studies include children's spontaneous themes, regular compositions, letters, and words most frequently misspelled in the written work of children. In general, frequencies are not given in these theme lists.

The interesting debate between Breed (10) and Horn (26) concerning the reliability of the investigations of words written by children suggests a number of unsolved problems. The chief issue, of course, is whether words found only in the vocabularies of children by these investigations shall be introduced into a spelling course. Moreover, some authors insist that children are not writing the things in school which they should be writing. Hence, the use of words frequently misspelled as a basis leads to a definite curricular error in that children are required to learn to spell technical and difficult words instead of using the dictionary or textbooks.

3. Composite Lists

Composite lists have been derived by noting the frequencies of words appearing in a combination of investigations. As one step in an investigation made under a grant of the Commonwealth Fund, Horn (25) made a compilation of eleven investigations of the words most commonly used in writing letters and one study of the words used in keeping minutes of meetings. Breed (9) obtained his list by using Horn's composite list made from eleven investigations of adult correspondence and his own composite list derived from five studies of children's themes. The comparison and attendant critical study resulted in three groups of words which were used in building a vocabulary of 3,481 words: (a) words used by both children and adults; (b) words of unusually high frequency used by children only, and (c) words of unusually high frequency used by adults only. Kyte (35) uses essentially the same technique. Washburne (54) compared the three lists by Anderson, Tidyman, and Thorndike. He found the first thousand words much alike, but marked variation appeared by the time he reached the third thousand. He included any word in his third thousand that was found in two of the three given lists.

4. Other Criteria

Some cautious workers insist that the criteria for selecting a word must go far beyond mere frequency lists. Among the criteria suggested are: cruciality, difficulty, geographical distribution, and spread in common types of writing. The Committee found no basic investigation concerning what words children in typical situations would learn without school instruction.

II. THE PROBLEM OF GRADE PLACEMENT

There is no general agreement on the exact principles to be used in grade placement. For example, a proposal to employ frequency of adult usage as such a principle seems to divide the investigators into opposing camps. One may say that a beginning has been made, in that fundamental principles are being discussed and that some at least have been objectively applied in the allocation of various words to the various grades. Difficulty and usage are the basic considerations. At times these are in conflict. Then, too, usage is affected by local needs and difficulty is modified by motivation.

1. Use by Children

When grade placement is determined on the basis of use by children, there are two considerations: the grade in which the word first appears in the writings of children and the stage of development at which the pupil has greatest need for it in his writings. On this point Breed (11) states: "Grade of first usage is unpractical and unpsychological—unpractical because of the congestion of words it occasions in the lower grades; unpsychological because it represents the standard of precocity, and not of normalcy. Difficulty of spelling and frequency of usage among children are the most satisfactory bases, and of these the second seems to be the better." The investigations used to throw light on these items are those reported by Bauer (8), French (36), Jones (31), McKee (38), Kansas City Committee (43), Tidyman (49), and others. Studies by Mrs. Horn (27), Housh (29), Kircher (34), Packer (42), and Thorndike (47) suggest the extent to which certain words are familiar to children at various levels, either in reading or speaking.

2. Using an Index of Difficulty

There is an effort to take into account word difficulty for the child in order to insure a fairly constant load of graded words from week to week. Authors have attempted to compute indices of difficulty by using such studies as those by Ashbaugh (3), Ayres (5), Barthelmess (7), Briggs (12), Buckingham (13), Hudelson, Stetson, and Woodyard (30), Kansas City Committee (43), Morrison and McCall (40), and Simmons and Bixler (44). For example, an author may determine the final position of the word by averaging the indices of difficulty from four different investigations.

Some authors have found it impossible to place all the words through the use of an index of difficulty, because test or scale data are not available. In that case they have resorted to experimental testing under a variety of situations in widely separated localities. Washburne (54) describes the experimental determination of difficulty which he accepts as the criterion for grade placement.

III. OTHER PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION

1. Cycling

Formal drill still plays a large part in the organization of spelling texts. Authors attempt to get a proper cycling of words by apply-

ing indices of difficulty. These indices have been obtained from such spelling scales as those by Ashbaugh (3), Ayres (5), Briggs (12), Buckingham (13), Hudelson, Stetson, and Woodyard (30), Morrison and McCall (40), and Simmons and Bixler (44).

A principle for the distribution of drill, generally endorsed but seldom or never adequately applied, is: The number of repetitions should be proportional to difficulty and the interval between repetitions should increase. Kyte (35) cycled words by using also the persistence of error in pupils' work, as indicated in investigations by Ashbaugh (3), Ayres (5), Capps (14), Fitzsimmons (36), and Simmons and Bixler (44).

2. Grouping

Authors used such experiments as those conducted by Wagner (23) and by Tidyman (51) to justify grouping by phonetic similarity. C. A. Phillips, of the University of Missouri, furnished the Committee a circular concerning an experiment involving one million spellings obtained in the city of Chicago. He concluded that the words were learned with greater efficiency when the associational element represented in homonyms, synonyms, and antonyms was left out. Some authors believe that the matter of grouping takes one on dangerous ground. One author refers to investigations which he believes show conclusively "that many types of grouping in common use and particularly synthetic grouping are definitely harmful."

3. The Number of Words

There is a marked tendency to limit the words in spelling texts to a relatively small number, say 3,000 to 4,000 words. According to Tidyman (50) the average number of common words reported in twelve investigations of the writing vocabularies of children and adults was 2,619.

IV. CONCERNING METHOD

1. General Psychology

The major basis for instruction in spelling is the authors' adaptation of the laws of learning and the principles of habit formation as furnished by general psychology. The following statement quoted from Tidyman (50) is typical of the lists of basic principles formulated by authors:

Spelling is mainly a matter of forming habits. The contributions of psychology to spelling are threefold: the general laws of learning, the principles of habit-formation, and the specific processes involved in learning to spell as revealed in the studies of the psychology of spelling. General laws of learning suggest that for maximum efficiency, the learning situation should be so manipulated that the pupils want to learn to spell, and, if possible, feel the need for learning the specific words that are to be taught; that sufficient repetition be provided to fix necessary associations; and that satisfaction attend correct spelling, and dissatisfaction attend incorrect spelling. The psychology of habit-formation tells us that the bonds should be formed as nearly as possible like those actually used in life; the pupil should get a clear image of the word; the pupil should deliberately reproduce the correct form of the word; and repetition should be continued to the point of automatic control. The analysis of the special processes involved in spelling gives us facts and principles relating to visualization, vocalization, the specific spelling bonds, and the like.

In corroboration of this guidance from general psychology, applications of these principals to the field of spelling are illustrated in investigations by Heilman (19), Winch (55), and Wolfe and Breed (57).

The application of these psychological principles leads authors into considerable variation, and an enormous range of experimental materials leaves many of the details still in doubt. For instance, the most common procedure is the test-study method or some modification of it, for which, for example, Keener (32) and Kilzer (33) furnish experimental support. Most modern spelling texts utilize the preliminary test to suggest attention to individual needs. But in a recent investigation Woody (58) compared the test-study method with the traditional and concluded that the two methods yielded no significant differences in gains or total number or persistence of errors.

2. Psychology of Spelling

The classroom experiments conducted by numerous investigators are used in the formulation of the special methods of teaching spelling. Illustrations of the contributions to the special psychology of spelling are given by Tidyman (50). Among these contributions are: pronunciation plays an important part in the learning process; syllabification is an important aid in learning to spell; visual presentation is superior to auditory presentation; writing helps greatly in learning to spell, and so on. Horn (22) lists forty-one principles for

which he feels some scientific basis exists. This list is extensively used by authors.

Three examples of other investigations of method in spelling are those by Archer (2), Masters (37), and McKee (39). Archer investigated transfer of training in spelling; McKee compared the teaching of spelling by column and context forms; Masters made an extensive study of spelling errors in schools and colleges. One of Masters' conclusions is that the most frequent forms of error in spelling are much the same for different grade levels.

Sudweeks (46) summarizes evidence concerning a large number of principles and methods in spelling.

To provide for individual differences and class differences, some authors conduct classroom experiments to determine the number of words that children of different mental levels use in their writing and the number that they may be expected to spell successfully. These authors maintain that there will be very little differentiation in the class work unless three separate lists of words are provided for this purpose. The plan is to provide a basic, or minimal, list (say, 1000 or 1800) of the most frequently used words for all members of the class, an additional list for the average pupils, and a second supplementary list for the brightest pupils.

Spelling seems to have lagged behind other school subjects in its specific attention to attitudes. To be sure, authors talk about a "spelling conscience," but they do not in general list specific ways to interest children in words as words, to develop the power to see words in ordinary reading so as to remember the spelling and to strive to continue this interest in words throughout life.

The special psychology of spelling is in serious need of further development. The investigations do not furnish conclusive evidence that mere drill on word lists is less effective than more elaborate methods. It appears to be difficult for authors to write spelling books that will really teach, that will be something more than mere word lists.

3. Diagnosis and Remedial Teaching

There is little agreement among authors when it comes to the treatment of special disabilities. A few problem cases have been treated experimentally by Hollingworth (20), Gates (18), and Witty (56). Perhaps the recency of Baker's (6) very significant study of

the remedial teaching of spelling may explain why authors have not referred to it.

4. Tests and Score Cards

It is rather common practice for authors to provide standard spelling tests as measures of achievement and as bases for comparison between the classes of the same grade in the same school and in different schools. Some authors place these tests in the textbooks; others provide them as separate publications. The authors of at least two texts have computed and presented standards for each week's unit in the course of study.

One would expect the spelling field to include a score card scientifically determined and generally accepted. But authors and research workers attach little, if any, importance to score cards. As a matter of fact the Committee found no reference to score cards in the studies or in the letters from authors other than those specially designed by publishers to promote their particular texts.

5. Calibration of Reading Instruction for Pupils

To insure presentation of instruction for pupils in a grade which can be read with ease and understanding by these pupils, some authors have given considerable attention to the calibration of such instructions. For example, Kyte (35) tested his instructions in the various grades and made such modifications of reading vocabulary and sentence structure as the mental ages and reading achievements of the children indicated should be made.

B. Scientific Techniques Used in the Field of Arithmetic

Authors of arithmetic textbooks obviously are confronted with the problems of choice of material, sequence of topics, and manner of presentation—what, when, and how. Numerous investigations throwing light on the curriculum and learning have been utilized by authors in the solution of these problems. The general outcome of the research studies dealing with the choice of materials is a fairly definite trail, whereas a sifting of studies relating to grade placement and method yields conclusions that are fragmentary, conflicting, and incomplete. Indeed, the progress made in recent years in the teaching of arithmetic rests to a considerable extent on a psychological basis rather than upon research of fundamental, basic, and inclusive types.

Apparently an author, when he wishes to glorify old-fashioned insight, intuition, and 'horse sense,' assures us that he follows "the principles of a sound educational psychology."

I. THE CHOICE OF CONTENT

In deciding what to teach, authors, in supplementing common sense and subjective analysis, appear to be guided by two criteria: practice and social utility as reflected in educational research. An author determines practice with respect to a particular item by making a comprehensive analysis of what he believes to be the best courses of study and the most desirable competing textbooks. One may hesitate to label this step scientific, but certainly these systematic and detailed comparisons furnish many important guides and checks to an author's thinking.

Authors recognize the criterion of social utility as the chief consideration in the choice of materials in arithmetic. Social utility may refer, as in the case of spelling, to needs of adults or of children. Curiously enough, the studies of the arithmetical needs of children are few in number and fragmentary in character. And no one of these studies is specifically mentioned in the prefaces of the arithmetic textbooks considered.

A study by Buckingham and MacLatchy (131)³ suggests that children upon entering school control an astonishingly large body of arithmetical principles and processes. As the children progress, we should expect that life in school would increase the number of situations requiring arithmetic and that these needs would become more complex. However, a comprehensive study of the arithmetical needs of children in other school subjects is not available to textbook writers.

Some authors refer to two types of studies of the needs of adults: computational, and informational. The studies relating to computational needs are illustrated by Wilson's collection (170) of 14,583 problems contributed by 4,068 different persons representing 155 different occupations; by Wise's survey (172); by Mitchell's examination (139) of cook books, factory payrolls, marked down sales advertisements, and general hardware catalogues; and by Woody's examination (174) of 4,661 bills of sale secured in a wholesale and re-

³ Numbers in parentheses refer to the bibliography at the end of this chapter. References to work in arithmetic begin with number 101.

tail hardware store, a wholesale and retail grocery store, and a large department store. These and similar studies are adequately described in Buswell's summaries (114, 115) and in the *Third Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence* (171).

The informational needs appear to be more complex than the computational. The following are typical studies of adult informational needs: Adams (101) tabulated mathematical material in newspapers and periodicals; Camerer (117) analyzed the minimal information needed about banking; Schorling (153) listed the frequency of mathematical terms, especially units of measure, geometric terms, and 'uncommon' fractions in newspapers and magazines. These and similar studies are listed by Buswell (114, 115) and in the *Third and Fourth Yearbooks of the Department of Superintendence* (155, 171). The chief outcome of these investigations has been to reduce greatly the number and complexity of topics. In spite of the clear agreement of the many investigators that both the computational and informational needs of people in common life are very simple, the momentum of practice maintains the encyclopedic and overloaded character of our textbooks, although the claim is made that texts include fewer topics and give more extensive and more nearly adequate drill on fewer things.

II. GRADE PLACEMENT

After an author has determined what he wishes to include in the way of skills, items of information, concepts, and so on, he faces the question of grade placement. Many important subsidiary questions arise, as for example: When should instruction in arithmetic begin? If there is to be no formal arithmetic in grade one, what control of arithmetic shall be assumed as a result of the incidental learning? The lack of a scientific basis for determining when arithmetic should begin is naïvely illustrated by a careful writer who, having reviewed the scientific evidence, says: "Although there appears to be a conflict between the results of the investigations by Taylor (159) and Washburne (166), both current practice and experimentation agree that arithmetic should begin in the primary grades." He might have added that common sense also suggests that arithmetic should begin somewhere in the neighborhood of the primary grades.

In general, textbook writers rely for grade placement on one or more of the following procedures:

(1) A writer may rest his case on practice. In using this technique either he or the publishing company analyzes practice as summarized in a study of textbooks or courses of study. Demands of logical sequence are probably far less than was assumed by many authors of a decade ago, and whatever demands may exist are probably taken care of in such studies of practice.

(2) The writer may modify his tentative program in the light of such grade placement studies as those by Brueckner (106), Guiler (123), and Washburne (166). Guiler made a detailed analysis of thirty courses of study in the arithmetic for the first eight years' work. He accepted any element in arithmetic which appeared in three or more of the thirty courses. The courses chosen were those which, in response to a questionnaire, were frequently mentioned by leading educators as possessing great merit. Strictly speaking, the Guiler study belongs in the same category as the analysis of practice described in the preceding paragraphs. It is, however, a more elaborate and detailed study. Then, too, it is more generally available to textbook writers than those analyses which are confidential reports in the possession of book companies.

(3) An author may further refine his judgment concerning grade placement by experimental teaching. The following examples serve to illustrate the types of procedures used by authors:

Authors of one series of arithmetics printed their material in an experimental edition which was used throughout a large city under the personal supervision of one of the authors. The material was also used and criticized by teachers of arithmetic in approximately twenty other school systems. By means of a very complete questionnaire sent to these teachers every month, many helpful suggestions were received. On the questionnaire the teachers gave the scores their pupils made on the progress tests, and these scores were used in modifying the decisions concerning grade placement. The city-wide trial of material under a supervisor who gives her full time to the study of pupil responses is undoubtedly an advanced step in curricular research.

Authors of another series of texts required a criticism from each of about eighty teachers on each article of the book. They used 3×5 cards and classified these by article numbers. It is asserted that the cards when massed totaled three feet in thickness, and two of the authors assert that they read all the material very carefully.

The authors of a third series submitted tabulations of records secured from each of about eighty teachers on each drill exercise. These tabulations show in great detail how the commercial edition of the book was adjusted in the light of the data secured through the use of the experimental edition.

Concerning the use of experimental editions, it should be noted that some authors prefer the piece-meal trial of text materials and would insist that the analysis of pupil responses thus secured is an even better technique for discovering the nature and causes of difficulties which pupils meet.

Perhaps the most important factor in grade placement is that of vocabulary. Arithmetic consists largely of drill and verbal problems. The solution of verbal problems overlaps intelligence and reading. The investigation by Dolch (121) supports the indictment that most textbooks are unnecessarily difficult. Hence, methods for testing the vocabulary of a book become important. According to prefaces and manuals, two methods for checking the vocabulary are available. The first method is to check against the *Teacher's Word Book* by Thorndike (164) or some word list that is the confidential property of a publisher. The second method is that of experimental teaching, to which reference has been made in preceding paragraphs.

III. METHOD

The more desirable of the newer textbooks differ from those of a generation ago in that they include certain new features which rest partly upon so-called 'principles of psychology' and partly upon evidence secured through investigation. Chief among these new features are: (1) a more detailed and careful analysis of the specific bonds that are to be formed, modified, or strengthened; (2) subject matter designed to avoid the formation of interfering or incorrect bonds; (3) a sustained program of drill constructed according to specifications based on experiments in learning; (4) provisions designed to meet the problem of individual differences; (5) new types of tests—inventory, instructional, diagnostic, remedial, and appraisal; (6) certain exercises specifically designed to increase the pupil's ability in problem-solving (reflective thinking); and (7) efforts to carry out a definite program of motivation.

1. Analyses of the Desirable Skills

Studies made by Brueckner (107, 108, 109), Knight (127, 128, 129), Merton (138), Osborn (146), Thorndike (161, 162) and others suggest that a greater number of skills are involved in arithmetic than are commonly provided for in the older textbooks. For example,

Merton lists eighteen skills needed in the addition of whole numbers and Knight fifty-five needed in division of fractions. In the newer textbooks and the newer drill booklets one may find analyses involving definite patterns which are to be used with whole numbers, fractions, decimals, percentage, and denominate numbers.

These extensive lists of unique skills are by no means acceptable in their entirety to all textbook authors. There are those who insist that the transfer, especially in the minds of the more able pupils, is far greater than these extensive lists imply. There are, however, important details concerning which there is complete agreement in the studies. For example, it is recognized that "2 plus 9" is not the same bond as "9 plus 2." In consequence it is safer to teach the one hundred addition skills than to teach the forty-five which appeared in the older textbooks, though Beito and Brueckner (133) conclude that "the bond formed in learning the direct form of an addition combination carries over almost completely to the reverse form." The tendency is now toward the formulation of a definite list of skills, processes, principles, and concepts which the author expects to establish. Knight and Setzafrandt (135), however, found that pupils achieved considerable ability in dealing with fractions having odd denominators when taught only fractions with even denominators.

2. Prevention of Error

It was only natural that authors, in deciding what to teach, should become more conscious of the undesirable habits which need to be avoided. There have been many studies of the errors found in pupils' work in arithmetic. Buswell and John (116) list the errors that pupils make when they apply the fundamental processes to whole numbers. Brueckner (108, 109), Morton (141, 142, 143), and others give detailed analyses of types of errors made in common fractions and decimals. Some of the other investigators in the field of errors in arithmetic are Anderson (102), Buckingham and Osburn (112, 113), Clapp (118), Counts (120), Kallom (126), Knight (128, 129), Monroe (140), Myers (144), Osburn (146, 147), Scott (154), Smith (156), Theisen (160), and Uhl (165). In fact Buswell and Judd (114) in 1925 reviewed thirty-one investigations dealing with diagnostic and remedial measures.

3. Drill

There are two chief principles of drill: (a) the amount of drill shall be proportional to difficulty; and (b) repetitions shall be distributed at increasing intervals in decreasing amounts.

Unfortunately, investigations of difficulty arrive at conflicting conclusions. There is not even agreement concerning the order of difficulty of the addition facts. No fewer than eight studies of the addition and subtraction combinations alone are mentioned by authors. The lists by Clapp (118) and Knight and Behrens (129) are most frequently used. The disagreement of the various findings induces one set of careful authors to pool the results of "eight studies by five investigators" to obtain the difficulty index of the addition and subtraction combinations. For difficulty of multiplication combinations authors refer to such studies as those by Norem and Knight (132), Clapp (118), and Fowlkes (122). To secure the index of difficulty of the multiplication and division combinations, the same authors combine the results of "seven studies by four investigators." Washburne and Vogel (168), in seeking an answer to the question, "Are any number combinations inherently difficult," compare their array with Clapp's order and conclude that the errors made by children trained under individual techniques are fewer than those found by Clapp in class groups. It is clear that in spite of extensive investigation we do not know very much about the problem of difficulty. 'Difficulty,' as used by most of the investigators, refers not to psychological steps involved in initial learning, but to percentage of pupils responding incorrectly, regardless of amount of previous practice, motivation, and the like. Thus, some writers assume that the zero combinations in the simple multiplication facts are difficult because pupils make numerous errors in dealing with this type of problem. Other investigators point out that the zero combinations are easily learned, inasmuch as marked improvement is attained by relatively small amounts of practice; that is to say, the pupils missed the zero combinations in the early days of standardized tests for the simple reason that the older books had neglected to provide practice on them.

The effort to apply the principle of distributed practice has resulted in far more careful cycling. Some textbook writers claim that they have carefully chosen the unit skills, have made a count of total repetitions, and have placed these repetitions in the text in a definite order that makes for economy and permanency of learning.

There are other specifications of drill which are accepted as general principles but which result in great variation when authors attempt to apply them. For example, it is generally agreed that some drill materials should have time limits, if for no other reason than for purposes of diagnosis. But, in applying the principle of a time limit, many questions confront an author. For instance, what is the optimal time unit for complete concentration on addition in the sixth grade? Is it 4, 5, 10, 12, or 20 minutes? All these and other time periods are found in textbooks of competent writers. Several investigators advocate a 5-minute period as a tonic at the beginning of the recitation. Another investigator asserts that experimental trial of 12-minute and 20-minute periods, even on mixed drills, has been found altogether too long for complete concentration.

A second debatable question is whether a single length of drill period can serve the needs of all pupils in a class. It is argued that each pupil has his own optimal rate, and that stimulation for greater speed tends to disorganize his work and cause inaccuracy. The authors of one set of books adopt a single period of time for the whole class, but provide three goals, or levels of achievement, for each test, which are statistically determined by the performance of large numbers of pupils who define the three types. Other authors set up more than three goals by using such measures as percentile ratings and P.E. ratings.

Thus we see that the practical application of principles whose theoretical validity is generally accepted results in wide variation and might well raise a question as to the validity of claims of a scientific basis of textbook construction.

One of the most significant by-products of the scientific movement in the construction of textbooks in arithmetic in the last decade is the widespread use of the supplementary drill or work booklet. It is felt by some authors that no textbook can furnish all the drill material needed for the wide range of abilities found in the typical class of the modern school. It is in these supplementary drill booklets that we find clear efforts to design materials according to definite specifications. But these drill booklets vary widely from those whose patterns are so definite that they can easily be traced by competent workers to those whose patterns—if they exist—cannot be discovered. Lutes and Samuelson (137) propose a technique for rating drill provisions in arithmetic textbooks.

4. Provision for Individual Differences

One of the main achievements of the science of education in recent times is the presentation of evidence causing teachers to recognize the problem of individual differences. Souba's study (157) of arithmetic abilities of children revealed intelligence quotients ranging from 75 to 135 and showed that their parents represented a wide variety of occupational groups and a wide range of economic and social levels. It is now clearly understood that children differ and that equal amounts of instruction cannot result in identical products. But again, there has been great difficulty in applying such information as we now possess. For instance, through a combination of several criteria—achievement test in arithmetic, scores on intelligence tests, previous school record, the teacher's opinion, and the like—it may be possible in sixth-grade arithmetic to classify children according to ability in a way that is satisfactory to the teachers concerned. But it is a far more difficult task to determine what and how these groups of pupils so classified shall be taught. Moreover, the whole scheme of classification, even if valid, is impractical in the large number of smaller schools in which the increased cost of such instruction is prohibitive. In consequence, textbook writers have adopted various plans by which they hope to increase the teacher's skill in teaching children who vary widely in ability.

These provisions for individual differences may be discussed under two headings: (a) drill on abstract problems, and (b) special devices used in solving verbal problems. In drill materials some authors have adopted a pattern of drill with the following features in both textbooks and supplementary drill booklets: (a) a uniform period of time for all drill units, (b) a series of preliminary inventory tests followed or supported by a small number of 'feeding' practice tests which gifted pupils may omit, provided they have shown a high degree of skill on the inventory test, (c) diagnostic tests including a narrow range of difficulties, and (d) provision of three goals, or levels of achievement, corresponding to the gifted, the average, and the slow student. Some authors believe it to be feasible and desirable to provide as many as ten ratings on a drill list of examples to meet the needs of groups of different abilities. The work book is used by some authors as a device to provide remedial work for the weak pupils and optional material for bright pupils.

The same principles are applied also to the solution of verbal problems. Some authors provide at the end of a topic several lists of miscellaneous review problems whose difficulty has been experimentally determined. There may, for example, be a list of problems designated as easy, another list for the average pupils, and a third list for the superior pupils. In addition to such lists one finds special types of activities for superior pupils, as, for example, reports on individual projects, recreations, and historical materials.

The literature on individual differences is very extensive, as Buswell's summaries (114, 115) show, and there is no doubt that these studies have materially affected the writing of recent textbooks.

5. New Types of Tests

One of the striking differences between the newer textbooks and the older is the insertion of new types of tests. These may take the form of completion, multiple choice, true-false, recognition, matching, and the like. These new forms of tests are woven into units whose purposes are suggested by the names: inventory, instructional, diagnostic, remedial, and appraisal. It is not always recognized that these different terms are perhaps more descriptive of the use of the material rather than descriptive of inherent differences in the material. There are available several reliable standardized tests for measuring pupils' ability in computation. The tests designed to measure problem-solving have been considered less satisfactory by some persons because there is an overlapping with general intelligence and reading ability, though it is not clear why the test should not overlap since problem-solving itself does. The more modern textbooks in arithmetic contain modifications of computational tests and problem scales. These are included with the aim of helping the teacher to measure the progress that pupils are making. It is to be noted that the tendency is toward an emphasis on the informal type of test for instructional purposes. It is a common practice for authors to suggest standards, or ratings, of achievement which they have derived from performances of pupils in experimental groups.

The literature on tests in arithmetic is very extensive. Since authors do not in general indicate in their prefaces or articles the sources of their test materials, it is difficult to describe in an objective way the extent to which they are being influenced by this material. The

chief sources are Buswell's summaries (114, 115), Paterson (149), the National Committee on Mathematical Requirements (150), Ruch (151), and Russell (152).

6. Problem-Solving

There have been many studies which attempt to analyze the difficulties pupils have in problem-solving. One of the common methods of analysis is to administer a scale for problems and to list the type errors on such test papers. Reports by Hanna (124), Hydle and Clapp (125), Osburn (146, 147), Stevenson (158), and Estaline Wilson (169) illustrate the method. Hanna's recent study (124), compares three methods of problem-solving. Hydle and Clapp (125) received and tabulated more than 350,000 solutions for problems in an attempt to determine the elements of difficulty in the interpretation of concrete problems in arithmetic. Banting (103), working directly with pupils, lists fourteen causes of difficulty in problem-solving. Out of such lists grew the systematic practice exercises in problem-solving to be found in modern textbooks. Brueckner (110) lists nineteen types of exercise that are being used both to determine the causes of difficulty and also to serve as guides for constructing exercises to improve the pupil's ability in solving problems. The value of these newer materials has been checked by control and experimental groups. Newcomb (145) finds appreciably greater improvement in both accuracy and speed in reasoning when pupils have been given careful, systematic, and logical procedure in problem-solving. Stevenson (158) shows that even slower pupils are markedly helped by systematic practice exercises. Lutes (136) concludes that "improvement of computational skill increases the pupil's ability to solve verbal problems," but Winch (173) says: "The great improvement in accuracy of arithmetical computation seems to have produced no improvement whatever in the accuracy of arithmetical reasoning. . ."

Studies by Brooks (104), Dolch (121), and Partridge (148), show need for the careful checking of vocabulary in arithmetic textbooks against appropriate standard word lists. Thorndike (164) has caused authors to give careful attention to the vocabulary. The giving of tests of verbal problems to pupils has made clear the overlapping of reading ability and skill in problem-solving. It has also caused authors to accept in principle the importance of having an experiential basis

for problems, which in essence treats problem-solving largely as a reading matter. This has resulted in numerous collections of 'real' problem material. It would seem that the most desirable technique is that used by only a few authors—namely, experimental classroom trial of textbook materials, previous to commercial publication, under record-taking conditions which enable authors to collect problems from children's projects and to locate and remedy vocabulary difficulties.

Another technique for collecting desirable verbal problems is to incorporate the business dealings of adults. The principle of having experience run ahead of teaching finds its best application in the substitution of informal teaching of arithmetic for the traditional method in the earliest grades. But there is evidence that the momentum of practice and tradition keeps authors from applying the principle of 'delay' to the extent which they in fact believe desirable. There is no clear-cut study of how much arithmetic children would learn grade by grade through life out of school and through experiencing a rich school curriculum without formal instruction in arithmetic. It is likely that we now teach, with much stress and strain on the part of the pupil and by enormous expenditure of time and money on the part of society, many things which the pupil would learn anyway or at any rate learn with far greater ease if we only waited for maturity to lend a hand.

A technique used by some authors to get better problem material is the rating of each verbal problem by a set of criteria. Illustrations of this technique are found in writings of Thorndike (163) and Clark (119).

It must not be assumed that these many studies have disposed of all debatable issues in problem solving. In fact Washburne and Osborne (167) conclude: "On the whole, the children who were taught no special technique of solving problems but simply solved many problems surpassed those who spent time learning a *method* of solving problems. In all cases the children made remarkable gains. This seems to indicate clearly that concentrated attention, even for a few weeks, on solving problems by *any* method brings a rich reward."

This statement, if valid, would seem to leave the whole matter of problem-solving not much further along the road toward a scientific basis than it was a generation ago. Nevertheless, the materials and methods of the newer textbooks are profoundly affected by the numerous studies of the issues involved in reflective thinking.

7. Motivation

The new education, with its emphasis on the child-centered school, has forced authors to give careful consideration to making the textbook interesting to children. In fact, the modern textbook hasn't a chance unless it can make reasonable claims that nothing has been overlooked in the way of motivation. To the authors of arithmetic there is no conflict between interest and effort. However, there is an astonishing paucity of studies dealing with children's interests in arithmetic. Brown (105) reports the mental tonic effect of a preliminary drill practice of five minutes at the beginning of the recitation. On page 33 of their *Manual*, Buckingham and Osburn (112) refer to two studies to prove that children's interests are rather definite at all times and that the interests of upper-grade pupils are quite likely to become permanent if they are encouraged. In the absence of convincing investigational evidence authors rest their case on experimental teaching and principles drawn from the psychology of motivation. A fundamental principle of interest is understanding, hence the great effort to draw problems from experiences of child life and the attention given to vocabulary. One preface states that children should solve real problems—problems which arise in home life, in school work, in play and games, problems which parents must meet and solve, and problems concerning business and government.

The prefaces mention most frequently the motivation provided by the frequent use of standards applied to drills on problem work, the inclusion of new types of tests, and the use of progress charts. This is an effort to interest the pupil in his own progress on the assumption that the greatest challenge in life is personal achievement. This principle, as stated in the *Eighteenth Yearbook* of this Society, is: "Children's knowledge of their previous performances, combined with the desire to surpass those records, is the greatest factor contributing to improvement." The study by Panlasigui and Knight (134) furnishes experimental evidence in support of this contention. Another principle frequently stated in prefaces emphasizes the importance of variety. Apparently the span of complete attention to a narrow range of mental activity is very short for children. When authors need to make a choice between the logical and the psychological, they do not hesitate to choose the latter if it promises increased interest on the part of the pupils.

The five chief devices used by textbook writers to secure interest are, then: (a) making the pupil a student of his own growth by means of informal tests, standardized examinations, and graphic records, (b) variety of materials and methods, (c) vitalizing materials by basing problems on child experience, (d) minimizing vocabulary difficulties, and (e) encouraging pupils to take responsibility for their own learning.

8. Controversial Methods

Extensive discussions of numerous controversial issues to be found in the manuals for arithmetic teachers suggest that method still operates largely in the realm of opinion and guess work. There are scores of debatable questions on each one of which an author must make a decision without adequate experimental data. Samples of such issues are: Shall he employ the take-away or additive method in subtraction? When a digit in the minuend is less than the corresponding digit in the subtrahend shall the pupil borrow or carry? Shall the multiplication and division facts or the addition and subtraction facts be taught together or separately? Are tables to be used at all in teaching the multiplication facts or should a broken order solely be employed? Shall the problems of percentage be classified as cases? In some texts authors are so much in doubt that they will include two rival methods of teaching a given skill. Pedagogically, this would seem one too many. For some of these questions the difference between one method or another may be immaterial. But even that needs to be proved before it can be asserted that the teaching of arithmetic rests upon a scientific basis. At any rate the number of crucial problems relating to method show that this phase of the work is still in a pioneer stage.

IV. SUMMARY: A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE JOB OF WRITING AN ARITHMETIC

It cannot be asserted that all the details of procedure involved in writing arithmetic textbooks rest on a strictly scientific basis, but there is a decreasing dependence on rules and traditional practice and an increasing effort to employ the method of the sciences. There are authors who appear to examine all discoverable facts to make sure that they are as nearly right as possible before they go ahead. The minimum which the school public has a right to expect

of an author of an arithmetic is stated in the following job analysis. This theoretical procedure is the result of assembling steps, every one of which, excepting (h) of 1, has been taken by one or more sets of authors.

1. The author should read
 - (a) Buswell (114, 115). He should make at least a bird's eye inspection of the more significant studies reported there and in the subsidiary summaries found in the Third and Fourth Yearbooks of the Department of Superintendence (171, 155).
 - (b) Brueckner (111), the chapter on the supervision of arithmetic.
 - (c) Monroe (140). The chapter on the Principles of Method in Teaching Arithmetic as Derived from Scientific Investigation.
 - (d) Osburn (146, 147) *Corrective Arithmetic*, Volumes I and II.
 - (e) Thorndike (162). *The Psychology of Arithmetic*.
 - (f) The prefaces of five recent sets of arithmetics and of five sets written a generation ago.
 - (g) The teachers' manuals of five recent sets of arithmetics.
 - (h) The *Twenty-Ninth Yearbook* of this Society (130).
2. The author should attempt to determine good practice by examining:
 - (a) Sixty of the more important courses of study in use in the United States. This step involves the making of an elaborate chart to be used for purposes of comparing the details concerned in the selection of items and grade placement.
 - (b) Five recent and competing sets of textbooks. This step requires the construction of an elaborate inventory chart similar to the one described in the preceding step unless such charts are available as confidential property of the publishers concerned.
3. The author should formulate a philosophy of arithmetic to guide him in his selection of content. For example, he must decide what position he will take on such issues as skill versus understanding, formal drill versus incidental drill in projects, and computation versus social-economic problems.
4. The author should list definitely:
 - (a) The mathematical concepts or notions to be modified in each grade, together with specific estimates of the status of these concepts at the beginning and at the end of each grade.

- (b) The unit skills that he expects to initiate in each grade, establish in each grade, and repair in each grade.
 - (c) The attitudes which he desires to emphasize in each grade.
 - (d) The principles that are to be taught on an informational level in each grade.
 - (e) The principles that are to be taught on a skill level in each grade.
5. The author should check his decisions relating to grade placements through the use of the comparison charts derived from the courses of study and from competing textbooks.
 6. The author should construct a program of educational psychology in which he lists such guiding principles as he believes to be valid relating to (a) motivation, (b) drill, (c) reflective thinking, (d) individual differences, and (e) appraisal.
 7. The author should build tentative teaching materials around his objectives in such a manner as to embody his accepted principles of psychology of learning and in accordance with the findings of such researches in the field of arithmetic as he considers significant.
 8. The author should make actual count of the number of repetitions of each unit skill that he wishes to raise to an automatic level. He should assure himself that none are neglected and make certain that the greater amount of practice is given to those bonds that he considers, on the basis of evidence, more difficult.
 9. The author should submit proof of the texts to ten outstanding experts in the teaching of arithmetic, this group to include classroom teachers and supervisors, and he should then revise the manuscript in the light of their criticism.
 10. The author should arrange for the publication of an experimental edition and for its trial in:
 - (a) Selected classes of at least twenty school systems widely distributed and representing a variety of conditions relative to skill of teachers, ability of children, and social and economic status of parents.
 - (b) Approximately one-half of the classes of each teacher in a city.
 11. The author should secure detailed reports from the teachers concerning both the controlled and experimental groups. These re-

ports should cover such items as the methods employed, the results on inventory and appraisal tests, the sufficiency of practice, the suitability of vocabulary, and the adequacy of motivation. From data reported, he should also derive the standards for progress tests to be used in the commercial edition of the books.

12. The author should revise his tentative materials in the light of the records secured.

C. Scientific Techniques Used in the Social Studies⁴

As one passes from the fields of spelling and arithmetic to the social studies for the *first six grades* one notices a striking contrast. Comparatively few well-planned investigations are available to writers of textbooks.

The more careful authors recognize at least three problems: (1) determination of content for a specified grade, (2) adjustment of materials to the reading abilities of pupils of that grade, and (3) adaptations of many kinds to provide for the various interests and intellectual powers of the children. A considerable number of investigations throw some light on the first problem, and a few definite attempts have been made to solve the others. It appears that comparatively few authors claim the use of objective research and some of these indicate the use of only a small portion of the composite of techniques to be considered in this article.

I. DETERMINATION OF CONTENT

In the determination of content, an author obviously is influenced by such considerations as the objectives and guiding principles which he accepts as valid, the grade for which the book is written, present practices, the needs of society, and the plan of organization which he decides to follow. Some sources of information on these points are expert opinions, courses of study, textbooks, children's literature, and research investigations.

1. Objectives

The objectives for a textbook in the social studies are determined by writers principally through consulting expert opinions. In some cases, these opinions are checked against the findings of investigations.

⁴ Credit for much of the work on this section is due O. F. Frederick, a graduate student in education at the University of Michigan.

In history, Miss Kelty (224) sought to discover a consensus of experts by tabulating the objectives which were discussed by five national committees, fifteen writers on history, and ten writers on education.

Guiding principles for the selection and organization of materials are gleaned from such writings as those of Bonser (211), Bobbitt (209), McMurry (229), and Parker (231).

2. Grade Placement

In determining the grade placement of their textbooks, authors consult courses of study, recommendations of prominent committees, and the findings of investigators. In particular, they refer to such investigations as those by Bagley and Kyte (205), Glass (218), and Miss Kelty (224).

3. Analyzing Current Practice

The content of some textbooks for the social studies is in part determined by analyses of other textbooks, courses of study, and the writings of specialists. This type of procedure is indicated in an article by Kyte (227). Some authors consult the findings of an investigation by Stratemeyer and Bruner (239) analyzing nine thousand courses of study. Also book companies indicate that their special research departments from time to time make valuable supplementary investigations, but the Committee had no opportunity to examine these to determine their value.

4. Investigations to Determine Essentials

In discussing the determination of content for social science textbooks for the first six grades, authors refer to such investigations as those by Bagley (202, 203), Bagley and Rugg (204), Bassett (207, 208), Bobbitt and others (210), Branom and Reavis (212), Charters (213), Cocking (235), Dulebohn (216), Goss (235), Hockett (219), Kelty (222), Lorenzen (216), Mahan (216), Marston, McKnown, and Bagley (228), Peters (235), Rugg (234), Rugg and Hockett (236), Showalter (237), Thomas (235), Washburne (242), Whitbeck (235), and Wooters (235). For geography, in particular, Bagley and Kyte (205) present several tables which show a composite of the chief findings of six investigations. E. U. Rugg (233) carried on a comprehensive investigation in an attempt to use research studies in the field of the social sciences and citizenship education as criteria in evaluat-

ing the present program of materials in the subjects in the secondary schools. To what extent authors utilize the findings of such research studies is not clear. Many of these investigations deal primarily with materials for the junior and the senior high school. However, as one author of elementary social science textbooks indicates, such investigations appear to be all that are available.

The preceding investigations involve the analytical and statistical treatment of the views of specialists, opinions of laymen, allusions in periodicals and books, and data on such items as area, population, imports, and exports. These studies attempt to determine the minimal essentials for social studies and deal with political platforms, major social problems, cultural needs, civic deficiencies, traits and duties of citizens, important dates, misplacements of emphasis, and similar topics. Summaries of such investigations have been prepared by Finch and committee (216), Horn (220), E. U. Rugg (233), and H. O. Rugg and committee (235).

5. The Organization of Materials

Most problems of organization of subject matter in the social studies are still decided on the basis of opinion, since research evidence on these problems is meager. And these opinions are by no means unanimous. Writers of history are not agreed as to the relative merits of topical, chronological, and biographical arrangements of materials. Some authors of geographies follow the one-cycle, others the two-cycle plan of organization. One might easily list other instances of lack of unanimity. In deciding the relative emphasis to place on facts, Washburne (243) tried to make the amount of time devoted to any topic approximately proportional to its relative importance as shown by a previous investigation (242) which he had conducted to ascertain the basic facts needed in history and geography. One notes the absence of studies for the purpose of determining the number, size, and placement of diagrams, pictures, and maps in textbooks for social science in the first six grades. Some general guidance is afforded authors by such writings as those of Bobbitt (209), Bonser (211), Clark (214), Gates (217), Johnson (221), Kendall and Stryker (225), Klapper (226), McMurry (229), Parker (231), Tryon (240), and Wayland (244).

II. ADJUSTMENT TO THE APPROPRIATE READING LEVEL

Realizing the necessity of adjusting the subject matter to the reading abilities of the pupils, some authors check the vocabulary, terms, expressions, and concepts of their materials against such studies as those by Ayer (201), Barr and Gifford (206), Dolch (215), Kelty (222), Meltzer (230), Pressey (232), Stephenson (238), and Thorndike (241). Kyte (227) reports an attempt to solve this problem experimentally. In still another classroom experiment the following procedure is employed: After the general vocabulary is checked against the Thorndike word list and the test has been annotated with the definitions of unusual words which it is found necessary to use, the material is submitted to a large number of class groups of the grade level to which the material is addressed, and the children are invited to read through the material under observation and mark every word which they do not understand the meaning of on a second reading of the material. This is frequently supplemented by rapid tests of word comprehension conducted in a way that makes it clear to the children that the material and not the children are being criticized.

III. MOTIVATION AND PROVISION FOR INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

Adjustment of textbook material to the differing interests and abilities of children is of vital importance in the social studies, as in other fields. In order to motivate the work and allow children to move forward in accordance with their varying interests and abilities, authors use various devices which they consider to be based on sound psychology. Some authors provide introductory questions or stories to connect the lesson or unit with experiences of the children, participative experiences to develop insight and appreciation, topics for discussion to elicit enjoyable socialized activity and give practice in reasoning about facts or problems within their grasp. Some other devices used by authors are games, suggestions for numerous projects and other types of activity, attractive maps, colored and action-type pictures, new-type tests, and vivid concrete presentation of materials. These and other devices are discussed in such writings as those by Kelty (223) and Wilson (245).

To determine the interest appeal and suitability of materials, some authors try their books in classrooms prior to commercial publication. In some instances, the teachers use the subject matter in the class and

then rate it on such items as interest, style, content, length, vocabulary, stimulation to thought, social or moral teaching, value as reading content, and value from the civic standpoint. The outcomes of such trials furnish the basis for revision of the book or manuscript. Kyte (227) shows that the interests of pupils vary greatly from what people suppose them to be.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In the field of the social studies for the first six grades, some textbook writers recognize at least three problems: determination of content for a designated grade, adaptation of materials to the reading abilities of the children concerned, and provision for motivation and individual differences. Apparently authors can secure slightly more objective help on the first of these problems than on the others.

For aid in constructing their textbooks, authors consult other textbooks, children's literature, courses of study, recommendations of outstanding committees, expert opinions, research investigations, and the principles of psychology. In addition, a few authors conduct personal investigations and experiments as a partial basis for their books. As Woellner and Lyman (246), indicate, research and classroom experimentation are presumably superior as a basis for textbook construction to individual opinion, present practice, or even a composite of expert opinion.

At best, scientific research in the field of the social studies for the first six grades is in the pioneer stage, in which investigators are attempting to refine their techniques.

D. Bibliographies

1. Bibliography for Spelling Textbooks⁵

1. ANDERSON, W. N. *Determination of a Spelling Vocabulary Based upon Written Correspondence*. Iowa City, 1921. (University of Iowa Studies in Education, Vol. II, No. 1.) 66 pp.
2. ARCHER, CLIFFORD. "Transfer of training in spelling," *Elem. English Rev.*, 5: 1928, 55-61.

⁵It appears that the most important summary sources books for authors of spelling textbooks have been: the *Eighteenth Yearbook of this Society* (22), the *Third and Fourth Yearbooks of the Department of Superintendence* (23, 36), and *Sudweeks* (46). These, along with Breed (11) and Tidyman (48), furnish an excellent introduction to the problems in the field of spelling.

3. ASHBAUGH, E. J. *The Iowa Spelling Scales—by Grades*. Bloomington, Ill., 1922. Each 16 pp.
4. AYRES, L. P. *The Spelling Vocabularies of Personal and Business Letters*. New York, 1913. 14 pp.
5. AYRES, L. P. *A Measuring Scale for Ability in Spelling*. New York, 1915. 58 pp.
6. BAKER, HARRY J. *Educational Disability and Case Studies in Remedial Teaching*. Bloomington, Ill., 1929. 172 pp.
7. BARTHELMESS, HARRIET M. *The Teaching of Spelling*. Boston, 1916. (Annual Report of School Committee. Bulletin No. XI, Department of Educational Investigation and Measurement.) 21 pp.
8. BAUER, NICHOLAS. *The New Orleans Public School Spelling List*. New Orleans, 1916.
9. BREED, F. S. "What words should children be taught to spell?" *Elem. Sch. Jour.* 26: 1925, 118-131, 202-214, 292-306.
10. BREED, F. S. "Adult life as a curriculum pattern for childhood," *Sch. and Soc.*, 27: 1928, 220-223.
11. BREED, F. S. *How to Teach Spelling*. Dansville, New York, 1930. 177 pp.
12. BRIGGS, THOMAS H. and KELLY, TRUMAN, L. *Sixteen Spelling Scales Standardized in Sentences for Secondary Schools*. New York. 55 pp.
13. BUCKINGHAM, B. R. *Spelling Ability, Its Measurement and Distribution*. New York, 1913. (Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 59.) 116 pp.
14. CAPPS, A. G. "Curriculum content of a high-school spelling course." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 2: 1920, 626-635.
15. CLARKE, W. F. "Writing vocabularies." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 21: 1921, 349-351.
16. COOK, W. A. and O'SHEA, M. V. *The Child and His Spelling*. Indianapolis, 1914. 282 pp.
17. GATES, A. I. *A Reading Vocabulary for the Primary Grades*. New York. 24 pp.
18. GATES, A. I. *The Psychology of Reading and Spelling—with Special Reference to Disability*. New York, 1922. (Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 129.) 108 pp.
19. HEILMAN, J. *A Study in Spelling*. Greeley, Colo., 1918. (Research Bulletin, Series 18, No. 7. The State Teachers College of Colorado.) 15 pp.
20. HOLLINGWORTH, LETA S. *The Psychology of Special Disability in Spelling*. New York, 1918. (Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 88.) 105 pp.
21. HORN, ERNEST and ASHBAUGH, E. J. "The necessity of teaching derived forms in spelling." *Journ. Educ. Psych.*, 10: 1919, 143-152.

22. HORN, ERNEST. "Principles of method in teaching spelling as derived from scientific investigation." *Eighteenth Yearbook* of this Society, 1919, Part II, Ch. III., pp. 52-78.
23. HORN, ERNEST, and COMMITTEE. "Spelling." *Third Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1925, Ch. IV, 110-151.
Summarizes and comments upon thirty-three studies which bear upon the selection of words for a spelling course of study.
24. HORN, ERNEST. "The spelling vocabulary of bankers' letters." *English Jour.*, 12: 1923, 383-397.
25. HORN, ERNEST. *A Basic Writing Vocabulary—10,000 Words Most Commonly Used in Writing*. Iowa City, 1926. (University of Iowa Monographs in Education, First Series, No. 4.) 225 pp.
26. HORN, ERNEST. "Childish and permanent values in curriculum making." *Chicago Sch. Jour.*, 9: 1927, 288-294.
27. HORN, MADELINE D. "The three thousand and three words most frequently used by kindergarten children." *Childhood Educ.*, 3: 1926, 118-122.
28. HOUSER, J. D. "An investigation of the writing vocabularies of representatives of an economic class." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 17: 1917, 708-718.
29. HOUSH, E. T. "Analysis of the vocabularies of ten second-year readers." *Seventeenth Yearbook* of this Society, 1918, Part I, Ch. IV, pp. 40-45.
30. HUDELSON, E., STETSON, F. L., and WOODYARD, ELLA. "Sixteen spelling scales." *Teachers Coll. Record*, 21: 1920, 337-391.
31. JONES, F. W. *Concrete Investigation of the Material of English Spelling*. Vermilion, South Dakota, 1914. 31 pp.
32. KEENER, E. E. "Comparison of the group and individual methods of teaching spelling." *Jour. Educ. Method*, 6: 1926, 31-35.
33. KILZER, L. R. "The test-study method versus the study-test method in teaching spelling." *Sch. Rev.*, 34: 1926, 521-525.
34. KIRCHER, H. W. "Analysis of the vocabularies of thirty-seven primers and first readers." *Twenty-fourth Yearbook* of this Society, 1925, Part I, Ch. 7, pp. 193-198.
35. KYTE, G. C. Unpublished studies in spelling on file at the School of Education, University of Michigan.
36. LEWIS, F. E., and COMMITTEE. "Spelling." *Fourth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1926, Ch. 6, pp. 126-172.
Summarizes and comments upon experimental work in spelling, presents a minimum vocabulary, and suggests problems for further research.
37. MASTERS, HARRY V. *A Study of Spelling Errors*. Iowa City, 1927. (Studies in Education, IV, No. 4.) 80 pp.

38. MCKEE, GRACE M. "Children's themes as a source of spelling vocabulary." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 25: 1924, 197-206.
39. MCKEE, PAUL. "Teaching and Testing Spelling by Column and Context Forms." Summarized by Lewis and Committee in the *Fourth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1926, Ch. 6, pp. 137-139.
40. MORRISON, J. CAYCE, and MCCALL, WILLIAM A. *Morrison-McCall Spelling Scale*. Yonkers, 1923. 16 pp.
41. NICHOLSON, ANNE (Editor). *A Speller for the Use of Teachers of California*. Sacramento, 1914.
42. PACKER, J. L. "The vocabulary of ten first readers." *Twentieth Yearbook of this Society*, 1921, Part II, Ch. 9, pp. 127-144.
43. *Preliminary Report of the Committee on Spelling*. Kansas City, Missouri, 1918. (Second Research Bulletin No. 3, Bureau of Research and Efficiency.) 50 pp.
44. SIMMONS, E. P. and BIXLER, H. H. *The Standard High-School Spelling Scale*. Atlanta, 1928. 64 pp.
45. *Spelling—Determining the Degree of Difficulty of Spelling Words*. Boston, 1915. (Bulletin No. IV of the Department of Educational Investigation and Measurement, Boston Public Schools.) 48 pp.
46. SUDWEEKS, JOSEPH. "Practical helps in teaching spelling: Summary of helpful principles and methods." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 16: 1927, 106-118.
47. THORNDIKE, E. L. *The Teacher's Word Book*. New York, 1927. 134 pp.
48. TIDYMAN, W. F. *The Teaching of Spelling*. Yonkers, 1919. 178 pp.
49. TIDYMAN, W. F. *Survey of the Writing Vocabularies of Public School Children in Connecticut*. Washington, 1921. (Teachers' Leaflet No. 15, U. S. Bur. Educ.) 18 pp.
50. TIDYMAN, W. F. "The supervision of spelling." (Ch. III, pp. 103, 108, 110, in *The Supervision of Elementary Subjects*, by Burton and others.) New York, 1929.
51. TIDYMAN, W. F. and JOHNSON, EDITH. "Value of grouping words according to similar difficulties in spelling." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 10: 1924, 297-301.
52. TURNER, E. A. "Rules versus drill in teaching spelling." *Jour. Educ. Psych.*, 3: 1912, 460-461.
53. WAGNER, C. A. *An Experimental Study of Grouping by Similarity as a Factor in the Teaching of Spelling*. (Doctorate thesis, University of Pennsylvania,) 1912. 26 pp.
54. WASHBURN, CARLETON W. "A spelling curriculum based on research." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 23: 1923, 751-762.
55. WINCH, W. H. "A motor factor in perception and memory." *Jour. Exper. Ped.*, 1: 1912, 261-273.

56. WITTY, P. A. "Diagnosis and remedial treatment of poor spellers." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 13: 1926, 39-44.
57. WOLFE, H. A. and BREED, F. S. "An experimental study of syllabication in spelling." *Sch. and Soc.*, 15: 1922, 616-622.
58. WOODY, CLIFFORD. "The evaluation of two methods of the teaching of spelling." *Yearbook Number XV of the National Society of College Teachers of Education*, 1926, pp. 155-171.

2. Bibliography for Arithmetic Textbooks⁶

101. ADAMS, H. W. "The mathematics encountered in general reading of newspapers and periodicals." Summarized by Franklin Bobbitt in the *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 25: 1924, 133-143.
102. ANDERSON, C. J. "The use of the Woody Scale for diagnostic purposes." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 18: 1918, 770-781.
103. BANTING, G. O. "The elimination of difficulties in reasoning." *Second Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1923, pp. 411-421.
104. BROOKS, S. S. "A study of the technical and semi-technical vocabulary of arithmetic." *Educ. Research Bull.*, 5: 1926, 219-222.
105. BROWN, J. C. "An investigation of the value of drill work in the fundamental operations of arithmetic." *Jour. Educ. Psych.*, 2: 1911, 81-88; 3: 1912, 485-492, 561-570.
106. BRUECKNER, L. J. "Certain arithmetic abilities of second-grade pupils." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 27: 1927, 433-443.
107. BRUECKNER, L. J. "A technique for analyzing the distribution of drill in fractions." *Jour. Educ. Method*, 7: 1928, 352-358.
108. BRUECKNER, L. J. "Analysis of errors in fractions." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 28: 1928, 760-770.
109. BRUECKNER, L. J. "Analysis of difficulties in decimals." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 29: 1928, 32-41.
110. BRUECKNER, L. J. "The supervision of arithmetic." (Ch. II, pp. 63-64, in *The Supervision of Elementary Subjects*, by W. H. Burton and others.) New York, 1929.
111. BRUECKNER, L. J. *Loc. cit.*, Ch. II, pp. 11-85.
112. BUCKINGHAM, B. R. and OSBURN, W. J. *The Buckingham-Osburn Searchlight Arithmetics—Teachers' Manual for Grades III and IV*. Boston, 1928. 249 pp.

⁶ This bibliography lists, in addition to the sources of the present writers, a number of studies which have been cited as important by authors of arithmetic textbooks. The listing of these studies, which the Committee could not examine, has seemed advisable for the convenience of workers who may care to investigate them.

113. BUCKINGHAM, B. R. and OSBURN, W. J. *The Buckingham-Osburn Searchlight Arithmetics—Teachers' Manual for Grades V and VI*. Boston, 1928. 193 pp.
114. BUSWELL, G. T. and JUDD, C. H. *Summary of Educational Investigations Relating to Arithmetic*. Chicago, 1925. (Supplementary Educational Monograph No. 27, Department of Education, The University of Chicago.) 212 pp.
115. BUSWELL, G. T. "Summary of arithmetic investigations." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 26: 1926, 692-703, 745-758; 27: 1927, 685-694, 731-744; 28: 1928, 702-709, 730-742; 29: 1929, 691-698, 737-747.
116. BUSWELL, G. T., with the coöperation of JOHN LENORE. *Diagnostic Studies in Arithmetic*. Chicago, 1926. (Supplementary Educational Monograph No. 30, The University of Chicago.) 212 pp.
117. CAMERER, ALICE. "What should be the minimal information about banking?" *Seventeenth Yearbook* of this Society, 1918, Part I, Ch. II, pp. 18-26.
118. CLAPP, F. L. *The Number Combinations—Their Relative Difficulty and the Frequency of Their Appearance in Textbooks*. Madison, 1924. (Bureau of Educational Research Bulletin No. 1, University of Wisconsin.) 19 pp.
119. CLARK, JOHN R. "Annual survey of textbooks and related publications in mathematics." *Jour. Educ. Method*, 7: 1927, 87-92.
120. COUNTS, G. S. *Arithmetic Tests and Studies in the Psychology of Arithmetic*. Chicago, 1917. (Supplementary Educational Monographs, Vol. I, No. 4, Department of Education, The University of Chicago.) 127 pp.
121. DOLCH, E. W. "Grade vocabularies." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 16: 1927, 16-26.
122. FOWLKES, JOHN GUY. "A report of a controlled study of the learning of multiplication by third-grade children." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 15: 1927, 181-189.
123. GUILER, W. S. "Curriculum building in arithmetic." *Educ. Research Bull.*, 3: 1924, 49-54.
124. HANNA, PAUL R. *Arithmetic Problem Solving: A Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Three Methods of Problem Solving*. New York, 1929. 68 pp.
125. HYDLE, L. L. and CLAPP, FRANK L. *Elements of Difficulty in the Interpretation of Concrete Problems in Arithmetic*. Madison, 1927. (Bureau of Educational Research Bulletin, No. 9, University of Wisconsin.) 68 pp.
126. KALLOM, A. W. "The importance of diagnosis in educational measurement." *Jour. Educ. Psych.*, 10: 1929, 1-12.
127. KNIGHT, F. B. "Organization of drill." Summarized by Wilson and Committee in the *Third Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1925, pp. 63-91.

128. KNIGHT, F. B. "Drill in arithmetic." *Jour. Educ. Psych.*, 14: 1923, 115-121.
129. KNIGHT, F. B. and BEHRENS, M. S. *The Learning of the 100 Addition Combinations and the 100 Subtraction Combinations*. New York, 1928. 82 pp.
- 130-134. KNIGHT, F. B. and COMMITTEE. "Report of the Society's Committee on Arithmetic." *Twenty-ninth Yearbook* of this Society, 1930. (130) pp. x + 749; (131) pp. 473-523; (132) pp. 551-568; (133) pp. 569-587; and (134) pp. 611-619.
135. KNIGHT, F. B. and SETZAFRANDT, A. O. H. "Transfer within a narrow mental function." *Elem. Sch. Jour.* 24: 1924.
136. LUTES, O. S. *An Evaluation of Three Techniques for Improving Ability to Solve Arithmetic Problems*. Iowa City, 1926. (University of Iowa, Monographs in Education, First Series, No. 6.) 42 pp.
137. LUTES, O. S. and SAMUELSON, AGNES. *A Method for Rating the Drill Provisions in Arithmetic Textbooks*. Iowa City, 1926. (University of Iowa, Monographs in Education, First Series, No. 3.) 148 pp.
138. MERTON, ELDA L. "Remedial work in arithmetic." *Second Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1923, pp. 395-411.
139. MITCHELL, H. E. "Some social demands on the course of study in arithmetic." *Seventeenth Yearbook* of this Society, 1918, Part I, Ch. I, pp. 7-17.
140. MONROE, W. S. "Principles of method in teaching arithmetic, as derived from scientific investigation." *Eighteenth Yearbook* of this Society, 1919, Part II, Ch. IV, pp. 78-95.
141. MORTON, R. L. "An analysis of pupils' errors in fractions." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 9: 1924, 117-125.
142. MORTON, R. L. *Teaching Arithmetic in the Intermediate Grades*. New York, 1927. 334 pp.
143. MORTON, R. L. *Teaching Arithmetic in the Primary Grades*. New York, 1927. 242 pp.
144. MYERS, G. C. "Persistence of errors in arithmetic." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 10: 1924, 19-28.
145. NEWCOMB, R. S. "Teaching pupils how to solve problems in arithmetic." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 23: 1922, 183-189.
146. OSBURN, W. J. *Corrective Arithmetic*, Vol. I. Boston, 1924. 182 pp.
147. OSBURN, W. J. *Corrective Arithmetic*, Vol. II. Boston, 1929. 279 pp.
148. PARTRIDGE, CLARA M. "Number needs in children's reading activities." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 26: 1926, 357-366.
149. PATERSON, D. G. *Preparation and Use of New Type Examinations*. Yonkers, 1925. 87 pp.
150. *Reorganization of Mathematics in Secondary Education*. (A report by the National Committee on Mathematical Requirements.) 1923.

151. RUCH, G. M. *The Objective or New-Type Examination*. Chicago, 1929. 478 pp.
152. RUSSELL, C. R. *Classroom Tests*. Boston, 1926. 346 pp.
153. SCHORLING, RALEIGH. *A Tentative List of Objectives in the Teaching of Junior High School Mathematics with Investigations for the Determining of Their Validity*. Ann Arbor, 1925. 137 pp.
154. SCOTT, W. "Errors in arithmetic." *Jour. Exper. Ped.*, 3: 1916, 296-307; 4: 1917, 147-149.
155. SCOTT, Z. E. and COMMITTEE. "Arithmetic." *Fourth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1926, Ch. VII, pp. 173-220.
156. SMITH, NILA B. "An investigation of the uses of arithmetic in the out-of-school life of first-grade children." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 24: 1924, 621-626.
157. SOUBA, A. *Diagnosis of Pupil Difficulties in Arithmetic*. Unpublished Master's thesis, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1923.
This study is cited by Brueckner in *The Supervision of Elementary Subjects*, Chapter II, p. 52, by Burton and Others. New York, 1929.
158. STEVENSON, P. R. "Increasing the ability of pupils to solve arithmetic problems." *Educ. Research Bull.* III, 1924, 267-270.
159. TAYLOR, J. S. "Omitting arithmetic in the first year." *Educ. Admin. and Superv.*, 2: 1916, 87-93.
160. THEISEN, W. W. and FLEMMING, C. W. "The diagnostic value of the Woody Arithmetic Scales—a reply." *Jour. Educ. Psych.*, 9: 1918, 475-488, 567-580.
161. THORNDIKE, E. L. "The psychology of drill in arithmetic—the amount of practice." *Jour. Educ. Psych.*, II: 1921, 183-194.
162. THORNDIKE, E. L. *The Psychology of Arithmetic*. New York, 1922. 314 pp.
163. THORNDIKE, E. L. *The Psychology of Arithmetic*. New York, 1922, pp. 266-284.
164. THORNDIKE, E. L. *The Teacher's Word Book*. New York, 1927. (Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.) 134 pp.
165. UHL, W. L. "The use of standardized materials in arithmetic for diagnosing pupils' methods of work." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 18: 1917, 215-218.
166. WASHBURNE, CARLETON W. "When should we teach arithmetic?—A Committee of Seven investigation." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 28: 1928, 659-665.
167. WASHBURNE, CARLETON W. and OSBORNE, RAYMOND. "Solving arithmetic problems." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 27: 1926, 219-226, 296-304, especially 301.

168. WASHBURNE, CARLETON W. and VOGEL, MABEL. "Are any number combinations inherently difficult?" *Jour. Educ. Research*, 27: 1928, 235-255.
169. WILSON, ESTALINE. "Improving the ability to read arithmetic problems." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 22: 1922, 380-386.
170. WILSON, G. M. *A Survey of the Social and Business Usage of Arithmetic*. New York, 1919. (Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education, No. 100.) 62 pp.
171. WILSON, G. M. and COMMITTEE. "Arithmetic." *Third Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1925, Ch. III, pp. 35-109.
172. WISE, C. T. "A survey of arithmetical problems arising in various occupations." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 20: 1919, 118-136.
173. WINCH, W. H. "Accuracy in school children—Does improvement in numerical accuracy transfer?" *Jour. Educ. Psych.*, 1: 1910, 557-589; 2: 1911, 262-271.
174. WOODY, CLIFFORD. "Types of arithmetic needed in certain types of salesmanship." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 22: 1922, 505-520.

3. Bibliography for Social Science Textbooks

201. AYER, ADELAIDE M. New York, 1926. *Some Difficulties in Elementary School History*. (Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 212.) 70 pp.
202. BAGLEY, W. C. "The determination of minimum essentials in elementary geography and history." *Fourteenth Yearbook of this Society*, 1915, Part I, Ch. IX, pp. 131-146.
203. BAGLEY, W. C. "Present-day minimal essentials in United States History as taught in the seventh and eighth grades." *Sixteenth Yearbook of this Society*, 1917, Part I, Ch. IX, pp. 143-155.
204. BAGLEY, W. C. and RUGG, H. O. *The Content of American History as Taught in the Seventh and Eighth Grades—An Analysis of Typical School Textbooks*. Urbana, Illinois, 1916. (School of Education Bulletin, No. 16, University of Illinois.) 59 pp.
205. BAGLEY, W. C. and KYTE, G. C. Berkeley, California, 1926. *The California Curriculum Study*. Chapters IX-XII, pp. 139-214.
206. BARR, A. S. and GIFFORD, C. W. "The vocabulary of American history." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 20: 1929, 103-121.
207. BASSETT, B. B. "The content of the course of study in civics." *Seventeenth Yearbook of this Society*, 1918, Part I, Ch. VII, pp. 63-80.
208. BASSETT, B. B. "The historical information essential for the intelligent understanding of civic problems." *Seventeenth Yearbook of this Society*, 1918, Part I, Ch. VIII, pp. 81-89.

209. BOBBITT, FRANKLIN. *How to Make a Curriculum*. Boston, 1924. Chs. I-VII, pp. 1-128.
210. BOBBITT, FRANKLIN and OTHERS. *Curriculum Investigations*. Chicago, 1926. (Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 31, Chs. I-XI, pp. 1-109, University of Chicago.)
211. BONSER, FREDERICK G. *The Elementary School Curriculum*. New York, 1920. 466 pp.
212. BRANOM, M. E. and REAVIS, W. C. "The determination and measurement of the minimal essentials of elementary school geography." *Seventeenth Yearbook* of this Society, 1918, Part I, Ch. III, pp. 27-39.
213. CHARTERS, W. W. *Curriculum Construction*. New York, 1923. Chapters XIX and XX, pp. 244-272.
214. CLARK, MARION G. "A study in testing historical sense in fourth and fifth grade pupils." *The Historical Outlook*, 14: 1923, 147-150.
215. DOLCH, E. W. "Grade vocabularies." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 16: 1927, 16-26.
216. FINCH, C. E. and COMMITTEE. "Junior-high-school social studies." *Fifth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, Washington, 1927, Ch. XII, pp. 213-290. Summaries of investigations comprise a part of the chapter.
217. GATES, A. I. "The psychological vs. the chronological order in the teaching of history." *The Historical Outlook*, 11: 1920, 227-230.
218. GLASS, J. M. *Curriculum Practices in the Junior High School and Grades V and VI*. Chicago, 1924. (Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 25. University of Chicago.) 181 pp.
219. HOCKETT, J. A. *A Determination of the Major Social Problems of American Life*. New York, 1927. (Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 281.) 101 pp.
220. HORN, ERNEST. "The application of methods of research to making the course of study in history." *Twenty-second Yearbook* of this Society, 1923, Part II, Ch. XIV, pp. 234-259.
221. JOHNSON, HENRY. *Teaching of History in Elementary and Secondary Schools*, New York, 1915. 497 pp.
222. KELTY, MARY G. "Time expressions comprehended by children of the elementary school." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 25: 1925, 522-528, 607-618.
223. KELTY, MARY G. *Teaching American History in the Middle Grades of the Elementary School*. Boston, 1928. 748 pp.
224. KELTY, MARY G. "The supervision of history." Chapter VIII in *The Supervision of Elementary Subjects*, by W. H. Burton and others, pp. 350-351, 373-377, New York, 1929.
225. KENDALL, C. N. and STRYKER, F. E. *History in the Elementary School*. Boston, 1918. 135 pp.

226. KLAPPER, PAUL. *The Teaching of History*. New York, 1926. 347 pp.
227. KYTE, G. C. "Experimentation in the development of a book to meet educational needs." *Educ. Admin. and Superv.*, 14: 1928, 86-100.
228. MARSTON, L. R., MCKNOWN, H. C. and BAGLEY, W. C. "A method of determining misplacements of emphasis in seventh and eighth grade history." *Seventeenth Yearbook* of this Society, 1918. Part I, Ch. IX, pp. 90, 96.
229. McMURRY, F. M. *Elementary School Standards*. Yonkers, 1913. 218 pp.
230. MELTZER, H. *Children's Social Concepts—A Study of Their Nature and Development*. New York, 1925. (Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 192.) 91 pp.
231. PARKER, S. C. *General Methods of Teaching in Elementary Schools*. Boston, 1922. 336 pp.
232. PRESSEY, LUELLA C. *The Technical Vocabularies of the Public School Subjects*. Bloomington, Illinois, 1924.
233. RUGG, E. U. *Curriculum Studies in the Social Sciences and Citizenship*. Greeley, Colo., 1928. (Colorado Teachers College Education Series, No. 3.) 216 pp.
234. RUGG, H. O. "Problems of contemporary life as the basis for curriculum making in the social studies." *Twenty-second Yearbook* of this Society, 1923, Part II, Ch. XV, pp. 260-273.
235. RUGG, H. O. and COMMITTEE. "The social studies." *Third Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1925, Ch. VII, pp. 217-277.
Summaries of investigations comprise a part of the chapter.
236. RUGG, H. O. and HOCKETT, JOHN. *Objective Studies in Map Location*. New York, 1924. (Social Science Monographs, No. 1. The Lincoln School of Teachers College, Columbia University.) 132 pp.
237. SHOWALTER, B. R. "Dates and historical perspective." *The Historical Outlook*, 19: 1928, 28-31.
238. STEPHENSON, O. W. "The special vocabulary of civics." *Jour. Educ. Research*, 18: 1928, 297-304.
239. STRATEMEYER, FLORENCE B. and BRUNER, H. B. *Rating Elementary School Courses of Study*. New York, 1926. 193 pp.
240. TRYON, R. M. *The Teaching of History in Junior and Senior High Schools*. Boston, 1921. 294 pp.
241. THORNDIKE, E. L. *The Teacher's Word Book*. New York, 1927. 134 pp.
242. WASHBURNE, C. W. "Basic facts needed in history and geography—A statistical investigation." *Twenty-second Yearbook* of this Society, 1923, Part II, Ch. XIII, pp. 216-233.

243. WASHBURN, C. W. "Building a fact course in history and geography." *Twenty-second Yearbook* of this Society, 1923, Part II, Ch. VI, pp. 99-110.
244. WAYLAND, JOHN W. *How to Teach American History*. New York, 1914. 349 pp.
245. WILSON, HOWARD E. "Things to do in the social science classroom." *The Historical Outlook*, 20: 1929, 218-224.
246. WOELLNER, R. C. and LYMAN, R. L. "Evaluating books on vocational guidance." *Sch. Rev.*, March, 1930, 191-199.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF TEXTBOOK AUTHORS

HERMAN G. RICHEY
School of Education,
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

The recognition that has been accorded the textbook as a vital force in American education makes pertinent a study of the factors that influence the nature of its content, organization, and underlying pedagogical principles. Although it may be said that textbooks are, for the most part, the results of evolutionary processes and are not purely the creations of those who write them, textbooks are given character by the authors' conceptions of the purposes and nature of education and by the completeness of their understanding of the processes of learning. Such a thesis gives rise to a number of problems: Who write our textbooks? What are the occupations of the authors and what place do they hold in the educational world? Have any changes been made within recent years in the personnel of the group which has written textbooks? Has the development of schools and departments of education and of laboratory schools been responsible for any changes in the numerical importance of various authorial groups?

I. METHOD OF SECURING AND CLASSIFYING DATA

This investigation was instituted by classifying the authors of textbooks according to their occupations, for the purpose of determining the relative importance of each group as measured by the number of authors belonging to it and by the number of books produced by each.

A second phase of the study is concerned with an investigation of the text-producing activities of teachers connected with university departments or schools of education and with laboratory schools. The

purpose was to determine the extent to which those teachers have made themselves felt in elementary and secondary education as measured by the number participating in supplying texts and by the number of books written.

The study was limited to cover only the last fifty years¹ and to include only textbooks by American authors in the subjects² of geometry, arithmetic, spelling, history, and reading which were thought to be representative and to satisfy the added requirement of a continuous presence in the course of study throughout the entire period.

The lists of textbooks of the five selected subjects were compiled from *The American Catalogue*, *The American Catalog*, *The United States Catalog*, *The Cumulative Book Index*, and from lists furnished by the Library of Congress. Textbooks in the two textbook collections of the University of Chicago and in the libraries of several publishing companies, descriptive catalogues, and classified lists were examined for assistance in making proper classifications.

The occupations of the authors were obtained from the following sources: *Who's Who in America*, title pages of texts in a number of collections, old and new descriptive catalogues, Appleton's *Cyclopedia of Biography*, letters from publishing firms, and verbal statements from officials of those companies.

II. THE NUMBER OF TEXTBOOKS WRITTEN EACH DECADE

For the five subjects, 1562 textbooks,³ including revised editions, were discovered. Arithmetic was found to contribute the largest number, 475; American history, the second in frequency, was represented by 415 texts. Each of these two subjects furnished nearly twice as many texts as any one of the other three subjects (see Table I, last column).

¹ Fifty-one years were actually covered in order to include books written in 1876, the date of the first issue of the *American Catalogue* which contained considerable data. The first period in each tabulation contains eleven years.

² This paper is an abstract of a part of the writer's unpublished master's thesis, *The Occupations of the Authors of School Text-Books, 1876-1926*, which is on file in the libraries of the University of Chicago. Other subjects, algebra, trigonometry, physics, and combined mathematics, were treated in the dissertation. Excluding them from the present study necessitated no significant changes in interpretation.

³ Readers were counted only when published in graded series and then a series was tabulated as one book.

TABLE I.—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS, INCLUDING REVISED EDITIONS, BY AMERICAN AUTHORS, BY DECADES

Subject	Decades					Total
	I 1876-'86	II 1887-'96	III 1897-'06	IV 1907-'16	V 1917-'26	
Geometry	20	49	60	60	49	238
Arithmetic	64	87	116	127	81	475
Spelling	24	27	60	71	48	230
American History	64	70	130	107	44	415
Reading	28	27	41	53	55	204
Total	200	260	407	418	277	1562

A considerable number of textbooks of each subject was found for each of the decades. The writer believes that most of the texts written have been tabulated and that the considerable differences in the number of books found for each decade are due to the differences in the number produced during each of those decades rather than to failure to find those that had been written. If such is the case, the number of books produced per decade doubled within forty years. The period, 1876 to 1916, was marked by a large production of texts of the selected subjects, while the decade beginning with 1917 showed a considerable decrease.

III. NUMBER OF TEXTBOOKS WHOSE AUTHORS COULD BE CLASSIFIED

The occupations of the authors of 1174, or 75 percent, of the 1562 new textbooks and revised editions were found. The occupations of the authors of 86 percent of the textbooks of history were discovered, while the occupations of the producers of only slightly more than one-half of the texts of spelling were found.

TABLE II.—THE NUMBER OF SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS FOR WHICH THE OCCUPATIONS OF THE AUTHORS WERE FOUND AND THE RATIO OF THAT NUMBER TO THE TOTAL NUMBER OF BOOKS FOUND, BY DECADES, 1876-1926

Subject	Decades										Total	
	I 1876-'86		II 1887-'96		III 1897-'06		IV 1907-'16		V 1917-'26			
	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent
Geometry	16	80	32	65	45	75	49	82	42	86	184	77
Arithmetic	49	77	61	70	88	76	95	75	64	79	357	75
Spelling	9	38	11	41	32	53	38	54	29	60	119	52
American History	49	77	57	81	115	88	93	87	41	93	355	86
Reading	20	71	19	70	28	68	45	85	47	85	159	80
Total	143	72	180	70	308	76	320	77	223	84	1174	75

Tabulating an author but once for the entire period except when he was active in more than one field, it was found that 814 authors wrote the 1174 textbooks for which the occupations of the authors were found.

For the purposes of this study, two other classifications were made throughout. In the first, an author was tabulated but once to each decade in which he wrote a book or in which one of his books was revised. In the second, an author was tabulated each time he wrote a book or each time a revision appeared.⁴

By the first tabulation, 1055 authors, for whom occupations were discovered, wrote 1174 textbooks. By the second classification, 1580 authors wrote the 1174 textbooks, and 1972 authors were found to have written 1562 books, the total number found.

TABLE III.—TEXTBOOKS AND THEIR AUTHORS

Subject	Actual Number Authors of All Books Tabulated	Actual Number Authors Whose Occupations Were Found	Authors for Whom Occupations Were Found		Authors of All Books Found: 2d Classification	Total Books Found	Number Books for Which Authors' Occup. Were Found
			1st. Classi- fication	2d. Classi- fication			
Geometry.....	171	126	154	243	299	238	184
Arithmetic....	284	182	297	517	654	475	357
Spelling.....	227	124	121	138	247	230	119
History.....	237	193	277	442	487	415	355
Reading.....	242	189	206	240	285	204	159
Total.....	1161	814	1055	1580	1972	1562	1174

The first series of tabulations more nearly reveals the actual number of writers than does the second. Nevertheless, owing to repeated entries of authors in succeeding decades, the total number of authors classified by the former procedure is more than 200 in excess of the actual number of different authors.

It was felt that the procedure employed permitted the tabulation of more usable data, particularly for comparisons, decade by decade, or for the studies of a single decade. That the occupation of an author was likely to change during a lapse of time was considered further justification for

⁴ Hereafter these two classifications will be referred to as first and second classifications respectively.

the method adopted. It was thought that the value of the study would not be impaired by occasional repeated tabulations of authors whose productivity extended over a long period of time, or whose popularity warranted the revision of their works in the succeeding decade or decades.

The results derived from the second classification indicated trends similar to those made apparent by the results of the first classification. This paper treats the tabulations derived from the first classification in greater detail. The tabulations of the second and more complete interpretations may be found in the unpublished thesis from which this paper is taken.

IV. THE OCCUPATIONS OF THE AUTHORS

A superficial survey of the data revealed that the occupations of the authors of school textbooks fell largely into a few easily-defined classes. Men and women connected with universities, colleges, normal schools, secondary and elementary schools, administrators of different ranks, and members of editorial staffs of publishing companies have been the chief contributors.

The problem considered here is the determination of the relative importance of each group as measured by the number of authors affiliated with and by the number of publications produced by each group.

1. By the First Classification

By the first classification, it was found (see Table IV) that, of the 1055 authors writing between 1876 and 1926 whose occupations were found,⁵ 27 percent were connected with universities and colleges and 12 percent were engaged in normal-school work, making a total of 39 percent connected with higher institutions of learning. Twenty-two percent were connected with elementary and secondary schools; 14 percent were superintendents; 15 percent were men connected with the editorial staffs of publishing companies or were writers without other employment; and more than 8 percent held various positions divided between school positions (such as examiners, inspectors, teachers in correspondence and business schools, librarians) and other positions and professions (such as physicians, lawyers, preachers, newspaper editors, insurance agents, army officers, internal revenue collectors, social workers, and senators). A few organizations, such as the Grand Army of the Republic, the Catholic Publication Committee, and the American Citizenship League, were entered as authors.

⁵ Hereafter in this paper unless an express statement to the contrary is made, references to authors are intended to designate only those authors whose occupations were found.

When the percentages representing each group of authors for each decade of the period are considered, certain trends seem to exist. The universities and colleges furnished 18 percent of the authors of the first decade and their contribution steadily increased until during the fifth decade 37 percent of the authors were connected with those institutions. The percentage of authors connected with normal schools and with secondary schools changed but little during the entire period, and the percentage connected with elementary schools increased slightly.

TABLE IV.—AUTHORS OF TEXTBOOKS WHOSE OCCUPATIONS WERE FOUND, CLASSIFIED TO SHOW ABSOLUTE AND RELATIVE NUMBER IN VARIOUS GROUPS, BY DECADES (An author is tabulated but once to a decade regardless of the number of his books.)

Connections of Authors	Decades										Total	
	I 1876-'86		II 1887-'96		III 1897-'06		IV 1907-'16		V 1917-'26			
	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent
Universities	18	16.4	22	14.6	52	20.4	56	19.1	75	30.6	223	21.1
Colleges	2	1.3	9	6.0	16	6.3	21	7.1	15	6.1	63	6.0
Normal Schools	11	10.0	20	13.3	38	14.9	37	12.6	23	9.4	129	12.2
High Schools	15	13.6	13	8.6	25	9.8	29	9.9	23	9.4	105	10.0
Elementary Schools	10	9.1	14	9.3	28	11.0	40	13.6	36	14.7	128	12.1
Superintendencies	9	8.2	16	10.6	31	12.2	58	19.7	35	14.3	149	14.1
Other School Positions	6	5.5	6	4.0	9	3.5	8	2.7	7	2.9	36	3.4
Publishers' Staffs	7	6.6	12	7.9	11	4.3	8	2.7	7	2.9	45	4.3
Without Other												
Position	21	19.1	27	17.9	30	11.8	22	7.5	14	5.7	114	10.8
Positions Not Listed	11	10.0	12	7.9	15	5.9	15	5.1	10	4.1	63	6.0
Total	110	100	151	100	255	100	294	100	245	100	1055	100

Of the total number of authors, the proportion that was made up by superintendents increased from 8 for the first decade to nearly 20 percent for the fourth and fell to 14 percent for the fifth period.

On the other hand, writers having no occupations aside from that of author and employees of publishing firms made up a steadily-decreasing proportion of the total number of authors, falling from approximately 26 percent for the first, to less than 9 percent for the fifth decade. Similarly, the proportion of the authors who were in no way connected with educational institutions or with publishing firms but who were regularly employed dropped steadily from 10 percent of the total for the first period to 4 percent for the fifth.

It seems quite clear that an increasing percentage of the authors came to be persons with university or college connections while a de-

creasing percentage came to be members of editorial staffs and persons whose sole activities were in connection with the authorship of textbooks.

Although, with the exception of elementary-school teachers, all occupational groups were represented by authors of textbooks in all the subjects considered, an analysis of the activities of each group of authors reveals certain preferences.⁶

For the first decade, the proportion of university men to the total number of authors writing textbooks in the several subjects was 5.6 percent for arithmetic, 14.7 percent for history, 22.2 percent for reading, and 50 percent for geometry. For the last decade, the range was from 22.4 percent for reading to 36.7 percent for spelling, with the percentages representing authors of textbooks of arithmetic, geometry, and history grouped near the upper limit.

During the third decade a relatively large number of university men were engaged in the production of arithmetic texts. After the first decade, high-school men represented a large portion of all producers of geometry texts and a slightly decreasing share of the authors writing texts of all the other selected subjects.

The number of elementary-school men engaged in writing texts of reading increased rapidly after the second decade. No textbooks of geometry were written by elementary-school teachers.

The proportion of superintendents to the total number of writers producing texts of spelling, American history, and reading increased during the first four decades but was smaller in each case for the fifth.

2. By the Second Classification

On the basis of tabulating an author each time he wrote or revised a book, it was found⁶ that, of the total number of authors for the entire period, the universities and colleges furnished nearly 27 percent; the normal schools, 12 percent; the high schools nearly 12 percent; and the elementary schools more than 9 percent. Superintendents made up 13 percent of the total; members of editorial staffs and authors not otherwise employed, 19 percent; and men of all other professions, 7 percent. These percentages are but slightly different

⁶ Mr. Richey has prepared extensive tables presenting this analysis in detail. Limitations of space prevent the publication of these tables in this Yearbook. Some of the features revealed are, however, included in the paragraphs that follow.—*Editor*.

from those derived from the first classification; in fact, five are larger, five are smaller, and the average difference is but 1.65.

The percentage of the authors of textbooks who were connected with universities and colleges increased from 13 percent of the total number of authors to nearly 39 percent. Normal schools furnished about 10 percent of the authors for each decade (except the third period, 17 percent). The percentage of those connected with secondary and elementary schools showed but little change; the percentage of those who were superintendents increased during the first four decades, but decreased during the last one; while the proportion of members of editorial staffs and authors having no other regular employment decreased from more than 33 percent for the first to 8 percent for the fifth period.

It appears, therefore, that, as the universities and colleges came to furnish more and more of the writers of textbooks, authors having no other occupation or employed as editors by publishing firms became relatively fewer in number, decade by decade. The proportion of this latter group to all authors decreased to one-fourth of its original status while the numerical importance of university and college men increased three-fold.

V. THE INFLUENCE, BY TEXTBOOK AUTHORSHIP, OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

The preceding discussion has made apparent that the number and the proportion of authors connected with universities have increased from decade to decade for the entire fifty years.

These university men who wrote textbooks in the subjects selected for study fell largely into two groups; the first group consisted of men who taught courses which were ordinarily related to the subject matter of the books that they wrote, the second, of men connected with schools of education or with laboratory schools.

This phase of the study is concerned with an investigation of the authorial activities of the teachers belonging to the second group, with a view of determining to what extent they have made themselves felt in elementary and secondary education as measured by the number participating in supplying texts and by the number of textbooks they have written. It is also desirable to determine the extent of the in-

fluence of these persons upon the several school subjects or types of subjects. As before, two tabulations were made throughout.

1. By the First Classification

For the entire period, it was found that of a total of 1055 authors, 75, or slightly more than 7 percent, were connected with schools or departments of education (see Table V). Fifty of these seventy-five authors wrote during the last decade and constituted more than 29 percent of all the authors tabulated for that period. Relatively few authors of previous decades were connected with university schools or departments of education.

The proportion that the number of authors connected with departments of education was of the entire number connected with universities grew from zero for the first decade to 9.1 percent for the second, to 13.5 percent for the third, to 28.6 for the fourth, and to 66.7 percent for the fifth decade.

The authors who were also teachers of education did not divide their productive activities equally among the selected subjects. The writing of the textbooks in reading, spelling, and arithmetic commanded more attention by far than did that of the other two subjects (see Table VI).⁷

Of the entire number of university men who produced textbooks of arithmetic, spelling, and reading, 61.9, 68.2, and 72.7 percents, respectively, were connected with departments of education, while of those writing texts of American history and geometry, only 4.5 and 11.9 percents, respectively, were so affiliated.

The same general trend is apparent in the tabulation of all subjects, but is more pronounced in the case of certain subjects. For all subjects, the percentages representing the authors connected with departments of education were larger for the fifth than for the fourth decade, and larger for the fourth than for the third decade (except in one case and then there was no decrease.) During the fifth decade, two-thirds of the authors of texts of the selected subjects who were university teachers were affiliated with the departments or schools of education and one-fifth of all the authors were so connected.

⁷ Of the university men who wrote textbooks of combined mathematics, algebra, physics, and trigonometry, 34.8, 17, 11.8, and 2.6 percents, respectively, were connected with departments of education.

TABLE V.—PARTICIPATION IN TEXTBOOK WRITING OF PERSONS CONNECTED WITH UNIVERSITIES AND WITH SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
(Author tabulated but once in a decade, regardless of number of books written.)

Decades	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
	1876-1886	1887-1896	1897-1906	1907-1916	1917-1926	
(1) No. Authors Whose Occupations Were Found	110	151	255	294	245	1055
(2) No. Authors Connected with Universities	18	22	52	56	75	223
(3) No. Authors Connected with Schools and Depts. of Education.....	—	2	7	16	50	75
(4) Percent (3) is of (1).....	.0	1.3	2.8	5.4	20.4	7.1
(5) Percent (3) is of (2).....	.0	9.1	13.5	28.6	66.7	33.6

TABLE VI.—PARTICIPATION OF PERSONS CONNECTED WITH UNIVERSITIES AND WITH SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN THE WRITING OF TEXTBOOK IN CERTAIN SCHOOL SUBJECTS: TOTALS 1876 TO 1926
(Author tabulated once a decade, regardless of number of books written.)

School Subject	Authors Connected with	
	Universities	Schools and Depts. of Educ.
Geometry	59	7
Arithmetic	42	26
Spelling	22	15
American History	67	3
Reading	33	24

2. By the Second Classification

By this method of tabulation, 1580 authors were found, including 311 who were connected with universities; of the latter number, 99 were found to have been members of the staffs of departments or schools of education. For the entire period, 6.3 percent of all authors were members of the faculties of such institutions; the percentage made up by this group increasing from zero for the first period to 0.9 for the second; to 3.8 for the third; to 5.6 for the fourth; and to 16.8 for the fifth decade.

Of the total number of authors connected with universities, 58.1 percent of the authors of texts of arithmetic; 64 percent of the producers of spelling books; and 64.9 percent of the authors of series of reading texts were members of departments of education. During the same period, only 11.5 percent of the authors of geometry textbooks and 6.3 percent of the authors of history texts who were connected with universities were of the educational departments.

From the evidence it appears that the number of authors of textbooks who were connected with departments of education increased steadily from zero for the first period to 56 for the fifth, which is 16.8 percent of the entire number of authors who produced books during the last decade, and 54.4 percent of the number of authors who were connected with universities during the same period. The rapid development of schools and departments of education which characterized the last years of the period studied was accompanied by steadily-increasing production on the part of men connected with such institutions, particularly in the fields of reading, spelling, and arithmetic.

CHAPTER V

THE SELECTION OF MANUSCRIPTS BY PUBLISHERS

FRANK A. JENSEN
Superintendent of Schools
Rockford, Illinois

The selection of textbooks begins with the publisher when he selects manuscripts presented to him for publication or selects authors to write them. The school administrator, supervisor, or teacher makes his choice from the finished products of the publishing companies; but the first step in selection has already been taken by the publisher.

The part played by the publisher in the selection of textbooks is not always realized by those who use textbooks. His part in American education is aptly described in the following quotation:¹

It is indispensable that there should be a great American clearing-house system to determine the possible visions. Our system of textbook making is not only the greatest in the world, but it is very nearly the greatest feature in American education. If a teacher in Fort Kent, Maine, or Chula Vista, California, discovers, or thinks she has discovered, a brilliant idea, she may be sure that some one of the many publishing houses that are the evolution of American education will make inquiries about her work. If they get good reports from the casual visitor, they will send an expert to look into her work with care. If the report continues to be favorable, they will ask her to put her thoughts in the best shape she can and let them see the manuscript. They will then submit this manuscript to specialists in whom they have confidence, and if these specialists report that there is really an idea of value, however crudely expressed, they will ask the teacher to associate with her some man or woman of large experience in school work to help her put it into workable shape; then this product of the original genius and experienced master is turned over to their editorial force, who give it the most effective form and feature that expert book-makers can develop. Then, and not till then, this evolution of schoolroom practice, fertile genius, broad experience, art and skill in book-making is given to the world.

¹ A. E. Winship. "Textbooks: Educational, Commercial and Political." *Department of Superintendence, N.E.A.* Cincinnati, Ohio, February 24, 1915.

To get evidence on the selection of manuscripts by publishers a series of questions was sent to thirty-five textbook houses. Replies received from thirty-three of them furnish the material for this chapter. The publishers' responses to many of the questions are of such general character that they can not be reported in tabular form, but typical replies are quoted as evidence for conclusions reached.

I. PUBLISHERS' METHOD OF SECURING MANUSCRIPTS

In order to learn how publishers secure manuscripts for textbooks, the author asked them to answer this question: "What methods do you employ as a publisher in the securing of manuscripts and of authors to write manuscripts for textbooks?" Typical replies among the thirty-two received were:

A great many manuscripts are offered to us. Many come to us through advisory editors. Our own editors are in evidence at educational gatherings and are often consulted by teachers with regard to books in process. Our traveling salesmen also receive many suggestions.

Our editors and our field representatives try to keep us informed of manuscripts in preparation and of persons qualified to do special work of this sort. Through educational periodicals and in educational writings also much information comes to us. And other ways of course might be mentioned.

We find authors by personal contact. Our editor-in-chief makes it his business to investigate prospective authors personally.

Various factors enter into the selection of authors and into the publication of material submitted by authors. Sometimes the author brings his material unsolicited to the publisher and if it is found to be sufficiently meritorious to justify preliminary examination, that courtesy is accorded. The material is then considered in the light of meeting present-day demands as reflected in the reports of educational committees or other committees representing in a large degree the ideas of the times. The all-important thing is: first, whether there is a sufficient demand for such a book to justify the expense of publication; and second, the quality and organization of the material.

In nearly every case we decide on the subject then seek the author. We seldom accept ready-made manuscripts.

While some good MSS. come unsolicited, our plan is to keep in close touch with the educational pulse and discover those who are doing work of exceptional quality and who, further, have the skill to put their material in usable form. Our company maintains a Textbook Research Department. One of its chief functions is the discovery of authors and materials for publication.

While we are constantly at work on a consistent publishing program and must occasionally ask this or that well-qualified teacher to

prepare us a book or a series to fill a gap, we are, nevertheless, cordially interested in such ideas, projects for manuscripts, or completed manuscripts as may be brought to us by teachers or administrative officers, whether well-known or unknown to us previously. All communications of this nature have our careful attention. From them some of the leading textbooks in the country today have developed. The writing of a conspicuously good textbook is a long, difficult, and sometimes a painful undertaking. In the early stages success is problematical. Inasmuch as we have not asked the author who comes to us in this way, to do the work, we are not obliged to take it unless it finally develops conspicuous merit. A large editorial staff competent to advise concerning the merit of projected manuscripts or finished manuscripts is, of course, essential to editorial hospitality toward the numerous ideas that develop from the experience of the rank and file of teachers in the classroom. Such hospitality is expensive, but we believe it to be in the best interests of educational publishing and of education itself.

Endeavor to find outstanding educators who have developed conspicuously successful work. Suggest putting this experience in shape for school use.

The publishers are evidently always on the lookout for prospective authors; their field men and editorial staffs are on the alert for new ideas and new authors. Some publishers have a special department to discover authors and materials for publication. Often teachers who are doing outstanding work are asked to put their ideas and techniques in manuscript form.

II. PRINCIPLES OF EVALUATION OF MANUSCRIPTS

To the question, "What are the underlying principles that determine the selection of new material either as manuscript or as an idea out of which to build a new textbook (question of authorship, subject matter, method of presentation, etc.)?" typical replies were:

An author must have recognized standing in his field. Subject matter must conform to the educational demand. The educator is responsible for the success of the schools, must say what courses of study are to be, what tools are needed, and must take the blame for success or failure of schools. The publisher undertakes to produce books he thinks schools want and thereby to render a service. He no longer, as was once the case, selects the teachers, makes the course of study and adopts his own books.

This question scarcely can receive an offhand answer. It goes to the heart of the schoolbook publishing business from the standpoint of the Editorial Department. When it is boiled down to a sentence, we could say we endeavor to discern by close observation what the

needs are and proceed on the basis of our best judgment plus the advice of those actually in school work.

First, the need or demand for a textbook in the field concerned; secondly, the most competent and available authorship; third, the selection and preparation of the subject matter, method of presentation, etc., so as best to adapt the book to classroom usefulness.

This question is very difficult to answer. The manuscript itself, if on a subject generally taught, tells the story. Very often, a publisher gambles on a new idea that seems to have merit and the endorsement of leading educators.

We are carefully studying educational trends as revealed at national meetings, through educational addresses, in outstanding books of educational theory, in the courses of the summer schools of universities, and in personal contact with educators. Authors are chosen primarily for their ability to teach and to present subject matter in a thorough and attractive way. We have our own ideas about methods of presentation and, frankly, we select authors whose ideas are in harmony with ours.

We first try to find out who is best suited to prepare a manuscript on a given subject—then try to induce him to prepare a book along the line of the subject we have in mind. We are influenced by surveys, tests, professional books, experiments in class in cities and teachers' colleges, as to use of new materials.

Educational tendencies are determined in various ways by papers read and discussed at the various educational gatherings, by committees appointed to investigate the subject and by whatever other source of information that is, or may be made, available with the single purpose in mind of supplying the demand. Authorship, subject matter, method of presentation, etc., are all important factors.

Authorship must be such as to guarantee its general soundness as to scholarship and organization. Subject matter dealt with must be chosen in the light of modern conclusions as to curriculum needs. MSS. must be in line with forward-looking tendencies in education and not merely good in the conventional sense.

Trends in education. Improvement over other textbooks and new ideas in presentation of subject material. Relation of material to city and state courses of study; relation to prospective state adoptions. Authorship, when it represents national prestige and authority on a certain subject. We are opposed to the use of authors who merely contribute their names because of holding some outstanding position in the educational world. Unless they represent a major factor in the actual writing of the texts we would not accept such authorship.

Is the book thoroughly sound in scholarship? Is it within the grasp of those for whom it is written? In method and in content is it abreast of present knowledge and practice as represented by leading courses of study, by reports and recommendations of important com-

mittees and other investigating bodies, and by the views of the most reliable educational thinkers? With the best efforts of author and editor, can the manuscript be made into a better book than any now available for the same purpose? And, finally, in view of the necessary investment of money and effort, will the financial and educational returns be adequate? In common parlance this generally means, can we count on a wide sale?

These replies indicate that the basic factors controlling the selection of manuscripts are: a need for new material; a manuscript that presents something in advance of anything now used; and an author able to write a textbook.

III. TYPES OF AUTHORS PREFERRED

There has been a marked change in the authorship of textbooks within the past twenty years. Not long ago the titles of textbooks frequently carried the name of the publishing company, for example, the *Heath Readers*, and *Appleton's Geographies*. Then, too, many series of textbooks have carried the name of the author; examples are *Hamilton's Arithmetic*, *Ray's Arithmetic*, *McGuffey's Readers*, *Baldwin's Readers*. At present textbooks frequently have titles which suggest the idea and spirit of the textbook, for example *Every Day Arithmetics*, *Easy Lessons in Reading*, *Live Language Lessons*, and *Child's Own Book of American Geography*.

Authorship has shifted from lay citizens and professional textbook writers to college professors expert in the various school subjects, often working with public-school administrators and teachers. To quote Rugg:

Since 1895, textbook companies, with an eye to sales, have tended more to form partnerships of professors and public school workers—superintendents, principals, or teachers. Few school books get wide adoption that are not prepared by such a partnership of subject matter, authority, and practical school administration.²

The present distribution of authorship is indicated by the answers of nineteen publishers to the question: "What percent of your authors during the last ten years are engaged in college work? In public school work? Or are laymen?" These replies are summarized in Table I.

²Rugg, Harold. "Curriculum-making via national committees," *26th Year-book of this Society*, 1927, Pt. I, p. 65.

TABLE I.—PERCENTAGES OF TEXTBOOK AUTHORS OF VARIOUS TYPES IN NINETEEN PUBLISHING HOUSES

Authors	Percentage		
	Highest	Lowest	Median
School People			
College	60	0	34
Public School	100	35	65
Laymen	17	0	0

The present tendency is clearly to secure authors from among those actively engaged in public-school work and in college teaching. There is also a decided tendency not to enlist the services of laymen in the preparation of textbooks.

A few responses of publishers who did not answer the question in terms of percents are:

“Roughly speaking, all our recent authors of college textbooks have been college teachers, and of public-school textbooks, public-school teachers or supervisors. A few of the most successful books have been written by private-school teachers. None of the books has been written by laymen.”

“No laymen. Ten years is too long a time for a significant figure. Our present authorship is drawn from people engaged in research work, usually closely connected with the public schools.”

“Percentages cannot be given offhand, but certainly 95 percent of our authors are engaged either in college or public school work. Books of our publication prepared for the grade schools are by authors who have had public-school experience, while the high school and college texts are made more largely by college authors. However, we have endeavored for high-school texts so far as possible to secure authors with high-school teaching experience.”

IV. PERCENTAGE OF MANUSCRIPTS ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION

The discriminating policy of publishers is very clearly pointed out in Table II, which is a tabulation of responses to the question: “What percent of manuscripts or part manuscripts presented to your company are accepted?”

Even if “small percentage” be taken as meaning something over 10 percent, the median number of manuscripts or part manuscripts accepted by the publisher is 5 percent or less of those submitted.

TABLE II.—PERCENTAGE OF MANUSCRIPTS PRESENTED THAT ARE ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION

Number of Publishers	Percentage
3	Less than 1
16	5 or less
8	5 to 10
4	“Small”
1	20
1	25
—	
33	

The range of answers to this question is from $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 percent to 25 percent. Many publishers supplement their answer to this question by stating that they do not ‘consider’ many manuscripts; most of their textbooks are written to order.

Typical comments in answering this question are as follows:

Practically no manuscripts submitted to our editorial department are accepted. We usually find the author we think likely to produce the type of textbook we want and then work with him in planning the book and in working it out.

Very low, probably under five. Our plan is to solicit authorship and not give very much attention to manuscripts submitted without solicitation.

Fully 90 percent of the manuscripts actually tendered for publication are rejected either before or after a preliminary examination. Of the 10 percent provisionally accepted, not more than 5 percent are finally accepted and published, the other 5 percent are returned to the authors.

The answers indicate that it is the practice of publishers to select an author to write a textbook rather than to select a manuscript from those offered. They make clear that the initial selection of the textbooks in our schools is done by the publisher.

But while the authorship, content, methods, and mechanical make-up of our textbooks are thus primarily controlled by the textbook publishers, each publisher knows that his books must run the gauntlet of the keenest critics in the world, his rivals, and he must constantly exercise his very best judgment in selecting his manuscripts if he is to succeed. The textbook publisher is a clearing house for the best ideas in education.

V. PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF MANUSCRIPTS BY PROSPECTIVE USERS

Since the publishers must exercise this discriminating influence, must decide what is or what is not to be in a textbook, we are interested in their methods of procedure. The following question was asked to throw light on this problem: "In what way, if any, does the publisher get the reaction of the school administration, supervisor, or teacher to the manuscripts presented for publication?"

Thirty-two publishers replied, thirty to the effect that they secure a definite check on the reactions of the users of the textbooks before they are published. The two others report that their managers, representatives, and editorial staff are in touch with the situation and can pass judgment on the advisability of publishing a textbook in question. Typical replies are:

We submit manuscripts and proofs for examination, criticism, and sometimes for class testing.

The publisher invariably consults several administrators, supervisors, or teachers in regard to a manuscript before it is published.

We usually have them read by some person or persons in position to pass judgment on their adaptability to a given use.

Manuscripts which seem to our editors to have possibilities are usually submitted to outside experts for reading—either to experts in the respective subjects or to experts in school practice, often to teachers in service. And our editors, of course, try to maintain close contact with school administrators and teachers.

If a manuscript offered for consideration is an important one, a major subject such as arithmetic or a series of readers, it is submitted for criticism to educators of recognized standing on the subject treated, and is furthermore reviewed by our representatives, most of whom were educators before entering upon their present work. In the case of proposed books of less importance, a supplementary reader for example, we usually reach our own decision after the MSS. are read by our editors and demonstrators.

We feel that our editorial department contains better judges of the value of a manuscript as a sales proposition than can be found among teachers. Through our agents our editors are in touch with conditions in all portions of the country. It is not a teacher's job to judge of the salability of a new book, and that is exactly the job of the editorial staff. Submitting manuscripts to teachers is a common method of trying to flatter teachers into using a book; we never do it.

Our editorial staff is made up almost entirely of former teachers. They have been trained in the critical evaluation of manuscripts. Nevertheless, we often seek advice outside our own staff; that is, from teachers, principals, superintendents, or college professors. One reader

may be a particularly good judge of the methods of presenting the subject, another may be a subject-matter expert, another may read a manuscript for its place in the school curriculum, another may be chiefly concerned with the English style. Or, if it is an advanced work, a specialist in this or that phase of the subject may be employed to examine it. Nearly all of these readers will be teachers or former teachers. In addition, we occasionally arrange for classroom trial.

We put the material out in trial form for experimental use in classes.

These replies show that publishers usually consult with subject-matter specialists and with others who are in close touch with the classroom in connection with the work of selecting and evaluating manuscripts which are to be published as textbooks. The answers indicate also some use in classrooms of experimental editions of books preliminary to final publication.

VI. DETERMINATION OF THE MARKET FOR A NEW TEXTBOOK

The publishing company, like any business enterprise, must anticipate and measure the need for a new textbook before building one and placing it on the market. An attempt to learn how publishers determine the need and market for a new textbook was embodied in this question: "What criterion do you employ as a publisher to determine the need for a new textbook or to anticipate a market for a new textbook?" Typical replies were:

By receiving constant reports from our field men and the formulation therefrom of records which reduce to a mathematical certainty the extent of the market and the need for new material. This involves of course the extent of dissatisfaction with existing textbooks and involves a clear and accurate understanding of educational movements so that an accurate judgment may be arrived at as to whether new material will be of a sort that will fit requirements coinciding with such tendencies.

Constant watchfulness of educational movements as reflected in addresses and writings, unremitting efforts through field representatives to detect educational tendencies and a real demand for textbooks, and careful study and consideration by our editorial department.

Our field men are required to attend educational meetings and conferences and to keep us acquainted with educational movements from their incipiency. The personality and the position of leaders in new educational movements necessarily become a factor in the publisher's estimate of a probable market.

Reports of committees on curricula, new courses of study, articles in educational periodicals, discussions in educational meetings, reports from our field men—out of all these and other ways comes information about new needs.

All the publishers answered this question and in very similar phrases. The publisher determines educational needs largely by following committee reports, research findings, outstanding courses of study, and educational yearbooks; and he gauges the dissatisfaction expressed for the textbooks now in use. The publisher, through his corps of workers, from the editorial staff to the staff of field representatives, endeavors to anticipate new markets for new textbooks. With the keen competition between publishers it would seem that really worth-while ideas would have no difficulty in finding a welcome from a publisher, who in turn would have no difficulty in finding a market for them.

VII. REORGANIZATION OF MANUSCRIPTS BY EDITORIAL STAFFS

Practically every publishing company maintains a well-organized editorial staff of experts in various fields to pass judgment on manuscripts presented and further to render assistance in reorganizing manuscripts that are accepted. Members of the editorial staffs are chosen with great care and represent those who know the schools and their needs as well as the subject matter, organization, and methods of presenting material in textbooks.

The following question to publishers was expected to yield information on the function of the editorial staff and its contribution to textbook making: "What are the principles involved when the editorial staff of the publisher revises the manuscript of the author?" Typical replies were:

This depends somewhat upon the author. If a manuscript is accepted without reservation on the publisher's part, it may be difficult to insist upon revision to which the author does not agree. The personal element enters into this to a very large extent, also the standing and ability of the author. As a rule our authors are more than willing to receive practical suggestions and to follow a policy of close coöperation.

If the author cannot do the needed revision, we employ someone to do the job.

This would depend entirely on the individual manuscript. Broadly, the principle would be to apply our experience and knowledge in the

editorial staff to enable us to fit particular texts to what we consider present conditions and possibilities for improvement in certain subjects.

Sometimes a manuscript is filled with brilliant ideas but is very sloppily written. In such cases our staff may give a great deal of attention to revising it. Sometimes it contains numerous factual inaccuracies, although presenting some brilliant ideas and very carefully written. We intend to weed out all these inadequacies.

We work with the author through the long process of hammering the book into shape. Of course, so far as possible, we get the author to make the desirable changes in his manuscript.

There is seldom any difficulty as to the revision of a manuscript with an author. If the manuscript has been good enough to warrant acceptance in the first place, the revision is of a minor and routine nature. Most authors are neither editors nor proof readers, and are grateful for whatever polishing of their work seems necessary.

We will not undertake the publication of a manuscript unless the author will accept suggestions from our editors. One book was written four times before it passed muster. Our editors suggest changes of all kinds. Most of our books are the results of much discussion of this sort.

We should not think of revising an author's work without his consent, but uniformly our authors welcome our suggestions. If we have previously agreed to publish the manuscript, the author is free to accept them or not, but even in such cases he will uniformly weigh them carefully and accept most of them. In the preferable case where we have not previously agreed to publish a manuscript, the author is even more desirous to conform to our suggestions, but in either case we make suggestions only; we do not issue commands, except in matters of positive right and wrong. The function of an editor is that of criticism and suggestion; usually it is not the writing or rewriting of textbooks.

Most successful textbooks are made by publishers' editors and not by the authors. Ninety percent of all manuscripts that come into the publisher's office have to be rewritten from *a* to *z*. Either the author does this according to specifications agreed upon with the publisher's editor, or the editor does it, or they both work together. The publisher's viewpoint is a national one; the author's viewpoint as a rule is a more or less local one. Textbooks have to be made to suit the needs of all the states, or in some instances of special regions, and no one author is in possession of a large enough amount of data pertaining to various needs and conditions, as is the publisher.

It seems quite clear that the editorial staff of the publishing company plays a very important part in determining what shall be selected for publication and how the material shall be put up in a textbook. No doubt the publishing company contributes much in this line

and discourages the placing on the market a larger number of presumptively useless textbooks. The editorial staff, in passing judgment on a manuscript, has a national point of view and attempts to interpret what the selectors of textbooks will chose. The aim is, by coöperation between author and editorial staff, to produce a textbook that is practical, without errors, and with possibilities for wide use in the schools. Some books are rewritten many times.

VIII. PUBLISHING EXPERIMENTAL EDITIONS OF TEXTBOOKS

To guard themselves further, to help them in interpreting school needs, as well as to test the practicality of a new manuscript, some publishers submit their new manuscripts to practical trial in the schoolroom before putting them out in textbook form. To determine the practice among publishers on this point, this question was proposed: "What is your practice in the matter of having a textbook tried in manuscript form in the classroom?" Sample responses are:

We have not employed this practice to any considerable extent.

We do not borrow schools for laboratory purposes. This seems to be the author's prerogative; at least they all tell us this has been done.

We established the practice and policy of experimental editions of textbooks that several publishers have begun to follow. It is our regular practice where we can get the authors to coöperate.

In most of our important textbooks, the material contained therein has in one way or another been tested and tried by classroom experiment.

We always want to make sure that all material that goes into our textbooks has been tried out as far as possible. Sometimes we even go to the trouble and expense of printing a book for test use.

If the book is in any sense an innovation, or if there is any doubt in the editorial department as to the general acceptance of certain features of a book, it is customary to have it tried in actual classroom work.

In our plan the textbook is the outgrowth of classroom practice. Carefully selected authorship obviates the necessity of placing the manuscript on trial in a classroom, except under the author's direction.

We never do it. We do not think this is done in good faith. As a method of flattering a teacher and obligating him to use the book when it is published, this has proved to be a very successful device, especially if the publishers mention the teacher's name in the preface. We can recall a case where a new textbook in a certain subject was being read in manuscript form by dozens of leading teachers in the subject. Each one thought he was helping the author to make the book. So many teachers were "helping" the author that it got to be a joke

among our men. Another very successful device is to send proof sheets all over the country to teachers and ask for suggestions and criticisms. Often, enough teachers can be signed up in this way to give a new book an excellent start. We never do this.

We frequently have textbooks tried in manuscript form in the classroom, often by the author or under his direction. We regard the practice highly. The degree of its utility depends in large measure, however, on the form in which the material is offered for experimental use. Typewritten or multigraphed copies afford a much less satisfactory trial than do printed books. An experimental edition, printed and bound in proper form, is, of course, very expensive, but when a publisher is able and willing to issue such experimental editions for use in schools under carefully controlled conditions, this method is of extraordinary value. The sole object should be to perfect the book or the series before publication. Rightly carried through, it is a truly scientific process of very great value to educational progress.

It is our policy to release no book, or books, which have not been tried in the classroom sufficiently long to determine: (1) difficulty in use of vocabulary, (2) pupil's interest, (3) adaptability to grade. We make sufficient mimeographed copies so that at least three groups of 100 children may use the material at least one-half year and in some cases for the full year.

All the publishers answered this question. It does not seem to be the general practice to print experimental editions to try in the school-room. Most publishers assume that the author has tried his technique and content in the classroom before putting his material into manuscript form.

IX. SUMMARY

1. Textbook selection begins with the publisher, who selects authors, manuscripts, and ideas out of which to make textbooks.

2. The publisher's entire force from the editorial staff to the staff of field men is on the alert to discover outstanding manuscripts, teaching ideas, and promising authors.

3. The fundamental considerations in the selection of manuscripts, ideas, and authors for new textbooks are: (1) the need for a new textbook, (2) the qualifications of the author, and (3) the character of the subject matter and the method of presentation.

4. Ability to write a textbook seems to be the guiding principle in the selection of authors.

5. Publishers prefer authors who are professionally active in educational work, especially as college teachers of the subject matter con-

cerned or as public-school workers. Few laymen now write textbooks.

6. Fewer than five percent of the unsolicited manuscripts offered to publishers are accepted and made into textbooks.

7. Practical school people, experts in their special fields, usually pass judgment on manuscripts before they are accepted and made into textbooks.

8. The publisher's entire staff, from the editorial force to the field men, are constantly studying the field with a view to anticipating markets for new textbook material.

9. The publisher's editorial staff passes judgment on manuscripts presented and controls the details of their revision and reorganization into a textbook. The editorial staff has a national point of view and understands what the school people as a whole will accept.

10. The material and methods incorporated in new textbooks have often been tried before publication under actual schoolroom conditions; usually the author, less often the publisher, arranges for such trial.

CHAPTER VI

NEW DATA ON THE TYPOGRAPHY OF TEXTBOOKS¹

B. R. BUCKINGHAM
Lecturer in Education
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

The Committee, desiring a chapter on the typography of textbooks, assigned to the writer the task of making the necessary investigations and of producing such a chapter. At first his plans were ambitious; but as the wide ramifications and great cost of these plans unfolded themselves, he was obliged by successive stages to limit the scope of the undertaking. Yet even on the resulting restricted basis the expense far exceeded available funds. These conditions were explained to the executives of three publishing houses—Ginn and Company, D. C. Heath and Company, and Houghton Mifflin Company. They gladly agreed that their firms should finance the project, sharing the cost equally. Practical suggestions were likewise made from time to time by these executives and by their staffs of editorial and typographical experts.

After the manuscript for a textbook has been written and edited, it has to be printed and bound in the form of a book. Much depends upon the various technical decisions made by the publisher at this point. In fact it is probable that the acceptability of a textbook depends more upon the style of printing, illustrating, and binding than is generally supposed. It is true that most score cards for appraising textbooks assign a relatively small number of points—say 15 in 100—to “mechanical make-up”; but the practice of using score cards is by no means general. Even when such measuring instruments

¹ The following school officials coöperated in giving the tests required by this investigation: Miss Julia E. Joslin, Supervisor of Primary Education, Lynn, Mass.; Mr. Arthur W. Kallom, First Assistant Director Department of Educational Investigation and Measurement, Boston, Mass.; the Sisters of Mercy, Diocese of Providence, R. I.; Miss Ruth E. Dority, Primary Supervisor, Arlington, Mass.; Miss Mary McSkimmon, Principal Pierce School, Brookline, Mass.; and Mrs. Katherine Kelly, Principal Cross St. School, Lowell, Mass. Special acknowledgment is due to Dr. Carl R. Doerning, Assistant Professor of Vital Statistics, Harvard School of Public Health, for the use of sorting and tabulating machines in analyzing the data.

are employed, they are not used exclusively. The general appeal, the first impression of attractiveness, as attractiveness is commonly understood, is hard to discount. The publisher who, after securing good manuscripts and editing them intelligently, would content himself with merely making books legible and durable would soon be driven out of business by publishers who realize the powerful appeal of an artistic appearance.

Prospective purchasers—lest they should not know what ought to please them—have been assisted in reaching aesthetic judgments by the adoption of certain standards, though whence these standards came it would in many instances be hard to say. Of course, when Dr. Bamberger, through the testimony of the children themselves, indicates what our choice should be in the color of book covers, we have no quarrel with the origin of the resulting standards. Moreover, blues and reds cost no more than yellows and browns. If children like certain colors better than others, there is every reason to let them have their choice (although even here other matters are involved, such as variety, decoration, legibility of lettering, and likelihood of soiling).

Most items, however, cannot be disposed of so easily. Their warrant is insecure and compliance with them may be expensive. Among these items are those dealing with the type page—for example, the quality of the paper, the width of each of the four margins, the character of the type (its design, width, and weight), the size of type, the length of the line, the interlinear spacing, and the space between words. On all these matters printers have recognized certain kinds of standards. According to them, the fore and foot margins bear some relation to each other. The interlinear spacing is related to the size of the type and both are related to the length of line. The printers' standards, however, are of an aesthetic character. They are designed to produce a pleasing page. Moreover, they permit of much variation. For example, it is quite impossible from the point of view of the printer to say that ten-point type is not so desirable as fourteen-point type. If the printer is dealing with ten-point type, his rules are designed to give him an artistic page just as certainly as they will if he is dealing with fourteen-point type.

The school, however, recognizes standards quite different from those of the printer—in fact, standards which have nothing to do with fine printing and which have grown up quite apart from the canons of the printer's craft. It is customary, for example, to favor primers

and first readers only if they are printed in eighteen-point type, generously leaded, with short irregular lines and wide spacing between words. Moreover, a great many colored pictures are demanded. Indeed, it is not unusual for pictures to constitute half of the book. Accordingly, the average primer has been reduced to an affair of three to five thousand words, or the contents of ten or twelve ordinary book pages.² Clearly this is expensive. The expense becomes evident when—as is invariably the case in progressive schools—one primer after another has to be purchased to furnish sufficient reading material.

First readers frequently have fewer than 10,000 words and second readers fewer than 20,000. Even the latter is still to a large extent a picture book, while the type page still exhibits a generous use of paper. The usual second reader, as far as printed matter is concerned, would not occupy more than sixty pages of an ordinary book. The writer does not remember ever to have seen in the numerous score cards for judging readers any item regarding the quantity of printed matter in the book. Strange that such books should be judged without reference to the amount of practice they afford in reading!

This should not be construed as an attack upon the features of primary reading books which add to their cost. The cost may be justified. In some cases we feel sure that it is. If the pictures in a primer unite with the text so as to make it more meaningful, they are almost certainly an aid to the learner. They make it easier for him at a time when we wish to place every facility at his disposal. Even pictures which merely heighten interest without actually joining with the text in carrying its message will be welcomed by many teachers, although others will observe that this heightened interest is a divided interest and hence distracting. But pictures—and we have a great quantity of them—which are merely introduced in order to have one on every page or one on alternate pages or one after an interval of not more than five pages—such pictures are inserted from the outside according to a formula. They may have no relation to the value of the book as an aid to the children in learning. They may even be an obstacle. Undoubtedly, however, they are very effective in appealing to the adults who select and purchase the books.

It is worth noting that in the present investigation all the stories were printed without pictures. They were good stories and the chil-

²The type area of the "ordinary book page" which the writer has under his eye at the moment measures $3\frac{3}{4}$ " x $6\frac{1}{8}$ ". It is set in large ten-point type, with slight extra leading. A setting of eleven-point type with normal leading would amount to the same thing. Such a page would contain quite 400 words of the size used in primers.

dren were hugely interested in them. They did not need the help of pictures. Their responses to questions on the text showed that they had *made their own pictures*.

The story of pictures, however, is not the one we have set out to tell. Illustrations have a bearing only as part of the general problem of the 'dressing' of a textbook. We are here concerned with the printed page and in particular with its size of type, length of line, and interlinear spacing. We shall note the part that they play in making a textbook expensive; and we shall inquire what relation these undoubted factors in expense bear to the readability of the printed matter. First, however, we shall trace the course of opinion and of experimental findings on these matters during the past thirty or forty years.

I. HOW THE MATTER STANDS

As early as 1892 Burnham³ quoting the conclusions (which refer to adults) of the German investigators, Cohn and Weber, gave 1.5 mm. as the minimum height of letters.⁴ Ten-point type will ordinarily have about this height. It is stated that according to Weber speed of reading was retarded when the size of type was greater than 2 mm. (say, 12-point). Interlinear space of 3 mm. and a length of line of 100 mm. (maximum) was required for the ten-point type. This interlinear space is less than was used in any of the samples in our investigation, while the suggested maximum for the length of line was approximately equal to the longest line employed by us. In general Burnham's statements permit a more compact type page than is usually allowed by subsequent investigators.

In 1896 Griffing and Franz⁵ experimented with twelve adult observers, each of whom read 1.8 mm. type and 0.9 mm. type. The results showed that on the average it took a little less time to read the larger type than to read the smaller—about 0.9 as much. When three-word and four-word phrases were exposed for one-twentieth of a second, only about half as many words were seen in the small type as in the large. A few additional experiments with very large type indi-

³ Burnham, William H. "Outlines of school hygiene." *Pedagogical Seminary*, 2:1892, 9-71 (pp. 49-51 devoted to reading).

⁴ In this article the height of letters means the height of those letters which have neither ascenders nor descenders, such as m, n, u, etc. This may be referred to as the height of the m. It is assumed that, unless stated to the contrary, the investigators mean the height of the m when they speak of the tallness of type.

⁵ Griffing, Harold, and Franz, S. I. "On the conditions of fatigue in reading." *Psych. Rev.*, 3: 1896, 513-530.

cated that legibility increased with size and that unled type was less legible than led. As to size, the conclusion was that "no type less than 1.5 mm. in height should ever be used"; and this agrees with Burnham's recommendation. Roughly speaking, ten-point type is regarded as the minimum for adults.

Shaw, in his *School Hygiene* (Macmillan, 1902), after quoting the recommendations of Cohn previously mentioned, comments to the effect that "in the lower grades, the type in which books are printed should be much larger than the smallest permissible size allowed by Cohn." Shaw then makes the recommendations given in Table I, though where he obtained them is not apparent.

TABLE I.—TYPE DIMENSIONS RECOMMENDED BY SHAW

Year	Minimum Size of Type, in mm.	Leading, in mm.
First.....	2.6	4.5
Second.....	2.0	4.0
Third.....	2.0	4.0
Fourth.....	1.8	3.6
Above fourth year.....	1.6	3.0

These recommendations are of little value to printers. They were made at a time when practice was quite different from what it is today. For example, the minimal size of type recommended for the first grade, namely, 2.6 mm., is rather baffling. Eighteen-point type is about 2.9 mm. high⁶—meaning, as Shaw no doubt means, the height of such letters as m, n, or u. Most series of type⁷ contain no sizes

⁶ At least the eighteen-point type used in this investigation is 2.9 mm. high (height of m). As a matter of fact, the point system as applied to type is not a measure of the size of the type, but rather of the size of the body on which the type is cast. All that "eighteen-point" really means is that the body of the type in question is eighteen points high, a point being 1/72 inch. This in turn means that matter set in eighteen-point type without leading will have a fixed number of lines per inch or per standard page, no matter what series of type is used. But it does not mean that the height of the letters as printed will be the same in different series of type. This depends on how much of the body is occupied by the letter and how much is left for interlinear space. Since the type used in this investigation (Monotype Number 8) is not extreme in this matter, statements of equivalence between height of letter in millimeters and number of points will be made with reference to that series of type.

⁷ The design of the type—its individuality, so to speak,—runs throughout a series. Each series consists of all or nearly all the recognized sizes of type body and is equipped with capitals, small capitals, and small or "lower case" letters, with italics, bold face, etc. All these letters have a shape, stroke, and size on the body which are characteristic of the series. Typical series are Cheltenham, Caslon, Century, Bodoni, Scotch, and so on.

between eighteen-point and fourteen-point. The latter is only about 2.25 mm. in height and hence cannot be used to meet a 2.6 mm. standard. According to printing conditions, therefore, a demand for "at least 2.6 mm." actually requires eighteen-point type.

The requirement of "at least 2 mm." for the second and third years is likewise disconcerting to the printer, especially when taken in conjunction with the demand for a 'leading' of 4 mm. Two millimeters is a nice round number, but not when translated into the units which the printer must use. Twelve-point type is not infrequently under 2 mm. in height. Accordingly, a printer could not use twelve-point type in one of these series and represent his product as conforming to Shaw's standards. The next size of type is fourteen-point. It is about 2.25 mm. high, as has already been stated. The printer will therefore have to use fourteen-point type in the second and third years if he is to conform to these standards.

Shaw's standard of 1.8 mm. for the fourth grade will generally mean twelve-point type, though some series which run large on the body may have this height in eleven-point.

Shaw apparently confuses 'leading' with 'interlinear space.' Even when type is set without leading, or 'solid,' there is perceptible space between the lines. Additional space is secured by the leading—that is, by narrow blank strips of metal inserted between the lines of type. The space secured by the leading alone is almost never as much as that already afforded by the blank part of the type.⁸ On account of the size of the figures which Shaw gives, it is fair to assume that he means interlinear space when he uses the term leading, because the 4.5 mm. called for in the first grade, to take an instance, if it were truly leading, would mean something like fifteen points, which is ridiculous.

The next question that arises is how Shaw means to have 'interlinear space' understood. If it is measured between letters like m, n, and u on successive lines, that is one thing; if it is measured between the descenders of one line and the ascenders of the next, that is another thing. The former method is customary and of course yields a considerably larger figure. For this reason, and also because Shaw's figures would be absurdly excessive according to the second method,

⁸ When space between lines is referred to in this chapter, the term, unless otherwise stated, means the space between such letters as m, n, u, o, etc., on successive lines.

it is assumed that in Table I 'leading' means 'interlinear space' measured between short letters of successive lines.

Shaw's statements illustrate two points: first, that so-called 'standards' which have subsequently been uncritically adopted by educational people have apparently been plucked out of the air; and second, that these standards have little reference to present printing conditions.

Huey,⁹ in 1908, summarized the experimental evidence and opinion which had accumulated up to that time. He quoted Cohn, Weber, and Griffing and Franz as above. He also quoted with evident approval Javal's findings in regard to length of line. According to Javal, long lines of print cause eye strain because fixation points are often nearer to one eye than to the other and because these differences in distance are constantly changing through rather wide ranges. Accordingly, Javal argues for short lines. He also argues for moderate leading, believing the space available for wider leading would be used to better advantage by increasing the size of type. This leads Huey to say: "A certain amount of leading should be required in school books, at least, but hardly more than Cohn's minimum of 2.5 millimeters" (page 409). Probably this refers to upper-grade books.

Assuming that 'leading' means 'interlinear space,' which is the only tenable assumption, this statement is altogether unacceptable for type in lower-grade books. In the present investigation seven different interlinear spacings were employed. The smallest of these resulted from three points of leading with twelve-point type. This yielded an interlinear space of 3.25 mm., which is considerably more than Cohn's minimum (converted by Huey into something like a maximum). If eighteen-point type is used—and Shaw's standards call for its use—the spacing without any leading at all would exceed 2.5 mm. In other words, the standard would be physically impossible to meet with type of that size. Even fourteen-point type set solid would probably still be spaced in excess of 2.5 mm. Obviously, then, neither eighteen-point nor fourteen-point could be used, since the lines can be no closer together than the shoulder of type will permit. Obviously, too, the sixteen-point type (found in some series) would be unavailable. The largest type which could be employed according to this standard for interlinear spacing would be twelve-point type with perhaps one point of leading. Even this degree of leading is a concession, because it might yield interlinear space slightly in excess of 2.5 mm. In the standard here

⁹ Huey, Edmund B. *The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading*. Macmillan, 1908. Especially Part IV.

quoted no distinction is made between books for primary and upper grades. The spectacle of little children using books printed in twelve-point type with one point of leading or no leading at all would indeed be revolutionary.

A slight relief is afforded by Huey in his argument for short lines. Although his own experiments favor a very short line, he refers to Dearborn's conclusions in support of a line of "moderate length" and sums up by stating that the tendency is to favor a 90 mm. line as a maximum. (This is practically the length of the 'intermediate' line used in the present investigation.)

Finally Huey (pp. 416-17) repeats the standards set up by Shaw in his *School Hygiene* "as the most usable approximate statement of what may properly be insisted on."

In 1911 a "Committee on the Standardization of School Books, etc." reported to the American School Hygiene Association at its fifth annual conference. Attention was given to the size of type, length of line, and "leading" in which school books should be printed. No new evidence was offered and Shaw's figures of 1902 were presented without change, just as these figures had been quoted by Huey in 1908. These standards (Shaw's) have an air of finality. They are so compact and neat that they are readily quoted in the general treatises on textbooks. For example, Hall-Quest in *The Textbook* quotes (p. 87) Shaw's figures without comment or acknowledgment as "Standards for Younger Children." It appears that with the lapse of time and with sufficient repetition these figures have now come to be accepted without question.

At the 1913 meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science a report was made by the "Committee to Inquire into the Influence of Textbooks upon Eyesight."¹⁰ Apparently no experimental evidence was secured by this Committee. Nevertheless, based upon what one may suppose to be a summary of existing evidence, together with the judgment of the Committee, a "Standard Typographical Table" was offered. Table II is a reproduction of this table with respect to size of type, interlinear space, and length of line. The writer has inserted parenthetically in column one the grades in the American school to which the ages approximately correspond.

¹⁰ *Report of the Eighty-third Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Birmingham, 1913.* John Murray, London, 1914. Pp. 268-300.

TABLE II.—THE STANDARDS OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE, 1913

Age of Reader	Minimal Height of Face of Short Letters, in mm.	Minimal Interlinear Space in mm.	Maximal Length of Measure of Line, in mm.
Under 7 yrs. (Grade I).....	3.5	6.5
7-8 yrs. (Grade II).....	2.5	4.0	100
8-9 yrs. (Grade III).....	2.0	2.9	93
9-12 yrs. (Grades IV-VI) ..	1.8	2.4	93
Over 12 years.....	1.58	2.2	93

The reader will observe that for the second grade this standard calls for a 2.5 mm. type as a minimum. This will ordinarily not allow fourteen-point type because such type is generally more than 2.5 mm. high. Sixteen-point type might be permitted, but it does not exist in most series. Accordingly, eighteen-point type is in general the type which must be used to meet this minimal standard for Grade II. Shaw's standard only required fourteen-point type in Grade II. Eighteen-point was reserved for Grade I. Thus, generally speaking, the standard of the British Association calls for eighteen-point type in the second grade unless sixteen-point is available, in which case the latter may be used. It may be remarked in passing that few if any textbooks for the second grade are set in type as large as eighteen-point type and that this standard would mean a material addition even to the present high cost of publishing a given amount of matter for use in that grade.

As to interlinear space, the British Association standard for the second grade repeats the Shaw standard—namely, a minimum of 4 mm. This is a very small amount of interlinear space when taken in conjunction with the fact that the British Association standards usually call for eighteen-point type. Generally speaking, this minimum means only one point of leading—which would present a decidedly crowded appearance with eighteen-point type.

As to length of line, it will be noted that the British Association standard permits 100 mm. in connection with the large type for the second grade. This is a longer measure than has usually been suggested. It is, however, justified, as the Committee points out, because it meets the practical difficulty of securing an even set of large letters on a short line.

In 1921 Bentley¹¹ reported his experiment on leading, using a twelve-point face and body of a monotype series. His length of line was kept constant at $3\frac{5}{16}$ inches. He used ten leadings, from 0 to 9 points inclusive, and employed eighteen readers. The best results were secured from seven-point leading. This is quite at variance with

¹¹ Bentley, Madison. *Leading and Legibility. Psych. Monographs*, 30:1921, No. 3.

practice, since twelve-point type is never set so wide. The investigation, however, cannot be criticized because it did not sustain present practice. Bentley specified accurately the conditions of his experiment, and his conclusions are entirely practicable to reproduce in a printing establishment. So far as the writer is aware, however, no one has done so.

In 1922 and 1923 Blackhurst¹² reported in three separate articles on size of type, leading, and length of line. Fifty second-grade children read material in each of the five common sizes of type, from ten-point to twenty-four-point, all other factors except size of type being made constant. Since the record was taken not only in speed but also in errors made while reading, it is assumed that the reading was oral.

For the second grade Blackhurst found an unbroken trend toward better reading, speed and errors considered, as the type increased in size. In other words, twenty-four-point type (height, 4.00 mm.) was read with greatest facility, while eighteen-point, fourteen-point, twelve-point, and ten-point followed in that order. Since twenty-four-point type was the largest size read by these children, it is quite possible that Blackhurst's subjects would have continued to show better results with still larger type.

Readings by thirty-six second-grade children were employed in securing evidence as to interlinear space. The following spacings were used: 1.00 mm., 1.33 mm., 1.66 mm., and 2.00 mm. This spacing was measured in a peculiar manner—between the descenders of one line and the ascenders of the next line. This makes comparison with the measures of other investigators impossible. The term "leading" is erroneously used for this spacing. No marked advantage was found for any one of these spacings, although a slight advantage is seen for lines set 1.33 mm. apart.

Finally, forty-eight second-grade children supplied the evidence as reported by Blackhurst on length of line. These lengths ranged from 55 mm. to 142 mm. If size of type and interlinear spacing were kept the same, some of these lengths would, at least from the point of view of practice, be regarded as absurd. The most desirable length

¹² Blackhurst, J. H. "Size of type as related to readability in the first four grades." *Sch. and Soc.*, 16: 697-700; "Leading as related to readability in the first four grades," *Sch. and Soc.*, 17: 363-364; "Length of line as related to readability in the first four grades," *Sch. and Soc.*, 18: 328-330.

of line is said to be from 90 to 103 mm., with evidence that the latter figure is nearer the desirable length.

This separating of size of type, length of line, and interlinear spacing as Blackhurst has done is wholly artificial. None of these exists by itself. No length of line, for example, can be said to be most desirable, independent of these other characteristics of the type page. For example, the 103 mm. line which is recommended without regard to size of type or interlinear space would be intolerable if the type were six-point, set solid. Four such lines would look like this:

There was to be a circus on Saturday. Bill could hardly wait for Saturday to come. Father told Bill that he would take him to the circus. They would go to see the parade too. At last Saturday morning came. Father and Bill started off for the parade. Father found a fine place to stand where they could see the parade.

It may be argued that the combining of the unqualified length of line with six-point type set solid is a bit of special pleading. With what, then, should it be combined? Perhaps the natural answer is that it should be combined with the best size of type and the best interlinear spacing revealed in Blackhurst's companion articles. This means that for the second grade twenty-four-point type is to be used with 1.33 mm. of spacing. This spacing is shown in the article to be equivalent to one point of leading. The setting of twenty-four-point type with one-point leading would be ridiculous. The printer, if he wishes to follow Blackhurst, will now have to decide to abandon either the twenty-four-point size or the 1.33 spacing. If he decides to hold to the twenty-four-point standard, he will now come into difficulties with the length of line. "From 90 to 103 mm." sounds as if the choice was easy. As a matter of fact, twenty-four-point type cannot be set with reasonably regular spacing between words on a line as short as 90 mm.

Five years later Blackhurst¹³ apparently went back to the standards of Shaw and Huey. He suggests a 90 mm. line, not even mentioning the 103 mm. line which he formerly preferred, and without conceding, as the British Commission with a better eye to practical conditions did concede, a longer line in connection with large type. In size of type he thinks that, until additional evidence has been secured, the recommendations of Shaw and Huey should be followed. He regards leading as important, but says that the appropriate amounts of it have not been determined.

¹³ Blackhurst, J. H. "Hygienic standards in type and format of reading materials." *Elem. English Rev.*, 5: 101-103, 118.

In 1923 Gilliland¹⁴ concluded that the reading of average adults was not greatly affected by changes in the size of type and that children were not affected so much as adults. "Size of type, therefore, is not relatively as important a factor in the reading of children as has sometimes been supposed." This conclusion is in line with the investigations of eye movement in the psychological laboratory at the University of Chicago. As early as 1918 Judd reported that "When all the variations are taken into account, it can be said that there is only a very slight change in the number of words recognized at each fixation in spite of the doubling of the size of the type."

In April and June, 1929, articles by Tinker and Paterson¹⁵ report investigations as to size of type and length of line. The findings do not immediately concern us, since they were based upon readings by college students. Ten-point type was read more rapidly than six-point, eight-point, twelve-point, or fourteen-point. An 80 mm. line was read more rapidly than any other of eight lengths varying from 59 mm. to 186 mm. The point was made in this investigation, as it was made in others, of keeping "other factors constant."

II. THE PROBLEM EMERGES

Summarizing, the writer wishes to make two points: first, that several of those who have given out standards have simply used their imagination; and second, that those who have made real investigations have obtained results of limited practical value.

A word on this second point. An investigator observes the law of the single variable; that is, he allows one variable to change while holding others constant. This is good experimental technique. It is an article of faith among investigators. Yet it won't work in the way in which it has been applied to typography unless one is prepared to go to very unusual lengths with it.

For example, in one especially good investigation a piece of printed matter is set in ten-point type on an 80 mm. line—a perfectly proper and normal arrangement. Both shorter and longer lines, all set in ten-point type, are compared one by one with the 80 mm. line and each time the 80 mm. line is read more easily. From this, of course, one

¹⁴ Gilliland, A. R. "The effect on reading of changes in the size of type." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 24: 1923, 138-146.

¹⁵ Tinker, Miles A., and Paterson, Donald G. "Studies of typographical factors influencing speed of reading, II. Size of type." *Jour. of Applied Psych.*, 13: 1929, 120-130; "III. Length of line." *Ibid.*, 205-219.

can conclude nothing as to the universal superiority of an 80 mm. line. One cannot even say (although the investigators in this case suggest it) that a line of 80 mm. is best for ten-point type. The results are valid only for the interlinear spacing employed, and the investigators do not tell us what that is. Widen the spacing and the probability is that a longer line may be employed to advantage. In fact, the situation is more complicated; the results are valid only for the series of type used with its characteristic shape of the letters, its height of the type face on the body (all ten-point type is not of the same height), its expansion or right-and-left spread-outness, and its width of heavy and light strokes. Accordingly, the printer, not knowing what series of type he may use, nor the spacing he may have between the lines, must be very sanguine if he suppose that merely by setting ten-point type on an 80 mm. line he is attaining desirable results. As a matter of fact, he supposes no such thing. He realizes that essential items are missing and probably wonders how the investigators 'got that way.'

In reality, it is too great an undertaking to carry out such an investigation along the lines usually employed. Suppose, for possible application to textbook printing, we recognize the seven pointings of type from eight to eighteen inclusive, eight lengths of line (as called for in the investigation just referred to), and an appropriate number of interlinear spacings, say ten (this is more or less a guess; there would be a large number). We now have 560 different specimens and we have said nothing about type series. We should certainly want three or four of the most typical series. With four series we would need 2240 specimens. But some series have varieties within them—expanded, standard, and condensed letters, and heavy, normal, and light strengths of line. Perhaps, to prevent our specimens from taking still higher flights, we may stabilize these variables by specifying normal expansion and strength of line. Then, since in textbook printing we recognize different standards for different grades, we shall want to submit each of these 2240 specimens at least to the first, second, third, and fourth grades; and in each of these grades, separately considered, we shall want enough returns to give us confidence in our results. The writer would certainly not wish to do with less than 200, or 800 for all four grades. This means 1,792,000 returns. No one is prepared to undertake any such task.

There is a way out and the present investigation is designed to show what it is. The law of the single variable is not denied. It is merely given a different application. For each series of type (and sub-series, if any) there need be but one variable after a few matters,

such as size of the edition, weight and quality of paper, and style of binding, have been determined. That variable may be the *total cost* required to set a standard amount of matter, the cost, let us say, of paper, presswork, and binding (plates excluded) for a book of 20,000 words. Or the cost of binding may be left out of account, since it is relatively constant, and the one variable may be merely the *cost of paper and presswork*. Again, the one variable may be taken as the *total area of the type pages* resulting from the setting of the matter according to given specifications. The point in any case is that one inclusive or composite variable may be chosen. Practically it makes little difference which of these three variables is used. In fact, it was found that if a given amount of matter was set according to a series of eighteen different specifications, the correlation¹⁶ between area and total cost, as above defined, was 0.93, that between area and cost of paper and presswork 0.88, and that between total cost and cost of paper and presswork 0.94. Any actual specification as to size of type, length of line, and amount of leading for a book of a given length works out to require a definite area of type pages, and the cost, either of the unbound paper pages or of the bound book, can be estimated by practical rules of procedure. Let us then set up our material according to a few well-recognized specifications so described that the printer can reproduce them. Then let us find (a) the total area of the type pages or the cost of a book made according to each of these specifications and (b) the readability of each of the specifications. That is our problem.

III. THE SPECIMENS

The type used in the investigation was a modern face known as Monotype No. 8, having normal 'set' and medium expansion. This is a type often employed in printing primary-grade books. The text was printed in eighteen different ways. Each way is called a *specimen*. There were three sizes of type, namely, eighteen-point, fourteen-point, and twelve-point. In the face, or series, of type here used the height of m for the eighteen-point is 2.9 mm.; for the fourteen-point, 2.25

¹⁶ At certain points in this discussion correlation figures will be mentioned. In all cases a very general statement of relationship is believed to be sufficient—that is, such a statement as may be made in terms of rank. Accordingly, one of the inspectional methods has been employed, namely, the 'Foot Rule.' Each R-value has then been converted into an r-value by one of the usual conversion tables.

mm.; and for the twelve-point, 1.9 mm. There were three lengths of line—the so-called ‘A’ line of 24 picas (4 inches, or 101.5 mm.) the ‘C’ line of 21 picas ($3\frac{1}{2}$ inches, or 89 mm.), and the ‘E’ line of $14\frac{1}{2}$ picas ($2\frac{7}{16}$ inches, or 61.5 mm.). Finally, there were three amounts of leading, namely, five-point, four-point, and three-point.

The specimen which was set in eighteen-point type on the A, or longest, line with five points of leading was coded as 18A5; the twelve-point type on the E, or shortest, line with three-point leading was known as 12E3; and so on. The E line was not used with eighteen-point type because it is impracticable to set such large type in so short a line. Five-point leading was not used with fourteen and twelve-point type because in textbook printing such wide leading is generally regarded as appropriate only for larger type. This practice was apparently justified by the results of our experiment.

TABLE III.—THE EIGHTEEN SPECIMENS USED IN THE EXPERIMENT

Size of Type	Interlinear Space		Length of Line		
	Leading	Total	A 4 inches 24 picas 101.5 mm.	C $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches 21 picas 89 mm.	E $2\frac{7}{16}$ in. $14\frac{1}{2}$ picas 61.5 mm.
1	2	3	4	5	6
18-pt. (2.9 mm.)	3-pt. 4-pt. 5-pt.	4.50 mm. 4.90 mm. 5.20 mm.	× × ×	× × ×	
14-pt. (2.25 mm.)	3-pt. 4-pt.	3.75 mm. 4.10 mm.	× ×	× ×	× ×
12-pt. (1.9 mm.)	3-pt. 4-pt.	3.25 mm. 3.60 mm.	× ×	× ×	× ×

Table III shows by the crosses the eighteen specimens. The reader will note in Column 3 the total amount of interlinear spacing (the distance between short letters in two successive lines) resulting from the different amounts of leading. This space between lines consists of two elements: (1) the blank part of the metal pieces containing the letters; and (2) the thin strips of blank metal inserted between the lines by the printer. These strips are called ‘leads’ and the amount of *additional* interlinear space produced by them is called

'leading.' The unit of measurement for leading is the point ($\frac{1}{72}$ inch, or 0.35 mm.). Because of the varying amounts of blank metal on different type bodies, the same number of points of leading does not produce the same interlinear space. Thus when eighteen-point type of the series we are using is given three points of leading, the total interlinear space is 4.50 mm. For the fourteen-point type the same leading makes the space only 3.75 mm.; and for twelve-point type, only 3.25 mm.

In the final investigation three stories—the result of considerable sifting—were each set according to the eighteen specifications already described. Figure 1 shows the first two lines of one of these stories as they appeared in each of the specimens.

The technical specifications for preparing the specimens were based on standards which should obtain in any printing establishment equipped to do textbook work. In addition to the requirements already indicated, it was specified that all the impressions should be from type, and in full color but without excess of ink; that normal spacing should be provided between words—*i.e.*, nine-unit for the sizes of type employed; and that the type was to be assembled in regular paragraph form with the usual one-em indentation of the first line.

The trimmed paper page was to be $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches by $7\frac{5}{16}$ inches. It was used for all specimens regardless of length of line. The paper was of English Finish grade and heavy weight. The back and fore margins were necessarily varied according to the length of line, but the head and foot margins were constant.

IV. SELECTING THE READING MATERIAL

Stories were submitted from the readers of the three coöperating publishing companies. Since the intention at first was to run the experiment in the first and third grades, the selections were from first and third readers—thirty from the former and twenty-five from the latter. One of the first-grade stories was printed according to eighteen different specifications and tried at Lynn. It proved to be too difficult for first-grade children. The trial showed also the impracticability, in the time at our disposal, of carrying out the test on first-grade children. Accordingly, our plan was revised. The third grade was dropped from consideration and the first-grade stories were critically studied for use in the second grade.

18 A 5 The night was so warm that Rob
18 A 4 could not get to sleep. His mother

18 A 4 The night was so warm that Rob
18 A 3 could not get to sleep. His mother

18 A 3 The night was so warm that Rob
18 A 2 could not get to sleep. His mother

18 C 5 The night was so warm that
18 C 4 Rob could not get to sleep.

18 C 4 The night was so warm that
18 C 3 Rob could not get to sleep.

18 C 3 The night was so warm that.
18 C 2 Rob could not get to sleep.

14 A 4 The night was so warm that Rob could not
14 A 3 get to sleep. His mother had pushed his

14 A 3 The night was so warm that Rob could not
14 A 2 get to sleep. His mother had pushed his

14 C 4 The night was so warm that Rob
14 C 3 could not get to sleep. His mother had

FIG. 1. THE EIGHTEEN SPECIMENS OF TYPE

14 C 3 The night was so warm that Rob
14 could not get to sleep. His mother had

14 E 4 The night was so warm
14 that Rob could not get to

14 E 3 The night was so warm
14 that Rob could not get to

12 A 4 The night was so warm that Rob could not get to
12 sleep. His mother had pushed his bed up close to

12 A 3 The night was so warm that Rob could not get to
12 sleep. His mother had pushed his bed up close to

12 C 4 The night was so warm that Rob could not
12 get to sleep. His mother had pushed his bed.

12 C 3 The night was so warm that Rob could not
12 get to sleep. His mother had pushed his bed

12 E 4 The night was so warm that
12 Rob could not get to sleep.

12 E 3 The night was so warm that
12 Rob could not get to sleep.

After some sifting three stories were chosen. They were slightly altered so that they had practically the same length, about 324 words, and the same vocabulary difficulty as determined by a graded word list. The length was intended to represent three to four minutes' reading. A trial of these stories in mimeographed form at Lynn showed that we had now gone too far the other way. They were too easy for second-grade children.

The three most suitable stories were now increased in vocabulary difficulty, printed all in the same set-up, and tried in the Boston schools. The teachers reported that two of the stories were so inferior to the third in interest that, in spite of the equating of mechanical difficulties, the stories were by no means equivalent. Inequality of interest, that is to say, bade fair to be a disturbing variable. Accordingly, we selected five additional stories to examine along with the one which had just proved to have high interest value. These six stories were all mechanically equivalent as nearly as we could determine. They were read to second-grade children in Boston and the children were asked to tell us which one they found the most interesting. By a pooling of these votes three stories were secured, namely, *The Circus*, *Nathan and the Bear*, and *The Parade*; and these stories constituted the text material for the final experiment.

The three stories were printed according to the eighteen specifications already referred to. Each story was equipped with twelve multiple-choice questions for testing comprehension. The first two of these questions, in each case, constituted a foretest. The remaining ten questions made up the real test. Subsequent trial of the material showed that something was still left to be desired in the equating of the difficulty of the stories. Table IV shows some of the facts about the stories.

TABLE IV.—COMPARISON OF THE THREE STORIES USED

	<i>Circus</i>	<i>Nathan</i>	<i>Parade</i>
No. of running words	333	338	323
Ratio of over-grade words to total words018	.015	.010
Time of reading (medians)*	3:15	3:28	3:00
No. of questions correct (medians)*	8.6	9.9	8.8
Speed and comprehension combined†	3.50	4.24	3.85

*Based on the performance of 94 children, each of whom read all three stories.

†The method of combining speed and comprehension is explained farther on.

Table IV shows that, while the three stories are not identical in difficulty, they are not distressingly different. The figures for "speed and comprehension combined" are the most significant. Their meaning may be explained as follows:

If a very great number of stories were assembled ranging in difficulty for second-grade pupils from very easy indeed to very hard indeed, with regard to time of reading and comprehension, it would be practicable to divide this extreme range into convenient units. The unit here employed is the range which defines the middle fifty percent of the children. In statistics this is called the probable error. Now there are about eight such units between stories of practically no difficulty and those of exceedingly great difficulty. The last line of Table IV means that the difficulty of the particular stories is in each case between $3\frac{1}{2}$ and $4\frac{1}{4}$ units on this eight-point scale, and that the stories differ by no more than three-quarters of a unit.

V. THE CHILDREN WHO READ THE FINAL SELECTIONS AND THE METHOD OF TIMING THEIR READING

The three selections which have just been described were read in May and June, 1930, by second-grade children in the public schools of Lynn, Massachusetts, and Boston, Massachusetts, and in the schools of the diocese of Providence, Rhode Island. At Lynn there were 1337 children, at Boston 407, and at Providence 266—total 2010. Every class read three stories, each in a different typographical form. In order to utilize all the comprehension questions, the timing was carried out upon a "constant work" plan. That is, every child read the whole selection, indicated his conclusion of it, and thus established his time of reading.

Experiment had proved that even with an assistant in the classroom the teacher could not reliably secure the timing of more than fifteen pupils in a class. In each case these fifteen pupils were selected for timing on the basis of their reading age, as determined by a previous performance on the Stanford Reading Test, Form W. The children chosen for timing were those who, according to this test, showed reasonably equal ability in reading. They were so seated as to be conveniently observed by the teacher. It is to be understood that all the children in every class were at the time of reading our selections treated in the same manner. All of them read the selections, reported their completion of each reading, and received the comprehension questions. All children were given as much time as they needed for answering these questions.

The total number of usable returns from the children who were timed was 2337. Since each child read three selections, this meant that 779 children were represented.

VI. THE RESULTS OF THE READING

As has already been indicated, both speed and comprehension were recorded for 779 children. Most of the previous investigations have been carried out on the basis of speed alone. The fact that we have used comprehension as well as speed is one of the departures from custom which this investigation involves. Another departure is the large number of cases from a given grade. So far as the writer is aware, no one has hitherto reported on more than fifty children for a grade.

Table V shows for each of the specimens the median time of reading and the median percent of comprehension based on the answers to ten questions. The table likewise shows the number of readings

TABLE V.—MEDIAN SPEED AND COMPREHENSION FOR EACH OF THE EIGHTEEN SPECIMENS

Specimens	No. of Readings	Median Speed of Reading		Comprehension	
		Time, in min. and sec.	Rank	Percents	Rank
18A3.....	132	4:11	14	83.2	2
18A4.....	94	4:01	11	71.0	15
18A5.....	136	4:25	17	75.5	11
18C3.....	121	3:39	6	68.7	18
18C4.....	141	3:27	5	75.9	8
18C5.....	125	4:51	18	77.3	7
14A3.....	156	3:52	8	70.9	16
14A4.....	114	4:18	15	80.7	4
14C3.....	124	3:42	7	82.3	3
14C4.....	108	4:00	10	75.6	10
14E3.....	177	3:19	3	71.1	14
14E4.....	100	3:55	9	70.0	17
12A3.....	150	4:02	12	71.4	13
12A4.....	127	4:07	13	75.8	9
12C3.....	123	4:22	16	80.2	5
12C4.....	111	3:17	2	77.5	6
12E3.....	155	3:08	1	74.0	12
12E4.....	143	3:25	4	85.7	1
Total.....	2337				

for each specimen. It will be noted that in but one case did the number of readings fall below one hundred. The table also shows the rank of the samples according to the speed with which they were read and according to the degree of comprehension.

1. Speed

The specimen known as 12E3 (see Table V) was read more rapidly than any other. By this time the reader will hardly need to be reminded that this specimen was set in twelve-point type (12) on a short line (E) (61.5 mm.) and with three points of leading (3). A glance at Figure 1 will give the reader a picture of the first two lines of this specimen.

Apparently, so far as speed is concerned, this same twelve-point type may be set on a materially longer line without much loss, provided the leading is increased. In other words, specimen 12C4 was read nearly as rapidly (3 min., 25 sec.) as 12E3 (3 min., 8 sec.).

If the size of type is increased to fourteen-point and the line is kept short, the leading may be reduced to three points and still have an advantageous set-up. In other words, specimen 14E3, which ranked third in point of speed, was read practically as rapidly (3 min., 19 sec.,) as 12C4.

The specimen which ranks fourth in point of speed is another example of twelve-point type, namely, 12E4. In fact, it appears that, so far as speed is concerned, the twelve-point type makes the best showing, especially if it is set on a short or medium line or has generous leading. The eighteen-point type does not put in an appearance until rank five and rank six, when that size of type set on an 89 mm. line with three-point or four-point leading shows to reasonable advantage. The 89 mm. line, or the 'C' line as we are calling it, is about as short a line as it is practicable to use with eighteen-point type. Apparently, however, if five points of leading are used in this situation, the spacing is too great for rapid reading; for the 18C5 specimen makes the worst showing of all the specimens, ranking eighteenth in the list. On the whole, then, the speed record for the specimens we have employed gives a slight advantage to the twelve-point type over the fourteen-point type, with the eighteen-point type a rather poor third.

Another interesting trend is exhibited in the speed figures of Table V. The short line is read more rapidly than the long line. Note these groups of items drawn from Table V:

	Rank		Rank		Rank
18A3	14	18A4	11	18A5	17
18C3	6	18C4	5	18C5	18
14A3	8	14A4	15		
14C3	7	14C4	10		
14E3	3	14E4	9		
12A3	12	12A4	13		
12C3	16	12C4	2		
12E3	1	12E4	4		

Inspection of these items will show that there are within the seven groups fifteen possible pairings of lines of different length with size of type and interlinear space the same. In all but three instances the shorter line has the advantage—and even the three reversals are small. They would doubtless be removed if the number of readings were materially increased.

It is easily seen that when the line is about as short as can well be used with the size of type in question, an advantage is gained in speed of reading—unless the leading is extreme. Only when the eighteen-point type is set on the C line does it make a good showing, and not then if it is leaded too much (18C5). The E line, which is about as short as is practicable with fourteen-point type, is better than either the A or C line. With the twelve-point type the E line (which is only about $\frac{1}{4}$ inch longer than the usual newspaper line) likewise shows to advantage. Type of that size could be set on a somewhat shorter line. Whether this would yield still better results, our data do not tell us.

2. Comprehension

One may question the advantage of using comprehension scores in a study of this sort. The pedagogy of the question is rather clear. The school has little interest in the speed with which a child can read what he does not understand. Indeed, unless reading is understood it can hardly be called reading. Moreover, without the check of comprehension the time in which some pupils will report that they have read a passage is exceedingly misleading. This was in part the reason for securing data on comprehension. Perhaps the same advantages could have been obtained by submitting the comprehension questions

to the pupils and then using the speed records of those only whose comprehension records reached a defined minimum.

In percents of comprehension and the rank of these percents for each specimen Table V discloses a sequence that differs from that pertaining to speed. There appears to be no close relationship between speed and understanding.¹⁷ As the ranks stand in Table V there is a small negative correlation ($r = -0.23$); but it is not very reliable, mainly because of the small number of pairs of numbers. The safest inference is that the type page which facilitates rapid reading is a little more likely to obstruct comprehension than it is to facilitate it, while the type page which retards reading has an equally slight tendency to yield opposite results in respect to comprehension. Examples of wide departure from the speed showing are easy to pick out. For instance, 18A3—large type, long line, and small leading—was read slowly, ranking fourteenth in that respect. On the other hand, it ranked second in point of comprehension. 18C5, which, as we have already said, was the worst of all the samples in speed, was nevertheless better than average in comprehension. 14A4, which was fifteenth in speed, came up to fourth in comprehension. 14E3 took the opposite turn; from being third in speed it fell to fourteenth in comprehension. Other similar shifts will be easily noticed in Table V.

When, however, the comprehension figures of Table V are closely scrutinized, it is again found that the specimens set in twelve-point type make a better showing than do those set in fourteen-point type and eighteen-point type. On this basis, however, the eighteen-point type makes a somewhat better showing than the fourteen-point type.

As to length of line, the comprehension record shows no clear trend. Note that 18A3 stands very high and that when the line is shortened (18C3) the showing is very bad. On the other hand, with a little more leading, the same size of type shows the opposite change when the line is shortened. In other words, 18A4 makes a poor showing while 18C4 makes a rather good showing. In one place the shortening of the line seems to produce consistently poorer results; this is with the fourteen-point type well led. 14A4 ranks fourth, 14C4 tenth, and 14E4 seventeenth. Here, then, the successive shortening of the line produces successively poorer results in comprehension.

¹⁷ Not to be confused with the correlation between speed and understanding for pupils. The evidence is that this is positive.

However, the matter is not so simple, for we come upon another place where shortening the line produces an equally consistent *improvement* in comprehension; this is with the twelve-point type well leaded. 12A4 ranks ninth, 12C4 sixth, and 12E4 first.

When figures behave this way, they are of doubtful value. One hypothesis may be that there is no advantage in having pupils answer comprehension questions. Each one may read a passage with a practically constant degree of understanding—that is, enough to satisfy him—no matter how the reading matter is printed. In that event, the investigators have been right in relying upon speed records alone—provided they could assure themselves that the pupils really did read without skipping or skimming. Perhaps in order to meet this proviso, a set of questions is justified even if one discards the record on them. Or such questions may be justified as a means of assuring that the speed records are worth using; that is, pupils falling below a certain degree of understanding may be dropped from consideration.

Again, the haphazard figures for comprehension may be due to defects in the test for comprehension. The writer is quite sure that the test would have been better if there had been more and harder questions. In one of the preliminary experiments a set of twenty questions was used. But objection was raised to the length and difficulty of the test and in the final experiment only ten questions were included.

3. Speed and Comprehension Combined

Whatever be the significance of the irregularities in the comprehension scores, it seems the part of wisdom to discover how the eighteen specimens will rank if speed and comprehension are combined in one array.

Table VI makes this combination of the figures for speed and for comprehension. The combination has been made by a straightforward statistical procedure, a detailed description of which would be out of place here. In brief, the median time for each sample was expressed as its excess above or defect below the median for all samples, and the result in each case was then divided by the variability of all the readings. Assuming the median to be at 4 P.E. above the practical zero for a distribution of second-grade readings, the ratios just mentioned were increased by four, thus referring them to this hypothetical zero and getting rid of negative signs. The resulting figures

were then multiplied by 100 in order to banish the decimal points. The same procedure was followed with respect to the comprehension figures. The mean of the speed figures and the comprehension figures was then taken as the general achievement of the pupils on each of the samples (Column 4). This gives equal weight to speed and comprehension. Any one who might wish to weight these items differently has the data in Table VI for doing so.

TABLE VI.—THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE CHILDREN, SPEED AND COMPREHENSION COMBINED FOR THE EIGHTEEN SPECIMENS

Specimens	Achievement on Comparable Basis			
	Speed	Compre- hension	Both (equal weight)	Rank on Both
18A3.....	375	435	405.0	7
18A4.....	390	375—	382.5	16
18A5.....	354	397—	375.5	17
18C3.....	422	363	392.5	10
18C4.....	440	399	419.5	5
18C5.....	316	405	360.5	18
14A3.....	403	374	388.5	13
14A4.....	364	422	393.0	9
14C3.....	418	430	424.0	4
14C4.....	391	397	394.0	8
14E3.....	452	375	413.5	6
14E4.....	401	369	385.0	14
12A3.....	389	377	383.0	15
12A4.....	381	398	389.5	11
12C3.....	358	420	389.0	12
12C4.....	455	406	430.5	2—
12E3.....	469	389	429.0	3—
12E4.....	443	447	445.0	1—

Figure 2, which gives the data of Table VI in graphic form, shows very clearly the extent to which the different specifications yield different results as to speed of reading, comprehension of the matter read, and what we may call 'general merit in reading.' The reader will note that the specifications differ rather widely when speed alone is considered, but that they are closely bunched together in respect to comprehension. Moreover, owing to the fact that a number of the specifications made an opposite showing in comprehension from their showing in speed, the clustering of the samples on the combined basis is likewise marked. The writer is not entirely satisfied to infer that these samples really do differ by such small amounts with respect




FIG. 2. THE EIGHTEEN SPECIMENS ARRANGED ACCORDING TO SPEED, COMPREHENSION, AND SPEED AND COMPREHENSION COMBINED

to comprehension. Part of this closeness of clustering around 400 is doubtless due to the shortcomings of the test questions; to the extent that this is true the huddling together of the specifications on the comprehension basis is likewise affected. Very likely little harm is done to any conclusions which we are likely to draw from the combined figures. A better comprehension test would only have the effect of spreading these results more widely. In other words, the difference between the more effective specifications and the less effective specifications would be greater, and any argument based upon the difference here exhibited would be strengthened.

As was to be expected from the run of the comprehension figures, the ranking of the specimens on the combination basis is appreciably different from their ranking according to speed. In fact, the correlation between speed alone and speed and comprehension combined is only about +.70. Nevertheless, the twelve-point type with the short line is still clearly advantageous; 12E4 takes first rank, and 12E3 takes third. According to speed these two specimens were respectively

fourth and first. The twelve-point type with the well-led intermediate line (12C4) occupies second position. Take away one point of leading, however, and it drops to twelfth place. Yet three points of leading are quite sufficient with fourteen-point type set on the C line. In other words, while 12C3 takes twelfth place, 14C3 is only surpassed by the three 12's just mentioned.

Only two of the six 18's make a better-than-average showing. In fact, three of them occupy, respectively, the worst position, the second worst, and the third worst. Indeed, the combining of the comprehension figures with the speed figures has seemingly served to place the twelve-point type in a stronger position and the eighteen-point in a weaker.

4. Relation of Readability to Area and Cost

Yet there are two of the eighteen-point specimens (namely, 18C4 and 18A3) which rank well in the series. Two or three of the 14's also make a good showing. Although in none of these cases is the rank at the very top, it is possible that other considerations, not as yet the subject of this inquiry, might cause us to prefer them in the actual printing of a book. On the other hand, the specimens which rank at the very top in speed and comprehension might be undesirable on other grounds.

We have already suggested what some of these other grounds may be. Let us consider first the area of the type pages needed to set a given amount of reading matter. The significance of this area is easily seen. At several points in the present discussion it has been evident that size of type and interlinear space may to some extent be substituted for each other. The series of type which are large on the body afford less interlinear space than do those which are small on the body. Ten-point type is hard to distinguish from eleven-point type of the same series if the former is given an extra point of leading. Some commentary on the possible substitution of interlinear spacing for size of type may be gathered from certain pairings taken from Table VI. When fourteen-point type is reduced to twelve-point and at the same time given an added point of leading, the ranking is improved in five out of a total of seven instances. In fact, it is possible to think of all the factors which affect the area covered by a fixed amount of matter (including spacing between words, expansion, and so on) as the *spread* of the printed matter. This spread has a clearly

evident and important relation to cost, on account of the amount of paper involved and the extent of the presswork required in running an edition.

In order to get at this matter of spread, the writer now assumed that a manuscript of 20,000 words was to be put into type. He secured the estimated number of full pages which such a manuscript would require, according to each of the eighteen specifications with which we have been dealing. In making this estimate one word was taken as equivalent to 4.7 characters. These numbers of pages (to the nearest whole number) are entered in Column 2 of Table VII. The pages, however, are not the same. The A line yields a type page 4" x 6", the C line 3½" x 6", and the E line 2⅞" x 6". Accordingly, the pages in Column 2 of Table VII were converted into square inches (Column 3).¹⁸

It is clear that there is a very great difference between the smallest and the largest areas (Column 3). The twelve-point type

TABLE VII.—AREA AND READABILITY COMPARED FOR THE EIGHTEEN SPECIMENS, ASSURING THEIR USE IN A BOOK OF TWENTY THOUSAND WORDS

Specimen	No. of Full Pages	Total Type Area		Rank and Speed of Reading	Rank in Speed and Comprehension Combined
		sq. in.	Rank		
1	2	3	4	5	6
12E3.....	108	1580	1	1	3
12A3.....	66	1584	2	12	15
12C3.....	76	1596	3	16	12
12A4.....	70	1680	4.5	13	11
12C4.....	80	1680	4.5	2	2
12E4.....	116	1696	6	4	1
14C3.....	98	2058	7	16	4
14A3.....	86	2064	8	8	13
14E3.....	142	2076	9	3	6
14C4.....	104	2184	10	10	8
14E4.....	150	2194	11	9	14
14A4.....	92	2208	12	15	9
18C3.....	154	3234	13	6	10
18A3.....	138	3312	14	14	7
18A4.....	144	3456	15	11	16
18C4.....	166	3486	16	5	5
18C5.....	172	3612	17	18	18
18A5.....	152	3648	18	17	17

¹⁸ Slight discrepancies are still to be noted, since the numbers of pages were taken, as above stated, to the nearest whole number.

with three points of leading requires less than 1600 square inches, while the eighteen-point type with five points of leading requires over 3600 square inches. None of the twelve-point specifications occupies more than 1700 square inches. The fourteen-point specifications run from about 2050 to 2200, while the eighteen-point specifications all require over 3200 square inches. The economy with which this matter may be set according to the different specifications obviously, then, varies greatly. One may be prepared to believe that the cost of paper and presswork may be twice as much in some of these cases as in others—a belief which is supported by estimates which have been furnished to the writer.

If, now, we place beside the figures for area, the ranks of the different specifications according to readability we are startled by the similarity in the ranking. In fact, as an inspection of Columns 4, 5, and 6 leads one to conclude, there is a substantial correlation between area and speed of reading and likewise between area and the combination of speed and comprehension. According to the Foot-Rule method, these correlations are, respectively, .51 and .38.

This is an amazing result. If there were no correlation at all between readability on the one hand and area on the other, we should be able to say in general that considerations of economy need concern us but little in the choice of our type page. When, however, considerations of economy actually enforce those of readability; when, in short, there is a tendency for the most readable type likewise to be the most economical in manufacturing, then the case seems to be closed. *The two great factors of readability and cost are not in opposition but are in reality in alliance.*

The figures of rank in Column 4 of Table VII are a bit misleading. It would be well to think of the first six ranks as substantially the same. The corresponding figures for area vary only from 1580 to 1696. All the specimens set in twelve-point type cover a relatively small amount of area. In point of speed three of these specifications rank among the first four of the entire eighteen. In point of speed and comprehension combined these specimens rank 1, 2, and 3. They are 12E4, 12C4, and 12E3. The fourteen-point type occupies materially more space independently of length of line or of leading, and only one of these specifications is as good as rank 6 on the speed-comprehension basis. The eighteen-point type shows up very badly.

It requires practically twice as much space as the twelve-point type, and only in one instance (namely, 18C4) does it occupy a really favorable position as to readability.

If a publisher uses this series of type (Monotype No. 8), the figures indicate rather conclusively the superiority of the twelve-point type set on a short line. If a publisher is unwilling to adopt a fourteen and one-half pica line he can still use the C line (twenty-one picas) with good economy and high readability. In other words, he can adopt 12C4. If he dares not risk the publication of a second-grade book in twelve-point type and is willing to take fourteen-point type, his best selection will be 14C3.

The writer secured figures on the cost of manufacturing an edition of 10,000 copies of a 20,000-word book according to each of the specifications. It was understood that this book was to be printed without illustrations of any kind on English-finish paper of standard grade weighing seventy pounds per ream of five hundred sheets, twenty-five by thirty-eight inches in size. Although figures were secured for binding this book, they are not here used because they have only a remote bearing upon our problem; moreover, they are relatively constant for variations in format such as these specifications produce.

Accordingly, in Table VIII is given the estimated cost of paper and presswork for each of the specimens. The figures are the cost of one hundred copies. The lay reader may not appreciate the number of special considerations which enter into the actual figuring of cost. Most of these special considerations have to do with the cutting of the paper to advantage and the waste or lack of it due to the way the book breaks into signatures. The result is that some of the specimens are shown to less advantage and others to greater advantage than would be the case in figuring upon another length of book. In the long run—that is, for many different books—the cost of paper and presswork will more nearly conform to the figures for area given in Table VII than they do in this instance. It is for this reason that area figures may, paradoxical as it may seem, prove to be better cost figures than the cost of figures themselves.

The reader will readily note that there is far from complete agreement in Table VIII between the ranking on the basis of cost (Column 3) and the rankings on the basis of readability (Columns 4 and 5); nevertheless there is no actual opposition, for by the method

TABLE VIII.—COST (PAPER AND PRESSWORK) OF ONE HUNDRED COPIES OF A BOOK OF TWENTY THOUSAND WORDS AFTER EACH OF THE EIGHTEEN SPECIMENS COMPARED WITH THEIR READABILITY

Specimen	Cost of Paper and Presswork		Rank in Speed of Reading	Rank in Speed and Comprehension Combined
	Amount	Rank		
1	2	3	4	5
12A3.....	\$3.35	1	12	15
12A4.....	3.55	2	13	11
12C3.....	3.68	3.5	16	12
12C4.....	3.68	3.5	2	2
14A3.....	4.13	5	8	13
12E3.....	4.38	6	1	3
14A4.....	4.43	7	15	9
14C3.....	4.62	8	16	4
12E4.....	4.75	9	4	1
14C4.....	4.79	10	10	8
14E3.....	5.55	11	3	6
14E4.....	6.01	12	9	14
18C3.....	6.98	13	6	10
18A5.....	7.11	14	17	17
18A3.....	7.49	15.5	14	7
18A4.....	7.49	15.5	11	16
18C4.....	7.50	17	5	5
18C5.....	7.72	18	18	18

we have been using the actual correlation between cost and speed is .16 and that between cost and the combination of speed and comprehension is .20. This means that on this particular job the printer would not be confronted with serious conflict between cost and readability.

The cheapest means of printing this 20,000-word book is with twelve-point type on the A (4-inch) line with three points of leading. But such printing ranks considerably below average in readability. Here, then, we have an opposition of claims to favor. The most conspicuous high rank is taken by the 12C4 specimen. This set-up costs only \$3.68 for paper and presswork and ranks second in point of readability. 12E3 is likewise indicated for favorable consideration. If, however, the publisher is averse to using twelve-point type for second-grade children, his best selection according to these figures would be 14E3. If eighteen-point type is to be employed the choice lies between 18C3 and 18C4. 18C3 costs about half a cent per volume less than 18C4

for paper and presswork. On the other hand, 18C4 is appreciably more readable, especially when both rate and comprehension are taken into account.

The writer is as keenly aware as the reader can be of the limitations of this study. As has already been explained, the time, effort, and amount of money involved were too great to permit the investigation to cover more ground. Nevertheless, within its narrow range the experiment has evident bearing upon practice. It is hoped and believed that further effort may produce usable information over a wider range of type variation and of school conditions.

•

CHAPTER VII

CURRENT PRACTICES IN SELECTING TEXTBOOKS FOR THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

FRANK A. JENSEN
Superintendent of Schools
Rockford, Illinois

The conclusions of this chapter are based on the responses of 172 city superintendents to a questionnaire which was sent to the superintendents of schools in all cities whose population was between 25,000 and 250,000. This number of questionnaires returned was 80.2 percent of the number sent. Only those parts of the questionnaire which are pertinent to current practice in selecting textbooks will be considered in this chapter. The responses of thirty-three publishers to a questionnaire sent to thirty-five firms are also used as evidence for some of the conclusions in this chapter.

I. AUTHORITY FOR SELECTING TEXTBOOKS

1. The Adopting Unit

What should be the legal unit for which textbooks should be adopted? Should it be the local district, the county, or the state? The answer to these questions has not been scientifically determined. Many people would answer: The larger the unit of administration, the better, if books are being adopted for a fairly homogeneous population. However, in a state where there is a diversity of interests, occupations, and social customs, it would be very difficult to justify uniform adoption. An industrial city may need books which are somewhat different from those used in an agricultural community.

A study of the laws affecting the selection of textbooks indicates that the authority for selection by any adopting unit is given or implied by the legal enactments of the state. Fifteen of the twenty-five states having the state as a unit for textbook adoptions exempt all cities of a certain size. Cities in all except ten states have city or district control in selecting textbooks.

2. Final Authority in Cities

The distribution of final authority in passing judgment on textbook selection in 172 cities is indicated by the report in Table I, of the responses to the question: "Whose authority is it to pass final judgment in the matter of textbook selection in your city? Check: (a) board of education, (b) committee of board of education, (c) superintendent of schools."

TABLE I.—FINAL AUTHORITY IN SELECTING TEXTBOOKS IN 172 CITIES

Authority	Number	Percent
Board of education.....	132	76.7
Committee of board.....	7	4.1
Superintendent of schools.....	33	19.2
	172	100.

The function of selecting textbooks is given to the cities by the state constitution or by special legislation. In some instances the function is specifically declared in the state code, but usually it is implied in the general statement of local educational control.

A change may be made in the school books used in the public schools by a vote of two-thirds of the whole school committee, at a meeting thereof, notice of such intended change having been given at a previous meeting. (State Code of Massachusetts)

Duties of the school directors: Eighth—to direct what branches of study shall be taught, what textbooks and apparatus shall be used, and to enforce uniformity of textbooks in the public schools; but they shall not permit books to be changed oftener than once in four years. (Illinois)

3. The Responsibility of the Superintendent

In practice, however, the responsibility for selecting textbooks rests with the superintendents of schools. This fact was indicated by the answers to the following question: "If this authority rests with the board of education: (a) Is it exercised by a committee of the board of education? Yes or No. (b) Or, do they act on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools? Yes or No." Of the 161 answers, 148 showed that the board of education acts on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools.

The superintendent's responsibility for recommending textbooks is specified in the rules and regulations of most of these city boards

of education. Often where the committee system still exists, and especially where boards of education have large membership, the superintendent recommends textbook changes to the board of education through a committee, usually called "the educational committee of the board of education." The following regulations of boards of education are characteristic statements of the duties of the superintendent with respect to the selection of textbooks:

He shall recommend textbooks and apparatus for the use of the general school system. (Joliet, Illinois)

He shall prepare and submit to the Board the courses of study to be pursued in the several schools. He shall recommend the adoption or discontinuance of text and supplementary books. (Somerville, Massachusetts)

The Superintendent shall recommend appropriate text and reference books, school supplies, apparatus, and furniture for the use of the schools, and shall submit such recommendations to the Board for its approval. (Elizabeth, New Jersey)

He shall prepare and submit to the Board for approval, the several courses of study to be followed and shall select and recommend to the Board for adoption all textbooks used in the schools. In the preparation of such courses and the selection of such textbooks, he shall have the coöperation of other officers of instruction and of such special committees of teachers, principals, and supervisors as he may from time to time appoint for such specific purposes. (Detroit, Michigan)

The following two quotations are to the point in the matter of who must carry the ultimate responsibility in selecting textbooks for a school system:

A man who is educationally big enough to be the superintendent of a school system should be big enough to assume all responsibility for the selection of textbooks. To appoint a textbook committee to vote on texts means in many cases that the superintendent is afraid to stand before his constituency and say, "I did it. What have you to say about it?" The committee divides the responsibility as well as the censure of the community, if any. To leave the vote in the hands of teachers is an admission that the superintendent knows little about the subject under discussion. If several books are to be adopted, a committee vote always means compromises and compromises should not enter into the selection of texts.¹

The superintendent must assume all the responsibility for the selection of textbooks. He appoints a committee, yet the burden of respon-

¹ Taber, C. W. "Selecting textbooks; the publisher's point of view." *Proceedings of N. E. A.* Salt Lake City, Utah, July 7, 1920.

sibility rests with him. He delegates to the committee the right and authority to do a piece of work but this act does not divide responsibility. An effort to transfer responsibility by a superintendent is sometimes made by placing the vote for the selection of textbooks in the hands of the teachers. This is either an open admission that he doesn't know anything about the work to be done or that he has not the courage to assume the responsibility. At least it is an effort to divide responsibility.²

The evidence collected and presented here shows clearly that in cities the responsibility for selecting textbooks rests upon the superintendent of schools.

II. ORGANIZATION FOR EVALUATING TEXTBOOKS

The next item of the questionnaire sent to superintendents was: "As a basis for the superintendent of schools' recommendation to the board of education, (a) Does he examine personally the available textbooks? Yes or No; (b) Does he have a textbook committee? Yes or No." The answers to this question show that ninety percent of the superintendents in these 172 cities use textbook committees and that more than half of them also examine the textbooks personally. The distribution of answers is shown in Table II.

TABLE II.—BASIS FOR SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION IN 172 CITIES

Basis	Yes	No	No Answer	Total
Personal examination of textbooks				
Number {	111	51	10	172
Percent {	64.5	29.6	5.9	100
Recommendation of committee				
Number {	156	11	5	172
Percent {	90.7	6.4	2.9	100

Some of the comments which accompanied the answers were:

Superintendent confers with leading teachers. (Illinois)

Director of curriculum makes recommendations based on committee reports after conferring with director of elementary instruction. (Colorado)

Examine textbooks but not very thoroughly. (Wisconsin)

Examine some of them. All recommended by committee or department head. (New Jersey)

²Rader, L. W. "Scientific selection of textbooks." *Fourth Yearbook. Department of Elementary School Principals*, 1925, pp. 298-302.

Problem is being handled by committees reviewing the curriculum. (Massachusetts)

The assistant superintendent is the committee.

Teachers individually recommend books to the superintendent of schools who lists the books recommended and presents the best to the school board. We have no committee. (Pennsylvania)

It is the policy in our school system to appoint committees of able teachers to canvass the field of available material where a change of textbook is desired. These committees are appointed with considerable care and their recommendations constitute a major factor in changing texts in this city. (Ohio)

The matter of selection of textbooks is left entirely in the hands of the superintendent to make the recommendation to the textbook and supply committee, who, in turn, recommend to the board and always uphold any selection made by the superintendent. The superintendent selects textbooks on merit as a result of scores given by the several teachers and principals working on a committee for that purpose. Textbooks are never selected without having been tried in the schoolroom by the teachers and the scores made out only after practical application. (Illinois)

The complaint about the inadequacy of a textbook goes to the principal; the principal carries it to me. I make an investigation of the situation to determine the correctness of the teacher's judgment. If I find a textbook is not meeting the school's needs, I have the teacher make an investigation of all recent texts on the subject. I then select from her selection and make a report of the results to the chairman of the textbook committee, who is a member of the board of education. He then brings the matter to the attention of the board for action. (Ohio)

The usual plan for the adoption of textbooks has been to have a committee of teachers, carefully selected, recommend the textbooks for the department in which they are working. This committee studies textbooks of all publishers which might be considered and then brings in a recommendation to the superintendent, who after consultation with the principals of the schools concerned, makes final decision. The board usually adopts the books thus recommended without question. (Pennsylvania)

The data presented in Table II and the supplementary comments made by superintendents indicate that in common practice the city superintendent of schools has a committee, of one kind or another, to advise him on the problem of selecting textbooks.

III. THE ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL OF TEXTBOOK COMMITTEES

1. The Origin of Committees

The textbook committee is organized in order to advise the superintendent of schools in the matter of selecting textbooks, and it is usually organized by him: of the 161 superintendents who answered the question, "Who appoints your textbook committee?" 155 said that the superintendent did so.

2. The Personnel of Committees

Information on the composition of textbook committees was gained from the responses to the question: "In a committee of seven, how do you distribute the personnel of the committee among teachers, supervisors, principals, administrators, and board of education members?"

Of the 172 questionnaires returned, 76 were completely answered; 41 answered by giving a check (✓) for those who should be on the committee without giving relative value among them; while 55 did not answer the question at all.

The distribution of the total membership of the committee suggested by the 76 superintendents who answered the question completely and by the 41 superintendents answering the question merely with a check (✓) to indicate who should be on the committee (without assigning the number of each to be on the committee) is shown in Table III. Each check mark was taken to represent one member.

TABLE III.—SUM OF MEMBERS SUGGESTED FOR TEXTBOOK COMMITTEES SUGGESTED BY 117 CITY SUPERINTENDENTS

Personnel	76 Specific Replies		41 General Replies	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Teachers	296	55.0	41	32.3
Principals	129	24.0	38	29.9
Supervisors	69	12.8	30	23.6
Superintendents	40	7.5	18	14.2
Board Members	4	0.7	0	0.0
Total	538	100.0	127	100.0

A suggested composition for a textbook committee of seven members is obtained in Table IV by combining the two sections of Table III and pro-rating the membership. It is evident that, according to the practice in most cities, a typical textbook committee would be

made up one-half of teachers, one-quarter of principals, and one-quarter of superintendents and supervisors.

TABLE IV.—SUGGESTED DISTRIBUTION OF MEMBERSHIP ON TEXTBOOK COMMITTEE
(Based on Table III)

Personnel	Number	Percent	Committee of Seven	
			Theoretical Number	Actual Number
Teachers	337	50.6	3.54	4 or 3
Principals	107	25.1	1.76	2 or 2
Supervisors	99	15.0	1.05	1 or 1
Superintendents	58	8.7	0.61	0 or 1
Board Members	4	0.6	0.04	0 or 0
Total	665	100.0	7.00	7 7

Comments by superintendents of schools in regard to the personnel of textbook committees are suggestive of the distributions among teachers, supervisors, and principals:

Appoint supervising principals and ask them to consult with teachers. (Illinois)

In our grades five teachers are selected to try for a year as many different publications. Results are discussed by teachers, supervisors, and principals. May hold several conferences; written report is finally submitted to me. (Maryland)

Committees are composed of teachers acting under leadership, generally of a supervisor. (Massachusetts)

There are eight elementary school principals who meet with the superintendent every Wednesday at 4 P. M. At these meetings textbooks are reviewed and discussed when necessary. (New York)

3. The Number of Members

The next item of the questionnaire was designed to collect superintendents' opinions as to the optimal number of members for a textbook committee. The question was: "How many members should be on the textbook committee?"

Of the 172 superintendents answering the questionnaire 135 specified the number of members they thought a textbook committee should have; 20 said indefinitely that the number "varies;" 17 failed to answer the question. The distribution of opinion among the 135 superintendents who answered the question is shown in Table V.

TABLE V.—DISTRIBUTION OF OPINION ON SIZE OF TEXTBOOK COMMITTEES
AMONG 135 CITY SUPERINTENDENTS

Size of Committee	Number Favoring	Size of Committee	Number Favoring
1	1	9	3
2	1	10	2
3	16	11	2
4	19	12	2
5	36	13	1
6	25	14	1
7	17	15	2
8	7	Total	135

The following comments on the size of the textbook committee were made by superintendents of schools or publishers:

All the principals and supervisors. (New Jersey)

Usually three. This committee may seek the services of the sub-committees. (Alabama)

Certainly not more than three. (Publisher)

A committee of three or five having knowledge of the subject matter of the textbook to be selected seems to be all right. (Publisher)

A small textbook committee of three to seven of the representative teachers, principals, and supervisors. (Publisher)

Three to five. Keep off the lazy ones. Be sure members are chosen for qualifications rather than because of twenty years' service. (Publisher)

The tabulation of the responses to the question as to the optimal size of the textbook committee and the comments of superintendents of schools and publishers leads one to place the number as five, with a possible range from four to seven (representing the limits of the middle fifty percent of answers). No doubt different textbook problems will call for committee of different sizes, but this study shows little excuse for a large committee.

IV. OPEN AND SECRET COMMITTEES

A textbook committee is generally considered a 'secret committee' if it is so organized and operated as to guard such information as the personnel of the committee, its size, and its functions. Its personnel or even its existence is supposed to be known only to its members and to the one who appoints them; this knowledge is supposed particularly to be kept from the publishers and their representatives. In an 'open committee' it is understood that publishers and their representatives can present their books to the committee; in a 'secret com-

mittee' it is understood that publishers and their representatives cannot present their books to the committee or interview its members.

1. The Practice of Superintendents

In Table VI are tabulated the superintendents' responses to the following question: "Are your textbook committees open or secret?"

TABLE VI.—OPEN AND SECRET TEXTBOOK COMMITTEES IN 159 CITIES

Type of Committee	Number	Percent
Open	130	81.8
Secret	23	14.4
Secret and Open	6	3.8
Total	159	100.0

The following comments on secret committees show how varied are the attitudes:

Open except to publishing trade, who are not to reach the members of the committee; nor are committee men permitted to read advertisements, plans, prints, or schedules setting forth merits of certain books. (Illinois)

Open to our teachers, but secret to book agents. (Wisconsin)

Secret, except on the day set when agents may appear before committee. (Ohio)

Secret if I understand your question. Book agents may interview only the chairman. (New York)

Some meetings are open, while others are closed. (Nebraska)

Certainly *not* secret. (New York)

I would not have a secret committee. (Missouri)

Open except to interested representatives of publishers. (Michigan)

We find that there is no such thing as a secret committee. We have had trouble due to leakage—there is no perfect way, but we prefer to be open and above board for the most of the work. (Georgia)

2. Publishers' Statements on the Secrecy of Committees

A question regarding secret committees was presented to the publishers in this form: "As a publisher, have you found that there often exists a secret committee?" The following comments indicate publishers' reactions to the secret textbook committee:

I never heard of one.

There is often a 'secret committee,' so-called. Nothing does more to destroy confidence and good faith in a school administration than the appointment of such a committee.

It is doubtful if there is ever a secret committee that some publisher does not know about.

Unfortunately, yes.

There are very few strictly secret committees. It seems that in most instances there are some book representatives who have either direct or indirect access to the workings of such committee.

Apropos of textbook adoptions, this morning's mail brings a score card from a little town over in Michigan. I will enclose a copy. Commenting on the situation, our representative says, "Agents will not be allowed personal interviews with the committee. The committee will be convened some time during the month, and the agent given 30 minutes in which to present his claims. There are 13 companies competing. Each company has sent 8 sets of books. If they would use the samples for texts, they would have about enough books to supply the classes without any adoption."

The publisher's representative is entitled, as an expert in his line, to know who are the people he should see to present his book and to speak for his book to those whose responsibility it is to select textbooks.

Then there is a tendency which seems to me to be a very dangerous one, which expresses itself in so-called 'secret committees.' If there is anything in the teachers' world in which there should not be secrecy, it is in learning all that she can about the relative values of books. No one can help her in this work so much as the well-qualified agent. Because there are some agents who are bores, the doors ought not to be shut against those of intelligence and scholarship and ability to explain. To the superintendent or supervisor who desires merely to "pass the buck" and who shelters himself or herself against an unwise selection, this sort of method of selection will appeal; but it seems to me that, since the great number of superintendents and supervisors are honest and fearless and anxious to make no mistakes, they ought to invite help rather than to exclude it.

Occasionally, we find that textbook representatives, who are supposed to be experts in the field, are forbidden admission to the committee who is selecting the textbooks. Such action is like the purchasing of an automobile without consulting an automobile dealer, the buying of life insurance without consulting a life insurance representative, or the buying of a suit of clothes without consulting a tailor or a clothes merchant. It is true that bookmen have sometimes abused the courtesies and privileges extended to them, but as a rule, if definite arrangements are made for consultation between the bookmen and the committee that is selecting textbooks, it seems to us that there is an advantage to be obtained thereby on the part of both the school and the publisher.

Yesterday I received a letter from one of my agents who had been in a very good town of some 40,000 inhabitants, and he told me that the superintendent had barred school-bookmen from seeing teachers because he was afraid that the teachers would be impressed too

much by the personality of the men, and therefore, choose men rather than books. I suppose what we should do is hire agents without personality, but somehow in the commercial lines businesses prefer salesmen who possess this qualification.

All the publishers answered this question. They are convinced that there is no such thing as a secret committee; some representative discovers the committee members and gets to them. The open textbook committee was, as a matter of fact, favored by 81.8 percent of the superintendents as well as by 93.7 percent of the publishers.

3. Why a Secret Committee?

In order to determine the real attitude toward secret committees and the justification for them, the following question was included in the questionnaire to city superintendents: "If you have secret committees, state your reasons for them." Some of the comments on this question made by the 14.4 percent of superintendents of schools favoring secret committees were:

We do not want any members of the committee interviewed by textbook representatives. (New York)

We desire an unbiased report. (Ohio)

So they may work without interruptions from book agents. (Iowa)

Can't be influenced by oratory. (Iowa)

To save the teacher's time. (Michigan)

Formerly we had public hearings with agents of the publishing house but no good purpose was accomplished and the agents themselves did not care to have them continued. (Rhode Island)

For comparison with comments from these 23 superintendents who favor secret committees, we have also comments from the 130 superintendents who favor open committees. The following two questions were proposed in order to learn their restrictions and methods of work: "(a) If your committees are open, do you place any restrictions on the publishers' representatives interviewing the committee?, Yes or No. (b) If you have any restrictions, what are they?" Of the 111 superintendents who answered this question, 54 said they did have restrictions, 57 that they did not.

Typical restrictions cited in answer to the second part of the question are the following:

Publishers' representatives are invited to appear before committee in committee room of the board. Personal calls at homes and dinner parties are discouraged. (Illinois)

Must not appear in person before the committee to sell their texts. Submit books only. (Kentucky)

Limited visits, at option of members, outside school time. (Massachusetts)

May send books for examination, but may not interview teachers.

May, by permission, see supervising principals. (Massachusetts)

May sample, but no personal follow-up work unless requested by the committee. (Massachusetts)

Depends on the publishers' agent. (Massachusetts)

Each book company is given two hours with the committee and no other agency work is permitted. (Ohio)

The superintendents' office is the clearing house; no book man interviews the teachers. (Pennsylvania)

Such interviews are arranged by director of curriculum, usually in the form of committee hearings. (Colorado)

Agents present their discussions for forty-five minutes before committee. They are not supposed to bother individual members. In fact, we sometimes do not announce membership of committee until time for hearings. (Nebraska)

Committee eliminates all but three or four books; then we invite the agents of these books to appear before the committee. (Michigan)

Closed season—two or three weeks before adoption. (California)

Book must sell itself, salesman must not do the selling; therefore salesmen do not interview the committee members. (Connecticut)

The secret committee seems to exist, where it does exist, for the purpose of curbing the activities of the publishers' representatives. No doubt this situation has been brought about by the use of questionable methods of selling in dealing with educational experts. The tendency discovered in this study is, however, clearly to use open committees. The open committee, with reasonable restrictions, seems to attain all and more than is attributed to the secret committee.

V. THE OPERATION OF THE TEXTBOOK COMMITTEE

Since the textbook committee plays such an important part in advising the superintendent of schools in the matter of selecting textbooks, the organization and actual workings of these committees should be considered.

1. The Permanence of Committees

In order to determine the length of time the textbook committee serves, the superintendents of schools were asked the following question: "Are your textbook committees permanent or temporary?"

Only 18 of the 163 superintendents who answered this question reported permanent committees; the other 145 said their committees were temporary.

The practice is to appoint a committee to do a definite piece of work and to dismiss the committee when that work is completed. Permanent committees, where they exist, appear to be associated with committees which are dealing continuously with the school curriculum.

2. The Function of the Committee's Report

The attitude of superintendents of schools toward the reports of their textbook committees was obtained by tabulating their responses to the question: "Is the report of your textbook committee final or a recommendation?" Of the 159 superintendents who answered this question, 154 said that the committee report was regarded as a recommendation; only 5 said that it was final.

The extent to which these recommendation committee reports are actually accepted by 154 superintendents who regard them as recommendations is shown in the tabulation in Table VII of the answers to the question: "What percent of your committee reports are rejected in part or full? (Estimate)"

TABLE VII.—ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY TEXTBOOK COMMITTEE
IN 154 CITIES

Attitude towards report	Number	Percent
100 percent accepted.....	95	61.6
95 - 100 percent accepted.....	14	9.1
90 - 95 percent accepted.....	9	5.8
80 - 90 percent accepted.....	6	3.9
70 - 80 percent accepted.....	3	2.0
60 - 70 percent accepted.....	1	0.6
50 - 60 percent accepted.....	3	2.0
Not specified	23	15.0
	154	100.0

These data indicate that, even if the superintendent of schools regards the report of the textbook committee as only a recommendation subject to his approval, nevertheless these recommendations are usually accepted and become in turn the superintendent's recommendation to his board of education.

3. Time for Committee Work

To determine when the work of the textbook committee was done, superintendents were asked the following question: "Do you make provisions for the textbook committee to do its work during school hours? Yes or No." Of the 155 superintendents who answered this question, 43 said the committees worked during the school hours, 112 that they worked outside of school hours. The tendency, then, seems to be not to arrange school time for the work of the textbook committee. However, committees formed of supervisors and principals would not be reported as doing the work "during school hours," though in practice they actually would take school time for textbook committee work.

It is interesting to note how the school time is provided for by the 43 who do arrange such time for the committee work. In 25 cases substitutes were hired; in four cases supervisors or principals took the regular work of the committee member; in five cases classes were dismissed early. Nine of the 43 did not tell how the work was arranged.

The following comments are typical:

Supply teachers furnished. (Colorado)

Sometimes work is taken by substitutes; at others, groups are dismissed. (Ohio)

Usually by earlier dismissal of afternoon session. (Massachusetts)

Some curriculum committees which have recommended textbooks have been paid for Saturday work. (Illinois)

Seldom done. Excuse class early. (Vermont)

These data indicate that usually membership on the textbook committee is an added duty of the teachers appointed. Where time is allotted for the work, a substitute teacher is often employed to release the committee member. The policy of early dismissal is a questionable one, which, no doubt, is considered as a makeshift plan where it is used. The supervisor or supervising principal on a textbook committee, if he has no room assignment, can so schedule his day that he can do his work on the textbook committee during the school day.

4. Supervision of the Committee

Since the textbook committee appointed by the superintendent is charged with a definite task, the following question was added in order to determine to what extent suggestions and outlines were given

to textbook committees: "Do you provide the textbook committee with any suggestions or outlines that will help or direct them in their work? Yes or No." Of the 151 superintendents who answered this question, 118 wrote "Yes," and 33 wrote "No."

Comments supplementing the answers to this question were:

Schedule of values on desired qualifications of texts.

Course of study is helpful. A rating scale.

No. Are now beginning the development of score card.

Have preliminary discussion of the type of book needed to fit the course.

The best of former reports as examples of the kind of a report wanted. Outline of things to look for.

This study indicates that it is common practice for the superintendent, who appoints the textbook committee, to outline their task and give them general suggestions for organizing their work and their report.

VI. SUMMARY

1. Practice in cities of a population between 25,000 and 250,000 indicates that the city usually operates as a unit in the selection of instructional material and has full power to select its own textbooks.

2. The authority for selecting textbooks rests legally upon the city board of education.

3. The board of education almost invariably delegates this authority to the superintendent of schools, but holds his recommendation subject to its (commonly perfunctory) approval.

4. The superintendent of schools calls upon his assistants, the actual users of textbooks, to advise him on the problem of selecting textbooks.

5. The advisers to the superintendent of schools are usually organized as a committee.

6. The superintendent of schools, who is responsible for the selection of textbooks and makes recommendations to the board of education, appoints the members of the textbook committee.

7. A distribution of membership in a textbook committee in keeping with practice in city schools and the opinion of city superintendents would comprise about 50 percent teachers, 25 percent principals, 15 percent supervisors, and 10 percent superintendent's staff. The board of education is rarely directly represented.

8. Large textbook committees are not practical; the effective committee has from three to seven members.

9. The efficient textbook committee is an open committee—open both to school people and to publishers' representatives.

10. Textbook committees are in most cases temporary; they cease to exist after they have solved their problems and made their reports. Permanent committees are usually associated with the committees working on curriculum revision.

11. The reports of the textbook committee are regarded as being only recommendations to the superintendent of schools, but the recommendations are usually followed.

12. The superintendent of schools, in appointing the committee, generally states its problem. The committee, however, sets up its own standards of evaluation for the instructional material considered.

CHAPTER VIII

THE USE OF SCORE CARDS IN EVALUATING TEXTBOOKS

C. R. MAXWELL
Dean of the College of Education
University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming

I. THE NEED FOR ANALYZING TEXTBOOKS

1. Multiplicity and Variety of Texts

The evaluation of textbooks presents a persistent problem to every school system. At the present time one finds many textbooks available in every subject that is taught in both the elementary and secondary fields; in fact, some of the larger publishing companies have two or three textbooks in the same subject. If all textbooks conformed in the organization of material, had the same order of presentation, were written with the same aims and purposes in view, contained vocabularies that were practically equivalent, and gave equal space to similar topics, the problem of selection would not present great difficulties. The selection might then be based on the color of the covers, the excellency of the binding, and the cost of the book. This condition, fortunately, is not the case.

2. Variation in Points of View

Textbooks are written from many and varied points of view; certain texts have been developed because the author wished to promulgate his point of view in organizing and teaching a subject. When certain theories in education have failed, the surest and quickest way to modify practice based on them has been to place on the market a textbook with a changed point of view. Teachers in our higher institutions frequently decide to write a textbook for the secondary schools because of the apparently poorly prepared students who have come to their classes. Occasionally teachers in our schools have been conscious of the difficulties and limitations of present textbooks and, to overcome these obstacles, have organized materials which have finally eventuated into textbooks. All these different influences must be

taken into consideration when a school system is confronted by the problem of selecting a new textbook.

3. Objectives of School Systems

From the standpoint of the school system, the evaluation of textbooks must be made in the light of definite educational objectives. For example, a school system has decided that individual instruction should play an important part in teaching procedure; textbooks, in that case, must be examined with this ideal in mind; or again, if a school system be operated with the idea that one of its chief functions should be the preparation for life outside of school, then the selection of materials must be made largely on their practical values. Such objectives must be given careful consideration by those responsible for selecting textbooks if the objectives are to be attained.

4. Influence of Committees Reorganizing Subject Matter

One of the marked tendencies in educational development in recent years has been the tendency for educational organizations to appoint committees on the reorganization of subject matter. Our national educational organizations have published yearbooks on the subject of reorganization, and most subject-matter fields in both the elementary and secondary schools have received consideration from such committees. After the reports of such committees have been published and disseminated, textbooks usually appear with statements in the preface that they have been prepared to meet the specific recommendation of these national committees. If a school system is interested in conforming to recommendations of such a committee, it is necessary to analyze these textbooks carefully to find whether or not they really have been written from the standpoint of such recommendations or whether only certain minor details of the reports have been featured in the texts.

5. Utilization of Scientific Studies

Many scientific studies of different aspects of subject materials have been made in the past few years, studies that have contributed to progress in our schools. Textbooks may bear in their prefaces statements that in the organization of material much use has been made of such studies, but a careful check on the contents must be made to verify such statements. Thus in the field of spelling we have accurate

studies of both the frequency and the difficulty of vocabularies. It would be unwise for a school system that is examining spellers not to check their vocabularies against the studies that have been made.

6. Variations in Distribution of Space

In many subjects the proportion of space devoted to different units of subject matter presents an important problem. If one takes the field of general science, for example, he is immediately confronted by the problem of the amount of space that should be devoted to different units of the field which this subject of necessity must treat; if the school administrator wishes to select a text with the biological aspect of science predominating, the book must be analyzed carefully to find whether or not the author has stressed that aspect in preparing his manuscript. In American history an author may give undue emphasis to the period or aspect of which he is a student; the only way this can be discovered is through a careful check of the content.

7. Variations in Organization of Material

The organization of subject material should be another important consideration in the selection of a textbook. The author may have approached the material from the standpoint of the logical development of the subject, with little thought about the learner. Textbooks that have been written by authorities in their field may not be suited to the immature pupils in an elementary or secondary school who approach the subject, not from the standpoint of its logical organization, but from the functional point of view. The only way one may discover the suitability of a textbook from the standpoint of organization is to make a careful and complete analysis of the content in the light of the psychology of the students who will study the text.

8. Difficulty of Vocabulary

Many textbooks that have many admirable qualities have been found practically valueless owing to the character of the vocabulary used. An expert in a given field is inclined to use the technical vocabulary of the scholar rather than the vocabulary of the immature student who is a novice in the subject. We have available a sufficient number of studies to make it possible to check vocabularies. A school administrator who fails to examine a textbook from this point of view may early regret the selection that he makes.

Other reasons could be elaborated to show both the desirability and necessity of analyzing textbooks before a selection has been made; the foregoing reasons, however, are sufficient to point out that a cursory examination of a book is not adequate and that scientific studies that have been made to improve our educational practices will be of little avail unless they are incorporated in textbooks that the children use.

II. FAULTY BASES OF SELECTION OF TEXTBOOKS IN THE PAST

In the past the method of selecting textbooks has not received the attention it has deserved. Owing to faulty methods of selection school systems and administrators have been the target of much unfavorable criticism. This criticism has been due perhaps in some measure to the pernicious activity of unscrupulous representatives of book companies and also to the lack of justifiable standards for selection on the part of school administrators. When those responsible for selecting textbooks were not supplied with a technique that would insure analysis, specious arguments were effective and were widely used. A scientific attitude toward the study of all school problems has brought about a change in many quarters in the techniques used in evaluating books, but unfortunately we still find arguments for adoption used that should be accepted with reservations, if at all. Five such arguments are these: First, the prestige of the author: it is taken for granted in this argument that an author who has a reputation as a scholar in his field is well equipped to prepare a textbook for children in the elementary school. Publishing companies have made much use of this argument as one of the basic considerations for the excellence of a textbook. Second, the prestige of the publisher has frequently been an argument used by the representative of large publishing companies, and they have frequently disparaged the books of more recent comers in the field. Third, the general appearance of the book has received undue emphasis. Of course, the esthetic qualities of a book have some value and should receive consideration, but other factors should have much more weight. Fourth, the wide use of a text is one of the most persistent arguments. Rarely a day passes that the writer does not receive an advertisement of some book wherein the most potent reason for its adoption is its wide use. Occasionally a map of the United States covered with red dots will be enclosed, each dot representing

a city or institution in which this particular text has been adopted. Even though the fallacy underlying such an argument is easily seen, apparently it must have much force or publishing companies would discontinue its use. The wide use probably means that this textbook meets general conditions in an admirable way, but it may be an argument against its use in a system having specific problems which it is attacking. Fifth, the cost of a book is an argument that has made a distinctive, but undue, appeal when recommendations have been made to school boards. When publishing companies bid against one another for adoptions, it naturally appears as a vital consideration; but to-day legal restrictions on the selling price of textbooks and the slight differences that prevail in prices of similar texts have made this argument less potent.

This brief analysis of the bases on which texts have been selected in the past and which are still prevalent in school systems that have not been impregnated with the scientific attitude of mind indicates the need for a technical instrument that will insure the proper selection of a textbook to meet the aims, objectives, and needs of a specific school system.

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCORE CARD

The development of a score card to assist in the analysis of textbooks is a natural successor to the haphazard methods for selecting textbooks that had prevailed. The decade between 1910 and 1920 represents the period of active development of plans for putting the selection of textbooks on a more scientific basis. A perusal of educational magazines in the latter half of this decade shows a considerable number of articles devoted to the problem of selecting and judging textbooks. If we judge interest in terms of number of articles and books, we should be led to infer that the last decade, 1920-1930, represents a further and considerable advance, for in this decade five books on the subject appeared, and the magazine articles increased approximately threefold.

While it is not possible to show a direct influence, undoubtedly the use of score cards in other fields was responsible for the attempts to elaborate score cards to assist in the selection of textbooks. For many years score cards have been used in the field of agriculture. In the department of animal husbandry score cards are the basis for rating

cattle in all livestock-judging contests. In the department of agronomy we find score cards used in comparing corn, grains, etc. In these fields one does not question the efficacy of the score card in reducing the subjective element in reaching decisions. About the same time score cards were beginning to be used to score textbooks, we find a development in the use of the score card in rating school buildings. In more recent years we find score cards developed for the purpose of rating teaching and teachers, principals, libraries, community health, sanitary conditions, etc. Thus it is seen that score cards represent one of the present-day means for rating characteristics in various fields in order that justifiable comparisons may be made.

IV. PRESENT USE OF SCORE CARDS IN CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS

To find to what degree score cards are used in evaluating textbooks, the following brief questionnaire was submitted to 200 city superintendents in a selected group of cities representing different population groups in every one of the 48 states:

1. Do you use score cards in the selection of textbooks in the elementary grades?
2. Do you use score cards in the selection of high-school textbooks?
3. Do you believe a wiser selection of textbooks is made by the use of score cards?
4. How many years have you used score cards for the selection of elementary textbooks?
5. How many years have you used score cards for the selection of high-school texts?
6. In what high-school subjects have you used score cards for the selection of textbooks?
7. Please submit copies of score cards used in the selection of high-school textbooks.

One-hundred and fifty replies were received to these 200 questionnaires. Of the 150, 84 approved the use of score cards; 27 considered them of no value; the remainder were non-committal. Replies from eighteen cities indicated that score cards were always used in the selection of textbooks in the elementary grades, but in only eight were score cards used in the selection of high-school textbooks. The longest period of years during which score cards had been used in any city was given as seventeen, while the median period was five years. Three-fourths of the number using the score cards have commenced their use within a period of five years. The answer to this question

seems to indicate that the movement toward the use of score cards is a recent one and that the tendency toward their use is increasing. High-school subjects in which score cards have been used in the selection of books include practically all the fundamental academic subjects. Only a few submitted copies of score cards used in the selection of high-school texts. These represented in practically all cases checking lists or score cards that have been printed in magazines and books. It indicated that very few cities have done any constructive work in the formulation of score cards of their own.

V. ARGUMENTS FOR THE USE OF SCORE CARDS

The question is frequently raised: What is the value of a score card in selecting textbooks? The selection of textbooks presents a technical problem, the study of which should represent a scientific procedure where the elements of chance are reduced to a minimum. The score card gives an opportunity to set up criteria as a basis for the analysis of the textbook. Unless such criteria are set up, the objectives of the school system may be lost sight of in the selection. Score cards present a convenient means for checking different elements that must be considered if a textbook is fully to realize its purposes. It has been said "opinion expressed through score card ratings has a better chance of being opinion up to the limit of insight than un-analyzed opinion has."¹ The better the score card, the better the final conclusions. Analysis of a book without a guide is analogous to sailing without a compass. If one selects a satisfactory textbook without a guide to assist in his analysis, he may select a good textbook to meet the educational objectives of his school system; but if he does, it will be mere chance. A score card used in examining books tends to remove the personal element in judgment. The more objective the score card, the less tendency for subjective judgment to enter into the examination. Without a guide and without careful comparative ratings, one's judgment of the content of a book may be very faulty. For example, an individual may tend to summarize carefully the aspect of the material in which he was particularly interested but to neglect other aspects which might be of equal importance.

In one of the recent descriptions of a technical method used in selecting a textbook for its city schools, the following committees were

¹ Franzen and Knight. *Textbook Selection*, p. 17.

reported:² committee on criteria of content; committee on analysis of content; committee on drills, tests, summaries, and reviews; committee on vocabulary; committee on size and number; committee on illustrations; committee on mechanical phases; and committee on procedures, discussions, and methods. The work of these committees finally eventuated in a score card for comparative purposes.

VI. ARGUMENTS AGAINST SCORE CARDS

The statement is sometimes made that we do not have justifiable criteria for the formulation of a score card. This is an extreme statement which represents an attitude of mind that one always finds on the part of critics when attempts are made to improve techniques in any field. The earlier attempts to formulate score cards called attention to pertinent factors that should be considered in the analysis of textbooks. These score cards aided greatly in overcoming the tendency to use such unjustifiable criteria as have been mentioned earlier and stimulated further attack upon the problem.

Score cards have also been criticized on the basis that criteria used represented in many instances merely the judgment of an individual and for this reason they had no scientific justification. A tabulation of the items used in twelve score cards indicates that there is considerable truth in this criticism. In these twelve score cards 160 different items are found. However, in fifty percent of the items there was practically unanimous agreement, showing that these items have considerable validity—judged by their use by those who have given much thought to the problem.

In several score cards that have been published weighted items have been used. The criticism has frequently been made that such weighted elements have little or no scientific validity because they have represented only individual opinions of the formulator, not opinions secured from a large group. But a large number of opinions would have little weight—it is a question of quality rather than of quantity. It is true that only a few published score cards have been carefully weighted by experts, and that we have little evidence of their value based on wide use.

Score cards have also been criticized because they have been formulated by publishers to insure the selection of their own product. Our

² Fuller. *Scientific Evaluation of Textbooks.*

most progressive publishing companies have been much interested in the technique for the formulation of score cards, but the number of score cards that have been circulated by publishers to insure the selection of their own books is comparatively small. Certain publishers, at least, are hoping that a good score card would result in careful unbiased judgment in weighing a textbook, so that political influence, local prejudice, and snap judgment would no longer play a part. Publishers have undoubtedly called the attention of school officials to the use that has been made of score cards and also to individual score cards that have resulted in the selection of a particular text. This is a legitimate procedure, and any textbook company is justified in calling to the attention of examiners any scientific techniques that have been used in the selection of textbooks.

VII. A SAMPLE SCORE CARD FOR LANGUAGE TEXTBOOKS

This chapter on score cards would be incomplete without the inclusion of a type score card which represents in its formulation not only an advanced technique but also a technique capable of utilization by any progressive school system. This score card has been formulated by Miss Mildred Dawson, Assistant Professor of Elementary Education, University of Wyoming, for the selection of junior-high-school language texts. It represents an advance over score cards that have been published previously in that, first, it makes provision for different bases for evaluation; second, it furnishes different methods of evaluation; and third, it makes provision for weighted values.

A few recognized authorities in the field of junior-high-school language were requested to give weighted values to the items in Divisions III and IV in this score card. The directions for scoring have been simplified to such a degree that a group of teachers such as one would find in an average school system could follow the directions and thus be able adequately to analyze textbooks in this field. The teachers in any school system are vitally interested in the textbooks that they must use, and for this reason they should assist in the examination and selection, and consequently a technique of examination should be used that is readily understandable by a group of teachers who have not been highly trained in statistical procedure. The type score card which follows meets such a need.

I. General Nature

The accompanying score card is based upon the principles of inclusiveness, objectivity of scoring, and adaptability to local situations. Inclusiveness has been provided by checking the items of the card against cards previously published and by consulting the results of analyzing language textbooks.³ Scoring has been made as objective as possible by a careful definition of terms and by a procedure of ranking based so far as possible on a careful objective analysis. A system of assigning score values to certain sub-items has been devised by combining the judgments of authorities in the language-composition field. The third principle of adaptability is involved in the possibility of leaving out certain sections of the score card where collection of data is not feasible and in ranking certain features of the textbook in the light of local needs.

2. General Method of Using the Score Card

The score card is divided into four main divisions, whose items are evaluated by scoring devices which seem peculiarly fitted to give objectivity in scoring. When the language textbooks have been examined and evaluated in regard to these sub-items, then these books are ranked (in each of the four major divisions) according to their worth as determined for each of the five divisions. That is, Book A. may rank first in Mechanical Features, third in Derivation of Data, second in Content, and first in Procedure. The examiners, with these four ranks in mind for each book, may choose according to which of the four features they consider to be most important to meet their particular needs.

3. Specific Items

Some explanation may be necessary to set forth the value of including certain items and of scoring in particular ways. In Division I D the writer has suggested that the publishing company furnish expertly derived data concerning the print of the book, because school people are not ordinarily qualified to judge this exactly. In Division II A the mode of derivation of the materials in the textbooks is evaluated by rating the quality of the procedure employed.

The items included in Division III have been derived by the actual analysis of representative recently published language textbooks. The data here should be entirely objective: page-spacing and other numerical values. The books should then be ranked according to their emphasis upon the subject matter which the examiners feel to be most needed in their particular school system.

³ Lyman, E. L. "A study of twenty-four recent seventh and eighth grade language texts." *Elementary School Journal*, 24: Feb., 1924.

Dawson, Mildred. "Language textbooks." *The Elementary English Review*, 6: Feb. and Mar., 1929.

Progressiveness, thoroughness, appropriateness of procedure, are the key-notes in evaluating the items in Division IV: Presentation. Here equated frequency of mentions is the mode of analysis, values being classified according to two types: specific directions, and self-direction and self-appraisal. The items in this division have been derived from Koos' statement of junior-high-school objectives and the statement of progressive tendencies in the teaching of English set forth by the Committee on the Reorganization of English in 1917.

Certain sections of Divisions III and IV can be rated only after considerable supplementary analysis. For illustration, several supplementary score cards are appended to indicate the form that such cards should take. Cards are provided for Sections III C 1, III C 2, III D and IV A, but the examiner will have to provide his own forms for Sections III A, IV B, IV C, and IV D.

Directions for Scoring

1. Assign separate symbols to indicate each text, *e. g.*, A, B, C, etc. Place these symbols at the head of columns in "Results of Analysis."
2. Score the items and sub-items within each major division by the method indicated in the two columns to the right of the individual items.
3. Use the method of evaluation indicated to the right of the larger items which includes the sub-items if no method is indicated to the right of said sub-items.
4. Have all the language books that are to be considered before the examiner when rating of items and sub-items is being done.
5. Examiner may consult article in February, 1929, issue of *The Elementary English Review* for a standardized method of page-spacing.
6. Rules for III A and III B
 - a. Encircle with red the page-space that represents a topic that is under-emphasized.
 - b. Encircle with blue the page-space that represents a topic that is over-emphasized.
 - c. Use these circles to determine the ranking for points in III B: Distribution of Emphasis.
7. Rules for analysis of III C-1
 - a. Give each series of lessons centering about some one general topic (*e. g.*, a project about our postal system) a value corresponding to the probable number of days that will be consumed in covering the topic. Be conservative; estimate as precisely as possible on the basis of probable procedure with your own pupils.
 - b. For each such series, note which of the following types of language activities are included: Grammar, Oral Composition, Written Composition, Correct Usage, and Literature.

SAMPLE SCORE CARD FOR EVALUATING JUNIOR-HIGH-SCHOOL LANGUAGE TEXTBOOKS

Textbooks	Summary					Total Rating
	Symbols	Rating for Divisions				
		I	II	III	IV	
	A B C D Etc.					

Rated by Date

Division I: Mechanical Features	Basis for Evaluation	Method of Evaluation	Weighted Value	Results of Analysis			
				A	B	C	D
A. Size	Inspection Inspection	Ranking Ranking					
B. Binding							
1. Durability	Inspection	Ranking					
2. Attractiveness							
3. Neutral tones							
C. Paper	Inspection	Ranking					
1. White							
2. Dull finish							
3. Texture—tough	Inspection Data from publisher and inspection	Ranking					
D. Print							
1. Legibility							
2. Conformity to standards	Inspection						
a. Length of line							
b. Type and leading							
3. Variation in giving	Inspection						
a. Models							
b. Emphasis to points							

		Results of Analysis		
		General Rank	Topical Rank	Weighted Value
<p>Division II: Derivation of Materials</p> <p>A. General Mode</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of current materials 2. Experience 3. Experimentation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Loose control b. Scientific control 4. Reference to findings of previous investigations 5. Reference to standards 6. Reference to objectives <p>B. Representative sampling</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Child population 2. Subject matter 	<p>Data from publisher</p>	<p>Rating as, Exceptional Superior Very Good Good Fair Poor</p>		
<p>Division III: Content</p> <p>A. Inclusiveness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammar <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Parts of speech b. Sentences c. Sentence analysis d. Paragraphs 2. Expression <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Drills, practice <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1. Vocabulary (2. Correct usage (3. Pronunciation (4. Punctuation (5. Capitalization (6. Spelling 	<p>Page spacing per item throughout book</p>	<p>Rating as Very inclusive Inclusive Fairly inclusive Narrow</p>	<p>45</p>	
		General Rank		
		General Rank: Inclusiveness		
		Total Page Space		
		Percent of Page Space		

	Basis for Evaluation	Method of Evaluation	Weighted Value	General Rank	
b. Oral composition (1. Guidance* (2. Assignment (3. Topics c. Written composition (1. Guidance* (2. Assignment (3. Topics 3. Instruction; use of books 4. Literature a. For appreciation b. For models B. Distribution of emphasis 1. Grammar 2. Expression a. Drills b. Oral composition c. Written composition 3. Instruction; use of books 4. Literature C. Articulation into units 2. Cumulative treatment	Use page space count in III, A	Ranking according to desired emphasis	25	General Bank: Inclusiveness	
				Total Page Space	
	Analysis of alternate page groups, beginning with first page	Count of number of lesson series and of mentions of language-activity-types (see system of evaluation given in rule)	15	Topical Rank	

*Guidance includes

1. Motivation
2. Setting up standards
3. Models

4. Selecting topics
5. Organizing
6. Expressing

7. Appraising
8. Revising
9. Publishing

	Basis for Evaluation	Method of Evaluation	Weighted Value	Results of Analysis	
				Topical Rank	
D. Gradation of topics 1. Difficulty 2. Interest	Sampling as above: new topics & procedures evaluated by classroom tryout, familiar ones on basis of experience	Percent of sampling rated as Highly appropriate Appropriate Fairly appropriate Poor	15		
Division IV: Presentation					
A. Qualities 1. Simplicity 2. Interest 3. Coherence 4. Thoroughness 5. Adaptability to local conditions 6. Attention on content, not activity	Sampling of alternate 50-page groups	Percentage of sam- pling rated Exceptional Superior Very good Good Fair Poor	30		
B. Attention to functions of the junior high school 1. Exploration 2. Recognition of individual needs, abilities, interests 3. Socializing opportunities 4. Materials of functional value 5. Higher standards of scholarship 6. Emphasis on progressive tendencies	Sampling as above Frequency of mentions of two types: specific directions only procedure involving self-direction and self-appraisal	Number of mentions of each type divided by number of pages in sampling so as to equate	20	Types of Mention	
C. Emphasis on original oral compositions 1. Written composition 2. Brevity 3. Stress on letter writing 4. Extension and mastery of vocabulary 5. Individual and basic spelling lists 6. Grammar—an aid to expression	Sampling as above Frequency of mentions of two types: specific directions involving self-direction and self-appraisal	Number of mentions of each type divided by number of pages in sampling so as to equate	40		

	Basis for Evaluation	Method of Evaluation	Weighted Value	Results of Analysis Types of Mention
<p>7. Objective measurement</p> <p>8. Utilization of life experience and activities</p> <p>9. Projects</p> <p>10. Audience situation, publishing</p> <p>11. Use of extra-curricular activities</p> <p>12. Use of models in composition</p> <p>D. Consistent use of conventional terminology</p>	<p>Check against the conventional list</p>	<p>Tabulate number of terms of conventional and unconventional type; rank according to percentage of consistent usage</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Topical Rank</p>

SUPPLEMENTARY SCORE CARDS

Section III C-1: Organization Articulation into Units Textbooks							
Total number of series							
Average: Days per series							
Total mentions							
Grammar							
Oral composition							
Written composition							
Correct usage							
Literature							

Section III C-2; Cumulative Treatment

Rules		Textbooks			
Total number of rules					
Average: Mentions per rule					

Section III D: Gradation of Topics

Gradation		Textbooks			
Difficulty					
Highly appropriate					
Appropriate					
Fairly appropriate					
Poor					
Interest					
Highly appropriate					
Appropriate					
Fairly appropriate					
Poor					

Section IV A: Qualities of Presentation

Qualities		Textbooks			
Simplicity					
Exceptional					
Superior					
Very good					
Good					
Fair					
Poor					
Interest					
Exceptional					
(etc. for each of the qualities and each of the degrees).					

- c. Total
 - (1) Sum of number of days included in all the series found in any one text; average number of days per series.
 - (2) Sum of number of times each of types of language activities appears in a separate exercise.
 - (3) Highest rank to the textbook showing best articulation on the basis of the two types of totals given above.
8. Rules for analysis in III C-2
 - a. Determine which rules of grammar, punctuation, etc., receive repeated practice in the sampling.
 - b. Check each rule as often as practice is repeated.
 - c. Total the checks for each text; determine the average number of mentions per rule.
 - d. Rank in order of greatest to least frequency.
9. Consult all definitions and apply them in scoring Division IV: Presentation.
10. In Division IV, use system of equating by dividing by number of pages so as to avoid giving more credit to longest books.
11. Determine general rank for Division IV on the basis of which features of presentation are most important in meeting the needs and interests of local pupils.
12. Add to supplementary table of Division IV A.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms have had to be rigidly defined to enable objective analysis. These definitions were worked out while the author was analyzing language textbooks and are copied verbatim from her article in the February, 1929, issue of *The Elementary English Review*.

The less obvious tendencies and junior-high-school functions are defined by means of an outline. This lists the types of content and teaching procedure indicative of progressiveness and alignment with upper grade objectives.

1. Extension and mastery of vocabulary.
 - a. Learning to use new and richer meanings for words.
 - b. Correct pronunciation.
 - c. Correct usage.
2. Grammar—an aid to expression—specific directions calling for the use of grammatical facts in composition writing and in life situations.
3. Mechanics of written composition.
 - a. Manuscript form.
 - b. Capitalization; punctuation.
 - c. Spelling, syllabication.
4. Elaborate technique for written composition.
5. Adaptation to individual differences.
 - a. Self-chosen topics.

- b. Self-appraisal; provision for needed practice.
- c. Additional drill for the slow group.
- d. Supplementary assignments for the most capable.
- 6. Objective measurement.
 - a. Comparison of objective text scores.
 - b. Use of standardized tests and scales.
- 7. Utilization of life experiences.
 - a. Topics for composition.
 - b. Application and appraisal in life situations.
- 8. Project: a problem arousing pupils to the purposeful planning and execution of a procedure which involves appraisal and improvement through self—or group—activity. (This includes a drill exercise only as it is an integral part of a larger, more inclusive activity).
- 9. Utilization of extra-curricular activities.
 - a. Dramatic productions presented to other groups.
 - b. Publication in the school paper.
 - c. Advertising campaigns, posters, etc.
 - d. Excursions to points of interest; *e. g.*, the post office.
 - e. Correlation with club work.
- 10. Exploration of interests and abilities.
 - a. Pupil-listing of topics of individual interest.
 - b. Self-and group-appraisal.
 - c. Tryouts for programs.
- 11. Conditions favoring higher standards of scholarship.
 - a. Publishing.
 - b. Activities initiated, planned, managed by pupils.
 - c. Appraisal by pupils on the basis of definite standards.
 - d. Practice to eliminate an individual's known errors; to improve skill where improvement is needed.
- 12. Socializing opportunities.
 - a. Committee work; group leaders.
 - b. Group appraisal and correction.
 - c. Projects.
 - d. Advertising; publishing.
- 13. Materials of functional value.
 - a. Practice to meet known needs and out-of-school demands.
 - b. Compositions of practical value.
 - (1) Letters requesting information from, or giving it to, actual people.
 - (2) Articles for publication.
 - (3) Talks furthering the purpose of a project.

It seemed that the varying kinds of emphasis which textbook assignments give to the tendencies and functions ought to be indicated. Two types of emphasis have been defined and utilized in counting the mentions. The definitions and illustrative examples follow.

Type 1: Specific directions guiding practice and application; for example: "In these sentences improve the verbs printed in italics."

Type 2: Self-direction by the pupil or the class; appraisal by the writer, his audience, or both.

"You probably notice that you still are making the errors that you discovered early in the term. The other pupils have probably noticed the same fact concerning their own speech. Perhaps you would like to form into committees of friendly service. The duties will be to watch over and correct the speech of fellow committee members—always in a kindly and helpful way. Perhaps you and your teacher can work out a plan for keeping account of errors and the progress you make in overcoming them."

Several experts in the field of language-composition teaching were asked to assign weighted values to certain features of language. The results were tabulated; the mean, median, and mode were computed. The mean was selected because it was the only central tendency which yielded values that totaled the desired one hundred points and because it seemed most nearly to express composite judgment.

CHAPTER IX

THE POLICIES OF PUBLISHERS IN MARKETING TEXTBOOKS

FRANK A. JENSEN
Superintendent of Schools
Rockford, Illinois

The conclusions of this chapter are based on responses to parts of questionnaires sent to superintendents of schools and to publishers.

After a manuscript has been transformed into a textbook, the publisher is confronted with the problem of selling it. The publishing of textbooks calls for large initial investments on which the publisher must realize adequate returns if he is to continue in business.

I. DESCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISEMENTS OF TEXTBOOKS

In placing a new book on the market, the publisher usually makes a general preliminary announcement in an educational magazine or sends out pamphlets which present the outstanding new features of the book as well as the training and experience of the authors. Often printed circulars and outlines of the new textbooks are placed in the hands of prospective users.

1. By Whom Prepared

Thirty-five publishers were asked: "Who writes the briefs of your textbooks, the author, the editorial staff, or the sales force?" Their answers should throw light on the preparation of these printed materials which influence those who select textbooks. Some of the replies were:

The sales force mostly, assisted by the editorial staff who seldom, however, initiate the matter. The author enters into the transaction only in an advisory capacity, and if he draws the first draft, as does sometimes happen, extensive revision is made and the final O.K. invariably placed upon it by the managers of the sales department.

Briefs come from many sources—editors, authors, salesmen, office correspondents. It depends entirely upon the occasion for a brief.

Situations differ. Some emphasize certain phases of a subject which in other places may not be so prominent. In general the agent can write the best brief if he can find out what a school wants. Too many schools don't know and some won't tell.

The authors, in all cases where we can get authors to do it. In all other cases one of our editors consults the author and prepares the brief from points obtained from the author. Sometimes one of our salesmen will, on his own initiative, prepare a brief. Such brief is referred to author and editor for O. K. We often get excellent briefs in this way, for our salesmen are on the firing line and are in position to see the textbook in its actual functioning.

Briefs, in the sense of descriptive material, would vary, of course, with the individual need. In the main, our selling force prepare statements which are used, but often the assistance of the editorial staff, even of the author, is secured.

We have a service bureau which looks after this feature in a general way. But no one can prepare as searching a brief as the properly equipped field man. Hence in our own arrangement the work of the service bureau is quite fully supplemented.

The briefs for textbooks are usually of a composite nature. The author may be asked to furnish a short summary. The members of the sales force are always asked to formulate selling points. The editorial staff usually combines these arguments into a brief.

The editorial staff and the sales force work together in this matter.

TABLE I.—EMPHASIS ON AUTHORSHIP OF BRIEFS BY THIRTY PUBLISHERS

Source of Brief	Ranked in Importance		
	1st.	2d.	3d.
Sales Dept.	12	11	7
Editorial Dept.	13	12	5
Author	13	3	14

Table I shows that 12 publishers rate their sales department first in writing briefs for textbooks 11 publishers rate it second; 7 publishers rate it third, and so on.

Briefs, then, are written to appeal to selecting committees; hence most of them are written from a salesmanship point of view and are developed by the sales or editorial staff. The author often prepares a statement of the outstanding features of his book. The field men interpret the statement to the selecting committees. Briefs obviously constitute an important factor in the selection of textbooks.

2. How Received by Superintendents

In the questionnaire sent to superintendents this question was proposed: "(a) What do you do with briefs and outlines of textbooks

sent to you by the publisher? (b) Do you think this type of advertising helps either in the selection or to initiate a change or addition? Yes or No." The answers to the questions are clearly summarized in Tables II and III.

TABLE II.—SUPERINTENDENTS' DISPOSAL OF PUBLISHERS' BRIEFS AND OUTLINES

Method of Disposal	Number	Percent
Put them in wastepaper basket.....	28	16.6
Read, review, and refer to others.....	100	59.6
File them	40	23.8
	168	100.0

TABLE III.—VALUE OF PUBLISHERS' BRIEFS AND OUTLINES IN INFLUENCING TEXTBOOK SELECTION

Evaluation	Number	Percent
Have some value.....	113	67.7
Have no value.....	47	28.1
Have questionable value.....	7	4.2
	167	100.0

3. The Publisher's Aim

The principles of textbook advertising used by the publishers are indicated in their responses to the question: "What is the principle of your advertising which aims to help the purchaser select your book?"

To give information, which we try to make exact as to content, organization, and method of presentation. It is folly to claim for a book features which it does not possess. If the purchaser doesn't get what he thinks he is going to find, it were better not to have made the sale.

Our advertising is an attempt to explain the "why" and the "what" of every textbook, perhaps more than the "who." Surely, it is a principle of the psychology of selling that all are interested in who uses thus and so. However, I fear, that in schoolbook publishing this is overemphasized. In other words, it is not "who uses" a book, but "what it is" that should count.

To present in a convincing way the superior features we claim for our books, to show that our books conform to the modern method of teaching, and that by their use, time will be saved, while the subject will be better taught.

Fair presentation of the textbook's claims, being careful not to overstate the case in any particular. The sale of one book by an agent

helps the sale of another by the same agent where the agent was careful not to mislead his purchaser in the sale of the first book. This principle is recognized by the management of the company in the training of its agents. This same principle holds good in our advertising department.

4. The Value of Periodical Advertising

Advertising of textbooks seems to be effective when it is sent directly to the selecting agents. But similar material condensed into a page of advertising in an educational journal is of questionable value if we may judge by the replies of school superintendents to the question: "Do you think the advertising of textbooks in educational magazines either helps in the selection or helps to initiate a change or addition? Yes or No." The replies are compiled in Table IV.

TABLE IV.—SUPERINTENDENTS' EVALUATION OF TEXTBOOK ADVERTISING IN EDUCATIONAL MAGAZINES

Evaluation	Number	Percent
Has some value.....	75	45.4
Has no value.....	81	49.1
Has questionable value.....	9	5.5
	165	100.0

Managers of publishing companies in personal conferences with the writer also expressed the opinion that advertising in professional journals has little value in selling textbooks, though it does help to build good will. Publishers feel that it is one way they can help to make the publishing of good professional magazines financially possible.

II. THE PUBLISHERS' REPRESENTATIVES

The publisher's representative plays an important part in the presentation of textbooks to the school people. His advice also is an important factor in building the publisher's policy with reference to what should be published, and how it should be presented to the school people. A study of the personnel of publishers' representatives indicates very clearly that the type of salesman has changed along with changes in the selecting agency. Two decades ago the publisher's representative had to sell his highly specialized commodity to laymen on boards of education who were often not at all competent to select textbooks.

1. Qualifications Now Demanded

As the selecting agency has changed, so the publisher's representatives have taken on new qualifications; to-day they are a group of men as well qualified to present their textbooks in an educational way as teachers are qualified to work on selecting committees.

One of the questions submitted to publishers was: "What are the qualifications you aim to secure in selecting your representative to call on the school people in the interest of your books?" Some of the answers were:

(1) Selling ability. (2) Required educational standing. (3) Experience in the field of education.

We select men who have had school experience and who have the educational background equivalent to the demands of educators in the particular section in which the bookman works. Of course, personality is always considered. Younger men are preferred.

First of all, a man must be in the best sense of the word a gentleman. He must have a liberal education and preferably have been engaged in educational work.

College education, teaching experience, pleasing personality, common sense, thorough familiarity with current educational practices, and ability to demonstrate that he thoroughly understands his subject.

The qualifications to be considered are many, just as in the selection of a salesman for any other line of business—good address, personality, experience either in selling or in teaching, personal habits, etc. As a matter of fact, with few exceptions, our representatives were previously members of the teaching profession—as a rule, superintendents of schools.

2. Training and Experience

A further indication of the training and experience of publishers' representatives is found in publishers' answers to these questions: "(a) What percent of your present staff are college graduates? (b) What percent of your present staff have had practical school experience as teacher, supervisor, or administrator?"

Thirty-one of the 33 publishers answered these questions. The answers to both questions ranged from 50 percent to 100 percent; the median answer in both cases was 95 percent. It is apparent, then that the training and experience of publishers' representatives are quite similar to those of the teachers, supervisors, and school administrators with whom representatives deal in presenting their textbooks.

The bookman of fifty years ago could rightly be called a "drum-

mer." His training was limited, and he knew little about textbooks he was selling, but he possessed habits and personal qualities which enabled him to get votes from members of the board of education. To-day the field agents of any reputable publishing company may properly be called the publishers' "representatives." They are well trained and have had practical school experience. Most of them know the contents of their textbooks and are competent to present their outstanding features to selecting committees.

3. How Superintendents Regard Them

The attitude of superintendents toward the publishers' representatives is suggested by the responses to the question: "Do you consider the publisher's representative an asset or a liability to the textbook committee?"

TABLE V.—SUPERINTENDENTS' EVALUATION OF PUBLISHERS' REPRESENTATIVES AS AIDS TO TEXTBOOK COMMITTEES

Evaluation	Number	Percent
Asset	99	59.3
Liability	38	22.7
Both asset and liability	24	14.4
Neither asset nor liability	6	3.6
	167	100.

The data in Table V indicate that publishers' representatives are helpful in the superintendent's program for selecting textbooks.

4. The Use of Special Demonstrators

Many publishers have special demonstrators, for whom engagements are made by the publisher's regular representatives. These special workers use the publisher's instructional material in demonstration lessons in various cities, either to introduce the materials or to help teachers to use them properly. Other publishers say that their regular field men are also demonstrators.

The work of these demonstrators was well defined in publishers' answers to the question: "What is the function of your demonstrator in the sales department of your business?" Typical replies were:

We have several whose time is spent in assisting schools in teaching the method of books of our publications which have been introduced

and in explaining what we have to offer to school authorities where a change in the method they may be using is contemplated.

Three-fold: First, the demonstrator is called upon to appear before teachers in the mass or in special groups to talk on the modern point of view in teaching the subject under consideration. This talk may or may not refer specifically to our books. This permits the so-called demonstrator at a later date or in personal conference to tie up our publication to the points made in the address. A second function is actually to take one of our textbooks and demonstrate its use or some phase of its use in the classroom. This is becoming less and less common because of lack of confidence on the part of supervisors in the set demonstration. A third function of a demonstrator comes after the adoption of a book, when opportunities often occur to meet teachers and to explain how the book or books may be used most effectively, and this is often followed by a demonstration on some particular phase requested by the supervisor.

The position of 'demonstrator,' as such, is passing; the demonstrators of to-day are more nearly educational advisors and not grandstand orators.

To aid teachers to understand problems connected with the teaching of their subjects, to talk to groups of teachers professionally on these problems, to assist teachers to use our books intelligently and properly, and to encourage teachers and others to use our books.

All our salesmen are supposed to be demonstrators; that is, they are supposed to be able to teach their material to teachers. We do not employ special demonstrators in the sales department. It weakens the responsibility of the salesmen.

The chief function of our demonstrators is to prove the actual classroom value of our books after they have been introduced into schools—in short, to help the teacher to get out of the books all that the authors have put into them. Incidentally, they may do some agency work but we do not require it of them.

Thirty-two of the 33 publishers answered this question. From their reactions, it is fair to conclude that the publisher's demonstrator has a definite place in a scheme of good salesmanship; that publishers generally have a demonstrator for elementary-school textbooks which emphasize definite methods of procedure, such as may be found in readers, geographies, and arithmetics; that the function of the demonstrator is to interpret the method of the textbooks to the teachers who are using them or to prospective users of the textbooks; but that the publisher's regular representative often plays the part of demonstrator for his company in some subjects.

III. EXCHANGE CONTRACTS

Exchange contracts, which formerly played so important a part in determining which textbook would be selected, have practically disappeared as the result of a common understanding among publishers. A uniform system of exchange seems now to be common practice; rarely does one hear of a publisher's making a book-for-book exchange regardless of the condition of discarded books.

The following list of terms of exchange with states where such listing is required is typical of the forms used by publishers:

TO BOARDS OF EDUCATION:

In accordance with the provisions of law, any of the textbooks herein listed will be furnished upon the terms and at the prices quoted herewith. Supplies will be furnished at the net prices named in the second column. For sixty days from the date of the first order the exchange period will be open, and the exchange prices named in the third column will be effective in each case where a copy of the old book displaced by ours and of corresponding grade is given in exchange. All books will be billed at net prices f.o.b. Chicago. Old books when received will be credited at the difference between the net and exchange prices.

We also take in exchange, dollar's worth for dollar's worth, all new books of the series displaced by ours, provided the books are in perfect condition and can be sold again as new stock. On the return of displaced new and old books we pay the freight. It is understood that the total number of such books is not to exceed the number of our books ordered for introduction.

We have no jurisdiction over the prices at which the books shall be sold to the pupil either as an outright sale or where another book is given in exchange. Such prices are usually agreed upon by the dealer and the school authorities.

(Signed) PUBLISHING COMPANY

	List Price	Net Price	Exchange Price
Book One	\$0.56	\$0.42	\$0.39
Book Two60	.45	.42

IV. THE PROMOTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF 'EXAMINATION' COPIES

In presenting textbooks to the schools, the publisher finds it necessary to adopt a liberal policy in the distribution of examination copies to prospective selecting agencies. This appears to be an essential part of the textbook selling program, although the cost of the practice very obviously adds materially to the ultimate price of the books. This liberal policy has led some individuals in school organizations

to abuse the courtesy, to collect a large number of examination copies and then to dispose of them for gain—a practice sufficiently prevalent to have earned a specific name: *sample grafting*.

One publisher writes:

There is another rather delicate subject, which is not mentioned in the questionnaire, but which, it seems, might well be given consideration. This is the question of free-sample abuses. In some localities they lean over backwards, but in many others the secondhand-book dealers continue to prosper in the wake of an adoption. This does not apply only to adoptions either. It is not unusual for a teacher of a one-room school with ten pupils to ask for ten dollars worth of samples from one publisher. We have no very definite suggestion as to how to get around this difficulty unless it would be that the superintendents should pass a resolution asking that all sample copies be stamped:

Sample Copy
Property of the X. Y. Z. Company
Not to be sold

The problem has been recognized editorially in professional journals as follows:

A very gross abuse of free samples of textbooks is also prevalent, so unethical that perhaps it ought to be glossed over, not revealed. Not a few school people sell to secondhand dealers the books which accumulate on their shelves. They do this seemingly without shame. There are few publishers who do not have to buy in, from the large secondhand bookstores, very considerable numbers of new textbooks which a little while before were given out to teachers as gratis inspection copies.¹

But publishers are sometimes thoughtlessly imposed upon by teachers, and a word needs to be said in this connection. The bane of the business is the terrific drain in the giving of free samples of textbooks. Perhaps publishers were originally at fault in encouraging this practice, but in fairness to them, teachers ought now aid in checking the practice. Textbooks could be sold at lower figures if this item of selling expense were materially reduced. And the teacher does hold much of the power of improvement in her own hands.²

In order to determine the attitude of superintendents of schools toward policies of sampling, they were asked the following question: "Do you expect publishers to furnish free copies for examination for each member of the committee?"

¹ Editorial, "Teachers and textbooks." *Peabody Journal of Education*, Vol. 2, No. 3, November, 1924.

² Editorial, "Textbooks." *Ohio School*, June, 1929.

Of the 170 city superintendents who answered this question, 120 reported that they did expect publishers to furnish free samples for the textbook committees, 50 that they did not. It appears, then, that in general both the publisher and the superintendent regard the furnishing of sample copies a legitimate item in the expense of a textbook publisher.

V. THE DISTRIBUTION OF DESK COPIES

In their eagerness to get business, publishers have in the past given desk copies for teachers when they secured adoptions. The writer's conferences with publishers seems to indicate that with regard to this practice they do not have among themselves a gentlemen's agreement such as they have in the matter of exchange prices. One company promises desk copies if it gets the adoption; another does not. Where books are of about equal merit, the publisher who promises desk copies might well expect the business; that one item might be the determining factor in the selection.

One judges from the reactions from publishers that, while they are trying to avoid the practice of furnishing desk copies, the school people are trying to have it continued. However, in one city of about 100,000 population, a series of textbooks was recently adopted and the publisher was given an order for copies for the entire system, including teachers as well as pupils. About a week later a box of textbooks was shipped to the purchasing agent of the school system but no bill accompanied the shipment. The number of books and distribution in the series indicated that the books were desk copies for the teachers. The purchasing agent kept the books, but asked for a bill.

A similar attitude on the part of superintendents was revealed in their answers to the question: "Do you expect the successful publisher to furnish desk copies for the teachers' use? Yes or No." Only 9 of the 169 superintendents who answered this question said that they did expect publishers to furnish free desk copies.

VI. SUMMARY

The following are some of the features that are discerned in the selling policies of the publishers:

1. Preliminary announcements, briefs of textbooks, and advertising material generally, are prepared by editors, sales force, and authors

to influence textbook committees. These materials unquestionably influence superintendents and textbook committees, especially when clearly informative and not overdone. Magazine advertising, however, is less effective.

2. The publisher's representative speaks for the textbook and has a definite influence on a textbook selection. By superintendents he is deemed an asset to the selecting committee.

3. Publishers' representatives nowadays possess all the qualifications common to any good salesman and in addition are thoroughly acquainted with the theory and practice of education in the schools. Practically all of them are college graduates who have had practical school experience.

4. The publisher's demonstrator, who works in close conjunction with the publisher's representative, also has a definite influence upon selecting committees and is a factor in textbook selection, though often primarily employed after a text has been selected.

5. Uniform exchange contracts are common among publishers. Exchange bargaining, therefore, is not now a common factor in textbook selection.

6. The distribution of examination copies is generally considered a natural part of the publisher's scheme for presenting new books. Since all companies follow about the same policy, this form of sampling does not constitute a factor in selecting a given text.

7. It is not the usual policy of publishers to furnish free desk copies to teachers where an adoption has been secured and the school people do not expect them. Free desk copies are not a factor in textbook selection.

CHAPTER X

THE PROBLEMS OF PUBLISHERS IN MAKING AND MARKETING TEXTBOOKS: A SYMPOSIUM

NELSON B. HENRY

Assistant Professor of Education
School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Much consideration is given by teachers to questions relating to the effective use of books in instruction, and naturally many members of the profession have given thought to the problems involved in the writing of textbooks, yet it is evident that many schoolmen do not fully apprehend the nature of the work of the publishers and the difficulties they encounter in keeping the schools supplied with the books they need.

There are certain tasks which the publishers have to perform, either to meet the expressed or the apparent wishes of their school clientele, or to comply with laws and official regulations prescribing their procedure in dealing with representatives of the schools, which are very definitely affected by attitudes and activities of members of the teaching profession.

I. METHOD OF COLLECTING MATERIAL

To influence individual teachers to become more familiar with the mutual objectives of teaching and publishing, and to stimulate organizations of teachers to correct the conditions and practices which tend to obstruct the necessary educational services of the publishers, the Yearbook Committee solicited statements from a group of publishers setting forth certain problems that might well be studied by schoolmen. The Committee's request was presented to some major officer of each of a selected list of publishers of textbooks. Each publisher was requested to list and define the important problems arising from his dealings with teachers and school officials. It was agreed that the source of any statement made would not be revealed. The companies represented in this symposium publish between 60 and 70 percent of the books used in the public schools.

This chapter has been submitted to each of the contributors for examination of his own statements and has been corrected in compliance with any requests received. It is not to be understood, however, that each contributor subscribes to the statements of all the others; on the contrary, very positive differences of opinion exist among the publishers with respect to some of the problems discussed.

It is the hope of the Yearbook Committee that the frank statements of the publishers here presented will stimulate discussion of these problems by members of the teaching profession and will thus improve some of the undesirable conditions which the members of the teaching profession have it in their power to remedy.

The different problems set forth by representatives of the twelve companies contributing are grouped under three classifications: the making of textbooks, five problems; the marketing of textbooks, three problems; and the attitude of teachers toward the preparation, sale, or use of textbooks, three problems.

II. PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE MAKING OF TEXTBOOKS

1. Instability of Educational Theory and Demand

The lack of uniformity and the lack of stability of educational theory with respect to the organization of courses of study, particularly in the field of the social sciences. The changing conceptions of educators, with respect to courses of study, according to the statement of one of the representatives interviewed, present a particularly difficult problem to the publishers of school textbooks, since the sale of a book in any instance depends upon the attitude of a particular individual or group of individuals toward the plan of organization of the book in question. Not only does it frequently happen that a book which is acceptable in one community is excluded from consideration in adoptions proposed for other communities, but there is also a rather general tendency on the part of teachers and school administrators to change from one type of textbook to another just as a matter of experiment.

It is explained that the publisher realizes very little profit on books that are used for a period of less than five years. The publishing company that undertakes to supply the fleeting demands of the different professional groups very promptly finds itself loaded up with a list of books for which there is no market. In order to realize a reasonable

profit from its business it is necessary for the company to maintain a conservative attitude in the face of the suggestions and entreaties of the members of the teaching profession that a new book be provided to meet the demand created by some new theory which for the moment has caught the fancy of influential parties in the profession. This demand for new types of books is at present especially apparent in connection with textbooks required by classes of the social sciences. An example cited is that of an insistent demand at the present time for a "one-cycle" geography. The company in question is willing to provide a "one-cycle" geography, or any other book of specified type, provided educational theory and demand is sufficiently uniform and stable to insure a reasonable market for the book for a period of time that will enable the company to realize a profit from the production and sale thereof. It is urged that the teaching profession be informed concerning the difficulty which confronts publishing companies as a result of the general tendency to abandon established types of textbooks without more definite knowledge of the relative values of the newer and the older ideas underlying the different types of books, and without a reasonable assurance that the proposed modification will permanently satisfy some new demand or correct some deficiency of the older plan.

2. Impracticality of Educational Experts

The impractical character of the knowledge of those who set themselves up as experts in the field of education and who prescribe criteria by which the course of study, textbook authors, and textbook publishers are to be guided. This is considered by one publisher as the source of one of the most difficult problems with which publishers have to deal. In emphasizing his statement of the tendency of influential persons in the field of education to be guided entirely by theory and by experiments conducted in more or less artificial situations, this writer asserts "that whenever publishers follow slavishly the dictates of the educationist in the making of textbooks, the textbook so made is usually a failure. In order to overcome this, we as publishers set up as a guide for ourselves criteria as follows: 'Follow the educationist in all matters where his criteria based upon so-called experimental evidence do not conflict with common sense, but where the so-called experimental evidence and common sense are in conflict, we make it a point to turn to the common sense side.' "

3. Inaccuracy and Irresponsibility of Authors

The lack of feeling of responsibility on the part of authors for the accuracy and validity of subject matter of manuscripts offered for publication. One manager complains that those who offer their manuscripts for use as textbooks in the schools are frequently unconcerned about the accuracy with which scientific studies are reported in these manuscripts, and apparently assume that it is the business of the publisher rather than that of the author to insure the reading public against misleading and inaccurate statements. It is true that the publishing companies maintain an editorial staff to determine the validity and significance of the material which is presented in the author's manuscript, but it is clearly impossible for any publishing company to maintain a staff of experts in every field of study in which textbooks are to be published. The expense incurred in checking the work of authors and would-be authors adds materially to the price at which books actually sold can be marketed by the publishing companies.

4. Unethical Use of Names as Authors

Lack of candor with respect to the authorship of books. Several of the publishing companies' representatives criticise the practice among educators of allowing their names to be associated with publications to which they have contributed little or nothing in the way of authorship. One manager asks the question: "Should there not be an ethical consideration with regard to the real and ostensible authorship of a schoolbook?" As he sees it, this is a problem for the members of the teaching profession to deal with, but he asserts that the publishing companies would be considerably relieved if they were not compelled to handle books which represent the work of one individual but which must be sold under the stimulus of the prominence of some one else. The representative of another publishing company expresses his idea in the following words:

A good textbook is a child of the mind and oftentimes is the product of a lifetime of study, experimenting, and working over; but very often a well-advertised university professor-politician will allow his name to go on a book as a joint author when he has not done one hour of work on the manuscript other than to read it over. In other words, the college professor sells his prestige for money, while the author, who has done all the work and really contributed something educationally, is deprived of a large share of the reward. Generally, cases of this kind

are well known; often college professors have been known to boast that they simply allowed their names to go on the books though they had nothing to do with them. The school people could in a short time stop this practice by refusing to adopt books offered under the conditions described.

5. Absurdity of Insistence on Recent Copyright Date

Insistence on the part of those responsible for the selection of textbooks that every book adopted must bear a recent copyright date. The editor of one of the companies declares that teachers and supervisors are "copyright mad." There have been frequent instances under his observation in which books were refused consideration on the mere score of date of publication. It is not an uncommon practice, he finds, for textbook committees and school officials to limit their selection arbitrarily to those books which have been published within the five years preceding. A representative of another company submits the following statement:

Great damage is being done to the schools of America by the incessant and insistent demand for "something new." The thoughtless superintendent and teacher look at the date of copyright of a book, and if the copyright is more than two years old, say without further investigation they don't want old-fashioned books. This thing is probably carried to its extreme in the case of a teacher who refused Palmer's translation of *The Odyssey* and said he wanted a "new" translation, as if a new translation prepared by some newspaper writer would take the place of the rhythmic prose and scholarship of Professor Palmer. We may expect that they will demand a new version of *Romeo and Juliet* instead of Shakespeare's.

The same general attitude is expressed in slightly different phrasing when applied to the making of new textbooks out of old ones. The publishers' interpretation of this attitude on the part of teachers is summarized in a statement of the writer of the letter just quoted.

There is constant and insistent demand for revised editions, without any adequate basis. While it may be true that certain phases of pedagogy change rapidly, they are changing a great deal less than people think, and many of the alleged changes are mere camouflage. It seems as if teachers were more anxious to find complaints about their books than admiration for them, and there are no textbooks in the world comparable with the American schoolbooks for elementary schools. The minute a complaint can be found, inquiry is made when the "revised edition" will be out, and in order to keep the sale up, the revised edition must be changed enough so that the representative can

point out "the revisions." These revisions are not usually important. They are merely saying the same things in another way, and make the books look new at the expense of the schools of America. McGuffey's *Readers* were standard books for two generations. For forty years children learned grammar from Reed & Kellogg. Colburn's *Mental Arithmetic* sold substantially for ninety years. But it is a reasonable assumption that no arithmetic published before 1900 is now in use in any school in America. There surely has been no change in the teaching of arithmetic which justifies this condition. The demand is not for something better; it is for something different, which is often something worse. It used to be necessary to get a book established in leading educational centers before it would be accepted by the lesser lights in the educational profession. Now, the fact that a book has been used in a few places is often an argument that it must therefore be an old book, and they don't want it. They want to try something new.

III. PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE MARKETING OF TEXTBOOKS

1. Methods of Adopting Textbooks

The "adoption" plan of regulating the use of books in the schools of a state, county, or district. This practice is apparently the source of several grievous problems with which publishers have to deal. The chief criticisms are directed toward the usual form of state adoptions and the difficulties and evils that grow out of it. The arguments advanced relate both to the commercial and to the educational consequences of this plan, and indicate that whatever profit it may afford accrues to the publishers and the politicians, while the children and the taxpayers stand a chance to suffer educational or financial losses. The disadvantages of adoptions for specified periods of time, and the advantages of free textbooks, with a large measure of freedom in the selection of books accorded the teachers who must use the books, are definitely indicated.

The fundamental fallacies of the state adoption idea are briefly summarized in the following quotation from one of the letters received:

It is my understanding that the movement for state uniformity originated in the desire of those in authority to bring about prices that were both cheap and uniform. Other reasons given for state uniformity were that it would enable the state authorities to make a uniform course of study, and that parents moving about the state would not be obliged to purchase new books whenever they changed their locations.

In the early years of state uniformity prices were lowered. Later, many states, of which Michigan and Illinois are examples, passed laws

requiring the publisher offering his books to give bond that the prices were the lowest quoted anywhere. As a result, books are furnished in such states as Michigan and Illinois at the same prices at which the same books are furnished in Indiana. It is apparent, therefore, that the argument in favor of state uniformity because it means cheaper books no longer holds.

The advantage of a course of study based on one set of books is not apparent and has never been taken seriously by many people.

The saving in expense to parents moving about is inconsequential.

The great evil of state uniformity is that the size of the contract attracts the politicians. Inevitably, influences creep in which are quite apart from the merit of the books, and frequently state adoptions are made in which the merit of the book is almost wholly disregarded.

In substantial agreement with the foregoing statement another writer indicates his opinion with respect to other units of adoption in these terms:

The question of county adoptions is almost the same. The larger the county, the worse it is. If the county is the smallest useful educational unit, it has probably got to be made the basis, and a group of small, bad county adoptions is probably better than one bad state adoption.

The best unit for an adoption, of course, is that in which the books are most nearly selected by the teacher who is responsible for the results. From the emphasis too often laid on adoptions, it would appear that books are an end in themselves, whereas they are merely a means of educating children. If a school turns out well-educated pupils, it is the combined result of teachers, books, libraries, and supervisors. Books are merely a tool, and the person who has to use the tool ought to have the choice of it. She ought to be teaching arithmetic—not some particular text in arithmetic, as is often the case. If you can get this selection of books practically down to the teaching force that is to use the book in an individual school, you will inevitably get the best and the most successful books used, for the reputation of the teacher and the school is at stake; whereas the results obtained in a village school have very little relation to the reputation of a group of educational politicians making the state contracts.

In none of the statements submitted does the publisher recognize any educational advantage in the adoption plan. Some of them candidly assert that the only possible benefits are those which the book companies realize from the assurance of continued use of adopted books. This point of view is expressed by one manager in the following paragraphs:

Why do we have adoptions? From my conversation with the generation of bookmen who are for the most part gone, I conclude that it was a policy inaugurated by them in order to 'salt down' business for a period of years, and was done during the time when schools gave all of their business to their favorite bookman. In those days there were boards of education and some superintendents who were not above sharing in the profits of the adoption. Legislators were appealed to to 'sew up' the business for five-year periods, and finally the state adoption was conceived. . . . To-day things have changed. Schoolmen are above these tactics. They want the best that can be produced. Agents must have the standards of business and of personal ethics possessed by the schoolmen. The publisher must concern himself with the production of good books and not with the manipulation of teachers and boards of education.

Who is benefited by adoptions? No one but the company who has the adoption. Certainly the pupil is not benefited by using an out-of-date textbook. Certainly a teacher does not like to have to apologize for the text and to supplement its deficiencies. Certainly the parent does not like to have books discarded just because the five years are up. Certainly publishers do not relish the terrific cost of agency work. They would rather have their agents go out as salesmen to take orders for such books as the schools require, than to incur the expense of 'looking into situations.'

Whatever the original motive back of the adoption plan, any adoption of a book or list of books is commonly made for a specified period of use. So long as parents are required to purchase the books their children need, there will be some objections to any proposed change in textbooks, regardless of the advantages offered. If free textbooks were provided in all the schools, the evils of the adoption plan could be more easily corrected. One representative explains:

In many states a book once adopted must be used for five years. This five-year period has its objections. It was doubtless put in as a saving to the patrons by preventing frequent changes—that is to say, it was to protect the school authorities against the persistent efforts of the publishers. It might be assumed that the school authorities would be able to take care of themselves and that they should have the privilege of changing more often than once in five years if it seemed to them for the good of the schools to do so. For instance, it might happen that a book had been adopted which proved upon trial not to be fitted, yet according to the law of some states that must be the textbook for a full five-year period. Again, a new book might appear, representing a radical departure from the method of previous books. It makes an immediate appeal to various school authorities, but they are prevented by law from introducing this particular book for two or three

years. Meanwhile, two or three groups of children have gone through the particular grade where this book would have been used, and have lost the advantage which they might have had by the use of this latest and best book.

It seems to me that the ideal condition from the standpoint of the school people and the publishers is a small unit, with the selection of the books in the hands of the teachers.

Conditions approach the ideal in the state of Massachusetts. The books are free. There is no stated time of adoption. The school people may take any book at any time or drop any book at any time. Conditions are identical with those in private schools or colleges.

If such conditions prevailed, the competition would be confined to the relative merits of the books, and it would become essential that the men who represented houses should know all these books and should be conversant with the best teaching methods in order to discuss their books intelligently and effectively. I might say that this is the type of representative that the publishers are employing more and more as the practice is growing of leaving such decisions to the teachers rather than to the school boards.

With the exception of Oklahoma, no state that has once legislated in favor of free textbooks has returned to the method of purchase by pupils. Free textbooks do away with some of the arguments for state uniformity.

I look forward to the time when free textbooks will be furnished throughout the country, when there will be no state uniformity and no period of adoption, when the selection of the books will be entirely in the hands of those who are to teach them.

2. Methods and Criteria in Selecting Textbooks

*a. The indefinite legal status of the position of superintendent, with the consequent inability or unwillingness of the superintendent to assume full responsibility for the determination of the policy and practice of the school system with respect to the selection and use of textbooks.*¹ This statement is presented by one of the managers as the chief source of the various difficulties which arise in connection with the selection of textbooks by city school systems. In general the superintendent's responsibilities are not legally defined, and he exercises only so much control over the selection of textbooks as the board of education voluntarily allocates to him or so much as he is able to assume without interference on the part of the board. If the mem-

¹ The reader should compare with this and succeeding sections the summary of the views and practices of the superintendents given by Superintendent Jensen in Chapter VII.—*Editor*.

bers of the profession could secure a more clearly defined status for the position of superintendent of schools, the superintendent would be compelled to take full responsibility for the selection of books to be used in the schools of his city. With this responsibility thus definitely and properly located, many of the indirect methods and secret practices which now prevail would be naturally eliminated. Furthermore, argues another manager :

To fix the responsibility upon the superintendent does not mean that he would not consult his principals, supervisors, and expert teachers. It simply means that he would be the final arbiter, that he would cast the decisive vote.

Whether because of lack of definite authority or because of lack of courage on the part of the superintendent, any shifting of the responsibility for textbook selections from the office of the superintendent, it is argued, increases the likelihood that selections will not be determined by the merits of the books considered and by the needs of the schools in which they are to be used. Thus, one publisher remarks :

Another favorite method of selecting textbooks is by the appointment of a committee. The superintendent selects committees on different subjects, and various members of the committee consider different books, and after several disagreements by a 4 to 3 vote they select some series which the superintendent promptly endorses, although he knows that it is not suitable for his schools, that it is more or less the result of compromise, and that the four persons who voted for it are the least efficient on the committee. Often these committees are all appointed and go through all the machinery of examining books, and then the books adopted in no wise resemble the choice the committees have made. Sometimes the book men are fooled by this process, but not very often, apart from the younger and inexperienced men. Now and again an entire school staff is invited to vote on textbooks, and they hold an election by the teachers. All these methods oblige a man who looks at it impartially from a distance to wonder why the school systems pay for a superintendent who is supposed to know something about education. Of course, a superintendent is entitled to ask advice and assistance from any of his teachers, but he should not try to shed the responsibility. He may very well demand an expert report from any teacher on the subject she is supposed to be especially proficient in, but the responsibility for the selection of books is his, and not to be delegated to any committee. It is a grave responsibility and on it depend to a considerable extent the educational results which he can hope to get from his school sys-

tem. In the great city school systems this may have to be delegated to an assistant superintendent, but the eventual responsibility should be placed on one intelligent, honest, impartial man, who is also responsible for educational results in the political division under his control, if you want adequate results.

b. The appointment of secret committees for the selection of textbooks. This is a practice condemned by the representatives of several different publishing companies. In one statement it is explained that the secret committee is resorted to by the superintendent or board of education as a means of avoiding responsibility or of escaping the annoyance of being canvassed by representatives of book companies. It is claimed by those who adopt this plan that it provides a surer method of securing an impartial consideration of all available books; but the plan does not always realize this purpose, because the membership of such committees usually becomes known to the textbook men. At times it has been discovered that individual members of the committee and representatives of some of the publishing companies have violated the instructions of the local authorities and have secretly consulted about particular books during the course of the committee's investigation. Those companies which have instructed their agents to comply with the request that they refrain from seeking any personal interviews with members of the committee have therefore not had an equal opportunity to present the claims of their publications. The plan is therefore inequitable in that the way is usually still open for some of the publishers to gain an advantage over their competitors. Furthermore, from the educational point of view the plan of the secret committee is ineffective because only certain ones of the books considered have been presented to members of the committee by the persons best qualified and prepared to explain their particular merits. "Secret committees, secret advisors, and secrecy of every nature should be abolished in the selection of texts."

c. Textbook committees and superintendents are not always frank and sincere in their dealings with publishing companies. It is asserted by the publishers that the companies are usually advised of a proposed change in textbooks and are requested to submit samples or are given to understand that the books will be considered for adoption if they are presented sometimes to find that the public announcement of a change in texts has been made merely for 'public consump-

tion' or perhaps merely to comply technically with a regulation that such announcement must be made. The committee or individual responsible for the selection of books in the meantime had already been effectively canvassed before the announcement was sent out. In such cases, the publishers are frequently put to needless expense and trouble to try to serve the interests of their business on the one hand and the interests of the school people on the other hand.

Another contributor declares that this type of insincerity has at times been carried to the point of permitting a representative

to enter into competition for the adoption of textbooks and to spend weeks of his time at considerable expense to his firm, and with the knowledge and consent of a superintendent, only to find that a decision had been arrived at even before the representative had had an opportunity of submitting his books or his bid. Such procedure is manifestly unfair, as its purpose is either to screen some action that would demand a defense unobtainable in any other way, or to protect the superintendent from representatives whose arguments he is disinclined to consider. Deliberate advance 'set-ups' of an entire list are certainly not unknown in some state adoptions, but what can the publisher do about it!

d. Textbook committees and others responsible for the selection of textbooks are too frequently influenced by considerations other than significant facts about the books themselves. Textbook committees are thought by some to give too much consideration to printed lists of cities, counties, or states in which a book has already been adopted. There is no question but that those charged with the responsibility of selecting a suitable text in any particular situation are thus influenced by the action of other committees or authorities in selecting those books. It is suggested that the primary responsibility of any publisher is to assist those whose duty it is to select a textbook by presenting his statement concerning his own offerings in terms of the essential characteristics of the books themselves. The fact that a book has been adopted in one large city may be a reasonable claim for attention, but it should not be the determining factor in its adoption in other large cities, for the obvious reason that the particular characteristics of the book which led to its adoption in the first instance may be characteristics which are of minor importance or of no importance at all in the second instance.

If the publishers do seek adoptions for their books by pressing claims of dubious sorts, they at least can offer in mitigation the stimu-

lating example of some of the authors of the books they are trying to sell. One writer describes the situation in these rather appalling assertions:

In recent years, the tendency of authors and persons in educational authority to throw their influence toward the selection of books written by them or by their friends has greatly increased. Men holding high educational positions do not hesitate to exert all the influence in their power for the selection of books written by them and from which they obtain financial advantage. Men are appealing to the loyalty of their former pupils to work for the selection of their books when their point of view obviously should be to tell their pupils that they do not want their books selected unless that would aid education in the state to a greater extent than any other publication.

The reverse of this is the man who on account of anger or pique tries to stop the adoption of a good book because he had a falling out with the publisher or has a personal quarrel with the author. A recent case was that of a professor who moved to a university and at once threw out the publications of a certain publisher because the publisher refused to give him, without charge, permission to use copyrighted selections, or because, to put it baldly, the publisher had refused to bribe him with property (which belonged to the authors and not to the publisher) to use his influence for the publisher's books. It sometimes seems as if this lack of moral sense and responsibility were more conspicuous among some of the more conspicuous figures in education than it is among the ordinary grade teachers.

e. In some city school systems the superintendent or board of education has a rule prohibiting representatives of publishing companies from calling upon the teachers. This is cited as a practice that is unfair to the publishing companies, unjust to the teachers, and not in the interests of the school system itself. One manager contends that there are always some teachers and some representatives of publishing companies who are unwilling to abide by such a regulation and that those publishers who comply with this request do not have an equal opportunity to acquaint the teachers of that system with their publications. In contrast, this manager submits as an example of wholesome practice a letter received by him from the superintendent of schools in a large midwestern city.

I beg leave to call your attention to the studies which we shall make of textbooks in the fields indicated below. You are invited to submit to members of the committees such texts as you may desire to offer.

We are desirous of studying the more recently published texts in plane geometry which may be used in the second grade of high school, with a view to contrasting with the present text, which was published several years previous to the publication of reports of the various organizations of mathematics teachers which have appeared in recent years. The committee consists of the following:

Publishers' representatives are at liberty to call on members of the committees at their respective schools at such time as the teachers may have to give when they are not engaged in filling their school duties. Representatives are requested to see principals as to whether it will be possible to call on teachers.

While it will not be necessary to call at the superintendent's office, representatives are always welcome and any information which we feel at liberty to give will be given to all. In this study we receive representatives of publishers in cordial and friendly spirit and welcome such information upon the merits of their respective publications as they may have to offer.

*f. The practice of using score cards as a basis for the selection of books to be adopted.*² The schoolmaster's use of the score card as a guide in the selection of books is considered by some of the publishers as in most instances an unreliable method, and in some instances a distinctly unfair method because a particular scoring plan is employed which unduly emphasizes characteristics of particular books or sets of books. One editor apparently visualizes certain educational disadvantages of the attempt to rate books and regards the tendency to use score cards as a backward rather than a forward step. To quote:

A good many years ago we largely dispensed with trying to mark children on a percentage basis, but we have only recently begun to try to mark textbooks. Both belong in the same category. It has become quite fashionable now to have standards on which textbooks are marked. In many cases the standards are quite foolish. In other cases they are all right for a big city, but when transplanted to an adjoining small town are quite worthless, because the conditions are different. In some cases an unusual type of book cannot be brought into the classification at all and is therefore thrown out, although it may be the exact book needed for that locality. It is very doubtful whether this testing system for textbooks is of value.

The practice is somewhat more emphatically decried by the manager who submits the following questions and comments:

How can the selection of textbooks in a city be made by a single individual or by a group of individuals constituting a committee with-

² The reader should compare this section with Chapter VIII by Dean Maxwell discussing the use of score cards.—*Editor*.

out a scale of measurement or a test being used that points conclusively to the selection of a given textbook or a given series of textbooks because such books were written to answer that particular scale or test?

Granted that a test or measuring scale is used, how can such a test or measuring scale be formulated on such general and intelligent lines that, with all honesty, no individual and no member of a committee will know in advance that the test and the measuring scale do not even indirectly point in advance in the direction of a given textbook or given series of textbooks either already published or to be published in time for measurement?

How can an honest measurement by test or by scale be reached through the judgment and scoring of each member of a committee uninfluenced by the judgment or scoring of any other member?

Assuming that the uninfluenced judgment of each individual can be obtained, will there not be so much variation in the scoring of free-thinking individuals that no unanimity can be obtained?

As publishers, we discovered some time since that there is comparatively little to fear in this modern day through representatives of textbook companies influencing the decisions of committees through practices that bear no relation to the relative merits of textbooks, but that there is everything to fear from the representatives of textbook companies influencing the decisions of committees through the practice of unduly emphasizing the merits of textbooks by setting up so-called standards of merit that distort a few arbitrarily defined merits into conclusive proof that a textbook is the best of those under consideration when it may be by far the worst if measured comprehensively and thoroughly by all standards of merit which should enter into the consideration. Under the guise of adopting books on merit, some of the worst practices in the schoolbook business have crept into adoptions in recent years; in fact, about every wrong result that is being obtained, as we see it, is done under the guise of intensive study of merit. Real merit, properly determined throughout a book and weighed in the balance, as against the merit throughout other books, is what we should like to see.

Another manager contends that the judgment of the classroom teacher is a safer guide than the score card. In explanation, he asserts:

It is practically impossible to use the score card system and secure fair and just decisions. In the numerous instances which this writer has observed, the score card system has not provided an impartial decision. This has become so uniformly true that we find publishing houses bringing out printed score cards of their own on arithmetic, geography, readers, in fact on practically all important subjects covered in the elementary and secondary school. Some publishing houses

have gone to the extent of including these printed score sheets in the presentation copies of the books sent out for examination.

It seems to me that the safest and best way to adopt textbooks is to make it a strictly individual and at the same time educational matter for the unit to be served. To illustrate: Here is a city of 30,000 people; a textbook in arithmetic is to be selected. The superintendent, the principal, and the teachers of arithmetic should know just where they are having their greatest trouble in presenting the subject of arithmetic to boys and girls in that school system. In arriving at the decision that a change in arithmetic texts should be made, these people have first decided in just what particulars their present text is failing to give results. Then it would appear that the selection of a new textbook will depend entirely upon securing a series of arithmetics which, after careful examination, best presents and develops the parts of arithmetic where the pupils and teachers are the weakest. Basically, this is the only successful way in which textbook changes should be considered. The score cards, which vary in about the same numerical ratio as there are people who make score cards, cannot possibly anticipate the weaknesses of arithmetic teaching in one unit, in another unit, etc. We believe it evident that textbook changes, to serve the best educational interests of a community, should be based on the recognized desired results in the individual school systems. If there is any truth in this statement, then it would follow that selections should be made by a representative vote of the teachers of the subject in which textbooks are to be changed.

3. School Conditions That Impose Unwarranted Expense on the Publisher

a. The difficulty of meeting the requirements of a trade that is not conversant with the purely business aspects of the service rendered by publishing companies. The publisher is engaged in selling books for profit to a group of persons who are not buying the books with the expectation of realizing themselves any financial profit from handling or using them. It is this fact that educators are selecting books with a view to educational value alone, argues one manager, that tends to make them lose sight of certain significant business principles which are necessarily important considerations for the publishers with whom they deal. It is almost as if the schoolmen said: "The schools are not run for financial profit; why should you publishers expect to make money?"

For example, after days of deliberation and consideration of the various books submitted by a number of competing publishing firms, each of which had met all the formal requirements in a way of sampling,

the provision of surety bonds, and the sending of representatives to furnish information desired by a certain state board, all bids were finally rejected on the ground that there was a striking similarity in prices of books of a given class as submitted by different textbook companies. It was argued that such similarity in a list of competing prices constituted sufficient evidence of collusion on the part of the companies concerned to make it imperative that the board refuse to negotiate further with these companies except on the basis of an entirely new set of bids. The view expressed by the publisher commenting on this action of the state board in question is that the very ordinary experiences of men engaged in commercial enterprise would have enabled them to understand that the conditions under which different publishing companies do business are practically the same for all companies whose marketable products are of the same general class. The incriminating element of identity in price lists as submitted by different firms seeking the adoption of any particular textbook is therefore evidence of nothing more than the well-understood fact that competition in this particular line of business is generally very keen. The prices submitted in this case would not likely appeal to any set of business men as evidence of anything else.

This instance is presented as a sample of the inability of educators to understand the purely business aspects of their dealings with publishing companies, to do business in a business-like way.

b. The numerous requests for free copies of textbooks. Unreasonable demands upon publishers for free books on the part of teachers, administrative officers, school boards, and textbook commissions are characterized by some of the bookmen interviewed as a serious problem in carrying on their business. In general it is contended that no other business enterprise is expected to distribute free samples of its wares in any such wholesale fashion as book companies are compelled to do, and that members of the teaching profession itself do not make such demands in purchasing other necessary school supplies and equipment. The net result of the practice is higher prices for the books which are sold to the school public, since all the expense of marketing, as well as the cost of production, must be liquidated in the revenues from sales.

The most emphatic objections relate to demands for free sample copies of books 'for examination.' Arguing that "the system is wrong in principle," one manager says the "self-respecting superintendent should demand of his board that all samples needed should be bought and paid for." The value of gift copies of school books sent out by

publishers is estimated by one representative at from 3 to 10 percent of the value of the books sold. Another states that for every 15 college texts sold, one is given away. The number of samples sent out by one company last year is given as 192,850 copies, and the writer adds that "we are considered by some teachers as stingy." The protest against this practice is fairly summarized in the following quotation:

It takes a sale of at least twenty books to pay for one free sample, and the demand on the publisher for free samples has steadily increased in recent years. This is to no small extent due to the lavish and foolish waste of sample copies on the part of representatives of some publishers, but it is also due to the increasing demand for copies on the part of educational authorities. This organization of committees within committees, followed by a demand for a separate sample copy for each member of each committee, results in such a demand for sample copies in the minor cities that the eventual sale hardly pays for it, especially as there is more than a suspicion that these sample copies are eventually used for study, to take the place of books that would otherwise be bought.

Moreover, there is a strong suspicion that these sample copies are sometimes sold by thoughtless educational persons, which results in their going into the second-hand trade and materially reducing the legitimate sales. If a teacher does not want the books given him, is it too much to ask him to return them to the giver?

It can fairly be expected that any city ought to be able to select its books without expecting the publisher to give away twenty to thirty copies. This is the only business which I know of where a merchant is expected to give away unlimited quantities of his product in order to secure a sale. Admitting that it is impossible to select a book wisely without examining it, it still is reasonable to ask that the educational authorities have copies submitted for examination used by more than one person, and not expect every person who has the slightest claim to a chance to examine the book, to be provided with a separate copy. As I have said before, this evil is partly due to the publishers themselves.

A further demand objected to by some of the publishers is that they furnish free 'desk copies.' Continuing the statement just quoted:

An evil which, however, is not due to the publishers to any extent, is the demand that, after a book has been adopted, the teachers shall be supplied with free desk copies. Educational authorities do not demand that their teachers be supplied with free chalk, free crasers, free stationary, free desks, or any other part of their school equipment, but they unhesitatingly demand that they be supplied with free books in many parts of the country. The schools do not gain anything by this,

for if the custom grows instead of decreases, the price of twelve books will have to be raised to cover the cost of thirteen, assuming that the thirteenth must be given away as a desk copy.

Objection is made also to the not infrequent practice of requesting free sets of books 'for trial with classes' with a view to adoption. This practice is an imposition upon the textbook companies, but competition does not permit the companies to refuse such requests.

It is suggested also that the growing practice of requesting publishers to donate books for a library for a school or a college should be discouraged. Some publishers feel that they must comply with such requests; and of course all such demands upon the companies must indirectly affect the price of books which are sold. Also the complaint is made that these libraries of textbooks are not always so administered as to make the books which are provided by the publishing companies conveniently serviceable to the people they are expected to serve.

An instance is cited by a representative of one publishing company, of a request he received from the head of a department in a state university where such an exhibit of books is maintained, asking for the publications of this company in his particular field as a contribution to a textbook library for his department. When reminded that such publications had already been furnished the library maintained at his institution, he replied that there were too many books in the library and that it was impossible for anybody to find what he wanted.

c. Legal and administrative trade restrictions. Conflicting and illogical laws governing the sale of textbooks, especially in the different states and communities having textbook uniformity, make the business of selling school books needlessly difficult and expensive. Admitting that the publishers are themselves responsible for the inception of some of the restrictions imposed, it is argued that such varying regulations have been set up by those in control of state and local school systems that it is impossible for the companies to establish and maintain uniform trade practices in their dealings with public-school systems. Every state or community having textbook uniformity makes its own regulations relating to textbooks without regard for the conditions prescribed by other states or communities, with the result that the publishers must contend with confusing and conflicting stipulations in the different territories in which they operate. As expressed by one representative:

Every schoolbook law requires the usual antitrust affidavit, the sworn statement that the wholesale price is as low as the book is sold for elsewhere, and bonds running into fancy figures. But these state laws are at variance in the word 'price.' In all of them the dealer's commission is fixed. In some states it is 10 per cent on retail, in others 15 per cent on retail, or 20 per cent on wholesale, etc.

Publishers are also required to allow an 'exchange rate' on old books displaced by new adoptions and sometimes are hampered by the necessity of making concessions to persons with whom they have trade relations in order to avoid misunderstandings and unfriendly criticism. They are imposed upon, we are told, by local dealers, by heads of institutions and school systems, and by individual teachers who order books, overestimating the requirements of their trade or classes, and claim the right to return unsold copies instead of paying for them. Again, it sometimes happens that unwarranted claims are made for the replacement of damaged books.

Publishers are constantly receiving claims for defective books. When thousands and thousands of copies of a book have been used in forty or fifty school systems, one suddenly bobs up and claims that the books from exactly the same lot and bound in the same way are defective. Of course, the answer is that the management of this school is defective and the children are not obliged to take care of their books. Fifteen or twenty perfectly filthy volumes showing every evidence of misuse are returned to the publisher for credit, and the publisher is usually weak-minded enough to credit them. They are usually returned by a dictatorial, unreasonable person, although of course he doesn't recognize himself as such, and they usually come back from schools well below the average in efficiency and are a criticism of the schools rather than of the publisher.

IV. GENERAL PROBLEMS RELATING TO CERTAIN ATTITUDES OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION TOWARD THE PREPARATION, SALE, AND USE OF TEXTBOOKS

1. Failure to Appreciate the Publisher's Educational Contribution

Lack of recognition of the fact that publishers are interested in, and at work on, educational problems, and not merely engaged upon a purely commercial enterprise. The task of preparing and selling books for use in the schools is said to be rendered more difficult than need be because of the failure of the school public to understand the nature of the educational service of the publishers. Discussing the

method of providing suitable textbooks for the schools, one writer explains:

There are two methods by which publishers bring out textbooks: First, they accept manuscripts from authors who, independently of any publishing house, have prepared and submitted the manuscript for acceptance; second, they use the method which is followed uniformly by this publishing company, as follows: Its editors make frequent trips throughout the country interviewing leading educators along certain definite, educational lines. These same editors attend all important educational meetings and keep their ears close to the ground to discover what is taking place in the educational field as shown through these educational meetings. More than that, these educators are constantly in touch with the sales forces of the company, and the field representatives on the other hand make it a part of their business to study educational trends in their respective territories and keep their company informed of such movements.

The fact is that any publishing house worthy of the name, a house that, so to speak, is marketing thoroughbreds, and not 'cotton mules,' is attempting at all times to give to the educators and schools of the country service as represented by high-class publications, far and beyond any sales which the schools of the country can possibly give the company. The first step in this direction is the ever increasing effort to secure not only the best authorship but also a product which will actually solve educational problems better than any textbooks have heretofore solved these problems. The publisher who accepts this as his objective can rightly claim that he is among the foremost of the country's educational influences. Not only, then, is every possible care taken in securing authorship, but likewise does the publisher help formulate the manuscript, and thus he becomes a real factor in the writing of textbooks. The art editor of a large publishing house is at least 75 per cent responsible for the aptness and the beauty of the illustrations; the editors are very largely responsible in all textbooks for the pedagogical equipment. I feel sure that the average educator little realizes how much painstaking care is represented in the making of a successful textbook.

Likewise the present-day textbook salesman has an educational mission to perform.

So far as this company is concerned, we go into the field and get the very best possible men as salesmen. Some of the points involved in selecting a representative are appearance, personality, actual experience in successful teaching, and a sympathy with teaching as a profession. It is our intention to get men who know the field of education, men who are in sympathy with it, men who can be of real service to school men in helping them to solve their problems. We take the

position that a good textbook is a very material aid in the solution of an educational problem, just as much so as the proper ax is to the woodman. We further take the position that unless our salesmen can be of real service to the school men on whom they call, there is no excuse for their jobs, and they cannot rightly claim the attention or time of the school men. If they cannot give the school men on whom they call more in the way of help and service than the school men can possibly give them in the way of adoptions and orders for books, then certainly there is no place for the book salesman.

As the representative of another company pleads:

Do not think of the publisher as a commercial agency alone. It is to the publisher that the teaching profession looks for educational leadership in the production of the newest and best textbooks, books representing the latest developments in teaching methods. The publisher's entire resources are invested, often at great hazard, in making such advanced books possible; so it is to the interests of the teaching profession to see that he is protected in the legitimate prosecution of his business.

2. Hypercritical Attitude Toward All Textbooks

Without knowledge of the difficulties involved in the preparation of textbooks, there is a tendency among teachers to adopt a critical and at times almost contemptuous attitude toward all available texts. Deploing this tendency and its obvious consequences, one writer says:

One other place where I believe that our educational experts (and this has been especially true of the teachers colleges and other teacher-training institutions) have done great injury to education is in the fact that frequently they have led their teachers in training to believe that textbooks are more or less unnecessary, with the practical result that many young teachers come out of the teachers colleges with the idea that they can present better courses in the various subjects to be taught than that usually found in the textbooks. This, I think you will agree, is an unfortunate attitude for young teachers to take.

3. Unethical Attitude Toward the Copyright

Lack of understanding of, or regard for, the significance of the copyright in its relation to textbook material. The statement is made that many individuals apparently do not realize that the request for the privilege of using considerable portions of some published text in the preparation of their own books is an unreasonable presumption on their part. The publisher is hesitant to refuse such a request since such refusal will certainly be interpreted as a selfish act intended

unduly to obstruct the would-be author's productive work. The fact that is overlooked by the person soliciting the publisher's permission to use such material is that this material exists as a result of the productive enterprise of some one else and that that some one is entitled to the rewards which normally ensue from authorship and which the copyright is intended to safeguard. A distinction is to be made, however, between individuals seeking the right to use copyrighted materials and the exchange agreements sometimes established between publishing companies, since it is obvious that the individual has nothing to offer in exchange for the value to be derived from the use of material belonging to some other author.

There is also a practice of frequent occurrence among teachers which violates the principle of the copyright as applied to textbook material. This is the practice of multigraphing sections of textbook material or lists of textbook exercises for distribution to members of a class. The obvious outcome and injustice of such practice is the denial of suitable recompense to the author for time and labor devoted to the preparation of his book and to the publisher for the investment required for the manufacture and distribution of the book. It does not seem unreasonable, one manager declares, to expect teachers to recognize the property rights of other teachers if the purposes and significance of the copyright law are generally understood.

V. IN CONCLUSION

The reader is again reminded that the statements presented in this chapter are intended to bring to the attention of members of the teaching profession some of the publishers' problems which, in the judgment of those contributing to this symposium, individual teachers generally and this professional group particularly may with propriety take cognizance of. It is to be noted also that these statements have been provided at the request of the Yearbook Committee, not on the initiative of the publishers. They have participated, in some instances somewhat reluctantly lest their motives be misunderstood, with the hope that this coöperative enterprise may lead to a better understanding on the part of teachers of the mutual interests of teachers and publishers, and with a desire to stimulate some organized professional activity in furtherance of remedial textbook legislation wherever the interests of the schools are found to require it.

Mention has been made of the fact that there are differences of opinion among publishers with respect to some of the problems discussed in this report. Doubtless there are differences of opinion among educators, too, on some of these questions. Some educators will take issue with some of the views expressed by one or more of the publishers who have coöperated with the Committee in this inquiry. Be that as it may, it is certainly true that some of the problems mentioned are so closely related to the interests of the schools and the teachers that any society of teachers may well give serious consideration to them. It is the hope of the Committee that the teachers and the publishers may be induced by this report to undertake some coöperative study of the problems mentioned and perhaps some coöperative movement to meet them.

CHAPTER XI

THE ETHICS OF MARKETING AND SELECTING TEXTBOOKS

J. B. EDMONSON

Dean, School of Education
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

I. THE PROBLEM AND THE METHOD

There is persistent criticism of some of the practices employed in selecting textbooks for the schools. Is this criticism valid? To secure opinions on this phase of the textbook problem, the writer submitted questions about certain practices to a representative list of persons interested in the selecting of textbooks, namely, to a few representatives of leading textbook companies, to a few superintendents of schools in all the states, and to a small number of persons selected from the membership of this Society. The questions were sent to 800 persons; replies were received from 323 persons—83 from the representatives of textbook companies, 198 from school administrators, and 42 from other persons engaged in educational work. The replies came from forty-two states and the District of Columbia. The replies are significant, perhaps, in the definite agreement shown on a few issues and the equally definite disagreement shown on other issues.

The directions accompanying the questionnaire included the following explanation of the terms ethical and unethical as used in the questions: "Interpret the expressions 'ethical' and 'unethical' to refer to the propriety of an act or practice." The questionnaire also contained a request that any practice be checked as "unimportant" if it was "so infrequent or inconsequential that it does not deserve to be included in the present list." Since the list of practices mentioned in the questionnaire was secured by numerous conferences with superintendents of schools, high-school inspectors, field agents and sales managers of publishing firms, and other well-informed persons, it was not surprising to find that very few individuals checked any practice as unimportant. Those who responded to the questionnaire were given an opportunity to submit a qualified answer to any question by checking the reply "Depends," and they were encouraged in

that case to explain upon what the decision would depend. Many such explanations were submitted; some of them are presented in this report.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts: (1) the practices of superintendents or of selecting committees, (2) the practices of representatives of textbook companies, and (3) opinions regarding general ethical conditions in the textbook business.

In presenting the results, the opinions of the field representatives of textbook companies are combined with those of the representatives of the schools because a careful study of the replies failed to reveal any significant differences in the point of view of these two groups. This may surprise some readers. It should be remembered, however, that many field representatives have had experience as school administrators and teachers and have had the same professional training as that required of school executives. Then, too, superintendents and field representatives frequently discuss the issues raised in the questionnaire and this tends to produce similarity of opinions.

II. OPINIONS ON THE ETHICS DISPLAYED IN THE PRACTICES OF SUPERINTENDENTS OR TEXTBOOK COMMITTEES IN SELECTING TEXTS

Sixteen questions relating to practices of superintendents or selecting committees were included in the questionnaire. These questions were answered by 323 persons. The distribution of replies is given in percentages for each question under the headings "Yes," "No," "Depends," and "Unimportant."

1. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent to recommend for adoption a book that had not been examined by the teachers?*

Yes	36.3 percent	Depends	23.4 percent
No	40.0 percent	Unimportant	0.3 percent

It is clear from the returns that this question raises a debatable issue. Some of the comments on it were:

If opportunity affords, teachers should examine the books first.

Depends on ability of teachers.

Depends on the superintendent's knowledge of objectives of the book.

No professionally minded superintendent likes to assume this responsibility.

On the issue presented in this question Henry¹ found that publishers recognize that the methods and criteria in selecting textbooks constitute a most perplexing problem. It is clear that we need to give more careful consideration to the teacher's part in the problem.

2. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent to replace a textbook without notifying the publishers of his intention to change?*

Yes	69.6 percent	Depends	10.0 percent
No	17.5 percent	Unimportant	2.9 percent

There is substantial agreement that a superintendent is not under obligation to notify publishing firms of his intention to make a change in textbooks. One person said that he could find no more reason for notifying the publishers than he could for notifying a storekeeper that he intended to buy his shoes from another firm.

Some of the comments on this question were:

Depends upon terms of previous adoption.

Compares with dropping a teacher without satisfactory explanation.

It is none of the publishers' business when a superintendent intends to change a textbook—he, not the publishers, is administering the schools.

There is no reason why a superintendent should notify any company that he intends to change textbooks, but there is every reason why his advisers should know and should be encouraged to obtain for examination every available text on the market.

3. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent or a selecting committee to try to distribute adoptions among several competing firms rather than to select books regardless of business interests?*

Yes	14.6 percent	Depends	7.5 percent
No	76.6 percent	Unimportant	1.3 percent

The writer was surprised to find any support for the policy of distributing adoptions among competing firms. Two comments, however, throw light on some of the issues involved.

Keep the interest of the pupils in mind first, and if they are just as well served by dividing the business, it is all right.

Schools are best served by distribution of business which keeps alive competition and rivalry to produce the best books possible; and while it might be perfectly ethical for a superintendent to confine his list to one or two publishers, it might look suspicious.

¹ The reader should compare the summary of opinion in this chapter with the findings of Henry reported in Chapter X.

4. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent to refuse to examine textbooks of a given company because of a personal dislike for the representative of that company?*

Yes	3.5 percent	Depends	5.1 percent
No	91.1 percent	Unimportant	.3 percent

It is apparent that opinion supports the view that personal prejudices should not be allowed to deprive pupils of an opportunity to use the best available textbooks. As one contributor expressed it, "Personal prejudices have nothing to do with the merits of textbooks."

5. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent or a selecting committee to give confidential information concerning plans for textbook adoptions to the representatives of certain companies and not to other competing companies?*

Yes	3.6 percent	Depends	6.2 percent
No	88.6 percent	Unimportant	1.6 percent

The answers to this question are overwhelmingly in favor of treating the selection of textbooks as a public rather than a private business. The replies condemn a 'confidential relationship' between the selecting agency and one or more firms to the exclusion of other possible competitors for public business. One contributor said:

Decidedly no; if superintendents or selecting committees are unfair, they invite unfair and unethical practices on the part of the bookmen.

6. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent or a selecting committee to give the representatives of certain companies opportunities for the presentation of the merits of books and to deny the privilege to competing companies?*

Yes	4.5 percent	Depends	7.4 percent
No	87.5 percent	Unimportant	.6 percent

This question involves issues similar to those involved in Question 5. Some of the comments suggest certain practical difficulties in the way of hearing the representatives of all concerns:

This may depend upon number and extent of examinations made.
Has a right to eliminate dead material.

No, unless selecting committee had by test eliminated certain texts as undesirable.

I have known instances where a superintendent was fully justified by reason of questionable tactics on the part of a book company or its

representative in refusing any consideration for that particular company or man.

Yes, where after careful consideration the superintendent and committee have reduced the books under consideration to a limited number and have then restricted the representation to the books on that list.

7. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent to keep secret the procedure to be followed in the selection of textbooks after the procedure had been defined?*

Yes	36.7 percent	Depends	15.1 percent
No	44.1 percent	Unimportant	4.0 percent

The replies indicate that this question is highly controversial. It is the writer's opinion, however, that secrecy in the selection of textbooks is unwise and injudicious even though it may not be unethical. A few of the comments of contributors were:

Depends on whether the plan would be defeated by publication.

Yes, with the approval of the school board.

I have never been able to discover why a textbook adoption can't be conducted in a free and open manner, as anything which is done in secrecy is done so for a purpose and always looks suspicious.

8. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent to create a secret committee to examine books and to submit reports which would be used as a basis of selection?*

Yes	58.7 percent	Depends	13.2 percent
No	24.8 percent	Unimportant	3.3 percent

This question also is controversial. While a majority of our respondents approve the use of secret committees, it should be noted that elsewhere in this Yearbook Dr. Jensen presents evidence that points in the other direction. He says:

A question regarding secret committees was presented to the publishers in this form: "As a publisher, have you found that there often exists a secret committee? All the publishers answered this question. They are convinced that there is no such thing as a secret committee; some representative discovers the committee members and gets to them. The open textbook committee was, as a matter of fact, favored by 81.8 percent of the superintendents as well as by 93.7 percent of the publishers.

Some of the comments of our contributors were:

Might be justified if experience shows that some companies exert unfair influence on board.

All right if committee is competent and honest and handles it in an ethical manner.

There is 'no such animal' as a secret committee.

It would be more practical to let the committee be known but issue restrictions as to calling on the committee.

9. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent or a selecting committee to favor the adoption of the books by local authors in preference to better books by outside authors?*

Yes	5.2 percent	Depends	5.9 percent
-----	-------------	---------	-------------

No	88.2 percent	Unimportant	0.7 percent
----	--------------	-------------	-------------

Books should be chosen for the children's sake rather than for royalties.

If the book by the local author equals, or nearly equals, the merits of other authors, then the local author might be favored.

The purpose is to get the best book.

This would be an absurd basis for selection.

10. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent or a selecting committee to receive any financial reward directly or indirectly from a textbook company for services in the selection of textbooks?*

Yes	1.0 percent	Depends	0.3 percent
-----	-------------	---------	-------------

No	98.4 percent	Unimportant	0.3 percent
----	--------------	-------------	-------------

As would be expected, the returns indicate sweeping condemnation of the acceptance of any financial reward for the performance of the important professional service involved in the selection of books.

11. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent or a selecting committee to invite authors of textbooks to take part in a conference regarding the merits of books?*

Yes	58.4 percent	Depends	17.4 percent
-----	--------------	---------	--------------

No	20.0 percent	Unimportant	4.2 percent
----	--------------	-------------	-------------

In this question we have another controversial problem, although the majority opinion approves the practice of inviting authors to contribute to conferences regarding the merits of textbooks. It is probable that the 20 percent who think the practice unethical thought of the author as participating as a sort of supersalesman. The comments made by a few contributors are appended.

Depends upon possibility of all competing authors being present, which is usually impossible.

All right if author discusses principles and not textbooks.

Committees are entitled to all information regarding latest ideas in any course and may have authors discuss such ideas of courses.

No, the author of a textbook should have no more standing in a committee than a salesman, unless the books under consideration include no book written by him or published by his publishers.

12. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent or a selecting committee to ask textbook companies to submit statements regarding textbooks for the accuracy of which statements companies would be willing to give full guarantees?*

Yes	90.2 percent	Depends	3.7 percent
No	2.7 percent	Unimportant	3.4 percent

This practice appears to be very generally approved. Some of the comments which accompanied the replies to this question were:

Yes, for the purpose of getting information.

Desirable practice to establish.

On their own publications only.

Yes, and as a matter of fact, this is one of the best ways for the selecting authorities to get information.

Not a question of ethics, but rather of advantage or expediency.

13. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent to encourage the board of education to become the agency for the examination and selection of textbooks?*

Yes	14.3 percent	Depends	10.2 percent
No	69.0 percent	Unimportant	6.5 percent

In view of the continued emphasis on the professional nature of the task of textbook selection it is surprising to find that as many as thirty per cent of the contributors fail flatly to condemn the policy of transferring this responsibility to the board of education, which is obviously a lay body. Most of the comments made on this question unqualifiedly condemn the practice of selection of textbooks by a board of education.

The best practice seems to be for the superintendent to nominate and the board of education to confirm.

Undesirable and poor policy. Very backward step.

Not unethical, but I can think of nothing more unwise, as you might as well let the children select their own books.

Such a superintendent would sign away one of his very important prerogatives by so doing.

14. *Would it be ethical for a superintendent to refuse to allow the representatives of a given company to seek the business of the school because of the refusal of the representative to conform to the superintendent's standards for transacting business?*

Yes	71.4 percent	Depends	21.0 percent
No	7.3 percent	Unimportant	0.3 percent

The returns support the right of the superintendent to resort to drastic measures in his efforts to enforce high standards of practice in matters pertaining to the selection of textbooks.

15. Would it be ethical for a superintendent to sell copies of textbooks that had been submitted to him for examination with a view to adoption?

Yes	6.2 percent	Depends	7.5 percent
No	79.5 percent	Unimportant	6.8 percent

From the replies to this question it appears that a superintendent is not justified in considering sample textbooks as private property. One contributor thus states the case:

The sample copies are for the specific purpose of facilitating the superintendent's work, and it is not right for him to put these into the second-hand market where they damage the business of the person or firm who represented them to him. He may put them in his school library for continuous reference or give them to indigent persons who cannot afford to buy books, or he may destroy them; but he has no right to sell them.

16. Would it be ethical for a superintendent to mimeograph for free distribution to pupils certain pages from textbooks not adopted for use in the schools?

Yes	14.6 percent	Depends	20.9 percent
No	58.9 percent	Unimportant	5.6 percent

The question relates to a practice that has been generally condemned. In view of the fact that this practice is definitely illegal and obviously unethical—plain theft from both publisher and author—it is surprising that as many as one-fifth of our respondents fail to condemn it at all. The following comments are quoted:

For a small group it is all right—providing due credit was given for the source.

With permission of publishers. Depends, all right as an experiment looking to future adoptions.

No; this is a theft of literary material belonging to the author and is obtaining something without proper payment.

As a matter of fact, it is a criminal infringement of the copyright laws.

If the practice grows, superintendents indulging in this policy will be prosecuted and may be subjected to heavy damages when caught;

giving away stolen goods without charge does not minimize the crime of stealing.

It is unfair for educators to utilize the work that represents years of labor and actual cash outlay of fellow-educators without compensation.

In order to summarize conveniently the outcome of the sixteen questions pertaining to the practices of superintendents and selecting committees, Table I has been prepared.

TABLE I.—REPLIES TO QUESTIONS IN SECTION I ARRANGED ACCORDING TO MAGNITUDE OF PERCENTAGE OF REPLIES IN 'YES' OR 'NO' COLUMN

Question No.	Percentage of Replies			
	Yes	No	Depends	Unimportant
10.....	1.0	98.4	0.3	0.3
4.....	3.5	91.1	5.1	0.3
12.....	90.2	2.7	3.7	3.4
5.....	3.6	88.6	6.2	1.6
9.....	5.2	88.2	5.9	0.7
6.....	4.5	87.5	7.4	0.6
15.....	6.2	79.5	7.5	6.8
3.....	14.6	76.6	7.5	1.3
14.....	71.4	7.3	21.0	0.3
2.....	69.6	17.4	10.0	2.9
13.....	14.3	69.0	10.2	6.5
16.....	14.6	58.9	20.9	5.6
8.....	58.7	24.8	13.2	3.3
11.....	58.4	20.0	17.4	4.2
7.....	36.7	44.1	15.1	4.0
1.....	36.3	40.0	23.4	0.3

In exactly half of the sixteen questions a 'yes' or a 'no' answer constitutes at least 75% of the responses, indicating very general agreement. Moreover, there is little uncertainty on these eight issues since the *depends* and the *unimportant* responses are together less than 10%, except for Question 15.

On Questions 14, 2, 13, and 16, a 'yes' or a 'no' answer is made about four times as often as its opposite; this we may regard as a decided majority opinion. Questions 8, 11, 7, and 1, however, indicate distinct division of opinion and may be regarded as controversial. They represent three issues: secret committees; the participation of authors

in textbook campaigns; and the right of the teacher to a voice in the selection of the book to be used in her classroom.

III. OPINIONS ON THE ETHICS DISPLAYED IN THE PRACTICES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TEXTBOOK COMPANIES

Twenty items of the questionnaire were included under the heading, "Practices of Representatives of Textbook Companies." Replies were received from 323 persons. The distribution of replies is given herewith in percentages for each question under the headings "Yes," "No," "Depends," and "Unimportant."

1. *Would it be ethical for a representative to try to influence the election or appointment of persons to teaching or administrative positions in order to secure the adoptions of certain books?*

Yes	2.3 percent	Depends	4.2 percent
No	93.2 percent	Unimportant	0.3 percent

These replies emphatically indicate that attempts to manipulate teaching personnel do not constitute a legitimate means of stimulating the sale of particular textbooks.

2. *Would it be ethical for a representative to try to stimulate dissatisfaction among teachers with the textbooks adopted for use in the schools?*

Yes	7.5 percent	Depends	13.3 percent
No	78.6 percent	Unimportant	0.6 percent

While the majority opinion is opposed to the practice of attempts on the part of representatives to arouse dissatisfaction among teachers with an adopted textbook, the arguments in favor of such activity are worthy of review. Typical of them are these:

Depends on his methods. All right if done openly and has facts as basis of arguments.

If dissatisfaction means a critical examination, all right.

If a representative stimulates dissatisfaction by talking the merits of a better book than is in use, I can see no reason why he should be prevented from doing so, as dissatisfaction is the mother of progress.

If the book is too ancient for modern times, he has a right to try to stimulate dissatisfaction; but if it is a book that has just been adopted, he has no right to stir up opposition to a book just to get his adopted in its stead.

Depends upon the motive behind it—there are some places in this country where the best thing that could possibly happen to the schools

would be to send a group of live representatives down there to stir up trouble with their curriculum.

3. *Would it be ethical for a representative to bring to the attention of a board of education unethical practices of a superintendent in the selection of textbooks?*

Yes	64.7 percent	Depends	16.5 percent
No	16.5 percent	Unimportant	2.3 percent

The division of answers to this question indicates that it is troublesome. A few of the comments offered by contributors were:

Yes, if done openly on professional basis and superintendent has a chance to defend himself.

In general, a superintendent who has degenerated to the point where he practices unethical methods in textbook procedure will very soon be discovered by his board of education, if not in textbook activities.

Such cases of a superintendent using unethical practices are very rare, and a better policy would be for the representative not to meddle in relations between board and superintendent.

4. *Would it be ethical for a representative to bring to the attention of the superintendent unethical practices of a committee in the selection of textbooks?*

Yes	82.7 percent	Depends	8.7 percent
No	7.3 percent	Unimportant	1.3 percent

There is more support for this proposal to file with the superintendent criticisms of a selecting committee than is given to the previous proposal to place before a school board criticisms of the acts of a superintendent. This is doubtless due to the feeling that the superintendent as the professional director of the schools is entitled to special consideration at the hands of the representatives of textbook companies.

5. *Would it be ethical for a representative to furnish to selecting committees his own analyses or criticisms of books of competing firms?*

Yes	42.4 percent	Depends	12.6 percent
No	38.0 percent	Unimportant	7.0 percent

This question brought out much difference of opinion. Criticizing competing books is characterized thus:

- Unwise.
- Poor taste.
- Not unethical, but crude.

Not unethical if all publishers are permitted to file analyses of their own and competing books; on the contrary, the selecting committee could well profit by comparing these analyses.

6. *Would it be ethical for a representative to try to secure confidential information regarding secret committees for textbook adoptions?*

Yes	10.4 percent	Depends	11.1 percent
No	77.5 percent	Unimportant	1.0 percent

The returns give very little support for a policy of interference with *any* program a superintendent may devise for the selection of textbooks. In some of the comments secret committees were condemned, not as illegal, but as definitely inadvisable.

7. *Would it be ethical for a representative to interview teachers regarding books without first securing the consent of the administrative or supervisory officers?*

Yes	8.4 percent	Depends	8.1 percent
No	81.9 percent	Unimportant	1.6 percent

The replies to this question furnish strong support for the right of the superintendent to formulate and enforce regulations relating to the selection of textbooks. Some of the contributors, however, favor a liberal attitude toward the interviewing of teachers by field representatives. Their comments were:

Too much authority is assumed over teachers by administrative officers.

Yes, if school time is not used.

When teachers disagree on selections and invite interviews, then certainly it is not unethical for the representative of a book company to interview them.

8. *Would it be ethical for a representative to try to secure speaking engagements for an author of a textbook in communities where the adoption of the author's book was under consideration?*

Yes	45.0 percent	Depends	14.7 percent
No	36.4 percent	Unimportant	3.9 percent

This question raises the issue of the relation of an author to the promotion of sales of his textbook. The replies indicate that there is no clear-cut agreement as to the propriety of the practice of involving an author in a sales campaign. Some of the comments on this question were:

Yes, if author discusses principles and not texts.

Not if he is an agent in disguise.

It would not be unethical for the representative, but it might not be in altogether good taste for an author to indulge in this sort of campaigning for his own product.

Why should an author not explain the plan and merits of his book?

9. *Would it be ethical for a representative to circulate criticism of superintendents who have made decisions adverse to the representative's company?*

Yes	0.3 percent	Depends	8.7 percent
No	89.4 percent	Unimportant	1.6 percent

The replies overwhelmingly disapprove of circulating criticisms of superintendents who have not adopted certain textbooks. They indicate that a superintendent is entitled to courteous acceptance of his decision by representatives who have failed to secure adoptions.

10. *Would it be ethical for a representative to try to secure adoptions by enlisting the interests of such organizations as the American Federation of Labor and the Chamber of Commerce?*

Yes	2.3 percent	Depends	4.5 percent
No	91.6 percent	Unimportant	1.6 percent

It is gratifying to find that so large a percentage of the contributors disapprove of involving non-school organizations in the selection of textbooks. Some of the comments on this question were:

Would not be unethical, but may not be wise, for when this is done there are usually factors brought into the situation that have nothing to do with the merits of the textbooks.

No, the American Federation of Labor, the local chamber of commerce, the Kiwanis Club, the Rotary Club, and all other similar organizations are not experts in education.

Most of them do not know one book from another and this is merely a method of organizing political pressure to defeat the judgment of the superintendent, who ought to know the best book.

There are other organizations, like the D.A.R. and the W.C.T.U., whose dictation of the contents of textbooks is at least questionable.

11. *Would it be ethical for a representative to take an active interest in the election of school board members in a community other than his own?*

Yes	1.4 percent	Depends	5.0 percent
No	92.6 percent	Unimportant	1.0 percent

The majority opinion indicates that representatives of textbook companies should not lend support in political contests involving schools outside of their own communities.

12. *Would it be ethical for a representative to appeal to sectarian or political prejudices in meeting the competition of other textbook companies?*

Yes	2.6 percent	Depends	3.8 percent
No	92.0 percent	Unimportant	1.6 percent

The returns on this question support the general point of view expressed in answer to Question 10. One contributor declared that prejudices of any kind tend to prevent the selection of the best textbooks. There seems to be general agreement that it is not in the interests of education to arouse prejudices.

13. *Would it be ethical for a representative to circulate petitions among teachers calling for changes in textbooks?*

Yes	3.6 percent	Depends	6.9 percent
No	87.2 percent	Unimportant	2.3 percent

The comments on this question were instructive. Among them were:

Impossible in a well-managed system. Ethical, but unwise.

Yes, if superintendent was remiss in recognizing needs of school.

No, but I can see no reason why the teachers should not circulate this petition themselves.

14. *Would it be ethical for a representative to claim a share of the adoptions of textbooks on the grounds that his company was entitled to a certain share of the business in a district or state?*

Yes	6.3 percent	Depends	4.6 percent
No	86.8 percent	Unimportant	2.3 percent

This question elicited a great many comments, some of which were quite emphatic. They included the following:

No, a rather low basis on which to bid for business.

Tempted to do so when you see how some committees act.

Textbook selection should be made entirely upon merit regardless of the distribution of business.

It is to the interest of the schools to spread the business over as long a list of publishers as possible in order to keep alive competition and rivalry, which will help to produce the best books at most favorable prices, but, of course, merit of books always comes first.

15. *Would it be ethical for a textbook company to employ attorneys to influence the adoption of textbooks?*

Yes	2.6 percent	Depends	3.9 percent
No	91.5 percent	Unimportant	2.0 percent

In thus lending strong support for the opinion that it is unethical for a textbook company to employ attorneys to influence adoption of textbooks, a number of respondents took pains to add that it was sometimes necessary and perfectly ethical to employ attorneys in order to protect certain interests, especially in connection with involved contracts for state adoption. The use of attorneys to bring undue influence to bear on selecting committees is what is condemned by the contributors to this question.

16. *Would it be ethical for a representative to refuse to recognize the selection of textbooks as an educational task rather than one of mere business significance?*

Yes	6.5 percent	Depends	3.3 percent
No	87.9 percent	Unimportant	2.3 percent

This question was included in order to determine whether the respondents considered the selection of textbooks as primarily an educational problem. The majority opinion supports the commonly accepted point of view that the selection of textbooks presents an essential educational problem which should be viewed differently from that of the selection of ordinary school supplies.

17. *Would it be ethical for a representative to try to cause a board of education to reject the textbook recommendations of the superintendent?*

Yes	2.0 percent	Depends	16.4 percent
No	81.3 percent	Unimportant	0.3 percent

The writer is surprised to find any support for the opinion that a textbook representative has a right to interfere with the recommendation submitted by a superintendent to his board of education. If the selection of textbooks is to be considered as an important professional task, the interference with the superintendent's freedom in the performance of this task is certainly unwarranted. Some of the comments on this question were as follows:

No, unless there is evidence of unprofessional influences; board should then be petitioned.

The only exception would be if an agent had conclusive evidence that the superintendent's recommendations were based upon other factors than the merits of the book.

In actual practice it is my observation that such situations arise only in cases where over-ambitious representatives are working under an overload of enthusiasm, are under pressure from their immediate superiors, or are too lazy to work according to the set procedure, and try through the cross-cut of politics to bring pressure on the board of education to bring about results favorable to their interests.

18. *Would it be ethical for a representative to interview members of a board of education regarding changes in textbooks when requested to do so by the superintendent?*

Yes	83.6 percent	Depends	7.3 percent
No	7.5 percent	Unimportant	1.6 percent

The replies from contributors indicate that a field representative should follow the wishes of the superintendent in matters relating to procedure in the selection of textbooks. It should not be assumed that the replies endorse the policy proposed in the question. Some of the comments were as follows:

Yes, but no superintendent should request it. Not wise.

Not an unethical practice, but a request of this kind coming from a superintendent would be an admission of weakness.

In general the superintendent in such a situation is too insecure for an agent to waste very much time in working any of his books.

19. *Would it be ethical for a representative to interview members of a board of education regarding the qualifications of candidates for teaching or administrative positions?*

Yes	10.3 percent	Depends	19.3 percent
No	69.7 percent	Unimportant	0.7 percent

From the percentage of contributors who replied affirmatively or with the answer "Depends," it would appear that there is considerable support for the right of a field representative to seek to influence the appointment of teachers or administrative officials, though the majority of superintendents and field representatives believe that such interviews are likely to be misunderstood. Some of the comments were as follows:

No, unless he is a crook. Not a part of his job.

Yes, so long as he does not allow his judgment to be biased in the direction of recommending only candidates who will recommend his books.

The unethical part would come in if the representative's activities result in putting a candidate, should he be appointed, under obligations in the matter of textbooks.

If he can lay business aside and has only the best interests of the school in mind.

A conscientious bookman can be uncommonly helpful in recommending appointees; he is experienced and widely acquainted, and his intervening could be entirely ethical.

20. *Would it be ethical for a representative to furnish samples of his textbooks to school-board members in a system where the superintendent of schools was responsible for making the recommendations for new textbooks?*

Yes	1.5 percent	Depends	11.2 percent
No	82.8 percent	Unimportant	4.5 percent

Since this question specifies that the superintendent of schools is responsible for making the recommendations for new textbooks, it is rather surprising to find any superintendents of the opinion that a field representative should feel free to furnish samples of his textbooks to school-board members.

21. *Would it be ethical for a representative to influence the appointment of persons to selecting committees?*

Yes	4.3 percent	Depends	6.6 percent
No	88.8 percent	Unimportant	0.3 percent

The comments which accompanied the minority answers to this question justified the practice where the motive is really to secure more competent committees. Some of the comments were:

Yes, if done discreetly and in the best interest of education.

Depends, if he knew old committee was unqualified and he had no 'strings' on suggestions.

22. *Would it be ethical for a representative to invite an author to appear before committees of teachers or boards of education to urge the adoption of the author's textbooks?*

Yes	40.3 percent	Depends	17.7 percent
No	39.7 percent	Unimportant	2.3 percent

This question also raises the problem of the relation of an author to the marketing of his textbook. The replies to this question, as well as to certain previous questions involving the author, point to the fact

that the contribution the author would make is uncertain. Some of the comments on this question were:

Depends, if this is the practice of the community. Usually poor business policy.

Not good selling practice.

If other companies had same privilege and if committee were not a secret one.

My experience with authors has been that they do not make very good agents.

TABLE II.—REPLIES TO QUESTIONS IN SECTION II ARRANGED ACCORDING TO MAGNITUDE OF PERCENTAGE OF REPLIES IN 'YES' OR 'NO' COLUMN

Question No.	Percentage of Replies			
	Yes	No	Depends	Unimportant
1.....	2.3	93.2	4.2	0.3
11.....	1.4	92.6	5.0	1.0
12.....	2.6	92.0	3.8	1.6
10.....	2.3	91.6	4.5	1.6
15.....	2.6	91.5	3.9	2.0
9.....	0.3	89.4	8.7	1.6
21.....	4.3	88.8	6.6	0.3
16.....	6.5	87.9	3.3	2.3
13.....	3.6	87.2	6.9	2.3
14.....	6.3	86.8	4.6	2.3
18.....	83.6	7.5	7.3	1.6
20.....	1.5	82.8	11.2	4.5
4.....	82.7	7.3	8.7	1.3
7.....	8.4	81.9	8.1	1.6
17.....	2.0	81.3	16.4	0.3
2.....	7.5	78.6	13.3	0.6
6.....	10.4	77.5	11.	1.0
19.....	10.3	69.7	19.3	0.7
3.....	64.7	16.5	16.5	2.3
8.....	45.0	36.4	14.7	3.9
5.....	42.4	38.0	12.6	7.0
22.....	40.3	39.7	17.7	2.3

Table II is analogous to Table I. It is seen that for 17 of the 22 questions the answer is 'yes' or 'no' in more than 75 percent of the cases. Questions 8 (speaking engagements for authors), 5 (supplying analyses of competing books), and 22 (inviting authors to urge adoption of their books) are apparently controversial issues.

IV. OPINIONS ON GENERAL ETHICAL CONDITIONS IN THE
TEXTBOOK BUSINESS

In order to secure an expression of opinion on certain trends in the ethics of textbooks marketing and selection, there was included in the questionnaire five questions relating to prevailing standards and practices as well as to influences tending to promote or undermine good practice. There were 323 sets of answers to these questions.

The first question was: "*How do the standards or practices followed in the marketing of textbooks compare with the standards followed in other kinds of business?*" In answer to this question 60.9 percent replied that the standards are higher, 3.4 percent that the standards are lower, and 35.7 percent that the standards are at the same level when compared with other businesses. There is evidence of progress in the fact that 96.0 percent of those who responded feel that the standards and practices followed in the marketing of textbooks compare favorably with those followed in other businesses.

The second question was: "*Is it your observation that the standards and practices observed in selecting textbooks are higher or lower than they were a few years ago?*" In reply 83.8 percent said that the standards and practices are higher, 2.1 percent that they are lower, and 10.4 percent that they are the same. Also 2.1 percent said that standards are not much changed, and 1.6 percent reported that they had no opinion on the question. It is most encouraging to find the majority opinion supporting the conclusion that the past few years have brought improvement in standards for the selection of textbooks.

The third item of this part of the questionnaire was: "*Mention any influences which in your judgment are tending to develop higher standards of practice in the selecting of textbooks.*" In the replies attention was called to the following influences:

1. The advance in the scientific study of education, with its emphasis on more intelligent performance of professional tasks.

2. The growing tendency to consider the selection of textbooks a professional task to be performed by teachers, principals, supervisors, and superintendents.

3. The policy of the better textbook companies of employing professionally competent field representatives.

The fact that the foregoing influences are recognizable in the situation is one of the most encouraging findings of the study. Any one

of the three can contribute much toward solving ethical problems in the selection of textbooks.

The fourth item was: "*Mention any influences which you believe are tending or are likely to tend to undermine standards of good practice in the selecting of textbooks.*" The responses to this question reiterated condemnation of practices disapproved in the questions in Parts I and II, relating to the activities of superintendents and field representatives. It is evident that baleful influences are most likely, in the opinion of many, to develop in connection with state adoptions, especially when political appointees who are laymen are able, directly or indirectly, to influence the selection of texts for the public schools, and thus to control the distribution of considerable sums of money. On the contrary, in territories where free textbooks are provided by local adoptions scandals appear to be decidedly uncommon.

A final question was: "*Is state legislation needed to insure or protect high standards of practice in the selecting of textbooks?*" The replies to this question were: 'Yes,' 14.6 percent; 'no,' 76.6 percent; 'somewhat,' 3.6 percent; 'doubtful,' 2.8 percent; 'hard to legislate,' 0.4 percent; 'don't know,' 2.0 percent. The replies indicate that the setting of standards is a problem to be faced by educational bodies rather than by legislative bodies. The opinion was expressed that superintendents, through their professional organizations, could solve the problem of developing high standards of practice if they would make sedulous efforts to do so.

V. A PROVISIONAL CODE OF ETHICS

If it were thought desirable to promulgate a formal code of ethics governing the selection of textbooks, the opinions gathered from this inquiry would provide a basis for the inclusion of numerous matters on which there is considerable agreement, as follows:

1. The selection of textbooks is an important educational undertaking, to be carried out in a professional manner. The responsibility and the authority should rest with the educational administration of a school system, rather than with a board of education or a group of laymen.

2. The purpose should be always the selection of the best textbooks for the use of the pupils. Hence, it is not ethical to make any effort to distribute the business among several competing firms or to

give weight to personal likes and dislikes toward publishers' representatives.

3. It is unethical, in general, for representatives to interfere with the relationship obtaining between superintendent and board of education; thus they should not appeal to boards of education to reverse the superintendent's recommendations, nor, if the superintendent is required to recommend textbooks, should they furnish samples of such books to school-board members.

4. It is not ethical for a superintendent or a member of a selecting committee to receive from a publisher any reward for services in the selection of textbooks.

5. Representatives should not foment dissatisfaction or circulate petitions calling for changes in textbooks. Neither should they circulate criticism of superintendents who have made decisions adverse to their companies.

6. It is not ethical for a representative to try to secure the appointment of administrators or teachers to their regular positions or on textbook committees for the purpose of influencing the selection of textbooks in his favor, or to try to influence the election of members of school boards.

7. It is not ethical to interview teachers without the prior consent of their superiors or to try to secure information about secret committees.

8. It is not ethical to utilize the influence of organizations of laymen to secure adoptions or to appeal to sectarian prejudices in meeting competition.

9. It is in general an undignified practice for an author to use his professional position to try to secure adoptions of his textbook through field work, professional addresses, or classroom instruction.

10. While it is not unethical to make use of secret committees in the selection of textbooks, there is considerable sentiment against such committees and evidence to show that genuine secrecy is not often attained; and it is charged that frequently the intent of the secrecy is to conceal an unethical selection.

11. The superintendent is justified in taking drastic measures if the conduct of publishers' representatives falls below high standards of practices for transacting public business.

12. It is unethical to give opportunity to some representatives to present the merits of their books and not to give this opportunity

to others. Similarly, it is unethical to give confidentially to some representatives information which is withheld from others.

13. It is not ethical to favor local authors unless their textbooks are as good as other competing textbooks.

14. It is neither legal nor ethical to reproduce, whether by printing or by mimeographing, any material covered by copyright unless expressly permitted by the holder of the copyright. This applies to books adopted as well as to books not adopted.

15. It should be considered ethical for a publisher's representative to bring to the attention of the superintendent any unethical practices of a textbook committee.

CONCLUSIONS

The opinions gathered from representatives of textbook companies, from superintendents of schools, and from members of this Society and set forth in this chapter have shown an encouraging situation. We are led to believe that the standards of practice in the marketing and selecting of textbooks have been lifted appreciably in recent years, that they are at least as high as those prevailing in other businesses, and that a large majority of the persons concerned are seriously desirous of bringing about still further improvement.

As a contribution toward such further improvement there has been presented in this chapter, on the basis of the opinions gathered by the writer, a provisional code of ethics comprising fifteen items. These items, combined with other material presented by other contributors in other chapters, have been utilized by the Committee in formulating conclusions and recommendations which it has presented in Chapter XVII. The reader should, therefore, consult that chapter to obtain the further development by the Yearbook Committee of the points brought out in this chapter.

•

CHAPTER XII

THE COST OF TEXTBOOKS

NELSON B. HENRY
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

The modern textbook, such as is generally used in the public and private schools of this country, is the most striking example of positive improvement in educational equipment and procedure in a generation of notable progress in the development of a general educational program. It is at once the expression of the best thought in methods of teaching and the best art and skill in mechanical production of a nation of unquestioned leadership in these lines of endeavor. No other feature of the work the schools are doing represents so clearly the outcomes of decades of scientific study of the problems of two fields of social progress. It is the product of commendable professional zeal combined with effective commercial enterprise, and it contributes much to effective teaching at all levels of instruction.

I. PUBLISHERS' REPORTS OF TEXTBOOK SALES

1. Difficulties in Securing Exact Figures

One of the impressive facts about the textbooks in use in our schools is the relatively small cost of these books as compared with other necessary means of instruction. This is one reason why only a few studies have been made of this aspect of school costs, although the chief deterrent is the obvious difficulty of securing complete reports relating to expenditures for school books. There is no uniform method of providing books for the pupils in the public schools of many of the states, and there is no regular procedure for collecting statements of payments for textbooks, except such as are made by boards of education and reported in bulletins of city school systems, state departments of education, and the Office of Education of the United States Department of the Interior. In some states books are purchased by the state or the school district for all the pupils in both

elementary and high schools; in other states, for all pupils in the elementary schools only. In certain states part of the local districts purchase books for all or for part of the pupils, while the pupils of other districts must furnish their own books; and in a few states all school books are privately purchased. A complete report of the cost of textbooks in the United States would therefore have to be based upon statements supplied by the numerous publishers of the books used in the schools. The Office of Education made an effort to collect such statements by special inquiry from the leading publishers of school textbooks in 1914 and again in 1929.

2. Expenditures in 1913 and 1928

Monahan¹ and Phillips² report summaries of the statements of textbook sales submitted by 43 publishing concerns for the year 1913 and by 60 companies reporting for the year 1928. In each case, it is thought, the companies in question furnished all but a small percentage of the books used in the public schools of the country. From these two reports it appears that the net sales of books for public school use amounted to about \$14,300,000 in 1913 and to about \$35,500,000 in 1928. Since purchases by boards of education were found to constitute about 80 percent of the publishers' sales in 1913, the total amount paid for books used by public-school pupils in that year is reckoned at approximately \$15,000,000, allowing a 25 percent margin on the books handled by local dealers. The like figure for 1928 is given as \$38,800,000, the purchases of boards of education being about 63 percent of the publishers' sales of books for public-school use. From the point of view of cost to the general public, as well as from the point of view of the publishers' sales, the textbook business connected with public elementary and secondary education is now two and one-half times its volume in 1913.

3. Relative Growth of Expenditures in these Fifteen Years

Singularly, the expenditures of boards of education for free textbooks have hardly doubled within the same period—the increase being from about \$11,500,000 to \$22,300,000 according to the two re-

¹ Monahan, A. C. *Free Textbooks and State Uniformity*. U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1915, No. 36.

² Phillips, Frank M. *Cost of School and College Textbooks for 1928*. Circular of the Office of Education, January 2, 1930.

ports cited—while payments for books privately purchased in 1928 amounted to almost five times as much as in 1913. That is, the purchases of textbooks for free use of public school pupils have increased less proportionately since 1913 than have purchases by the parents of pupils, despite the fact that many more school children are now supplied with books at the expense of the state or the local school district. Besides the introduction of free textbooks on a statewide basis in Texas in 1920, many local districts have made provision for supplying pupils with books under the permissive legislation of other states since Monahan's study was made. The less rapid increase noted with respect to payments for textbooks purchased by boards of education as compared with purchases privately made seems to indicate that there are significant economies in the free textbook plan, perhaps even larger economies than have been claimed by the most outspoken advocates of the plan.

Other comparative figures from the reports of Monahan and Phillips show that the net sales by publishers of books used by pupils in public elementary and secondary schools increased from 78 cents per pupil enrolled in 1913 to \$1.41 per pupil in 1928. On the other hand, these net sales amounted to 2.7 percent of the total expenditures for public schools in 1913, and only 1.6 percent of the 1928 expenditures. Thus, while changes in prices and the obvious tendency to provide more books of a kind for the use of school children have increased the amount spent per pupil by 80 percent, it has not been necessary to increase the appropriations for books at the same rate that other expenditures for school purposes have been increased. If payments for books had increased as much in proportion as the total cost of public schools from 1913 to 1928, the net sales by publishers in 1928 would have been nearly \$24,000,000 more than the actual sales as reported by Phillips.

II. THE COST OF BOOKS IN FREE TEXTBOOK STATES

The figures which have been presented in the preceding paragraphs relate to textbook costs and total expenditures for public schools in the country as a whole. More definite cost relationships can be shown when the areas considered are limited to those in which all books are purchased by boards of education, since the variable cost factor of the dealer's profit is introduced where books are privately purchased.

While twenty states now have laws requiring boards of education to provide free textbooks for pupils, in six of these states the law applies to elementary-school pupils only. Many high-school pupils in each of these six states are therefore required to purchase their own books. Of the fourteen states in which boards of education are required by law to provide books for both elementary-school and high-school pupils, California has a state printing office for the manufacture of elementary-school books, and the actual cost of the books so provided is not definitely known.

1. The Cost in Thirteen States Compared with Total School Expenditures

In Table I the ratio of payments for textbooks to the total expenditures for public schools in 1927-28 is shown for each of the other thirteen states in which the free textbook law is mandatory with respect to both elementary- and secondary-school grades.

TABLE I.—PERCENT THAT EXPENDITURES FOR TEXTBOOKS IS OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THIRTEEN STATES, 1927-28

State	Percent of Total Expenditures Paid for Textbooks*	State	Percent of Total Expenditures Paid for Textbooks*
Delaware.....	2.5	New Jersey.....	1.3
Maine.....	2.6	Pennsylvania.....	1.8
Maryland.....	1.7	Rhode Island.....	1.6
Massachusetts.....	1.4	South Dakota.....	2.2
Montana.....	2.4	Texas.....	1.9
Nebraska.....	2.2	Wyoming.....	1.9
New Hampshire.....	1.8		
		Average (13 States)....	1.7

* Computed from data of Tables 24 and 26, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1930, No. 5.

The average for these thirteen states (1.7 percent of all public-school expenditures) is comparable with Phillips's estimate of 1.6 percent for net sales by publishers in all of the states (including those in which some or all of the books are privately purchased). One naturally expects to find a larger difference, since it is generally understood that more books are provided for pupils under the free textbook plan. It is to be remembered, however, that the ratios considered are necessarily small in absolute values because of the magnitude of the total expendi-

tures upon which the comparison is based. Moreover, this comparison of expenditures for textbooks with total expenditures is probably less significant than a comparison with current expenses. Certainly this is the case when consideration is given to the percentage figures shown for the individual states listed in Table I. For example, Maine allotted to textbooks twice as large a portion of all funds expended in 1927-28 as did New Jersey. But when current expenses and capital outlay are separated, it is found³ that capital outlay accounts for nearly 22 percent of the total public-school expenditures of New Jersey in the same year, as compared with 7 percent for Maine. This variability is accentuated when expenditures for different years are taken into consideration. Thus, capital outlay amounts to 12 percent of the total expenditures in Montana in 1927-28, as compared with 16 percent in Maryland; but in 1925-26, the figures are 4 percent for Montana and 28 percent for Maryland.

2. The Cost in Thirteen States Compared with Current School Expenses

In view of the variability noted with respect to payments on account of capital acquisition and construction on behalf of the different state school systems and for any given state in different years, a tabulation has been made of the relation of the cost of textbooks to the annual current expenses of the public schools of these thirteen states from 1920 to 1928. Statements of payments for free textbooks alone have been collected by the Office of Education since 1918 (a few omissions appear from the failure of certain state departments to make the report in proper form). The percentages shown in Table II are computed from these tabulations as presented in Bulletins entitled *Statistics of State School Systems* for the years designated in this table. No data could be procured for Rhode Island for the years prior to 1926.

The public schools of these thirteen states enrolled 5,931,000 pupils in 1928, or approximately 24 percent of the reported enrolment of that year in all the states. The total annual current expenses of the public schools of this group amounted to 25 percent of the expenses of all state school systems in the same year. Since this is obviously a fair sampling of the nation's schools with respect to both membership and annual costs, it is apparent that if textbooks were provided

³U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1930, No. 5, Table 27.

TABLE II.—PERCENT THAT COST OF TEXTBOOKS IS OF TOTAL CURRENT EXPENSES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND HIGH SCHOOLS IN THIRTEEN FREE-TEXTBOOK STATES, 1920-28

State	Percent of Annual Current Expenses Paid for Textbooks				
	1920	1922	1924	1926	1928
Delaware.....	3.3	3.4	2.6	2.6	2.7
Maine.....	4.3	3.5	3.2	3.1	2.8
Maryland.....	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.0
Massachusetts.....	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.6
Montana.....	2.7	1.7	2.0	2.2	2.7
Nebraska.....	4.5	2.1†	2.5	2.4	2.4
New Hampshire.....	2.2	2.6	2.3	2.0	2.0
New Jersey.....	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.6
Pennsylvania.....	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.2
Rhode Island.....	2.2	2.1
South Dakota.....	3.7	1.1	1.7	1.5	2.4
Texas.....	11.2*	2.0†	2.5	4.4	2.4
Wyoming.....	2.7	2.8	2.0	2.1	2.0
Mean.....	2.4‡	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.0
Median.....	2.7	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.2

* Year of introduction of free textbooks.

† Estimated from data in annual report of State Department of Education.

‡ Estimated from data in Bulletin No. 240 of State Department of Education.

§ Excluding Texas.

for all pupils in all states in the same manner as in the states of this group, the annual bill for books would be approximately 2.2 percent of the annual current expenses. The total current expenses of all state systems in 1928 amounted to \$1,797,500,000. On the basis of this estimate, all public-school pupils might have been supplied with books for that year at a cost of \$39,545,000. Phillips's estimate, based upon reports of sales by publishers in that year, is \$38,800,000. This would probably be increased somewhat by sales of other publishers not reporting. But if the cost were a half-million dollars more, it would imply that all public-school pupils were as well supplied with books as are those in states where books are provided at public expense.

3. The Cost in City Schools

That the appropriations required for supplying public-school pupils with books are relatively less burdensome when city schools rather than state school systems are considered is indicated by the reports of

cities in which books are purchased for both elementary-school and high-school pupils by the board of education. By courtesy of the Office of Education, the reports which had been received by the middle of September relating to the school year 1929-30 were checked to determine the percentage of current expenses represented by payments for textbooks. The average for 134 cities was found to be 1.4 percent. Grouping these cities on the basis of the number of pupils in average daily attendance in elementary and high schools, the portion of current expense represented by payments for textbooks was determined as indicated in Table III.

TABLE III.—PERCENT THAT COST OF TEXTBOOKS IS OF TOTAL CURRENT EXPENSES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN 134 CITIES, 1929-30

Average Daily Attendance in Elementary and Secondary Schools	Number of Cities	Total Current Expense	Payments for Textbooks	Percent for Textbooks
20,000 or more.....	8	\$126,371,000	\$1,743,000	1.4
10,000 to 19,999.....	13	21,815,000	255,000	1.2
5,000 to 9,999.....	23	19,034,000	305,000	1.5
2,000 to 4,999.....	42	12,380,000	242,000	1.9
1,000 to 1,999.....	36	4,955,000	109,000	2.2
500 to 999.....	12	898,000	19,000	2.1
All cities.....	134	\$186,053,000	\$2,673,000	1.4

While the payments for textbooks in cities with less than 2,000 pupils in average attendance are about the same proportionate part of all current expenses as that indicated for the state school systems providing free textbooks for all pupils, it appears that larger cities allot only about 1.5 per cent of the annual current appropriations for the purchase of textbooks when all pupils are provided with books at the expense of the local school district.

III. THE PER CAPITA COST OF TEXTBOOKS

1. In Thirteen States

In terms of the net sales reported by publishers (in the studies by Monahan and Phillips) the amount paid for textbooks per pupil enrolled in the public schools increased between 1913 and 1928 from 78 cents to \$1.41. In terms of the reports of the states providing books at the expense of the state or school district there was in 1928 an average expenditure of \$1.55 per pupil enrolled. While most of these

states provided free books prior to 1913, the cost of books has been separately reported in the bulletins of the Office of Education only since 1918. Using the data assembled in these bulletins, the cost per pupil enrolled in each of the free textbook states excepting California was determined as shown in Table IV. State reports were used for the figures for Nebraska and Texas in 1922, but no data were available for Rhode Island prior to 1926.

TABLE IV.—COST PER PUPIL ENROLLED OF FREE TEXTBOOKS IN THIRTEEN STATES, 1920-28*

State	Payments for Textbooks per Pupil Enrolled				
	1920	1922	1924	1926	1928
Delaware.....	\$1.34	\$1.99	\$1.76	\$1.89	\$1.96
Maine.....	1.87	1.85	1.87	1.87	1.87
Maryland.....	.77	1.05	1.28	1.38	1.36
Massachusetts.....	.95	1.32	1.37	1.41	1.51
Montana.....	2.17	1.58	1.80	2.04	2.64
Nebraska.....	2.59	1.72	1.99	1.73	1.81
New Hampshire.....	1.26	1.75	1.61	1.65	1.65
New Jersey.....	.91	1.44	1.56	1.52	1.72
Pennsylvania.....	.95	1.41	1.55	1.65	1.66
Rhode Island.....				1.53	1.76
South Dakota.....	2.28	.80	1.35	1.20	2.01
Texas.....	3.16	1.00	.89	1.97	1.02
Wyoming.....	1.99	2.35	2.31	2.21	2.16
Mean.....	1.61	1.33	1.38	1.67	1.55
Median.....	1.60	1.51	1.59	1.65	1.76

* Data from the sources indicated for Table III.

The enrollment of elementary-school and high-school pupils in all state school systems in 1928 was approximately 25,180,000. If all schools had been supplied with books on the same basis as the schools of the thirteen states specified in Table IV, the total cost of textbooks for all public-school pupils would have been \$39,029,000. Reckoned in this manner, the total cost is very little more than the estimate made by Phillips, which was \$38,800,000, including an allowance for the dealers' profits on books privately purchased.

Considering the percentages and per-capita figures relating to the payments for textbooks in the individual states listed in Tables II and

IV, it is noted that while there are instances of marked variability, there is a general tendency for the state to follow a rather consistent policy with respect to appropriations for textbooks. For the most part, the period considered shows a tendency to increase the amount spent per pupil from year to year, although this increase is so small that the total payments for textbooks are advanced somewhat less rapidly than are total payments for all current expenses.

2. In City School Systems

The sources of information with respect to city school systems need a few words of explanation.

A letter of inquiry addressed to 150 city-school superintendents secured data for determining the per-pupil cost of textbooks in 60 cities distributed among 20 states.⁴ Many more replies were received, some from cities in which books are supplied for elementary-school pupils only, some from cities whose pupils are supplied with books from funds appropriated by the state rather than by the local district, and a few came from cities that do not provide free textbooks for any pupils. As the questionnaire was sent out last April, a number of the replies reported for a school or fiscal year ending prior to January, 1930, while others, especially those not replying immediately, reported for a school or fiscal year ending between April 1 and September 1, 1930. This list could hardly be regarded as representative of cities in general, for, while 20 states are represented, 26 of the 60 replies furnishing the necessary data came from cities of three states, 10 in Massachusetts, 10 in Pennsylvania, and 6 in New Jersey. Moreover, relatively few of the small cities are included. Taking advantage of the offer of the Statistical Division of the Office of Education, this list of 60 cities was increased to a total of 177 by reference to the 1929-30 reports received prior to September 15. Twenty-five states are represented, including 10 of the 14 states in which books are furnished free to all pupils. None of the cities of California is included because the state prints and furnishes books for its elementary-school pupils. Delaware, Maryland and Texas are not represented because all books are paid for by state appropriations and the cost of books does not appear as an item of expense to the city school system.

In addition to the cities representing the ten free-textbook states, there are 13 cities of New York State, and 11 of Connecticut. The number of cities of each of the other states is: Colorado 1, Idaho 1, Illinois 2, Iowa 2, Louisiana 1, Michigan 4, Ohio 4, Tennessee 1, Utah 2, Vermont 1, Washington 2, West Virginia 1, Wisconsin 5. Many other city school reports indicated payments for textbooks, but only those were se-

⁴In this part of the study the writer was assisted by Mr. G. E. VanDyke.

lected whose reports showed clearly that books are furnished for both elementary and high-school pupils. All such reports were used, regardless of the number of cities chosen from a given state. Since some cities in this group provide books for pupils in regular day schools only, while others report payments for books for pupils in evening, part-time or special classes, the tabulation made includes only the cost of books for pupils in elementary, junior high and high school grades. The cost per pupil in average daily attendance in these units was determined.

Table V presents a summary of the per-capita costs derived from the sources mentioned. The cities are grouped on the basis of the total average daily attendance in the regular day schools of elementary and secondary grades.

TABLE V.—PER-CAPITA COST OF TEXTBOOKS FOR PUPILS IN THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF 175 CITIES*

Average Daily Attendance in Elementary and Secondary Schools	Number of Cities	Number of Pupils	Payments for Textbooks	Per-Pupil Cost of Textbooks
20,000 or more	21	2,271,000	\$3,897,000	\$1.72
10,000 to 19,999	25	346,600	581,000	1.68
5,000 to 9,999	33	247,500	449,000	1.81
2,000 to 4,999	46	140,700	263,000	1.87
1,000 to 1,999	39	55,500	119,000	2.15
500 to 999	13	9,900	21,000	2.12
All cities	177	3,071,200	\$5,330,000	1.73

*The report for any given city is for a school or fiscal year ending in 1929 or 1930.

It costs the smaller cities a little more to provide books for pupils than it does the larger cities, although the particular grouping presented here results in a slightly higher average for the largest group than for the next lower classification group. The significant fact is that *three million pupils were provided with books last year, as adequately as present teaching practice seems to require, at a cost of only \$1.73 per pupil in average attendance.*

IV. THE COST OF BOOKS FOR PUPILS IN DIFFERENT GRADES

1. In Nine Free-Textbook States

Data furnished by replies to a questionnaire sent to state departments of education show the relative cost of books for pupils of elementary-school and of high-school grade separately for nine of the states in which all pupils are supplied with books at public expense. The cost per pupil on an enrollment basis is shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI.—PER-CAPITA COST OF ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL AND OF HIGH-SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS IN NINE FREE-TEXTBOOK STATES, 1928-29

State	Elementary Schools			High Schools		
	Enrollment	Cost of Textbooks	Per-Pupil Cost	Enrollment	Cost of Textbooks	Per-Pupil Cost
Maine.....	135,900	\$215,500	\$1.59	26,800	\$77,100	\$2.87
Maryland.....	233,600	268,800	1.15	39,900	94,500	2.37
Massachusetts.....	585,800	751,100	1.28	158,400	415,600	2.62
Montana.....	95,400	194,100	2.03	23,300	70,200	3.02
Nebraska.....	258,700	357,000	1.38	66,500	206,100	3.10
New Hampshire.....	60,100	78,600	1.31	13,600	42,600	3.13
New Jersey.....	627,400	1,036,100	1.65	97,400	315,900	3.24
Pennsylvania.....	1,513,900	2,219,500	1.47	383,300	951,100	2.48
Rhode Island.....	93,800	110,500	1.18	17,000	48,800	2.86
Total.....	3,604,600	\$5,231,200	\$1.45	826,200	\$2,221,900	\$2.69

As classified in the reports submitted, the elementary-school pupils in these states are provided with books at a cost per pupil enrolled of \$1.45. Books for high-school pupils naturally cost more per pupil; the average for these nine states is \$2.69. It is understood, of course, that in the present stage of development of junior high schools, it is not possible to make a very positive classification of pupils on a state-wide basis. However, the comparative figures shown may be regarded as approximately representative of the relative cost of books for pupils of elementary-school and of high-school grade, since the enrollment of each separate grade is usually reported by the local school district.

2. In City Schools

In city school districts, reports are now commonly made in form to indicate the distribution of pupils among the three units of organization—elementary, junior high, and high school—wherever any junior-high-school units are maintained. Where the traditional organization prevails, the number of pupils in elementary-school and high-school units is universally recorded. Data assembled for 165 cities, 90 of them reporting some pupils in junior-high-school units and 75 of them reporting on the 8-4 basis, show the number of pupils in average daily attendance in these organization units, and the payments for textbooks similarly classified. As this list was secured

partly by questionnaire and partly from reports submitted to the Office of Education, the data do not relate to the school year 1929-30 in all cases; but none of them antedates the school year 1928-29.

TABLE VII.—PER-PUPIL COST OF TEXTBOOKS FOR PUPILS IN ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL AND HIGH-SCHOOL GRADES OF 75 CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS ORGANIZED ON THE 8-4 PLAN

Number of Pupils in Elementary Schools	Elementary Schools				High Schools		
	Number of Cities	Average Daily Attendance	Cost of Textbooks	Per-Pupil Cost	Average Daily Attendance	Cost of Textbooks	Per-Pupil Cost
6,000 or more.....	14	254,900	\$376,000	\$1.48	66,700	\$219,000	\$3.28
2,000 to 5,999.....	18	53,300	80,000	1.50	17,600	47,000	2.69
1,000 to 1,999.....	20	29,100	51,000	1.75	9,100	26,000	2.86
300 to 999.....	23	16,300	27,000	1.66	6,700	22,000	3.28
Total.....	75	353,600	\$534,000	\$1.51	100,000	\$314,000	\$3.14

TABLE VIII.—PER-PUPIL COST OF TEXTBOOKS FOR PUPILS IN ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR-HIGH, AND SENIOR-HIGH GRADES OF 90 CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS ORGANIZED ON THE 6-3-3 PLAN

Number of Pupils in Elementary Schools	Number of Cities	Elementary Schools			Junior High Schools			High Schools		
		Average Daily Attendance	Cost of Textbooks	Per-Pupil Cost	Average Daily Attendance	Cost of Text-books	Per-Pupil Cost	Average Daily Attendance	Cost of Text-books	Per-Pupil Cost
10,000 or more....	17	1,465,300	\$2,256,000	\$1.54	192,700	\$359,000	\$1.86	302,100	\$712,000	\$2.36
5,000 to 9,999..	26	183,100	197,000	1.08	63,600	121,000	1.90	43,000	130,000	3.02
2,000 to 4,999...	18	58,500	83,000	1.42	21,400	42,000	1.96	16,400	56,000	3.41
1,000 to 1,999...	15	22,300	31,000	1.39	8,500	19,000	2.24	7,300	25,000	3.42
300 to 999...	14	10,200	18,000	1.76	3,800	8,000	2.11	3,500	12,000	3.43
Total.....	90	1,739,400	\$2,585,000	\$1.49	290,000	\$549,000	\$1.89	372,300	\$935,000	\$2.51

Tables VII and VIII show the cost per pupil in average daily attendance for textbooks in the two and in the three units of organization of the 8-4 and the 6-3-3- groups, respectively, with the cities classified on the basis of the number of pupils in their elementary schools.⁵

⁵Detailed figures showing the average daily attendance, the total cost of textbooks, and the per-pupil cost of textbooks, both in the elementary-school grades and in the high-school grades of each of seventy-five cities, and also in the elementary-school, the junior-high-school, and the senior-high-school grades of each of ninety cities have been omitted from the Yearbook for economy of space. These figures, of which Tables VII and VIII are summaries, may be consulted by responsible parties on application to Professor Henry.—*Editor*.

From Table VII it appears that high-school books cost a little more than twice as much per pupil as books for elementary-school pupils where the schools are organized on the 8-4 plan—the averages are \$1.51 and \$3.14 in the 75 cities of this list.

As shown in Table VIII, books of elementary-school grade in the 90 cities having some pupils in junior-high-school units cost \$1.49 per pupil, approximately the same as for elementary-school pupils in the 8-4 group of cities. The identity of these averages is doubtless due in part to the fact that many of the cities reporting junior-high-school units have not completely reorganized their schools, and still have some eight-grade elementary schools. For the group of cities represented in Table VIII, books for junior-high-school pupils cost just 40 cents more than the average for elementary-school pupils in the same cities. Insofar as these two groups of cities are representative of cities in general, it appears that books for high-school pupils cost more in cities maintaining four-year high schools exclusively, but the general average for the cities included in Table VIII is materially reduced by the lower per-pupil cost in the seventeen largest cities. Excluding these 17, the average for the other 73 cities is \$3.17, as compared with \$3.14 in the 75 cities represented in Table VII.

V. CONCLUSION

The data here presented show that textbooks are surprisingly inexpensive, especially when their importance in the education of the children of this country is considered. This is true from the point of view of the portion of total annual expense used for the purchase of textbooks, as well as from the point of view of the amount expended per pupil. Since the figures used in this study relate to school systems in which books are provided for pupils at public expense, it may be inferred that the percentages and per-capita figures presented apply to conditions under which pupils are adequately supplied with books. It is unfortunate that more definite cost comparisons could not be drawn between the school systems here considered and others in which books are privately purchased. It is generally known that under the private purchase plan many pupils do not have the books they need. As has been indicated, Phillips's estimate of the total cost of

books for pupils in the public schools of the country in 1928 is approximately the same amount that would be required to supply all pupils on the same basis as the provisions made for pupils in free textbook states. A more adequate study of this phase of the textbook question would doubtless be a profitable undertaking.

•

CHAPTER XIII

THE STATE PUBLICATION OF TEXTBOOKS

ELLWOOD P. CUBBERLEY
Dean of the School of Education
Stanford University, California

I. A POLITICAL ISSUE

State publication of school textbooks in the United States has, from the first, been largely a political issue. There has never been, and is not now, in any American state, any educational demand that the schoolbooks used in the schools be printed by the state. In no case has the proposal come from school administrators or from organized bodies of teachers. To the contrary, the chief opposition to the proposal, whenever and wherever advanced, has come from those responsible for the proper education of the children of the state.

II. WHAT STATES HAVE TRIED IT

While the proposal that the state print its schoolbooks has been up for consideration, at different times within the past half century, in a number of our states, only three states have ever actually put the plan into operation, and in one of these (Indiana) it was undertaken years ago, and then abandoned before much money had been spent on it or much harm had been done to the schools. In California and Kansas the plan is now in operation in so far as the printing of elementary-school textbooks is concerned, and Kansas is beginning the printing of some high-school textbooks as well.

California established a state printing plant to do the state printing—blanks, forms, stationery, laws, reports, catalogues—in 1875, and in 1886 extended the idea to the state printing of elementary-school textbooks. In 1916 a determined effort was made to extend the plan to the printing of high-school texts, and in 1928 to the printing of supplemental elementary-school texts. In both of these proposed extensions the proponent was the state printer, aided by members of the legislature, while the opposition, which led to defeat in each case,

came from the organized teachers and school administrators of the state. Kansas established a state printing plant in 1905, and in 1913, acting on figures submitted by the state printer, provided for the printing of school textbooks as well at the state printing plant. Three other states (Nevada, Oregon, and Washington), all western, maintain state printing plants to do the general state printing, and in two of these there has been much recent agitation for the printing of schoolbooks as well. Of the other states, three or four provide that their general state printing shall be done at the state penitentiary or state reform school, and approximately one-half of the states provide for some form of contract system to control the prices on the state printing that has to be done.

III. STATE PRINTING OF SUPPLIES

As applied to the printing of blanks, forms, stationery, laws, reports, catalogs, and similar work, a material saving doubtless has been effected by a contract system, and probably some saving also under actual state printing, over the plan of letting out the different jobs locally on bids. Where such saving has been effected, it has been but natural that state officials should reason that a similar saving might also be effected on the price of schoolbooks, if they too were printed locally instead of being bought from publishers. Such a plan, it also has been argued, would provide labor for printers and bookbinders within the state, instead of sending money outside to provide work for printers and bookbinders located chiefly in a few cities in a small number of the North Atlantic states. Once create a state printing plant to do the state printing, it seems, and the state printer may almost certainly be expected to begin a movement to take over the printing of school textbooks as well.

IV. STATE AUTHORSHIP NO LONGER URGED

It used also to be argued, though this argument is seldom advanced now by any intelligent person, that additional money might be saved to the state on authors' royalties if the books also were written only by citizens of the state. Indiana and California each suffered from a severe attack of this home-product idea in the beginning of their experiences in the state printing of school textbooks. In Indiana, where the system had been created by legislative act, the

results of the home production of schoolbooks soon proved fatal to the continuance of the system, and the state fortunately was able to rid itself of it; in California, the state printing of textbooks was enabled to survive state authorship, and to evolve into a better system, owing to the protection of a mandatory constitutional provision, adopted at the time the idea of the state printing of textbooks seized the state.

V. TYPICAL ARGUMENTS FOR STATE PRINTING AND TYPICAL OBJECTIONS TO IT

In arguing for the state printing of textbooks two main contentions have been advanced: it has been claimed, first, that "a great saving" of money to the people of the state might thereby be effected, and second, that a uniform content in instruction might thereby be provided for.

1. The Argument for Reduced Cost

In arguing the first claim the total cost of textbooks usually has been stated, rather than the per capita cost or the percentage of saving, and extravagant claims have been made as to the economies that might be effected by local publication. Two good illustrations of these exaggerated claims may be cited. One, cited by Buckingham, concerns Illinois. It was there proposed in 1912 that the state print its own textbooks, and the president of the State Federation of Labor made and published an estimate of what could be so saved. Politicians and newspapers asserted that the saving to the people would exceed a million dollars a year; but a careful check showed that the entire schoolbook business in the state at that time was only about \$750,000 per annum. The other illustration is taken from the 1925 message to the legislature of the governor of the State of Washington. Relying on figures supplied him by the state printer, he said in his message that "California and Kansas have demonstrated that state publication of textbooks means a reduction of approximately 50% in their cost," and that state printing of the schoolbooks for the schools of the State of Washington "should result in a saving of nearly \$500,000 annually." A careful tabulation of figures in the office of the state superintendent of public instruction at Olympia, made later by expert accountants, revealed that the total average yearly cost, over the preceding five years, for all schools in the state, had

been \$315,406 for elementary schools, and \$117,694 for high schools, or a total cost for both of \$423,100.

Repeated studies have shown that the cost for textbooks, large as it may seem to be to the father of a family of children who has to buy books at the same time that he buys dresses and suits and shoes, is, after all, but a very small fraction of the cost for education. The family-burden aspect of this cost may be relieved entirely by a state-wide system of free textbooks. Next to the teacher employed, the textbook is the most important item of cost in the conduct of a school system—not in amount, but in educational importance; yet studies have shown that the cost for textbooks is only about 1.5 percent of the total cost for the conduct of the schools, while the cost for the teacher runs from 65 to 70 percent of the total cost. Any saving made by the state printing of textbooks, even under the most liberal system of cost accounting, could not exceed from one-quarter to one-third of one percent of the cost of the conduct of the school system—an entirely negligible saving compared with the handicap placed on the teacher by the adoption and retention of books unsuited to the needs of the schools. To supply these needs the schools are forced to buy supplemental books, the cost for which far more than negatives, as we shall show later on, any possible saving that state printing may effect. That education is not primarily the saving of money, but the intelligent spending of money, is something that it seems difficult for many people to realize.

2. The Argument for Uniform Content

The movement for state publication of school textbooks has also been, in part, an expression on the part of legislators of a uniform-content conception as to the nature of the educative process. To certain types of minds the idea of a general uniform content in instruction, at least for all elementary schools, makes a strong appeal. Such minds would standardize all school work, and have all pupils in a state given a uniform teaching content. Assuming that this were either desirable or possible, it would be a far more intelligent procedure to standardize by means of uniform courses of study than by means of uniform textbooks. Uniformity is not, however, an educational possibility. Numerous studies have shown that children differ much, both in schools and in communities, in their ability to use books

as tools and to acquire the knowledge that teachers try to impart. Our cities have found by experience that to have a variety of textbooks, rather than uniformity, is the more desirable plan, and that children in different classes and in different schools vary much in their ability to use different types of books. In schools where pupils have been divided into ability-groups, it has been found that textbooks differing in character—in sentence structure, style, difficulty of material, and scope of treatment—are desirable for use with different ability-divisions.

3. Different Communities Need Different Textbooks

What is true as regards pupils and classes also holds true for different types of communities within a state. Unprepared and beginning teachers in rural and village communities need a textbook that will largely carry the subject; the mature and capable teacher in a good city school system, where there is good teaching equipment and professional supervision, has quite different textbook needs. Rural children, too, ought to have a somewhat different type of readers, arithmetics, language, and science books from those used by city children. Under any plan providing for uniform content, or for the adoption of uniform textbooks, this variety is not possible except as the school supplements the state texts by buying additional books, and then the expense for textbooks inevitably is increased. In all adoptions under state uniformity of textbooks plans, the best that can be done is to strike as nearly a general average as is possible, with the result that the books selected usually are too difficult for the more backward portions of the state, and not up to what the better city school systems desire to use. It is a heavy price that the people of our rural districts pay to-day, in a lessened interest in school and an away-from-the-farm tendency for their children, by following the lead of politicians intent on currying favor with them by trying to save them a dollar or two on the cost of the schoolbooks they buy.

A school textbook is an instrument to help teachers and school authorities to carry out the educational ideas underlying a course of study, and a well-made course of study represents a constructive effort, on the part of someone who has been thinking, to put in teachable form an organized philosophy of the educative process. Most of the progress that has been made educationally in this country, during the past three-quarters of a century, has been made by our cities, and

it has been made there chiefly because city superintendents have been freer to experiment, to try different ways of doing things, to buy the best new teaching tools as soon as they appeared, and to provide their teachers with any variety of teaching equipment needed for the work they proposed to do. Different courses of study represent different educational conceptions, and our educational progress stands witness to the great desirability of this liberty to try different ways and means.

4. The Supervising Unit Should Be the Adopting Unit

The two important elements that condition success with any course of study are, first, the character of the teaching force that must carry the educational ideas represented by it into execution and, second, the textbooks and teaching materials that are available for use with the pupils. This fundamental fact of necessity dictates that the unit both for the adoption of textbooks and for the working out of courses of study should always be the unit of supervision; consequently, either the uniform state adoption of textbooks or the state publication of them tends to hinder educational progress without giving any compensating return. The solution for the textbook problem, then, lies in free textbooks to reduce individual costs and family burdens, and local adoption and purchase of textbooks, with the unit of supervision, city or county, acting as the unit for adoption and purchase. Even then, all the textbooks provided for the schools of a supervisory unit should not, of necessity, be the same in kind, but rather whatever variety in texts the needs of the children to be taught may dictate should be allowed.

5. Uniform Textbooks Particularly Undesirable in High Schools

The disadvantages of uniformity in school textbooks becomes even more marked when we pass from the elementary school to the junior and the senior high schools. Both these types of schools are new and rapidly changing institutions, where method and particular content count for less, and the knowledge and personality of the teacher count for more, than in the case of the elementary school. It is surprising that anyone who knows anything about the problems and purposes of high-school work should advocate uniformity in textbooks for high schools. Progress in education and effective teaching do not come through superimposed uniformity, and superimposed uniformity is

what the state publication of textbooks inevitably means. Teachers trained by different methods, teachers teaching different types of classes and students, and teachers in small rural high schools and in large city high schools, all have different textbook needs. It is the *results* of teaching that are important; not the tools to be used. It is this wrong conception of the educative process that underlies the whole textbook problem. The emphasis in education should be placed on teaching, whereas state printers and legislators largely focus it on textbooks and the saving of dimes.

6. Introduction of Improved Textbooks Sadly Delayed

There is another aspect of the forced uniformity in textbooks question that applies to all types of schools. New textbooks—textbooks that modify the type of instruction that is possible because they represent real advances in content or in the organization of subject matter—are appearing every year. Uniform state adoption almost inevitably prevents the early use of these new textbooks, and state publication prevents it for an even longer time, because of the cost factor in making a change. Under an open-list plan with local adoptions, and with sale prices fixed by a state board—which is all the protection the public needs—any school system that desires to do so may begin the use of a new textbook almost from its appearance. Under state uniformity, or still worse under state publication, a school may wait for years, and possibly never be able to use the desired textbook. As a matter of fact the better school systems—city systems with the larger number of pupils—will not and do not wait; they have their pupils buy, or they furnish, the required state textbooks, and then they provide the desired textbooks as “supplemental” books, and pay for them from local funds. This is the usual result, but any possible financial saving for the taxpayer vanishes in the process.

7. Publishers' Prices Are Not High

One would think, from the way state printers, governors, legislators, and newspapers play up the question of textbook costs that they represent the chief item in the cost of school maintenance; actually they are a very small one, and the possible savings by state printing are far smaller. The question of textbook costs has, as a result, been emphasized out of all proportion to its importance. As a matter of

fact, even the retail prices of textbooks are very reasonable. No other forms of publication, except certain magazines of wide sale that depend on their advertising for support, are sold so cheaply. When one compares the well-printed and substantially-bound textbooks of to-day, with their excellent illustrations and maps, good paper, clear type, and careful composition and proof reading—all of which has called for extra expense—with the average novel, history, book of travels or essays, or book of biography which sells at from three to ten times the price of a textbook of similar size, one realizes how cheaply schoolbooks actually are sold. These prices, like those on a Ford automobile, are possible only by reason of wide markets and large-scale production. That the same economic principles apply to the production of school textbooks that apply to the manufacture of automobiles, safety razors, ready-made clothing, or moving-picture films, state printers and legislators too often fail to realize.

The argument, so far, has been largely directed against state uniformity of any type, either by state adoption or by state publication, and for the reason that either plan is educationally unsound and unsatisfactory, and that both plans have been condemned generally by those responsible for the conduct of our schools. The minute that free textbooks are provided, the last excuse for state uniformity disappears. Let us, however, examine the experience of the one state that has published its own textbooks long enough to permit of the drawing of conclusions therefrom as to state publication.

VI. California's Experience with State Printing¹

In 1884, in an anti-book-trust movement that swept the state, and for which the practices of certain publishers' agents of that period probably were largely responsible, the Constitution of California was amended to provide that the State Board of Education should "compile and publish" a state series of textbooks for the schools. The legislature of 1885 appropriated \$150,000 for added equipment for the state printing plant, and \$20,000 with which to employ authors

¹ For an elaborate study of the California situation the reader may profitably consult the doctorate thesis of P. R. Davis, "State Publication of Textbooks in California," Berkeley, 1930. A convenient summary of it appears in the *Sierra Educational News*, December, 1930. Davis's study, which appeared after Dr. Cubberley's chapter had been written, confirms Dr. Cubberley's conclusions completely and brings an even stronger indictment against the educational adequacy of the state-printed texts.—*Editor*.

and purchase manuscripts. These sums were to constitute a "revolving fund," presumably sufficient to meet all future needs. The sums, however, proved wholly inadequate; supplemental appropriations were called for from time to time; and up to 1913, when school textbooks were made free and extra-cost items were lost in general state charges, a total of \$812,354.57 had been appropriated by the legislature of California to provide for the writing and printing and handling of school textbooks. For this sum, which represents a developmental expense that any business would have to reckon with, no interest or sinking-fund charge has ever been assessed against the cost of manufacturing schoolbooks, and the cost prices for book manufacture, as given out to-day by the state printer, utterly ignore the costs for this long developmental experience. In addition to the amount just named, other indirect charges, which any publishing house would have to include in its cost-accounting or go into bankruptcy—interest on plant, depreciation, storage, postage, telegrams, carrying charges, adoption charges, depreciation of plates, cost of changes to new books—also have been ignored in price-fixing and have further increased the extra appropriation cost to at least \$1,000,000 for the twenty-eight years that the state published and sold its own books. How much these extra costs have been since 1913 is anyone's guess. Yet, despite this added charge on the taxpayers—equal, for the period from 1885 to 1910, to an added charge of 23 percent to the cost of textbooks as paid by the parents purchasing them—California was not able to provide schoolbooks materially cheaper than the publishers would have supplied the same books, printed on better paper, and much better bound.

By 1903, the complaints against the books prepared became so pronounced that an opinion was obtained from the attorney general of the state, uncontested by any interest, though clearly a stretch of the constitutional provision, which permitted the State Board of Education to abandon contract authorship and to lease plates of books issued by regular publishers, on a royalty basis. By this "legal legerdemain" the state printing of textbooks plan was saved from disaster, and the California schools were enabled to rid themselves of the worst feature of the plan. Better textbooks have since been obtained. Finally, in 1913, elementary-school books were made free, the direct charge to the parent disappeared, and the cost—whatever

that may now be—henceforth was buried in the general tax burden of the state. If the budget allowance is not sufficient to enable the state printer to supply the books needed by a growing state, as happened recently under an economy governor, the schools merely get along on short rations.

While at present the textbooks supplied seem to be manufactured at reasonable figures, and are reasonably satisfactory mechanically, it is evident from the statement of costs issued that all cost items have not been taken account of. It is also a matter of common report among the educators of California that the question of whether or not the state printer can print any new book, within reasonable price limits, has to be considered in making adoptions; some otherwise desirable school textbooks, it is commonly understood, have not been adopted for use for this reason. Some of the books adopted for printing, it has been asserted, have been so cheapened in the process of reproduction that their wearing qualities have been materially reduced. Superintendents have claimed that old plates, and old editions with old data, have been retained after newer and better editions of the same book were on the market because of the term-period of adoption and the cost to the state of changing the plates. In other cases, state syllabi or outlines, to supplement an out-of-date state textbook, have had to be issued by the commissioner of elementary schools in an effort to supplement an obsolete text. Sometimes the fault of not supplying adequate and proper textbooks has rested with the state printer, sometimes with the governor and the budget, and sometimes with the state board of education as the adopting body.

The chief difficulty with the plan, however, is still more fundamental than these defects, serious as they may be, in that a publicly owned monopoly has been created from which there is no escape. If this monopoly operates efficiently, it may save a little public money; if it operates inefficiently, it wastes public money and greatly injures the schools at the same time. When we add to these difficulties the fact that a number of the larger publishing houses, publishing some of the best of all the available school textbooks, absolutely refuse to rent their plates to the state, the plan appears to be less economical, and educationally far less efficient, than would be a plan whereby the state board of education approved books and standardized prices, and then allowed each school system to purchase the books it desired

and furnish them free to the pupils. Such a plan now prevails for high-school books in California, and the plan is generally satisfactory, except to the state printer.

The cost factor may be examined further by summarizing from a report made recently (1925) by a committee of the Washington Education Association, which made a study of the California publication-plan costs at the time the governor of Washington recommended that the state embark on the state publication of school textbooks.

After summarizing the California law, this committee pointed out that 75 percent of the textbooks then in use in the State of Washington could not be used, except when purchased as supplemental books, in the California schools because the publishers of these books will not lease their plates to a state; that of the arithmetic texts used in 217 of the 219 cities of Washington, not one could be adopted in California for the same reason; that the most popular series of readers used in the Washington schools also could not be adopted; that no author of much intelligence, having a valuable textbook, would limit its use to one state; and that under local or even state adoption publishers will quote an exchange price for the old books displaced, whereas under state publication the old books are a dead loss, and that this fact tends to the retention of books which have outlived their period of usefulness. In the matter of textbook costs, they compared figures for the city of Seattle with the California figures, with the following result: the Seattle per-pupil cost for elementary-school textbooks, for the five-year period 1919-24, averaged \$1.25, and the corrected California figures, for the same years, gave a per-pupil cost of 58c. The report then concludes with the following statements:

The \$1.25 cost figures in Seattle cover all supplementary books, as well as all textbooks used in the grade schools, while the California figure of 58 cents covers state-published books only. We should further remember that the California legislature, a number of years ago, answered the demand for the repeal of the state-publication law on the ground that inferior books were secured thereunder by passing a supplementary-textbook law, permitting an annual local expenditure of 80 cents per pupil for supplementary books. Now add this 80 cents to 58 cents, the average yearly California cost of state-published books for the period taken, and \$1.38 is the only figure that can be fairly compared with the \$1.25 cost figure in Seattle.

That this 80 cents per pupil is actually spent in California is evidenced by an examination of pp. 118-121 of the 31st Biennial Report of

the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of California, which indicates a total expenditure of \$517,000 in 1922-23, and \$577,000 in 1923-24, for supplementary books.

This matter of costs under state publication should not be passed without examination of the accounting system by which the state printer of California arrives at his per-pupil cost figures. He gives due consideration to the cost of labor, paper, printing, binding, and miscellaneous materials, but he neglects to charge against the price of his books any interest on the state's investment in plant and machinery. Nor does he charge off anything for depreciation. A 6 percent annual interest charge on the \$1,000,000 appropriated through the years from the general fund by the California legislature to cover deficits and capitals outlays in connection with state printing, plus a 5 to 10 percent write-off for depreciation of plant, plates, and machinery, are legitimate charges against the per-pupil cost of state-printed books, but these are ignored by the state printer of California.

State publication not only means inferior books, but it means increased cost, based upon the California experience. There is no reason to assume that Washington can improve upon California in the matter of costs. . . .

Owing to the fact that inferior and obsolete texts are common under state publication, thereby seriously crippling the school system, and that state publication will not result in a financial saving to the people of the state, we, the representative assembly of the Washington Education Association, go on record as being definitely opposed to state publication of textbooks in the State of Washington.

VII. A GENERAL PICTURE OF THE SITUATION

A good textbook is an evolution, and something that cannot well be made to order. Every successful publisher, like every successful manufacturer, is continually experimenting, and a successful school textbook usually is the outcome of a long period of trial and error. Large publishers, too, have as authors men and women who write for the English-speaking world, and not for the confines of a state. Still more, of 225 companies publishing schoolbooks in America, fewer than ten have their own printing plants. Instead, engraving, map work, color work, press work, and binding are done in large specialty plants, because it is cheaper to do so and because experimental costs are thereby largely eliminated. The few firms who do maintain their own publishing plants have to do an enormous business, and a highly specialized business at that, to maintain their plants on a financially profitable basis. Only after long and costly experimenting, well illustrated in the case of California, can a state printing and binding establish-

ment reach a point where it can manufacture even tolerably good schoolbooks at anything approaching a competitive figure. If all developmental and incidental charges are included in the cost calculations, and if books are changed or revised as often as the publishers revise them, it cannot do this at all. *The conclusion is inevitable that it is an exhibition of the utmost lack of good financial judgment—to say nothing of the far more important educational considerations involved—for any American state to embark on state publication of the schoolbooks used in its schools.*

The manufacture of a good school textbook is an art, and small plants seldom attain to a high degree of workmanship at any reasonable figure. Still worse, however, is the limitation of the schools of a state, under state publication, to one basal text in each subject, whereas all educational considerations point to the desirability of the local adoption of multiple lists. All the legitimate interests of a state in the matter of textbook control can be met by approved listing, with freedom to the different units of supervision to adopt the working tools they see fit to employ. Anything less is a violation of the professional attitude and spirit and rights of the teaching force of a state.

One often wonders how long the people of California and Kansas, or any other state for that matter, will continue to build schoolhouses as architects direct, to equip them with all needed teaching devices, to employ teachers who have been trained at public expense and selected with care, to pay good salaries to superintendents of schools to direct the education of youth and efficiently manage the schools; and then continue to ignore all expert advice as to teaching tools and to allow politicians to determine plans for textbooks that affect the education of millions of children—all because they promise the public a little pecuniary saving—when the prime question is not *cost*, but *quality* and *good teaching*. With no constructive grasp of the problem involved, with puerile insinuations against the motives of those who oppose them, with open boasts as to the probable attitude of the people, with demagogic claptrap instead of educational argument, these men—impervious to educational ideas and in the sacred name of economy—are allowed to tinker with the educational machinery and drag instructional efficiency down to the level of political necessity for the little state printing and the accompanying political

patronage that it affords. It is a serious reflection on the practical efficiency of our form of American government that professional opinion, in a matter of such fundamental importance, has been swept aside so lightly. Viewed, however, from the point of view of the number of states that have recently refused to embark on state publication of textbooks, despite the urging of governors, legislators, state printers, or labor-union forces, there is renewed hope that the force of educational opinion may yet be able to prevail in a matter of such national importance.

•

CHAPTER XIV

LEGISLATIVE AGENCIES FOR TEXTBOOK SELECTION

W. L. COFFEY
Dean, College of the City of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

From a very early date the textbook has played an important part in our scheme of education. The close relation which it bears to education has had wide influence on legislation. Every state in the union, as this chapter discloses, has passed textbook laws. Several states have placed the control of textbooks in the hands of boards with little restriction. The majority of the states, however, have placed more or less limitation upon the rights of officers who have been given authority to determine adoption, sale, and use of textbooks.

I. LEGAL ADOPTING AUTHORITIES IN THE SEVERAL STATES

The statutes governing selection and adoption of textbooks may be classified from the standpoint of the adopting authority as state control, state and school-board control, county board of education and school-board control, and school-board control.

Certain states prescribe a textbook commission or board which is to select textbooks for the schools of the state and enter into contracts with publishers for their sale and distribution. In some of these states the selection and adoption is limited to the elementary schools, in others, to all schools except those of the larger cities. In a few states the authority for selecting and adopting textbooks is conferred upon the county board of education for certain school districts and upon each school board for the other school districts. In other states the state textbook commission or the state board of education and each school board divide the authority. In seventeen states the school board alone does the selecting and adopting. In some of these states the school board is free to adopt such textbooks as it pleases; in others it must make its selection from a filed list, though even in these states the textbook companies are at liberty to file any or all

their textbooks for sale. Table I shows in convenient form a classification of states with reference to the adopting authority.

TABLE I.—CLASSIFICATION OF STATES WITH REFERENCE TO THE TYPE OF ADOPTING AUTHORITY

State Textbook Commission or Committee	State Board of Education	State Textbook Commission or State Board of Education and Local School Board	County Board of Education and Local School Board	Local School Board
Alabama Florida Montana* Oklahoma Tennessee Texas† Utah§	Arizona Idaho Indiana Kansas Louisiana North Carolina* South Carolina Virginia	Arkansas California Connecticut Georgia Kentucky Mississippi Nevada New Mexico North Carolina Oregon West Virginia	Iowa Georgia Maryland Missouri North Carolina† South Dakota Washington Wisconsin	Colorado Delaware Illinois Maine Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Nebraska New Hampshire New Jersey New York North Dakota Ohio Pennsylvania Rhode Island Vermont Wyoming

* Adopts elementary-school textbooks.

† Adopts high-school textbooks.

‡ Adopts closed list for elementary schools, multiple list for high schools.

§ Cities of the first and second class excluded.

|| The people at their annual meeting adopt the textbooks for the common schools (rural schools); the school boards for other districts.

II. A LIST OF PROVISIONS FOUND IN STATE TEXTBOOK LEGISLATION

In order that the statutes of each of the states may be easily compared in their essential features the following outline has been prepared by analyzing the textbook laws now in force in all the states. All the important items in each textbook law have been placed in this outline; no one state, it will be understood, has passed a textbook law that makes all these provisions.

Outline of a Hypothetical Textbook Law Formed by Selecting the Important Provisions Included in Every One of the State Textbook Laws

I. Legislative Provisions Governing the Adoption of Textbooks

A. Adopting body

1. Manner of election or appointment
2. Personnel

3. Number of members
4. Term of service
5. Restrictions on members (against right to act)
6. Powers and duties
7. Authority of chief educational officer
- B. Area affected by adoption
 1. State
 2. County
 3. District
 4. Exemptions
- C. Period of adoption
- D. Procedure for adoption
- E. Special provisions
 1. Provision for supplementary books
 2. Provision for exchanging
 3. Provision for dropping
 4. Provision for revising
 5. Provision as to the number of books that may be changed at any one time
 6. Provision as to adopted books
- F. Quality of books considered at adoption
 1. Subject matter
 2. Material
 3. Printing
 4. Binding
 5. Mechanical qualities
 6. Grading
 7. Illustrations
 8. Size
 9. Price
 10. General suitability
- G. Contract required by adoption
 1. Nature of contract
 2. By whom prepared or approved
 3. With whom filed
 4. By whom executed
 5. Penalty for violation
- H. Bonds guaranteeing performance of contract
 1. By whom authorized
 2. Amount
 3. Period
 4. With whom filed
 5. Provision for more than one action against the bond
- I. Authority of the state to publish
 1. Elementary textbooks
 2. High-school textbooks

- J. Type of list of textbooks adopted
 - 1. Open list
 - 2. Closed list
 - K. Requirements for filing
 - 1. Sample copies of textbooks
 - 2. Price lists
 - 3. Special editions
 - 4. With whom filed
 - a. Chief state school officer
 - b. County superintendent
 - c. State textbook commission
 - d. County textbook commission
 - L. Miscellaneous
- II. Legislative Provisions Relating to the Price for Which Textbooks May Be Bought and Sold
- A. Price regulation
 - 1. Uniform
 - 2. As low as anywhere in the United States
 - B. Commission allowed
 - C. Exchange price
 - D. Provision for depositories
 - E. Source of funds for the purchase
 - 1. State
 - 2. County
 - 3. School district
 - 4. Special funds
 - 5. Parent or other private source
 - F. Authority for the purchase of textbooks
 - 1. State board of education
 - 2. Special state board
 - 3. County board
 - 4. School board
 - 5. Parent or other private source
 - G. Authority to purchase for indigent children
 - 1. Right to do so
 - 2. State
 - 3. County
 - 4. School district
 - H. Price for which textbooks may be purchased
 - 1. By unit purchasing
 - a. State
 - b. County
 - c. School district
 - 2. By the parent or other private person
 - a. At cost
 - b. At cost plus a commission

- I. Provision to prohibit restraint of trade
 - J. Provision for purchase of textbooks when child moves from the district
 - K. Provision for publication of textbook lists
 - 1. Items included
 - a. Prices
 - b. Exchange price
 - c. Discount
 - 2. By whom furnished
 - a. State board of education
 - b. State textbook commission
 - c. State school officer
 - d. County board of education
 - e. County superintendent of schools
 - f. County textbook commission
 - 3. To whom furnished
- Manner of distribution
- 1. State board of education
 - 2. State textbook commission
 - 3. Chief state school officer
 - 4. Special board
 - 5. State depositories
 - 6. Textbook agencies
 - 7. Private agencies
 - 8. County board of education
 - 9. County depositories
 - 10. County superintendent
 - 11. School district
- III. Legislative Provisions Relating to the Use of Textbooks
 - A. Uniformity and free textbook provisions
 - 1. Unity of uniformity with grades or subjects affected
 - a. State
 - (1) Elementary schools
 - (2) High schools
 - (3) Specified subjects
 - b. County
 - (1) Elementary schools
 - (2) High schools
 - (3) Specified subjects
 - c. School district
 - (1) Elementary schools
 - (2) High schools
 - (3) Specified subjects
 - 2. Free textbooks
 - a. Type of control
 - (1) Mandatory

- (a) Elementary schools
- (b) High schools
- (c) Specified subjects
- (2) Permissive
 - (a) Elementary schools
 - (b) High schools
 - (c) Specified subjects
- b. Unit affected
 - (1) State
 - (a) Elementary schools
 - (b) High schools
 - (c) Specified subjects
 - (2) County
 - (a) Elementary schools
 - (b) High schools
 - (c) Specified subjects
 - (3) School district
 - (a) Elementary schools
 - (b) High schools
 - (c) Specified subjects
- c. Authority for providing
 - (1) State board of education
 - (2) State textbook commission
 - (3) County board of education
 - (4) School board
 - (5) Legal school electors
 - (6) Special board
 - (7) Chief state school officer
 - (8) County superintendent of schools

III. SUMMARIES OF LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS OF THE SEVERAL STATES

In order to show the extent to which states have incorporated the items enumerated in the foregoing outline, twelve summary tables have been prepared. These are arranged in accordance with the four types of control heretofore mentioned. It is not possible, of course, to show by such summary tables the precise manner in which these items have been applied in detail in the textbook laws of the several states.¹

1. In States Where State Control Prevails

Tables II A, II B, and II C summarize the important provisions of textbook laws in those states in which some type of state board

¹For such details consult the writer's *Legislative Enactments and Judicial Decisions Affecting the Adoption, Sale, and Use of Textbooks*, Chapters IV-VII.

or state commission exercises control over the textbooks that may be used in the public schools.

The chief educational officer is a member of the adopting body in the states of Alabama, Arizona, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah and Virginia. The governor is also a member in Alabama, Arizona, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. In Louisiana the chief educational officer is the secretary of the board that adopts textbooks. In North Carolina the governor and superintendent of public instruction appoint a state committee to adopt high-school textbooks and a state committee to adopt elementary-school textbooks.

The textbook laws of Florida, Indiana, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas have provisions which restrict the members of the adopting bodies. For example, a member of the textbook commission of Florida cannot be a member of any book firm at the time of his appointment, nor can he be appointed if he has previously been a member of such firm.

The textbook laws of Indiana and Texas have provisions that aim to prohibit restraint of trade in textbooks by the publishers.

The adopting body of Alabama may drop any book at the end of a year if three-fourths of its members so authorize. In South Carolina, it cannot change a textbook within five years without the consent of the General Assembly.

The textbook commission of Texas is required to renew existing contracts for textbooks for a period not to exceed six years if the books offered for adoption do not appear to be better than those in use. The superintendent of public instruction is required to secure an expression concerning the value of the books in use from the independent districts and from the county superintendents of schools.

The state schoolbook commission of Kansas is given authority to provide for the printing and publishing of a complete series of textbooks. It may, however, adopt textbooks of the commercial publishers to provide those it is unable to publish. All printing which the state does must be under the supervision of the state printer at the state printing plant.

The state superintendent of education of Alabama may negotiate with the publishers or authors for the preparation and publication of special textbooks for the public schools of the state which may be

certified to the textbook purchasing board for consideration. The board may require him to negotiate for the publication of other textbooks.

The adopting bodies in several of the states included in Table II are composed of both appointed and either elected or ex-officio officials. The elected officials secure their offices by popular vote. The ex-officio officials are those holding some other state office, usually by popular election.

Bonds and contracts are required in all but three of this group of states. In Idaho and Louisiana this requirement is at the discretion of the respective state boards of education. Kansas, with its state publication of textbooks, has no need for bonds and contracts.

With the exception of four states in this group, the governor appoints those members who are appointed.

Price regulation and uniformity are characteristic of all the states listed in these three tables, except Idaho. In that state, the state board of education might have similar requirements.

Nine of the states require that the textbook companies must sell their books at the lowest price for which they are sold elsewhere under similar conditions.

In some of the states, the adopting body selects more than one book in each subject, giving the school district the right to choose from the list. In some of them the state adoption is limited to specified subjects or grades.

2. In States Where a Combination of State Control and District Control Prevails

Tables IIIA, IIIB, and IIIC summarize the important legal provisions relative to textbooks where both state and school-district control prevails. In this group of states, state adoptions may be for elementary and secondary schools or they may be for only elementary schools or they may be for certain specified subjects. In nine of the eleven states, certain types of school districts are exempt from compliance with the laws governing state adoptions. These school districts that are exempt usually adopt their textbooks in the same manner that they conduct any other district business.

The chief educational officer is a member of the adopting body in Arkansas, California, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nevada, New

TABLE II A.—STATE CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO ADOPTION
 (Key: Y, yes; N, no; S, state; C, county; D, district; T.C, textbook commission or committee; T.B., Textbook Purchasing Board; S.B., state board of education; E, elected; A, appointed; P, professional; NP, non-professional; Ex, ex-officio)

States	Reference to Textbook Law in Force (see end of chapter)	Authority That Adopts	Professional or Non-Professional?	Method of Approval	Is Chief Educational Officer a Member?	Any School Districts Exempt?	Period of Adoption in Years	Provision for Supplementary Books?	Written Contract Required?	State Publication Permitted?	Bonds Required?
Alabama	1	T.B.	NP	Ex	Y	N	6	N	Y	Y	Y
Arizona	2	S.B.	P	A, Ex	Y	N	5	N	Y	N	Y
Florida	3	T.C.	P	A	Y	N	8	Y	Y	N	Y
Idaho	4	S.B.	P	A	Y	a	a	N	Y	N	Y
Indiana	5	S.B.	P	A, Ex	Y	N	5	N	Y	Y	Y
Kansas	6	T.C.	NP	A, Ex	Y	N	b	Y	Y	Y	Y
Louisiana	7	S.B.	NP	A, E	Y	Y	6	Y	Y	N	Y
Montana	8	T.C.	NP	A	N	Y	5	Y	Y	N	Y
North Carolina (c)	9	T.C.	P	A	N	N	d	Y	Y	N	Y
Oklahoma	10	T.C.	NP	A, Ex	Y	Y	5	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Carolina	11	S.B.	NP	A, Ex	Y	N	e	N	Y	N	Y
Tennessee	12	T.C.	NP	A, Ex	Y	N	5	Y	Y	N	Y
Texas	13	T.C.	NP	A, Ex	Y	N	6f	Y	Y	N	Y
Utah	14	T.C.	NP	A, Ex	Y	Y	6	N	Y	N	Y
Virginia	15	S.B.	NP	A, Ex	Y	N	5	N	Y	N	Y

a. State Board of Education determine.
 b. Period of adoption not given. Commissioner given authority to vary period for high-school texts.
 c. North Carolina also has county-board control and state and district control.
 d. High-school textbooks for five years, elementary textbooks indefinite, one to five years.
 e. State Board of Education determines.
 f. May adopt for less than six years.

TABLE IIC.—STATE CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE USE OF TEXTBOOKS
 (Key: Y, yes; N, no; M, mandatory; P, permissive; S, state; C, county; D, school district; El, elementary; H, high school; Sp, specified subjects; S.B., State board of education; B.E., board of education; T.C., textbook commission)

States	Uni- formity	Unit of Uniformity						Free Textbooks			
		State			County			Permitted	Type of Control	Unit Affected	Who Authorizes
		El	H	Sp	El	H	Sp				
Alabama.....	Y	Y	Y					Y	P	C	B.E.
Arizona.....	Y	Y	Y					Y	M	S	S.B.
Florida.....	Y	Y	Y					Y	M	S	T.C.
Idaho.....	^a							Y	P	S	S.B.
Indiana.....	Y	Y	Y					Y	P	D	Voters
Kansas.....	Y	Y						Y	P		
Louisiana.....	Y	Y						Y	M	S	S.B.
Montana.....	Y	Y						Y	M	S	S.B.
North Carolina.....	Y	Y					Y				
Oklahoma.....	Y	Y									
South Carolina.....	Y	Y									
Tennessee.....	Y	Y									S.B.
Texas.....	Y	Y						Y	P	S	S.B.
Utah.....	Y	Y						Y	P		
Virginia.....	Y	Y						Y	P	D	B.E.

^a. The State Board of Education may provide for uniformity.

TABLE IIIA.—STATE AND DISTRICT CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO ADOPTIONS

(Key: Y, yes; N, no; S, state; C, county; D, district; T.C., textbook commission or committee; S.B., state board of education; E, elected; A, appointed; P, professional, N.P., non-professional; Ex, ex-officio; B.E., board of education)

States	Reference to Law	Authority That Adopts	Professional or Non-Professional?	Elected or Appointed?	Is Chief Educational Officer a Member?	Any School Districts Exemplified?	Period of Adoption in Years	Provision for Supplementary Books?	Written Contract Required?	Bonds Required?	State Publication Permitted?	District Control in Adoptions
Arkansas.....	16	T.C.	N.P.	A, Ex	Y	Y	6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Junior and senior high schools and cities of first class
California.....	17	S.B.	N.P.	A	Y	Y	4	Y	N	Y	Y	High schools
Connecticut.....	18	B.E. ^a	N.P.	A, E	N	N	5	N	N	N	N	
Georgia.....	19	S.B. ^b	N.P.	A, Ex	Y	Y	5	Y	Y	Y	N	County, agricultural, and local districts
Kentucky.....	20	T.C.	N.P.	A, Ex	Y	Y	10	Y	Y	Y	N	Cities of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th class ^c
Mississippi.....	21	T.C.	P	A	Y	Y	5	Y	Y	Y	N	Municipal separate schools
Nevada.....	22	T.C.	N.P.	A, Ex	Y	Y	4	Y	Y	Y	N	High schools
New Mexico.....	23	S.B.	N.P.	A, Ex	Y	Y	6	N	N	N	N	Above 8th grade
North Carolina.....		^d										
Oregon.....	24	T.C.	P	A	N	Y	6	N	Y	Y	N	To complete courses of study
West Virginia.....	25	S.B.	N.P.	A	Y	Y	5	Y	Y	Y	N	

^a The state board of education determines the books that shall be chosen by the school committee or school visitors.

^b Georgia also has school board and county control.

^c High schools and towns and cities of 3,500 or over are exempt.

^d See Table IIIA.

^e Adopted from a multiple list of three books on each subject.

TABLE IIIB—STATE AND DISTRICT CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO PRICE
(Key: Y, yes; N, no)

States	Manner of Distribution																		
	Is there price regulation?	Is the Commission permitted to purchase books?	Is there an exchange price for displaced books?	Is the price uniform for the State?	Is provision made for depositories?	Must the price be as low as anywhere in the U. S.?	Is provision made for distribution of textbooks?	May books be purchased for indigent children?	State Board of Education	State Textbook Commission	Chief State School Officer	Special Board	State Depositories	Textbook Agencies	Private Agencies	County Board of Education	County Depositories	County Superintendent	School District
Arkansas.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y			Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
California.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N					Y				Y	Y	Y
Connecticut.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N					Y	Y			Y	Y	Y
Georgia.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N					Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Kentucky.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N					Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Mississippi.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N					Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Nevada.....	Y ^a	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N					Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
New Mexico.....	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	N		Y			Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
North Carolina.....	c	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N									Y	Y	Y
Oregon.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N											
West Virginia.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N											

^a For adopted books.
^b State board of education determines.
^c See Table IIB.

Mexico, and West Virginia. The governor is also a member in Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Nevada, and New Mexico.

Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, and Mississippi have provisions in their textbook laws which aim to secure members of the adopting bodies who will be impartial in their selection and adoption of textbooks. Georgia and Kentucky, as well as California, also have provisions against the restraint of trade.

The textbook commission of Kentucky may extend, upon thirty days written notice, the contracts of adoption for an additional period of ten years. The original contracts must have the provision that this action may be taken.

The commission for the adoption of elementary textbooks for Mississippi may adopt, by unanimous consent, for less than five years, and the commission for the adoption of high-school textbooks may drop, by a two-thirds vote, any book which it deems unsatisfactory.

The textbook laws of California permit the adopting body to compile in part or in whole the textbooks in use and to compile and manufacture such other textbooks as it may deem necessary and essential for use in the elementary schools of the state. It may purchase books and lease maps, plates, engravings, or copyright material for the manufacture of textbooks. It may pay royalties and do such other things as are necessary to procure a series of textbooks for the elementary day and evening schools. It may cause the adopted books to be published and printed by the superintendent of state printing at the state printing office.

In Oregon the state board of education must appoint on the textbook commission, persons of recognized scholarship and professional training who have been actively engaged in teaching or supervision for five years preceding the appointment.

In eight of this group of states the governor appoints the appointed members of the commission.

3. In States Where County Control Prevails

Tables IVA, IVB, and IVC summarize the important provisions of textbook laws in those states that have county control. All school districts which are exempt from county control are free to select and adopt, through their proper agents, such textbooks as they deem essential. The data included in the three tables, therefore, applies to county textbook adoptions.

TABLE IIC.—STATE AND DISTRICT CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE USE OF TEXTBOOKS
 (Key: Y, yes; N, no; M, mandatory; P, professional; S, state; C, county; D, school district; EL, elementary; H, high school; Sp, specified subjects; S.B., state board of education; B.E., board of education)

States	Uni- formity	Unit of Uniformity						Free Textbooks			
		State		County		School District		Permitted	Type of Control	Unit Affected	Who Authorizes
		El	H	Sp	El	H	Sp				
		El	H	Sp	El	H	Sp				
Arkansas.....	Y						Y	M	S	B.E.	
California.....	Y		Y				Y	P	D	B.E.	
Connecticut.....	Y			Y			Y	P	C, D	B.E.	
Georgia.....	Y				Y						
Kentucky.....	Y						Y	M	S	S.B.	
Mississippi.....	Y		Y				Y	P	S	B.E.	
Nevada.....	Y										
New Mexico.....	Y						Y	M	S	S.B.	
North Carolina.....	•										
Oregon.....	Y										
West Virginia.....	Y	Y					Y	P	D	B.E.	

• See Table IIC.

TABLE IV.A.—COUNTY AND DISTRICT CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO ADOPTIONS
 (Key: Y, yes; N, no; S, state, C, county; D, district; T.C., textbook commission or committee; E, elected; A, appointed; P, professional; NP, non-professional; Ex, ex-officio; B.E., board of education)

States	Pre-ference to Law in	Authority That Adopts	Professional or Non-Professional?	Appointed or Elected?	Is Chief Educational Officer a Member?	Any School Districts Ex-empt from County Adoptions?	Period of Adoption in Years	Provision for Supplementary Books?	Written Contract Required?	Bonds Required?	State Publication Permitted?	District Control in Adoptions
Iowa.....	26	C,B,E	NP	E	N	Y	5	N	Y	Y	N	All but counties.
Georgia.....	1	f	NP	A,E	N ^a	Y	3	Y	N	N	N	Baltimore.
Maryland.....	27	C,B,E	NP	E	N ^b	Y	5	Y	Y	Y	N	.
Missouri.....	28	C,B,E	NP	E	N ^c	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
North Carolina.....	•	•	NP	Ex	N	Y	5	N	Y	N	N	High-school subjects.
South Dakota.....	29	T.C	NP	A,E	N	Y	3, 5	Y	N	N	N	Counties.
Washington.....	30	T,C,C(d)	NP	E	N ^d	Y	5, 3	Y	Y	Y	N	High-school and first-class districts.
Wisconsin.....	31	C,B,E	NP	E	N ^e	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	

^a He lists all textbooks before they can be offered for sale by any publisher.

^b He lists the books from which county and school boards must adopt.

^c School districts of more than 1,000 school children and towns having affiliations with the university are exempt.

^d The state is divided into two divisions. The textbook division adopts for the first division, the county board of education for the second division.

^e He has charge of filing of textbooks with prices together with a bond.

^f See Table IIIA.

^g See Table IIIA.

TABLE IVB.—COUNTY AND DISTRICT CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO PRICE
(Key: Y, yes; N, no)

States	Manner of Distribution																		
	Is there price regulation?	Is commission permitted on the sale of books?	Is there exchange price for displaced books?	Is the price uniform for the county?	Is provision made for depositories?	Must the price be as low as anywhere in the U. S.?	Is provision made for distribution of textbooks?	May books be purchased for indigent children?	State Board of Education	State Textbook Commission	Chief State School Officer	Special Board	State Depositories	Textbook Agencies	Private Agencies	County Board of Education	County Depositories	County Superintendent	School District
Iowa.....	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y										Y	Y
Georgia.....	o	N	N	Y	o	N	Y	o										Y	Y
Maryland.....	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	o										Y	Y
Missouri.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y							Y				Y
North Carolina.....	d	d	d	d	d	Y	d	d											
South Dakota.....	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y										Y	Y
Washington.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N											
Wisconsin.....	Y	Y	Y	Y(b)	Y	Y	Y	N											

^a The price for the county is uniform for county adopted books.

^b The price is uniform for the state and must be maintained as low as anywhere in the United States.

^c See Table IIIB

^d See Table IIB.

TABLE IVC.—STATE AND DISTRICT CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE USE OF TEXTBOOKS
(Key: Y, yes; N, no; M, mandatory; P, permissive; S, state; C, county; D, school district; El, elementary; H, high school; Sp, specified subjects; B.E., board of education)

States	Uni- formity		Unit of Uniformity										Free Textbooks				
			State			County ^a			School District ^b				Permitted	Type of Control	Unit Affected	Who Authorizes	
	El	H	Sp	El	H	Sp	El	H	Sp								
Iowa.....	Y												Y	P	D	Voters	
Georgia.....	d					Y			Y								
Maryland.....	Y			Y	Y	Y			Y	Y			Y	M	C, D	B.E. ^c	
Missouri.....				Y	Y	Y			Y	Y			Y	P	D	Voters	
North Carolina.....	•																
South Dakota.....	Y			Y									Y	P	C	Voters	
Washington.....	Y		Y	Y	Y		Y						Y	P	D	B.E.	
Wisconsin.....	Y			Y	Y	Y			Y				Y	P	C, D	B.E.	

^a The books are uniform for the county if uniformity is adopted.

^b Each school district other than those governed by county adoptions adopts its own books and thereby establishes uniformity only for the district.

^c County board of education for the county and board of education for the school districts not governed by county adoptions.

^d See Table IIIC.

^e See Table IIC.

The chief educational officer is not a member of the adopting body, but he does exercise, in some states, a function in that he files lists of textbooks which may be offered for sale. In most cases, however, this function is nothing more than listing and publishing for distribution the textbooks with prices which a publisher offers for sale. In Maryland, Missouri, and Wisconsin the textbooks must be listed by the publisher before he can offer them for sale in the state.

The textbook laws of Iowa and Missouri have provisions that aim at the selection of impartial members of the adopting body.

Missouri and Wisconsin prohibit a publisher from taking any action that will cause a restraint of trade.

The laws of Washington divide the state into two divisions according to school-district classification. The textbook commission adopts the textbooks for the first division; the county board of education, those for the second division.

In South Dakota, the county textbook committee is composed of the county superintendent of schools, the president of the board of education of each independent school district, the county auditor, the state attorney, the county commissioners, and one member from each commissioner's district selected by the members of the school boards within each district. The county superintendent is chairman and the auditor is secretary.

No state in this group has a professional body for the adoption of textbooks. In no state are free textbooks mandatory. All these states, however, permit free textbooks to be authorized.

4. In States Where District Control Prevails

Tables VA, VB, and VC summarize the important legal provisions that govern the adoption of textbooks in those states in which the school board is the adopting body and the school district is the unit of control.

The states of this group have no provisions of law that require contracts and bonds in connection with the adoption of textbooks. Several of these states, however, have either contracts or bonds, or both, in connection with the filing of textbook lists. These contracts and bonds usually assure that certain prices and qualities of textbooks will be maintained for a specified period.

TABLE VA.—SCHOOL-DISTRICT CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO ADOPTIONS
 (Key: Y, yes; N, no; S, state; D, school district; E, elected; A, appointed; P, professional, NP, nonprofessional;
 B.E., board of education)

	Reference to Law in Code	Authority That Adopts	Professional or Non-Professional?	Elected or Appointed?	Is Chief Educational Officer a Member?	Must Districts Adopt from a State List?	Period of Adoption in Years	Provision for Supplementary Books?	Written Contract Required?	Bonds Required?	State Publication Permitted?
Colorado.....	32	B.E.	NP	E	N	N	4	Y	N	N	N
Delaware.....	33	B.E.	NP	E	N	Y			N	N	N
Georgia.....	*	.									
Illinois.....	34	B.E.	NP	E	N	Y	5	Y	N	N	N*
Maine.....	35	B.E.	NP	E	N	N	3 ^b		N	N	N
Massachusetts.....	36	B.E.	NP	E	N	N	.		N	N	N
Michigan.....	37	B.E.	NP	E	N	Y	5	Y	N	N	N
Minnesota.....	38	B.E.	NP	E	N	Y	3-5		N	N	N
Nebraska.....	39	B.E.	NP	E	N	Y	5	N	Y	Y	N
New Hampshire.....	40	B.E.	NP	E	N	N	.	N	N	N	N
New Jersey.....	41	B.E.	NP	A, E	N	N	.	N	N	N	N
New York.....	42	B.E. ^d	NP	A, E	N	N	5	N	N	N	N
North Dakota.....	43	B.E.	NP	E	N	Y	3		N	N	N
Ohio.....	44	B.E.	NP	E	N	Y	5	Y	N	N	N
Pennsylvania.....	45	B.E.	NP	A, E	N	N	5	Y	N	N	N
Rhode Island.....	46	B.E.	NP	E	N	N		N	N	N	N
Vermont.....	47	B.E.	NP	E	N	N	.	Y	N	N	N
Wyoming.....	48	B.E.	NP	E	N	Y		Y	N	N	N

* Cities of more than a hundred thousand population may publish textbooks.

^b School committee may change books within the three-year period.

^c No definite period of adoption.

^d The legal voters adopt the textbooks in the common-school districts.

* See Table IIIA.

TABLE VB.—SCHOOL-DISTRICT CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO PRICE
(Key: Y, yes; N, no)

States	Manner of Distribution																			
	Is there price regula- tion?	Is commission permitted on sale of books?	Is there exchange price for displaced books?	Is the price uniform for the state?	Is provision made for depositories?	Must the price be as low as anywhere in the U. S.?	Is provision made for dis- tribution of textbooks?	May books be purchased for indigent children?	State Board of Edu- cation	State Textbook Commission	Chief State School officer	Special Board	State Depositories	Textbook Agencies	Private Agencies	County Board of Education	County Depos- itories	County Superin- tendent	School District	
Colorado.....	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N											Y	
Delaware.....	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N												Y
Georgia.....	•	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N							Y				Y	
Illinois.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N											Y	
Maine.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N											Y	
Massachusetts.....	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N							Y				Y	
Michigan.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N											Y	
Minnesota.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N											Y	
Nebraska.....	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N											Y	
New Hampshire.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N											Y	
New Jersey.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N											Y	
New York.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N											Y	
North Dakota.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N							Y				Y	
Ohio.....	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N											Y	
Pennsylvania.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N							Y				Y	
Rhode Island.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N											Y	
Vermont.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N											Y	
Wyoming.....	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N											Y	

* See Table IIIB.

TABLE VC.—SCHOOL-DISTRICT CONTROL SYSTEMS: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE USE OF TEXTBOOKS
 (Key: Y, yes; N, no; M, mandatory; P, permissive; S, state; C, county; D, district; EL, elementary; H, high school;
 Sp, specified subjects; B.E., board of education)

States	Unit of Uniformity			Unit of Uniformity			Free Textbooks			
	State		County		School District		Permitted	Type of Control	Unit Affected	Who Authorizes
	El	H	Sp	El	H	Sp				
Colorado.....	Y						Y	P	D	Voters
Delaware.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
Georgia.....	*									
Illinois.....	Y						Y	P	D	Voters
Maine.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
Massachusetts.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
Michigan.....	Y						Y	P	D	Voters
Minnesota.....	Y						Y	P	D	Voters
Nebraska.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
New Hampshire.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
New Jersey.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
New York.....	Y						Y	P	D	Voters
North Dakota.....	Y						Y	P	D	Voters
Ohio.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
Pennsylvania.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
Rhode Island.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
Vermont.....	Y						Y	M	D	B.E.
Wyoming.....	Y						Y	P	D	B.E.

With three exceptions, the adopting body is elected by the legal voters.

All but two of this group of states have provisions for free textbooks; in nine of them this provision is mandatory.

In Delaware, the chief educational officer is a member of the state board of education that prescribes the list of textbooks (together with their prices) from which boards of education of the several school districts must adopt their textbooks.

The textbook laws of Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Wyoming provide that the publishers must file his list of textbooks and prices before his books may be purchased for the public schools. Boards of education must adopt their textbooks from these lists. These states, by this method, secure state uniformity of prices and quality of textbooks.

The Ohio textbook law requires that all textbook lists must be filed with the chief educational officer. He, with the governor and the secretary of state, determine the price for which textbooks may be sold within the state.

Illinois and Wyoming have provisions of law that aim to safeguard the state against restraint of trade by the publisher.

Illinois cities of more than one hundred thousand population may publish elementary-school and high-school textbooks.

Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming do not attempt, by law, to restrict their school boards in their adoption of textbooks.

IV. LIST OF THE TEXTBOOK LAWS OF THE SEVERAL STATES

The references that follow are the textbook laws cited by number in Tables IIA, IIIA, IVA, and VA.

1. Alabama. General Acts, 1927, Act 309, p. 288-299.
2. Arizona. Revised Statutes of 1913, par. 2825-2836 as amended by Chap. 35 of the session laws of Arizona of 1922, p. 210.
3. Florida. Compiled Laws, 1927, Vol. 1, Chaps. VIII, IX; Sections 846-889.
4. Idaho. Compiled Statutes, 1919, Section 803.
5. Indiana. Burns Annotated Statutes, 1926, Vol. 2, Sections 6480-6505.
6. Kansas. Revised Statutes, Annotated, 1923, Chap. 72, Sections 4101-4113, pp. 1209-1212.

7. Louisiana. Act 100 of 1922 Acts, as amended by Act 16 of 1924 Acts of La., as amended by Act 100 of 1928 Acts.
8. Montana. Revised Codes, 1921, Chap. 96, Sections 1187-1200; Revised Codes, 1923-27, Chap. 96, Sections 1188-1199.
9. North Carolina. Public Laws of 1923, Chap. 136, Part X; Public Laws of 1927, Chap. 249; Public Laws of 1929, Chap. 283; Act 30; Public-Local and Private Laws, Extra Session, 1924, Chaps. 154; 182.
10. Oklahoma. Compiled Stats. Annotated, 1921, Sections 10246-10281 as amended by compiled Oklahoma Stats., 1926, Chap. 86, pp. 817-919; Laws of 1929, Chaps. 260; 482.
11. South Carolina. Code of Laws, 1922, Vol. 3, Sections 2683-85 as amended by Act No. 192 of the Acts of South Carolina, 1927.
12. Tennessee. Public Acts, 1927, Chap. 80; Public Acts of 1930, Joint Resolution No. 36.
13. Texas. Revised Civil Statutes, 1925, Chap. 16 as amended by Chap. 213 of the General and Special Laws of Texas of 1927; Laws of 1929, Chap. 210.
14. Utah. Compiled Laws, 1917, Chap. 7, Sections 4555-5563 as amended by Chap. 98 of the Laws of Utah, 1921.
15. Virginia. Acts of the Assembly, 1922, Chap. 143, as amended by Chap. 564, Acts of the Assembly of Virginia, 1926; Chap. 412, Section 618 Acts of the Virginia Assembly, 1930.
16. Arkansas. Crawford and Moses Digest of Statutes, 1921, Sections 9062-9092, as amended by Act 285 of the Acts of Arkansas of 1921, as by Act 379 of 1913, as by Act 153 of 1925, as by Act 123 of 1929. Revised Code of 1928, Sections 1048-1057.
17. California. School Code of 1929, Chap. 23 of Statutes and Amendments to Codes.
18. Connecticut. General Statutes. Revision of 1930, Vol. 1, Chap. 48.
19. Georgia. Parks Annotated Cases, 1904, Sections 1432-1465; Parks Annotated Code of Ga., Supplement of 1922, Article 3; Supplements of 1926, Article 3.
20. Kentucky. Acts of 1926, Chap. 77, as amended by Chap. 48-49 of the Ky. Acts of 1928.
21. Mississippi. Laws of 1924, Sections 249, 291; Chap. 311 of Laws of Miss., 1926. Laws of 1930, Article XXIX; Mississippi Code, Annotated, 1930, Chap. 163.
22. Nevada. Revised Laws, 1912, Vol. 1, Chap. 12, Sections 3398-3412 as amended by Chap. 231, Stats. of 1915, p. 352 and Chap. 208, Stats. of 1920-21, p. 305, Section 13.
23. New Mexico. Laws of 1925, Chap. 75; Laws of 1929, Chap. 191. New Mexico Statutes Annotated, 1929, Sections 120-1701 and 120-1714.

24. Oregon. Laws of 1920, Chap. 25, Sections 5337-5350 as amended by Oregon Laws Supplement, 1921-27, Chap. XXV, Sections 5337-5340, 5345, 5347, 5349.
25. West Virginia. Barnes Code Annotated, 1923, Chap. 45, Sections 11-13, p. 65.
26. Iowa. Code of 1924, Chap. 231.
27. Maryland. Bagby's Annotated Code, Vol. 2, Article 77, Chap. 10, Sections 129-133.
28. Missouri. Revised Stats. 1919, Vol. III, Act XIII, Sections 11369-11397, as amended by an Act of the General Assembly, approved March 24, 1921, Mo. Laws, 1921, p. 624, Section 16, par. 12; H. B. 793, Section 25, p. 33 of 1929 Laws.
29. South Dakota. Revised Code, 1919, Chap. 10, Sections 7618-7630.
30. Washington. Remington's Compiled Stats., 1922, Chap. XXIX, Sections 4893-4905; Laws of Washington, 1927, Chap. XVIII, Sections 4776.
31. Wisconsin. Statutes 1929, No. 40.24-40.29.
32. Colorado. Courtright's Statutes, 1914 edition, Sections 5925, 5977 L.
33. Delaware. Laws of 1921, Chap. 160, Section 8; Laws of Delaware, 1923, Chap. 173, Section 138.
34. Illinois. Smith-Hurd Rev. Statutes, 1929, Chap. 122, Sections 502-520.
35. Maine. Revised Statutes, 1916, Chap. 16, Sections 22, 23, 38.
36. Massachusetts. General Laws, 1921, Chap. 71, Sections 48-50.
37. Michigan. Act No. 319, Public Acts, 1927, Part II, Chap. 31.
38. Minnesota. Masons Statutes, 1927, Chap. 14, 3048-3057.
39. Nebraska. Compiled Statutes, 1922, Act XIX, Sections 6498-6507.
40. New Hampshire. Public Laws, 1925, Chap. 118, Section 14; Chap. 120, Section 3.
41. New Jersey. Compiled Statutes, 1708-1910, Vol. 4, p. 4775; p. 4741, Article VI; p. 4744, Article VI, Section 68 and p. 4752, Section 85.
42. New York. McKinley's Consolidated Laws, Book 16-Education, 1928.
43. North Dakota. Supplement to the Compiled Laws of 1913, 1913-25, Chap. 12, Section 1397a1.
44. Ohio. General Code, Annotated, 1921, Sections 7709-7720, as amended by Laws of Ohio, 1925, p. 404.
45. Pennsylvania. Purdon's Pennsylvania Statutes, Annotated, Title 24, Education, 1930, Sections 821-823.
46. Rhode Island. General Laws, 1923, Chap. 70, Sections 978; 993-994.
47. Vermont. General Laws, 1917, Chap. 67, Sections 1327-29; Chap. 57, Sections 1238.
48. Wyoming. Compiled Statutes, 1920, Chap. 150, Sections 2315-2325, as amended by Wyoming Session Laws, 1927, Chap. 89, Sections 5-7.

•

CHAPTER XV

JUDICIAL OPINION ON TEXTBOOK SELECTION

W. L. COFFEY
Dean, College of the City of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

Throughout the United States the textbook is an essential tool in the process of instruction. It is not surprising, therefore, for actions to arise in the courts to determine who has the authority to select, adopt, and change textbooks. The decisions discussed and cited in this chapter illustrate some of the motives and legal principles which have been evolved through the settlement of issues growing out of the administration of textbook laws.

Court decisions not only settle disputes but also set up legal principles which aid in interpreting and understanding functions that are delegated to bodies or individuals. Judicial law of to-day is the result of a slow development of a system of principles based upon common sense, reason, and previous experience. Some variation among decisions in the different jurisdictions should be expected, since those making decisions have different backgrounds of training and experience. On the other hand, one should expect to find a few general principles that are common to all jurisdictions. The fact that some states leave to the school districts or their agents the authority to adopt textbooks while others deal with this subject through a central agency, such as a textbook commission or a board, is not important, except as it might affect the service which the textbook is meant to offer. What is important is whether textbook legislation favors the child and whether courts, to that end, have maintained a liberal policy.

Space will not permit a discussion of each of the many textbook cases that have been before the courts.¹ Only leading cases will be considered in this chapter.

¹ For that purpose, consult Coffey, Wilford L. *Legislative Enactments and Judicial Decisions Affecting the Adoption, Sale, and Use of Textbooks*, Chapters VIII-XIII.

I. SELECTION AND ADOPTION OF TEXTBOOKS

1. Adopting Supplementary Books

If an adopting body is given the authority to adopt basal textbooks for the common elementary schools in specified subjects, does such an authority carry with it the right to designate and adopt textbooks other than those specified? This question was presented to the Court of Appeals of Kentucky in 1926 in the case of *Mills, County Superintendent of Schools, v. Schoberg*.² The statute known as the "Uniform Textbook Law of Kentucky," enacted in 1904, provided that the State Schoolbook Commission should receive sealed bids or proposals from the publishers of school textbooks on the branches required to be taught in the common schools of the state, naming the subjects. It also provided that nothing in the statute should prevent the use of supplementary books in any of the schools where the adopted books were used in good faith. The Commission not only adopted a list of basal books, but also adopted an extended list of supplementary books.

The Court, in ruling upon the question presented by the facts, held that the Commission had no authority beyond that granted by law. The fact that the law provides that supplementary books may be used was no justification for the Commission's adopting these books. An adopting body must have specific or implied authority before it can act.

2. Exclusive Privileges of Contractor

A state passes a uniform textbook law which provides that the lowest bidder shall have the right to furnish textbooks for the public schools, that the books adopted shall be introduced and used to the exclusion of all other textbooks within the state, and that the contractor shall print on the back of the book the contract price and the exchange price. As the result of such a law the following questions arose: Does the contractor have the exclusive privilege of furnishing the textbooks for the public schools? May a person use a textbook of the same content that does not comply with all other requirements of the law? Does the law create a monopoly which makes it unconstitutional? Is such a law obnoxious to the constitution or the common law?

² *Mills, County Superintendent of Schools v. Schoberg*, 287 S.W., 729; *State Textbook Commission v. Weathers*, 184 Kentucky, 748.

These questions came before the Supreme Court of Alabama for interpretation as a result of the passage of a Uniform Textbook Law.³ This law provided that a commission should select the textbooks for the public schools, that these books should be used to the exclusion of all others and that the price and the exchange price should be printed in the back of the books. A citizen of the state provided his son with a book published by the company that secured the contract but this book did not have printed in it the contract and exchange prices, nor was it supplied by one of the depositories designated by law; otherwise the book was identical with the adopted book. The Supreme Court in the case of *Dickinson v. Cunningham*⁴ passed upon the questions herein set forth. It held that the Legislature, under the state constitution which gave it the authority to establish and control schools, could grant a contractor the exclusive right to furnish textbooks. Further, it could provide for their selection and adoption, and require that only those books that comply with all the requirements of the law may be used. Such a law neither creates a monopoly nor violates any provision of the state constitution. It therefore established the principle that the Legislature, unless restricted by constitutional law, is supreme in its control of the public schools.

3. Courts and Legislatures

Courts may pass upon questions of law, but they cannot use their judgment for that which has been vested in the Legislature. "If it be true that the power is a legislative one, then it is indisputably true that the courts cannot control legislative discretion."⁵

³ Alabama. Uniform Textbook Law, Act March 4, 1903.

⁴ *Dickinson v. Cunningham*, 37 So., 345;

Leeper v. State, 53 S.W., 962;

State of Indiana v. Haworth, 23 N.E., 946;

Hoovey v. State, 119 Ind., 395;

Curryer v. Merrill, 25 Minn., 1-4;

State v. Board, 18 Nev., 173;

State v. Harman, 31 Ohio, 250;

People v. Board, 49 Cal., 684;

People v. Board, 55 Cal., 331;

Bell v. Sampson, 23 S.W., 575;

Gray v. State, 72 Ind., 576;

Bancroft v. Thayer, 5 Sawyer, 502, Federal Case, No. 835;

Cooley, Constitutional Limitations, 5th ed. 225, Note 1.

State v. Haworth, 23 N.E., 946;

Legal Tender Cases, 12 Wall, p. 547-61;

School District No. 1, Reno County, et al v. R. B. Shaddock, 25 Kans., 467;

People ex rel. Bellmer v. State Board of Education, 49 Cal., 684.

4. Exemption of Some Districts

If the legislature passes a uniform textbook law, it is incumbent upon every school district of the state to abide by the provisions of the statute. The legislature, however, may exempt certain of its school districts by means of a classification based upon population or otherwise so that the system of adoption is made to have a general and uniform application to the whole state. A state may thus pass textbook laws that apply to a part or all of its school districts without violating the principle of uniformity if the application of the law is general for the same type of districts.⁶

5. Rules Vary with States

There is no general rule that defines the procedure that constitutes adoption of textbooks. In every case the consummation of adoption is dependent upon the laws of the state. An adopting body must comply with the requirements of the statute to have its procedure legal.⁷

II. APPROVAL OF TEXTBOOKS

1. The Approving Authority

The approval of textbooks is controlled by a statute. The several states determine through their legislatures who shall be the final authority in this determination. With the exception of New York, the approving authority is vested in some type of board or commission. In New York the legal voters in the common school district designate the textbooks at the annual meeting. In the case of

* State ex rel. Boyle, Attorney General v. Board of Education of the City of Topeka, 53 Pac., 478; 59 Kans., 501;

State ex rel. Simon County Attorney v. Fairchild et al., State Textbook Commission, 125 Pac., 40;

Attorney General v. Detroit Board of Education, 133 Mich., 681;

Campana v. Calderhead, 17 Mont., 548;

Francis v. Alleghany School District, 24 Pittsburgh, L.J. (N.S.) 19;

⁷ Griggs et al. v. Board of Education of Atlanta et al., 90 S.E., 48;

Jones v. Bank of Cumming, 131 Ga., 614;

Gallup v. Smith, 59 Conn., 354;

State ex rel. Addy v. State Board of Education et al., 94 S.E., 110;

State of Nevada ex rel. John Newman v. State Board of Education of the State of Nevada, 1 Pac., 844;

Greene v. Board of Education of the City and County of San Francisco et al., 63 Pac., 161;

Parkhurst v. City of Revere, 161 N.E., 599.

Campana v. Calderhead et al⁸ the Supreme Court of Montana held that where there was no provision in the statute for adoption of textbooks the board of education might adopt them under the general powers vested in them. The legislature having failed to prescribe either the textbooks or the procedure to secure them, the board was the proper body to exercise this function.⁹

2. Authority of the School Board

As a result of the approval of textbooks through the method of adoption, the courts have been called upon to settle questions that concern the relationship between officials and layman. In the case of County Court v. Armstrong¹⁰ the Court held that the law commits the government and conduct of schools in general to the discretion of the board of education. Regardless of the results there is no remedy so long as the board acts within its legal power and authority. The residents must comply with the board's regulations.¹¹ A parent or other interested party must, therefore, show that his interests have been jeopardized and that the board of education has not complied with the law before he can ask a court to intervene.¹²

3. Right of Publisher to Compel Purchase

Does the publisher of textbooks have any rights that must be respected in the approval of textbooks? In the case of Eaton and Company v. Royal et al, School Directors,¹³ the plaintiff, a publisher of textbooks, entered into a contract with the State Board of Education to furnish a textbook in history for the schools of the state. The defendant school district did not purchase this history. The court held that the publisher had a right to compel its use in this district, for he was entitled, by reason of his contract, to the portion of his profits that would accrue through such use. A similar principle was set forth in Rand McNally and Company v. Royal et al, School Di-

⁸ Campana v. Calderhead et al, 44 Pac., 83.

⁹ Spedden et al v. Board of Education of Independent School District of Fairmont et al, 81 S.E., 724.

¹⁰ County Court v. Armstrong, 34 W. Va., 326.

¹¹ Donahoe, prochein ami v. Richards et al, 38 Maine, 379.

¹² McNees et al v. School Township of East River, County of Page et al, 110 N.W., 325.

¹³ Eaton and Company v. Royal et al, School Directors, 78 Pac., 1093.

rectors.¹⁴ The board of education had omitted the use of one of the approved books in the sixth grade.

A different ruling was established in the case of *Wagner v. Royal et al, School Directors*.¹⁵ The directors purchased the textbooks which had been required by the course of study adopted by the state board of education, but they had not used one of the textbooks for this whole period specified by the course of study. The court held that the company had its sales. Beyond that, it had no redress against the school directors.

4. Changing Contract Price

The statutory rights of a book company were set forth in an Illinois case by the Supreme Court of that state in 1920.¹⁶ The textbook law of Illinois provided that any book company that wished to sell textbooks in the state must file a list of books in the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with a sworn statement of the usual list price, the lowest wholesale price, and the lowest net exchange price. The textbook company was also required to file a bond with the Superintendent guaranteeing the faithful performance of the terms set forth in the field lists. It was required to furnish all filed books for a period of five years and to reduce prices whenever it reduced them elsewhere in the United States. In 1917 the plaintiff company filed its list of books and prices. In 1919 it filed a revised list in which the prices were increased. The question involved was whether the legislature could require the book company to maintain prices for five years regardless of conditions that might arise after the company had its books approved for the schools of the state through the process of filing. The court held that the company must furnish its books as filed in 1917 at the prices designated and for the period of five years.

5. Revision of Texts Under Contract

In the case of *Silver, Burdett and Company v. Indiana State Board of Education et al*¹⁷ the question arose as to the right of a

¹⁴ *Band McNally & Co. v. Royal et al. School Directors*, 78 Pac., 1103.

¹⁵ *Wagner v. Royal et al, School Directors*, 78 Pac., 1094.

¹⁶ *People ex rel. Albright et al v. Blair*, 126 N.E., 605.

¹⁷ *Silver, Burdett & Company v. Indiana State Board of Education et al*, 72 N.E., 829.

textbook company to claim contractual rights when it had not followed the provisions of the statute. The Indiana law provided that whenever the contractor for furnishing textbooks filed with the Superintendent of Public Instruction his consent to a revision of books, a revision might be ordered by the State Board of Textbook Commissioners if they thought such a revision necessary. The Commissioners were given authority to select some one to do the revising. The Company was required to pay the cost of this revision. The cost was first to be agreed upon by the Commissioners. If no agreement was possible, the Commissioners were given authority to advertise for bids from other companies. The law required the Commissioners to do the selecting of the persons for the revision, but in this case the company actually selected the persons. The price for the work was not agreed upon before the revision was begun. The court held that the State Board of School Book Commissioners was not compelled to accept the revised books because the textbook company had not complied with the terms of the law. The court summed up the principle of law involved as follows: "Appellant was dealing with a statutory board, clothed only with statutory power, and it was bound to take notice of the scope and extent of authority conferred upon it."

6. No Redress without Contractual Relation

Textbook laws are passed for the benefit of the public. For this reason there must be a contractual relation between the book company and the board, or other legal authority, before a textbook company can bring action for redress of a wrong.¹⁸ A board of education may even reconsider its vote of approval through the process of adoption if such action is taken before contractual relation exists or the rights of others have been jeopardized.¹⁹

7. Rights of School District to Disregard State Approval

After a list of textbooks have been approved and the adoption consummated by the proper state agency, a school board has no choice

¹⁸ Johnson v. Ginn, 105 Ky., 655;
American Book Company v. McElroy, 76 S.W., 850;
Butler and Company v. Shirley Township School District, 15 Pa., County Court Reports, 291;
Krickbaum v. The School District of Benton, 3 Kulp, 30; Lezerne Legal Register Reports, Vol. 3.

¹⁹ State v. Womack et al, 29 Pac., 939.

but to abide by the decision of this authority unless the school district which they represent has been definitely exempted from the terms of the law. The laws of Kansas²⁰ empowered the textbook commission of that state to select and adopt a uniform series of school textbooks for use in the public schools in certain named branches and to fix the maximal price for which certain readers might be sold to the pupils. The law required the contract made by the textbook commission to be for five years and provided that no school district of the first and second class might use any books other than those adopted, but that other books might be used as references. The Supreme Court of the state held that a board of education had no right to permit any other books to be used than those adopted by the textbook commission. The proviso relative to reference books could not be interpreted to mean readers of another publisher. This same principle had been set forth in other jurisdictions.²¹

In the case, *The School Commissioners of Baltimore City v. State Board of Education*,²² the Supreme Court of Maryland had before it the question of the right of the city of Baltimore to be excluded from the operation of the state law which provided for the selection of a uniform series of textbooks by the state Board of Education. Baltimore claimed exemption because, at the time of the adoption of a revised constitution, it had a school system which was authorized by statute and which was an exception to that in force in other parts of the state. No exemption was made in the constitution nor in the textbook law. The court held, therefore, that Baltimore was governed by the textbook law of the state.

It is apparent that a school district is governed by the laws of the state and that its board of education has only such rights as are provided in the general statutes or reserved to it as a special right or privilege.²³

²⁰ Kansas. General Statutes of 1909, sections 7813, 7822, 7824.

²¹ *Westland Publishing Company v. Royal*, 36 Wash., 399;

Wagner v. Royal, 36 Wash., 428;

State ex rel. v. Haworth, 122 Ind., 462;

State ex rel. Roberts v. School Directors of Springfield, 74 Mo., 21.

²² *The School Commissioners of Baltimore City v. The State Board of Education*, 26 Md., 505.

²³ *The People ex rel. Beckwith v. The Board of Education of Oakland et al*, 55 Cal., 331.

III. PURPOSE AND APPROVAL OF CONTRACTS AND BONDS

No general distinction exists between the purpose and approval of contracts and bonds in connection with the sale of textbooks and their purpose and approval in other types of business. The contract sets forth the terms agreed upon by the parties and the bond guarantees the faithful performance of these terms. The courts²⁴ have upheld the right of the Legislature to provide for both. Education is a state function, the general administration of which is vested in the legislative branch of the government and in those state agencies to whom authority has been delegated. Therefore, issues arising in courts have generally not been concerned with the right to enter into contracts and furnish bond, but with the procedures that have been followed in their approval.

1. Decisions on the Validity of Contracts

The Supreme Court of Utah in 1902 had before it the textbook law of the state for interpretation. The law required that the Superintendent of Public Instruction call a convention every five years to decide upon the textbooks to be used in the district schools. At a convention sealed proposals for furnishing textbooks were received. The law required the contract to be let to the successful bidder. It also required the convention to open and read the bids publicly and to fix the amount of the bonds. The convention did not read the full proposal with each bid and it gave to a committee the power to fix the amount of the bonds for the convention. The action of the convention was attacked on two grounds. First, the convention failed and neglected to open and read the proposals publicly, and second, it failed to fix the amount of the bonds as required by law. The court held the contract and bonds legal. The statute was directory and not mandatory, so that a substantial compliance was all that was necessary.²⁵ The court stated its conclusions in the following terms:

It is a common rule of statutory construction that, when language construed in a strict and literal sense would lead to an absurdity, such language should be liberally construed, when by so doing the object and purpose of the statute will be accomplished.

²⁴ *Charles Scribner's Sons v. Board of Education of District No. 102 of Cook County, Ill.*, et al, 278 Fed., 866.

²⁵ *Tanner v. Nelson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction*, 70 Pac., 984.

Arkansas passed a textbook law²⁶ which required definite things to be done to carry out the provisions of the law; namely, a contract prepared by the Attorney General, a written contract executed in duplicate and satisfactory to the commission. The Supreme Court of Arkansas²⁷ held that these provisions were mandatory, and that until fully complied with, there was no contract. If there had been no statute prescribing the procedure to be followed, a different rule might be applicable; namely, that "when a contract is actually entered into between two parties with the intention to become bound thereby, it is consummated within the meaning of the law, notwithstanding the fact that it was agreed that the terms of the contract should be reduced to writing."²⁸

2. Decisions on the Approval of Bonds

Must bonds be approved in accordance with the provisions of the statute authorizing them? In general, the same rules apply in the approval of bonds as of contracts; that is, if the statute designates in a mandatory way the procedure by which a transaction may be accomplished, that procedure must be followed to make the transaction legal. There is a tendency, however, on the part of the courts to approve the procedures for the approval of bonds if the rights of all parties have been protected, even though there may be some variation between the procedure used in approval and that specified by the statute. The case of *Reid et al v. Commonwealth et al*²⁹ illustrates this tendency. The statute required the bond of the textbook company to be approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General. It was approved by the Superintendent and the Assistant Secretary acting in the absence of the Secretary. The Attorney General was not present. The

²⁶ Arkansas. Crawford and Moses Digest, section 9065 et seq. as amended by Act of 1921, p. 326, and Act of 1923, pp. 198, 347.

²⁷ *McRae et al, State Textbook Commission v. Farquhar and Albright Co.*, 269 S.W., 375;
American Book Co. v. Marrs, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 262 S.W., 730;
Charles Scribner's Sons v. Marrs, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 273 S.W., 793.

²⁸ *United States v. Purcell Envelope Co.*, 249 U.S., 313;
Emerson v. Stevens Grocer Co., 95 Ark., 421;
Kilgore Lumber Co. v. Halley, 140 Ark., 448.

²⁹ *Reid et al v. Commonwealth et al*, 94 S.W., 641.

court held the bond valid, citing other cases to substantiate its ruling.³⁰ "The failure to observe strictly directions of the statute, where the statute is substantially complied with, cannot operate to deprive the state of the security which the bond was designed to give."

Textbook contracts, then, are generally designed to reduce to writing the terms of agreement between the adopting or purchasing authority. Bonds are required to protect the public. Courts appear to be satisfied if these two objectives are accomplished even though there may be some irregularities in arriving at their consummation.

IV. REGULATION OF THE PRICES OF TEXTBOOKS

A state may regulate the price for which textbooks may be sold for use in the school districts of the state. Those wishing to sell textbooks for this purpose must meet the terms prescribed. An outstanding case covering this phase of textbook administration is *Macmillan Company v. Johnson*, State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Michigan.³¹ In 1919 Michigan passed a textbook law³² which provided, among other things, that no school district or school board could use, adopt, or permit to be used in the school district any textbook not listed with the Superintendent of Public Instruction in accordance with the terms of the law for filing contracts and bonds. It required textbooks to be sold in Michigan as cheaply as anywhere in the United States. Even though a certain price was filed, this price must be lowered if lowered elsewhere.

The plaintiff attacked the law on the following grounds:

- (1) The statute prohibits the plaintiff from selling books in Michigan except at prices that will ruin its business.
- (2) The statute deprives plaintiff of its property without due process of law.
- (3) The statute attempts to regulate interstate commerce by regulating prices of books shipped into the state.

³⁰ *American Book Co. v. Wells*, 26 Ky. Law Reporter, 1159; 83 S.W., 622; *Louisville City Ry. Co. v. Masonic Savings Bank*, 12 Bush, 416; *Rand McNally & Co., et al v. Turner*, County Superintendent of Schools et al, 94 S.W., 643.

³¹ *Macmillan Co. v. Johnson*, State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Michigan (District Court E. D. Mich. S. D., Aug. 27, 1920) 269 Fed., 28.

³² Michigan. Public Acts of 1919, Act 380; Chapter 31, Part II, Act 319 P. A. of Mich., 1927.

(4) The statute discriminates in favor of dealers against other dealers.

The court disposed of the questions involved by stating that the Legislature had the right to control its districts even in the matter of the price at which textbooks may be sold for use in them. This statute was directed to the school districts and their agents. The plaintiff had no vested right, for there was nothing in the law that required it to sell its books to Michigan school districts. If it chose to do so, it must comply with the state law. Other court jurisdictions have announced the same principle of law.³³

V. RESTRICTIONS ON SUBJECT MATTER

The maintenance of public schools is a matter of state, rather than of local, concern.³⁴ School districts exist because the state finds this a convenient way to carry out its educational program. It may require these districts to do any act which it might perform directly. It may place such restrictions upon them as it deems essential. It has full authority, unless its constitution provides otherwise, to prescribe the subject matter that may or shall be taught in its schools.³⁵ There is a long line of cases that hold that the legislature has very wide powers in its control over school districts.³⁶

VI. RELATION OF STATUTORY PROVISIONS TO AUTHORITY OF BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND PERSONS

Boards of education, members of commissions, and others who are given authority to adopt, select, or provide for the sale and use of textbooks derive their authority from a state statute. Their powers

³³Polzin v. Rand McNally & Co., 250 Ill., 561;

Bowman v. Hamlet et al, 166 S.W., 1008.

³⁴MacQueen v. Port Huron, 194 Mich., 328.

³⁵Associated Schools of Independent District No. 63 of Hector, Renville County v. School District No. 83 of Renville County, 142 N.W., 325;

Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis v. State ex rel. Sanders, 28 N. E., 61.

³⁶Commonwealth v. Hartman, 17 Pa. St. Reports, 118;

High School District v. Lancaster Co., 60 Nebr., 147;

Board of Education of Sauk Center v. Moore, 17 Minn., 412;

Marengo County v. Coleman, 55 Ala., 605;

Walston v. Nevin, 128 U.S., 578;

Curryer v. Merrill, 25 Minn., 1;

Boggs v. School Township, 128 Iowa, 15;

City of Columbus v. Town of Fountain Prairie, 134 Wis., 593.

exist by virtue of a legislative act, and they, therefore, have no authority except that recited in the act or implied from the granted powers. Boards, commissions, or persons are designated for the purpose of carrying out a state policy deemed necessary by the legislature. Each must look to the law for its right to act. Not only must it find its authority in the law, but it must follow the provisions of the law in the manner indicated.

The principle set forth in the preceding paragraph is illustrated in the case of *Tyre v. Krug et al*³⁷ and in others.³⁸ In *Tyre v. Krug* the Supreme Court of Wisconsin was asked to rule whether the Board of Education of Milwaukee had the authority to permit the principals of schools to sell textbooks to the pupils within the school building at a profit. The court found no provision of law that gave such authority. Inasmuch as the law did not provide for such sales, the court held that such permission was beyond the power of the board to grant, and the action of the principals was illegal.

The constitution of Illinois provided that, "The General Assembly shall provide a thorough and efficient system of free schools, whereby all the children of the state may receive a good common school education."³⁹ By reason of this provision the legislature of Illinois enacted school laws that defined explicitly the authority of a school board. Under these statutory powers one of the school boards passed a resolution to furnish free textbooks for the first four grades. The right to do so was challenged by an injunction, which the court sustained, on the ground that no such authority had either expressly or implicitly been granted.⁴⁰

A study of the textbook cases convinces one that the courts have consistently upheld the principle of state control of textbooks for use in the public schools. The decisions that have varied from this principle have been concerned with techniques, procedures, individual and public rights, and administration of textbook laws. Many of these decisions have not been discussed in this chapter.

³⁷ *Tyre v. Krug*, 149 N.W., 718.

³⁸ *Kuhn, Attorney General et rel. Sheehan et al v. Board of Education of the City of Detroit*, 141 N.W., 574;
Borden et al. v. La. State Board of Education, 168 La., 1005; 123 So., 655;
Bush v. Dubuque, 69 Ia., 233.

³⁹ Illinois. Constitution of 1870, Art. 8, Section 1.

⁴⁰ *School Directors v. Fogelman*, 76 Ill., 191;
Glidden v. Hopkins, 47 Ill., 529;
Mathis v. Gordy, 47 S.E., 171.

For the convenience of the reader, the textbook cases referred to in this chapter and others dealing with legislation have been listed alphabetically at end of Chapter XVI.

VII. SUMMARY

1. An adopting authority must confine its adoption to the textbooks prescribed by law.
2. In the absence of constitutional limitation, a state has authority to provide for the selection and adoption of textbooks, to impose upon its school officers such duties as it deems proper, to make schools uniform even as to textbooks, and to grant the exclusive privilege to a person, firm, or corporation to furnish these books to the public schools.
3. A "uniform series" of textbooks, unless defined by a statute, does not mean uniformity for every grade and by the same author. The statute is satisfied if there is uniformity within each grade. The principle of uniformity is not violated by the exemption of all districts with certain classes.
4. Mandatory provisions of statute must be followed in adopting textbooks.
5. One must consult the statutes of a state to ascertain who has the approval of textbooks.
6. A parent or other interested party must show that his rights have been jeopardized before he may ask a court to intervene.
7. If a textbook company enters into a contract with a constituted state authority for the exclusive sale of textbooks within the state, it is entitled to have the business that grows out of this contract.
8. If a statute provides certain conditions that must be met by a book company in order for it to sell books to the public schools within a state, the book company must comply.
9. Whenever a book company deals with a statutory board or officers whose duties are prescribed, it must adopt and follow the law and procedure set forth in the statute. It is presumed to know the law and any limitations which may be prescribed.
10. Unless prohibited by constitutional provision or statute, a board may vote to reconsider its action in the adoption of textbooks if the reconsideration occurs before the issue of contracts or before the rights of others have been jeopardized.

11. A provision in a statute that other books may be used as reference cannot be interpreted to mean that other textbooks may be used in addition to the adopted books.
12. Only adopted textbooks may be used unless the law provides otherwise.
13. Statutory details which are mandatory in their nature must be complied with to make a binding contract or a valid bond.
14. The trend of modern authorities is in favor of upholding bonds in favor of the public if they have been duly accepted although the statutory directions have not been strictly followed.
15. A state may regulate its school districts even as to the price of textbooks.
16. The state legislatures are limited only by their constitutions in prescribing the subject matter that may or shall be taught in the public schools.
17. Boards of education and others derive their authority to adopt and provide for the sale and use of textbooks from legislative enactment, either expressed or implied.
18. Boards of education have no authority to furnish free textbooks unless the law expressly grants it.

•

CHAPTER XVI

STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING PROPOSED TEXTBOOK LEGISLATION

W. L. COFFEY
Dean, College of the City of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

This chapter sets forth certain general principles and certain criteria that should be considered in drafting textbook legislation. It also summarizes from various test cases the extent of the state's authority in textbook legislation, and the extent and limitations of the authority of boards of education, textbook commissions, and other persons who have to do with the administration of textbook laws.

At the end of the chapter will be found an alphabetical list of important textbook cases.

I. SEVEN PRECAUTIONS TO BE OBSERVED IN DRAFTING TEXTBOOK LEGISLATION

On the basis of textbook legislation, of court decisions, and of numerous discussions of the textbook problem, it is possible to enumerate certain precautions that ought to be observed in drafting textbook legislation. Seven such precautions may be enumerated as follows:

First, there should be no restrictions on a school district's right to have the use of the best textbooks. Second, the selection and adoption of textbooks should be in the hands of a professional body uninfluenced by any persons who represent a political unit, because technical and professional, not political, judgment is required in such selection and adoption. Third, laws should be drafted so that they are not in conflict with the state and federal constitutions or with the principles established by the decisions of courts of last resort. Fourth, the selection and adoption of textbooks should be governed by those ideals that will best promote the state's interest, while at the same time giving the school districts, the state's sub-divisions, the maximum of freedom to use the best books published and to use as many different

books in any one grade or subject as appears desirable for the governmental and educational improvement of the state and for the welfare of the individual. Fifth, the method of selection and adoption should be such that book companies are encouraged to produce textbooks which are the result of the work of the best talent in the country. Sixth, the textbook selected or adopted should not only be the best book that can be produced, but it should also be available at a price as low as that paid by the user in any other state, taking into consideration any differences in price due to transportation and handling. Seventh, the child should not be limited to textbooks either written or produced within the adopting state or district, but should have the privilege of contact with any textbook that will further his proper development.

These seven precautions will next be briefly discussed.

1. School Districts Should Not Be Restricted

Why should there be no restrictions on a school district's right to the use of the best available textbooks? No proof is needed in this country to demonstrate that the textbook is by far the greatest single agent used in the schoolroom for the dissemination of information. Regardless of what may be our belief in the importance of the thorough preparation of the teacher, we must all recognize the helpfulness of a well-organized and informing book. It is not probable that any one book contains the variety of subject matter which is helpful in a child's development. Any law that restricts the free use of approved books may limit his opportunity for a broad training. This situation may arise in those states that provide for the adoption of one book only on a subject. A study of the literature concerning textbooks suggests that such is the general opinion of educators who have investigated the problem. A textbook statute should be framed in the interest of the parties affected. The most important member of these parties is the child. The state's future welfare will depend in part upon the type of training he receives. In this country the textbook is one of the essential tools used in this training.

2. Selection and Adoption Should Be by Professional Body

Why should the selection and adoption of textbooks be under the control of a professional body that is free to exercise its unrestricted judgment? As indicated in the preceding paragraph a textbook is

a very important instrument in the educational process. Its use has a great influence on the child. If a well-planned and well-organized textbook is produced, it is the result of technical and educational skill which can be properly judged only by those who have that type of professional and technical training which distinguishes between valuable and mediocre or poor material. Neither the selection of the textbook nor the appointment of members to select them should become a political issue. The first cannot be settled by the voters because they do not as a mass have the technical information on which to base a judgment. The second cannot be settled in a like manner, for it is an economic question, the answer of which is dependent upon several factors impractical of presentation to a large group with varied educational training.

3. Textbook Laws Must Accord with Legal Principles

Legislation appears as a remedy against a wrong perpetrated on society or it is passed to authorize a person, firm, corporation, or a state, to perform acts and duties. It is a procedure that society has set up to carry out its will. During the period of a state and nation's history, various phases of the constitution of the nation and the constitution of the state are submitted to the courts for interpretation. Out of such interpretations come rules and principles which become the law of the nation or the state or of both. These principles must be considered whenever bills are drafted for introduction by law-making bodies.

4. Textbook Selection Is Both a State and a Local Problem

The courts of every state of the United States have interpreted education to be a state as well as a local function. The Federal constitution leaves to the state the right to control its educational policy. The state, therefore, becomes the general unit in educational matters. It has the authority to set forth the policies that shall obtain in the education of her people. In general the states have used two means to carry out their policies. They have passed laws that have general application to all districts and laws that apply to certain districts only. That is, they have recognized that there are broad policies that are suitable to all districts. They have further recognized that certain districts, such as city districts, have special problems not applicable

to the state as a whole. The same principle applies to the selection of textbooks. A textbook may be selected to promote a general policy and yet it may be insufficient to do all that should be done for the children of every school district. Whatever method of selection and adoption is set up by a state, the two problems, a state policy and local initiative, should have consideration.

5. Regulations Should Invite Best Books by Best Authors

A study of the statutes controlling the selection and adoption of textbooks indicates that many of the states have framed their textbook legislation to permit adopting bodies a large measure of discretion in the type of books selected. In such states the mechanical make-up, literary merit, and authorship may be considered. If a state unduly restricts its adopting agency, or if it publishes its own textbooks without the opportunity for the productions of the best-qualified authors of this country, it may deny to its children the best textbooks on the market. Whenever a state drafts textbook legislation, either as new laws or the amending of laws already on the statute books, it should be sure that it does not place obstacles in the way of its adopting body or bodies. Its legislation should provide that better books, as they appear, shall find their way into the schools at a time when they are most useful.

6. Reasonable Price Control Is Desirable

In most of those states having laws that exercise a detailed control over adopting or filing of textbooks, a requirement for price control appears to be an important feature. Several of the states have statutes that go no further in this particular, as a state policy, than to insure that their school districts and their patrons pay no more for the same quality of books than the school districts and patrons of other states. More than half of the states provide that the textbooks must either be sold at a fixed price or at cost plus a small commission which is designated by law. There appears to be a tendency, therefore, to keep the cost of textbooks within a reasonable price to the purchaser and to prevent price discrimination among the states. However, price is only one factor. School administrators will likely agree that it is not so important a factor as the quality of the book.

7. Restriction to Local Publication Is Undesirable

A few school administrators in charge of state school policies have been confronted with proposed textbook legislation, the purpose of which was to provide for some type of state preparation of textbooks. Only five states ever passed laws to permit local publication. In three of these states, Alabama, Illinois, and Indiana, provisions for state (or city) publication under certain conditions have either never been made use of or have been tried and given up; in a fourth state, California, the schoolmen are now struggling vigorously against the state printing of textbooks. If one is to judge by these facts and by the literature that discusses it, state publication has few, if any, characteristics that would commend it as a policy to be followed. In this day of specialization it is doubtful whether a state can compete with private agencies in the publication of textbooks. Salaries insufficient to hire competent persons, inadequate legislative appropriations, and uncertainty of tenure are handicaps which a state usually faces. The professional skill and technique required are such as to make it unlikely that a state can justify the attempt to publish its textbooks. If a good textbook were only the product of the author's labors, a state might become an equal competitor with any private organization for his product. But such is not the case; it is the result of editing, verifying, grading, and arranging of content, as well as of authorship. Our best textbooks come on to the market only after the most careful consideration by competent and highly trained experts.

II. FEATURES THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR INCORPORATION IN TEXTBOOK LEGISLATION

The textbook laws, the court decisions, and the printed discussions and reports show that state textbook laws, if they are to be drawn in the interest of public education and in conformity with prevailing judicial opinion, should incorporate the following features:

1. The price should be uniform for the state, f.o.b. publisher's office.
2. The price should be as low as that offered to any other state or its sub-divisions for the same type and quality of book under similar conditions of distribution and handling.
3. Laws should be framed to encourage competition among publishers for the preparation of textbooks of the best type and quality at a minimum of cost consistent with a reasonable profit

- to the publisher and good workmanship in the books produced.
4. Textbooks should be selected and adopted by the best-trained and best-qualified body at the command of the selecting and adopting unit.
 5. The adopting body, if selected for that purpose, should be selected by a non-political authority.
 6. No restrictions should be placed on a school district's right to supply such supplementary books as its educational authorities deem essential for the best interests of the education of the children.
 7. The period of adoption should be sufficiently elastic to permit the selection of the best textbooks on the market as soon as they are available.
 8. In state adoptions, the multiple list is preferable.
 9. Either the state or its subdivisions should have the authority to furnish free textbooks.
 10. The distribution of textbooks should be conducted in such a manner that the supply is readily accessible for the children.

III. THE AUTHORITY OF THE STATE IN TEXTBOOK LEGISLATION

Judicial interpretations which define the authority of the state to pass textbook legislation afford the following statements:

1. A state, if not restricted by its constitution, has wide latitude in exercising its control over textbooks used in its public schools.¹
2. A state may grant the exclusive right to a person, firm, or corporation to furnish textbooks for the public schools.²
3. A state may make schools uniform even as to the textbooks to be used.³
4. A state may prescribe the conditions under which textbooks may be permitted to be used if the control is directed against the school district or its officers.⁴

¹ State of Indiana v. Haworth, 23 N.E., 946.

Hoovey v. State, 119 Ind., 395.

Curryer v. Merrill, 25 Minn., 1-8.

State v. Board, 18 Nev., 173.

People v. Board, 49 Cal., 684.

Bancroft v. Thayer, 5 Sawyer, 502 Federal Case, No. 835.

² Dickinson v. Cunningham, 37 So., 345.

Leeper v. State, 53 S.W., 962.

³ State ex rel. Boyle, Attorney General v. Board of Education of the City of Topeka, 53 Pac., 478; 59 Kans., 501.

⁴ Polzin v. Band McNally & Co., 95 N.E., 623.

5. A state may provide the conditions under which its sub-divisions, school districts, may permit textbooks to be used.⁵
6. A state, in the absence of constitutional limitation, may provide for the selection and adoption of books for such period as it deems best.⁶
7. A state may provide for the filing of textbooks and require those selling them to the school districts to sell them as cheaply as anywhere in the United States with the commission included.⁷
8. A state may regulate school districts even to the extent of prescribing the textbooks they may use and the price that may be paid for them, but it cannot interfere with the right of individuals to contract with others.⁸
9. A state, if not restricted by its constitution, may prescribe and limit the subject matter that may be taught in the schools.⁹
10. A state may publish textbooks and sell them to its children or it may authorize others to do so and prescribe the terms.¹⁰
11. A state may provide that textbooks selected by a designated authority must be used to the exclusion of all others, without thereby creating a monopoly or without being in restraint of trade.¹¹
12. A state may not impair a contract for the sale of textbooks by any person, firm, or corporation.¹²
13. A state may not regulate the sale of textbooks to be used elsewhere than in the public schools.¹³

⁵ Charles Scribner's Sons v. Board of Education of District No. 102 of Cook County, Ill. et al, 278 Fed., 366.

⁶ Charles Scribner's Sons v. Marr, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 273 S.W., 793.

⁷ Bowmann v. Hamlet et al., 166 S.W., 1008.

⁸ Macmillan Company v. Johnson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction (District Court E.D. Mich. S. D. Aug. 27, 1920) 269 Fed., 28.

⁹ Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis v. State ex rel. Sander, 28 N.E., 61.

¹⁰ Commonwealth v. Hartman, 17 Pa. St. Reports, 118.

¹¹ Leeper v. State, 53 S.W., 962,
City of Memphis v. Memphis Water Co., Heisk, 530,
State v. Haworth, 122 Ind., 462.

¹² Dickinson v. Cunningham, 37 So., 345,
Leeper v. State, 53 S. W., 962,
State v. Haworth, 122 Ind., 462.

¹³ Rand McNally & Co. v. Hartranft, 73 Pac., 401.

¹⁴ Charles Scribner's Sons v. Board of Education of Dist. No. 102, Cook County, Ill., 278 Fed., 366.

14. A state may prescribe the limit of profit which a dealer may have for selling textbooks to the public schools. It may not control price or profit to other agencies of the state.¹⁴

IV. THE AUTHORITY OF BOARDS OF EDUCATION, TEXTBOOK COMMISSIONS, AND OTHERS IN ADMINISTERING TEXTBOOK LAWS

Principles evolved by court decisions and having the force of law to govern the actions of boards, commissions, and other persons in the administration of textbook statutes are the following:

1. A school board may adopt textbooks as a part of their general control of schools even though there is no law authorizing the adoption.¹⁵
2. The selecting or adopting authority must confine its selection or adoption to the prescribed purposes set forth in the statute.¹⁶
3. A board of education has no authority to enter into a contract for the furnishing of textbooks unless the statute so provides.¹⁷
4. The adopting authority may not adopt a book for a period less than that prescribed by statute.¹⁸
5. The validity of contracts for the sale of textbooks may not be impaired by subsequent action of boards, commissions, or individuals.¹⁹
6. In the absence of statutory authority, a textbook commission has no authority to reconsider its action after having selected textbooks and entered into a contract for furnishing them.²⁰
7. A contract between a board and a textbook company is not enforceable if the board has not complied with the fundamental provisions of the statute.²¹
8. If the statute provides that only adopted textbooks shall be

¹⁴ *Macmillan Company v. Johnson*, Superintendent of Public Instruction (Dist. Court, E. D. Mich. S. D., Aug. 27, 1920) 269 Fed., 28.

¹⁵ *Campana v. Calderhead et al*, 44 Pac., 83.

¹⁶ *State Textbook Commission v. Weathers*, 184 Ky., 748.

¹⁷ *State ex rel. Boyle, Attorney General v. Board of Education of the City of Topeka*, 53 Pac., 478; 59 Kans., 501.

¹⁸ *Griggs et al v. Board of Education of Atlanta et al*, 90 S.E., 48.

¹⁹ *Rand McNally and Company v. Hartranft*, 73 Pac., 401.

²⁰ *State ex rel. W. H. Wheeler and Company v. Shawkey*, 98 S.E., 759.

²¹ *Butler and Company v. Shirley Township District*, 15 Pa. County Court Reports, 291.

- used, a board of education has no authority to permit others to be used.²²
9. Books adopted by a board of education may be changed only as prescribed by law.²³
 10. Statutory details which are mandatory in their nature must be complied with to make a binding contract.²⁴
 11. If the state authorizes a certain officer or body to contract for textbooks, no other officer may perform the function. Such authority may not be delegated.²⁵
 12. A school board must obey the mandates of the legislature relative to the subject matter to be taught.²⁶
 13. Boards, commissions, and persons derive their authority over textbooks from legislative enactments either expressed or implied.²⁷
 14. Failure of the adopting authority to follow the mandatory provisions of the statute makes the action of the adopting authority illegal and the selection void.²⁸
 15. A board of education has no authority to permit a person to sell textbooks within a school building for profit unless the statute so authorizes.²⁹
 16. Boards of education may not legally furnish free textbooks unless the law expressly grants such authority.³⁰
 17. A resolution of a board of education adopting textbooks does not constitute a binding contract between the board and a book company unless the statute so provides.³¹

²² *Westland Publishing Company v. Royal*, 36 Wash., 399.
State ex rel. v. Howarth School Trustee, 122 Ind., 462.

²³ *State ex rel. Flowers v. Board of Education of the City of Columbus*, 35 Ohio, 368.

²⁴ *McRae et al. State Textbook Commission v. Farquhar and Albright Company*, 269 S. W., 375.

²⁵ *Charles Scribner's Sons v. Marrs*, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 262 S.W., 722.

²⁶ *Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis v. State ex rel. Sander*, 28 N.E., 61.

²⁷ *Gay v. Haggard, Road Supervisor*, 133 Ky., 425.

²⁸ *Johnson v. Ginn*, 49 S. W., 470.

²⁹ *Tyre v. Krug*, 149 N.W., 718.

³⁰ *Graham H. Harris et al v. Peter Kill*, 108 Ill. App., 305.

³¹ *Attorney General ex rel. Marr v. Board of Education of Detroit*, 133 Mich., 681.

18. After a contract with a textbook company has been executed, it may not be cancelled without the consent of all parties concerned.³²
19. If a statute provides that action may be maintained on a bond for breach of contract or agreement, only one action may be brought against such bond unless the statute or the terms of the bond so provide.³³

V. FOURTEEN TEST QUESTIONS APPLICABLE TO TEXTBOOK LEGISLATION

Those persons who are responsible for the drafting of textbook legislation would do well to evaluate the proposed legislation critically in terms of the following questions:

1. Is it constitutional according to the rulings of courts of last resort?
2. Is its board a professional and skilled authority?
3. Does it permit a school district the use of the best textbooks on the market?
4. Will the state, its sub-divisions, or the people, secure textbooks as cheaply as those of other states under similar conditions?
5. Does the proposed legislation conform to the principles established by state and federal courts?
6. Will the publishers be encouraged to produce better books?
7. Will the state have the benefit of the most capable authors and the most competent editorship in its textbooks?
8. Has the opportunity for political abuse been reduced to a minimum?
9. Has the law recognized the publisher, the state, the parent, and the child in a way that is equitable for each?
10. Has provision been made for free textbooks and books for indigent children?
11. Will textbooks be distributed to the best advantage to the user?
12. Does the proposed legislation recognize the importance of supplementary books?
13. Has provision been made for the variation of textbook needs for the different sized districts of the state?
14. Will the legislation, if enacted, be easy to administer?

³² State ex rel. W. H. Wheeler and Company v. Shawkey, 95 S. E., 759.

³³ B. F. Johnson Publishing Company v. Commonwealth, 30 Ky., 148.
Burton County Superintendent et al. v. Maynard, Merrill & Co. et al, 105 S.W., 115.

VI. AN ALPHABETICAL LIST OF IMPORTANT TEXTBOOK CASES

- Allyn and Bacon v. Louisville School Board et al., 115 S. W., 206.
 American Book Co. v. McElroy, (Ky.), 76 S. W., 850.
 American Book Co. v. Marrs, State Supt. of Public Instruction, 262 S. W., 730.
 American Book Co. v. Wells, 26 Ky. Law Reporter, 1159; 83 S.W. 622.
 American Book Co. et al. v. State, 113 So., 592.
 American Book Co. v. State, 113 So., 592.
 Associated Schools of Independent District No. 63 of Hector, Renville County v. School District No. 83 of Renville County, 142 N. W., 325.
 Attorney General v. Detroit Board of Education, 133 Mich., 681.
 Baltimore School Commissioners v. State Board of Education, 26 Md. 505.
 Bancroft v. Thayer, 5 Sawyer, 502, Federal Case No. 835.
 Bansencer v. Mace, 18 Ind., 27.
 Bell v. Sampson, 23 S. W., 575.
 Bellmyer v. Independent District, 44 Iowa, 564.
 B. F. Johnson Publishing Co. v. Commonwealth, 30 Ky. Law Rep., 148.
 Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis v. State ex rel. Sander, 28 N. E., 61.
 Board of Education of Sauk Center v. Moore, 17 Minn., 412.
 Boggs v. School Township, 128 Iowa, 15.
 Borden et al. v. Louisiana State Board of Education, 168 La., 1005; 123 So., 655.
 Bowman v. Hamlet et al., 166 S. W., 1008.
 Burton, County Superintendent et al. v. Maynard, Merrill Co. et al. 105 S. W., 115.
 Butler and Company v. Shirley Township School District, 15 Pennsylvania County Court Reports, 291.
 Campana v. Calderhead, 17 Montana, 548.
 Charles Scribner's Sons v. Marrs, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 273 S. W., 793.
 Charles Scribner's Sons v. Board of Education of District No. 102 of Cook County, Ill., et al. 278 Fed., 366.
 Clark v. School Directors, 78 Ill., 474.
 Clinton School Township v. Lebanon National Bank, 18 Ind. App., 42.
 Campana v. Calderhead et al., 44 Pac., 83; 17 Mont., 548.
 Commonwealth v. Ginn & Co., 111 Ky., 110; 85 S. W., 688.
 Commonwealth v. Hartman, 17 Pa. St. Reports, 118.
 Conley v. School Directors, 32 Pa. St., 194.
 Curryer v. Merrill, 25 Minn., 1-8.
 Dickinson v. Cunningham, 37 So., 345.
 Donahoe, prochein ami v. Richards et al., 38 Maine, 379.
 Duncan v. State Board, 74 S. Car., 560; 78 S. Car., 227.

- Eaton and Company v. Royal et al., School Directors, 78 Pac., 1093.
 Effingham, Maynard and Company v. Hamilton, 68 Miss., 523.
- Francis v. Alleghany School District, 24 Pittsburgh, L. J. (N. S.), 19.
 Funk and Wagnalls Co. v. American Book Co., 16 Fed., 2 d., 137.
- Graham H. Harris et al., v. Peter Kill, 108 Ill. App., 305.
- Greene v. Board of Education of the City and County of San Francisco et al., 63 Pac., 161.
- Griggs et al. v. Board of Education of Atlanta et al., 90 S. E., 48.
 Groziani v. Commonwealth, 97 S. W., 409.
- Iverson v. Indianapolis School Commissioners, 39 Fed., 735.
- Johnson v. Ginn, 105 Ky., 655; 49 S. W., 470.
 Johnson et al. v. Weed-Parsons Printing Co., 36 Misc. Rep. 628, 74 N. Y. Supp., 373.
- Jones v. Board, 88 Mich., 371.
- Krickbaum v. The School District of Benton, 3 Kulp, 30.
- Kuhn, Atty. Gen. ex rel. Sheehan et al., v. Board of Education of the City of Detroit, 141 N. W., 574.
- Leeper v. State, 53 S. W., 962.
- Macmillan Co. v. Johnson, Superintendent of Public Instruction (District Court E. D. Mich. S. D., Aug. 27, 1920), 269 Fed., 28.
- McNees et al. v. School Township of East River County of Page et al., 110 N. W., 325.
- McRae et al State Textbook Commission v. Farquhar and Albright Co., 269 S. W., 375.
- Mathis v. Gordy, 47 S. E., 171.
- Maynard, Merrill and Co. et al. v. Chowning et al., 105 S. W., 114.
- Mills v. Shoberg, 216 Ky., 223.
- Morrow v. Wood, 35 Wis., 59.
- New Hampton Institute v. Northwood School District, 74 N. H., 413.
- Parkhurst v. City of Revere, 161 N. E., 599.
- People ex rel. Mack v. Board of Education of School District No. 5, 51 N. E., 633.
- People v. Board of Education, 175 Ill., 9.
- People v. Board, 49 Cal., 684.
- People v. Board, 55 Cal., 331.
- People ex rel. Albright et al. v. Blair, 126 N. E., 605; 292 Ill., 139.
- Polzin v. Rand McNally & Co., 95 N. E., 623; 250 Ill., 561.
- Rand McNally & Co. et al. v. Turner, County Superintendent, et al., 94 S. W., 643.
- Rand McNally & Co., v. Commonwealth, 106 S. W., 238.
- Rand McNally & Co. v. Hartranft, 73 Pac., 401.

- Rand McNally & Co., v. Royal, 78 Pac., 1103.
Reid et al. v. Commonwealth et al., 94 S. W., 641.
School District v. Thompson, 24 Okla., 1.
School District No. 1 Reno County et al. v. R. B. Shadduck, Kans.,
January Term, 1881.
Silver, Burdette and Company v. Indiana State Board of Education
et al., 72 N. E., 929.
State Textbook Commission v. Weathers, 184 Ky., 748.
State of Indiana v. Haworth, 23 N. E., 946.
State v. Board, 18 Nev., 173.
State v. Howarth, 122 Ind., 462.
State ex rel. Boyle Attorney General v. Board of Education of the City
of Topeka, 53 Pac., 478; 59 Kans., 501.
State ex rel. Simon County Attorney v. Fairchild et al., State Textbook
Commission, 125 Pac., 40.
State ex rel. Addy v. State Board of Education et al., 94 S. E., 110.
State ex rel. Flowers v. Board of Education of the City of Columbus,
35 Ohio St., 368.
State of Nevada ex rel. John Newman v. State Board of Education of
the State of Nevada, 1 Pac., 844.
State v. School District, 31 Nebr., 552.
State Board of Education v. Kenney, 230 Ky., 287; 185 W (2d), 1114.
State ex rel. W. H. Wheeler and Company v. Shawkey, 93 S. E., 759.
State v. Blue, 122 Ind., 600.
State ex rel. Wolfe v. Bronson et al., 21 S. W., 1125.
State ex rel. Roberts et al. Appellants, v. The School Directors of
Springfield, 74 Mo., 21.
State v. Womack et al., 29 Pac., 939.
State v. Webber, 108 Ind., 31.
Tanner v. Nelson, State Supt. of Public Instruction, 70 Pac., 984.
Trustees of Schools v. People, 87 Ill., 303.
Tyre v. Krug, 149 N. W., 718.
Wagner v. Royal et al., School Directors, 36 Wash., 428; 78 Pac., 1094.
Westland Publishing Co. v. Royal, 36 Wash., 399; 78 Pac., 1096.

CHAPTER XVII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

This chapter was prepared after the members of the Yearbook Committee had had an opportunity to read in galley proof the different parts of the book. It is intended to answer the query: Does the Committee have any opinions or recommendations on certain major issues of the textbook problems? This question is appropriate since our Committee has had the textbook problem before it for more than five years.

An account of the procedure followed in preparing this chapter may be of interest. The first step involved the preparation of a provisional statement of the chapter. This draft was submitted to several members of the Committee for criticism, after which a copy of the chapter was sent to members with instructions to consider the following questions:

1. Which of the present conclusions and recommendations do not meet with your full approval? Why?
2. What other conclusions and recommendations should be added?

The conclusions and recommendations that follow, therefore, express the position of the Committee on important issues. The Committee, as a matter of fact, was able to concur unanimously upon each one of the twenty-two statements as finally formulated.

1. The educational interest of the pupil must at all times be the primary consideration in appraising plans for making and selecting textbooks.
2. The principle is cardinal that the selection of textbooks is the prerogative of the educational personnel of our schools. Hence the Committee urges that educational administrators should defend their exercise of this prerogative against the claims or the interference of others, whether they be publishers, members of school boards, politicians, or other laymen. The Committee believes that the superintendent should take the final responsibility in recommending textbooks.

3. School administrators should be aggressive in demanding high standards of practice on the part of selecting committees and on the part of publishers and their representatives. The Committee invites the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association to frame standards of practice for the selection of textbooks and to place these standards in the hands of textbook publishers.
4. The Committee likewise invites publishers to frame standards of practice for their field representatives and to place these standards in the hands of school administrators and selecting agencies.
5. Unethical practices are so clearly detrimental to the public welfare that, in the judgment of the Committee, state or regional commissions representing the profession should be created which will be charged with the duty of investigating complaints, whether made against bookmen, schoolmen, or others, and with the further duty of making public all pertinent facts in the event that the complaints are justified.
6. The cost of textbooks is so negligible a part in the total cost of education, especially when account is taken of the value of good textbooks, that further increase in cost is fully warranted where necessary to secure better instructional material for pupils.
7. Free textbooks should be provided in all public schools in the interests of better educational opportunities for the children and of economy to the general public.
8. State adoption of textbooks often gives rise to questionable practices in connection with the selection and prescription of the texts. This Committee believes that our profession should seek to modify existing legislation in such a way as to eliminate these practices. The Committee believes, indeed, that the state is not a desirable unit for textbook adoption, that, on the contrary, the unit for adoption should be the local unit of school administration and supervision.
9. State publication of textbooks is unwise, uneconomical, and educationally unsound. Our profession should continue to resist its extension.
10. In making the two preceding statements with respect to state adoption and state publication, the Committee does not wish to be interpreted as condemning the principle of state uniformity

in courses of study; the Committee recognizes that many facts, particularly with respect to the mobility of our population, point to the desirability of some degree of uniformity in subject matter and in grade placement among the schools of a state or even of a larger area than the state. Reasonable uniformity in subject matter and grade placement, particularly in the elementary school, would greatly facilitate the provision of adequate textbooks and need not destroy the values inherent in diversity of textbook approach and treatment.

11. Publishers should feel obligated to refuse to publish manuscripts that do not meet high standards of excellence in textbook-making.
12. There is much need for careful research on problems relating to the mechanical features of textbooks. Publishers should be encouraged to carry forward such research.
13. The critical trial of instructional materials in classrooms before publication in textbook form is commended.
14. Publishers have real cause for protest against some of the practices of school administrators as listed in this Yearbook in the chapters entitled "Current Practices in Selecting Textbooks for the Elementary Schools" and "The Problems of Publishers in Making and Marketing Textbooks." In particular, the Committee believes that the publishers have cause for protest and grounds for legal action against those schoolmen who engage in the practice of reproducing copyrighted material without securing the consent of the publishers.
15. The use of the plan of secret committees in textbook selection is not good educational practice.
16. For authors who are in educational work to use their positions to secure adoptions of their textbooks is likely to invite criticism endangering the good repute of our profession.
17. The use of a score card for the evaluation of textbooks has certain obvious advantages in directing attention systematically to various items that should receive consideration. On the other hand, seeming numerical precision may be misleading, in that the qualitative whole is seldom to be measured by the sum of its quantitative parts. Score cards devised in terms of a particular book should not be used in the selection of textbooks.

18. Teachers, as the users of textbooks, should have a voice in their selection, but the Committee calls attention to the fact that effective participation on the part of the teachers requires special competence.
19. The choice of textbooks is so important an educational task that the study of approved methods and standards for selection should be emphasized in the professional preparation of teachers.
20. Supervisors of teachers in service and instructors in professional schools should show teachers how to follow and also to supplement the textbook intelligently with respect to both content and method.
21. American publishers are entitled to much praise for producing textbooks that represent high qualities of bookmaking and generally also of qualities of content and organization not found in textbooks of other countries. The Committee believes that too much praise cannot be given to the reputable publishers of the United States for the meticulous care with which manuscripts are examined and with which errors in form and content are detected and corrected.
22. The Committee lends its full endorsement to the conclusion that the standards of practice in the selection of textbooks not only are higher to-day than formerly but also are relatively higher than those which prevail in many other lines of business. This conclusion is in agreement with the returns reported in the chapter entitled "The Ethics of Marketing and Selecting Textbooks." The Committee further believes that this trend is full of encouragement and that it points to the possibility of an early solution of certain problems in the making and marketing of textbooks.

The foregoing conclusions and recommendations of the Committee are intended to assist our profession in protecting the interests of the schools in matters involving the selection of textbooks. It is hoped that they will stimulate a large amount of profitable discussion of textbook problems.

•

CHAPTER XVIII
A SELECTED AND ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF
LITERATURE RELATING TO TEXTBOOKS

G. T. BUSWELL
Professor of Educational Psychology
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

In selecting the material for this bibliography, the compiler examined approximately five hundred references. Since it was not the purpose of the Committee to provide a complete bibliography, only those references have been included which are quantitative or critical in character. The compiler has also attempted to exclude material of purely local interest and articles which represent nothing more than an opinion regarding some aspect of the textbook problem. No foreign references have been included. There is a large number of unpublished theses which deal with some aspect of the textbook problem, but since this material is difficult for the average reader to secure, it has been omitted. No legal documents have been included in the bibliography. The ninety-one references which follow are sufficient to provide an intelligent background to any student who wishes to make a further contribution to the literature of textbooks. The bibliography includes only two or three references beyond the date, December 31, 1929.¹

1. AMERICAN SCHOOL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION. "Committee on the standardization of schoolbooks." *Amer. Physical Educ. Rev.*, 16: Apr., 1911, 254-257.

This report is concerned with the hygienic norms for schoolbooks. The first part outlines the standards for paper and printing based on previous investigations. In the second part suggestions are made regarding further investigation and possible improvements.

2. ARMSTRONG, L. E. "The California textbook system." *Sierra Educ. News*, 7: Oct.-Nov., 1911.
History and analysis of the textbook situation in California.

¹ The compiler is indebted to Mr. A. E. Traxler for assistance in preparing the annotations to this bibliography and to the Library of the Department of Education, Ohio State University, for an extensive initial bibliography.

3. AVERY, L. B. "State printed textbooks in California." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 19; Apr., 1919, 628-633.
A brief critical discussion of seven propositions relating to state-printing of textbooks.
4. AYRES, LEONARD P. "Purchase of textbooks." *School Organization and Administration*. Cleveland, Ohio, 1916, 94-109. (Survey Committee of the Cleveland Foundation.)
Discusses the free textbook plan, supporting the discussion with statistical data secured from Cleveland.
5. BAKER, ELIZABETH W. *The Development of Elementary English Language Textbooks in the United States*. Nashville, Tennessee, 1929. 80 pp. (George Peabody College for Teachers, Contributions to Education, No. 45.)
Traces changes in textbooks from 1840 to 1930.
6. BAMBERGER, FLORENCE E. *The Effect of the Physical Make-up of a Book upon Children's Selection*. Baltimore, 1922. 162 pp. (Johns Hopkins Press, Johns Hopkins University, Studies in Education, No. 4.)
Investigates the following problem: Does the outward form of a book have any influence upon a child's desire to read? Contains 50 tables, several of which are accompanied by diagrams. Also has a score card for evaluating the various factors in the physical make-up of a book for primary children.
7. BARR, A. S. "Textbook accounting." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 23: Oct., 1922, 127-135.
A definite system of textbook accounting is outlined. Discusses budget, inventory, depreciation, standards of distribution, types of materials, minimal standards of classroom equipment, the available supply. Contains some tables and charts.
8. BENNETT, H. E. "The text as a factor in poor English." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 25: Dec., 1924, 277-289.
A critical analysis of the technique of making elementary-school textbooks; also a series of tentative principles for the construction of elementary language texts.
9. BENTLEY, MADISON. "Leading and legibility." *Critical and Experimental Studies in Psychology from the University of Illinois*. Princeton, New Jersey, 1921, 48-61. (Psychological Review Company, Psychological Review Monograph Supplements, 30: No. 3.)

An experimental study of the influence of different amounts of leading on rate of reading. Eighteen adults used as subjects. Article contains tables and graphs showing reading rates and reading distances for different sizes of type and varying amounts of leading.

10. BRANHAM, ALFRED IVERSON. "The development of the American school textbook." *Amer. Sch. Brd. Jour.*, 81: Aug., 1930, 58-59, 122, 125.

An instructive account by "an old bookman" of the development of textbooks from the days of McGuffey to the present, with reference especially to the rise of competition, of the idea of state adoption and state uniformity, and of the evils of free sampling and free exchange.

11. BROWN, J. F. "School textbooks from an editor's point of view." *Jour. of Educ.*, 96: Oct. 19, 1922, 380-383.

Discusses five factors that must be considered in the preparation of textbooks, namely, selection of material, organization, presentation, style, and accuracy. Analyzes the relationship of author and editor in the making of textbooks.

12. BROWN, J. F. *State Publication of School Books*. New York, 1915. 51 pp.

Makes extended reference to state publication of books in Ontario, California, Georgia, and Kansas. Opposes state publication of schoolbooks. Finds that "the choice seems to lie between inferior books at prices that show no saving at all when all the cost factors are included, and the best books at prices that permit a fair publisher's profit." A brief abstract of this reference is made by the author, under the same title, in *Sch. and Soc.*, 2: Oct. 2, 1915, 474-485.

13. BROWN, J. F. "Textbooks and publishers." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 19: Jan., 1919, 382-388.

Presents the publisher's point of view about textbooks. Maintains that the publisher is not a mere manufacturer and distributor of books, but is a constructive worker in the field of education. Discusses three ways in which a publisher may find the books that the schools need.

14. BUCKINGHAM, B. R. "The textbook and its vocabulary." *Jour. of Educ. Research*, 14: Sept., 1926, 142-145.

Recent vocabulary studies have shown that the textbooks contain too many hard words. Says that vocabulary is not the only difficulty. Textbooks are permeated with the adult point of view. Need textbooks that are written through the cooperation of the subject-matter specialist and the educational specialist.

15. BURR, SAMUEL E. "The selection of textbooks and the use of textbook rating scales." *Bulletin Dept. Elem. Sch. Principals*, 8: July, 1929, 573-575.
Presents a plan for a basic rating scale.
16. BURTT, H. E. and others. "Legibility of backbone titles." *Jour. of Applied Psych.*, 12: April, 1928, 217-227.
Reports an experimental study to determine what style of backbone title on books is most legible. Words were presented in three styles: (a) reading upward with the letters 90 degrees from normal position; (b) reading downward with the letters 90 degrees from normal; (c) reading downward with the letters in normal position.
17. BUTCHER, THOMAS W. "Some difficulties attending the work of a textbook commission." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 19: March, 1919, 500-505.
An exposition of some of the weaknesses of uniformity laws. Discusses difficulties attending work of a textbook commission.
18. (EDITORIAL) "The California textbook plan; its history and results." *Jour. of Educ.*, 69: Feb. 18, 1909, 173-180.
Reviews the history of the state-publication movement and discusses the editorial difficulties of state publication, the heavy burden on the state board of education, the financing of state publications, and state manufacturing difficulties. Unfavorable to state publication of textbooks.
19. CAST, G. C. "Selecting textbooks." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 19: Feb., 1919, 468-472.
Emphasizes the importance of selecting textbooks which will be adapted to the character, intellectual equipment, and professional training of the teachers that use them. Teachers in rural and village schools need texts which are largely "self-teaching," while experienced teachers should have texts which will enable them to bring into action their own resources.
20. CAVERLY, ERNEST R. "Fundamental principles underlying the preparation of a score card for textbooks in English." *English Jour.*, 15: April, 1926, 267-275.
Calls attention to reasons why a score card for the selection of textbooks is desirable. Discusses briefly three basic considerations that should influence the preparation of a score card—accuracy in the choice of items, objectivity, and reliability.
21. COOK, WILLIAM A. "Types and aspects of state control; course of study and textbooks." *Federal and State School Administration*. New York, 1927, 271-289.

Discusses legal basis for courses of study, uniform courses of study, advantages and disadvantages of free textbooks, extent of use of free texts, state publication of texts, and advantages and disadvantages of uniform texts.

22. COOPER, C. E. "A method for judging and scoring textbooks in grade-school geography." *Jour. of Educ. Method*, 4: April, 1925, 325-333.
The article deals with a method of judging textbooks. The points compared are authors, time of publication, mechanics, paragraphing, binding, size, etc.
23. CORNELL, L. S., and others. "State uniformity of textbooks." *Proc. Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1888, 225-237.
A series of three discussions of state uniformity and free textbooks. Opposing points of view represented.
24. COX, E. M. "Free textbooks." *Western Jour. of Educ.*, Feb., 1903, 88-98.
A report to the California Council of Education.
25. CUBBERLEY, ELLWOOD P. "The school textbook problem." *State School Administration*. Boston, 1927, 555-581.
Discusses such topics as importance of the textbooks, uniformity in textbooks, state price-fixing, free textbooks, and state publication of textbooks. Opposes state uniformity in textbooks and state publication of textbooks and favors free textbooks.
26. CURTIS, FRANCIS D. "More from our textbooks." *Sch. Rev.*, 33: Dec., 1922, 770-776.
An argument for the syllabus method, making use of more than one textbook.
27. DAHL, EDWIN J. "Choosing a textbook in the senior-high-school social sciences." *Sch. Rev.*, 35: Oct., 1927, 621-626.
An argument for a scientific method of choosing textbooks. Discusses a detailed topical analysis of 41 books in the social sciences. Points out the differences among these books and shows how one could select a textbook adapted to his needs.
28. DAHL, EDWIN J. "The overlapping of content material in senior-high-school social science textbooks." *Historical Outlook*, 29: Feb., 1928, 80-87.
Reports a study of 41 textbooks, 15 in civics, 12 in economics, 4 in sociology, and 10 in problems of democracy, in order to discover the extent to which there is overlapping in content.

- 28a. DAVIS, PERCY R. *State Publication of Textbooks in California*. Berkeley, 1930. 91 pp.
This doctorate thesis from the University of California is a pertinent contribution to a perplexing problem, and is valuable because of its dispassionate and thorough discussion.
29. DONOVAN, H. L. "How to select textbooks." *Peabody Jour. of Educ.*, 2: July, 1924, 1-11.
A discussion of methods of adopting textbooks. Describes the methods of the Kentucky textbook commission to illustrate a desirable form of procedure. Offers three suggestions regarding selection of texts.
30. DOUGLASS, C. E., and THOMAS, CHARLES SWAIN. "Educating the public to higher standards of textbook making." *Proc. Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 62: 1924, 537-544.
Two papers presented in a meeting of the Department of Educational publications.
31. DUNN, FANNIE W. *Interest Factors in Primary Reading Materials*. New York, 1921. 70 pp. (Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 113.)
Treats the elements in primary reading material that are of interest to children in the first three grades. Summarizes previous studies. Classifies the material in 29 primary reading books. Reports tests for reading interest given to children.
32. ENGELHARDT, N. L. and ENGELHARDT, FRED. "Textbook management." *Public School Business Administration*. New York, 1927, 717-739. (Teachers College, Columbia University.)
Discusses legal provisions, scientific selection of textbooks, purchases, allocation of books to buildings, distribution and control within the building, inventory, repairs, and re-use.
33. FAULKNER, RICHARD D. "The California state textbook system." *Educ. Rev.*, 20: June, 1900, 44-60.
The history of state printing of textbooks in the state of California, beginning with the circumstances which led to the passage of the law and tracing the working of the system down to 1900. The article indicates that state publication has not been a success in California.
34. FITZPATRICK, F. A. "The bookman in relation to the textbook problem." *Educ. Rev.*, 43: 282-291.
A discussion of the relation of publisher and bookseller to education.

35. FOWLKES, JOHN GUY. *Evaluating School Textbooks*. New York, 1923. 34 pp.
A general discussion of measuring textbooks, followed by a measure for primary methods readers, basal literary readers, language books, and spelling books.
36. FRANZEN, R. H. and KNIGHT, F. B. *Textbook Selection*. Baltimore, 1922. 94 pp.
Deals first with the criteria for the selection of textbooks, including the major criteria of the factor of interest, the factor of comprehension, the permanent methods of study involved, the permanent value of the content, and the mechanical construction of the text. Illustrates by application of criteria to textbooks in English and geography.
37. FULLER, FLORENCE D. *Scientific Evaluation of Textbooks*. Boston, 1928. 88 pp.
An experiment in the coöperative evaluation of junior-high-school mathematics textbooks.
38. GILLILAND, A. R. "The effect on reading of changes in the size of type." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 24: Oct., 1923, 138-146.
A laboratory study to determine changes in reading process induced by varying size of types. A group of children and a group of adults studied. Seven tables present results. Found that reading of average adult is not greatly affected by changes in size of type between the limits of 36-point and 6-point type. Children are less affected than adults by changes in size of type.
39. GLOVER, MANSON, "A spelling-book score card." *Jour. of Educ. Research*, 8: June, 1923, 59-62.
Presents a score card which reduces to a quantitative basis the comparison of two or more spelling texts. Outlines general method for using the score card.
40. HALL-QUEST, ALFRED LAWRENCE. *The Textbook: How to Use and Judge It*. New York, 1918, xvi + 265.
A comprehensive treatment, taking up the plan of the textbook in modern education, history of the textbook, its meaning and methods of supply, the selection and judging of textbooks, the textbook as a tool, the textbook as a guide, the textbook as a source of knowledge, the textbook as a means of interpreting truth, the textbook as an incentive or inspiration.
41. HOOD, WILLIAM R. *Free Textbooks for Public-School Pupils*. Washington, 1924. 14 pp. (Government Printing Office, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1923, No. 50.)
Contains a tabular digest of state laws relating to free textbooks. Also a good general discussion.

42. HORN, ERNEST. "The selection of silent reading textbooks." *Jour. of Educ. Research*, 2: Oct., 1920, 615-619.
Gives four groups of questions which may be asked when inquiring into the ability of a pupil to work with books. Holds that any book which is used to train pupils in silent reading must be either specifically arranged with exercises to develop abilities represented by these groups of questions or should be easily adapted to such exercises. Lists and discusses eight outstanding characteristics of such a book.
43. HOWARD, GEORGE. *Free Textbooks in Public Schools*. Raleigh, North Carolina, 1924. 75 pp.
Discusses problems of free textbooks, such as budgeting, cost and administration, hygienic and sanitary features. Outlines a plan for eliminating major objectionable features now existing and discusses economy and educational features of the proposed plan. Presents 28 tables and two charts.
44. HUEY, E. B. "Hygienic requirements in the printing of books and papers." *Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading*. New York, 1908, 406-418.
In this chapter discusses minimal size of type, thickness of letters, space between letters, best length of line, color and finish of paper in relation to legibility and eye strain. Makes frequent references to experimental studies. Presents samples of proper size of type for grades one to four. Suggests that schoolbooks which do not measure up to definite hygienic standards should be rejected.
45. HUNTER, ELEANOR. "Advertising in schoolbooks." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 23: March, 1923, 517-521.
Discussion of advertising as a means of helping pay for textbooks and its value for children. The Educational Advertising Agency formed in 1919 with a view to selling advertising to schoolbook publishers in order to make possible free textbooks. The difficulties which the agency encountered and the progress which it has made. Written in days when such advertising was permitted.
46. JENKS, J. W. "Schoolbook legislation." *Citizenship and the Schools*. New York, 1906, 207-264.
A chapter that shows condition of legislation concerning schoolbooks throughout the United States at that time and gives account of legislation in Indiana. Discusses advantages and disadvantages of state publication of textbooks and free textbooks.
47. JESSUP, W. A., and COFFMAN, L. D. "Judging textbooks." *Supervision of Arithmetic*. New York, 1916, 106-135.
A general chapter discussing numerous problems relating to textbooks.

48. JOHNSON, FRANKLIN W. "A checking list for the selection of high-school textbooks." *Teachers College Record*, 27: Oct., 1925, 104-108.
Gives a checking list and a list of standards for textbooks, worked out by the writer and his students in a course in supervision. Each list has four major divisions: general consideration, subject matter, helps and aids to instruction, and mechanical make-up.
49. JUDD, CHARLES H. "Analyzing textbooks." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 19: Oct., 1918, 143-154.
Discusses briefly state publication and state adoption of textbooks. Points out the need of cultivating an intelligent system of choosing books. Considers the value of score cards. Discusses the needless repetition of material in textbooks for different grades and adds a table showing results of an inquiry in this direction.
50. KEBOCH, F. D. "Variability of word difficulty in five American history texts." *Jour. of Educ. Research*, 15: Jan., 1927, 22-26.
Reports a comparison of a sampling of words from each of five American history texts with the lists given in Thorndike's *Word Book*. Finds no great variability of word difficulty in these five books. Four tables summarize data.
51. KIBBE, DELIA E. "Duplicate materials in elementary readers." *Elem. English Rev.*, 4: Feb., 1927, 35-41.
A checking list compiled from fourteen series of elementary-school readers for Grades III to VIII. Lists all titles in the fourteen series and gives the books in which that title may be found.
52. KLINGMAN, C. E. "Textbook legislation in Iowa." *Iowa Jour. of History and Politics*, 13: Jan., 1915, 53-113.
Discusses history of textbook legislation in Iowa, county uniformity and its workings in Iowa, state uniformity and the cost of schoolbooks. Concludes that county uniformity should be made compulsory in Iowa and that state uniformity has failed in other states.
53. KULP, D. H. "Toward scientific textbook-writing as illustrated by a research in developing a sociology for nurses." *Amer. Jour. of Sociology*, 33: Sept., 1927, 242-247.
Deals with methods for the determination of materials for a textbook: (1) the armchair method; (2) the jury method; (3) the composite method; (4) the utility method; (5) the analytic-synthetic method. Discusses the latter method in detail. Gives three ways of weighting the materials for a textbook.

54. KYTE, GEORGE C. "Calibrating reading material." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 25: March, 1925, 533-546.

Describes in detail a method used for grading reading material through giving tests to children. Finds that much of the material selected for a reader on the basis of opinion will be ill-adapted to the grade in which the reader is used, but that testing the material will insure the selecting of reading materials in keeping with the stage of reading achievement of the pupil.

55. KYTE, GEORGE C. "Experimentation in the development of a book to meet educational needs." *Educ. Admin. and Superv.*, 14: Feb., 1928, 86-100.

A study in scientific textbook construction. Sets up criteria as measures of a satisfactory book. Describes series of investigations which were used in the fourth grade.

56. LIVELY, BERTHA A. and PRESSEY, S. L. "A method for measuring the 'vocabulary burden' of textbooks." *Educ. Admin. and Superv.*, 9: Oct., 1923, 389-398.

Present a method of dealing with the vocabulary difficulty of textbooks and the results of the application of this method to fifteen books of varying difficulty. Suggest that vocabulary difficulty may be evaluated by examining thousand-word samplings. Outline three methods for summarizing facts with regard to such a sampling.

57. LYMAN, R. L. "A study of twenty-four recent seventh- and eighth-grade language texts." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 24: Feb., 1924, 440-452.

Analyzes progressive features of instruction and attempts to find whether books are consistent with the aims and purposes of the junior high school movement. Presents tables showing space given to various materials and number of mentions of progressive tendencies in English instruction in these textbooks.

58. MARBLE, ALBERT P. "If there should be uniformity in textbooks, should it be by state contract, by state publication, or by state decree?" *Proc. Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 1888, 201-211.

An argument against all three means of providing state uniformity: state decree, state contract, and state publication.

59. MAXWELL, C. R. *The Selection of Textbooks*. Boston, 1921. 139 pp.

Discusses the textbook as a necessary tool, the common basis for the selection of texts, current methods of selecting textbooks, method and

term of adoption, free textbooks versus individual ownership, and justifiable standards for selection. Gives outline for judging all texts, and special outlines for evaluating texts in different subjects.

60. MAXWELL, C. R. "The selection of textbooks." *Sch. and Soc.*, 9: January 11, 1919, 44-52.

Discusses the prevailing standards and justifiable standards for the selection of textbooks. Prevailing standards: prestige of author, prestige of publisher, efficiency of sales force, general appearance of book, wide use of a text, cost. All these factors should be considered minor. Justifiable standards: must be definite and objective. Suggests general principles that should aid in the selection of textbooks.

61. MEAD, C. D. "The best method of selecting textbooks." *Educ. Admin. and Superv.*, 4: Feb., 1918, 61-69.

Outlines a method of selecting textbooks used in Cincinnati. Discusses the appointing of committees and sub-committees of teachers to work on the problem. Lists suggestive standards which were submitted to the committees in various subjects.

62. MILLIS, WILLIAM A. "State uniformity of high-school books." *Educator-Journal*, 8: March, 1908, 321-328.

Discusses the arguments advanced both for and against state uniformity of high-school books. Reduces the arguments to two propositions: (1) state uniformity will save money and is therefore good; (2) state uniformity is another step in the centralization of administration, in the removal of responsibility and opportunity from the people with whom it should rest, and therefore is not good.

63. MONAHAN, A. C. *Free Textbooks and State Uniformity*. Washington, 1915. 67 pp. (Government Printing Office, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1915, No. 36.)

Deals with history of free textbook movement, with arguments for and against, cost of textbooks, extent of free textbook movement, uniformity of textbooks, and history of state printing of textbooks in California and Kansas. Contains a tabular digest of laws relating to free textbooks and a tabular presentation of state laws relating to uniform textbooks.

64. NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY. *Report of an Investigation into the Cost of Providing Free Textbooks in the Public Schools of New York*. Albany, 1915. 445 pp.

A study to determine the cost of textbooks for the state, based on the costs in New York City. Presents data relating to both initial and renewal costs.

65. OHLER, GEORGE W. "Safe economics consistent with improved standards of textbook making." *Proc. Nat. Educ. Assoc.*, 60: 1922, 804-808.
Discusses fundamentals which have to do with textbook making. Book should be built for service, authorship should be carefully selected, and book kept growing to meet changing needs. Opposes the carrying of advertising material in educational publications.
66. OTIS, E. M. "A textbook score card." *Jour. of Educ. Research*, 7: Feb., 1923, 132-136.
Contains a textbook score-card with the following major divisions: local adaptability, subject matter, arrangement and organization, aids to instruction and study, mechanical features, and special features.
67. PACKER, J. L. "The vocabularies of ten first readers." *Twentieth Yearbook* of this Society, 1921, Part II, 127-144.
A study of the words found in first readers from ten well-known series. Presents two tables. The first indicates the total number of words found in the ten readers with the frequencies specified. The second table gives all the words in alphabetical order within descending frequency groups.
68. PECK, ELIZABETH S. "Textbook democracy." *Education*, 43: May, 1923, 566-569.
Discussion of progress made in textbook writing. Excellently written books are especially desirable for teachers with little training.
69. PETERSHAM, MAUD. "Illustrating books for children." *Elem. English Rev.*, 2: March, 1925, 85-89.
Interesting discussion of the kind of pictures which should go into children's books, with sample pictures. Holds pictures a small child looks at may mean as much to him as text he tries to read.
70. (EDITORIAL) "Political attorneys and textbook adoptions." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 28: Nov., 1927, 162-164.
Article comments on power of attorneys retained by salesmen who are promoting the interests of certain books. These attorneys frequently bring undue pressure to bear upon members of adopting board. Remedy is for school officers to cultivate a more ethical attitude.
71. POWERS, S. R. "The vocabularies of high-school science textbooks." *Teachers College Record*, 26: Jan., 1925, 368-382.
Lists the vocabularies in two general science textbooks, five biology textbooks, and two chemistry textbooks. Compares them with the word list in Thorndike's *Word Book*. Finds that the vocabulary burden of all these texts is unnecessarily large.

72. RADER, L. W. "Scientific selection of school texts." *Fourth Year-book, Nat. Educ. Assoc.: Dept. of Elem. Sch. Principals*. 1925, 298-304.
Discusses the meaning of the scientific selection of school textbooks. Outlines the steps in the selection of texts in St. Louis. Gives three score sheets used in scoring arithmetics for the elementary school.
73. RANKIN, MARY ISABEL. "A study of the recurrence of words in certain primers." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 28: Dec., 1927, 278-285.
A study of three primers representing different periods of publication. Deals with relative size of vocabularies, compares vocabularies with standard lists, and studies the manner in which vocabularies were manipulated.
74. ROETHELEIN, BARBARA ELIZABETH. "The relative legibility of different faces of printing types." *Amer. Jour. of Psych.*, 23: Jan., 1912, 1-36.
An investigation to determine the relative ease or difficulty with which various forms of printed letters can be read. Summarizes previous studies in reading. Twenty-six faces of type, set in 10-point size, were used. Found that certain faces of type are much more legible than other faces and that legibility is the product of six definite factors. Bibliography of 40 titles.
75. SELKE, ERICH, and SELKE, G. A. "A study of the vocabularies of beginning books in twelve reading methods." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 22: June, 1922, 745-749.
Records number of different words found in each of twelve books, with frequencies, and compares books in regard to vocabularies used. Finds little agreement.
76. SPAULDING, FRANK E. *Measuring Textbooks*. New York, 1922. 40 pp.
Discusses the chief objectives of teaching reading, language, and spelling. Presents measuring scales for primary methods readers, basal literary readers, language books, and spelling books.
77. STALLARD, WILLIAM B. "A study of textbook commissions; a brief review of the methods of adopting textbooks in the various states." *Kentucky High School Quarterly*, 11: Oct., 1925, 19-81.
A summary of practices in different states.
78. STILLWELL, KATHERINE M. "Making schoolbooks." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 19: Dec., 1918, 256-267.
An interesting account of how schoolbooks are made. Begins with the author's manuscript submitted to the publisher and carries the reader

through the various stages to the finished book. Describes such mechanical features as typesetting and electrotyping. Enables the reader to see the textbook as the result of combined human effort.

79. STONE, R. E. "Duplication of reading material in fifteen second-grade readers." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 20: May, 1920, 702-710. Deals with number of selections duplicated by any two of the fifteen readers, number of pages devoted to duplicated selections, place of occurrence of favorite selections, comparison of favorite selections as to length and title.
80. (EDITORIAL) "A summary of the situation in various states regarding textbooks." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 28: Feb., 1928, 404-405. Quotes a statement prepared by Bureau of Education. Discusses briefly the following topics: importance of textbooks, state printing, state-wide uniformity, selection, free textbooks, arguments for free textbooks, arguments against free textbooks.
81. SWAN, MARY A. and others. "Arithmetical vocabulary for first and second grades." *Curriculum Study and Educational Research Bulletin*, 2: Sept.-Oct., 1927, 4-14. Useful study for authors of primary-grade textbooks.
82. THIES, L. J. *The Time Factor in Arithmetic Texts*. Iowa City, Iowa, Feb., 1926. 38 pp. (University of Iowa, Monographs in Education. First Series, No. 2.) Compares the time required for teaching each topic in two textbooks if the teacher follows the book exactly.
83. THORNDIKE, E. L. "The standardization of instruments of instruction." *Seventh Conference on Educational Measurements* (Indiana University). 1920, 14-24. Discusses the standardization of vocabulary for school readers, the standardization of material for arithmetics, and the standardization of methods in arithmetic and reading.
84. TIDWELL, CLYDE J. *State Control of Textbooks*. New York, 1928. 78 pp. (Teachers College, Bureau of Publications.) Shows trends in textbook legislation since 1895 and the laws in effect in 1927. Discusses uniformity and free textbooks.
85. TRYON, R. M. "Maps in forty-four textbooks in American history for the junior-high-school grades." *Sch. Rev.*, 33: June, 1925, 428-443.

A study to determine the present status of geographical phases of historical content for junior-high-school grades. Shows distribution of colored maps in 42 textbooks and distribution of black-and-white maps, by periods, in 44 textbooks.

86. WATT, H. A. "Plagiarism in college texts." *Educ. Rev.*, 62: Sept., 1921, 152-158.
Paraphrasing of older books by new ones illustrated and discussed. Also the tendency of some college professors to publish work of their students as their own.
87. WEBER, OSCAR F. "Methods used in the analysis of textbooks." *Sch. and Soc.*, 24: Nov. 27, 1926, 678-684.
Eight methods of analysis used in selecting textbooks for class use are listed and discussed critically. Illustrations are given of rules and score cards used under various methods.
88. WHIPPLE, GUY M. "The selection of textbooks." *Amer. Sch. Brd. Jour.*, 80: May, 1930, 51-53, 158.
Presents figures on costs, discusses arguments for and against state uniformity, shows limitations attaching to nine commonly used criteria for selection, using numerous concrete illustrations.
89. WILSON, MAUD E. "Repetition of material in elementary readers." *Elem. Sch. Jour.*, 28: April, 1928, 622-626.
Reports a study of the repetition of material in 139 books used as basic and supplementary readers in the elementary grades of Long Beach, California. Purpose was to find what readers might be discontinued on account of duplicated material.
90. WOODY, CLIFFORD. "The overlapping in the content of fifteen second readers." *Jour. of Educ. Research*, 2: June, 1920, 465-474.
Presents overlapping in types of literature in the fifteen readers studied, shows duplication in selections, and makes suggestions for avoidance of duplication. Discovers two well defined tendencies: that of employing imaginative type of literature and that of repeating the same selections in various readers.
91. WORCESTER, D. A. "Some characteristics of a good college textbook." *Sch. and Soc.*, 27: Feb. 18, 1928, 193-196.
Article deals with suggestions made by students in several classes concerning what makes a textbook good or bad. The following points are raised: comprehensibility, use of detail, accuracy of tables and graphs, degree to which book is adapted to group of students for which it is written, accuracy in facts, presentation of "minimal essentials," extent to which book calls attention to outstanding problems to be solved in the field studied.

•

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

(As Revised at the 1924 Meeting and Amended at the 1926, 1928, and
1929 Meetings of the Society)

Article I

Name.—The name of this Society shall be “The National Society for the Study of Education.”

Article II

Object.—Its purposes are to carry on the investigation of educational problems, to publish the results, and to promote their discussion.

Article III

Membership.—Section 1. There shall be three classes of members—active, associate, and honorary.

Section 2. Any person who is desirous of promoting the purposes of this Society is eligible to membership and shall become such on payment of dues as prescribed.

Section 3. Active members shall be entitled to vote, to participate in discussion, and under certain conditions, to hold office.

Section 4. Associate members shall receive the publications of the Society, and may attend its meetings, but shall not be entitled to hold office, or to vote, or to take part in the discussion.

Section 5. Honorary members shall be entitled to all the privileges of active members, with the exception of voting and holding office, and shall be exempt from the payment of dues.

A person may be elected to honorary membership by vote of the Society on nomination by the Board of Directors.

Section 6. The names of the active and honorary members shall be printed in the Yearbook.

Section 7. The annual dues for active members shall be \$2.50 and for associate members, \$2.00. The election fee for active and for associate members shall be \$1.00.

Article IV

Officers.—Section 1. The Officers of the Society shall be a Board of Directors, a Council, and a Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 2. The Board of Directors shall consist of six members of the Society and the Secretary-Treasurer. Only active members who have contributed to the Yearbooks shall be eligible to serve as directors.

Section 3. The Board of Directors shall be elected by the Society to serve for three years, beginning on March first after their election. Two members of the Board shall be elected annually (and such additional members as may be necessary to fill vacancies that may have arisen).

This election shall be conducted by an annual mail ballot of all active members of the Society. A primary ballot shall be secured in October, in which the active members shall nominate from a list of members eligible to said Board. The names of the six persons receiving the highest number of votes on this primary ballot shall be submitted in November for a second ballot for the election of the two members of the Board. The two persons (or more in the case of special vacancies) then receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected.

Section 4. The Board of Directors shall have general charge of the work of the Society, shall appoint its own Chairman, shall appoint the Secretary-Treasurer, and the members of the Council. It shall have power to fill vacancies within its membership, until a successor shall be elected as prescribed in Section 3.

Section 5. The Council shall consist of the Board of Directors, the chairmen of the Society's Yearbook and Research Committees, and such other active members of the Society as the Board of Directors may appoint from time to time.

Section 6. The function of the Council shall be to further the objects of the Society by assisting the Board of Directors in planning and carrying forward the educational undertakings of the Society.

Article V

Publications.—The Society shall publish *The Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* and such supplements as the Board of Directors may provide for.

Article VI

Meetings.—The Society shall hold its annual meetings at the time and place of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Other meetings may be held when authorized by the Society or by the Board of Directors.

Article VII

Amendments.—This constitution may be amended at any annual meeting by a vote of two-thirds of voting members present.

MINUTES OF THE ATLANTIC CITY MEETING OF THE
SOCIETY, FEBRUARY 22 AND 25, 1930

The Atlantic City meeting of the Society will be remembered by those in charge of the program as a succession of disappointments verging upon calamities. First came the staging by the authorities of the National Education Association of a Pageant of Time which in effect dispossessed the Society of its anticipated place of meeting on Tuesday evening, caused an eleventh-hour revision of printed programs, and withdrew from our expected audience several hundred auditors. Second there was the receipt at Atlantic City of the disheartening news that Professor Knight, chairman of the Committee that produced the Arithmetic Yearbook, who was, of course, scheduled to introduce the volume to the Society, had fallen a victim of influenza while passing through Chicago en route to our meeting, and was confined to a hotel room there under physicians' orders. Then, third, followed, the anxious waiting for the next speaker, Professor Buckingham; the final decision to start the Saturday program without him and to let him speak that evening or on Tuesday; and later the discovery that he had been fogbound on a Sound steamer between Boston and New York Friday night and was sailing for Europe Sunday night.

The printed programs of our two sessions read as follows:

FIRST SESSION—FEBRUARY 22, 1930

Saturday Evening at 8:00—At the Auditorium Ballroom

This session will be devoted to a discussion of the Twenty-Ninth Yearbook of the Society, entitled *Report of the Society's Committee on Arithmetic*, with special reference to Part I, *Some Aspects of Modern Thought on Arithmetic*.

Dr. L. V. Koos, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Society, will preside.

I. "The Main Points of View in the Arithmetic Yearbook"

F. B. Knight, Professor of Educational Psychology, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, and Chairman of the Yearbook Committee.

(15 minutes)

II. "The Social Value of Arithmetic"

B. R. Buckingham, Lecturer, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

(20 minutes)

III. "Features of an Adequate Curriculum"

R. L. West, Director of Teacher Training, State Department of Public Instruction, Trenton, New Jersey.

(15 minutes)

- IV. "The Nature and Uses of Testing and Remedial Programs"
C. E. Greene, Director of Research, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado.
(15 minutes)
- V. "Critique of Part I of the Yearbook"
L. J. Brueckner, Professor of Elementary Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
(20 minutes)

Five-minute Speeches from the Floor:

- A. W. Kallom, Department of Educational Investigation and Measurement, Boston, Massachusetts.
Clifford Woody, Professor of Education and Director of the Bureau of Educational Reference and Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
G. M. Wilson, Professor of Education, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

SECOND SESSION

Tuesday Evening at 8:00—At the new Auditorium, Senior High School

This session will be devoted to a discussion of the Twenty-Ninth Yearbook of the Society, entitled *Report of the Society's Committee on Arithmetic*, with special reference to Part II, *Research in Arithmetic*.

Dr. L. V. Koos, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Society, will preside.

- I. "The Research Presented in Part II of the Yearbook"
G. T. Buswell, Professor of Educational Psychology, Department of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
(20 minutes)
- II. "A Plea for Fundamental Research"
W. A. Brownell, Professor of Educational Psychology, George Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee.
(15 minutes)
- III. "Newer Tendencies in the Supervision of Arithmetic"
Velda Bamesberger, Director of Elementary Education, Toledo, Ohio.
(15 minutes)
- IV. "Critique of Part II of the Yearbook"
W. J. Osburn, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
(20 minutes)

- V. "The Yearbook in the Light of Principles of Education"
Ernest Horn, Professor of Education, State University of Iowa,
Iowa City, Iowa.
(15 minutes)
- VI. "Summary for the Committee"
F. B. Knight, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
(10 minutes)
-

Five-minute Speeches from the Floor:

- J. H. Beveridge, Superintendent of Schools, Omaha, Nebraska.
Will French, Assoc. Superintendent of Schools, Tulsa, Oklahoma.
R. L. Morton, Professor of Mathematics, College of Education,
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

Despite the absence of Messrs. Knight and Buckingham, the Saturday evening program was not devoid of interest to the audience, particularly that portion of the program that centered around the so-called 'five-minute' speeches, including the passage at arms between Professor Wilson and the young woman who challenged some of his remarks concerning the Arithmetic Committee and its work.

As so often happens, a chance phrase—in this case Professor Woody's reference to 'reductionists'—diverted some of the discussion both Saturday and Tuesday evenings that might perhaps more profitably have been expanded to touch upon other and equally important issues raised by the Yearbook.

The smaller, but perhaps more highly selected, audience that preferred arithmetic to pageant on Tuesday evening likewise found a program not devoid of interest. Professor Buswell, for example, took occasion to preface his formal presentation with some apt remarks concerning the issues that had been raised Saturday evening, thus in a way representing and defending the Committee in the absence of Chairman Knight.

In the series of discussions which closed this second session Professor Morton gave over the time that had been allotted to him to Mr. Will French, whose felicitous remarks charmed as well as edified the audience.

At the risk of departing from convention, the Secretary begs leave to append here, for the enjoyment of those at least who were able to attend these two sessions, these rhymed 'minutes of the Atlantic City meeting' from the pen of Miles Gloriosus, the well-known poet of pedagogy:

“THE ATLANTIC CITY MEETING OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
THE STUDY OF EDUCATION”

BY MILES GLORIOSUS

Saturday Evening

(THE ONSET)

On Stanley on! Charge Chester charge!
...But Knight? Ah, where is he?
Alas, his ill digestional,
To wit, the flu intestinal,
Holds him by inland sea.

On Stanley on! Charge Chester charge!
...But Buckingham? Where's he?
Alas, a misty fog malign
O'ertook the old Fall River Line.
He comes not o'er the lea.

So fate, the great reductionist,
Deletes them from the field
And Woody gaily leaps the moat
The while Guy Wilson rocks the boat.
Will the committee yield?

Tuesday Evening

(THE CHAMPION)

Now Buswell girds his loins anew
And Ernest Horn steps to the front
In spite of Osburn's trenchant tones,
Which might strike terror to one's
bones.
...But who now bears the brunt?

Up rides a mild young Lochinvar
From Oklahoma's plain,
He lacks Will Rogers' lariat
And Beechnut Gum—but, spite o' that,
He conquers all disdain.

With smile and seeming lack of speed
He wins them all en masse.
Will French he is from Tulsa Town
And when big Koos would pipe him
down,
R. Morton cries, “I pass!”

L'ENVOI

All hail to Oklahoma, then!
Her two Wills have a way!
A smile will always best a blow
And haste is better made when slow.
The Yearbook wins the day!

GUY M. WHIPPLE, *Secretary.*

SYNOPSIS OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SOCIETY DURING 1930

This synopsis, limited to matters of importance only, is presented in order that the members of the Society may be properly informed concerning the acts and the policies of those who have been elected by them to direct the work of the Society.

FIRST 1930 MEETING OF THE BOARD

(Haddon Hall, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 23, 1930)

Present: Directors Bagley, Charters, Horn, Freeman, Koos, Whipple.
Absent: Director Judd.

1. The following acts were arranged by correspondence after the May, 1929, meeting of the Board: (a) approved the nomination to the Textbook Committee of Superintendent F. A. Jensen, Professor N. B. Henry, and Dean W. L. Coffey; (b) appropriated not to exceed \$650 to complete the work of the Textbook Committee in 1930; (c) granted to Mr. E. U. Rugg permission to print entire in a forthcoming monograph material that had originally appeared in Chapter XI of the *Twenty-Fifth Yearbook*, Part II; and (d) accepted with regret the resignation from the Board, on account of difficulties in attending our meetings, of Director Terman, effective December 20, 1929.

2. The Secretary certified the outcome of the fall (1929) election whereby Directors Koos and Horn were reelected and Professor Frank N. Freeman, of the University of Chicago, was elected to complete the unexpired term of Director Terman, resigned.

3. Director Judd forwarded a communication tendering his resignation from the Board because the transfer of Dr. Koos to Chicago and the election of Dr. Freeman brought up to three the number of Board members from the University of Chicago. The Board voted unanimously to lay this resignation on the table and to ask Director Judd to continue to serve out the period for which he was elected.

4. Director Koos was reelected Chairman of the Board, to serve until March 1, 1931.

5. No formal action was taken on complaints regarding discounts on yearbooks sold to school boards under certain special conditions.

6. Superintendent C. W. Washburne having requested the endorsement of the Board of requests he was making from certain foundations for the subsidizing of research in elementary and secondary education, the Board voted unanimously that it was "inexpedient to take action committing the two thousand or more members of this Society to the support of any general proposals or policies pertaining to matters outside the immediate activities of the Society."

7. Reports were received from the chairmen of various yearbook committees and action thereon taken as follows:

a. Committee on the Textbook. Chairman Edmonson submitted orally a statement of his Committee's work. The Board encouraged the idea of incorporating in the yearbook a brief reviewing chapter, with the idea that particular interest would attach to it if the Committee could secure statements from several persons representing the progressive movement in education. The Board also voted not to exceed \$200 to be contributed by the Society toward the expense of the typographical investigation undertaken for this yearbook by Dr. Buckingham with the coöperation of three Boston publishers.

b. Rural Education. Chairman Brim also presented orally a statement of his Committee's work. The Board suggested for this yearbook also the desirability of a chapter contributed by a reviewing committee. The Board voted to add \$400 to the present balance of this Committee.

8. Yearbooks under consideration were further discussed and handled as follows:

a. Supervision. Directors Judd and Horn having reported that other organizations were contemplating the publication of material on this topic, the Board voted, on their recommendation, that the Society should not undertake a yearbook on supervision.

b. Secondary Education. After an extended discussion of a report by Director Koos upon the situation in this field of investigation, the Board concluded that it was not opportune for the Society to undertake a yearbook on secondary education.

c. The Teaching of Science. On the basis of an extended report by Director Whipple and of a conference with Drs. Powers and Curtis, the Board voted to appoint a yearbook committee composed of Messrs. S. R. Powers (chairman), F. D. Curtis (vice-chairman), G. Craig, E. R. Downing, C. R. Pieper, and R. Watkins; to appropriate \$500 for the use of this Committee in 1930; and to plan for at least a preliminary report in the form of a yearbook of some 250 pages for publication in 1932.

d. Geography. On the basis of a report by Director Bagley indicating cordial support for the undertaking on the part of the National Council of Geography Teachers, the Board instructed Directors Bagley and Whipple to confer further with representatives of that Council concerning the preparation of a yearbook on geography and to report to the Board, if possible, at its May meeting.

e. Liberal Arts College. On the basis of a report by Director Charters of correspondence and conferences between him and various persons and organizations, the Board voted to lay on the table the proposal to initiate a yearbook on the liberal arts college in view of the investigations already in progress by other organizations.

f. Special Disabilities. After listening to correspondence between Director Judd and Professor C. S. Berry concerning a plan for a yearbook on this topic, the Board concluded that the plan was substantially like the plan for a yearbook on mental hygiene which had previously been debated by the Board and judged undesirable at present. Director Horn then outlined the possibilities of a yearbook dealing primarily with educational dis-

abilities, with special reference to the causes underlying difficulties encountered by pupils in various school subjects, and he was asked to report further on this plan at the next meeting.

g. *Validation of Objective Examinations.* The suggestions of Professor G. M. Ruch for the subvention of an elaborate study of this topic were discussed briefly and then referred to the next meeting for further discussion.

9. Yearbooks were proposed on the two following topics:

a. *School Business Administration and School Buildings.* This topic was proposed by Professor N. L. Engelhardt. Director Horn was asked to confer with the proposer and to report at the next meeting, particularly with respect to the matter of school buildings.

b. *Problems of Method.* After informal discussion it was agreed that Director Horn should report at the next meeting concerning the feasibility of a relatively brief yearbook classifying and evaluating methods and assembling typical studies of classroom methods.

10. There was brief discussion of the general policies that should govern the making and distribution of offprints from the yearbooks. The Secretary was requested to formulate a set of regulations for discussion by the Board and decisions were made concerning requests by Dr. Lowrey, Dr. Buckingham, and Superintendent Washburne for permission to distribute offprints of their contributions to yearbooks under certain special conditions.

11. The treasurer presented comparative figures showing the income and outgo of the Society's funds under various categories during the past five years.

SECOND 1930 MEETING OF THE BOARD

(Statler Hotel, Buffalo, New York, May 11, 1930)

Present: Directors Bagley, Horn, Freeman, Koos, Whipple.

Absent: Directors Charters, Judd.

1. The Yearbook Editor called attention to high charges for authors' alterations in certain chapters of the Arithmetic Yearbook and asked for a ruling on his action in provisionally assessing a portion of these charges against the authors who were responsible. The Board voted that, in view of the special conditions obtaining, the specific charges in question should be assumed by the Society, but that hereafter alterations in galley and page proof exceeding in cost fifteen percent of the cost of original composition shall be assessed as personal charges against the author.

2. An informal discussion of certain criticisms of recent yearbooks led the Board to these conclusions: (a) there would probably be some gain if an effort were made to reduce the size of future yearbooks, without, of course, sacrificing adequacy of presentation; (b) it would probably be desirable to include in each yearbook a series of concise summarizing statements, even though some of these might be controversial and not agreed to by all the yearbook committee; (c) it would be desirable to include in

most yearbooks the report of a small group of reviewers from without the personnel of the yearbook committee, but such a report ought to be done well and on the basis of access to the completed yearbook material well in advance of its printing; (d) the occasional demands for an index to yearbooks like that on arithmetic seem not to be justified, but it might be desirable to publish a summarizing table of contents and complete index to all the yearbooks from one to thirty. The Editor was asked to report on this suggestion.

3. Yearbooks under consideration and newly proposed were considered as follows:

a. Geography. On motion of Director Bagley, amended by Director Freeman, there was created a Yearbook Committee on Geography, with the following personnel: A. E. Parkins (chairman), W. C. Bagley, R. M. Brown, E. E. Lackey, Edith Parker, D. C. Ridgley, and DeForest Stull. The Board appropriated \$300 for the use of this Committee in 1930 and urged the preparation of material for publication in 1933.

b. Problems of Method. After extended discussion of the possible contents of a yearbook on method, Director Horn was instructed to organize a committee to produce a volume on this topic under his chairmanship, and \$600 was appropriated for the use of this committee. Among the topics proposed for treatment were a critique of the laws of learning and of various plans for classroom procedure, and a careful study of the place of transfer in teaching and learning.

c. School Buildings and Equipment. The Board created a Yearbook Committee on School Buildings and Equipment, to operate under the chairmanship of Professor N. L. Engelhardt, and appropriated \$300 for the preliminary needs of this committee.

d. Curriculum-Making. Director Horn presented to the Board a proposal to produce a yearbook dealing not with the content of, but rather with the methods of making, curricula. It was the consensus of the Board that this undertaking, however, should not be considered for the present.

e. The Activities Program in the Elementary School. This topic was suggested as an opportune one and as holding out prospects of a valuable contribution. The Board asked Directors Bagley and Horn to confer with Professor F. G. Bonser and others and to submit recommendations later to the Secretary for reference to the Board by correspondence. (Recommendations favoring this undertaking were subsequently made and endorsed by the Board. A committee is being organized under the chairmanship of Professor Bonser.)

f. Educational Planning. The Board discussed informally the demands placed on educational authorities by modern social and industrial developments for wise guidance of educational enterprises to meet prospective future developments. Director Horn was asked to confer with interested educators concerning the possibilities of producing a fruitful yearbook in this field.

For the Board of Directors,
G. M. WHIPPLE, *Secretary.*

YEARBOOKS IN PREPARATION BY COMMITTEES
OF THE SOCIETY

Yearbooks on the following topics have been authorized by the Board of Directors as explained in the Synopsis of the Proceedings of the Board of Directors. The order in which the reports of the six committees concerned will be published cannot be stated with certainty. Members of the Society who are interested in the plans for these yearbooks are urged to correspond freely with the chairmen of the committees.

- I. "THE ACTIVITY CURRICULUM IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL"
Chairman: Professor F. G. Bonser, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
- II. "GEOGRAPHY"
Chairman: Professor A. E. Parkins, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee
- III. "PROBLEMS OF METHOD"
Chairman: Professor Ernest Horn, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
- IV. "RURAL EDUCATION" (Second report)
Chairman: Professor Orville G. Brim, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
- V. "SCHOOL BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT"
Chairman: Professor N. L. Engelhardt, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
- VI. "THE TEACHING OF SCIENCE"
Chairman: Professor S. R. Powers, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

ACCOUNTS OF THE TREASURER OF THE SOCIETY FOR 1929

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE YEAR JANUARY 1, 1929,
TO DECEMBER 31, 1929

Balance on Hand, January 1, 1929, per prior report..... \$22,067.37

RECEIPTS

From Sale of Yearbooks by the Public School Publishing Company:

Royalties, June to December, 1928.....	\$5,328.73	
Royalties, January to June, 1929.....	8,358.15	
		\$13,686.88

Interest on Bonds, etc.:

Interest on Registered Liberty Bond.....	\$ 42.50	
Interest on Other Liberty Bonds.....	42.50	
Interest on U. S. Treasury Bond.....	42.50	
Interest on Dominion of Canada Bond.....	55.00	
Interest on Detroit-Edison Bond.....	50.00	
Interest on Alabama Power Bond.....	50.00	
Interest on Utah Power and Light Bond.....	50.00	
Interest on Chicago Junction E. R. Bond.....	50.00	
Interest on Interstate Power Bond.....	50.00	
Interest on Royalties.....	138.21	
Interest on Savings Account.....	309.47	
Interest on Checking Account.....	.88	
Profit from Dominion of Canada Bond.....	20.25	
		901.31

Special Contribution to Expense 28th Yearbook.....	350.00	
Dues from Active and Associate Members.....	4,640.03	
		19,578.22

Total Receipts for the Year..... \$19,578.22

Total Receipts, including initial balance..... \$41,645.59

EXPENDITURES

Yearbooks

Manufacturing and Distribution:

Printing 5,500 28th	\$ 7,026.50	
Mailing 28th	640.64	
Binding 1500 copies 28th in cloth.....	983.40	
Corrections and mats 28th.....	653.95	
Reprinting 526 copies 19, I.....	216.42	
Reprinting 5054 copies 24, I.....	1,647.80	
Reprinting 2000 copies 26, II.....	950.00	
Reprinting 4105 copies 27, I.....	1,533.00	
		\$13,651.71

Preparation by Committees:

Preschool Committee	\$ 4.19	
Arithmetic Committee	1,722.84	
Textbook Committee	1,010.74	
		2,737.77

Total Cost of Yearbooks..... \$16,389.48

Meetings

Cleveland Society Meeting	\$ 181.54	
Board of Directors' Meetings	705.19	
A. A. A. S. Council Meeting	118.63	
		<u>1,005.36</u>

Secretary's Office

Salary	\$ 2,500.00	
Office Rent	300.00	
Clerical Assistance	349.87	
Stationery and Printing	161.71	
Office Equipment	110.00	
Postage and Express	77.33	
Telegraph and Telephone	8.83	
Office Supplies	7.58	
Auditing	40.00	
Bonding	12.50	
Safe Deposit Box	5.00	
Dues Refunded	8.50	
Collections and Bad Checks	8.60	
Foreign Checks Held for Collection	15.50	
		<u>3,605.42</u>

Total Expenditures for 1929	\$21,000.26
Balance on Hand, December 31, 1929	20,645.33
	<u>\$41,645.59</u>

ANALYSIS OF BALANCE ON HAND, DECEMBER 31, 1929

Checking Account, Danvers National Bank, \$2,416.87, Less \$30.35 checks outstanding	\$ 2,386.52
Savings Account, Danvers National Bank	10,347.93
\$1,000 Detroit-Edison Bond 5 1940	940.00
1,000 U. S. Treasury Reg. 4¼ 1938	1,000.00
2,000 U. S. Liberty and Treasury Bonds 4¼	1,926.88
1,000 Interstate Power 5 1957	990.00
1,000 Alabama Power Co. 5 1951	1,027.50
1,000 Utah Power and Light Co. 5 1944	1,004.50
1,000 Chicago Junction R. R. 5 1940	1,022.00
	<u>\$20,645.33</u>

GUY M. WHIPPLE, *Treasurer.*

HONORARY AND ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

(This list includes all active members enrolled on December 31, 1930.)

HONORARY MEMBERS

DeGarmo, Professor Charles, Coconut Grove, Fla.
Dewey, Professor John, Columbia University, New York City.
Hanus, Professor Paul H., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ACTIVE MEMBERS

Abernethy, Professor Ethel M., Queens College, Charlotte, N. C.
Adams, Jesse E., College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
Ade, Lester K., Prin. New Haven State Normal School, New Haven, Conn.
Aherne, Mrs. Vina M., 146 Grafton St., New Haven, Conn.
Aitken, C. C., State School, Walkaway, Australia.
Albright, Denton M., Supt. of Schools, Rochester, Pa.
Alder, Miss Louise M., State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.
Alexander, Professor Carter, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Alger, John L., Pres., Rhode Island College of Education, Providence, R. I.
Alleman, S. A., Supt. of Schools, Napoleonville, La.
Allen, C. F., School Administration Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.
Allen, Professor Fiske, State Normal School, Charleston, Ill.
Allen, I. M., Supt. of Schools, Highland Park, Mich.
Allison, Dr. Samuel B., Dist. Supt., Board of Education, Chicago, Ill.
Almack, Professor John C., Stanford University, Cal.
Alter, Harvey E., Thomas Street School, Rome, N. Y.
Amann, Miss Dorothy, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.
Anderson, Ernest W., 64 Fulton St., Medford, Mass.
Anderson, Harold A., School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Anderson, Harold H., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Anderson, Mrs. Helen B., 414 W. Fayette St., Pittsfield, Ill.
Anderson, John A., Indio, California.
Andrews, Professor B. R., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Andrus, Dr. Ruth, State Department of Education, Albany, N. Y.
Anduson, Homer N., Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Denver, Colo.
Angell, Miss L. Gertrude, Buffalo Seminary, Bidwell Parkway, Buffalo, N. Y.
Angle, Miss Oakie, Supervisor of Experimental Schools, Wilton, Conn.
Anspaugh, G. E., Komensky School, Chicago, Ill.
Antholz, H. J., Supervising Principal, Spooner City Schools, Spooner, Wis.
Archer, C. P., State Teachers College, Moorhead, Minn.
Arnold, E. J., Supt. of Schools, Bremen, Ohio.
Ashbaugh, Dr. E. J., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
Atkins, Miss Ruth E., 723 Third St., St. Cloud, Minn.
Augustin, Miss Eloise D., "The Maples," Otsego Co., Laurens, N. Y.
Avery, Geo. T., Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo.
Ayer, Dr. Adelaide M., Dir. Training, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.
Ayer, Professor Fred C., University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
Ayer, Jean Y., Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Ave., New York City.

Bachrodt, Walter L., Supt. of Schools, San Jose, Cal.
Badanes, Saul, Public School 173, Pennsylvania Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

- Bader, Miss Edith M., Supervisor of Public Schools, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Bagley, Professor William C., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Bailey, Francis L., 509 W. 121st St., New York City.
 Baker, C. A., Dean of Normal School, Rio Baptist College, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
 Baker, Frank E., President State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Baker, Dr. Harry J., 153 E. Elizabeth St., Detroit, Mich.
 Ballou, Frank W., Supt. of Schools, Washington, D. C.
 Balyeat, F. A., School of Education, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
 Bamberger, Miss Florence E., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Bamesberger, Miss Velda, Dir. Elem. Educ., Toledo, Ohio.
 Bane, Miss Anna W., Roosevelt School, Summit, N. J.
 Barber, Fred H., Box 247, Emory, Virginia.
 Bardwell, R. W., Supt. of Schools, Madison, Wis.
 Bardy, Joseph, 5231 Wayne Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Barfoot, Harry N., Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Barnes, Harold, Supervisor Elem. Educ., Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Barnes, Percival Simpson, Supt. of Schools, East Hartford, Conn.
 Barringer, Benton E., State Normal School, Bowling Green, Ohio.
 Barton, W. A., Jr., Coker College, Hartsville, S. C.
 Bateman, Miss Eva I., 1048 Glenwood Blvd., Schenectady, N. Y.
 Baumgardner, Miss Nina E., State Teachers College, Mankato, Minn.
 Bawden, Herrick T., Teachers College, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Bayles, E. E., Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
 Bayne, Thomas L., Jr., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Beall, Ross H., Quadrangle 90-B, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Beattie, Alfred W., Supervising Prin., Ben Avon, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Beatty, Willard W., 30 Garden Ave., Bronxville, N. Y.
 Beck, G. Herman, Prin., 3009a Victor St., St. Louis, Mo.
 Becker, Miss Elizabeth, Lockhart School, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Bedell, Ralph C., Southwest High School, Kansas City, Mo.
 Bednar, Miss Christine, 132 West Marquette Road, Chicago, Ill.
 Beeby, Daniel J., 4747 S. Union Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Beechel, Miss Edith, 1230 Amsterdam Ave., New York City.
 Behrens, Professor Minnie S., Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville, Texas.
 Beito, E. A., Columbia University, New York City.
 Bell, Dr. J. Carleton, 1032A Sterling Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Bemiller, J. F., Supt. of Schools, Galion, Ohio.
 Bender, John F., School of Education, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
 Benedict, Ezra W., Fair Haven, Vt.
 Benson, Dr. C. E., New York University, Washington Sq., New York City.
 Benson, J. R., 6131 Magnolia Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
 Benton, G. W., 88 Lexington Ave., New York City.
 Benz, H. E., College of Educ., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
 Bergman, W. G., Assistant Director of Research, Public Schools, Detroit, Mich.
 Berman, Dr. Samuel, 5336 N. Sydenham St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Berry, Professor Charles S., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Berry, Miss Frances M., Dept. of Educ., Baltimore, Md.
 Betts, Emmett A., 323 Brown St., Iowa City, Iowa.
 Betts, Mrs. Mary Tuite, 32 Verona Bldg., Walnut Hills, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Beveridge, J. H., Supt. of Instruction, Omaha, Neb.
 Bick, Miss Anna, 2842A Victor St., St. Louis, Mo.
 Bickford, C. W., Supt. of Schools, Lewiston, Me.
 Biddle, Dr. Anna E., South Philadelphia H. S. for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Birkhead, E. F., Supt. of Schools, Winchester, Ky.
 Bird, Professor Charles, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Bishop, Fred G., Supt. of Schools, Two Rivers, Wis.

- Bixler, H. H., Board of Education, Atlanta, Ga.
Blackburn, J. Albert, New Jersey College for Women, New Brunswick, N. J.
Blanton, Miss Annie Webb, Box 1742, University, Austin, Texas.
Blue, Harold G., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo.
Blumberg, A. Alvin, 2136 S. Seventh St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Bly, Professor John, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.
Bode, Frederick Chester, University Station, Box 94, Syracuse, N. Y.
Bogan, Miss Eleanore M., 96 Woodland Ave., Detroit, Mich.
Bogan, L. E., Superintendent of Schools, Okay, Okla.
Bohan, John E., West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
Bolton, Dean Frederick E., University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Bonser, Professor F. G., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Boraas, Julius, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.
Bossing, Professor Nelson L., University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
Bott, Professor E. A., University of Toronto, Toronto 5, Canada.
Bowen, Wayne F., Box 84, Compton, Calif.
Bowyer, Vernon, Skinner School, 1070 W. Jackson Boul., Chicago, Ill.
Boyer, Charles, Supt. of Schools, Atlantic City, N. J.
Boyer, Philip A., 6320 Lawnton Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
Bracken, J., 305 N. Meramec, Clayton, Mo.
Bradner, J. W., Supt. of Schools, Middlesboro, Ky.
Bragdon, Miss Helen D., Dean, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
Breckenridge, Miss Elizabeth, Prin., Louisville Normal School, Louisville, Ky.
Breed, Frederick S., 1224 E. 57th St., Chicago, Ill.
Brewer, Miss Anne T., 74 W. 5th St., Oswego, N. Y.
Brewer, Professor John M., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Bridgett, Miss Alice E., Colony Street School, E.F.D. 1, Wallingford, Conn.
Briggs, Dr. Howard L., Dir. of Vocational Educ., Bd. of Educ., Cleveland, Ohio.
Briggs, Dr. Thomas H., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Brim, Professor Orville G., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Brinkley, Sterling G., Emory University, Ga.
Brinser, Ira S., Supt. of Schools, Newark, Del.
Bristow, W. H., Dept. of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa.
Brooks, Professor Fowler D., Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md.
Brooks, Professor John D., Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.
Brown, F. J., School of Education, New York University, New York City.
Brown, George Earl, Supt. of Schools, Cochise Co., Bisbee, Ariz.
Brown, J. C., Supt. of Schools, Pelham, N. Y.
Brown, Miss M. Ethel, Supervisor Elementary Grades, Schenectady, N. Y.
Brown, Robert M., Rhode Island College of Education, Providence, R. I.
Brown, Stella E., 4213 Belmar Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Brown, W. O., 406 Beveridge St., Carbondale, Ill.
Brownne, Mrs. Hetty S., Dir. River Bond Country Day School, San Antonio, Texas.
Brownell, S. M., Supt. of Schools, Grosse Point, Mich.
Brownell, Professor W. A., Duke University, Durham, N. C.
Bruce, Miss Clara H., Ahmednagar, Bombay Presidency, India.
Brueckner, Dr. Leo J., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Brust, Miss Huldah, Primary Supervisor, Rockville, Md.
Bubeck, Allan F., Dept. of Educ., State Teachers College, Kutztown, Pa.
Buchanan, William D., 5511 Vernon Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Buckingham, Dr. B. E., Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass.
Buckner, Professor Chester A., Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Burdick, Raymond C., Supt. of Schools, Watertown, N. Y.
Burkhard, William E., 1631 W. Buscomb, Philadelphia, Pa.
Burnham, Professor Ernest, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Burns, Robert L., Prin., Cliffside Park High School, Grantwood, N. J.
Buros, Francis C., Benj. Franklin Apts., Windsor Terrace, White Plains, N. Y.

- Buros, Oscar K., Prin. Washington School, Milburn, N. J.
 Burton, Thomas C., Staten Island Academy, New Brighton, New York.
 Buswell, Dr. G. T., School of Educ., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Butler, Leslie A., Supt. of Schools, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 Butsch, R. L. C., School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Butterworth, Professor Julian E., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Byrne, Lee, 319 12th Ave., S. E., Aberdeen, S. D.
- Calvin, Miss Henrietta W., Board of Education, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Cameron, Norman W., Prin., State Teachers College, West Chester, Pa.
 Cameron, Walter C., Prin., Lincoln Junior H. S., Framingham, Mass.
 Camp, Dr. H. L., 743 Wayne Ave., Indiana, Pa.
 Canine, Edwin N., Dir. Supervisal Teaching, State Normal, Terre Haute, Ind.
 Carkin, S. B., Prin., Packard Commercial School, New York City.
 Carmichael, Professor A. M., Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.
 Carney, Professor Mabel, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Carpenter, Professor W. W., University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Carrington, Professor Evelyn M., Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville, Texas.
 Carroll, Herbert A., South Berwick, Maine.
 Carrothers, George E., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Carson, Dr. C. C., 951 Washington St., Miami Beach, Fla.
 Carter, Professor Ralph E., Extension Div., Indiana Univ., Indianapolis, Ind.
 Cassel, Lloyd S., Supt. of Schools, Freehold, N. J.
 Castle, L. E. Supt. of Schools, Stuart, Iowa.
 Cattell, Dr. J. McKeen, Garrison, N. Y.
 Cattell, Miss Psyche, 2 Avon St., Cambridge, Mass.
 Cavan, Professor Jordan, Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.
 Chace, S. Howard, Supt. of Schools, Beverly, Mass.
 Chadwick, Raymond D., Dean, Duluth Junior College, Duluth, Minn.
 Chambers, M. M., 136 Chittenden Ave., Columbus, Ohio.
 Chambers, Will G., Dean of Education, State College, Pa.
 Champlin, Carroll D., Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
 Chandler, Paul G., Millersville State Normal School, Millersville, Pa.
 Chandor, Miss Valentine L., 137 E. 62nd St., New York City.
 Chapman, Ira T., Supt. of Schools, So. Broad St., Elizabeth, N. J.
 Charters, Professor W. W., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Chauncey, Marlin R., 509 W. 121st St., New York City.
 Chew, Samuel L., Supt. Dist. No. 5, Carlisle and Race Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Chidester, Albert J., Berea College, Berea, Ky.
 Chiles, E. E., Prin., Harrison School, 4163 Green Lea Place, St. Louis, Mo.
 Clarahan, Professor Elizabeth, Constantinople Woman's College, Constantinople, Turkey.
- Clark, Professor John R., 425 W. 123d St., New York City.
 Clement, Professor W. F., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.
 Cline, E. D., Superintendent of Schools, Dubuque, Iowa.
 Cochran, Professor T. E., Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky.
 Coffey, Wilford L., Dean, College of the City of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.
 Coffman, Lotus D., Pres., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Cole, C. E., R.F.D. 1, Temple, Pa.
 Cole, Robert D., School of Educ., Univ. Sta., Grand Forks, N. D.
 Collier, Miss Genevieve L., Horton School, Port Chester, N. Y.
 Collins, Miss Eloise, San Mateo, Fla.
 Compton, C. V., Supt. of Schools, McCamey, Texas.
 Cook, Albert S., Dept. of Educ., Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md.
 Cook, Mrs. Katherine M., Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
 Cook, Walter M., 225 Iowa Avenue, Iowa City, Iowa.

- Cooke, Miss Flora J., Francis W. Parker School, 330 Webster Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Cooper, H. E., Dean, Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College, Richmond, Ky.
Cooper, William J., Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C.
Courtis, Dr. S. A., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Cowan, Miss M. G., 17 Learmonth Terrace, Edinburgh, Scotland.
Cox, Philip W. L., School of Educ., New York Univ., New York City.
Coxe, Dr. W. W., Educ. Research Division, State Dept. Educ., Albany, N. Y.
Coy, Miss Genevieve L., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Craig, Professor G. S., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Cram, Fred D., 2222 Clay St., Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Crane, Thomas F., Newtown High School, New York City.
Crawford, Professor C. C., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Crawford, J. R., School of Educ., Univ. of Maine, Orono, Maine.
Crewe, Miss Amy C., Baltimore Co. Public Schools, Baltimore, Md.
Crofoot, Miss Bess, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.
Crosby, Dr. Maurice H., Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Crowley, James A., Robert Gould Shaw School, West Roxbury, Mass.
Cubberley, Professor Ellwood P., Stanford University, Calif.
Cummings, F. L., Corvallis, Oregon.
Cunliffe, R. B., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
Cunningham, Resdon J., Box 217, Helena, Mont.
Curtis, Professor Francis D., University High School, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Dana, Marion P., State Teachers College, Buffalo, N. Y.
Darling, W. T., Supt. of Schools, Wauwatosa, Wis.
DaRocha, José Duarte, Dir. da Instrucao Publica, Nietheroy, Estado do Rio, Brazil.
Daughters, Freeman, University of Montana, Missoula, Mont.
Davidson, Percy E., Stanford University, Calif.
Davis, Professor C. O., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Davis, Courtland V., 1218 W. 4th St., Plainfield, N. J.
Davis, Sheldon E., Pres., State Normal College, Dillon, Mont.
Deahl, Professor Jasper N., University of West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.
Dearborn, Dr. Walter F., 79 Fresh Pond Parkway, Cambridge, Mass.
Dearmont, Dr. W. S., Southwestern Louisiana Inst., Lafayette, La.
Decker, Fred J., 3085 Cadillac Blvd., Detroit, Mich.
DeLong, L. B., Asst. Director, Teacher Training Extension, Harrisburg, Pa.
Delph, G. E., 34 E. Monroe St., Phoenix, Ariz.
DeLuce, Miss Olive S., Missouri State Teachers College, Maryville, Mo.
Denworth, Dr. Katharine M., Bradford Academy, Bradford, Mass.
DeVoss, Dr. James C., State Teachers College, San Jose, Cal.
Diehl, John C., Supt. of Schools, Erie, Pa.
Dondineau, Arthur, Detroit Public Schools, 1354 Broadway, Detroit, Mich.
Donovan, H. L., Pres., State Teachers College, Richmond, Ky.
Doty, Mrs. Elizabeth, 3838 Parallel Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas.
Dougherty, Miss Mary C., Grade Supervisor, River Rouge, Mich.
Doughton, Isaac, State Normal School, Mansfield, Pa.
Down, Edgar F., Supt. of Schools, Ferndale, Mich.
Downs, Miss Martha, 114 Baker Ave., Wharton, N. J.
Doyle, Miss Mary E., 205 N. Tacoma Av., Tacoma, Wash.
Drake, E. H., Supt. of Schools, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Drew, Miss Elizabeth L., Prin., Gunsaulus School, 5126 Univ. Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Duboc, Professor Jessie L., Montana State Normal College, Dillon, Mont.
Dulles, Miss Julia C., State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg, Pa.
Dunkelberger, George F., Selinsgrove, Pa.
Dunkle, John L., Prin., State Normal School, Frostburg, Md.
Dunn, Professor Fannie W., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

DuShane, Donald, Supt. of Schools, Columbus, Ind.
 Duvall, Dr. Sylvanus M., Scarritt College for Christian Workers, Nashville, Tenn.
 Dysart, Professor Bonnie K., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.

Eaton, Professor T. H., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Ebert, Miss Jessie D., 108 Union St., Schenectady, N. Y.
 Eby, Professor Harvey L., University of California, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Eddy, John M., Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Miss.
 Edgerton, Dr. Harold A., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Edmonson, J. B., Dean, School of Educ., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Edwards, Arthur U., Supt. of Schools, Geneva, Ill.
 Edwards, H. E., Emanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs, Mich.
 Eells, W. C., 735 Dolores St., Stanford University, Cal.
 Elliott, Charles H., 330 Lincoln Ave., New Brunswick, N. J.
 Elliott, Miss Edna M., 801 Beaver Ave., Midland, Pa.
 Elliott, Miss Lucy C., Board of Education, St. Louis, Mo.
 Ellis, Dr. A. Caswell, Director, Cleveland College, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Ellis, C. C., Pres., Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa.
 Ellis, Manley M., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
 Ellis, W. D., Prin., Richmond Normal School, Richmond, Va.
 Elson, William H., 633 Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Engelhardt, Professor Fred, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Engelhardt, Professor N. L., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 English, H. B., Dept. Psychol., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio.
 English, Miss Mildred, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Raleigh, N. C.
 Ertmeyer, Dr. C. E., North Central College, Naperville, Ill.
 Ernst, Miss L. B., 6058 Kingsbury Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
 Ernest, Walter L., 5445 N. St. Louis St., Chicago, Ill.
 Evans, Professor A. W., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.
 Evans, Miss Edna S., 33 Walter St., Salem, Mass.
 Evans, J. E., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
 Evenden, Dr. E. S., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Everts, Ora L., New Jersey State Normal School, Glassboro, N. J.
 Ewart, Joseph A., Supt. of Schools, Stamford, Conn.

Fagan, Charles, Cascade School, Seattle, Wash.
 Fancher, W. L., Dean, Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.
 Fast, L. W., Supt. of Schools, Mt. Clemens, Mich.
 Feeney, T. L., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
 Fellows, Ernest W., Supt. of Schools, Gloucester, Mass.
 Fernald, Roy L., Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa.
 Ferriss, Professor Emery N., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Findley, W. C., 3201 Fifth Ave., Des Moines, Iowa.
 Finkenbinder, E. O., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
 Finley, Dr. Charles W., State Teachers College, Upper Montclair, N. J.
 Firman, Sidney G., Supt. of Schools, Glen Ridge, N. J.
 Fisk, Frank E., 111 Gibson St., Canandaigua, N. Y.
 Fiske, Henry M., St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
 Fitzgerald, James A., 329 S. Clinton St., Iowa City, Iowa.
 Fitzpatrick, Edward A., Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Flaas, Miss G. Louise, 1117 35th St., Sacramento, Cal.
 Flanders, J. K., Head, Dept. of Educ., State Normal School, Oswego, N. Y.
 Fletcher, Walter H., 46 Tonney St., Dorchester, Mass.
 Floyd, Oliver B., Prin. of the High School, Glasgow, Mont.
 Fockler, E. R., Hilo High School, Hilo, Hawaii, T. H.
 Foertsch, Fred E., Grant Bldg., 17th and Pine Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Ford, Professor Willard S., Univ. of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal.

- Forney, E. B., 3137 Fremont Ave., S., Minneapolis, Minn.
 Foster, Dr. H. H., Head, Dept. of Educ., Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
 Fowlkes, Professor John Guy, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 Franklin, E. Earle, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Frawley, Miss Honora M., 430 W. 24th St., New York City.
 Freden, Gustaf, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston, La.
 Freeman, E. N., Supt. of Schools, Wheatridge, Colo.
 Freeman, Professor Frank N., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 French, Will, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Tulsa, Okla.
 Freynick, Julius A., Jr., 316 W. 46th St., New York City.
 Friswold, Ingolf O., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Frizzell, Bonner, Supt. of Schools, Palestine, Texas.
 Froman, Mrs. Eula C., Southwestern State Teachers College, Weatherford, Okla.
 Frost, Professor Norman, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
 Frostic, F. W., Supt. of Schools, Wyandotte, Mich.
 Frutchey, Fred P., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Frye, Ellis K., Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill.
 Fuller, J. Burns, Prin., Roosevelt High School, Ypsilanti, Mich.
 Fuller, William David, Modesto Junior College, Modesto, Cal.
 Fuqua, Miss Blanche, Board of Education Bldg., Terre Haute, Ind.
 Futer, Cecil R., 404 North 52nd St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Futrall, Miss Alma, Supt. of Schools, Lee County, Marianna, Ark.
- Gambrill, Professor Bessie Lee, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
 Gambrill, J. M., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Ganders, Harry Stanley, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Gard, Willis L., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
 Gardiner, Miss Ana L., 18 East Caramillo St., Colorado Springs, Colo.
 Gardner, C. A., Prin., North Side High School, Fort Worth, Texas.
 Gardner, Miss Emma J., Bartlett Avenue School, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Gardner, Miss Ethel M., 150 Hotel Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Garlin, Professor E. E., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.
 Garver, F. M., Bennett Hall, Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Gast, Professor Ira M., New York University, New York City.
 Gates, Professor Arthur I., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Gates, C. Ray, Supt. of Schools, Elm St., Grand Island, Neb.
 Gaumnitz, W. H., Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
 Gerberich, Dr. J. E., Univ. of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
 Germane, Professor C. E., Univ. of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Gerry, Henry L., Teachers College of the City of Boston, Boston, Mass.
 Geyer, Denton L., Chicago Normal College, Chicago, Ill.
 Gibbs, Dr. M. E., 1834 13th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Gibson, C. E., Prin., Ravenna School, Seattle, Wash.
 Gift, Elmer B., 301 Corprew Av., Fayette, Mo.
 Gilbert, Luther C., School of Educ., University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
 Gilland, Thomas M., Supt., Donora Public Schools, Donora, Pa.
 Gillet, Harry O., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Gillett, A. D. S., Pres., Superior State Teachers College, Superior, Wis.
 Gilson, Wm. Geo., 1705 N. Lotus Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Glassbrook, Mrs. Tillie Hartung, R.F.D. No. 2, Box 554, Hayward, Cal.
 Goddard, Professor Henry H., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Goetch, E. W., 115 E. 15th St., Cedar Falls, Iowa.
 Goldthorpe, Professor J. Harold, Univ. of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Good, Professor Carter V., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Goodier, Floyd T., Supt. of Schools, Dist. No. 170, Chicago Heights, Ill.
 Goodykoontz, Miss Bess, Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
 Gosling, Thomas Warrington, Supt. of Schools, Akron, Ohio.

- Gould, George, 201 State Hall, Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Gray, Miss Olive, 6345 University Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Gray, William S., Dean, School of Education, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Greene, Charles E., Dir. Research, Public Schools, Denver, Colo.
 Greene, Harry A., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Greene, Miss Mary C., Dir. of Special Education, Providence, R. I.
 Greenman, Miss Gladys M., Dir. Kindergarten and Primary Grades, Greenwich, Conn.
 Greenwood, Professor Grace E., Florida State College for Women, Tallahassee, Fla.
 Gribbel, Professor S. C., Washington Univ., St. Louis, Mo.
 Griffin, Harold D., Dean, Crescent College, Eureka Springs, Ark.
 Griffin, Miss Hazelle B., Percy M. Hughes School for Crippled Children, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Griffin, Lee H., Ginn & Co., 2301 Prairie Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Griffin, Miss Margery M., 5557 Pershing Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
 Grizzard, Miss Mabel Youree, Prin., Central Ward School, Waxahachie, Texas.
 Grizzell, Professor E. D., Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Groves, Professor J. W., Fresno State College, Fresno, Cal.
 Gruenberg, Benjamin C., 418 Central Park, West, New York City.
 Gustafson, Professor David, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Gwinn, J. M., Supt. of Schools, San Francisco, Cal.
- Hacker, L. W., 500 Normal Ave., Normal, Ill.
 Haggerty, M. E., Dean, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Haines, Andrew S., 1129 Wakeling St., Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Haines, W. C., 320 Union St., Moncton, New Brunswick, Canada.
 Haisley, Otto W., Supt. of Schools, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Hake, Miss Anna M., High School, 230 Springs Ave., Gettysburg, Pa.
 Hall, George F., Supt. of Schools, High School, Grantwood, N. J.
 Hall, Dr. John W., University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
 Halleck, Reuben Post, 1154 So. Third Ave., Louisville, Ky.
 Hamilton, E. D., Prin. Simmons School, St. Louis, Mo.
 Hamilton, Katharine, Dept. of Educ., Endicott Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
 Hamlin, H. M., 227 Russell Ave., Ames, Iowa.
 Hanna, Paul B., Seth Low Hall, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Hansen, Einar A., College of Education, Ohio Univ., Athens, Ohio.
 Hansen, G. S., Superintendent of Schools, Safford, Arizona.
 Hanson, Professor W. L., Boston University, Boston, Mass.
 Harap, Dr. Henry, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Hardy, Miss Rose Lees, Asst. Supt. of Schools, Washington, D. C.
 Hare, H. Frank, Supv. Principal, Camp Hill, Pa.
 Harnesberger, Miss Virginia, State Teachers College, Harrisonburg, Va.
 Harper, J. R., Supt. of Schools, Wilmette, Illinois.
 Harris, Miss Alice L., Asst. Supt. of Schools, City Hall, Worcester, Mass.
 Harris, Mrs. Grace M., Prin., Park School, Brookline, Mass.
 Harrison, Miss Mary R., Head, Dept. Educ., Park College, Parkville, Mo.
 Hart, Professor Walter W., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 Hartill, Rufus M., Prin., Middle Village School, Ridgewood Sta., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Hartman, B. M., 170 W. Franklin Ave., Midland Park, N. J.
 Haskell, Charles O., Supt. of Schools, Bartelsville, Okla.
 Hatcher, W. B., Supt. of Schools, Baton Rouge, La.
 Hatfield, W. W., Head, Dept. of English, Chicago Normal College, Chicago, Ill.
 Hausauer, Mrs. Mathilda W., 92 Wallace Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.
 Haviland, Walter W., Prin., Friends' Select School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Hawkins, Geo. L., 911 Locust St., St. Louis, Mo.
 Haycock, Robert L., Asst. Supt., 1606 Longfellow St., Washington, D. C.
 Reckert, J. W., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

- Heckman, Dr. Samuel B., College of City of New York, New York City.
Hedrick, E. H., Supt. of Schools, Medford, Ore.
Heffelfinger, John B., Supt. of Schools, Newton, Kan.
Helms, W. T., Supt. of Schools, Richmond, Cal.
Hendrix, H. E., Supt. of Schools, Mesa, Ariz.
Henry, Professor Nelson B., School of Education, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Henry, Dr. T. S., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Herlinger, H. V., Supt. of Schools, Midland, Pa.
Herriott, M. E., Board of Education, Los Angeles, Cal.
Herron, Miss Helen, 1933 Elysian Fields Ave., New Orleans, La.
Herron, Miss Lucile F., 2047 N. New Jersey St., Indianapolis, Ind.
Hertzler, Dr. Silas, Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.
Heyl, Miss Helen Hay, State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.
Hicks, J. Allen, National Research Council, Washington, D. C.
Hill, Howard C., School of Educ., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Hill, Professor Patty S., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Hill, William C., Prin., Central High School, Springfield, Mass.
Hillegas, Professor M. B., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Hilliard, George H., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Hirsch, Miss Blanche, Prin., Alcuin Preparatory School, New York City.
Hockett, John A., School of Education, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Hodgkins, George W., 1821 Kalorama Rd., Washington, D. C.
Hoekje, John C., Registrar, Western State Normal School, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Hogan, Miss Frances M., 1016 Wood St., Houston, Texas.
Hogan, Dr. Ralph M., Y. M. C. A., Tsinan, Shantung, China.
Hoke, Kremer J., Dean, College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Va.
Hollis, E. V., Morehead State Teachers College, Morehead, Ky.
Holmes, J. R., 613 N. Grand, Okmulgee, Okla.
Holt, Marx E., Prin. Seward School, Chicago, Ill.
Homburger, E. H., Woodward, Okla.
Hood, E. A., Prin., Grant School, 100 Limit Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Hook, T. E., Troy, Ohio.
Hopkins, Professor L. T., Lincoln School of Teachers College, New York City.
Hopper, A. M., State Dept. of Educ., Baton Rouge, La.
Horan, Miss Ellamay, 6946 Chappel Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Horn, Professor Ernest, State Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Horn, John Lewis, School of Education, Mills College P. O., Cal.
Horn, Miss Marion, Hamden, Conn.
Horridge, Professor F., 408 E. Esther St., Long Beach, Cal.
Hosie, Professor James F., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Hotz, H. G., University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
Howard, F. E., Hilo High School, Hilo, Hawaii, T. H.
Howard, George, County Supt. of Schools, Salisbury, N. C.
Howarth, Walter E., 1140 Allengrove St., Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hoyt, Franklin S., Houghton Mifflin Co., 2 Park St., Boston 8, Mass.
Hubbard, L. H., President, College of Industrial Arts, Denton, Texas.
Hudelson, Dr. Earl, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
Hudson, J. Jones, Cleveland School of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Hughes, Dr. J. M., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
Hughes, R. O., Asst. Dir. Curriculum Study and Research, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Hughes, W. H., 1058 N. Mentor, Pasadena, Cal.
Hull, Dr. Osman R., 5261 College View Ave., Eagle Rock, Cal.
Humphrey, C. F., Prin., Junior High School, Michigan City, Ind.
Humphreys, Miss Pauline A., Central Mo. State Teachers Coll., Warrensburg, Mo.
Hutson, P. W., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Hyde, Clement C., Prin., Hartford Public High School, Hartford, Conn.

- Hyde, Miss Eva Louise, Collegio Bennett, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
 Hyde, Richard E., Fairmount State Normal School, Fairmount, W. Va.
- Isanogle, A. M., Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.
- Jackson, C. E., 409 Union Court, Elizabeth, N. J.
 Jackson, L. L., Asst. Com. of Educ., Dept. of Pub. Instr., Trenton, N. J.
 Jacobs, Professor Ralph L., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Jagers, R. E., Department of Education, Frankfort, Ky.
 Jeddloh, Professor Henry J., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
 Jeffers, Fred A., Supt. of Schools, Painesdale, Mich.
 Jeffrey, R. G., Prin., Sawyer Avenue School, Chicago, Ill.
 Jemison, Miss Margaret, Emory University, Ga.
 Jensen, Frank A., Supt. of Schools, Rockford, Ill.
 Jensen, Milton B., Central State Teachers College, Mt. Pleasant, Mich.
 Jessen, Carl A., Secretary, Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
 Jewell, Ralph H., Alpha Phi Sigma House, State College, Pa.
 Johnson, A. W., Prin., Junior High School, Minot, N. D.
 Johnson, B. Lamar, State Teachers College, Montclair, N. J.
 Johnson, Professor F. W., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Johnson, H. O., Supt. of Schools, Kenton, Mich.
 Johnson, Laurence C., Prin., Orchard Park Consolidated School, Orchard Park, N. Y.
- Johnston, Miss Helen, 445 Jackson St., Rochester, Pa.
 Johnston, Kathryn, Prin., Hawthorne School, Helena, Mont.
 Johnston, W. B., 3400 Columbia Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Jones, Arthur J., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Jones, Galen, Asst. Supt. in charge Secondary Schools, Tulsa, Okla.
 Jones, George Ellis, 73 Harwood St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Jones, T. J., 621 71st Ave., West Allis, Wis.
 Jordan, Floyd, Teachers College, Syracuse Univ., Syracuse, N. Y.
 Jordan, Dr. R. H., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Judd, C. H., Director, School of Educ., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Jung, Miss Elizabeth, 97 East Lane Ave., Columbus, Ohio.
- Kallen, H. M., 66 West 12th Street, New York City.
 Kallen, Miss Miriam, Teachers College of the City of Boston, Boston, Mass.
 Kallom, Arthur W., Board of Education, Boston, Mass.
 Katterjohn, H., 176 Marquoit Place, Elmhurst, Ill.
 Kaufmann, Miss Myrtle L., Asst. Supt. of Schools, Spokane, Wash.
 Kearney, Leo I., Board of Education, New York City.
 Keating, John Francis, Supt. of Schools, Pueblo, Colo.
 Keener, E. E., Box 127, Lagrange, Ill.
 Kefauver, Professor G. N., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Keith, Allen P., 20 Locust St., New Bedford, Mass.
 Keith, Miss Edna, Elementary Supervisor, Joliet, Ill.
 Kelihor, Miss Alice V., Yale Clinic of Child Development, New Haven, Conn.
 Keller, Lester E., 415 Kirkwood Blvd., Davenport, Iowa.
 Kelley, Professor Truman L., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 Kelly, F. J., Pres., University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
 Kelly, Fred E., Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.
 Kelsey, Mrs. Minnie Carson, 1096 Hillside Ave., Stratford, Conn.
 Kemp, W. W., Dean, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
 Kent, Raymond A., University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.
 Kerr, W. H., Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Cal.
 Keys, Noel, Haviland Hall, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Cal.
 Kilpatrick, Professor W. H., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.

- Kimmel, W. G., 1004 Physics Building, Columbia University, New York City.
 King, Professor LeRoy A., Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Kirby, Professor Thomas J., State Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Kirk, John R., State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo.
 Kitson, Professor Harry D., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Kline, Charles W., East High School, Waterloo, Iowa.
 Kline, Leroy J., Supv. Principal, Williamstown, Pa.
 Klisc, Miss Nira M., Clarinda, Iowa.
 Knight, Professor F. B., State Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Knox, William F., Superintendent of Schools, Jefferson City, Mo.
 Koch, Professor H. C., Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
 Koch, Professor Helen L., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Kohs, Samuel C., Federation of Jewish Charities, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Koontz, Norman C., Supt. of Schools, Indiana, Pa.
 Koos, Frank H., 832 Piedmont Ave., Winston-Salem, N. C.
 Koos, Professor Leonard V., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Kramer, Miss Sophia, Pewaukee, Wis.
 Kranz, George A., Prin. of Schools, Sweet Grass, Mont.
 Krishnayya, Professor Stephen G., Mysore University, Mysore, India.
 Kruse, Professor Paul J., N. Y. State College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Kuehn, Miss Nita E., 2708 Clark Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.
 Kutz, R. M., Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.
 Kyte, Professor George C., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Lackey, Professor E. E., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Lackey, Guy A., Oklahoma Agricultural & Mechanical Col., Stillwater, Okla.
 Lamport, H. B., Director of Instruction, Highland Park, Mich.
 Lane, R. H., Deputy Supt., Chamber of Commerce Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.
 Langdon, Miss Grace, Apt. 22, 21 Claremont Ave., New York City.
 Langworthy, Harry W., Supt. of Schools, Gloversville, N. Y.
 Lantrip, Miss Dora B., 4525 McKinney Ave., Houston, Texas.
 LaPoe, James L., Bur. Educ. Research, Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio.
 Laramy, Robert E., Supt. of Schools, Altoona, Pa.
 Larson, J. A., 1622 Woodrow, Little Rock, Ark.
 Latham, O. Ray, Pres., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
 Lathshaw, Harry F., Dir. of Special Education, Baltimore, Md.
 Lawton, Miss Louisa H., Rogers Clark Ballard School, Louisville, Ky.
 Layton, S. H., 285 W. Williams St., Delaware, Ohio.
 Layton, Warren K., Asst. Dir. Guidance and Placement, Detroit, Mich.
 Leal, Miss Mary A., So. Phila. High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Leath, Miss Mary, Primary Supervisor, 1598 Carr Ave., Memphis, Tenn.
 Lebeis, Miss Clara D., Dept. of Educ., St. Paul, Minn.
 Lee, Miss Frances, The Lee School, 107 Marlborough St., Boston, Mass.
 Lehman, Harvey C., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
 Lehman, Miss Ruth, Dept. of Home Economics, Univ. of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
 Leker, Chas. A., Polytechnic Institute of Porto Rico, San German, Porto Rico.
 Lemon, J. E., Superintendent of Schools, Blue Island, Ill.
 Leonard, J. Paul, 509 W. 121st St., New York City.
 Lessenger, W. E., Detroit Teachers College, Detroit, Mich.
 Lewis, Fred D., Lincoln Junior High School, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Ligon, Professor M. E., 658 South Lime, Lexington, Ky.
 Lincoln, Edward A., Grad. Sch. of Educ., Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
 Liveright, Miss Alice K., Prin., Andrew Jackson School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Livesay, Professor T. M., Univ. of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.
 Livingood, F. G., Dept. of Education, Washington College, Chestertown, Md.
 Lockwood, Miss Jessie M., Prin., John Muir School, Seattle, Wash.
 Loewenstein, Miss Fannie H., Southern Junior High School, Louisville, Ky.

- Logan, Miss Anna E., 112 N. Campus Ave., Oxford, Ohio.
 Logan, L. E., Dean, Morristown Normal and Industrial College, Morristown, Tenn.
 Long, George E., Prin., Mooresville High School, Mooresville, Ind.
 Longshore, W. T., 520 W. 40th St., Kansas City, Mo.
 Longstreet, R. J., Peninsula Station, Daytona Beach, Fla.
 Lord, L. C., Pres., Eastern Ill. State Teachers College, Charleston, Ill.
 Lorge, Irving, Box 466, 525 W. 120th St., New York City.
 Lowry, Charles D., 628 Foster St., Evanston, Ill.
 Luckey, Dr. Bertha M., Board of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Lull, H. G., Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kan.
 Lundeen, Earnest W., Cotner College, Bethany Station, Lincoln, Neb.
 Lutes, O. S., University of Maine, Orono, Me.
 Lyons, Miss Sarah A., 15 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
- MacKay, James L., 573 S. Clay Ave., Kirkwood, Mo.
 MacLatchy, Miss Josephine, Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio.
 MacMillan, Dr. D. P., 460 S. State St., Chicago, Ill.
 MacQuarrie, T. W., Pres., State Teachers College, San Jose, Cal.
 McAllister, Cloyd N., Berea, Ky.
 McAuliffe, Miss Mary F., Albert Palmer School, Boston, Mass.
 McCallister, J. M., Northern Normal and Industrial School, Aberdeen, S. D.
 McCarthy, J. C., 789 Orange St., New Haven, Conn.
 McCarty, Professor Stella A., Dept. of Education, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.
 McClure, Worth, Superintendent of Schools, Seattle, Wash.
 McClusky, Howard Y., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 McCormick, Firman S., 15,119 Esther Ave., Lakewood, Ohio.
 McCormick, J. Scott, Bureau of Educ., Manila, Philippine Islands.
 McDade, James E., Asst. Supt. of Schools, 460 S. State St., Chicago, Ill.
 McDonald, Miss Mary L., 159 W. Kingsbridge Road, New York City.
 McDonald, Robert A. F., Bates College, Lewiston, Me.
 McDonald, Mrs. V. R., 2607 Oakland Ave., Nashville, Tenn.
 McDonough, E. M., Asst. Dir. of Evening Schools, 15 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
 McDonough, William P., 36 Winthrop St., Charlestown, Mass.
 McFarland, George A., Pres., State Teachers College, Minot, N. D.
 McGucken, William J., St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.
 McIsaac, Professor John S., Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.
 McKee, W. J., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
 McKinney, H. T., Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va.
 McKinney, James, American School, Drexel Ave. and 58th St., Chicago, Ill.
 McMullin, Walter G., Dist. Supt., 12th and Wharton Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
 McNeill, Rev. Leon A., 307 East Central Ave., Wichita, Kan.
- Mabrey, F. D., Prin., Englewood Intermediate School, Englewood, N. J.
 Magill, Professor Walter H., Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Mahoney, Professor John J., Boston University, Boston, Mass.
 Malott, Jas. I., State Teachers College, Rivor Falls, Wis.
 Manahan, J. L., University of Virginia, University, Va.
 Mann, Carleton H., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Manry, James C., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Manuel, Professor H. T., University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
 Markowitz, Miss Martha B., Superv. Training, Mt. Auburn Training Sch., Cleveland, Ohio.
 Marks, Professor Sallie B., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
 Marrs, S. M. N., State Supt. of Pub. Instruction, Austin, Texas.
 Martin, A. E., Prin. McCoy Public School, Kansas City, Mo.
 Martin, T. J., Prin., Lincoln Grammar School, Honolulu, T. H.
 Masson, J. S., Asst. Supt. of Schools, Lorain, Ohio.

- Masters, Dr. Harry V., Washington State Normal, Bellingham, Wash.
 Masters, J. G., Prin., Central High School, Omaha, Neb.
 Mathews, Professor C. O., Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
 Maxfield, Francis N., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Maxwell, C. E., Dean, College of Educ., University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
 May, E. O., Prin., Township High School, Robinson, Ill.
 Mayberry, Lawrence W., Wichita, Kan.
 Maynard, M. M., Dept. of Educ., Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.
 Mead, Professor Arthur R., Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
 Mead, Professor Cyrus D., University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
 Meek, Dr. Lois H., Child Dev. Inst., Columbia University, New York City.
 Meeks, Miss Rose I., 8641 143rd St., Jamaica, N. Y.
 Meigs, Mrs. H. C., 839 75th Ave., West Allis, Wis.
 Melby, Ernest O., School of Education, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
 Melcher, George, Supt. of Schools, Kansas City, Mo.
 Meltzer, Dr. H., Psychiatric Clinic, Dept. Public Welfare, St. Louis, Mo.
 Mendenhall, Edgar, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kan.
 Meredith, Professor A. B., New York University, New York City.
 Meriam, Professor J. L., University of California, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Merritt, Mrs. Lillian H., Elem. Supervisor, 321 Turin St., Rome, N. Y.
 Merry, Mrs. Frieda Kiefer, Supv. Special Studies, Perkins Inst. for the Blind,
 Watertown, Mass.
 Messler, W. A., State Normal School, Jersey City, N. J.
 Metcalfe, Mrs. Zaida Miner, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Mildred, Sister M., St. Francis Convent, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Miller, C. S., Lansdowne, Pa.
 Miller, Charles W., Prin., West Street School, Newburgh, N. Y.
 Miller, Irving E., State Normal School, Bellingham, Wash.
 Miller, Lawrence Wm., 2257 S. Filmore St., Denver, Colo.
 Miller, Professor W. S., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Mills, Professor C. N., Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Ill.
 Moehlman, Dr. A. B., School of Educ., Univ. of Mich., Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Monroe, Dr. Walter S., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
 Moore, Miss Annie E., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Moore, Clyde B., Caldwell Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Moore, Miss Helen J., 1834 13th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Moran, Rev. Thomas, 958 W. 57th St., Los Angeles, Cal.
 Morris, Professor J. V. L., Northwestern State Teachers College, Alva, Okla.
 Morrison, Miss Fanny, 169 Mt. Vernon St., Dover, N. H.
 Morrison, Professor H. C., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Morrison, J. Cayce, State Dept. of Education, Albany, N. Y.
 Morris, Mrs. Elizabeth C., Rural Supervisor, Buncombe Co., Asheville, N. C.
 Morrow, Mrs. Fidelia Page, Red Lodge, Mont.
 Morse, Miss Lucia B., Downer's Grove, Ill.
 Mort, Professor Paul, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Morton, R. L., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
 Mossman, Professor Lois C., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Mowry, Warren W., District Supt., Loudon District Public Schools, South
 Charleston, W. Va.
 Moyers, A. Edison, Supt. of Schools, Sidney, Iowa.
 Mueller, Professor A. D., University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
 Mucrman, J. C., 113 N. Duck St., Stillwater, Okla.
 Muga, Miss Mary A. S., Asst. Supt. of Schools, Fall River, Mass.
 Mulholland, Miss Mary, Prin., Lake Street School, Kalamazoo, Mich.
 Munson, Oscar F., 4309½ Clinton St., Los Angeles, Cal.
 Murphy, Miss Eleanor J., 95 Alban St., Dorchester, Mass.
 Murphy, Miss Mary E., Dir., Elizabeth McCormick Mem. Fund, Chicago, Ill.

- Myers, C. E., R.F.D. 1, Camp Hill, Pa.
 Myers, Garry C., Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Myers, Professor George E., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Nagle, J. Stewart, Exec. Sec. China Child Welfare, Inc., Baltimore, Md.
 Nash, H. B., Dir., Dept. Educ. Measurements, Public Schools, West Allis, Wis.
 Nation, Seth, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Neal, Miss Elma A., Dir. Elem. Educ., San Antonio, Texas.
 Nelson, Milton G., New York State College for Teachers, Albany, N. Y.
 Nelson, M. J., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
 Nelson, N. P., State Normal School, Oshkosh, Wis.
 Netherland, Mrs. Rosa S., 613 Third St., N. E., Washington, D. C.
 Newlon, Jesse H., Apt. 71, 21 Claremont Ave., New York City.
 Newman, Hugo, Prin. New York Training School for Teachers, New York City.
 Nicholls, Miss Feodore M., Perkins Institution for the Blind, Watertown, Mass.
 Nichols, C. A., Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.
 Nicholson, Miss Nell Grant, 6410 San Bonito Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
 Nietz, Professor John A., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Nifenecker, Eugene A., Board of Educ., 500 Park Ave., New York City.
 Noble, Stuart G., Dept. of Educ., Tulane Univ., New Orleans, La.
 Norem, Grant M., State Teachers College, Minot, N. D.
 North, Ward T., Supt. of Schools, Corydon, Iowa.
 Norton, John K., Director, Research Div., N.E.A., Washington, D. C.
 Norton, Dr. Margaret Alltucker, 1201 16th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Nuttall, L. John, Dean, Col. of Educ., 360 No. Univ. Ave., Provo, Utah.
 Nutterville, Miss Catherine, Board of Education, Butte, Mont.
- O'Brien, F. P., Dir., Bur. Sch. Serv. and Res., Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.
 O'Hearn, Miss Mary, 11 Copley St., Roxbury, Mass.
 Ojemann, R. H., State University of Iowa, Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, Iowa City, Iowa.
 O'Keefe, Timothy, St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn.
 Olson, Willard C., School of Education, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 O'Neil, Joseph A. F., Prescott School, Elm St., Charlestown, Mass.
 Oppenheimer, J. J., University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.
 Opstad, Iver A., 513 Grant St., Iowa City, Iowa.
 Osburn, Dr. W. J., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Otterman, Charles, 3301 Observatory Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Overman, James R., Head, Dept. of Math., State College, Bowling Green, Ohio.
 Owen, Dr. E. D., Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Owens, Glenn, Prin., Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md.
- Padin, Dr. José, Commissioner of Education, San Juan, Porto Rico.
 Palmer, Miss Grace, Librarian, State Teachers College, Springfield, Mo.
 Palmer, James B., 6 Chestnut St., Potsdam, N. Y.
 Palmer, Miss Luella A., 424 East 57th St., New York City.
 Panlasigui, Isidoro, Univ. of the Philippines, Manila, P. I.
 Park, M. G., State Normal School, Cortland, N. Y.
 Parker, Miss Edith P., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Parkins, Professor A. E., George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
 Partch, C. E., Act'g Dean, Sch. of Educ., Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, N. J.
 Patrick, Miss Mary L., Prin., Vanderpoel School, Chicago, Ill.
 Patterson, E. S., 725 N. 14th St., Keokuk, Iowa.
 Patterson, Herbert, Dean, Sch. of Educ., Oklahoma A. & M. Col., Stillwater, Okla.
 Patterson, Miss Mildred V. W., 1710 6th St., Rensselaer, N. Y.
 Patty, Professor W. W., School of Educ., Indiana Univ., Bloomington, Ind.
 Pauly, Frank B., Dir. of Research, Board of Education, Tulsa, Okla.

- Payne, Professor A. C., Indiana State Teachers Coll., Terre Haute, Ind.
Payne, Professor E. George, New York Univ., Washington Sq., New York City.
Peet, Miss Harriett E., 8 Willard St., Cambridge, Mass.
Peik, W. E., Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Pendleton, Charles S., George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Penfold, Arthur, 332 Beard Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.
Peters, C. W., Dir. of Educational Research, State College, Pa.
Petersen, Miss Anna J., 201 Ward St., New Brunswick, N. J.
Petit, L. H., Supt. of Schools, Chanute, Kan.
Philhower, Chas. A., Supv. Prin., Westfield, N. J.
Phillips, J. J., Supt. of Schools, Lancaster, Ohio.
Pickell, Frank G., Supt. of Schools, Montclair, N. J.
Piedalue, Miss Mary B., 49 Church Lane, Scarsdale, N. Y.
Pieper, Professor Charles J., New York University, Washington Square East,
New York City.
Pierce, Professor Mary D., State Teachers College, Farmville, Va.
Pillsbury, W. H., Pelham, N. Y.
Pinkston, Miss Eva G., 5652 Belmont Ave., Dallas, Texas.
Pintner, Professor Rudolf, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Piper, Ernest E., 63 E. Hancock Ave., Detroit, Mich.
Pittman, Dr. M. S., Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich.
Porter, David C., State Teachers College, Slippery Rock, Pa.
Powers, J. Orin, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
Powers, S. R., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Prather, A. P., Superintendent of Schools, Earlington, Ky.
Pratt, O. C., Administration Bldg., Spokane, Wash.
Proctor, Professor Wm. M., Stanford University, Cal.
Pryor, Hugh C., Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kan.
Puckett, Roswell C., Director of High Schools, Toledo, Ohio.
Purchase, J. E., Prin., Teachers' Training College, Christchurch, New Zealand.
Purdom, Dr. T. Luther, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Radeliffe, Paul R., Supt. of Schools, Nutley, N. J.
Rader, L. W., 911 Locust Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Radley, Arthur A., Superv. Prin., Deposit High School, Deposit, N. Y.
Ball, E. E., Pres., North Central College, Naperville, Ill.
Ramsdell, Miss Maude, Hanover, Mich.
Randolph, Corliss F., Prin., 15th Avenue School, Newark, N. J.
Rankin, P. T., 16823 Plainview Rd., Detroit, Mich.
Rawdon, Howard L., Supt. of Schools, Oberlin, Ohio.
Reals, Professor Willis H., Dept. Educ., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Bearick, Miss Anna J., 2715 Olive St., St. Joseph, Mo.
Reavis, Dr. W. C., University of Chicago High School, Chicago, Ill.
Rector, Miss Lizzie E., 347 60th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Reed, Miss Mary M., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Reed, Professor S. L., Okla. Ag. & Mech. Coll., Stillwater, Okla.
Reeder, Professor Edwin H., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York
City.
Beeve, William D., 106 Morningside Drive, Apt. 92, New York City.
Reeves, Professor F. W., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Reid, O. L., Yale School, Youngstown, Ohio.
Reinhardt, Professor James M., University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
Reitz, W. L., 514 Fourth St., Oakmont, Pa.
Remmers, Herman, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Repp, Austin O., State Teachers College, Flagstaff, Ariz.
Reynolds, Fordyce T., Supt. of Schools, Gardner, Mass.
Reynolds, O. E., Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa.

- Rhoton, Professor A. L., Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
 Richardson, Miss Anna E., Amer. Home Economics Assoc., Washington, D. C.
 Richey, Herman G., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Ridgley, Professor Douglas C., Clark University, Worcester, Mass.
 Riefling, Miss B. Jeannette, 3171 Portis Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
 Riggs, F. B., Headmaster, Indian Mountain School, Lakeville, Conn.
 Riley, T. M., 200 La France Ave., Alhambra, Cal.
 Rinsland, Henry D., Sch. of Educ., Univ. of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
 Risk, Professor T. M., University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.
 Risley, James H., Supt. of School Dist. No. 1, Pueblo, Colo.
 Ritter, Elmer L., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
 Robbins, Professor Charles L., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Roberts, Professor Geo. L., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
 Rock, Robert T., Jr., Dept. of Psychology, Catholic Univ., Washington, D. C.
 Rodgers, J. Harvey, Superv. Prin., Glassboro Public Schools, Glassboro, N. J.
 Rodwell, Mrs. Rose M., 1029 Keyes Ave., Schenectady, N. Y.
 Rogers, Professor Agnes L., Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
 Rogers, Don C., Dir., Bur. of Bldg. Survey, 460 S. State St., Chicago, Ill.
 Rogers, Lester B., Dean, School of Educ., Univ. of So. Cal., Los Angeles, Cal.
 Rogers, V. M., Superintendent of Schools, Gunnison, Colo.
 Root, A. R., Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.
 Root, Charles C., State Teachers College, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Rosen, Ben, Associated Talmud Torahs, 330 S. 9th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Rosier, Joseph, Pres., Normal School, Fairmont, W. Va.
 Ross, C. C., University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
 Rowell, Arthur B., Supt. of Schools, 400 Washington Ave., Glencoe, Ill.
 Rowland, Albert Lindsay, Supt. of Schools, Cheltenham Twp., Elkins Park, Pa.
 Rowland, Sydney V., Supt. of Radnor Public Schools, Wayne, Pa.
 Ruch, Professor G. M., Haviland Hall, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Cal.
 Ruediger, Dr. W. C., George Washington Univ., Washington, D. C.
 Rufi, Professor John, School of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Rugg, Dr. Earle U., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo.
 Rugg, Dr. Harold, Lincoln School of Teachers College, New York City.
 Ruggles, Allen M., University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
 Rust, Miss Metta M., 434 West 120th St., New York City.
 Rutledge, R. E., Dir. Research and Auxiliary Agencies, Oakland, Cal.
 Ryan, H. H., Prin., Wisconsin High School, Madison, Wis.
 Ryan, Professor W. Carson, Jr., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
 Rynearson, Edward, Director Vocational Guidance, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Sachs, Dr. Julius, Columbia University, New York City.
 Sailer, T. H. P., 219 Walnut St., Englewood, N. J.
 Samuelson, Miss Agnes, Supt. of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa.
 Sanders, Miss Mary Shipp, Chief Supervisor of Rural Schools, Austin, Texas.
 Sanger, Wm. T., Pres., Medical College of Virginia, Richmond, Va.
 Saunders, Joseph H., 330 52nd St., Newport News, Va.
 Sauvain, Nelson, Devils Lake, N. D.
 Scarf, Professor Robert C., Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.
 Scheck, Charles C., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Schlegle, F. L., Asst. Supt. of Schools, Kansas City, Kan.
 Schmidt, Miss Evangeline, 669 12th Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.
 Schmidt, Professor G. A., Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo.
 Schmieding, Alfred, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill.
 Schorling, Raleigh, School of Education, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Schradieck, Miss Helen E., 1319 Carroll St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Schumacher, Very Rev. Matthew, Pres. College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.
 Schweppe, Miss Emma, 48 N. Walnut St., East Orange, N. J.

- Scoe, H. Jalmar, Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Scofield, E. J., Supt. of Schools, School District No. 44, Perham, Minn.
- Scott, F. A., 31 Blake St., Belmont, Mass.
- Scott, Zenos E., Supt. of Schools, Springfield, Mass.
- Seamans, Ray E., Vocational Director, West Newton, Pa.
- Seith, Miss Ellen E., 9516 115th St., Richmond Hill, N. Y.
- Sealock, W. E., Station A, Box 1372, Lincoln, Neb.
- Sears, Professor J. B., Stanford University, Cal.
- Segel, David, Dept. of Research, Long Beach City Schools, Long Beach, Cal.
- Selke, George A., Pres., State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minn.
- Serenius, A., University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Sexson, J. A., 320 E. Walnut St., Pasadena, Cal.
- Shales, J. M., Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.
- Shankland, Sherwood D., 1201 16th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Shanklin, W. R., Central Collegiate Institute, Moose Jaw, Sask., Canada.
- Sharlip, Lou N., Prin., William S. Stokley School, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Shaver, Professor J. T., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.
- Shaw, L. E., Prin., John B. Allen School, Seattle, Wash.
- Shea, Frank P., Prin., Mt. Pleasant School, New Bedford, Mass.
- Sheffer, W. E., Supt. of Schools, Manhattan, Kan.
- Shelters, Ronald R., Supt. of Schools, Watervliet, Mich.
- Shepard, Fred S., 43 High St., Passaic, N. J.
- Sherrod, Dr. C. C., Pres., East Tenn. State Teachers Coll., Johnson City, Tenn.
- Shinn, II. H., Superintendent of Schools, Hart, Mich.
- Shoemaker, W. A., 206½ W. 13th St., New York City.
- Shove, Miss Helen B., Prin., Longfellow School, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Short, Clarence A., Pres., Wesley Collegiate Institute, Dover, Del.
- Shotwell, Fred C., 1 School Plaza, Franklin, N. J.
- Shurtliff, Dean Oliver, Fairmont State Teachers College, Fairmont, W. Va.
- Sias, Professor A. B., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
- Sickles, F. J., Supt. of Schools, New Brunswick, N. J.
- Siepert, Albert F., Dean, Bradley Institute, Peoria, Ill.
- Silverberg, Miss Celia, Board of Education, Buffalo, N. Y.
- Simboli, Mrs. Grace E., 505 W. 122nd St., New York City.
- Simon, H. B., Superintendent of Schools, Norfolk, Neb.
- Simpkins, Rupert R., Dir. Training, Western State Teachers Coll., Macomb, Ill.
- Simpson, B. R., Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Singleton, Gordon G., Dept. of Education, Atlanta, Ga.
- Sipple, E. M., Director, The Park School, Baltimore, Md.
- Slauson, Herbert M., 433 S. 5th Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Smart, Frank L., Supt. of Schools, Davenport, Iowa.
- Smiley, Wm. H., Supt. Emeritus, 414 14th St., Denver, Colo.
- Smith, B. Glen, The Dixie College, Saint George, Utah.
- Smith, C. A., 4548 Flora Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
- Smith, Charles A., Supt. of Schools, Provo, Utah.
- Smith, Professor Dora V., Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Smith, Eugene E., Beaver Country Day School, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
- Smith, Francis F., 405 McKinley Ave., Fresno, Cal.
- Smith, Gerard T., Prin. Starrett School for Girls, 4515 Drexel Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
- Smith, Professor H. E., University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
- Smith, H. L., Dean, School of Educ., Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
- Smith, Harry P., Teachers College, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
- Smith, Miss Helen C., 821 Sixth St., S. E., Minneapolis, Minn.
- Smith, J. Russell, School of Business, Columbia University, New York City.
- Smith, James H., Superintendent of Schools, West Side, Aurora, Ill.
- Smith, Jesse L., 334 Vine Ave., Highland Park, Ill.

- Smith, L. W., Supt. of Schools, Berkeley, Cal.
 Smith, Mrs. Margaret M., Prin., Ebert School, Denver, Colo.
 Smith, Miss Nila B., 6653 Vinewood Ave., Detroit, Mich.
 Smith, Q. M., Pres., Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville, Tenn.
 Smith, William F., Supt. of Schools, Elwood, Ind.
 Smoot, Miss Lucy J., 4011 Baltimore, Kansas City, Mo.
 Snarr, O. W., Dir. of Training, State Teachers College, Mankato, Minn.
 Snavelly, F. B., Prin., Grammar School No. 8, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Snedden, Professor David, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Southall, Professor Maysie, Geo. Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
 Speer, Miss Dorothy, Isabella Thoburn College, Lucknow, U. P., India.
 Spencer, Professor Lloyd H., Northern Normal and Industrial School, Aberdeen, S. D.
 Spencer, Robert R., Prin., Washington Junior High School, Honolulu, Hawaii.
 Spencer, W. L., Superv. Secondary Education, Montgomery, Ala.
 Spozio, Mrs. Evangeline Adams, State Teachers College, San Francisco, Cal.
 Starch, Professor Daniel, 1874 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
 Stark, William E., Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.
 Steel, H. J., State Teachers College, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Steele, Miss Roxana A., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
 Stewart, Rolland M., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Stillwell, William Earle, Headmaster, University School, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Stockwell, Miss Bessie M., 403 Park St., Hackensack, N. J.
 Stoddard, George D., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Stone, C. T., Supt. of Schools, Long Branch, N. J.
 Stone, Dr. Cliff W., 603 Linden Ave., Pullman, Wash.
 Stone, Wm. H., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Stout, D. G., 324 College Ave., Ithaca, N. Y.
 Stoutemeyer, J. Howard, 1000 East King St., Franklin, Ind.
 Stratemeyer, Miss Florence, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Strayer, Professor George D., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Strecker, John K., Baylor University, Waco, Texas.
 Strong, B. Norman, Arsenal School, Hartford, Conn.
 Strong, Professor Edward K., Jr., Stanford University, Cal.
 Stuart, Miss Josephine B., 549 County St., New Bedford, Mass.
 Stull, DeForest, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Sullivan, Miss Helen E., 669 Hyde Park Ave., Roslindale, Mass.
 Sullivan, Miss Julia E., 9 Marion St., Charlestown, Mass.
 Sultzter, Miss Mary F., School 97, Jackson Place, Baltimore, Md.
 Sutherland, Miss Anne, Walnut Hill High School, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Sutherland, Dr. A. H., 54 W. 71st St., New York City.
 Suzzallo, Dr. Henry, The Carnegie Foundation, 522 5th Ave., New York City.
 Swasey, Miss Marion H., 58 Maple St., New Bedford, Mass.
 Sweeney, Miss Ellen C., Superv. Elem. Grades, New Bedford, Mass.
 Symonds, Percival M., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
- Talbot, John E., State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minn.
 Tall, Miss Lida Lee, Prin., Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.
 Tallman, R. W., Vice-Pres., Western State College of Colorado, Gunnison, Colo.
 Tanger, Landis, Pres., State Teachers College, Millersville, Pa.
 Tarbell, B. W., 3815 Vliet St., Milwaukee, Wis.
 Taylor, Joseph S., sometime Dist. Supt. of Schools, 2275 Loring Place, New York City.
 Teach, Charles E., San Luis Obispo, Cal.
 Temple, Professor Alice, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Terman, Professor Lewis M., Stanford University, Cal.
 Terry, Paul W., School of Educ., Univ. of Alabama, University, Ala.

- Thayer, Dr. V. T., 63rd St. and Central Park West, New York City.
 Theisen, Dr. W. W., Asst. Supt. of Schools, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Thomas, Oscar D., 6160 Webster St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Thompson, Clem O., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Thompson, Miss Mary A., 1111 McCausland Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
 Thompson, Robert S., 509 West 121st St., New York City.
 Thorndike, Professor Edward L., Columbia University, New York City.
 Thorne-Thomsen, Gudrun, Prin., Ojai Valley School, Ojai, Cal.
 Thorpe, B. R., Hiawatha, Kansas.
 Thralls, Miss Zoe A., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Threlkeld, A. L., Supt. of Schools, Denver, Colo.
 Thurber, Charles, Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass.
 Tibbets, Miss Anna, Greenville Woman's College, Greenville, S. C.
 Tidwell, R. E., Dir. Extension Div., Univ. of Alabama, University, Ala.
 Tireman, Dr. L. S., University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.
 Toaz, Robert K., Supt. of Schools, Huntington, Long Island, N. Y.
 Toops, Dr. Herbert A., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Tostlebe, M. F., Northern Normal and Industrial School, Aberdeen, S. D.
 Trabue, Professor M. E., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
 Tracy, Miss Bettie M., Director of Research, Wheeling, W. Va.
 Trainer, F. W., University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
 Trites, Miss Flora, Dept. of Educ., State of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
 Trow, Wm. Clark, School of Education, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Troxel, Professor O. L., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo.
 Truesdell, Benj. W., Vice-Prin., High School, Wichita, Kan.
 Turney, Professor Austin H., University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.
 Tustin, L. T., Dept. of Education, Charleston, W. Va.
 Tuttle, J. O., Ginn and Company, San Francisco, Cal.
 Tyler, Henry T., Chair. Dept. of Psychology, Teachers College, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Tyler, Ralph W., Bur. Educ. Research, Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio.
 Tyson, George R., Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.
- Uhl, W. L., Dean, School of Educ., Univ. of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
 Umstattd, J. G., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Updegraff, Dr. Harlan, 26 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
- Vakil, K. S., Educ. Inspector, Southern Div., Ahmendabad, Bombay, India.
 Vance, Professor Thomas F., Iowa State Coll. Agri. & Mech. Arts, Ames, Iowa.
 Van Dusen, Earl C., Superintendent of Schools, Little Falls, Minn.
 Van Ormer, A. B., Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa.
 Van Tassel, R. J., Dept. of Philosophy, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
 Van Wagenen, Dr. M. J., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Vincent, H. D., Superv. Prin., Public School 16, Troy, N. Y.
 Von Borgerode, Professor Fred, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Vorhies, F. W., Supt. of Schools, Colfax, Iowa.
 Vreeland, Wendell, Asst. Superv. of Research, Board of Education, Detroit, Mich.
- Waddell, Professor C. W., University of California, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Wager, Ralph E., Emory University, Ga.
 Wahl, O. E., Supt. of Schools, Long Prairie, Minn.
 Wahlert, Miss Jennie, 2918 Harper St., St. Louis, Mo.
 Wakeman, Seth, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
 Waldo, Dwight B., Pres., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
 Walker, Professor E. T., 6104 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Walker, Miss M. Eugenia, Baker Junior High School, Denver, Colo.
 Wallin, Dr. J. E. W., Atlantic University, Virginia Beach, Va.
 Walls, W. A., Supt. of Schools, Kent, Ohio.

- Walters, R. J., 2045 So. Clarkson St., Denver, Colo.
 Warner, Dr. William E., Dept. of Ind. Arts Educ., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio.
 Washburne, Carleton W., Supt. of Schools, Winnetka, Ill.
 Washburne, Professor John N., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Wass, Clifton Ennis, Marris, Conn.
 Watkins, Earl P., Supt. of Schools, Ilion, N. Y.
 Watkins, Ralph K., University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Watson, E. H., Dir. of Training, State Teachers College, Commerce, Texas.
 Watson, Miss Jennie A., Highland School, McKeesport, Pa.
 Watts, Rowland, 3315 Powhatan Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 Webb, L. W., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
 Webber, Geo. H., Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville, Ga.
 Weber, A. W., 2207 E. 85th St., Cleveland, Ohio.
 Weber, S. E., School Administration Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Webling, G. H., 1932 Bingham St., Honolulu, T. H.
 Webster, Dr. Geo. W., 30 N. Michigan Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
 Weersing, Professor F. J., Univ. of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Weglein, Professor David E., 2400 Linden Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 Weideman, Charles C., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
 Weinberg, Mrs. E. David, 525 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.
 Welling, Richard, Chairman, Self Government Committee, Inc., 2 Wall St., New York City.
 Wells, Guy F., New York Training School, 445 W. 135th St., New York City.
 Wells, S. R., Prin., Roosevelt High School, East Chicago, Ind.
 Welsh, Wm. Henry, Grant Bldg., 17th and Pine Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Wessels, Harry, Prin., Nathan Hale Junior High School, New Britain, Conn.
 West, Professor Henry S., University of Miami, Miami, Fla.
 West, Dr. Paul V., New York Univ., 32 Waverley Place, New York City.
 West, Roscoe L., Asst. Com. of Educ., Dept. of Public Instruction, Trenton, N. J.
 Westbrook, Dr. C. H., Dean, Shanghai College, Shanghai, China.
 Wheat, Leonard B., 509 W. 121st St., New York City.
 Whelan, Miss Louise M., 19 E. Hunter Ave., Maywood, N. J.
 Wherry, Neal M., Supt. of Schools, Holton, Kan.
 Whipple, Dr. Guy M., 10 Putnam St., Danvers, Mass.
 White, Frank S., Fairmont State Normal School, Fairmont, W. Va.
 White, Miss Edna N., Director, Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, Mich.
 Whitney, Albert W., 1 Park Ave., New York City.
 Whitney, Frank P., 2164 Taylor Rd., E. Cleveland, Ohio.
 Whitney, Frederick L., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo.
 Wickey, Miss Rose, 219 Library Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.
 Wilber, Miss Flora, Director Educ. and Mental Meas., Ft. Wayne, Ind.
 Wilcox, Miss Lillian A., 900 Gencsoe Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.
 Wilde, Arthur H., 125 Fair Oaks Park, Needham, Mass.
 Wiley, George M., Asst. Com. of Educ., State Education Dept., Albany, N. Y.
 Wiley, Ross B., Dept. of Public Instruction, Honolulu, T. H.
 Wilkerson, H. Clifton, 421 Roundtree Ave., Platteville, Wis.
 Willett, G. W., 428 So. Spring Ave., La Grange, Ill.
 Williams, Miss Annie C., School No. 56, Baltimore, Md.
 Williams, D. S., Supt. of Schools, Bozeman, Mont.
 Williams, Professor E. I. F., Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio.
 Williams, Lewis W., University High School, Urbana, Ill.
 Willing, Matthew H., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 Willingham, Henry J., Pres., State Normal School, Florence, Ala.
 Wills, Benj. G., Box 805, Arcata, Cal.
 Wilson, Bryan O., Apt. 23, 627 Lincoln Ave., Alameda, Cal.
 Wilson, Professor G. M., Boston University, Boston, Mass.

- Wilson, James H., Supt. of Schools, Rocky Ford, Colo.
Wilson, Mrs. Jessie W., 15 Arnold Place, Dayton, Ohio.
Wilson, Mrs. L. L. W., South High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
Winans, B. A., Supt., City Schools, Livingston, Mont.
Winchell, Professor Cora M., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Winter, Miss Olice, 3210 W. 66th St., Chicago, Ill.
Wiseman, Miss Ellen G., Girls' High School Colony, 620 Mass. Ave., Boston, Mass.
Witham, Ernest C., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
Woelfel, Norman, 503 W. 121st St., New York City.
Wolfe, A. A., Supt. of Schools, Kanawha, Iowa.
Wood, O. A., 4213 E. 58th St., Kansas City, Mo.
Wood, Thomas D., 525 W. 120th St., New York City.
Woods, Professor Roy C., Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.
Woods, Miss Velma E., Territorial Normal School, Honolulu, Hawaii.
Woody, Dr. Clifford, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Woolley, Dr. Helen T., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Worcester, Professor Dean A., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Works, Professor George A., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Worthington, Edward H., L. B. 80, Wyncote, Pa.
Wright, Miss Louise B., 1516 Denniston Av., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Wright, Owen B., 2131 30th St., Rock Island, Ill.
Wylie, Dr. Andrew T., New York Univ., Washington Sq., East, New York City.
- Yakel, Ralph, Supt. of Schools, Jacksonville, Ill.
Yoakum, G. A., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Yonkers, Ralph B., 5017 Griscom St., Frankfort, Philadelphia, Pa.
Young, John A., Asst. Supt. of Schools, Bridgeport, Conn.
Young, Leonard, Supt. of Schools, 226 North First Ave., E., Duluth, Minn.
Young, Ross N., Prin., Marshall High School, Minneapolis, Minn.
Young, William E., Supervisor, Hibbing, Minn.
- Zerbe, Hobson M., 285 Wyoming Ave., Kingston, Pa.
Ziegler, J. W., John C. Winston Co., 1006 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Zinns, Roland W., Prin., George W. Peckham Jr. High School, Milwaukee, Wis.
Zirbes, Miss Laura, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Zook, D. E., 6048 Kenwood Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Zornow, Theo. A., Prin., Madison Junior High School, Rochester, N. Y.
- ♦

•

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

1. **Purpose.** The purpose of the National Society is to promote the investigation and discussion of educational questions. To this end it holds an annual meeting and publishes a series of yearbooks.

2. **Eligibility to Membership.** Any person who is interested in receiving its publications may become a member by sending to the Secretary-Treasurer information concerning name, address, and class of membership desired (see Item 4) and a check for \$3.50 or \$3.00 (see Item 5).

Membership may not be had by libraries or by institutions.

3. **Period of Membership.** Applicants for membership may not date their entrance back of the current calendar year, and all memberships terminate automatically on December 31st, unless the dues for the ensuing year are paid as indicated in Item 6.

4. **Classes of Members.** Application may be made for either active or associate membership. Active members pay dues of \$2.50 annually, receive a cloth-bound copy of each publication, are entitled to vote, to participate in discussion and (under certain conditions) to hold office. Associate members pay dues of \$2.00 annually, receive a paper-bound copy of each publication, may attend the meetings of the Society, but may not vote, hold office, contribute to the yearbooks, or participate in discussion. The names of active members only are printed in the yearbooks. There were in 1930 about 1100 active and 1200 associate members.

5. **Entrance Fee.** New active and new associate members are required the first year to pay, in addition to the dues, an entrance fee of one dollar.

6. **Payment of Dues.** Statements of dues are rendered in October or November for the following calendar year. By vote of the Society at the 1919 meeting, "any member so notified whose dues remain unpaid on January 1st, thereby loses his membership and can be reinstated only by paying the entrance fee of one dollar required of new members."

School warrants and vouchers from institutions must be accompanied by definite information concerning the name and address and class of membership of the person for whom membership fee is being paid.

Cancelled checks serve as receipts. Members desiring an additional receipt must enclose a stamped and addressed envelope therefor.

7. **Distribution of Yearbooks to Members.** The yearbooks, ready prior to each February meeting, will be mailed from the office of the publishers, only to members whose dues for that year have been paid. Members who desire yearbooks prior to the current year must purchase them directly from the publishers (see Item 8).

8. **Commercial Sales.** The distribution of all yearbooks prior to the current year, and also of those of the current year not regularly mailed to

members in exchange for their dues, is in the hands of the publishers, not of the secretary. For such commercial sales, communicate directly with the Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois, which will gladly send a price list covering all the publications of this Society and of its predecessor, the National Herbart Society.

9. **Yearbooks.** The yearbooks are issued about one month before the February meeting. They comprise from 700 to 800 pages annually. Unusual effort has been made to make them, on the one hand, of immediate practical value, and on the other hand, representative of sound scholarship and scientific investigation. Many of them are the fruit of coöperative work by committees of the Society.

10. **Meetings.** The annual meetings, at which the yearbooks are discussed, are held in February at the same time and place as the meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Applications for membership will be handled promptly at any time on receipt of name and address, together with check for the appropriate amount (\$3.50 for new active membership, \$3.00 for new associate membership). Generally speaking, applications entitle the new member to the yearbook slated for discussion during the calendar year the application is made, but those received in December are regarded as pertaining to the next calendar year.

GUY M. WHIPPLE, Secretary-Treasurer.

10 Putnam Street,
Danvers, Mass.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL HERBERT SOCIETY

(Now the National Society for the Study of Education)

	Postpaid Price
First Yearbook, 1895.....	\$0.79
First Supplement to First Yearbook.....	.28
Second Supplement to First Yearbook.....	.27
Second Yearbook, 1896.....	.85
Supplement to Second Yearbook.....	.27
Third Yearbook, 1897.....	.85
Note—Ethical Principles Underlying Education. John Dewey. Reprinted from Third Yearbook.....	.27
Supplement to Third Yearbook.....	.27
Fourth Yearbook, 1898.....	.79
Supplement to Fourth Yearbook.....	.28
Fifth Yearbook, 1899.....	.79
Supplement to Fifth Yearbook.....	.54

PUBLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

	Postpaid Price
First Yearbook, 1902, Part I—Some Principles in the Teaching of History. Lucy M. Salmon.....	\$0.54
First Yearbook, 1902, Part II—The Progress of Geography in the Schools. W. M. Davis and H. M. Wilson.....	.53
Second Yearbook, 1903, Part I—The Course of Study in History in the Common School. Isabel Lawrence, C. A. McMurry, Frank McMurry, E. C. Page, and E. J. Rice.....	.53
Second Yearbook, 1903, Part II—The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education. M. J. Holmes, J. A. Keith, and Levi Seeley.....	.53
Third Yearbook, 1904, Part I—The Relation of Theory to Practice in the Education of Teachers. John Dewey, Sarah C. Brooks, F. M. McMurry, <i>et al.</i>53
Third Yearbook, 1904, Part II—Nature Study. W. S. Jackman.....	.85
Fourth Yearbook, 1905, Part I—The Education and Training of Secondary Teachers. E. C. Elliott, E. G. Dexter, M. J. Holmes, <i>et al.</i>85
Fourth Yearbook, 1905, Part II—The Place of Vocational Subjects in the High- School Curriculum. J. S. Brown, G. B. Morrison, and Ellen H. Richards.....	.53
Fifth Yearbook, 1906, Part I—On the Teaching of English in Elementary and High Schools. G. F. Brown and Emerson Davis.....	.53
Fifth Yearbook, 1906, Part II—The Certification of Teachers. E. P. Cubberley.....	.64
Sixth Yearbook, 1907, Part I—Vocational Studies for College Entrance. C. A. Herrick, H. W. Holmes, T. deLaguna, V. Prettyman, and W. J. S. Bryan.....	.70
Sixth Yearbook, 1907, Part II—The Kindergarten and Its Relation to Elementary Education. Ada Van Stone Harris, E. A. Kirkpatrick, Maria Kraus-Bocité, Patty S. Hill, Harriette M. Mills, and Nina Vandewaiker.....	.70
Seventh Yearbook, 1908, Part I—The Relation of Superintendents and Principals to the Training and Professional Improvement of Their Teachers. Charles D. Lowry.....	.78
Seventh Yearbook, 1908, Part II—The Co-ordination of the Kindergarten and the Elementary School. B. J. Gregory, Jennie B. Merrill, Bertha Payne, and Margaret Giddings.....	.78
Eighth Yearbook, 1909, Parts I and II—Education with Reference to Sex. C. R. Henderson, and Helen C. Putnam. Both parts.....	1.60
Ninth Yearbook, 1910, Part I—Health and Education. T. D. Wood.....	.85
Ninth Yearbook, 1910, Part II—The Nurse in Education. T. D. Wood, <i>et al.</i>78

Tenth Yearbook, 1911, Part I—The City School as a Community Center. H. C. Leipziger, Sarah E. Hyre, R. D. Warden, O. Ward Crampton, E. W. Stitt, E. J. Ward, Mrs. E. C. Grice, and C. A. Perry.....	.78
Tenth Yearbook, 1911, Part II—The Rural School as a Community Center. B. H. Crocheron, Jessie Field, F. W. Howe, E. C. Bishop, A. B. Graham, O. J. Kern, M. T. Scudder, and B. M. Davis.....	.79
Price for Yearbooks VI to X inclusive, 8 vo. cloth.....	5.00
Eleventh Yearbook, 1912, Part I—Industrial Education: Typical Experiments Described and Interpreted. J. F. Barker, M. Bloomfield, B. W. Johnson, P. Johnson, L. M. Leavitt, G. A. Mirick, M. W. Murray, C. F. Perry, A. L. Safford, and H. B. Wilson.....	.85
Eleventh Yearbook, 1912, Part II—Agricultural Education in Secondary Schools. A. C. Monahan, R. W. Stimson, D. J. Crosby, W. H. French, H. F. Button, F. R. Crane, W. R. Hart, and G. F. Warren.....	.85
Twelfth Yearbook, 1913, Part I—The Supervision of City Schools. Franklin Bobbitt, J. W. Hall, and J. D. Wolcott.....	.85
Twelfth Yearbook, 1913, Part II—The Supervision of Rural Schools. A. C. Monahan, L. J. Hanifan, J. E. Warren, Wallace Lund, U. J. Hoffman, A. S. Cook, E. M. Rapp, Jackson Davis, and J. D. Wolcott.....	.85
Thirteenth Yearbook, 1914, Part I—Some Aspects of High-School Instruction and Administration. H. C. Morrison, E. R. Breslich, W. A. Jessup, and L. D. Coffman.....	.85
Thirteenth Yearbook, 1914, Part II—Plans for Organizing School Surveys, with a Summary of Typical School Surveys. Charles H. Judd, and Henry L. Smith..	.79
Fourteenth Yearbook, 1915, Part I—Minimum Essentials in Elementary School Subjects—Standards and Current Practices. H. B. Wilson, H. W. Holmes, F. E. Thompson, R. G. Jones, S. A. Curtis, W. S. Gray, F. N. Freeman, H. C. Pryor, J. F. Hosc, W. A. Jessup, and W. C. Bagley.....	.85
Fourteenth Yearbook, 1915, Part II—Methods for Measuring Teachers' Efficiency. Arthur C. Boyce.....	.79
Fifteenth Yearbook, 1916, Part I—Standards and Tests for the Measurement of the Efficiency of Schools and School Systems. G. D. Strayer, Bird T. Baldwin, B. R. Buckingham, M. R. Trabue, F. W. Ballou, D. C. Bliss, E. G. Childs, S. A. Curtis, E. P. Cubberley, C. H. Judd, George Melcher, E. E. Oberholtzer, J. B. Sears, Daniel Starch, and G. M. Whipple.....	.85
Fifteenth Yearbook, 1916, Part II—The Relationship Between Persistence in School and Home Conditions. Charles E. Holley.....	.87
Fifteenth Yearbook, 1916, Part III—The Junior High School. Aubrey A. Douglass..	.85
Sixteenth Yearbook, 1917, Part I—Second Report of The Committee on Minimum Essentials in Elementary-School Subjects. W. C. Bagley, W. W. Charters, F. N. Freeman, W. S. Gray, Ernest Horn, J. E. Hoskinson, W. S. Monroe, C. F. Munson, H. C. Pryor, L. W. Rapeer, G. M. Wilson, and H. B. Wilson....	1.00
Sixteenth Yearbook, 1917, Part II—The Efficiency of College Students as Conditioned by Age at Entrance and Size of High School. B. F. Pittenger.....	.85
Seventeenth Yearbook, 1918, Part I—Third Report of the Committee on Economy of Time in Education. W. C. Bagley, B. B. Bassett, M. E. Branom, Alice Camerer, J. E. Dealey, C. A. Ellwood, E. B. Greene, A. B. Hart, J. F. Hosc, E. T. Housh, W. H. Mace, L. R. Marston, E. C. McKown, H. E. Mitchell, W. O. Reavis, D. Snedden, and H. B. Wilson.....	.85
Seventeenth Yearbook, 1918, Part II—The Measurement of Educational Products. E. J. Ashbaugh, W. A. Averill, L. P. Ayres, F. W. Ballou, Edna Bryner, B. E. Buckingham, S. A. Curtis, M. E. Haggerty, C. H. Judd, George Melcher, W. S. Monroe, E. A. Nifenecker, and E. L. Thorndike.....	1.00
Eighteenth Yearbook, 1919, Part I—The Professional Preparation of High-School Teachers. G. M. Cade, S. S. Colvin, Charles Fordyce, H. H. Foster, T. W. Gosling, W. S. Gray, L. V. Koos, A. R. Mead, H. L. Miller, F. C. Whitcomb, and Clifford Woody.....	1.65
Eighteenth Yearbook, 1919, Part II—Fourth Report of Committee on Economy of Time in Education. F. C. Ayer, F. N. Freeman, W. S. Gray, Ernest Horn, W. S. Monroe, and C. E. Seashore.....	1.10
Nineteenth Yearbook, 1920, Part I—New Materials of Instruction. Prepared by the Society's Committee on Materials of Instruction.....	1.10
Nineteenth Yearbook, 1920, Part II—Classroom Problems in the Education of Gifted Children. T. S. Henry.....	1.00
Twentieth Yearbook, 1921, Part I—New Materials of Instruction. Second Report by the Society's Committee.....	1.80

Twentieth Yearbook, 1921, Part II—Report of the Society's Committee on Silent Reading. M. A. Burgess, S. A. Curtis, C. E. Germane, W. S. Gray, H. A. Greene, Regina R. Heller, J. H. Hoover, J. A. O'Brien, J. L. Packer, Daniel Starch, W. W. Theisen, G. A. Yoakum, and representatives of other school systems	1.10
Twenty-First Yearbook, 1922, Parts I and II—Intelligence Tests and Their Use. Part I—The Nature, History, and General Principles of Intelligence Testing. E. L. Thorndike, S. S. Colvin, Harold Rugg, G. M. Whipple. Part II—The Administrative Use of Intelligence Tests. H. W. Holmes, W. K. Layton, Helen Davis, Agnes L. Rogers, Rudolph Pintner, M. R. Trabue, W. S. Miller, Bessie L. Gambrell, and others. The two parts are bound together.	1.60
Twenty-Second Yearbook, 1923, Part I—English Composition: Its Aims, Methods, and Measurement. Earl Hudelson.	1.10
Twenty-Second Yearbook, 1923, Part II—The Social Studies in the Elementary and Secondary School. A. S. Barr, J. J. Coss, Henry Harap, R. W. Hatch, H. C. Hill, Ernest Horn, C. H. Judd, L. C. Marshall, F. M. McMurry, Earle Rugg, H. O. Rugg, Emma Schweppe, Mabel Snedaker, and C. W. Washburne.	1.50
Twenty-Third Yearbook, 1924, Part I—The Education of Gifted Children. Report of the Society's Committee, Guy M. Whipple, Chairman.	1.75
Twenty-Third Yearbook, 1924, Part II—Vocational Guidance and Vocational Education for Industries. A. H. Edgerton and others.	1.75
Twenty-Fourth Yearbook, 1925, Part I—Report of the National Committee on Reading. W. S. Gray, Chairman; F. W. Ballou, Rose L. Hardy, Ernest Horn, Frances Jenkins, S. A. Leonard, Estaline Wilson, and Laura Zirbes.	1.50
Twenty-Fourth Yearbook, 1925, Part II—Adapting the Schools to Individual Differences. Report of the Society's Committee. Carleton W. Washburne, Chairman.	1.50
Twenty-Fifth Yearbook, 1926, Part I—The Present Status of Safety Education. Report of the Society's Committee. Guy M. Whipple, Chairman.	1.75
Twenty-Fifth Yearbook, 1926, Part II—Extra-Curricular Activities. Report of the Society's Committee. Leonard V. Koos, Chairman.	1.50
Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, 1927, Part I—Curriculum Making: Past and Present. Report of the Society's Committee. Harold O. Rugg, Chairman.	1.75
Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, 1927, Part II—The Foundations of Curriculum-Making. Prepared by individual members of the Society's Committee. Harold O. Rugg, Chairman.	1.50
Twenty-Seventh Yearbook, 1928, Part I—Nature and Nurture: Their Influence Upon Intelligence. Prepared by the Society's Committee. Lewis M. Terman, Chairman.	1.75
Twenty-Seventh Yearbook, 1928, Part II—Nature and Nurture: Their Influence Upon Achievement. Prepared by the Society's Committee. Lewis M. Terman, Chairman.	1.75
Twenty-Eighth Yearbook, 1929, Parts I and II—Preschool and Parental Education. Part I—Organization and Development. Part II—Research and Method. Prepared by the Society's Committee. Lois H. Meek, Chairman. Bound in one volume. Cloth Edition	5.00
Paper Edition	3.50
Twenty-Ninth Yearbook, 1930, Parts I and II—Report of the Society's Committee on Arithmetic. Part I—Some Aspects of Modern Thought on Arithmetic. Part II—Research in Arithmetic. Prepared by the Society's Committee. F. B. Knight, Chairman. Bound in one volume. Cloth Edition.	5.00
Paper Edition	3.50
Thirtieth Yearbook, 1931, Part I—The Status of Rural Education. First Report of the Society's Committee on Rural Education, Orville G. Brim, Chairman. Cloth	2.50
Paper	1.75
Thirtieth Yearbook, 1931, Part II—The Textbook in American Education. Report of the Society's Committee on the Textbook, J. B. Edmonson, Chairman. Cloth	2.50
Paper	1.75

PUBLIC SCHOOL PUBLISHING COMPANY, BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS

Agents—The Baker and Taylor Company

New York

