# SELECTION OF RESOURCES IN CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION: AN APPROACH TO THE SELECTION OF RESOURCES FOR ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

by

CLAYTON WALTER TILLOTSON

B.Ed., University of Lethbridge, 1973

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Faculty

of

Education

ACCEPTED
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DATE 1 June 83 DEAN

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]
Dr. S.M. Allen

[redacted]
Dr. R.H. Fowler

[redacted]
Dr. C.F. Goulson

Supervisor: Dr. R.H. Fowler

## ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate procedures used for selecting textbooks for curricula with particular reference to elementary Social Studies in British Columbia. The investigation included analyses and comparisons of procedures for selection as described in the literature. In order to proceed with the investigation a classification scheme was developed. This scheme sorted instruments for textbook selection into: checklists, weighted rating scales, annotative questionnaires, combination types, and aesthetic critiques. Criteria for assessing instruments used for textbook appraisal also were selected with reference to the literature. These criteria included the instrument's effectiveness in terms of assessing behavioral objectives, reading level, and content of the text. Additional criteria concerned the depth and flexibility and the degree of subjectivity or objectivity allowed to analysts. Inquiry, a major component of the new Social Studies, was also examined and considered in relation to the British Columbia curriculum. Processes used by the Ministry of Education for the selection of new texts for Social Studies in British Columbia were compared with processes reported in the literature. The conclusion was that a comprehensive instrument for selecting textbooks would be useful to the Ministry

for future textbook selecting. As a result, a two-part model, consisting of a checklist for initial sorting, plus an annotative questionnaire for in-depth analysis was developed for this study. The proposed instrument, a synthesis of many instruments from the literature plus the B.C. Ministry of Education's present process for textbook selection, required a thirty hour training period for analysts who would use it. The instrument included sections on reading level, social considerations, and aesthetic criticism and should provide a useful tool for Ministry or school district personnel to use in evaluating and selecting textbooks. The instrument's emphasis on inquiry learning would be particularly appropriate for the new Social Studies program in British Columbia.

Examiners:

[redacted]

Dr. S. M. Allen

[redacted]

Dr. R.H. Fowler

[redacted]

Dr. C.F. Goulson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to thank Dr. R.H. Fowler, my supervisor, for the time and effort he has expended on my behalf in advising and guiding me during the preparation of this thesis. His prompt review and return of submitted chapters and his succinct comments were especially appreciated in view of the necessity for me to send materials by mail during the past year.

My thanks also to Dr. S. Allen and Dr. C. Goulson who have provided helpful advice, especially during the early stages of my thesis work.

I am also indebted to Dr. E. Eisner and Dr. E. Vallance who provided valuable assistance by supplying copies of their papers and articles which related to my thesis topic.

# INTRODUCTION

## Current Practices for Selection of Materials

The selection of textbooks for curricula has often been a somewhat haphazard process. As Massialas and Cox (1966) stated:

> The selection of textbooks often takes place on the basis of superficial and unsophisticated criteria. For example, teachers may recommend a textbook for adoption merely on a quantitative basis: "a thick book" is better than a "thin book." Or the more topics an author has dealt with, the more names of kings and battles, and the more chronological charts there are, the more desirable the text is considered to be. (p. 201)

Eash and Rasher (1978) also have emphasized the superficiality of textbook selection. They found that teachers may spend as little as one hour per year on the selection of textbooks for curriculum (p. 4). Moreover, Brodbelt (1972) warned that, "Once a textbook is selected, efficient school finances means that teachers are usually 'stuck' with that choice for the next few years" (p. 487).

In contrast to the unsophisticated processes above, were the approaches which often required analysts to undertake special training before commencing assessment of textbooks for curricula. These more complex procedures employed checklists, rating scales, annotative questionnaires, or a combination of two or more of these approaches to determine whether specific criteria had been met by the textbooks under consideration.

Instruments for the selection of learning materials have been prepared by researchers and consultants such as Breiter and Menne (1974), Brodbelt (1972), Connell et al. (1967), Eash (1972a) and Zenger and Zenger (1976), to name a few. In addition, consortia have been formed for the purposes of researching and preparing instruments for selecting materials for curricula. Some of these consortia include: The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (EPIE), The Social Science Educational Consortium (SSEC), The Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (Berkeley), and The Centre for Educational Technology, University of Sussex (Sussex).

## Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to describe, categorize, analyze, and synthesize methods of selecting suitable textbooks for curricula. Instruments used for selection, as reported in the literature, were analyzed and evaluated in terms of their appropriateness for selecting textbooks in terms of objectives, reading level, content, and ease of implementation as related to the inquiry goals which were stressed in the "new" Social Studies curriculum in British Columbia.

As a result of the analyses of a number of approaches to the selection of materials, a model of an instrument for determining suitability of textbooks for the Proposed Curriculum Guide Social Studies, K-11 (British Columbia, 1980) has been provided.

This instrument has been analyzed in the light of goals and objectives of the new curriculum. Special emphasis has been placed on the appropriateness of the proposed instrument for selecting textbooks relating to the inquiry skills of Social Studies at the elementary level.

The study, by examining instruments of selection and comparing their strengths and weaknesses, should provide useful information to teachers, consultants, and Ministry personnel who are, or may become, involved in the process of selecting textbooks.

## Questions to be Examined

(1) What selection procedures have been developed for matching materials to curricula?

(2) How effective are these procedures?

(3) How are instructional resources presently being selected for the proposed Social Studies curriculum in British Columbia?

(4) Which method of selection would be most useful in determining the suitability of textbook materials for teaching the inquiry goals in the British Columbia elementary Social Studies curriculum?

## Terms and Abbreviations Used in the Study

In the interest of brevity the following shortened forms and abbreviations have been used throughout this study:

Aoki, Williams, & Wilson. British Columbia Social Studies Assessment, 1977. -- (Assessment)

British Columbia Ministry of Education, Curriculum Development Branch. -- (Curriculum Branch)

British Columbia Ministry of Education, Curriculum Branch. -- Proposed Curriculum Guide Social Studies, K-11, 1980. -- (B.C. Guide)

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute. -- (EPIE)

Educational Resource Centre, St. Gallen, Switzerland. As reported in Eraut, Goad, & Smith, 1975. -- (Swiss)

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. As reported in Eraut, Goad, & Smith, 1975. -- (Berkeley)

Haussler & Pittman, Kiel, Germany. As reported in Eraut, Goad, & Smith, 1975. -- (Haussler and Pittman)

Morrissett, Stevens, & Woodley. Curriculum Materials Analysis System. As presented in D.M. Fraser, 1969. -- (CMAS)

National Board of Education, Stockholm, Sweden. As reported in Eraut, Goad, & Smith, 1975. -- (Swedish)

University of Sussex, Centre for Educational Technology. As reported in Eraut, Goad, & Smith, 1975. -- (Sussex).

## Research Methodology

The research for this study involved analyses of data presented in the literature. Analyses have been made of the following:

(1) Existing methods for selection of materials for curricula

(2) Present methods of selecting materials for the British Columbia Social Studies curriculum.

(3) Inquiry goals of the British Columbia Social Studies curriculum.

In addition, a synthesis of existing methods of selection has been constructed in order to propose a model for selection of textbook materials for the Social Studies curriculum (elementary level) in

British Columbia. The synthesis has been constructed on the basis of strengths and weaknesses examined during analysis of existing approaches to the selection of textbooks.

# Chapter I

## APPROACHES TO SELECTING RESOURCES: A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

### Problems in Current Procedures

Selection of learning materials is an important aspect of the successful implementation of curricula. As Eash and Rasher (1978) wrote, "Instructional materials represent a major time commitment for students since 80 percent of a student's classroom hours are spent engaging materials" (p. 4). Of these materials, the textbook is often the main element around which instruction is presented (Massialas & Cox, 1966, p. 201; Warming & Baber, 1980, p. 684). However, once textbooks have been selected they must be used for years, according to Brodbelt (1972, p. 487) and Zenger and Zenger (1976, p. v). Alan Tom (1977), in a U.S. Health, Education and Welfare publication, reinforced the fact that textbooks must be used for some years after selection when he observed that, "Typically once every five years, a committee is formed to survey the available texts in order to recommend one of them for adoption" (p. 5).

Bender and Baker (1979) cautioned against non-systematic, subjective approaches to the selection of textbooks for curricula. They advised that, "unstructured, subjective comments [for appraising textbooks] will not do" (p. 363). Other educational researchers and

journal writers have also deplored the weak and inconsistent criteria that have been used in textbook assessment. Eash, in his 1972a study, stated, "I have always thought that judging a book by its cover had limitations -- but I am inclined to believe that most of our assessment of instructional materials has not moved much beyond that" (p. 219). "The thumb test," reported by Davis and Eckenrod (1972), "in which a text is judged by flipping through pages and noting the reputation of the author, the questions at the end of the chapters, and the quality of the illustrations" (p. 714), was another example of how casually textbooks have been selected for implementation. Four years later, Krause (1976) observed that "a teacher's personal preferences" and a readability check were not sufficient for the appraisal of textbooks (p. 212). As late as 1978 Fetter complained that lists of evaluative criteria for the selection of textbooks "have been elementary and inadequate" (p. 55).

The literature revealed another problem with the selection of textbooks for curricula -- the lack of proper training of personnel. Eash (1972a) pointed out this shortcoming when he wrote, "Teachers are not used to looking at materials analytically, and in the training period I have found that old and cherished instructional packages are often seen in a new light after assessment" (p. 219). J. Peter Rothe (1980) expressed a similar concern when he stated, "Teachers do not have the luxury of time or perhaps the expertise to recognize the possible pitfalls in developed materials earmarked for future implementation" (p. 31). The EPIE Report No. 54 (1973)

suggested "training for the selection job" (p. 9). The Report also mentioned that a training period would "do much to point up the inaccuracy of a number of accepted conventions about selection - for instance, that reading the teacher's manual will reveal whether a student workbook does the teaching job well" (p. 10).

## Some Systematic Approaches to Selection of Materials

Most of the "systematic" approaches to the selection of the materials for curricula, as described in the literature, have involved the use of some type of form or instrument. These instruments have been developed by individual researchers or consultants, by committees formed for the assessment of textbooks, by groups of teachers, or by consortia of university professors and researchers. Such instruments have provided specific criteria for use in the appraisal of textbooks being considered for possible adoption.

The instruments usually required a response to a series of questions about the textbooks being analyzed. These instruments ranged in style and complexity from the relatively simple checklist format to the combination type which incorporated checklist, rating scale, and annotative components.

Some of the instruments were published in books or journals. Others were supplied to people who took training programs offered by institutions or companies which produced the instruments. A few instruments appeared in unpublished papers or in a condensed form

in publications dealing with the process of selecting educational materials. The Analysis of Curriculum Materials (Eraut, Goad, & Smith, 1975) provided samples of seven instruments including the CMAS, Eash, Berkeley, Swiss, Haussler and Pittman, Swedish, and their own Sussex, schemes.

Instruments for selecting materials were usually written for a particular subject, and sometimes for a particular grade level or age group. However, Eraut et al. (p. 9) claimed that with minor modifications, most instruments could be adapted into a single general scheme for all subjects and all ages.

Aoki, Williams, and Wilson, in the Assessment (Summary Report, 1977), mentioned a simple scheme for teachers to use in examining prescribed textbooks for Social Studies in British Columbia. Four specific criteria were presented, including: student thinking, student interest, reading level of text, and how the text fits the course outline. Teachers were expected to rate textbooks on a scale from "poor" to "excellent" on each of the above criteria (p. 35). This was the extent of systematization provided by the Assessment. A similar very broad, generalized type of appraisal appeared in An Approach to Selecting Among Social Studies Curricula, by Alan Tom (1977). Tom explained that teachers wanted textbooks which were at appropriate reading level for students, factually accurate with contemporary interpretations of events, attractively illustrated, and written in a style which would retain students' interest (p. 6).

In Australia, Connell and his colleagues also looked at broad

criteria for examining learning materials. They proposed a checklist with several sub-questions under the headings:

(1) Relation to Educational Objectives (course of study)

(2) Format (appearance and quality of book)

(3) Organization (of learning materials)

(4) Content (factual, adequacy of materials, challenge to students)

(5) Presentation (level, concepts, interest)

(6) Use of Learning Aids and Reference (maps, graphs, etc.)

(pp. 294-295)

However, Connell and his group warned that, "It is unlikely that a single book will fully meet the needs of a particular class or course or will even be completely up-to-date" (p. 296).

Bender and Baker (1979) advocated a strict, objective, tightly controlled system for selection based on teacher-developed criteria. As they explained it, "Statements of criteria for selection of materials must be explicit. These should be developed cooperatively by those most concerned and involved in the selection of these materials" (p. 363).

A detailed examination of textbooks according to specific criteria was also required by the Curriculum Materials Analysis System (CMAS). This instrument, prepared and distributed through the Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC) at Boulder, Colorado, and developed by Irving Morrissett and his associates, was described by Milburn (1977) as "the most popular analytic schema in use in social studies materials analysis" (p. 237). In using the CMAS scheme, the

evaluators were required to write a detailed analysis in response to the following headings:

(1) Descriptive Characteristics

(2) Rationale and Objectives

(3) Antecedent Conditions

(4) Content

(5) Instructional Theory and Teaching Strategies

(6) Overall Judgments

(Morrissett, Stevens, & Woodley, 1969, p. 248)

Each main heading was further divided into sub-categories to allow for depth of analysis. The following excerpt which illustrates the CMAS scheme was presented in Eraut et al. (1975, pp. 56-57).

3.0 ANTECEDENT CONDITIONS

What are the particular conditions for which the materials are designed, or under which they are most likely to be successful?

3.1 Pupil characteristics

With what kinds of pupils will the materials be most useful and successful? Urban or rural? White, Negro, or Mexican? Under-achievers? College-bound? What previous pupil preparations and/or aspirations and/or achievements are required? What are minimum initial levels of cognitive, social, and motoric skills?

3.2 Teacher capabilities and requirements

What are the teacher prerequisites for successful use? Special courses? Specifiable type and length of teaching experience? Unusual intelligence or skills?

3.3 Community

Is the community hostile or open to innovation? Are there elements in the curriculum that might be particularly attractive or offensive to the community?

3.4 School

Do the materials and methods require special teaching facilities or circumstances? Large or small rooms? Flexible scheduling? Special equipment? What kind of required library facilities?

3.5 Articulation

Do the materials fit well with the existing curriculums that will precede and follow them? Do they fit well with materials in other subjects studied simultaneously?

Another in-depth approach to the selection of educational materials was provided by EPIE which suggested that prospective analysts co-operate in developing suitable criteria for use in analyzing textbooks (EPIE Report No. 54, 1973). In this way a "common language" would be established among members of the selection committee. As the Report stated, "A systematic statement of criteria, co-operatively developed, is a remarkably useful tool. The very development of the statement helps to make the terms for selection explicit to all" (p. 10).

Breiter and Menne (1974) also stressed the determination of criteria as a first step in the selection process. The second step required a rating of the textbooks using these criteria. Brodbelt (1972), on the other hand, suggested that an overview of the broad instructional goals of the school district needed to be written first. From this list the teachers or the committee for selecting textbooks were expected to develop suitable criteria for the analysis of materials (p. 488). The choice of materials would then be closely related to the instructional program and to the students in the school or the system.

The Sussex scheme, as proposed by Eraut, Goad, and Smith (1975) in Great Britain, employed an anecdotal and descriptive approach to the analysis of textbooks for curricula. The Sussex instrument presented a series of questions under the headings:

(1) Introduction (facts, rationale, issues and perspectives)

(2) Description and Analysis of Materials (pupil and teacher materials, structure of materials)

(3) The Materials in Use (features, modifications, implications for implementation)

(4) Evaluation (for aims, curriculum, materials, suitability)

(5) Decision Making in a Specific Context (optional)

(Eraut, Goad, & Smith, p. 79)

As in the CMAS scheme, sub-categories to the headings were provided to encourage in-depth analysis of materials. The example below illustrates the approach used by the Sussex scheme.

PART 4. EVALUATION

4.1 Other Sources of Evidence
4.1.1 The development of the resource
(i) What evidence of developmental testing is available? (i.e. testing that is primarily intended to show how the resource can be improved).
(ii) Is there evidence that improvements resulted from the developmental phase?
4.1.2 (i) What reports are available from the author, publisher or independent evaluator?
(ii) Was the evaluation qualitative or quantitative?
(iii) What was the evidence of final validation?
4.1.3 What information about the users of the resource and their experience is available?
4.1.4 Where has the resource been reviewed and what were the major evaluative comments?
4.1.5 What unintended outcomes or side-effects have been reported?
4.1.6 Is there any evaluative evidence from comparable and similar resources?
4.1.7 The analyst is invited to comment on the evaluation evidence available in terms of its relevance to users supporting differing aims and strategies.
4.2 Give arguments for and against pursuing the particular aims endorsed by the material in this area of the curriculum. Relate your arguments to potentially competing aims, the patterns of use outlined in Part 3 and various forms of traditional practice.

(Eraut, Goad, & Smith, 1975, p. 108)

The underlying idea of the Sussex scheme was that materials were to be analyzed according to the questionnaire provided and the analyst's response was to be anecdotal. The optional section (Part 5) was provided for a decision-making committee to use in selecting materials for purchase. Because the Sussex scheme can require detailed, specific responses to nearly 60 questions, it remains one of the most comprehensive and complete approaches to the selection of materials described in the literature.

A German approach to the analysis of textbooks for curricula has been developed by Haussler and Pittman (1973) at Kiel. This approach featured anecdotal questions along with a checklist and a rating scale. The Haussler-Pittman scheme was quite complex because of the variety of responses required, as demonstrated by the following excerpts.

(annotative component)

4. Effectiveness
4.1 On what level of specification are the objectives of the curriculum stated?
4.2 What kind of tests are provided to evaluate the attainment of the objectives of the curriculum?
4.3 What kinds of evaluation studies were carried out during the field testing of the curriculum and with what results?

(checklist component)
The student gains knowledge of specific facts or The student gains knowledge of conventions
0 = no 1 = yes
The student gains knowledge of scientific technology
0 = no 1 = yes

(rating scale component)
Degree of student direction
0 = can't determine
1 = the student recieves complete directions on how to perform in the instructional unit

2 = the student has some opportunity to organise the instructional unit in his own way
3 = the student is autonomous: he is completely free to organise the instructional unit in his own way

(Eraut, Goad, & Smith, 1975, pp. 75;83;84)

An entirely different approach to selecting textbooks for curricula was the "aesthetic mode" advocated by Eisner (1978, 1979), Mann (1969), and Vallance (1976, 1977). The aesthetic approach was a move away from the technical, scientific paradigm of CMAS and similar schemes. As Vallance (1976) explained, both art and curricula "are selective, referring only to the most salient of the qualities which determine the work's effect on the writer [analyst] " (p. 20). Appraisers were expected to draw upon their experiences and feelings to supply their own subjective criteria from which to consider textbook materials. Milburn (1977) explained that, "The language of the final judgement" will convey a "shared understanding" to those who read an aesthetic analysis (p. 240).

Several other instruments for the analysis and selection of learning materials have been reported in the literature. Eash (1972a) and the Swedish National Board of Education (Swedish, 1974) both employed combinations of checklists, annotations, and rating scales in their approaches to selection. Instruments developed by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (Berkeley, 1970) and Nichols and Ochoa (1971) in the United States, used an annotative design -- as did the St. Gallen scheme (Swiss, 1972). Checklist were constructed by Fetsko (1978), Fetter (1978), and Massialas and Cox (1966); while Ball (1976), Rothe (1980), Warming and Baber (1980),

and Zenger and Zenger (1976) produced rating scale or weighted types of instruments. A system of classifying instruments for selection according to their approaches has been devised for this study and is presented in the next section of this chapter.

## Classification of Instruments for Selection of Materials and a Survey of Problems

A survey of the literature revealed few attempts to group or classify current approaches to the selection of materials. Milburn (1977, pp. 237-241) discussed "scientific" and "aesthetic" approaches and Eraut et al. (1975, p. 54) presented a chart which listed the main features of seven instruments for selecting materials. However, neither of these articles, nor others in the literature, presented formal classification schemes. For the purposes of this study, a five-point classification has been developed to include major approaches to selecting materials for curricula. These five categories include: checklists, weighted rating scales, annotative questionnaires, combination instruments, and aesthetic responses.

### The Checklist Types

Checklists were generally characterized by a set of questions or criteria to which teachers, committee members, or other appraisers of textbooks were expected to respond with a checkmark or a simple "yes" or "no" answer. Usually the analyst was expected to answer

only the questions presented -- in a strictly objective manner. Little, if any, provision was made for annotative comments about the materials under analysis.

Massialas and Cox (1966) presented a list which included 14 broad questions broken down into several sub-questions. The questions were worded so that only a yes or no response was required (pp. 202-203). Though not presented as a formal instrument, this list supplied the nucleus for a textbook appraisal form. A similar checklist which contained several spaces for yes or no answers to questions about objectives, format, organization, content, presentation, and the use of learning aids, was presented by Connell and his associates (1967, pp. 294-297)

The "new Social Studies" and its requirements were the main aim of William Fetsko's (1978) list of 14 criteria for the selection of textbooks. This list (p. 52) could easily be adapted into a checklist format for use in considering the suitability of textbooks, especially in Social Studies. In comparison, Fetter's (1978) basic model checklist was ready to use as it provided space for marking yes or no answers to a number of questions. The instrument was designed for the appraisal of various types of instructional materials, including textbooks, and was Fetter's answer to poorly designed forms which he had previously encountered (pp. 55-56). The list provided by Bender and Baker (1979, p. 364) posed questions which could easily be answered "yes" or "no". However, a few of the questions about the producer of the materials and the purpose of the content of the materials did require a short statement.

The strengths of the checklist type of instrument seemed to lie in the speed and objectivity with which a busy analyst could appraise learning materials. The checklist could also be used for a preliminary selection of a "short list" of textbooks for more comprehensive analysis.

There were problems with checklists as well. First of all, they were usually short and contained only "simplistic" questions which must be answered by yes or no type responses. Secondly, no clear indication of quality was represented by "yes" or "no" replies to questions. In addition, little opportunity was presented for comments or criticisms of the materials. The EPIE Report No. 54 (1973) explained these objections to checklists when it stated:

> When it comes to applying the subtle criteria of content and coverage, methodology and rationale - in short the instructional design of material - a simple checklist or questionnaire is not likely to suffice; the committee members will want to devise a more probing form, perhaps a rating scale or a questionnaire which allows for qualified answers rather than just "yes" or "no." (p. 16)

## The Weighted Rating Scale Types

Weighted rating scale types of instruments were often modified checklists which provided for a letter, a number, or a symbol to be used to denote the level or quality of a particular topic according to specified criteria. The analyst was expected to answer the questions provided in an objective manner. A profile or summary sheet was sometimes provided at the end of the instrument to give an overall assessment of the textbook being considered.

The Assessment (1977), with four questions and five levels of response to each question, provided a very simple weighted type of instrument for the use of Social Studies teachers in British Columbia. An example from the instrument used in the Assessment is shown below.

| | |
|---|---|
| Challenges students to think | ----- |
| Is interesting to students | ----- |
| Fits with course outline | ----- |
| Has appropriate reading level | ----- |

Code: (1) Poor (2) Unsatisfactory (3) Satisfactory
(4) Good (5) Excellent

(Assessment, 1977, Vol. 3, Part 2, Table 2-44, p. 55)

Peter Rothe (1980), whose article referred to locally produced programs, suggested a scale which included, "acceptable, needs improvement, and unacceptable" (p. 31), for a list of items about the objectives, activities, and evaluation procedures presented in learning materials. Rothe's list could be adapted for the analysis of textbooks as well as for locally produced programs.

More complex weighting was used by Brodbelt(1972) in his scheme which recommended the use of mathematical criteria for selecting textbooks for Social Studies. The use of mathematical ratings, Brodbelt maintained, required a "forced choice" which produced an objective, unbiased scientific approach to the selection of textbooks (p. 488). Each item on a list of criteria was rated on a scale from 1 (low) to 7 (high). Specific items which received a low or high total rating could be easily compared from one textbook to another. As Brodbelt explained:

> The mathematical apportioning of numerical points may initially appear tedious, but its value in specifically pointing out discrepancies in quality of textbooks outweighs the time necessary to calculate specific numerical values. (p. 490)

The two-phase process of Breiter and Menne (1974), referred to previously, required that each major topic explored by the text be subjected to what they termed, "a Social Studies Topics Rating Scale" (p. 3). This scale which went from 1 (inappropriate topics) to 5 (important, relevant topics) served as a type of preliminary assessment. Phase two required that textbooks which had passed the initial screening be rated again using a teacher-constructed "Text Analysis Worksheet" with a scale of 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent) (p. 5). At the conclusion of this phase, the mean of the scale scores was taken for each text. From these means a top textbook or two could be chosen for each grade level.

Weldon and Sharon Zengers' Handbook for Evaluating and Selecting Textbooks provided another form of weighted assessment for textbook materials. Their rating scale included: "poor, acceptable, good, excellent, not included, and not applicable." A short form (8 pages) was supplied as a preliminary tool to eliminate grossly unsuitable texts. Then the long form (22 pages) was provided for detailed analysis of the physical features, objectives, content, and philosophy of the remaining textbooks. A profile chart was then constructed to provide a means of comparing textbooks.

Though the fifty-question, three-level chart, included in the article by Howard Ball (1976), was less complicated than any of the

last three mentioned, it employed some comprehensive criteria for the appraisal of textbooks (pp. 209-210). An even simpler, but still comprehensive instrument, was presented by Warming and Baber (1980). This instrument examined four areas, "the text, the author, the reader, and the teacher," in a twenty-item format. The writers also suggested that a readability estimate be used with their textbook inventory form (p. 694). A portion of the Warming and Baber instrument is reproduced below.

| | excellent 5 | adequate 3 | inadequate 1 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Appropriate readability level | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Author(s) reputable in field | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Indicates successful field-testing of text and assessment instruments | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Published by reputable firm | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Table of contents exhibits logical development of subject | --- | --- | --- |
| 6. Meets course objectives | --- | --- | --- |

(Warming and Baber, 1980, p. 695)

An advantage of the weighted rating scale instruments was that levels of quality could be indicated by the analyst as he examined a textbook according to specific criteria listed in the instrument. In addition, objectivity (judgement without feeling or bias) could be maintained because each analyst responded to the same specific questions from a predetermined, limited scale of answers. Moreover, the profile or summary chart provided an overall rating for the comparison of textbooks with each other.

One of the major disadvantages of the weighted types of instruments was the lack of provision for comments about the material.

Responses were usually made by letter or number ratings or checking of specified columns such as poor, fair, good, or excellent. No indication of the depth of analysis or the time and effort spent by the analyst was evident from the responses to the instrument. A person could have rushed through an appraisal, placing checkmarks in a rather superficial fashion, and a selection committee depending on this rating could be misled into adopting a set of textbooks of inferior quality. The danger of using only total scores or means (as in Brodbelt's scheme) was referred to in the EPIE Report No. 54 which concluded that a very attractive, though inaccurate book, might receive the same number of points as a less attractive, but factually accurate book (p. 16).

## The Annotative Types

Annotative types of instruments for the analysis of materials generally consisted of an extensive list of questions prepared by a selection committee, a commercial firm, or an educational consortium. Analysts used their own words in reply to the questions, although specified terms were usually agreed upon beforehand in a training session. These answers were expected to explain in detail how the materials under examination either did or did not meet the criteria outlined in the instrument. One, two, or three levels of questions could be required (see earlier example from the Sussex instrument) in order that important criteria would be examined in sufficient depth by analysts.

One annotative instrument, the Berkeley scheme (1970), included a short series of questions which examined textbooks for goals and objectives, content and materials, classroom strategy and activities, and implementation requirements. Training for use of the Berkeley analysis scheme was not mentioned, probably because as Eraut et al. stated, "the scheme has hitherto been used only by the laboratory's own staff" (p. 34).

Another annotative approach, also presented by Eraut and his colleagues, was the Swiss plan (1972) which required somewhat complex responses to its instrument. Sub-questions provided for detailed, in-depth responses to each of the basic questions posed by the instrument. The Swiss scheme examined elements, aims, prerequisites, methods, assessment, and special information contained in the textbooks being analyzed (pp. 70-73).

In contrast to the Swiss plan, an instrument prepared by Nichols and Ochoa (1971) presented only eight broad questions under two components -- knowledge and intellectual. The knowledge component sought annotative responses to questions on social issues, interdisciplinary conceptual organization, recency, and bias. The intellectual component was subdivided into analytic basis for inquiry, higher level questioning, decision-making, and establishing a relationship between knowledge presented and the learner's own life. The analyst was expected to complete a thorough report on the materials examined. The examples of analyses completed using the Nichols and Ochoa method revealed that such appraisals could run to a page and a half or more of single-spaced, typed material (pp. 293-294;304).

The EPIE analysis scheme required extensive responses to a lengthy (18 page) list of criteria. Educators were required to undergo an intensive training program in order to qualify as EPIE analysts. This training provided "a common language" and a common approach to "applying a systematic, objective analysis to educational materials" (British Columbia Ministry of Education, EPIE Information, 1980, p. 1). The reports prepared under this system were collected and used to provide overall ratings of materials on local and sometimes national bases. (See various EPIE reports in different subject areas.)

The Ministry of Education in British Columbia was strongly committed to the use of instruments "derived from EPIE" according to Ian Parker's (1980) article in Horizon. Parker, a consultant in the Curriculum Branch, also mentioned that Alberta and Manitoba have used the EPIE approach for selecting materials for curricula.

Another annotative approach, the British Sussex scheme (Eraut et al., 1975), also required a training period (minimum 30 hours) before analysts were allowed to rate materials. The analysis was expected to be very comprehensive and could take from a week to a month, depending on the purpose of the assessment. Eraut and his colleagues, who developed the Sussex instrument, presented their definition of a curriculum analysis scheme as, "an organised set of questions and/or techniques designed for general application to certain types of curriculum materials with the aim of elucidating and evaluating their most important characteristics" (pp. 32-33).

The CMAS (1969) scheme also employed an annotative type of instrument as it required descriptive and analytic comments about learning materials being examined. Discussion of CMAS and samples of questions used in the CMAS analysis scheme were presented earlier in this paper.

Advantages of the annotative types of analysis included the opportunity for the analyst to qualify his replies to questions and to be able to explain why he considered certain features to be important or unimportant facets of the learning resources being examined. A degree of objectivity and common criteria was maintained by directed questions, but responses made in the analyst's own words could reflect some of his feelings toward the materials. The annotative format also forced the analyst to make in-depth examinations of resources so that he could respond to the different levels of questions posed about specific criteria.

Some of the problems with the annotative type of analysis stemmed from the time and the cost required for the initial training period which could range upward from a week. In addition, the analysis itself could take from a week to a month if very detailed assessments were desired. Objectivity could be compromised somewhat as analysts responded in their own words to the criteria outlined in the instrument. Since a lengthy report was produced by the annotative method, teachers, administrators, or selection committees may not have the time to read and consider the report carefully before the decision to adopt a particular textbook or resource must be made.

Combination Types

Several of the instruments examined in this study could be classified as combination types since they included features of the checklist, the rating scale, and the annotative schemes of learning resource analysis.

A combination type of instrument has been developed by Eash (1972a). The Eash instrument included a yes - no checklist at the beginning of each section; then each section also contained an annotative question followed by a rating scale (1 to 7). The final section required a summary statement (annotative) of the weaknesses and strengths of the resource being considered, followed by a final rating scale which supplied an "overall assessment" of the material (p. 217).

Another combination instrument was the Swedish scheme developed by Nystrom (1974), and reported by Eraut, Goad, & Smith (1975, pp. 76-78). First a five-point scale was provided to assess a number of stated criteria. Then an "open ended invitation to list merits and demerits" was presented. This was followed by a sort of checklist concerning the depth of coverage offered each topic in the textbook. Specific parts of the instrument were directed to students, teachers, and reviewers.

Haussler and Pittman (1973) have also produced a combination instrument, as reported in Eraut et al. (1975, pp. 74-75; 83-84). This instrument used codable information that could be adapted to a computer system. Primarily designed for locating materials, the system included questions at the lesson-unit levels and supplied a

list of numerically coded content words. However, annotative answers were required for a series of questions about the content, instructional methods, adaptiveness, effectiveness, and administration of materials. (See earlier examples from Haussler and Pittman.)

The major strength of the combination instruments resulted from the use of up to three types of analyses on one textbook or other resource; thus allowing for the speed and objectivity of checklist and rating scales, but also retaining some of the in-depth comments of annotative responses.

A criticism of the combination instruments was that rating scales and annotations were different types of measurement and could cause confusion in the minds of analysts (Eash 1972a, p. 217). A further disadvantage may have arisen when the instruments were used to assess different subject area materials because some of the checklists and rating scales may give different results when applied to such diverse subjects as Mathematics, Art, Social Studies, and English. A training period was desirable for combination types of instruments because teachers and other appraisers may not have the necessary background for complex analyses (Eash, p. 219; Rothe, p. 31). However, as in the annotative method, cost and time factors could pose a problem when a training period is involved.

## The Aesthetic Method

In the aesthetic scheme, the analyst or "critic" approached curriculum materials in much the same manner that an art critic approached a painting. The critic then communicated his feelings

and impressions about the materials in a commentary which should help explain to another viewer of the materials what the critic found to be relative and significant.

Elliot Eisner (1978, 1979) and Elizabeth Vallance (1976, 1977) have written several articles advocating an aesthetic method of analyzing learning materials. As Vallance (1976) stated, "The curriculum critic connects the tradition of critical practice with educational expertise; each illuminates the other" (p. 13).

The advantages of this method lay in the freedom from the scientific and technical assessments so deplored by Eisner (1979, p. 11). The analyst could concentrate on specific aspects of the materials which he felt might affect teachers and students who would use the materials in the classroom. As Vallance (1976) explained, "And if the tools of art criticism help us to see qualities in a work of art that might have been overlooked, the tools of criticism should similarly help us to more clearly see the unique qualities of curriculum materials" (p. 10). The aesthetic method may be useful as a tool for selecting textbooks, especially if it is used in conjunction with another type of instrument to provide a global rating of materials.

Disadvantages of aesthetic criticism lay in the very selective and subjective approach of this method to the analysis of materials. The term analysis may be a misnomer when applied to this method of selection because no aesthetic criticism could provide anywhere nearly as much detail as would an annotative instrument such as Sussex, or a combination instrument such as Eash's. Lack of

consistency between raters could make comparisons difficult, especially if different critics rated different resources using different criteria. A sort of "beauty is in the eye of the beholder" situation could prevail.

Analyses of instruments used in the five approaches for selecting materials will be conducted in Chapter II. Specifically, instruments will be analyzed in terms of specific objectives, reading levels, content, depth and flexibility, subjectivity and objectivity, and training of analysts for using each instrument.

# Chapter II

## ANALYSIS AND CRITICISM OF INSTRUMENTS FOR THE SELECTION OF LEARNING MATERIALS

Twenty-three approaches to assessing learning materials, most incorporating some form of instrument, have been examined in this study. Each instrument has been analyzed and critiqued in terms of its utility in selecting materials. The term "materials" has been used in this chapter because some of the instruments were designed for analysis of a wide variety of learning media, not just texts. Criteria for analysis included: (a) behavioral objectives (b) readability levels (c) presentation of content matter (d) depth and flexibility of appraisal (e) degree of objectivity and/or subjectivity (f) optimal training period required. Five of the instruments -- Berkeley, Swiss, Haussler and Pittman, Swedish, and Sussex -- were available only in the Eraut, Goad, and Smith publication, The Analysis of Curriculum Materials. As a consequence, this publication has been used in this study as a reference for these five instruments.

### The Use of Behavioral Objectives as a Reference Point in Assessment of Materials

Statements in the literature which described the behavior to be demonstrated by students after they had completed specific learning tasks were called "behavioral objectives or measurable outcomes"

(Mason & Ayers, 1980, p. 2). The proponents of the use of behavioral objectives in curriculum design such as Bloom (1971), Gagne (1974), Tyler (1950), and others, have advanced many reasons for this method of organizing curriculum. However, the behavioral objectives mode also has some detractors such as Eisner (1969), Macdonald (1974), and Vallance (1976). Gagne's article explained that behaviorally stated objectives served to "communicate" outcomes among curriculum planners and designers, teachers, students, and the public (1974, p. 223). In addition, Gagne presented five categories of learning -- motor skills, verbal information, intellectual skills, cognitive strategies, and attitudes --- which may be written in the behavioral mode to include: (a) "what the student will have learned from the instruction" and, (b) "the performance he will then be able to exhibit" (p. 222).

Behavioral objectives also provided a visible measure (learning outcomes) which some administrators viewed as tools for evaluating teacher performance. As Ebel (1970) pointed out, "Behavior is overt and observable, whereas knowledge, ability etc., are hidden inside their possessers" (p. 159). Maxine Greene explained accountability and its behavioral components when she stated, "There is a new consumerism among educational publics that moves them to demand a kind of 'quality control' in the schools, precise measurement of 'output' and an honest accounting of what has been achieved" (n.d. p. 16).

Curriculum guides may state that teachers are required to use behavioral objectives in the classroom. The Proposed Curriculum Guide Social Studies, K-11 (British Columbia, 1980) listed "student

outcomes" expected (pp. 20-21). Moreover, often the use of measurable outcomes was mandated, not explicitly but implicitly, through the wording of goals and aims of the curriculum. Furthermore, school districts, and indeed administrative officials at particular schools, have required that learning units and lessons be written in behavioral form (Haefle, 1980, p. 352; Wilson, 1977, p. 205). Hence it is not surprising that some instruments for the selection of materials have included questions concerning the presentation of behavioral objectives in learning materials.

The checklist types of instruments of Bender and Baker (1979), Fetsko (1978), Fetter (1978), and Massialas and Cox (1966), did not contain questions about behavioral objectives per se. However, each of these instruments included questions asking whether goals and objectives were clearly stated. On the other hand, Connell and his colleagues (1967) specifically asked about objectives related to: (a) knowledge, skills, and attitudes (b) the teacher and the course of study and, (c) the balance between content and activities for pupils (p. 294).

In examining those approaches to selection of materials which utilized weighted rating scales, either behavioral objectives were not mentioned, or they were alluded to in an implicit rather than explicit manner. No mention of behavioral objectives was apparent in the weighted rating scales presented by Brodbelt (1972) or Breiter and Menne (1974). However, implicit references to behavioral objectives were contained in rating scales such as the one in the Assessment (Vol. 3, Part 2) which included the criteria "Fits with

course outline" (p. 57). Warming and Baber (1980), and Zenger and Zenger (1976) also presented questions about meeting course objectives and chapter objectives in their weighted scales. Howard Ball (1976, pp. 209-210) questioned student attainment of instructional objectives and how assessment forms and tests were used to measure student mastery of objectives.

Rothe's (1980) short rating scale was clearly oriented toward behavioral objectives. The scale included questions related to how behavioral objectives specified student behavior, reflected learning concepts, skills and activities, and how the evaluation process was handled in terms of objectives or outcomes (p. 31).

The annotative types of instruments, except for the CMAS scheme, did not require responses specifically related to behavioral objectives. However, because of the annotative nature of responses required of the analyst, it would be possible for implicit or explicit behavioral objectives of a textbook or other resource to be reported. As for the EPIE analysis system, behavioral objectives in materials could be analyzed using EPIEform A '79 (B.C. Ministry of Education) under, "learner objectives" or "methodology -- characteristics" (pp. 4;8). A similar process could be used in the Berkeley model under, "goals and objectives" (Eraut et al., p. 63), in the Swiss scheme under, "aims" or "method" (Eraut et al., p. 70), and in the Sussex approach under, "materials in use" or "description and analysis of materials evaluation" (Eraut et al., pp. 105-108).

However, the CMAS scheme used behavioral objectives in a more explicit manner (Davis & Eckenrod, 1972, p. 716; Eraut et al., p. 38).

The CMAS model examined learning materials in terms of observable behavioral outcomes expected of students. In addition, the evaluation section of CMAS asked whether the behavioral objectives could be successfully accomplished by using the materials, and how success could be measured (Morrissett, Stevens, & Woodley, 1969, p. 247).

A behavioral component was also evident in the combination instrument of Eash (1972a). Eash commented that by using his scheme, "choosing instructional materials will be removed from the realm of vague intuitions ... [and] will have a degree of predictive validity for learning outcomes with students" (p. 49). Hence the first section of his form was devoted to objectives. Questions were either couched explicitly in behavioral terms or implied an understanding of behavioral objectives as shown in the following example from the Eash instrument.

| I | Objectives | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Are there objectives stated for the use of the material? | --- | --- |
| | 1. General objectives? | --- | --- |
| | 2. Instructional objectives? | --- | --- |
| | 3. Are the objectives stated in behavioral terms? | --- | --- |
| | 4. If stated in behavioral terms do the objectives specify: | | |
| | a) type of behavior? | --- | --- |
| | b) conditions under which it will appear? | --- | --- |
| | c) level of performance expected? | --- | --- |
| | 5. List examples of objectives | | |
| B. | If there are no examples stated for the use of the material, are the objectives instead implicit or readily obvious? | --- | --- |
| | 1. If yes, please outline below what objectives <u>you</u> believe govern the purpose of the material. | | |
| C. | What appears to be the source of objectives (both stated and implicit objectives)? | | |

(Eash, 1972a, p. 196)

The Haussler and Pittman instrument (as reported by Eraut et al.) examined the "behavioral elements" and their emphasis in curriculum materials. Under the heading, "effectiveness" were questions relating to the specificity of objectives and tests (p. 74). In contrast the Swedish scheme, also reported by Eraut et al. (pp. 76-78), made no references to behavioral objectives and mentioned only the "goals and guidelines of the curriculum."

The aesthetic approach of Vallance (1976), because it examined materials in the manner of artistic criticism based on the analyst's feelings and experiences, did not include measurable outcomes written in the behavioral mode. According to Huebner (1966, pp. 14-18) aesthetic contemplation of learning resources could be compared to a consideration of the beauty, wholeness and design, and symbolic meaning of a work of art.

In summary, the literature presented only a few instruments which contained sections designed specifically for examining behavioral objectives. Rothe's rating scale, the CMAS annotative scheme, and the combination type instruments of Eash and Haussler-Pittman appeared to be the best suited for evaluators seeking a behavioral objectives focus in learning materials.

## Reading Level as a Criterion for Assessment

The reading grade level of materials in a textbook is perhaps the key to whether or not that textbook is useful to the majority of students in a classroom. The same criteria applies to all other

learning resources as well. As Rothe stated, "Successful transfer of information from a social studies program to your students depends to a large extent on whether the materials have been written at the appropriate level of linguistic complexity" (p. 32). Moreover, Jantzen (1979) warned that reading grade levels were steadily declining when he wrote:

> Teachers and adoption committees look for texts whose readability is guaranteed by standard reading formulas. Junior high texts, publishers are finding, are best written at elementary grade levels - and senior high texts not much higher than that. (p. 72)

These statements pointed out the importance of the use of devices to assess levels of readability in appraising materials. Instruments for selection which incorporated readability measures, or which suggested the use of supplementary formulas for readability estimates, provided a necessary means for the assessment of materials for curricula.

Surprisingly few of the schemes for analyzing resources contained explicit means for testing readability. For example, Fetsko's checklist was designed to determine whether characteristics of the "new social studies" were included in textbooks being considered for adoption (p. 52). However, no mention of readability level was included even though the new program required students to use an inquiry approach which incorporated reading and research activities. Similarly, there was no mention of readability level in the checklists of Fetter or Massialas and Cox. Bender and Bakers' checklist only alluded to readability when it asked whether vocabulary levels were appropriate (p. 364).

On the other hand, Connell and his colleagues posed a question specifically on readability when they asked:

> Is the readability level of the text suited to the grade level for which it is prepared? (Consider appropriateness of vocabulary, sentence length and complexity of sentence structure.) (p. 295)

However, Connell et al. did not explain how readability was to be determined. From the nature of the question, it appeared that teachers or developers of curriculum were to provide readability estimates based on their teaching experience.

Readability was considered in detail in some of the weighted scales and virtually ignored in others. Ball did not mention readability levels at all, possibly because his form was designed for all media not just textbooks. Breiter and Mennes' instrument seemed to be more concerned with "topics" in a textbook rather than reading levels.

The Assessment (Summary, p. 35) asked whether the textbook material being considered was at the appropriate reading level as the first of its four questions. Brodbelt (p. 489) considered sequence, clarity, interest, size of print, and vocabulary as parts of his readability questions. However, none of the aforementioned instruments referred to any of the standard readability scales such as Fry, Spache, Mugford, and many others, which are recognized in the literature.

In contrast to the imprecise approaches to readability implied in the instruments described, Peter Rothe suggested that supplementary formal scales such as Dale-Chall, Flesch, Fry, and Cloze be used

in analyzing learning materials (p. 32). These reading scales, and several others, were presented in detail by Harrison (1980). However, Rothe's rating scale instrument itself did not include a readability question. Warming and Baber discussed Fry's (1977) and Raygor's (1977) reading graphs as important adjuncts to their 20 item scale which had as its final question, "Appropriate readability level" (p. 695).

The strongest approach to readability by the weighted type of instrument appeared in Zenger and Zengers' model. They included one major heading which contained several sub-questions on readability levels. In addition, a 10 page appendix was included with the instrument. This appendix contained an outline of both the Fry and Cloze procedures along with examples of how they should be used to determine the readability of textbook materials. Readability was again included in the "Textbook Evaluation Profile Chart" (p. 31) at the end of the Zenger and Zenger instrument.

Though annotative approaches to selection required a training period and comprehensive in-depth responses to a number of questions, none of the instruments examined included a direct question on the readability level of textbooks or materials being examined. However, because of the annotative nature of the responses, any of the instruments could elicit individual comments on readability from analysts. For example, EPIEform A '79 included questions about characteristics, product development, and entry competencies, any of which could include reading levels if the analyst chose to respond in that manner. However, it appeared that when an annotative type of instrument was

used, a separate readability formula or graph would need to be used along with the instrument to ensure that all analysts examined the resource being considered in respect to the important readability factor.

As in the annotative instruments, the combination instruments did not contain specific references to reading levels. Because the annotative portions of most combination instruments comprised a fairly small portion of the whole scheme, there was even less of a chance that analysts would address readability levels in their replies. A separate readability instrument would be needed with most combination types of instruments.

The weighted rating scale instruments -- Rothe, Warming and Baber, and Zenger and Zenger -- provided the most useful approaches in terms of readability levels as criteria for evaluating textbook materials. However, Zenger and Zengers' approach was far superior to the other two in that it included several questions on readability in the instrument itself, and also included two standard readability measures in the appendix. None of the other approaches or instruments provided questions which adequately assessed the readability levels of learning materials.

## Content as a Criterion for Assessment

Instruments for the selection of materials usually contain one or more questions about "content," (i.e. the subject matter or disciplinary structure presented in the material). For example, analysts may be asked to examine textbooks for Social Studies in terms

of adequacy of course coverage, organization of materials, quality of materials, bias in materials, and the use of recent source materials. Aspects of content in learning resources are examined in a variety of ways by different schemes, and the depth of analysis of content varies among instruments.

All checklist instruments addressed the issue of suitability of content. Fetsko (p. 52) included questions relating to the suitability of materials in terms of multi-disciplined, cross-cultural content presented in the inquiry mode. The instrument proposed by Fetter presented two questions requiring a "yes" or "no" response related to content: "(a) Is the quality of the material sufficient?" and "(b) Is the quantity of the material sufficient?" (p. 56). Bender and Baker (p. 364), Connell et al. (p. 295), and Massialas and Cox (pp. 202-203) all included a number of questions related to content in their approaches. These instruments asked about congruence of materials with the course of study, sequence of presentation, scope of materials, logic of content, accuracy of information, accuracy of materials presented, and treatment of minority and cross-cultural groups in textbooks. Massialas and Cox also asked whether the inquiry system was employed by the material in the presentation of content (p. 202).

The weighted rating scales considered in this study also examined content. The simple instruments presented by the Assessment (Vol. 3, Part 2, p. 59) and Peter Rothe (p. 31) suggested general approaches to the evaluation of materials for content. For example,

resources were to be rated on: student interest, student challenge, grade level appropriateness, accuracy, and currency of materials. Warming and Baber's appraisal instrument included questions similar to the above plus specific questions about bias and definition of terms. The instruments developed by Ball and by Brodbelt added questions on cross-cultural studies and multi-disciplinary studies to the above lists.

The most comprehensive examination of content in the weighted scale instruments was the Zenger and Zenger approach. Their 23 page instrument provided questions related to such values as honesty, respect, responsibility, learning principles, continuity of materials, school philosophy, and correct grammar. All of these items were in addition to those previously mentioned for other weighted scales.

Breiter and Menne first identified the major topics presented in the textbook being analyzed. Then they rated the content of each topic on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) according to just three criteria: clarity, relevance, and appropriateness of level (p. 6).

Questions about content in annotative-type instruments ranged from fairly general (Berkeley) to quite specific (EPIE). The Berkeley scheme, in particular, lacked specificity when it presented questions such as, "What is to be learned?" and "How are content and materials organized?" (Eraut et al., p. 63). The Swiss instrument, originally developed to evaluate mathematics materials

but applicable with slight modification to other subject areas, examined prerequisites, linear or spiral organization, and flexibility of teaching methods (Eraut et al., pp. 70-71).

The Sussex scheme required assessors to describe content in terms of topics, themes, or chapter headings, and to indicate "emphases" given to different aspects of the subject matter (Eraut et al., p. 104). In addition, the form of presentation of the materials and the "coverage of the subject matter in terms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes" were to be assessed (pp. 105-106). Other sub-questions about the structure of the materials were related to content and required annotative responses.

The CMAS instrument examined content in relation to subject area along with a concern for multi-disciplined approaches to materials (Morrissett, Stevens, & Woodley, p. 250). Another section examined cognitive and affective learning as well as the learning theory implicit or explicit in the materials (p. 252). Questions relating to content in terms of behavioral objectives also characterized the CMAS scheme. For example, one question asked, "What specific (content related) changes are intended in the knowledge, attitudes and behavior of the students?" (p. 253).

The Nichols and Ochoa instrument examined content in respect to what they termed the "knowledge component" in relation to social issues, inter-disciplinary presentation of material, and bias in the materials (p. 291). This instrument also examined content in respect to methods such as inquiry, decision-making, and higher level questioning. The final question concerned student interest

and the relativity of the materials to the student's "life space" (p. 292).

The EPIE instrument provided the most detailed and specific analysis of content of all the annotative types. This instrument examined such content-related themes as: the developer's rationale, the topics covered, the scope and sequence of materials, the congruence among components in the materials, the accuracy of materials, the presence or absence of bias, and the currency of the materials. Each major question included guidelines for the analyst. For example, "Scope: characteristics" included the statement, "You should report on: rationale for content selection, range of total package, range within sections or units, extent of subject area for total package," and similar points (EPIEform A '79, p. 6).

The combination types of instruments also contained questions related to content. Eash examined scope and sequence, cognitive, motor, and affective aspects, as well as the methodological approach in his instrument for the appraisal of textbooks. He also included sub-questions to encourage some depth of answers, as well as a quantitative rating scale for an overall picture of the treatment of content in the textbook (pp. 196-198).

Content in the Haussler-Pittman scheme was divided into three sections: behavioral elements, subject matter elements, and general elements. Behavioral elements concerned skills, knowledge, and affective behavior encouraged by the content of the material. The section on subject matter stressed types of subject matter and degree of emphasis placed on different aspects of subject matter.

The section on general elements examined inquiry learning, organizing structures, and the degree of integration of disciplines (Eraut et al., p. 74).

The Swedish scheme examined the content of learning materials in terms of the home, school, and the working world. The instrument also contained a question about whether the material was suitable for low, average, and high ability students. Students were asked to respond to questions about content in relation to background knowledge required, level of difficulty, level of interest, and number of exercise examples (mathematics) in the materials. The Swedish scheme provided the only instrument which allowed direct student input into the analysis of learning materials. In addition, teachers and reviewers were given "an open ended invitation to list merits and demerits" of the content (Eraut et al., p. 77).

The aesthetic approach proposed by Vallance did not appear to be concerned with systematic examination of content. Because of the personal, subjective nature of aesthetic criticism, it appeared unlikely that much more than style, flow, and appearance of materials would be considered in terms of content.

Because they provided for depth and flexibility of responses, the annotative and the combination types of approaches to assessing the content of resources, especially for Social Studies, appeared to be best. Of these instruments, the CMAS and the EPIE schemes were particularly appropriate because they posed questions and subquestions which required the analyst to report on the content of

the materials in great detail. The Haussler-Pittman combination scheme was also good for assessing content in textbooks in that it required detailed annotative responses to questions and sub-questions about the main content elements in the materials.

## Depth and Flexibility of Textbook Analysis

The term "depth" was used in this study to refer to the number of questions about specific topics, components, methods, or characteristics presented in instruments for the appraisal of materials. The amount of detail suggested for each reply was also considered to be part of the depth of response. In some cases only a few questions, which required a checkmark or a simple indication of rating, were presented. Other instruments provided two or three levels of sub-questions to ensure that the analyst examined the material in detail. "Flexibility" was the term used to refer to the amount of freedom the analyst was allowed in responding to questions on a particular instrument. For example, some instruments limited answers to "yes" or "no" or numerically coded responses. Some instruments allowed analysts to add additional questions, while others encouraged observations and open, intuitive comments about the materials being considered.

The simple, inflexible analysis has a place in providing a quick check in order to eliminate totally unsuitable texts or other resources from a large selection. This type of analysis may also serve teachers, school administrators, or committees

who have only limited time to select textbooks and other resources for a specific program. However, considering the importance of textbooks for curricula, and the finances involved in the purchase of a textbook or series, it would seem appropriate to use the more comprehensive types of instruments for most purposes of textbook appraisal.

Neither depth, nor flexibility, was allowed in most of the checklist forms studied. For example the question, "Does the material achieve its stated purpose?" (Bender and Baker, p. 364) might elicit a "no" response. However, the material might have been useful for another purpose. An in-depth, flexible response could have qualified the simplistic answer by pointing out the potential usefulness of the resource for a specific unit or concept. A limitation of the checklist response was also evident in the question, "__ Is factual content of the text accurate? Are conclusions logical and interpretations free from bias?" (Connell et al., p. 295). In actuality, three questions have been posed but only one response is provided for. A scheme which allowed for flexible responses might have drawn a comment for each of the questions. A question in Fetter's checklist (p. 56) asked, "Is the content of this instructional material sufficient in quantity to adequately cover the course as provided in the syllabus? Yes ... No ..." The word "cover" in this case is ambiguous. There might not have been enough material to cover the whole course, but enough material may have been available on a specific topic or unit to

make the resource an excellent supplement. A flexible response would have allowed the analyst to alert a potential user to the strengths of the material as well as the weaknesses pointed out in the checklist.

Weighted rating scales differed greatly in the amount of depth and flexibility of analysis which they provided. The Assessment included a scale of 1 to 5 on which four criteria could be rated from poor to excellent. The nine items in the Rothe example also included little depth or flexibility as only three levels of response from "acceptable" to "unacceptable" were provided (p. 31).

Brodbelt's 23 item list used a numerical rating system which allowed some depth of analysis by providing a weighted factor for each question, thus allowing a comparison between resources or between sections in a single resource such as a textbook. However, flexibility was minimal because responses were limited to the numerical codings supplied with the instrument.

The rating scales of Ball, and Warming and Baber, were similar in format except that the former included 60 questions while the latter included just 20 questions. The larger number of questions allowed somewhat more depth because there were more responses available under each category. Little flexibility was provided by either instrument because of the three-level scale employed in each case.

The Breiter and Menne scheme provided for some depth of analysis, according to the topics and sub-topics chosen for examination. For example, the major topic "Canadian History" could

include the sub-topic "British Columbia History" which could include the sub-sub-topic "The Great Depression in British Columbia." Then the topics would be rated on the "Social Studies Topics Rating Scale" (SSTRS) which employed a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) limiting any further depth or flexibility of response to the material.

Zenger and Zengers' system presented a number of set questions under each main heading. However, space was provided as well for the evaluator to add further questions which could increase the depth of analysis by encouraging more detailed questions on any topic. Flexibility of responses was also provided for by the inclusion of a "comments" section at the end of each heading (pp. 10 ff). The Zenger and Zenger scheme, because of its provisions for depth and flexibility, was the best of the weighted types studied.

Annotative instruments tended to provide varying levels of depth of analysis according to how questions were posed, and whether sub-questions were included in their schemes. Most of these instruments were flexible because of the annotative responses which allowed comment on the materials.

Nichols and Ochoa proposed eight broad questions such as, "Is the information in the textbook objectively presented?" (p. 291). Similarly broad questions such as, "What is to be learned?" (Eraut et al., p. 63) were included in the Berkeley instrument. In this respect neither scheme required specific in-depth answers, although some analysts would likely provide a great deal of depth in their answers to these types of questions. Flexibility was

amply provided for by the open-ended annotative responses encouraged by these instruments.

The Swiss, the Sussex, and the CMAS schemes all provided for in-depth responses by including broad questions accompanied by sub-questions. These instruments also featured the flexibility available in annotative responses to questions. Examples from CMAS and Sussex were presented in Chapter I of this paper.

The EPIE scheme provided a great deal of scope for in-depth analysis. A question such as, "Describe the developer's reasons for developing the program" (EPIEform A '79, p. 3) was accompanied by eight items which the analyst might consider in answering the initial question. In addition, flexibility of response was available because of the annotative format.

The combination instrument of Haussler and Pittman had a fairly large annotative component, including sub-questions, which allowed for both depth and flexibility. The Eash and Swedish schemes relied mostly on weighted checklist with only a small annotative component. Neither much depth, nor much flexibility, was provided because of the limited responses allowed by their scales.

The aesthetic mode described by Vallance and Eisner was totally subjective. As a result, no depth of analysis was specified in their articles. However, this approach was completely flexible allowing the analyst freedom to describe the learning resource, or any facet of it, in any manner and in as much or as little detail as he might choose.

The best of the instruments, in terms of flexibility and depth of analysis criteria, were the annotative and combination types. The open-ended nature of the questions encouraged the analyst to supply flexible, in-depth responses to questions posed in the instruments. The EPIE instrument was perhaps the most comprehensive of the annotative types, but the CMAS, Sussex, and the Swiss schemes also provided adequate depth and flexibility for analyzing learning materials. The Haussler and Pittman combination instrument similarly provided adequate depth and flexibility for the analysis of materials.

## Degree of Subjectivity or Objectivity

The term "subjectivity" as used in this study, referred to the personal views and feelings of the analyst toward learning materials being examined. In contrast, "objectivity" referred to verifiable, fixed alternatives, involving no personal views or feelings toward the materials being analyzed (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1979).

Of course, most instruments for analyzing learning materials were not purely subjective nor purely objective in responses sought. Instead, the instruments could be arranged on a continuum with the proponents of the aesthetic approach such as Vallance representing the subjective mode; while Brodbelt, who required "forced choices" (p. 488), best represented the objective approach.

The subjective nature of aesthetic criticism was explained in

Vallance's (1977) article when she wrote, "This question boils down to the more fundamental issue of what the critic sees in the artifact [or learning resource material] , how he or she examines it, what details are selected to be reported" (p. 93).

The Berkeley scheme and the Nichols and Ochoa scheme both required annotative answers to a short list of broad questions. Each instrument contained a substantial subjective component because the analyst was able to respond in the manner he chose without any further direction.

Some subjective component was also evident in the annotative nature of the EPIE, Sussex, and Swiss schemes. However, questions were worded in such a way that even annotative answers were controlled or directed to encourage a large degree of objectivity. As the EPIE Report No. 54 stated, "Committee members [require] ... a sense of the necessity for objective information as a mold and a brake on subjective opinion" (p. 10). The annotative component of Haussler and Pittmans' instrument also allowed a degree of subjectivity, but questions and sub-questions were quite specific in encouraging objective responses.

Both the Eash and Swedish schemes used objective rating scales as major components of their instruments. Eash indicated his concern for objectivity by alluding to it in several places in his article, "Developing an Instrument for Assessing Instructional Materials," in which his assessment instrument was presented (1972a).

The Zenger and Zenger instrument's provision for space for additional questions to be added by the analyst, and the comments

section, introduced some subjectivity into an otherwise objective instrument. The remaining weighted scales and checklists ensured a high degree of objectivity by allowing only "yes" or "no" or numerically coded answers.

The most important approach to examining textbooks from a subjective point of view was the aesthetic mode presented by Vallance. This approach allowed analysts to write critiques of texts or other learning materials based on their own feelings, perceptions, and experiences without reference to directed questions.. The best attempt at a purely objective approach was Brodbelt's numerically coded checklist. The EPIE annotative instrument, and the Eash combination instrument were also expected to result in objective ratings, according to their producers, because they required answers to set questions about the texts and learning materials being evaluated. However, in actual practice, many of the instruments introduced both subjective and objective components because of the types of responses allowed or the number of choices allowed the analyst.

## Optimal Training Period

Some of the simpler schemes surveyed for this study made no suggestions at all regarding the training of people who might use their assessment instrument. Other schemes implied that a training period would be useful, while some schemes suggested training periods before their appraisal forms were used. Still other schemes

required a training period before analysts were "certified" competent to use their instruments in assessing textbooks.

The checklist instruments did not include any suggestions that a training period was necessary for their use. Most of the instruments of this type were straightforward and simply worded and could be filled in by analysts without difficulty.

Most of the rating scales examined also did not specify a training period. However, some instruments such as those of Ball, Brodbelt, Rothe, and Warming and Baber, mentioned learning theories, special terms, organization, style, weighting, learning experiences, and other criteria. A common approach to these topics, such as that supplied by a training program, would seem to be implied by the articles accompanying these schemes.

The Breiter and Menne, and the Zenger and Zenger instruments were self-contained in that complete details and directions for the use of the instruments was included and the material was presented in a step-by-step sequence. Perhaps a short workshop would be helpful if a committee were to use either of these instruments, but a lengthy training period appeared unnecessary.

The Assessment, directed as it was to large numbers of individual teachers in the field, did not contain any mention of training for its simple four item questionnaire.

The EPIE Training Package (British Columbia Ministry of Education 1980) explained that analysts using their scheme must be familiar with the EPIE vocabulary. In addition, the training course literature also

explained the intents, content, methodology, and means of evaluation of learning materials required by EPIE. Trainees were committed to an intensive three day, two evening course. At the end of the course, the trainee was expected to complete an analysis which would be sent to California for evaluation. Trainees who successfully passed the test evaluation would become certified EPIE analysts.

An intensive training program was also considered important by the designers of the Sussex scheme. As Eraut et al. stated:

> We have found 1 week workshops on the analysis of curriculum materials particularly useful .... In our experience it takes at least two weeks to produce an analysis for circulation, but 1 week is sufficient time for people to get used to the idea of curriculum analysis and to make a relatively penetrating appraisal of some materials. (pp. 28-29)

An alternative training program for the Sussex scheme involved making it a component of a Master's program in curriculum (p. 109).

The CMAS scheme also suggested a training period of about a week for potential analysts (Morrissett, Stevens, & Woodley, pp. (231-232). Like the Sussex scheme, the CMAS training program has been used as part of (graduate and undergraduate) university courses (p. 234).

No mention of a training program was made in the Swiss scheme, but the annotative format of the instrument used suggested that a training period similar to the CMAS or Sussex programs would be reasonable.

Neither the Berkeley, nor the Nichols and Ochoa schemes included any mention of a training requirement for the use of their instruments.

However, the Berkeley instrument was designed for use by its own staff and the Nichols and Ochoa instrument was presented mainly for individual teacher use. If these schemes were to be used by committees in the selection of textbooks, some training procedures would likely be advisable to ensure co-ordination of appraisals in terms of the reality of classroom teaching and current research on learning (Morrissett, Hawke, & Superka, 1980, p. 563).

Eash stated, "For optimum results in using the [Eash] instrument it is necessary to have a training period" (p. 219). However, nowhere in his report on studies conducted during construction and field tests of the instrument did he outline how long or in what depth the training period should be. There was no mention of a training period for either the Haussler and Pittman or the Swedish instruments but, since both schemes were reported in Eraut, Goad, & Smith, perhaps some of the preliminary information concerning the training of analysts was left out. The largely annotative Haussler and Pittman scheme, in particular, would appear to require some form of training period for the same reasons that purely annotative schemes did. The Swedish scheme was mainly a rating scale so perhaps a training period would not be necessary.

Though the aesthetic approach did not indicate a formal training period, Vallance (1977) made it clear that the analyst or critic "must be prepared to defend his or her perceptions and selections on both aesthetic and educational grounds" (p. 103). The experience and training of the teacher or specialist was expected to enter into the aesthetic judgements made about textbooks.

## Summary

Two of the better checklist instruments for assessment of Social Studies materials were supplied by Connell et al., and by Massialas and Cox. Both checklists presented basic questions along with an indication that items could be added or changed to suit the purposes of appraisal committees.

Neither checklist required objectives to be stated in behavioral form. Connell and his colleagues emphasized the factual, logical, and student interest aspects of content, while Massialas and Cox were more concerned with inquiry and multi-disciplined reflective thinking aspects of content. Depth of analysis could be accomplished for either list by the addition of questions or sub-questions, and by the separation of multiple questions into individual parts. A short training period would appear to be desirable for both schemes so that committee members would have a common understanding of terms and approaches to the analysis.

The checklist format would be suitable for quick, overview types of analyses in order to produce short lists of texts or other resources for further, more comprehensive examination.

The most useful of the weighted scales was the Zenger and Zenger scheme. It consisted of two parts, a "Short Form" for initial screening of textbooks and a "long Form" for a more comprehensive appraisal of textbooks.

Questions and objectives were not stated in behavioral terms, but both general and specific objectives were examined in some

detail with space provided for additional questions and comments. Several questions about reading level were included in the instrument along with an appendix which presented two procedures for estimating the readability of textbooks and other resource materials.

The Zenger and Zenger instrument also provided a number of questions relating to the quality, quantity, values, philosophy, and the educational integrity of learning material content. Some depth of analysis was provided as well by the inclusion of space for the evaluator to fill in additional questions at the end of each section, if he so desired. Similarly, a comments section allowed for flexibility of response by analysts.

Generally, the Zenger and Zenger instrument was objective, as were all the rating scale instruments. However, the provision of space for additional questions and comments permitted some subjective input by analysts. No training period was suggested for the use of the instrument. The instructions were presented in a clear, step-by-step sequence which should be easy to follow. However, as with the checklist format, a short session to ensure a common approach to the analysis of learning materials would seem to be useful.

Three of the annotative schemes -- CMAS, EPIE, and Sussex, -- provided excellent instruments for the appraisal of resources for curricula. These instruments all provided for comprehensive in-depth examination of learning materials.

The CMAS scheme was designed to analyze materials according to behavioral objectives. On the other hand, specific behavioral objectives were not mentioned by either EPIE or Sussex. In addition,

the annotative forms lacked questions about readability. Some supplemental readability formulas or estimates appear to be needed with these annotative analyses.

Content was examined in detail by all three of the instruments. Sub-questions and annotative responses provided for depth of analysis in the three instruments as well. Flexibility of response was also supported by the annotative nature of comments which allowed analysts to point out features, strengths, and weaknesses in materials or in chapters or sections of textbooks.

The CMAS, EPIE, and Sussex schemes provided questions and sub-questions in order to ensure a high degree of objectivity in the responses to their instruments. At the same time, by seeking annotative replies to questions, the instruments introduced a degree of subjectivity into the analysis. The training period of approximately one week, suggested by all three schemes, was designed to ensure a common language and a common approach to resource appraisal by all committee members.

The aesthetic approach was not expected to be used alone as an instrument for selecting learning materials. Instead it was expected to serve as a supplementary "critique" which could be used in conjunction with a formal instrument such as the Zenger and Zenger, CMAS, EPIE, or the Sussex schemes in order to provide a broadly based appraisal.

The chart which follows outlines how each instrument meets or does not meet the criteria listed in this chapter.

*Criteria for judgement*

| *Name of model* | *type* | *behavioral objectives* | *readability* | *content* | *depth* | *flexibility* | *objective* | *subjective* | *training required* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Bender & Baker* | *CK* | *I* | *I* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *N* |
| *Connell et al.* | | *I* | *Y* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *N* |
| *Fetsko* | | *I* | *N* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *N* |
| *Fetter* | | *I* | *N* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *N* |
| *Massialas & Cox* | | *I* | *N* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *N* |
| *Assessment* | *RS* | *I* | *I* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *N* |
| *Ball* | | *I* | *N* | *Y* | *Y* | *N* | *Y* | | *I* |
| *Breiter & Menne* | | *N* | *N* | *Y* | *Y* | *N* | *Y* | | *N* |
| *Brodbelt* | | *N* | *I* | *Y* | *Y* | *N* | *Y* | | *I* |
| *Rothe* | | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *I* |
| *Warming & Baber* | | *I* | *Y* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *I* |
| *Zenger & Zenger* | | *I* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *N* |
| *Berkeley* | *A* | *I* | *N* | *Y* | *N* | *Y* | | *Y* | *I* |
| *CMAS* | | *Y* | *N* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* |
| *EPIE* | | *I* | *N* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* |
| *Nichols & Ochoa* | | *N* | *N* | *Y* | *N* | *Y* | | *Y* | *I* |
| *Sussex* | | *I* | *N* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* |
| *Swiss* | | *I* | *N* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | | *Y* | *I* |
| *Eash* | *C* | *Y* | *N* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *Y* |
| *Haussler & Pittman* | | *Y* | *N* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *Y* | *I* |
| *Swedish* | | *N* | *N* | *Y* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *N* |
| *Vallance* | *AE* | *N* | *N* | *N* | *N* | *Y* | | *Y* | *N* |

*Code: CK - Checklist RS - Rating Scale A - Annotative C - Combination AE - Aesthetic*
*Y - Yes, clearly stated or specified N - No, not mentioned or clearly implied*
*I - Implied in the model*

*Note: Some models contain significant elements of both objective and subjective approaches so both columns have been marked for these models.*

# Chapter III

## INQUIRY GOALS IN THE NEW BRITISH COLUMBIA SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM: THE PROBLEM OF CONGRUENCE OF GOALS AND RESOURCES

The examination of the congruence between available textbooks and the inquiry goals for Social Studies in British Columbia required several steps. First, the literature was examined in order to ascertain the most recent findings as to the nature of inquiry learning. Secondly, the Proposed Curriculum Guide, K-11 (1980) for British Columbia was analyzed to determine the type of inquiry learning proposed by the curriculum developers. This analysis was supplemented by an interview with Ian Parker, the Ministry's Curriculum Consultant in Social Studies, and by the examination of a paper by Parker entitled, "Social Studies Curriculum Revision" (1980, pp. 14-15). Finally, teachers' views, as reported in the British Columbia Social Studies Assessment (1977), were examined to ascertain their perspectives on the problem of achieving congruence of goals and resources.

### Inquiry Learning: Terms, Definitions, Models

Educational literature, especially in the field of Social Studies, often referred to inquiry teaching and learning processes. However, as John Lee (1974) explained, "The range and shades of meaning associated with inquiry indicate that inquiry may, quite properly, mean a great many somewhat different things to different people" (p. 60).

Similar statements have been made by Beyer (1971a, pp.7-8) and Oliner (1976, p. 4).

A variation in the terminology used to describe inquiry was frequently encountered in the literature on Social Studies. For example, Bruner (1968) used the terms "discovery" and "inquiry" interchangeably (p. 10) in his article entitled, "The Art of Discovery." Saunders (1969) also mentioned the "discovery or inquiry approach" (p. 139) in his description of one strategy for teaching, although he later referred to "pure discovery" and "directed discovery" (p. 140) as being somewhat different from each other.

Hilda Taba (1967) used the term "problem solving" (p. 31) in relation to Dewey's (1933) "reflective thoughts" (p. 106). Lee asked, "Are inquiry and problem solving the same thing?" His response was, "The answer is probably 'yes'" (pp. 69-70). Maxim (1977) also used inquiry and problem-solving synonymously when he wrote, "This type of learning is often referred to as problem solving or inquiry" (p. 53).

Another term encountered in the literature was "reflective thinking." Dewey (1933) listed five steps to reflective thinking (pp. 106-116). These steps have formed the basis for inquiry models of Beyer (1971a), Fenton (1968), Massialas and Cox (1966), Taba (1967), and others. Crabtree (1967) mentioned reflective thinking as being an important part of the "new social studies under the rubric of inquiry" (p. 78).

Many other terms have also been used by proponents of the

inquiry method. Jean Fair (1977) listed several of these terms when she wrote:

> Dewey's formulation has been followed by a host of analyses and inquiries which, in turn, have resulted in a proliferation of terms: to reflective thinking have been added problem-solving, inquiry, critical thinking, Socratic method, discovery, inductive and deductive thinking, intellectual abilities, scientific method, analysis and clarification of issues, convergent and divergent thinking, values clarification, and decision-making. (p. 30)

The definitions for inquiry were somewhat less diverse than were the variety of ways of using the term. Kliebard (1968) defined inquiry as:

> Inquiry is an attitude toward learning and a philosophy of education. The central values are the open mind and the autonomous probing of the learner. If the teacher would promote inquiry, he must provide the child with problems to focus upon, give him opportunities to theorize and test his theories, and help him with road maps that suggest better theories and more productive strategies of investigation. (p. 57).

Lee commented that, "Inquiry is a process, a set of actions occurring in some order" (p. 60), and "Inquiry involves a set of investigative actions undertaken to discover an answer or answers within a mass of evidence" (p. 61). Massialas (1967) defined inquiry as the "process by which one explores and validates alternatives" (p. 8). In the broadest sense, these statements by Lee, Kliebard, Massialas, and others represented a degree of consensus among theorists as to the meaning of inquiry.

Though theorists differed on the more explicit approaches to inquiry in the classroom, there were similarities among their approaches as well. As Edwin Fenton (1968) explained, "[other models] differ in detail from ours, but the similarities among them all

outweigh the differences. About the nature of inquiry, we have widespread agreement" (p. 91).

Most of the proponents of inquiry teaching and learning acknowledged that Dewey's (1933) five steps to reflective thinking served as a basis for their inquiry models. Dewey's steps included: (a) suggestion (recognition of a problem) (b) intellectualization (analysis of a problem) (c) hypothesizing (and gathering data) (d) reasoning (considering consequences) (e) testing the hypothesis (verification) (pp. 106-116).

Edwin Fenton's six-step inquiry model demonstrated his debt to Dewey. The Fenton inquiry model is presented in brief form below:

1. Recognizing a problem from data
2. Formulating hypotheses
3. Recognizing the logical implication of hypotheses
4. Gathering data
5. Analyzing, Evaluating, and Interpreting the data
6. Evaluating the hypothesis in light of the data
   (Fenton, 1969, pp. 544-545)

Massialas and Cox outlined a model similar to Fenton's, but they called it "The Reflective Model" (p. 115).

Dewey's influence was also evident in Bruner's (1968) "hypothetical mode" of teaching which required students to: (a) search out, organize, and hypothesize about a topic (b) experience intrinsic rewards from working on the problem (c) learn and use the problem-solving method of discovery, and (d) internalize the resultant learning (pp. 3-13). Suchman's (1968) model saw inquiry as a process beginning with a challenge to the child's universe (a discrepant event), followed by the child's collecting of data

to build and test his theories, and culminating in the discovery of a generalization or solution to a problem (p. 56). Beyer, Crabtree, Fair, Taba, and others, all proposed inquiry models of teaching and learning which drew from Dewey's earlier work.

Brubaker, Simon, and Williams (1977) summed up the most common approaches found in inquiry models when they wrote, "That method [inquiry] would include sensing a problem, articulating it, hypothesizing a plausible solution, gathering data, testing the hypothesis, and drawing appropriate conclusions" (p. 203).

## Inquiry Goals in the Proposed British Columbia Social Studies Curriculum

Inquiry processes were of considerable importance in the Proposed Curriculum Guide Social Studies, K-11 (British Columbia, 1980). Developers of the B.C. Guide appeared to have based their approaches to inquiry on the theories of Fenton (1968,1969) which in turn were based on Dewey's theory of "reflective thinking."

The philosophy of the curriculum reinforced inquiry when it proposed a balance between content and process learning. The process aspect suggested "the development of concepts through discovery and inductive thinking" (pp. 2-3). In addition to this statement of philosophy, five areas of curriculum focus were presented: (a) "Canada's cultural and physical heritage" (b) "the cultural and physical heritage of the world" (c) "roles, responsibilities and rights of the individual in society" (d) "development of inquiry,

analysis and problem solving skills" (e) "the willingness and capacity to apply knowledge and skills as a member of society" (p. 2). Further explicit references to inquiry processes occurred in the amplification of goals (a), (b), and (c) above. Along with each of these goals was a statement such as, "More specifically, by the end of the compulsory curriculum, the student, through the exercise of critical thinking and problem solving skills will be expected to ..." (pp. 3-4). In addition, the B.C. Guide mentioned skills which "must be taught and learned as an integral part of the Social Studies program" (p. 11). One of these skills, designated as a primary responsibility of the Social Studies, was "inquiry processes" (p. 11).

Further emphasis on inquiry responsibility was evidenced in the "Sequence of Instruction Charts" which required grade one teachers to introduce inquiry skills using problem-solving and decision-making processes (p. 30). Grades two to eleven required teachers to further develop inquiry skills in students (pp. 37-122). A chart entitled "Inquiry Processes" further emphasized the use of inquiry-based teaching and learning in the Social Studies program in British Columbia. This chart provided more explicit directives for teaching than the "Sequence" chart in that inquiry skills were to be introduced in grade one, developed in grades two to eight, and tested, retaught, and maintained in grades nine to eleven (pp. 140-141). In addition, several other skills relating to the inquiry process were listed for most grades. Some of these skills included: locating, acquiring, organizing, discussing, interpreting, and evaluating information (pp. 36-125).

The inquiry processes outlined in the B.C. Guide were similar to processes presented in the literature on inquiry. For example, problem-solving as it appeared in the B.C. Guide bore a definite resemblance to Beyer's model and to Fenton's inquiry model described earlier in this chapter. The following excerpt from the B.C. Guide should illustrate the similarity with the Fenton model in particular.

1. Define a problem
2. Establish a tentative answer
3. Interpret information available
4. Gather additional information
5. Analyze information to re-examine tentative answer
6. Synthesize information into firmer answer
   (B.C. Guide, 1980, p. 30)

Decision-making was the second part of the inquiry process outlined in the B.C. Guide. The model below from the B.C. Guide closely resembles the Woodley and Driscoll model which follows it.

1. Identify problem or issue
2. Identify possible alternative solutions
3. Gather, analyze and interpret information
4. Evaluate alternatives and establish priorities
5. Test priorities and analyze consequences of each
6. Plan a course of action
7. Establish group decision
8. Take some action on group decision
9. Evaluate group's decision
   (B.C. Guide, 1980, p. 30)

For comparison purposes the Woodley and Driscoll decision-making model is presented below.

1. Identifying the occasion for a decision
2. Recognizing the values implicit in a decision situation
3. Seeking and finding alternatives
4. Creating alternatives
5. Predicting consequences of alternatives
6. Weighing alternatives and selecting one course of action
7. Determining appropriate action to implement the decision
8. Taking action to implement the decision
9. Reflecting on the decision, action and results.
   (Woodley & Driscoll, 1977, p. 238)

In summary, the B.C. Guide mandated the teaching of inquiry skills in Social Studies from grades one to eleven. The models of Fenton and Beyer appeared to have been used as a basis for the problem-solving component, while the Woodley and Driscoll model appeared to have been used as a basis for the decision-making component of the curriculum design presented in the B.C. Guide.

## Textbook Selection Process for the Social Studies Curriculum in British Columbia

Emphasis on inquiry in the B.C. Guide compounded the difficulty in selecting textbooks because some texts were not written to encourage explicit inquiry goals. In addition, as Morrissett, Stevens, and Woodley pointed out, effective use of some texts in the inquiry mode required supplementary resources and/or additional teacher training.

Ian Parker, Curriculum Consultant at the British Columbia Ministry of Education, in an article entitled "The Social Studies Curriculum Revision (1980)" outlined the process for selection of textbooks for the new curriculum. According to this outline, three types of committees were entrusted with the task, namely, (a) Materials Selection Committees (b) the Management Committee and, (c) a K-12 Advisory Committee (pp. 14-15)

The Materials Selection Committees, whose members were trained in materials evaluation according to the EPIE program adopted by the Ministry of Education, were given the initial task of sorting materials into potentially prescribed, potentially authorized, or

unsuitable, categories (p. 14). In an interview (January, 1981) Parker explained that "prescribed" referred to materials basic to the curriculum, suitable for most students, and which the teacher could use to arrive at prescribed outcomes. "Authorized" referred to materials which the teacher could use to provide enrichment, supplementary information, or remediation. "Not suitable" referred to materials which were not written at the appropriate grade levels, were not addressed to the topics outlined in the curriculum, or were otherwise unsatisfactory for student use.

Parker's article, a combined progress report and explanation of procedures for revising the curriculum in Social Studies, explained that following initial sorting the committees would examine the materials in much greater detail. He stated:

> The potentially prescribed materials will then be submitted to an in-depth analysis. This will consist of a careful examination of their instructional design and other considerations including bias, accuracy, currency and physical characteristics. The model used in this stage is derived from the Educational Products Exchange Institute, a process also used in Alberta and Manitoba. (1980, p. 14)

In addition, the materials were to be examined as to readability on at least two standard measures and for concept load as well. Social considerations such as: treatment of sex, ethnic background, social class, religion, and age, in the materials were also to be considered by the examining committees.

After these analyses had been completed, the material was to be field tested in a "few classrooms" in order to obtain "specific objective information about students' and teachers' reactions to the materials" (pp. 14-15). Following the field testing, the Materials

Committees were to gather all the evaluations and develop recommendations as to which materials would support the curriculum and what types of materials were required, but had not been submitted for examination. A similar, but less rigorous, process was to be used for authorized materials.

The Management Committee then was to decide (a) whether or not to accept the decisions on potentially prescribed or authorized resources submitted by the Materials Committees, and (b)whether to revise the draft curriculum in light of the suggested resources. In addition, this committee was to refer their decisions, revisions, and recommendations to senior Ministry officials for final approval (p. 15). As Parker commented, "The evaluation of all submissions will require at least a full year" (p. 14).

Once the recommendations had been submitted to the Ministry, all existing committees would be replaced by the Advisory Committee for Social Studies K-12 which would respond to concerns from the field and "evaluate any newly developed materials which might support the curriculum" (p. 15). As Parker mentioned in January 1981, the Advisory Committee would continue to check materials and receive input after implementation of the curriculum. Their recommendations would carry a great deal of weight in determining changes, suitability in the field, required supplementary materials, and other considerations.

The interview also revealed that the proposed new curriculum was designed to serve as a core or framework to be used for several years. This would allow for continuous revision which would be less costly

than throwing everything out and starting over every few years.

Selection and operation of the committees was also explained by Parker in the interview. Prospective candiates for the Materials, Management, and Advisory Committees were nominated by superintendents, school boards, and the British Columbia Teachers' Federation. From the resulting list a rural/urban mix of committee members was selected to include a variety of experience, subject area expertise, and goegraphical locations.

The training program for members of the Materials Selection Committees consisted of a three-day Instructional Design Workshop based on the Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE) training package. The EPIE package was designed to examine rationale, objectives, scope, sequence, methodology, and evaluation instruments contained in materials being considered for adoption. In addition, EPIE required examiners to determine "goodness of fit" or congruence of materials with the new curriculum (EPIE Training Package, Draft, March 1980).

Readability was assessed using two standard measures such as Fry, Dale-Chall, or Spache depending on the reading level required for specific textbooks. Comments from reading specialists were added to the readability estimates. The concept load, or depth and difficulty of concepts presented, was also considered for each grade level as part of the readability assessement. Field testing in selected schools using the Cloze procedure provided the final test of readability before the textbooks were considered for the prescribed list (Parker, 1981).

An instrument, developed by the Ministry, and entitled Detailed Analysis of Learning Resources - Social Considerations (1981), was to be used by analysts as a guide for examining the following headings: "Language Usage, Ethnic References, References to Belief Systems, Role Portrayals of the Sexes, References to Violence, Sexual References, Age Portrayals, References to Social Class, and Other Considerations" (pp. 2-3). This comprehensive thirteen-page instrument required annotative responses to in-depth questions about social factors in the materials under analysis. Questions in the instrument appeared to have been expanded from Part IV of EPIEform A '79 which addressed "Bias of Content" concerning racial, ethnic, sex, age, religious, socioeconomic, and language considerations. The importance of this aspect of textbook evaluation was underscored by Parker who revealed in the January 1981 interview that over the past few years the Ministry has experienced a geometric increase in the rate of complaints and criticisms regarding social biases in materials.

The Materials Selection Committees worked for six days during the summer, then two days in each of September, October, and November. Each member of a committee was expected to complete an analysis each day. Generally, completed reports on each major textbook -- which were a synthesis of several individual analyses -- included about 30 pages for EPIE analysis, 20 pages for readability, and 10 to 20 pages for social considerations (Parker, 1981).

In essence, the committees began with broad criteria in order to "sort" the textbooks into prescribed, authorized, or unsuitable categories. Then the committees refined the criteria and examined the textbooks in more detail using the EPIE, readability, and social considerations instruments outlined above.

In view of the assessment of instruments for analyzing learning materials, as reported in Chapter II of this paper, it appeared that the Materials Selection Committees were using suitable devices for selection. For example, EPIE analysis was considered to be one of the better annotative instruments for examining resource materials. Readability estimates on the materials incorporating two standard instruments, plus the use of Cloze procedures in field tests, adequately addressed reading levels of the materials. The addition of social considerations, in an instrument which provided a great deal of detail, helped to provide for ethnic and human rights concerns about the materials. Taken together, these instruments required members of the Materials Selection Committees to carefully examine textbooks under consideration and to report in great detail on the strengths and weaknesses of such textbooks.

Some of the problems of congruence of textbooks with the curriculum occurred in the areas of currency of information and statistics, biases, level of material published, readability, and the lack of inquiry oriented material, according to Parker (1981). He also advised that a few topics , such as the study of a specific African nation, had to be changed because of a dearth of material

on that nation while material on a similar nation was presented in one or more suitable textbooks.

At this time it is difficult to gauge how well the Ministry is achieving congruence between resources and inquiry goals since the process is now simply underway.

## Teacher Views on the Congruence of the Goals of Social Studies With Prescribed and Authorized Resources: Ministry Responses

The views of teachers in British Columbia regarding the suitability of prescribed textbooks for the Social Studies curriculum have been reported in the British Columbia Social Studies Assessment, 1977. This document explained the importance of teacher input to the curriculum in the statement:

> ... it was thought that information in respect to the appropriateness and usefulness of such resources as teachers' manuals, picture sets, atlases, teacher reference books and books for student use would be highly useful for the purposes of the Social Studies Assessment Project. (Vol. 3, Part 2, p. 1)

In order to rate the prescribed textbooks as to goals of the curriculum, and congruence with the curriculum, a series of questionnaires was completed by 2,193 elementary level teachers (grades 1-7). The specific questionnaire regarding student textbooks contained four criteria. The "criteria cluster," as it was designated, and the codes for the criteria were listed below the tables for textbooks for grades three to seven (Vol. 3, Part 2, pp. 55-59).

These criteria did not direct teachers to respond in terms of the handling of inquiry by the textbooks even though the curriculum guide then in use (B.C. Guide, 1974) specified the teaching of inquiry skills (pp. 3-6). A comment in the Assessment about teacher views on curriculum did, however, refer to the fact that teachers considered the development of inquiry skills to be important (Vol. 3, Part 1, p. 27). It would appear that teachers were somewhat restricted in their responses to textbooks by the limited nature of the questionnaires seeking teacher views on these materials.

The Summary Table of teacher ratings of student books for grades three to seven is reproduced below. This table revealed that of the 81 student textbooks examined by teachers, none was given a "good" or "excellent" rating. No books were rated "poor" either. The bulk of the books (74) were rated as "satisfactory" and seven books were rated as "unsatisfactory."

Teacher Rating of Student Books (Year 3-7)

Summary Table

| | No. of Books for Each Rating | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Student Books | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Books |
| Year 3 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Year 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Year 5 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 21 |
| Year 6 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 25 |
| Year 7 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| Total Books | 0 | 0 | 74 | 7 | 0 | 81 |

Criteria Cluster: Challenges students to think.
Is interesting to students.
Fits with course outline
Has appropriate reading level.

Code: 1 - Poor 2 - Unsatisfactory 3 - Satisfactory
4 - Good 5 - Excellent
(Assessment, 1977, Vol. 3, Part 2, Table 2-42, p. 54)

The Assessment questioned the adequacy of student textbooks rated only "satisfactory" when it concluded:

> The fact that year 3-7 teachers rate 74 of 81 student books (91 percent) in the "satisfactory" category raises the question of what indeed this judgement represents. Are books rated by a professional group simply as "satisfactory" in fact of high enough quality to be prescribed for general use? If one concludes that Social Studies books should be more than "satisfactory", then a comprehensive review of elementary student books is required. In respect to those books judged as unsatisfactory, immediate review is indicated. Particular attention should be given to those books issued on a per-pupil basis.
> (Vol. 3, Part 2, p. 54)

However, there is need for caution in interpreting these observations. The report by teachers that prescribed texts were only "satisfactory" can be explained in various ways. For example, better texts may just not have been available for the curriculum content in question. Moreover, textbooks which were not written in the inquiry mode may have provided sufficient information for inquiry teaching if manuals providing guidance to teachers had been available. Specific inquiry processes may have been difficult to incorporate into texts designed for varied provincial, national, or even international markets. Inquiry, as described in the literature, has been considered to be a broad, multi-resource process requiring supplemental materials such as television, films, speakers, magazines, and newspaper stories for a variety of viewpoints. Such variety is difficult to accommodate in a single textbook for student use. Finally, teachers may have

expected too much of prescribed texts, especially those issued on a per-pupil basis. Reliance on one text could hinder the inquiry process which is best carried out with diverse inputs of information.

Some of the major recommendations of teachers related to the congruence of textbooks with curriculum goals were: "(a) curriculum materials should be listed with annotated comments and a clear indication of readability level (b) the Ministry of Education should review newly published books and inform teachers of their suitability and, (c) books for student use should be field-tested before being prescribed" (Vol. 3, Part 1, pp. 31-34).

The Ministry's process for selecting textbooks for the 1980 curriculum, as described by Parker (1980,1981) incorporated these teacher recommendations to a large degree. As the Assessment stated, "It would appear, therefore, that a major review of Social Studies curriculum resources and of the methods used to select them is necessary in order that the gap between those who 'select' and those who are required to 'use' may eventually be closed" (Vol. 3, Part 2, p. 111). The process of selecting textbooks for curriculum, as outlined by Parker, appeared to be an attempt to close this "gap" between selectors and users in two ways. One way was by using as selectors teachers who would later be users of the resources. In addition, the use of EPIE analysis, readability estimates, and social considerations instruments by committees of teachers to determine congruence between textbooks and goals of the curriculum would ensure teacher input and involvement before the texts become prescribed resources for Social Studies in the classrooms of British Columbia.

Generally, the Assessment and the resulting Proposed Curriculum Guide Social Studies, K-11 for British Columbia appeared to have made use of teacher views and recommendations. The Advisory Committee was to provide further teacher input as the textbooks were used in the schools of the province. The judgements of teachers who responded to the Assessment and teachers who worked on committees to select textbooks for Social Studies will be tested by their peers as the new curriculum is implemented across the province.

# Chapter IV

## A PROPOSED PROCESS FOR THE EVALUATION OF RESOURCES FOR THE NEW CURRICULUM FOR SOCIAL STUDIES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

In response to comments in the Assessment, requirements outlined in the new B.C. Guide (1980), and a review of the relevant literature on the selection of learning resources, a two-stage process for evaluation of learning materials, especially textbooks, for the new curriculum in British Columbia has been developed in this paper. The process, explained and analyzed in this chapter, should provide analysts with a clear indication of the congruency of proposed resources with respect to inquiry goals of the new B.C. Guide.

In the first stage, an instrument entitled "Preliminary Checklist for Textbooks in Elementary Social Studies," was adopted with minor modifications from Touchstones for Textbook Selection (Warming and Baber, 1980). This weighted checklist was to serve as an initial screening device to select textbooks which might be suitable as either prescribed or authorized resources for Social Studies in British Columbia. The instrument featured a rating-scale system to provide comparison scores for textbooks being analyzed. Such scores could be used to determine which texts should be rejected at the outset as unsuitable, and which texts should be subjected to a more comprehensive evaluation.

The second instrument, "A Proposed Instrument for Determining Suitability of Textbooks for Curriculum in Elementary Social Studies," was a synthesis drawn from many models encountered during the course of this study. This comprehensive instrument required detailed annotative responses to a series of in-depth questions based on criteria from the B.C. Guide (1980), and on published instruments such as those of CMAS, Sussex, and others. The proposed instrument is examined in detail later in this chapter.

## Preliminary Checklist for Textbooks in Elementary Social Studies

This instrument, adapted from that proposed by Warming and Baber (1980), was chosen to provide a checklist type of evaluation for the initial screening of textbooks. Though the focus of this paper was on the selection of textbooks for elementary Social Studies, the proposed instrument could be used for secondary levels as well.

Such an instrument would have proved useful to the Ministry's Materials Selection Committees inasmuch as all resource materials were to be first sorted into potentially prescribed, potentially authorized, and unsuitable categories (Parker, 1980, p. 14). Parker (1981) further indicated that a great deal of material had been received from publishers following the Ministry's request for submissions of learning materials to support the proposed curriculum. Thus the preliminary checklist could be used to eliminate texts which were entirely unsuitable for the topics and methodology required by

the B.C. Guide. In short, a preliminary checklist would lessen the amount of material that would need to be examined in depth so costs and workload could both be reduced.

This particular checklist was chosen because it contained only 20 questions so could be completed in a relatively short time. The questions were to be checked off according to a rating of 1 - inadequate, 3 - adequate, or 5 - excellent. The instrument was useful in that it provided comprehensive questions on scope, sequence, course objectives, appropriateness of language, content, social aspects, and evaluation. In addition the weighted checklist provided ratings on individual topics, and overall ratings in mathematical form. Choice of 1,3,5 instead of 1,2,3 allowed for a more visible numerical spread between ratings when profiles or summaries were prepared from analysts' reports. The proposed checklist reads as follows:

Text title _____

Author/s _____

Publisher _____

Publication date _____ Cost _____

Reviewer's name _____

Date of review _____

| | excellent 5 | adequate 3 | inadequate 1 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Appropriate readability level | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 2. Author(s) reputable in field | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 3. Indicates successful field-testing of text and assessment instruments | ___ | ___ | ___ |

| | excellent 5 | adequate 3 | inadequate 1 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Published by reputable firm | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 5. Table of contents exhibits logical development of subject | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 6. Meets course objectives | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 7. Language appropriate for intended students | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 8. Presents major concepts thoroughly and accurately | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 9. Defines difficult/important ideas and vocabulary in context or in a glossary | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 10. Contains visual illustrations of key concepts | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 11. Levels of abstraction appropriate for readers | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 12. Provides chapter objectives | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 13. Provides chapter summaries | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 14. Format interesting and material well presented | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 15. Avoids stereotypes and sexist language | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 16. Provides for concrete application of abstract concepts | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 17. Recommends resources and research projects | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 18. Suggests alternate resources for students experiencing difficulty | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 19. Provides teacher's guide or manual | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 20. Provides for assessment of instructional objectives | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| Subtotals | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| Total score | | ___ | |

Before using the proposed checklist, selection committees should co-operatively determine minimum acceptable standards or scores for the learning materials which they plan to evaluate. At this time it should also be determined whether different "weighting" should be assigned to any of the questions in the checklist. This development of standards should take place during the training session prior to analysis of materials for specific curricula. Such a process is consistent with the EPIE Report No. 54 (1973) which stated that, "systematic ... criteria, co-operatively developed" was necessary for consistent, thorough evaluation (p. 10). Warming and Baber also indicated that analysts might wish to assign different weights to some questions in their list (p. 695). However, it should be pointed out that in the proposed checklist each question's rating is somewhat subjective in nature because not all analysts, even after a training session, would rate materials the same.

## A Proposed Instrument for Determining Suitability of Textbooks for Curriculum in Elementary Social Studies

After gross discrimination of submitted resources through the use of the checklist, analysts would use the "Proposed Instrument for Determining Suitability of Textbooks for Curriculum in Elementary Social Studies" to analyze, in detail, the remaining resources. This instrument, a blend of existing instruments dealing with readability and social considerations, was developed to include detailed questions

specific to the requirements of the new British Columbia curriculum in Social Studies. However, although this instrument was designed for use in evaluating elementary Social Studies textbooks, with slight modification, it could be used to evaluate textbooks and materials for other grades and other subject areas. The study of Eraut, Goad, and Smith (1975) also pointed out that most instruments for the analysis of learning materials could easily be adapted for different subjects and different grade levels (p. 9).

The proposed instrument was developed as a possible improvement of existing instruments used at the Ministry. In the view of this observer, one comprehensive instrument including an aesthetic examination of textbook material is preferable in terms of efficiency and thoroughness to the three different processes employed by the Ministry, i.e. EPIE analysis, and assessments according to criteria relating to readability and social considerations.

Major criteria for selecting questions for the proposed instrument were based on statements of philosophy, goals, and objectives presented in the B.C. Guide (1980). Many of the chosen criteria were of a general nature common to most instruments used in the evaluation of learning materials. They included references to levels of readability, degree of bias or stereotyping, congruency of content, and goal objectives. The proposed instrument, however, also stressed criteria related to the special nature of the new British Columbia curriculum in Social Studies.

For instance, inquiry learning was emphasized as a goal in the

B.C. Guide. Inquiry was referred to both explicitly and implicitly many times in the first 13 pages of the proposed curriculum with further references to inquiry skills appearing throughout the remaining pages of the Guide. Further evidence of the importance of inquiry was demonstrated by the order of skills presented in the B.C. Guide. "Inquiry processes, " encompassing problem-solving and decision-making components, was listed as the first skill to be developed (p. 30).

Questions about presentation, accuracy, content, objectives, readability, and social issues in the proposed instrument all related to inquiry because the nature of inquiry involves selecting, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information (Fenton, 1967, p. 2). Moreover, the B.C. Guide (pp. 3-5) required that inquiry skills be used by students in attaining goals of the outlined program.

No single model encountered in the literature attempted to cover all the facets of textbook analysis presented in the proposed instrument. For example, description, student motivation, content, learner goals, teacher methodology, student evaluation, and textbook review, were considered in some detail in CMAS, EPIE, and Zenger and Zenger. Specific references to readability measures were most clear in Rothe and Zenger and Zenger. Moreover, in-depth consideration of social factors was not found in the literature in anywhere near the detail of the proposed instrument. Only the Ministry's draft instrument on social considerations addressed this aspect of textbook evaluation in some detail. Finally the provision for aesthetic review presented a radical departure from published instruments in that both an aesthetic

critique and directed questions on topics mentioned above were included in one instrument. The overall effect of the inclusion of all these different factors resulted in the construction of a very comprehensive instrument providing for more broad, detailed analysis of textbooks than any single instrument described in the literature.

Most of the instruments presented in the literature included some questions similar to the questions used in the proposed instrument. However, most of the questions in the proposed instrument have been selected and adapted from the following sources:

EPIE Training Package (Ministry of Education, British Columbia, 1980).

Eraut, Goad, and Smith, 1975.

Harrison, 1980.

Morrissett, Stevens, and Woodley, 1969.

Rothe, 1980.

Social Considerations (Ministry of Education, British Columbia, 1981).

Vallance, 1976,1977.

Warming and Baber, 1980.

Zenger and Zenger, 1976.

## Analysis of the Component Parts of the Proposed Instrument

The proposed instrument was designed to gauge the suitability and congruency of textbooks for the new Social Studies curriculum in British Columbia as outlined in the B.C. Guide (1980). Congruence was addressed by constructing questions on goals and objectives of

the new curriculum. Consistency and depth of analysis were encouraged by the specificity of questions, the inclusion of sub-questions, and the request for examples or excerpts from the text to support the analyst's responses. Similar approaches were favored by the CMAS, EPIE, and Sussex schemes. Each section in the proposed instrument also allowed ample provision for flexibility of response by closing with an open-ended statement to which the analyst could add comments pertinent to that section, much like the Zenger and Zenger approach.

Readability was addressed by the proposed instrument in two important ways. First, the analyst was required to employ a standard formula and a graph of readability. Secondly, the vocabulary and concept load was examined in a series of questions. Harrison (1980) reinforced the necessity for matching readers with suitable texts by using readability formulae. However, he also cautioned that concept load, context in which the material is presented, and student interest all entered into the overall readability of texts (pp. 148-151). The section on social considerations, borrowed from the Ministry's excellent document on the same topic, examined some current concerns of the Canadian public as evidenced by recent newspaper and magazine articles about sex, age, ethnic discrimination, religious cults, violence, class distinction, and other social factors. Most instruments in the literature mentioned one or more of these topics, but none adequately covered the field, especially from a Canadian perspective.

In addition, the section on aesthetic consideration of a text presented a unique opportunity for the analyst to respond at a "feeling" level. No other comprehensive instrument included an aesthetic review, thus limiting "subjective" impressions that an analyst might report about a text. In conjunction with other more objective sections, the aesthetic review should help provide a balanced analysis of the text.

In order to examine the proposed instrument in terms of criteria suggested in the literature, and criteria outlined in the B.C. Guide, a section-by-section discussion of the instrument follows.

## Information Sheet

The first section of the proposed instrument required a listing of the title, author, publisher, copyright date, and cost of the textbook under consideration. Other questions concerned the age and grade levels of students who might use the text, major themes or topics presented, and whether the text was a basic or supplementary reference. These latter questions required more extensive consideration than the first group, but still provided "standard" information readily available from the text, the teacher's manual, or the provincial curriculum guide. A space at the end of the page allowed the analyst to make brief comments if desired. The first section of the proposed instrument is reproduced below.

1.0 Textbook Information Sheet

1.1 Title of textbook _____

1.2 If part of a series, list series title _____

_____

1.3 Author(s) _____

1.4 Grade level(s) _____

1.5 Age level(s) of students _____

1.6 Major themes or areas of study _____

_____

1.7 Basic to curriculum or supplementary _____

1.8 Publisher _____

1.9 Copyright date/revisions _____

1.10 Number of pages _____

1.11 Textbook cost _____

1.12 Analyst's name and/or number _____

1.13 Date reviewed _____

1.14 Comments _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

General Description

In the second section the analyst was expected to describe and offer judgements on texts under consideration in terms of construction, appearance, cost, organization, and appropriateness for students at the target grade level.

Basically this section approached textbook evaluation from three points of view: construction and durability, use by students, and as a teaching tool. The first two sets of questions addressed construction of the text in terms of quality and durability as well as cost considerations. The following question considered the student's point of view relative to print size, glare, and ease of reading the pages. The following four questions examined the usefulness of the text as a teaching tool in reference to titles, headings, main ideas, summaries, and the index and glossary. Also considered in these questions was the currency of information, the representations of technology, and societal views. Finally, illustrative materials such as maps, charts, tables, and pictures were examined in terms of congruency and currency with textbook content. Section 2.0 is reproduced below.

2.0 General Description of the Textbook

2.1 Is the cover strong, attractive, and of lasting quality? Does the binding appear durable enough to withstand several years of use? Do the covers and pages open flat for easy student use?

2.2 Is the paper of good quality, durable, and free from glare? Is the print sharp and clear, of good contrast, and of a size appropriate to grade level? Is the type varied to provide attractive, easy-to-read pages.

2.3 Is the cost of the textbook reasonable in comparison to other texts of similar quality? Are additional support materials required? If so, what is their cost and availability?

2.4 Are suitable titles, headings, and sub-headings included? Are the main ideas of paragraphs, chapters, and subsections clearly stated and suitably expanded? Are summaries included at the ends of each chapter, topic, or unit? Is an index, table of contents, and glossary included in the text?

2.5 Does the text contain up-to-date information and statistics? Is current technology and a true picture of today's society presented?

2.6 Are illustrations and photographs of good quality, interesting to students, relevant to textual material? Are illustrations and photographs contemporary, not dated by dress, unless their purpose is to portray a certain period in history? Are illustrations placed near the textual material they refer to?

2.7 Are tables, graphs, maps, and charts current, appropriate, easy to read and decipher, and placed near references in the text? Are captions for the tables, maps, and charts clearly written and printed in a suitable size type?

2.8 Additional comments about the general descriptive aspects of the textbook.

The estimated life span and costs of the text referred to in the first three sets of questions in section 2.0 would be of prime importance to administrators and school boards faced with provincial guidelines restricting expenditures for educational purposes. Such restrictions have been widely discussed in the newspapers of British Columbia. For example, the Salmon Arm Observer ("Trustees Preparing," 1982) and the Victoria Times-Colonist ("Cutback Protest," 1982) both mentioned severe cutbacks in spending by school jurisdictions in the province.

Other important considerations raised by questions in this section were print size, clarity, and attractiveness of pages in the text. The effect of these factors on students was discussed at a recent (April 1982) librarians' meeting in Medicine Hat, Alberta where it was concluded by the group that small print, glossy hard to read pages, and unattractive format often caused books to remain unread on the shelves. Harrison concurred with this view when he wrote that improper type size, clarity, and legibility of print "do lower the reader's motivation" (pp. 16-18). Since a textbook is often used on a daily basis, it should have attractive pages with clear print of a suitable size and style for the target student population.

A textbook, to be suitable for the provincial curriculum with its emphasis on inquiry, would have to be suitable for teaching inquiry skills. Several of the questions in section 2.0 were indirectly related to the process of inquiry teaching. For example, questions about the organization and presentation of materials in the textbook according to titles, headings, main ideas, summaries, and the provision of an index and glossary, all concerned inquiry because students must be able to understand and utilize information effectively in their problem-solving and decision-making activities. Well organized material could facilitate this process. In addition, quality, relevance, and currency of illustrative material such as pictures, tables, graphs, maps, and statistical information, would also affect the inquiry process. As Nichols and

Ochoa (1971) explained in their article, format and presentation would help determine the usefulness of a text for inquiry teaching and learning (p. 292).

The final statement in section 2.0 allowed the analyst to make additional comments related to the general description of the text. This opportunity for the analyst to comment beyond the specific questions posed in each section followed the instrument presented by Zenger and Zenger and was also provided in subsequent sections of the proposed instrument. Allowance for immediate comment was a definite strength of the instrument because it allowed flexible responses to topics in each section while items were fresh in the analyst's mind. In comparison, the Eash (1972a) instrument required the analyst to withold comments until the end of the instrument (p. 200).

Student Interest and Motivation

Questions in this section referred to the interest and motivation of students using the text in terms of their own life-space, language, and special situations. In addition, challenges presented to students, and the provision of various entry and exit points in the material were considered. Section 3.0 is reproduced below.

3.0 Student Interest and Motivation

3.1 Is the text interesting and acceptable to the target students? Does the text consistently demonstrate the relationship between the knowledge presented and the learner's own life situation? Is there adequate variety in presentation of the material to retain student interest?

3.2 Are the vocabulary levels, type of language, and topics presented appealing to an audience which may vary according to sex, aptitude, ethnic origin, and interests? Is the material designed for students at the proper grade level? Can the material be used successfully by low, average, and high ability students?

3.3 Do the activities and exercises presented serve to motivate, stimulate curiousity, and present challenges to the learner? Do out of class readings and projects provide additional stimulation of student interest?

3.4 Are special competencies necessary for students to use the text successfully? If so, are these competencies identified clearly in the text or teacher's manual? Are readiness materials provided where special social or cognitive skills are required for entry into a chapter or unit? Are alternative sources of readiness materials identified? How could the text material have been written to develop entry competencies as the units progress?

3.5 Are entry points indicated so that students can begin or terminate activities at certain places in the text according to interest, ability, or time constraints? Are these entry points logical so that concepts and generalizations specified in the curriculum will still be learned?

3.6 Is the time and activity load of the student taken into consideration? How much time is required prior to study of the units or sections for development of vocabulary, familiarization with concepts, and gathering of additional materials? Is this time commitment reasonable for students at this age or grade level?

3.7 Additional comments on student interest, motivation, or entry competencies as related to the textbook.

Student interest, perhaps one of the most important determinants of the effectiveness of any textbook, was examined in questions 3.1 and 3.2. Relevance of the text for the student may be determined by a number of factors including vocabulary used, topics presented, and consideration of the student's own life situation, aptitudes and abilities. The opportunity for an analyst to examine student interest

factors in the text was presented in section 3.0. In contrast, the EPIEform A '79 instrument examined student interest only incidentally as part of questions on affective learning and level of materials. Fetter's (1978) checklist demonstrated even less concern for student interest when it referred only to "individual differences" (p. 55). The examination of motivation, curiosity, and presentation of challenges to students by the text was also important in the area of student interest and was considered in this section. According to Goodwin Watson (1974) learning interest and motivation was enhanced by: (a) novel, stimulating tasks (b) tasks not too easy and not too hard and, (c) intellectually stimulating tasks which interest children (pp. 150-151). Watson's observations reinforced the need for questions 3.1 and 3.2 in this section of the proposed instrument.

The next three questions in section 3.0 examined the text from a teacher's point of view to determine if special competencies were required of students who would use the text, and if so what readiness materials were available to help develop these competencies. Such information would help the teacher in planning and locating materials thus making teaching with the text easier and more efficient. Also considered was the provision for entry and exit points i.e. provision for a student to begin the study of a specific topic at a certain place in the unit without the necessity of completing the whole unit from start to finish. Such a provision would help teachers who might want to have students inquire into a particular topic in depth rather than superficially "covering" the whole unit. For example,

one group of students could examine the foods of Woodlands Indians, and another group could inquire into the types of housing used by these people. Each group would use only a part of the unit, that which pertained to their topic. The time and activity load of students using the text was also a useful question for teachers who would need this information in order to plan their program in Social Studies in relation to both the concepts and generalizations required by the curriculum and to time requirements for other subjects on the student's timetable. In this respect questions about the clarity, conciseness, and level of the material would help teachers to ensure that students would not be unduly burdened by text requirements.

Content

This section examined what the textbook actually contained according to topics or themes, presentation of skills, writing style, conceptual framework, disciplinary bases, generalizations, and controversial issues. Section 4.0 is reproduced below.

4.0 Content

4.1 What are the major topics, themes, or skills covered in the text? Are they congruent with the topics or skills specified in the curriculum? Are these topics, themes, or skills presented at a suitable level for the students who are expected to use the text? Is there sufficient material in the text to adequately cover the curriculum requirements?

4.2 Does the text employ an objective writing style that is clear in explanation and emphasis? Does the text employ proper terminology, grammar, and sentence structure? Are historical and chronological facts accurate and reliable with reference, whenever possible, to original documents?

4.3 Does the text use a clear, explicit conceptual framework which the student can follow? Is the material presented in a rational order and a logical sequence? Is provision made for branching out along a particularly interesting or relevant path? Is there provision for returning to a topic which may be re-examined in light of study in a subsequent unit?

4.4 Are clearly stated, or implied, principles or generalizations developed in the text? Are these ideas related to social issues and presented in such a way as to encourage inquiry? Are values oriented questions presented along with several points of view, but with no "right" or "wrong" answers specified?

4.5 Are controversial issues which are addressed in the text of interest to students at the target age/grade level? Is enough information available for the topics being studied to allow inquiry and decision-making processes to be used by students?

4.6 Are data and points of view from many disciplines present in text material? Are items such as sources of information, conflicting evidence, possible sources of bias, and recent developments, subject to critical analysis in the text?

4.7 Does the knowledge presented in the text support an understanding of geographical, ecological, historical, and population patterns of people? Are ideas and generalizations drawn from the studies of various cultures? Are these cultures and their ideas presented in an intelligent, non-biased, empathetic manner?

4.8 Can the text be used as a basic reference source for study and inquiry? Does the text contain material not readily available in other sources? Are the materials presented in such a way as to explore new directions and dimensions of the topic?

4.9 Additional comments about the content of the textbook.

Topics, themes, and skills were addressed first in this section. It would appear that the initial consideration of the analyst should be to determine the congruency of these items with the curriculum. For example, the Grade VI program outlined in the B.C. Guide (1980)

stated that, "four different peoples or countries to be examined should be drawn from four different continents" (p. 69). If only one or two continents were presented in the text, congruency should be questioned immediately. Congruency should also be questioned if inquiry skills have been entirely neglected in the textbook. Similarly, unless prescribed topics were presented in sufficient detail and depth, inquiry would be difficult to implement and the text would not meet the congruency criterion.

Question 4.2 related indirectly to inquiry when it addressed writing style, terminology, accuracy and reliability of facts, and references to original documents. The Grade IV unit which examined the entry of various provinces into the Dominion of Canada provided an example of a unit which could involve all the items in question 4.2 (B.C. Guide, p. 60). Experience with fourth grade students has shown that a great deal of time and effort on the teacher's part would be required to interpret material on this topic unless it was presented by the text in clear writing style and at a suitable level with simplified terminology. Facts, and references to documents, would also have to include concrete examples and be clearly related to the topic.

The next two questions in section 4.0 concerned the development of a conceptual framework arranged in a rational, logical sequence to encourage the development of larger generalizations such as "communities change over time" in the Grade III program (B.C. Guide, p. 42). However, the inclusion of a provision for branching out or

returning to a unit or theme was also included to preclude lock-step work through concepts by following the text page by page. Such a process would defeat the development of inquiry skills which were stressed in the curriculum. As Beyer (1971a, p. 35), Brubaker, Simon, and Williams (1977, p. 203), and Greta and Harold Morine (1973, pp. 189-190) have indicated, inquiry proceeds in an elliptical pattern rather than in a linear fashion.

A multi-discipline approach with emphasis on geography, history, economics, political science, sociology, and other disciplines, was also considered in relation to presentation of material in the text. As the B.C. Guide (1980) stated, "the new draft curriculum ... does not attempt to classify content and student learning [only] in terms of history and geography" (p. 3). Nichols and Ochoa (1971) reinforced the idea that the "new" Social Studies needed a broader base than in the past when they wrote:

> Social issues cannot be studied from the perspective of a single discipline; the complexity of such issues requires the definition of a broad knowledge base that includes the natural sciences and the humanities as well as the social sciences. (p. 291)

The examination, in question 4.7, of how the text supported an understanding of people with respect to their societal development in the context of a physical and cultural environment also dealt with the multi-disciplined nature of Social Studies. In addition, the consideration of whether ideas and generalizations were drawn from studies of different cultures was also addressed. Both of these factors would affect the quality of inquiry encouraged by the text and the issue of values presented in the

following question of the proposed instrument.

The questions on values in section 4.0 were particularly relevant to the "new" Social Studies and were posed in relation to social issues and whether the text was careful not to present only "right" answers. Under the heading "Student Objectives" the B.C. Guide (1980) mentioned that the old curriculum emphasized "the process of valuing" while in the proposed curriculum "values are implicit in issues but are dealt with in suitable context" (pp. 20-21). Also, under the heading "Issues" the new curriculum stated "that teachers be sensitive to students' maturity and values" and students should not be directed to "identify 'correct' solutions" to problems (p. 11). Other sections of the elementary curriculum made indirect references to values with statements like, "engage in fair play" and "demonstrate willingness to include newcomers" (p. 55). It was interesting to note that the 1981 Alberta Social Studies Curriculum was even more explicit in its emphasis on "value objectives" for each major topic studied (p. 4).

Also examined in this section was the consideration of the text as a basic reference source for inquiry learning. There has been a great deal of controversy in the literature about whether a single text at each level, especially in the elementary grades, should be used for Social Studies. To begin with, the inquiry process does not appear to be well served by a single text because that method is based on references to several sources of information and varying points of view as indicated by Beyer (1971a, p. 35) and many others. Massialas and Cox (1966) observed that, "even with greatly improved

textbooks in social studies the teacher would not be justified in relying on one text" (p. 203). Connell et al. (1967) reinforced the same idea when they wrote that, "reliance on a single source of reference has attendant dangers" (p. 296). Morrissett, Superka, and Hawke (1980) also concurred with these views when they recommended that teachers should "use a greater variety of instructional techniques and learning resources" for Social Studies (p. 572). On the other hand, teachers in some jurisdictions have indicated support for a single text at each grade level. Jantzen (1979) referred to a "super-text" for each grade, likely to be available about 1985, which would incorporate "critical thinking skills and survival and coping skills" (p. 72). Morrissett, Hawke, and Superka indicated that "most teachers generally like to use textbooks" because "textbooks help teachers organize various bodies of knowledge they teach" (p. 563). British Columbia's teachers, according to the Assessment (Vol. 3, Part 1, p. 32), were "undecided whether or not a single comprehensive textbook should be made avaiable at each grade level."

Learner Goals and Objectives

This section was concerned with general goals of the text and how these goals served to develop the goals of the curriculum. In addition, specific behavioral objectives and learning taxonomies were considered. Section 5.0 is reproduced below.

5.0 Learner Goals and Objectives

5.1 How are general goals stated and developed in the text? Are they explicit or implicit in the presentation of materials? Are the general goals congruent with the goals stated in the curriculum guide? How do problems, exercises, readings, and activities directly or indirectly develop the general goals of the curriculum?

5.2 Does the manual provide the teacher with examples for writing day-to-day lesson plans in behavioral objective form? Do such objectives specify behavior or action that the student will perform, under what conditions the behavior will occur, and the level of performance the student must reach? Are suggested behavioral objectives congruent with the objectives specified in the curriculum guide?

5.3 What should students be able to do generally in the cognitive domain? Are students required to perform processes in the cognitive domain which involve the Bloom"s taxonomy steps of: acquiring knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation? Are these processes balanced without undue emphasis on the first two steps? Do these cognitive processes fit with the curriculum guide recommendations for the course?

5.4 Are exercises included which require students to operate in the affective domain? Are students required to examine value positions? Do the exercises encourage the steps in Krathwohl's taxonomy such as: awareness of values, response to values, stating one's own values, organizing values into a system, and internalization of values in the student's own life? Are the affective components of the text congruent with recommendations from the curriculum guide?

5.5 Additional comments about learner goals and objectives presented in the text and the teacher's manual.

The overall goals of any program determine its direction and focus. Most instruments for the evaluation of textbooks, as presented in the literature, included a question or two about general goals. The proposed instrument also examined general goals and

the important consideration of the congruency of goals in the text with goals of the curriculum. Since the four stated general goals of the curriculum required the use of inquiry skills (B.C. Guide, pp. 3-5), most of the material in the text would need to be presented in a manner that would facilitate inquiry by students.

The next group of questions in section 5.0 addressed the writing of specific units and lesson plans in terms of behavioral objectives. The term "behavioral objectives," referring to an end result of learning that must be observable and measurable according to predetermined criteria, has been replaced by some researchers by new terminology. For example, Mason and Ayers (1980) explained:

> Originally an objective stated in terms of behavior to be demonstrated was called a behavioral objective. This term has been replaced by behavioral outcome or learning outcome, and more recently by measurable outcome. (p. 2)

The utility of measurable outcomes has been widely reported in the literature as: (a) a planning tool for teachers and curriculum writers (b) a means of measuring student performance and, (c) a means of measuring teacher performance for accountability purposes (Orlosky & Smith, 1978, pp. 149-152). The B.C. Guide (1980) made references to objectives that students "will be expected to know" (pp. 3-6). Though these objectives imply measurable outcomes, they are not written in measurable form and it would appear that the teacher, in conjunction with the text and the teacher's manual, would be expected to provide the actual measurable outcomes for the day-to-day teaching and evaluation of students.

Use of Bloom's (1956) and Krathwohl's (1964) taxonomies in the cognitive and affective domains were the topics of the next two questions in section 5.0. In particular, the summary of each taxonomy in the proposed instrument allowed the analyst to determine whether sufficient emphasis was given by the text to higher levels of thinking rather than simple recall type exercises. Both taxonomies would affect the formulation of measurable outcomes as well because, as Davies (1978) has pointed out, all learning objectives fall into one of the three taxonomies -- cognitive, affective, or psychomotor (pp. 152-156). The new curriculum, with its emphasis on inquiry, was directly related to Bloom's taxonomy. Muir (1979) stated that several authors in the literature had suggested a definite relationship between the process of inquiry and the "higher cognitive processes" outlined by Bloom's taxonomy (p. 385). In addition, emphasis on valuing and interpersonal skills in the curriculum (B.C. Guide, pp. 30-86) would require the application of Krathwol's taxonomy as students become aware of their own values and respond to them in socially acceptable ways. Congruency with the curriculum would require that both taxonomies be employed as bases for exercises and evaluation processes developed in the text and teacher's manual.

Teacher Preparation and Methodology

Questions in this section examined the role of the teacher from three main points of view: (a) procedures and approaches permitted

and encouraged by the text and teacher's manual (b) placement and preparation of students for using the text and, (c) preparation, background, and attitudes useful for teachers using the text and teacher's manual. It should be pointed out that some questions in this section were similar to earlier ones, but section 6.0 referred to teachers' use of the text and manual while earlier questions were directed toward student use of the text.

6.0 Teacher Preparation and Methodology

6.1 Examine the materials thoroughly and describe a typical lesson. Explain the presentation, activities, exercises, and evaluation procedures suggested for this lesson.

6.2 Are various flexible, adaptive approaches to the text such as exposition, games, role-playing, debate, simulation, research, discussion, class presentation, model-building, note-making, and similar activities encouraged by the manual or text? Are individual teaching styles provided for?

6.3 Does the manual provide the teacher with diagnostic tests or suggestions for reviewing students' conceptual and experiential backgrounds? Are any diagnostic tests included with the manual easy to mark and interpret? Do these tests provide enough valid information to be useful to teachers?

6.4 Does the manual and/or text allow the teacher to provide for individual differences and learning styles of students? Are adequate remedial or enrichment activities or exercises provided? If not, are sources for such material indicated in the manual? Are lists of suggested materials for each lesson or unit provided?

6.5 Is much of the content of the text written to facilitate teaching by the inquiry method? Does the manual suggest inquiry oriented teaching activities and exercises based on the text material? If little or no guidance is supplied for inquiry teaching, can text materials be easily adapted for the inquiry mode of teaching required by the curriculum guide?

6.6 Does the manual encourage the teacher to use higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy for questions and assignments presented to students? Are decision-making activities explained and developed in the manual to facilitate the the teaching-learning process?

6.7 Does the manual suggest how teachers may encourage student input as the activities in the text are explored? Is teaching for creative thinking encouraged by the manual, or is the student required to supply the "right" answers? Does the manual explain and encourage the use of Krathwol's taxonomy as the teacher directs the student toward examination of values raised in the text?

6.8 Does the manual explain how the teacher may sometimes use the text as a vehicle for independent activities or study by the student? Are definitions and technical terms used in the text explained clearly, and at a level which can be understood by a student working independently on a topic or unit? Are supplementary run-off sheets or masters included in the manual to provide additional guidance for students working independently?

6.9 Does the manual clearly demonstrate to the teacher how new concepts developed in the text are linked to the average student's experiential background or prior knowledge? Are activities and knowledge from the course clearly transferable to events the student may expect to face in the future?

6.10 Does the manual state how much teacher time is needed to cover each unit? Is this reasonable in view of the time allotted for the subject? How much pre-preparation by the teacher is required before beginning the teaching of each unit?

6.11 What knowledge, skills, and attitudes are demanded of the teacher if the textbook is to be adequately used? Are these factors clearly spelled out in the manual? What special training, if any, is required? Would in-service training be necessary, or highly desirable, for teachers who plan to use this text? If in-service is deemed to be desirable, what type of training would be most suitable, and how much time would be required for the training?

6.12 Is the teacher provided with a sufficient number of examples for each new concept introduced in the text? Is the number of concepts introduced in each section or unit suitable for the learning capacities of the

target students? Are comprehensive follow-up activities included in the manual to help provide reinforcement of concepts and learning from earlier lessons?

6.13 Does the manual provide a reproduction of each page of the student's text along with background information, notes, and suggestions for teaching the material in the text? Are information and sample lessons from actual use by other teachers provided?

6.14 Additional comments about teacher methodology and preparation.

The first group of questions in section 6.0 asked the analyst to examine the text and teacher's manual thoroughly and to describe suggested presentation, activities, exercises, and evaluation procedures recommended for a typical lesson. The resulting report by the analyst should provide sufficient detail for a prospective teacher to make at least a tentative judgement about the suitability of the text as a teaching tool for the curriculum specified by the Ministry of Education for British Columbia.

Provision for teaching the text material by a variety of approaches, and provision for individual teaching styles was considered next. This was important in evaluating a text which could possibly be required for province-wide use by a large variety of teachers with differing backgrounds, philosophical outlooks, personalities, and teaching styles. As the Assessment pointed out, "a variety of methods for teaching Social Studies is the feature which teachers agree most strongly should be part of the existing Social Studies program" (Vol. 3, Part 1, p. 19). Articles in the literature such as that of Morrissett, Superka, and Hawke (1980), acknowledged that "teachers have different instructional styles and strengths" (p. 572).

Toomey's (1977) Australian study of teachers and curriculum planning also revealed that teachers perceive, plan, and teach differently (pp. 121-122).

The inclusion of diagnosis and review tests to help the teacher to "place" students according to their conceptual and experiential backgrounds in Social Studies was clearly addressed by the next series of questions. Provision of valid and reliable tests in the manual would allow a teacher to conduct specific examinations of a student's Social Studies concepts and background learning. This would be preferable to multi-subject standardized tests now being used for the purpose in some jurisdictions.

Individual differences and learning styles of students, and provision for remedial or enrichment activities to help teachers accommodate these differences, were also considered in section 6.0 of the proposed instrument. This was an important consideration because if the text or teacher's manual were not to provide for such differences, the teacher could be required to rewrite parts of the material, supplement it with outside and possibly costly resources, or spend considerable time explaining concepts and guiding activities in a class heterogeneous in terms of ability grouping.

The next three questions in this section required the analyst to examine whether the text and the teacher's manual were written to encourage inquiry teaching with emphasis on the higher levels of Bloom's cognitive, and Krathwohl's affective, taxonomies. Nichols and Ochoa (1971, p. 292) stressed the importance of these factors when

they advocated inquiry teaching to help children examine questions such as: (a) "Why did this happen? (b) Could it happen today? (c) What implications does this information have?" They also deplored the type of textbook which emphasized low-level, recall types of questions and advocated instead a textbook which would cause the learner to "explain, interpret, and translate data in ways that are meaningful to him." A good textbook was also expected to provide students with decision-making exercises requiring students "to clarify their values in respect to important social issues" (p. 292).

Also examined in section 6.0 was whether the manual explained how independent study could be effectively carried out by students using the text under consideration. This would require that the level of the text in terms of concepts, readability, technical terms, and definitions, be suitable for most students in the classroom so that a minimum of teacher input be required. The teacher might have a student research a topic independently and then bring the results to class for more depth of inquiry and discussion.

The next set of questions examined another item cited by Nichols and Ochoa (p. 292) when the analyst was asked whether the manual demonstrated how new concepts developed in the text could be related to the student's prior knowledge and life situation. One question, asking whether activities and knowledge generated by the text would be transferable to the student's future life, was directly related to a comment in the B.C. Guide that students should develop "the willingness to apply these [skills learned in Social Studies] in dealing with problems and issues that will confront them in the future" (p. 5).

Another concern of teachers addressed by questions in this section of the proposed instrument was the time required to prepare, teach, and evaluate lessons and units from the textbook. The literature has recognized that teachers may be required to devote a large amount of time to certain courses or units of study. For example, Beyer (1971b), in reference to the teaching of Social Studies, explained that, "teaching concepts consumes time voraciously" (p. 91). In addition, recent newspaper reports have indicated that teachers consider a reduction in teaching time to be one of the most pressing changes required in their working conditions (Medicine Hat News, "Teachers Call," 1982). Moreover, a recent Alberta Teachers' Association survey indicated that fully 50% of the respondents felt that insufficient preparation time was made available to teachers in the province (Keeler, 1982, p. 30). Thus, any text requiring a heavy time commitment on the part of teachers would be unacceptable in view of these concerns with instructional and preparation time.

The training of teachers was next considered by questions in section 6.0. These questions asked what knowledge, skills, and attitudes would be demanded of teachers who might use the text under examination. Additional questions concerned whether some type of in-service training would be needed before teachers could use the text effectively. If such training was needed, how much time would be required for an adequate training program? Morrissett, Hawke, and Superka (1980) were particularly critical of the type of training Social Studies teachers have received in the past. Their criticism was based on research which revealed that most teachers

of Social Studies used "lecture" and "discussion/recitation based on textbooks" even though many resources were available for inquiry based teaching (p. 563). These researchers went on to recommend that teachers should be provided with release time or financial support for necessary training which would allow for hands-on experiences with materials and exposure to a variety of teaching procedures (Morrissett, Superka, & Hawke, 1980, p. 573).

Section 6.0 concluded with questions about the examples provided in the teacher's manual for use in introducing new concepts and for follow-up activities to reinforce concepts previously introduced in the textbook. The questions again referred to the teacher's time commitment in using the text because if insufficient material were provided, the teacher would need to expend time and energy in gathering enough materials to supplement the concepts presented in the text. Such additional materials could also add to the cost of using the text.

## Evaluation of Students

Evaluation of students was examined in section 7.0 from the teacher's point of view as affective, psychomotor, cognitive, and combination evaluative formats were considered. In addition, this section was concerned with self-evaluation, formative evaluation, and measurable outcomes as components in an overall evaluation of students. Section 7.0 is reproduced below.

7.0 Evaluation of Students

7.1 Is the main focus of student evaluation in the textbook or the teacher's manual affective, psychomotor, cognitive, or a combination? Are there appropriate testing materials to evaluate both process and product learning? Is the validity and reliability of the tests discussed in the manual?

7.2 Are formative evaluation processes included to guide learning and instruction? Are there any self-evaluation exercises included for student use?

7.3 How are the main topics covered in the units or sections evaluated? Does the evaluation refer to clearly measurable outcomes which are congruent with the content, methodology, and goals of the text and curriculum? Are levels of competency specified for measurable outcomes?

7.4 Additional comments about evaluation of students.

The analyst examining types of evaluation, appropriateness of evaluative material, and validity and reliability of tests presented in the teacher's manual and the text, would be guided to some degree by the new curriculum. For example, the B.C. Guide indicated that evaluative processes should provide the student, the teacher, and the parent with a composite picture of the student's progress through, and mastery of, what has been taught and learned in class (p. 12).

The inclusion in section 7.0 of questions about self-evaluation by students, and formative evaluation by both students and teacher, indicated that the analyst was to go beyond mere end of unit tests and other such grading devices. He was to examine if provision was made for feedback to teachers and students so that improved planning and hopefully, improved instruction and student performance could result from such evaluations.

Finally, the questions considered whether measurable outcomes had been used as a basis for evaluation. Important in this question was the consideration of whether the evaluative instruments presented in the teacher's manual were indeed designed to measure what had been taught in the classroom.

There has been much written in the literature about evaluation, its forms, and its purposes. The article by Brubaker, Simon, and Williams (1977) perhaps clarified evaluation in the field of Social Studies as well as any when it examined evaluation for inquiry, discipline, and social issues (pp. 203-205), all of which were included in the new curriculum, and all of which were addressed by one or more of the questions presented in section 7.0.

Evaluation and Testing of Textbooks

This section was concerned with details and results of testing by the publisher and by outside agencies. Reports from teachers in the field were also considered. Section 8.0 is reproduced below.

8.0 Evaluation and Testing of the Textbook

8.1 Has the text been previewed by experts in the field or by one of the reputable testing consortia such as EPIE or CMAS? Is it possible to obtain results from a library, from the publisher, or from outside agencies? Are details of field-testing included in the teacher's manual and are the results of such testing easily verifiable?

8.2 Are anecdotal results obtainable from teachers who have used the text in the province and/or in other provinces? Are statistical results from testing by teachers in the province and/or other provinces available? What is the significance of these results?

8.3 Additional comments about evaluation and testing of the text.

The question about tests conducted on the textbook by outside agencies could cause some problems for an analyst who might have only a day or two to spend examining a textbook. If copies of reviews by reputable agencies such as CMAS or EPIE were not provided along with copies of journal articles, the analyst would likely not have time to search out such information and therefore might have to base his considerations on only one source such as field-test reports from the publisher. The second question which referred to the availability of information about tests conducted on the text should at least alert potential purchasers to problems the analyst might have encountered in obtaining such information. The other question in this section which referred to results and statistics from teachers in the field could also be a problem unless such information were gathered prior to the analysis of a textbook.

Reviews in journals and in reports prepared by CMAS, EPIE, or similar organizations could provide good descriptive and analytic information. The information might be useful for analysts because many of the criteria used in the above instruments would be common to the proposed instrument. In addition, some of the reports represent a synthesis of several submissions by members of a consortium like EPIE. However, there is a negative side to such a synthesis as well since a combination of many reports "averaged" together could result in a smoothing out of very good or very bad features discovered during an evaluation of a textbook.

The use of anecdotal and statistical reports from teachers

who have used the text would provide an additional source of information to the analyst. However, because of the differences in teaching styles, different emphases in different provinces, and the subjective nature of anecdotal reports, this source of information may not prove to be as reliable as a report based on specific criteria. At the same time, it should be remembered that teachers' anecdotes would be the result of actual classroom use of the text but reports from consortia might reflect analyses compiled by a committee whose members may not have used the text in a classroom situation.

Readability of a Textbook

This section examined reading level of textbooks according to: (a) a standard formula (b) a reading graph and, (c) the appropriateness and number of concepts presented in any given unit or lesson. Also considered were the number and type of examples used to explain concepts, technical and non-technical vocabulary usage, sequencing, and the complexity and style of sentences. Section 9.0 is reproduced below.

9.0 Readability of a Textbook

9.1 Determine the appropriate reading grade range using one of the standard formulae supplied with the training package i.e. Spache or Mugford, plus one other measure such as the Fry or Raygor graph supplied with the training package.

9.2 Is the concept load of the textual materials appropriate for students at the age or grade level in question?

Are the number of concepts introduced in each section of the text comensurate with the learning capacities of the students? Would many of the concepts, if used without explanation, be familiar to most students?

9.3 Are there sufficient examples for the student to be able to read the materials and understand the main concepts presented with a minimum of teacher aid? Are concrete and abstract words used clearly and in context with examples, definitions, and explanations to add clarity and relevance to the text materials?

9.4 Is the technical and non-technical vocabulary used in the text clear and easily understood with the help of context clues? Are pronunciations and meanings of difficult words supplied? Are technical words used in the context of essential, supportive, or supplementary nature?

9.5 Is the developmental sequencing of ideas clear, logical, and in small enough steps for students to follow easily?

9.6 Are sentences in the text of a suitable length and complexity for students at this age/grade level? Are different kinds of sentences used to provide a varied pace and interest for students? Is the writing style formal or conversational?

9.7 What summary statements can be made about the readability of the textbook? Additional comments about the reading level of the textbook.

Harrison (1980) examined readability at length and concluded that no single factor could be measured to predict the success that a student might experience in using a text. A checklist for readability, proposed in an article by Irwin and Davis (1980, pp. 124-130), incorporated a variety of components similar to the questions posed in section 9.0 above.

The questions in this section begin with a request for the analyst to determine the reading grade of the text using a standard formula. The reason that no single formula was included as part of the proposed instrument can be explained by Harrison's (p. 115)

chart of readability measures. This chart showed that some formulae were better suited to primary level materials, while others were more suitable for intermediate levels. Some weakening of reliability near the upper and lower suggested limits of the formulae was also noted by Harrison. The training course for users of the proposed instrument was designed to acquaint analysts with selected readability formulae and their strengths and limitations. Thus analysts would choose a suitable formula, from those supplied with the training package, for each level of textbook examined. The Fry and Raygor graphs, also supplied with the training package, covered all levels and were to serve as additional checks on the reading level of texts being analyzed.

The concept load i.e. number, frequency, and difficulty of concepts presented in a given unit or section of a textbook, also was an important part of the readability assessment in the proposed instrument. For example, a text might employ simple vocabulary but present a large number of unfamiliar concepts about a difficult topic such as nuclear power. Grade three students could probably read the words and sentences but might not understand enough of the concepts to get any substantial meaning out of the text.

Closely related to concept load was the next question asking if the text provided sufficient examples of concepts and whether new words were used in a context familiar to students. The use of concrete, familiar examples to explain unfamiliar concepts would be an important determinant of the readability level of a textbook, especially for children at the lower grade levels. Irwin and Davis'

weighted checklist on readability incorporated a number of questions about concept load and how concepts were developed and explained in a textbook (p. 129).

The use of technical and non-technical terms, vocabulary, and the pronunciation and meanings of difficult words was also considered in the examination of readability level of texts by the proposed instrument. Obviousy, if difficult words could be deciphered and understood with the help of context clues, explanations, or glossaries, readers would find the material easier to use and understand. Similarly, the development of new ideas in a clear and logical sequence would allow for better understanding of textual materials by students.

Finally, readability level was addressed in section 9.0 by a set of questions which examined such factors as the length and complexity of sentences, variety and pace of sentences, and whether writing style tended to be formal or conversational. As many school librarians have observed, books with page after page of long complex sentences in pedantic prose will not be signed out very often. A similar lack of interest would occur if a textbook were written in much the same style.

Social Considerations

Section 10.0 was adopted with only minor modifications from the Detailed Analysis of Learning Resources - Social Considerations prepared by the Curriculum Branch, Ministry of Education, British Columbia (1981). This section required the analyst to examine both print and visual materials in the text very carefully in order to consider the

following aspects: language used in the text, references to ethnic groups, sexual roles, belief systems, violent events, sexual acts and exploitation, age, social class, and other considerations. Section 10.0 is reproduced below.

10.0 Social Considerations

10.1 Introduction: The social considerations analysis provides the selectors of learning resources with descriptive information relevant to any potential concerns that appear in the content or its presentation. The nature of this analysis requires that the analyst read the text thoroughly and examine the visuals. Such a close reading of the entire text may not occur at any other stage of the selection process.

There are certain aspects which are important to consider in the analysis of both print and visual components of the text. Keep these in mind while completing the analysis:

10.1.1 Author's tone. The author's attitude toward the materials and/or audience. These attitudes tend to influence all features of the textbook.

10.1.2 An error by omission. This may be difficult to identify because the analyst must carefully examine what is included in order to determine what is absent. It is important to note that the author may identify errors by omission and clarify the reasoning for these.

10.1.3 The extent of the reference. Where a reference receives little attention in the text the analyst should indicate this treatment just as more extensive references should be recorded as such.

10.1.4 The frequency of occurrence. A potential concern with multiple references should be indicated as such.

10.1.5 The setting. This influences author's tone and presentation of the content. The time period when the material was written or written about, the social situation, and geographical location are features of the context that provide insight into potential concerns. For example, it is not valid to impose present values on sixteenth century literature. The text should reflect the values of the day.

10.2 Language usage will vary depending on the user and the setting in which it is used. It is important to note that not only should the usage be suited to the context, but also, the usage should be appropriate to the audience.

This is particularly true for a student audience who may not be mature enough and/or who may lack the experiential background necessary to understand and appreciate given usage.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.2.1 use of profanity
10.2.2 use of incorrect grammar
10.2.3 use of slang or jargon
10.2.4 use of dialect; formal or informal style
10.2.5 users of above language forms (personality traits, emotions, interests, actvities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.2.6 setting of given language usage (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.2.7 author's tone
10.2.8 error by omission

10.3 Ethnic groups may be identified by various traits which include race, language, national or geographical origin, customs, and religion. Ethnic references are manifested in the personal traits and circumstances, attitudes, and actions of its group members.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.3.1 members (personality, traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.3.2 relationship with others (ethnic members and other members of society)
10.3.3 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.3.4 descriptive language used
10.3.5 author's tone
10.3.6 error by omission

10.4 References to sexual roles surface in the portrayals of men and women. These sexual role portrayals depend on the personal traits and circumstances, attitudes, and actions of men and women.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.4.1 the roles presented (what are they?)
10.4.2 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.4.3 the role players (personality traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.4.4 relationship with others (within and between sexes)
10.4.5 descriptive language used
10.4.6 author's tone
10.4.7 error by omission

10.5 Belief systems are organized sets of doctrines or ideas about some philosophy, being, or phenomenon. Cults, philosophies, political views, and religions are all examples of belief systems. References to belief systems emerge in the personal traits, circumstances, attitudes, and actions of their members. The treatment of these members by non-members provides further insights.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.5.1 nature of the system (what characterizes it?)
10.5.2 group members (personality, traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.5.3 relationship with others (members and non-members)
10.5.4 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.5.5 author's tone
10.5.6 error by omission

10.6 Violent events can be both physical and emotional. They may take such forms as hand-to-hand fighting, the use of weapons, torture, verbal abuse, accident, horror, etc. These forms of violence vary in their degree of social acceptability. The violence of everyday events may vary depending on the setting and the participants. Further, their effects range depending on how the author presents them.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.6.1 the act of violence itself
10.6.2 the setting of the violence (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.6.3 participants (personality, traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.6.4 degree of explicitness
10.6.5 the function of the violence (is it central to a major theme or unit found in the content?)
10.6.6 author's tone
10.6.7 error by omission

10.7 Sexual references vary depending on the degree to which they are either explicit or implicit, the setting in which they occur, and their participants. Sexual references include descriptions of the human body, references to sexual activity, sexual exploitation, etc. Further the effect of these references varies depending on their role in the content and the manner in which they are presented.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrences and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.7.1 the sexual reference itself
10.7.2 the setting of the reference (time period, social situation, goegraphical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.7.3 participants (personality, traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.7.4 degree of explicitness
10.7.5 author's tone
10.7.6 error by omission

10.8 Age portrayals deal with the presentation of members of different age groups and their treatment by other members of society. References to the generation gap, the aged, parent-child relationships, etc., are to be considered.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references)

10.8.1 members (personality, emotions, traits, activities, physical features and appearance, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.8.2 setting of the portrayal (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.8.3 relationship with others (group members and other members of society)
10.8.4 descriptive language used
10.8.5 author's tone
10.8.6 error by omission

10.9 References to social class tend to separate out groups of people from other members of society. Social class distinctions are often revealed in the portrayals of class members, their circumstances, and treatment by others.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references)

10.9.1 members (personality, emotions, traits, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.9.2 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.9.3 relationship with others (class members and other members of society)
10.9.4 descriptive language used
10.9.5 author's tone
10.9.6 error by omission

10.10 There may be other considerations in the instructional material not covered by the above comments. Comment on any of the following aspects encountered in the materials.

10.10.1 moral issues (these might include use/abuse of drugs, alcohol, the law ... or such things as gambling, slavery, nuclear arms ...)
10.10.2 family structure
10.10.3 management and labor relations
10.10.4 references to atypical individuals (those who depart from the norm either mentally, physically, or emotionally)
10.10.5 any other references which are social issues

For the topics above, or any other considerations deemed important, quote accurately with page references. Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references.

10.10.6 representatives or members (personality, interests, traits, emotions, activities, physical features and appearance, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.10.7 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, goegraphical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.10.8 descriptive language used
10.10.9 author's tone
10.10.10 error by omission

Canadians have become increasingly aware of references to ethnic groups, social classes, women, the aged, religious groups, and others, which tend to have pejorative overtones. As Parker (1981) explained, complaints about social references in educational materials have increased exponentially in the past few years. These concerns were instrumental in the Ministry's development of a scheme solely for the analysis of social considerations in learning resources. Though this instrument addressed questions raised by EPIE (B.C. Ministry of Education, Draft, 1980) under the heading "Bias of Content," it provided additional questions, sub-questions, and detail which required the analyst to examine textual and visual material with great care to determine the treatment of social groups and social issues.

The instructions, questions, and sub-questions in section 10.0 of the proposed instrument demonstrated that it was very carefully constructed to address major social concerns in the province. For example, ethnic problems have surfaced in some areas as immigrants move into a region and the residents of that region oppose the

newcomers' taking of jobs. Women's movements have been active in seeking "equal rights" for women in the business, political and even church fields. The aged have formed groups such as the "Gray Panthers" to help combat the emphasis on services, products, and employment directed to youth. Youth, in turn, has complained that opportunities for employment, rises in tuition fees, and other discriminatory acts and laws tend to place them in an inferior position. The concerns of religious groups and others have also been addressed by the social considerations section of the proposed instrument.

Further flexibility in the instrument was provided by the inclusion of a question on "other considerations" not covered by the first nine sets of questions in this section. Conceivably no offensive material should be included in Social Studies texts selected with the aid of this instrument. However, no instrument, and no analyst, could be expected to detect or respond to every concern of every group which might surface during the use of a textbook. In fact, too careful screening of a textbook could be counterproductive because, as Hodgetts and Gallagher (1978) have warned, "textbook authorities insist that school materials shy away from controversy, and in an effort not to offend anyone, they simply become bland" (p. 22). The key to using this section of the proposed instrument would involve the use of common sense in identifying obvious prejudices and unsuitable references to sex and violence for the grade levels which might be required to use the texts under consideration.

Aesthetic Review

Section 11.0 was based on the aesthetic approach to textbook selection suggested by Eisner (1978,1979) and Vallance (1976,1977). This section of the proposed instrument allowed the reviewer to conduct a subjective examination of the textbook. Section 11.0 is reproduced below.

11.0 Aesthetic Review of the Textbook

> This section requires a "change of gears" by the analyst. Here, the reviewer is asked to respond as subjectively as necessary in order to examine the textbook at a "feeling" level. The reviewer should state what he or she likes or dislikes, finds appealing or unappealing, finds interesting or uninteresting. Moreover, the reviewer may examine the material in the text from any aesthetic point of view such as the use of color, use of language, flow of language, or any other consideration he may prefer. This subjective view of the text should be written much as an art or music critic writes a review of a display or performance.

The strength of this section was that it departed from the directed question format and allowed the analyst freedom to respond in terms of both his experiences in teaching and his sense of the aesthetic qualities of a textbook. For example, as Jantzen (1979) has pointed out, upper elementary texts need to be written at a fairly low reading level, but experience and aesthetic considerations would likely cause an analyst to reject as unsuitable a text which had the appearance of a primary level "little kids'" book. In addition, the aesthetic review might direct a teacher or selection committee member toward an interesting or novel feature of a text not pointed out in the directed questions.

General Critique and Recommendations

The concluding section of the proposed instrument required the analyst to summarize his findings and to make recommendations regarding possible adoption of the text under consideration.

12.0 General Critique and Recommendations

> Write a brief overall summary and critique of the text with recommendations for or against adoption of the text as a prescribed or authorized resource for the age or grade level being considered. Reasons should be stated for your assessment.

## Training Program for Use of the Proposed Instrument

A comprehensive three to five day training program of approximately 30 hours was a prerequisite for use of the proposed instrument for analyzing textbooks. The training was essential to ensure that analysts would employ common terminology and operate from a common frame of reference in examining and reporting on textbooks. The EPIE system, adopted by the Ministry for analyzing textbooks, reinforced the need for systematic evaluation "based on a common language and a common system" (B.C. Ministry of Education, EPIE Training Package, 1980, p. 3). Another important aspect of the training was the actual practice in writing evaluations which allowed analysts to refine their evaluative and reporting skills under supervision before attempting analyses entirely on their own. This compared with the Sussex instrument which required a similar 30 hour program for the analyst with "most of his training time

being taken up by guided practice" (Eraut et al., p. 86) EPIE also required the completion of practice analyses, one of which had to be sent to California for grading, before certification in the EPIE system would be granted.

The training program was also designed to demonstrate that though there is bound to be some overlap in an instrument of this nature, the analyst should examine each question in light of the section where it appears. For example, a question in one section might refer to the learner's time commitment, while a similar question in another section might refer to the teacher's time commitment for a unit of work. Where overlapping questions appeared to result in redundancy, the analyst was requested to make a brief comment noting his earlier response to the question in another section of the instrument.

## Congruency of the Proposed Instrument With Inquiry Goals of the Social Studies Curriculum in British Columbia: A Summary

The Proposed Curriculum Guide Social Studies, K-11 (British Columbia, 1980) stated that the teaching of inquiry skills was a "primary responsibility" of teachers in the Social Studies program (p. 11). Some of the skills that students were expected to develop included: locating, acquiring, organizing, discussing, interpreting, and evaluating information. These skills were required by students so that they would be able to conduct problem-solving and decision-

making activities as part of the inquiry process (pp. 30-32). However, it was rather unfortunate that the B.C. Guide did not provide an actual definition of inquiry as a guide for potential users. Moreover, the literature included some different definitions according to the writers and the use they wished to put the inquiry process to in teaching Social Studies. Under the circumstances, it would seem to be a useful exercise for analysts and their instructors to develop a working definition for inquiry before the proposed instrument is used to examine textbooks.

The proposed instrument for evaluating textbooks included a number of questions relating to the congruency of the text to the curriculum in terms of the process of inquiry. For example, section 2.0 of the instrument dealt with headings, clarity of main ideas, and summaries, in relation to the skills of locating, acquiring, and organizing information. More specifically, questions 2.4 to 2.6 dealt with the currency and relevance of information, statistics, and visual material, all important considerations for inquiry learning.

Section 3.0 provided more questions which implicitly related to the inquiry process. Specifically, these questions dealt with how the proposed text provided appeal, motivation, stimulation, and challenging materials. Moreover, differing entry and exit points, as as specified in question 3.5, could also enhance inquiry because a student could pursue an area of interest through inquiry, then return to the main topic to continue on the central theme of the unit. The time and activity load of students referred to in 3.6

was also an important consideration because inquiry-based studies could involve a great deal more time than the lecture and question method (Hodgetts & Gallagher, 1978, pp. 21-23).

Section 4.0 presented several questions which more directly referred to inquiry. For example, question 4.1 asked which major skills were developed in the text. Since inquiry was described as an important skill by curriculum writers (B.C. Guide, p. 11), it should be developed in the text. Further questions in this section referred to the sufficiency of material, accuracy of facts, chronology, and reference to original documents. All of these items could affect the efficiency and depth of the inquiry processes possible in using the text. Additional questions asked whether points of view from different disciplines and cultures were presented in the text. These questions were particularly pertinent in view of the fact that inquiry, by its very nature, involves examination, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of several points of view (B.C. Guide, p. 30).

Explicit references to inquiry teaching and learning appeared in questions 4.6 and 4.7 of the proposed instrument. Question 4.6 asked if the text could be used as a basic reference source for inquiry study and the following question asked whether principles and generalizations developed in the text were presented in such a way as to encourage inquiry into social issues. Both questions related directly to congruency between the text and the curriculum which specified that inquiry processes be developed in grades four to seven (B.C. Guide, p. 141).

Both Bloom's cognitive taxonomy and Krathwohl's affective taxonomy formed part of the inquiry processes of problem-solving and decision-making as outlined in the curriculum. Questions 5.3 and 5.4 concerned the ability of students to apply increasingly higher levels of these taxonomies as they worked through units in the text. Congruency between the curriculum and the text could exist if these higher levels of the taxonomies were indeed developed by the exercises and activities presented in the text.

Questions in section 6.0 encouraged the analyst to determine if the text and teacher's manual were written to facilitate inquiry teaching methods. Inquiry oriented activities and exercises were mentioned as teaching tools to encourage development of higher level thinking processes in students. Bloom and Krathwohl were again mentioned in this section with respect to the teacher's mastery of these taxonomies to develop inquiry skills in the students in their charge. Independent study by students was considered in 6.8 suggesting that individual research could be assigned by the teacher as a part of an inquiry unit.

The last three questions in section 6.0 dealt with skills, attitudes, training, and knowledge required of the teacher who would use the text under consideration if it were prescribed. If the text were to be congruent with the curriculum, this question would imply that teachers would possess, or would need to be trained in, the use of inquiry methods.

Section 7.0 on evaluation of students did not contain any

direct references to inquiry. However, a question on whether provision was made to evaluate process and product learning was implicitly concerned with inquiry which has been described as a process rather than a product (Brubaker, Simon, & Williams, 1977, p. 203). Congruency would require that the process of inquiry be somehow evaluated, perhaps informally using a teacher's checklist of the student's activities during the inquiry unit. Moreover, the philosophy of the British Columbia educational system, as outlined in the B.C. Guide (pp. 2-3), indicated a necessity for both product and process learning.

Section 8.0 was concerned with evaluation and testing of the textbook and made no reference to inquiry. However, reference was made to reputable publications such as EPIE which might review a textbook. Reviewing publications often included questions or statements about inquiry learning or teaching in their reports and evaluation instruments (Eraut, Goad, & Smith, 1975, p. 54). Perusal of outside reports and reviews about the textbook under consideration could provide information regarding the congruency of that text with the curriculum.

Upon first examination readability, as considered in section 9.0, appeared to have little direct relationship to the inquiry process. However, implicit in inquiry study was the ability of the student to be able to read and understand the English language at the appropriate grade level in order to gather and apply knowledge and facts to activities such as problem-solving and decision-making (B.C. Guide, p. 31). Congruency, in this case, would be

difficult to ascertain. However, materials written at too high a level would present a barrier to meaningful inquiry so they could be considered to be incongruent with the curriculum.

The whole of section 10.0 on social considerations was closely related to the inquiry processes specified in the curriculum. The inquiry steps of analyzing, interpreting, evaluating, and examining consequences of social action could be affected by the presentation of material in the text, especially at the elementary levels. The analyst, responding to this section of the proposed model, would need to keep the potential student user of the text in mind when considering the suitability of material for inquiry into social considerations. Suitability of materials would imply some degree of congruency of text materials with the curriculum, while a text which was considered unsuitable in this area would not be congruent with curriculum requirements. An unsuitable text would be of little use as a primary reference for inquiry study.

Thus the proposed instrument for evaluating textbooks for elementary Social Studies in British Columbia was suitable for determining many areas of congruency between a textbook under consideration and the curriculum of the province. If the analyst has conducted a careful examination of a text based on the proposed instrument, the results should indicate whether the text was congruent with the curriculum requirements or not.

## Recommendations for Further Study

The primary purpose of the proposed instrument was to provide a medium by which analysts could examine a textbook in detail to determine that text's congruency with the new Social Studies program in British Columbia. The proposed instrument seems to have met that purpose very well. However, three topics suggested by the research and analyses conducted for this paper appear to require further study. These topics include: the time allocated for analysis of each textbook, the need for intensive training of teachers who would be required to use a newly prescribed textbook, and evaluation of the proposed instrument after it has been used by analysts in the field.

Analysts who examined resources proposed for the new Social Studies curriculum in British Columbia spent six days during the summer plus two days in each of September, October, and November in training and on analysis of materials (Parker, 1981). Perhaps a future study could determine optimum training periods required by analysts who would use the proposed instrument, optimum time for the analysis of each text, and the optimum number of analyses required for each text under consideration. This information could help the Ministry of Education to ensure valid, efficient, comprehensive evaluations at realistic costs.

In outlining problem areas for Social Studies in the 1980's Morrissett, Hawke, and Superka (1980) stated that, "While many materials incorporating varied learning activities have been

developed, few preservice or inservice programs have emphasized practical ways to use these techniques" (p. 563). It would appear that a study to determine or develop the best, most efficient, and most likely to be used process for training teachers to use newly prescribed textbooks would be of value to teachers and administrators, and in some cases Ministry officials. Such a study could point the way for extensive in-service, pre-service, or even apprenticeship training programs which would last as long as necessary to enable teachers to gain a great deal of hands-on experience in using the new texts.

A follow-up study to determine the effectiveness of the proposed instrument after many analysts have used it would also appear to be useful. This study could evaluate the instrument from the analyst's point of view and from the point of view of administrators and Ministry personnel who have selected textbooks based on results generated by the questions in the instrument. The study could also serve as a vehicle for revising the proposed instrument as necessary in the light of experience gained in its use.

# Chapter V

## CONCLUSION

Chapter I of this study entailed a search of the literature to determine current practices for the selection of learning materials, usually textbooks, for schools. Two major approaches to the selection of textbooks were revealed in the literature. The first approach involved superficial, highly subjective checks of materials by teachers or administrators using vague, often unwritten criteria such as how thick a book was, number of illustrations and number of questions included at the ends of chapters. Though this approach was deplored by writers in the literature, their research revealed that many jurisdictions did indeed select materials using unsophisticated and inconsistent criteria.

The second approach to the selection of learning materials involved some type of formal instrument which could serve as a guide for consistent evaluation of learning resources. Development of the more detailed instruments usually required that analysts undergo a training program in order that common terms and frames of reference be used in writing evaluations.

Many systematic approaches to the selection of curriculum materials were presented in the literature but no clear classification of instruments was presented. As a result, a scheme for classifying instruments was developed for this paper. The scheme divided instruments into the following categories: checklists, weighted rating scales, annotative questionnaires,

combination types, and aesthetic critiques.

Checklists were lists of objective questions requiring simple yes, no, or checkmark responses. Weighted rating scales were really checklists which required numerical responses to indicate the rating of materials according to stated criteria. Annotative questionnaires required responses, in the analyst's own words, to a series of questions which allowed comments on particular strengths and weakness of material. Combination types of instruments were usually composed of an annotative component plus a checklist or weighted scale component; sometimes features of all three types were included. The aesthetic critique was a supplementary approach which called on the personal experience, knowledge, and feelings of the analyst as he reviewed learning materials in much the same manner as an art or music critic might review a show or performance.

Chapter II examined criteria to be used in assessing instruments for the evaluation of learning materials. The first criterion considered whether the instrument in question used behavioral objectives, sometimes called measurable outcomes, in assessing materials. Another criterion involved the assessment or non-assessment of reading level in the text or other resource by the instrument. Questions about course content were also expected to be included in the instrument with emphases being placed on suitability, congruence with the curriculum, accuracy, currency, and treatment of minority groups by the textbook. Further criteria involved depth of analysis produced by the types of questions in the instrument and the flexibility allowed analyst to comment on

the materials. Finally, the degree of objectivity or subjectivity of responses generated by each instrument was examined.

According to the aforementioned criteria, the annotative schemes of CMAS, EPIE, and Sussex were considered to be the best of the instruments analyzed. However, some weaknesses in the area of readability were noted in the above instruments.

Chapter III examined inquiry terms, definitions, and models presented in the literature. Generally, the process of inquiry as used in Social Studies consisted of several steps such as: stating a problem, forming an hypothesis about the problem, gathering additional information about the problem, synthesizing the information into some possible solution to the problem, and evaluating results.

Major goals of the new curriculum in Social Studies were modelled on inquiry processes presented in the literature. The new curriculum mandated the teaching of inquiry skills and both explicitly and implicitly emphasized the use of inquiry throughout the Social Studies program.

The process for selection of textbooks for the Social Studies curriculum in British Columbia was also examined in this chapter with reference to the training of analysts and the initial sorting of submitted texts into prescribed, authorized, and unsuitable categories. It was discovered that the Ministry has carried out in-depth analyses of existing texts by Materials Selection Committees which examined them using the processes of EPIE analysis along with instruments dealing with readability and social considerations.

Ministry officials were expected to make the final decisions about suitability of texts for the curriculum based on the analysts' reports.

Teacher views, as gathered from the Assessment, revealed that they considered inquiry to be important in Social Studies. However, in this respect the teachers rated the presently prescribed (1977) textbooks to be only "satisfactory." No texts were rated "good or excellent." Teachers suggested that prescribed texts be listed with annotative comments and an indication of readability, that the Ministry determine suitability of newly published books, and that student books be field-tested before being prescribed for Social Studies instruction. According to reports and interviews with a ministry official, it appeared that the main recommendations of teachers were incorporated into the procedures employed for the selection of textbooks for the new curriculum.

Chapter IV proposed two instruments for the evaluation of textbooks. The first instrument was an objective checklist borrowed from the literature to be used as a preliminary sorting device to eliminate unsuitable texts. The second instrument proposed was a synthesis of many instruments presented in the literature, plus two readability estimates, a social considerations instrument produced by the Ministry, and an aesthetic critique. This combination resulted in a unique instrument for evaluating textbooks for elementary Social Studies in British Columbia.

An analysis of the proposed instrument revealed that it opened with a standard information sheet, followed by a general description section which examined quality and general suitability of the text. Student interest, motivation, and special competencies were next considered followed by an examination of the content of materials in the text. Learner goals and objectives of the text were also considered in relation to the goals presented in the curriculum. The preparation and methodology required by teachers to use the text according to the curriculum was also examined as was the procedure used to evaluate students. Details and results of tests conducted on the textbook itself were examined as well in this chapter.

Readability of the text involved the use of standard formulae and a reading graph as well as questions about concept load, context of words, and technical vocabulary. Social considerations examined the ethnic, sex, age, violence, and social class portrayals in the text. The aesthetic review encouraged a subjective examination of the text based on the analyst's experience and knowledge. In addition, a final question asked for a general critique and recommendations regarding the adoption or non-adoption of the text. All of the above criteria were reinforced by the literature, the B.C. Guide, and the recommendations of the Assessment.

Congruence of the proposed instrument and the inquiry goals of the new Social Studies was important in view of the heavy emphasis on inquiry in the B.C. Guide (1980). Analysis of the

proposed instrument in relation to inquiry revealed that most sections of the instrument addressed inquiry either explicitly or implicitly and that the proposed instrument was indeed congruent with the inquiry goals of the B.C. Guide.

Recommendations for further study included the time required for analysis of each text, the need for teacher training in the use of new texts, and evaluation of the proposed instrument after it has been used for some time.

In summary, the study pointed out the need for a structured program for evaluating textbooks for Social Studies curricula. Such considerations as the type of instrument to be used for evaluating texts, the training program for analysts, and the congruency of textbooks with the curriculum were addressed in the study. Culmination of the study was the provision of a proposed instrument for the analysis of textbooks. This instrument should provide a useful tool for teachers, school administrators, and Ministry officials in British Columbia as they address the difficult task of selecting textbooks for elementary Social Studies in British Columbia.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Education. 1981 Alberta social studies curriculum. Edmonton: Author, 1981.

Aoki, T.T., Williams, D.M., & Wilson, D.C. British Columbia social studies assessment, summary report. Victoria, B.C.: Queen's Printer, 1977.

Aoki, T.T., Williams, D.M., & Wilson, D.C. British Columbia social studies assessment, teacher views. Victoria, B.C.: Queen's Printer, 1977.

Ball, H.G. Standards for materials selection. Journal of Reading, 1976, 20, 208-211.

Bender, D.R., & Baker, P.D. How to do better what we already know how to do. Clearing House, 1979, 52, 362-365.

Beyer, B.K. Inquiry in the social studies classroom: A strategy for teaching. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1971. (a)

Beyer, B.K. Teaching concepts in the classroom. In B.K. Beyer & A.N. Penna (Eds.), Concepts in the social studies. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971. (b)

Bloom, B.S. Mastery learning and its implication for curriculum development. In E. Eisner (Ed.), Confronting curriculum reform. Boston: Little Brown, 1971.

Bloom, B.S. (Ed.), Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: McKay, 1956.

Breiter, J., & Menne, J. A procedure for textbook evaluation illustrated by an analysis of fifth-grade social studies texts. 1974. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 132 130)

British Columbia Ministry of Education. Detailed analysis of learning resources social considerations. Victoria, B.C.: Curriculum Development Branch, 1981.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. EPIE information. Victoria, B.C.: Curriculum Development Branch, 1980.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. EPIEform A '79. Victoria, B.C.: Curriculum Development Branch, 1979.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. EPIE training package. Victoria, B.C.: Curriculum Development Branch, 1980 (draft).

British Columbia Ministry of Education. Proposed curriculum guide social studies, K-11. Victoria, B.C.: Queen's Printer, 1980.

Brodbelt, S. Using mathematical criteria for selecting social studies textbooks. Clearing House, 1972, 46, 487-492.

Brubaker, D.L., Simon, L.H., & Williams, J.W. A conceptual framework for social studies curriculum and instruction. Social Education, 1977, 41, 201-205.

Bruner, J. The act of discovery. In R.F. Allen, J.V. Fleckenstein & P.M. Lyon (Eds.), Inquiry in the social studies. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1968.

Bruner, J. Structure in learning. In G. Hass, J. Bondi & J. Wiles (Eds.), Curriculum planning a new approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974.

Connell, W.F., Andersen, W.E., Debus, R.L., Howie, G., Maclaine, A.G., Miller, T.W.G., Neale, M.D., Spearitt, D., Wylie, J.F., Campbell, W.J., & Verco, D.J.A. The foundations of education. Sydney, Australia: Ian Novak, 1967.

Crabtree, C. Supporting reflective thinking in the classroom. In J. Fair & F.R. Shaftel (Eds.), Effective thinking in the social studies. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.

Cutback protest billed April 29. Victoria Times-Colonist, April 3, 1982.

Davies, I.K. Taxonomies of objectives. In D.E. Orlosky and B.O. Smith (Eds.), Curriculum development issues and insights. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978.

Davis, J.E., & Eckenrod, J.S. A process for selecting instructional materials. Social Education, 1972, 36, 714-717.

Dewey, J. How we think. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1933.

Dicks, S., DeCarie, G., & Collins, J. What content? What understanding? Reactions to teaching Canada for the '80s. History and Social Science Teacher, 1978, 14, 41-45.

Dunfee, M., & Sagl, H. Social studies through problem solving: A challenge to elementary teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Eash, M.J. Comments on problems in the development of instruments for evaluating curricula. In J. Weiss (Ed.), Curriculum evaluation: Potential and reality. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972. (b)

Eash, M.J. Developing an instrument for assessing instructional materials. In J. Weiss (Ed.), Curriculum evaluation: Potential and reality. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972. (a)

Eash, M.J., & Rasher, S.P. Improving local curriculum adoption decision making through the use of criterion referenced evaluation: A case study in social studies. Paper presented at the AERA annual meeting, Toronto, March, 1978.

Ebel, R.L. Objectives: A close look. Phi Delta Kappan, 1970, 52, 171-173.

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute. Improving materials selection procedures; A basic "how to" handbook. No. 54. New York: Author, 1973.

Eisner, E.W. Instructional and expressive educational objectives: Their formulation and use in curriculum. In W.J. Popham, E.W. Eisner, H.J. Sullivan, & L. Tyler (Eds.), Instructional objectives. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Eisner, E.W. The impoverished mind. Educational Leadership, 1978, 35, 15-23.

Eisner, E.W. The use of qualitative forms of evaluation for improving educational practice. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1979, 1(6), 11-19.

Eraut, M., Goad, L., & Smith, G. The analyis of curriculum materials. Brighton, England: University of Sussex, 1975.

Fair, J. Skills in thinking. In D.G. Kaufman (Ed.), Developing decision making skills. Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

Fenton, E. The inquiry approach. Exploration, 1967, 7(2), 2-3.(a)

Fenton, E. Inquiry and structure. In R.F. Allen, J.V. Fleckenstein & P.M. Lyon (Eds.), Inquiry in the social studies. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1968.

Fenton, E. The new social studies. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1967. (b)

Fetsko, W. Textbooks and the new social studies. The Social Studies, 1979, 70(2), 51-55.

Fetter, W.R. An evaluation instrument for instructional materials. Educational Technology, 1978, 18(10), 55-56.

Fry, E. Fry's readability graph: Classification, validity, and extension to level 17. Journal of Reading, 1977, 20, 242-252.

Gagne, R.M. Behavioral objecives? Yes! In G. Hass, J. Bondi & J. Wiles (Eds.), Curriculum planning: A new approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1974.

Greene, M. Equality/excellence. Unpublished, undated paper distributed at University of Victoria by J.B. Macdonald, Summer 1980.

Haefle, D.L. How to evaluate thee, teacher - let me count the ways. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 61, 349-352.

Harrison, C. Readability in the classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Harty, S. Who produced these teaching materials? Today's Education, 1978, 67(4), 62-63.

Hodgetts, A.B., & Gallagher, P. Teaching Canada for the '80s. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978.

Huebner, D. Curricular language and classroom meanings. In J.B. Macdonald & R.R. Leeper (Eds.), Language and meaning. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1966.

Hug, W.E. Are they appropriate? That's the question. Today's Education, 1978, 67(4), 63-64.

Irwin, J.W., & Davis, C.A. Assessing readability: The checklist approach. Journal of Reading, 1980, 24, 124-130.

Jantzen, S.L. What textbooks will be like in 1985. Media and Methods, 1979, 15(5), 70-72.

Keeler, B.T. The results are in. ATA Magazine, 1982, 69(3), 30.

Kliebard, H.M. In search of modes of inquiry. In R.F. Allen, J.V. Fleckenstein & P.M. Lyon (Eds.), Inquiry in the social studies. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1968.

Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S., & Masia, B.B. Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook II: Affective domain. New York, McKay, 1964.

Krause, K.C. Do's and don'ts in evaluating textbooks. Journal of Reading, 1976, 20, 212-214.

Lee, J.R. Teaching social studies in the elementary school. New York: Free Press, 1974.

Macdonald, J.B. An evaluation of evaluation. Urban Review, 1974, 7(1), 3-14.

Mann, J.S. Curriculum criticism. Teacher's College Record, 1969, 71(1), 27-40).

Mason, G., & Ayers, J.D. Objectives and measurable outcomes. Education reports. Victoria, B.C.: University of Victoria, 1980.

Massialas, B.G. The inquiry approach to social studies. Exploration, 1967, 7(2), 8-10.

Massialas, B.G., & Cox, B. Inquiry in social studies. New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.

Maxim, G.W. Methods of teaching social studies to elementary school children. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1977.

McNeil, J.D. Curriculum, a comprehensive introduction. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.

Milburn, G. Social studies curriculum materials evaluated? History and Social Science Teacher, 1977, 12, 237-241.

Morine, G., & Morine, H. Discovery: A challenge to teachers. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973.

Morrissett, I. Project span; Analysis and proposals for the 1980s. Social Education, 1980, 44, 558-560.

Morrissett, I., Hawke, S., & Superka, D.P. Six problems for social studies in the 1980s. Social Education, 1980, 44, 561-569.

Morrissett, I., Stevens, W.W., & Woodley, C.P. A model for analyzing curriculum materials and classroom transactions. In D.M. Fraser (Ed.), Social studies curriculum development: Prospects and problems. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1969.

Morrissett, I., Superka, D.P., & Hawke, S. Recommendations for improving social studies in the 1980s. Social Education, 1980, 44, 570-576.

Muir, S.P. Testing a case for inquiry social studies in the elementary school. Social Education, 1979, 43, 385-387.

Nichols, A.S., & Ochoa, A. Evaluating textbooks for elementary social studies: Criteria for the 'seventies. Social Education, 1971, 35, 290-294;304.

Oliner, P.M. Teaching elementary social studies. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976.

Orlosky, D.E., & Smith, B.O. Aims and objectives in curriculum planning. In D.E. Orlosky & B.O. Smith (Eds.), Curriculum development issues and insights. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978.

Parker, I. Personal interview, January 30, 1981.

Parker, I. The social studies curriculum revision June 1980. Horizon, 1980, 19(1), 14-15.

Pennock, C.D. Social studies textbooks in grades 4 through 7: Are they really too hard? Exploration, 1974, 14(2), 66-73.

Raygor, A.L. The Raygor readability estimate: A quick and easy way to determine difficulty. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), Reading: Theory, research, and practice. Clemson, S.C.: National Reading Conference, 1977.

Rosenshine, B. Problems in the development of instruments for evaluating curricula. In J. Weiss (Ed.), Curriculum evaluation: Potentiality and reality. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972.

Rothe, J.P. Evaluating social issue materials before implementation. Horizon, 1980, 19(1), 30-32.

Saunders, N. Changing strategies of instruction: Three case examples: In D.M. Fraser (Ed.), Social studies curriculum development: Prospects and problems. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1969.

Simon, R.I. Aesthetic criticism and curriculum description. Curriculum Inquiry, 1977, 7, 107-120.

Suchman, J.R. Learning through inquiry. In R.F. Allen, J.V. Fleckenstein & P.M. Lyon (Eds.), Inquiry in the social studies. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1968.

Taba, H. Implementing thinking as an objective in social studies. In J. Fair & F.R. Shaftel (Eds.), Effective thinking in the social studies. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.

Teachers call for reduced workload. Medicine Hat News, April 13, 1982, p. 2.

Tom, A. An approach to selecting among social studies curricula. St. Louis: Central Midwestern Regional Education Laboratory, 1977.

Toomey, R. Teachers' approaches to curriculum planning. Curriculum Inquiry, 1977, 7, 121-129.

Trustees preparing for major budget reductions. Salmon Arm Observer, March 31, 1982, pp. 1;9.

Tyler, R.W. Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Vallance, E. The application of aesthetic criticism to curriculum materials: Arguments and issues. Paper presented at the AERA convention, San Francisco, April 1976.

Vallance, E. The landscape of "the great plains experience." Curriculum Inquiry, 1977, 7, 87-105.

Warming, E.O., & Baber, E.C. Touchstones for textbook selection. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 61, 694-695.

Watson, G. What do we know about learning? In G. Hass, J. Bondi & J. Wiles (Eds.), Curriculum planning: A new approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1974.

Webster's new collegiate dictionary. Toronto: Thomas Allen & Son, 1979.

Welch, W.W. Some problems in evaluating a national curriculum project. In J. Weiss (Ed.), Curriculum evaluation: Potential and reality. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972.

Wilson, R.J. Three faces of evaluation: Students, teachers, curriculum. History and Social Science Teacher. 1977, 12, 203-206.

Woodley, C.P., & Driscoll, L.A. A model and suggestions for evaluating decision-making skills. In D.G. Kurfman (Ed.), Developing decision making skills. Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

Zenger, W.F., & Zenger, S.K. Handbook for evaluating and selecting textbooks. Belmont, California: Fearon Publishers, 1976.

# APPENDIX

## A Proposed Instrument for Determining Suitability of Textbooks for Curriculum in Elementary Social Studies

1.0 Textbook Information Sheet

1.1 Title of textbook _____

1.2 If part of a series, list series title _____

_____

1.3 Author(s) _____

1.4 Grade level(s) _____

1.5 Age level(s) of students _____

1.6 Major themes or areas of study _____

_____

1.7 Basic to curriculum or supplementary _____

1.8 Publisher _____

1.9 Copyright date/revisions _____

1.10 Number of pages _____

1.11 Textbook cost _____

1.12 Analyst's name and/or number _____

1.13 Date reviewed _____

1.14 Comments _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.0 General Description of the Textbook

2.1 Is the cover strong, attractive, and of lasting quality? Does the binding appear durable enough to withstand several years of use? Do the covers and pages open flat for easy student use?

2.2 Is the paper of good quality, durable, and free from glare? Is the print sharp and clear, of good contrast, and of a size appropriate to grade level? Is the type varied to provide attractive, easy-to-read pages.

2.3 Is the cost of the textbook reasonable in comparison to other texts of similar quality? Are additional support materials required? If so, what is their cost and availability?

2.4 Are suitable titles, headings, and sub-headings included? Are the main ideas of paragraphs, chapters, and subsections clearly stated and suitably expanded? Are summaries included at the ends of each chapter, topic, or unit? Is an index, table of contents, and glossary included in the text?

2.5 Does the text contain up-to-date information and statistics? Is current technology and a true picture of today's society presented?

2.6 Are illustrations and photographs of good quality, interesting to students, relevant to textual material? Are illustrations and photographs contemporary, not dated by dress, unless their purpose is to portray a certain period in history? Are illustrations placed near the textual material they refer to?

2.7 Are tables, graphs, maps, and charts current, appropriate, easy to read and decipher, and placed near references in the text? Are captions for the tables, maps, and charts clearly written and printed in a suitable size type?

2.8 Additional comments about the general descriptive aspects of the textbook.

3.0 Student Interest and Motivation

3.1 Is the text interesting and acceptable to the target students? Does the text consistently demonstrate the relationship between the knowledge presented and the learner's own life situation? Is there adequate variety in presentation of the material to retain student interest?

3.2 Are the vocabulary levels, type of language, and topics presented appealing to an audience which may vary according to sex, aptitude, ethnic origin, and interests? Is the material designed for students at the proper grade level? Can the material be used successfully by low, average, and high ability students?

3.3 Do the activities and exercises presented serve to motivate, stimulate curiousity, and present challenges to the learner? Do out of class readings and projects provide additional stimulation of student interest?

3.4 Are special competencies necessary for students to use the text successfully? If so, are these competencies identified clearly in the text or teacher's manual? Are readiness materials provided where special social or cognitive skills are required for entry into a chapter or unit? Are alternative sources of readiness materials identified? How could the text material have been written to develop entry competencies as the units progress?

3.5 Are entry points indicated so that students can begin or terminate activities at certain places in the text according to interest, ability, or time constraints? Are these entry points logical so that concepts and generalizations specified in the curriculum will still be learned?

3.6 Is the time and activity load of the student taken into consideration? How much time is required prior to study of the units or sections for development of vocabulary, familiarization with concepts, and gathering of additional materials? Is this time commitment reasonable for students at this age or grade level?

3.7 Additional comments on student interest, motivation, or entry competencies as related to the textbook.

4.0 Content

4.1 What are the major topics, themes, or skills covered in the text? Are they congruent with the topics or skills specified in the curriculum? Are these topics, themes, or skills presented at a suitable level for the students who are expected to use the text? Is there sufficient material in the text to adequately cover the curriculum requirements?

4.2 Does the text employ an objective writing style that is clear in explanation and emphasis? Does the text employ proper terminology, grammar, and sentence structure? Are historical and chronological facts accurate and reliable with reference, whenever possible, to original documents?

4.3 Does the text use a clear, explicit conceptual framework which the student can follow? Is the material presented in a rational order and a logical sequence? Is provision made for branching out along a particularly interesting or relevant path? Is there provision for returning to a topic which may be re-examined in light of study in a subsequent unit?

4.4 Are clearly stated, or implied, principles or generalizations developed in the text? Are these ideas related to social issues and presented in such a way as to encourage inquiry? Are values oriented questions presented along with several points of view, but with no "right" or "wrong" answers specified?

4.5 Are controversial issues which are addressed in the text of interest to students at the target age/grade level? Is enough information available for the topics being studied to allow inquiry and decision-making processes to be used by students?

4.6 Are data and points of view from many disciplines present in text material? Are items such as sources of information, conflicting evidence, possible sources of bias, and recent developments, subject to critical analysis in the text?

4.7 Does the knowledge presented in the text support an understanding of geographical, ecological, historical, and population patterns of people? Are ideas and generalizations drawn from the studies of various cultures? Are these cultures and their ideas presented in an intelligent, non-biased, empathetic manner?

4.8 Can the text be used as a basic reference source for study and inquiry? Does the text contain material not readily available in other sources? Are the materials presented in such a way as to explore new directions and dimensions of the topic?

4.9 Additional comments about the content of the textbook.

5.0 Learner Goals and Objectives

5.1 How are general goals stated and developed in the text? Are they explicit or implicit in the presentation of materials? Are the general goals congruent with the goals stated in the curriculum guide? How do problems, exercises, readings, and activities directly or indirectly develop the general goals of the curriculum?

5.2 Does the manual provide the teacher with examples for writing day-to-day lesson plans in behavioral objective form? Do such objectives specify behavior or action that the student will perform, under what conditions the behavior will occur, and the level of performance the student must reach? Are suggested behavioral objectives congruent with the objectives specified in the curriculum guide?

5.3 What should students be able to do generally in the cognitive domain? Are students required to perform processes in the cognitive domain which involve the Bloom"s taxonomy steps of: acquiring knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation? Are these processes balanced without undue emphasis on the first two steps? Do these cognitive processes fit with the curriculum guide recommendations for the course?

5.4 Are exercises included which require students to operate in the affective domain? Are students required to examine value positions? Do the exercises encourage the steps in taxonomy such as: awareness of values, response to values, stating one's own values, organizing values into a system, and internalization of values in the student's own life? Are the affective components of the text congruent with recommendations from the curriculum guide?

5.5 Additional comments about learner goals and objectives presented in the text and the teacher's manual.

6.0 Teacher Preparation and Methodology

6.1 Examine the materials thoroughly and describe a typical lesson. Explain the presentation, activities, exercises, and evaluation procedures suggested for this lesson.

6.2 Are various flexible, adaptive approaches to the text such as exposition, games, role-playing, debate, simulation, research, discussion, class presentation, model-building, note-making, and similar activities encouraged by the manual or text? Are individual teaching styles provided for?

6.3 Does the manual provide the teacher with diagnostic tests or suggestions for reviewing students' conceptual and experiential backgrounds? Are any diagnostic tests included with the manual easy to mark and interpret? Do these tests provide enough valid information to be useful to teachers?

6.4 Does the manual and/or text allow the teacher to provide for individual differences and learning styles of students? Are adequate remedial or enrichment activities or exercises provided? If not, are sources for such material indicated in the manual? Are lists of suggested materials for each lesson or unit provided?

6.5 Is much of the content of the text written to facilitate teaching by the inquiry method? Does the manual suggest inquiry oriented teaching activities and exercises based on the text material? If little or no guidance is supplied for inquiry teaching, can text materials be easily adapted for the inquiry mode of teaching required by the curriculum guide?

6.6 Does the manual encourage the teacher to use higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy for questions and assignments presented to students? Are decision-making activities explained and developed in the manual to facilitate the the teaching-learning process?

6.7 Does the manual suggest how teachers may encourage student input as the activities in the text are explored? Is teaching for creative thinking encouraged by the manual, or is the student required to supply the "right" answers? Does the manual explain and encourage the use of Krathwol's taxonomy as the teacher directs the student toward examination of values raised in the text?

6.8 Does the manual explain how the teacher may sometimes use the text as a vehicle for independent activities or study by the student? Are definitions and technical terms used in the text explained clearly, and at a level which can be understood by a student working independently on a topic or unit? Are supplementary run-off sheets or masters included in the manual to provide additional guidance for students working independently?

6.9 Does the manual clearly demonstrate to the teacher how new concepts developed in the text are linked to the average student's experiential background or prior knowledge? Are activities and knowledge from the course clearly transferable to events the student may expect to face in the future?

6.10 Does the manual state how much teacher time is needed to cover each unit? Is this reasonable in view of the time allotted for the subject? How much pre-preparation by the teacher is required before beginning the teaching of each unit?

6.11 What knowledge, skills, and attitudes are demanded of the teacher if the textbook is to be adequately used? Are these factors clearly spelled out in the manual? What special training, if any, is required? Would in-service training be necessary, or highly desirable, for teachers who plan to use this text? If in-service is deemed to be desirable, what type of training would be most suitable, and how much time would be required for the training?

6.12 Is the teacher provided with a sufficient number of examples for each new concept introduced in the text? Is the number of concepts introduced in each section or unit suitable for the learning capacities of the target students? Are comprehensive follow-up activities included in the manual to help provide reinforcement of concepts and learning from earlier lessons?

6.13 Does the manual provide a reproduction of each page of the student's text along with background information, notes, and suggestions for teaching the material in the text? Are information and sample lessons from actual use by other teachers provided?

6.14 Additional comments about teacher methodology and preparation.

7.0 Evaluation of Students

7.1 Is the main focus of student evaluation in the textbook or the teacher's manual affective, psychomotor, cognitive, or a combination? Are there appropriate testing materials to evaluate both process and product learning? Is the validity and reliability of the tests discussed in the manual?

7.2 Are formative evaluation processes included to guide learning and instruction? Are there any self-evaluation exercises included for student use?

7.3 How are the main topics covered in the units or sections evaluated? Does the evaluation refer to clearly measurable outcomes which are congruent with the content, methodology, and goals of the text and curriculum? Are levels of competency specified for measurable outcomes?

7.4 Additional comments about evaluation of students.

8.0 Evaluation and Testing of the Textbook

8.1 Has the text been previewed by experts in the field or by one of the reputable testing consortia such as EPIE or CMAS? Is it possible to obtain results from a library, from the publisher, or from outside agencies? Are details of field-testing included in the teacher's manual and are the results of such testing easily verifiable?

8.2 Are anecdotal results obtainable from teachers who have used the text in the province and/or in other provinces? Are statistical results from testing by teachers in the province and/or other provinces available? What is the significance of these results?

8.3 Additional comments about evaluation and testing of the text.

## 9.0 Readability of a Textbook

9.1 Determine the appropriate reading grade range using one of the standard formulae supplied with the training package i.e. Spache or Mugford, plus one other measure such as the Fry or Raygor graph supplied with the training package.

9.2 Is the concept load of the textual materials appropriate for students at the age or grade level in question? Are the number of concepts introduced in each section of the text comensurate with the learning capacities of the students? Would many of the concepts, if used without explanation, be familiar to most students?

9.3 Are there sufficient examples for the student to be able to read the materials and understand the main concepts presented with a minimum of teacher aid? Are concrete and abstract words used clearly and in context with examples, definitions, and explanations to add clarity and relevance to the text materials?

9.4 Is the technical and non-technical vocabulary used in the text clear and easily understood with the help of context clues? Are pronunciations and meanings of difficult words supplied? Are technical words used in the context of essential, supportive, or supplementary nature?

9.5 Is the developmental sequencing of ideas clear, logical, and in small enough steps for students to follow easily?

9.6 Are sentences in the text of a suitable length and complexity for students at this age/grade level? Are different kinds of sentences used to provide a varied pace and interest for students? Is the writing style formal or conversational?

9.7 What summary statements can be made about the readability of the textbook? Additional comments about the reading level of the textbook.

## 10.0 Social Considerations

10.1 Introduction: The social considerations analysis provides the selectors of learning resources with descriptive information relevant to any potential concerns that appear in the content or its presentation. The nature of this analysis requires that the analyst read the text thoroughly and examine the visuals. Such a close reading of the entire text may not occur at any other stage of the selection process.

There are certain aspects which are important to consider in the analysis of both print and visual components of the text. Keep these in mind while completing the analysis:

10.1.1 Author's tone. The author's attitude toward the materials and/or audience. These attitudes tend to influence all features of the textbook.

10.1.2 An error by omission. This may be difficult to identify because the analyst must carefully examine what is included in order to determine what is absent. It is important to note that the author may identify errors by omission and clarify the reasoning for these.

10.1.3 The extent of the reference. Where a reference receives little attention in the text the analyst should indicate this treatment just as more extensive references should be recorded as such.

10.1.4 The frequency of occurrence. A potential concern with multiple references should be indicated as such.

10.1.5 The setting. This influences author's tone and presentation of the content. The time period when the material was written or written about, the social situation, and geographical location are features of the context that provide insight into potential concerns. For example, it is not valid to impose present values on sixteenth century literature. The text should reflect the values of the day.

10.2 Language usage will vary depending on the user and the setting in which it is used. It is important to note that not only should the usage be suited to the context, but also, the usage should be appropriate to the audience. This is particularly true for a student audience who may not be mature enough and/or who may lack the experiential background necessary to understand and appreciate given usage.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.2.1 use of profanity
10.2.2 use of incorrect grammar
10.2.3 use of slang or jargon
10.2.4 use of dialect; formal or informal style
10.2.5 users of above language forms (personality traits, emotions, interests, actvities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.2.6 setting of given language usage (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.2.7 author's tone
10.2.8 error by omission

10.3 Ethnic groups may be identified by various traits which include race, language, national or geographical origin, customs, and religion. Ethnic references are manifested in the personal traits and circumstances, attitudes, and actions of its group members.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.3.1 members (personality, traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.3.2 relationship with others (ethnic members and other members of society)
10.3.3 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.3.4 descriptive language used
10.3.5 author's tone
10.3.6 error by omission

10.4 References to sexual roles surface in the portrayals of men and women. These sexual role portrayals depend on the personal traits and circumstances, attitudes, and actions of men and women.
Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.4.1 the roles presented (what are they?)
10.4.2 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.4.3 the role players (personality traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.4.4 relationship with others (within and between sexes)
10.4.5 descriptive language used
10.4.6 author's tone
10.4.7 error by omission

10.5 Belief systems are organized sets of doctrines or ideas about some philosophy, being, or phenomenon. Cults, philosophies, political views, and religions are all examples of belief systems. References to belief systems emerge in the personal traits, circumstances, attitudes, and actions of their members. The treatment of these members by non-members provides further insights.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.5.1 nature of the system (what characterizes it?)
10.5.2 group members (personality, traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.5.3 relationship with others (members and non-members)
10.5.4 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.5.5 author's tone
10.5.6 error by omission

10.6 Violent events can be both physical and emotional. They may take such forms as hand-to-hand fighting, the use of weapons, torture, verbal abuse, accident, horror, etc. These forms of violence vary in their degree of social acceptability. The violence of everyday events may vary depending on the setting and the participants. Further, their effects range depending on how the author presents them.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.6.1 the act of violence itself
10.6.2 the setting of the violence (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.6.3 participants (personality, traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.6.4 degree of explicitness
10.6.5 the function of the violence (is it central to a major theme or unit found in the content?)
10.6.6 author's tone
10.6.7 error by omission

10.7 Sexual references vary depending on the degree to which they are either explicit or implicit, the setting in which they occur, and their participants. Sexual references include descriptions of the human body, references to sexual activity, sexual exploitation, etc. Further the effect of these references varies depending on their role in the content and the manner in which they are presented.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrences and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references).

10.7.1 the sexual reference itself
10.7.2 the setting of the reference (time period, social situation, goegraphical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.7.3 participants (personality, traits, emotions, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.7.4 degree of explicitness
10.7.5 author's tone
10.7.6 error by omission

10.8 Age portrayals deal with the presentation of members of different age groups and their treatment by other members of society. References to the generation gap, the aged, parent-child relationships, etc., are to be considered.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references)

10.8.1 members (personality, emotions, traits, activities, physical features and appearance, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.8.2 setting of the portrayal (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.8.3 relationship with others (group members and other members of society)
10.8.4 descriptive language used
10.8.5 author's tone
10.8.6 error by omission

10.9 References to social class tend to separate out groups of people from other members of society. Social class distinctions are often revealed in the portrayals of class members, their circumstances, and treatment by others.

Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references (quote accurately with page references)

10.9.1 members (personality, emotions, traits, interests, activities, physical features and appearance, age, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.9.2 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, geographical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.9.3 relationship with others (class members and other members of society)
10.9.4 descriptive language used
10.9.5 author's tone
10.9.6 error by omission

10.10 There may be other considerations in the instructional material not covered by the above comments. Comment on any of the following aspects encountered in the materials.

10.10.1 moral issues (these might include use/abuse of drugs, alcohol, the law ... or such things as gambling, slavery, nuclear arms ...)
10.10.2 family structure
10.10.3 management and labor relations
10.10.4 references to atypical individuals (those who depart from the norm either mentally, physically, or emotionally)
10.10.5 any other references which are social issues

For the topics above, or any other considerations deemed important, quote accurately with page references. Consider the following for both text and visuals; comment fully paying particular attention to the frequency of occurrence and extent of the references.

10.10.6 representatives or members (personality, interests, traits, emotions, activities, physical features and appearance, socio-economic status, family setting)
10.10.7 setting of the reference (time period, social situation, goegraphical location, circumstances surrounding the reference, mood, degree of formality)
10.10.8 descriptive language used
10.10.9 author's tone
10.10.10 error by omission

## 11.0 Aesthetic Review of the Textbook

This section requires a "change of gears" by the analyst. Here, the reviewer is asked to respond as subjectively as necessary in order to examine the textbook at a "feeling" level. The reviewer should state what he or she likes or dislikes, finds appealing or unappealing, finds interesting or uninteresting. Moreover, the reviewer may examine the material in the text from any aesthetic point of view such as the use of color, use of language, flow of language, or any other consideration he may prefer. This subjective view of the text should be written much as an art or music critic writes a review of a display or performance.

## 12.0 General Critique and Recommendations

Write a brief overall summary and critique of the text with recommendations for or against adoption of the text as a prescribed or authorized resource for the age or grade level being considered. Reasons should be stated for your assessment.

VITA

Surname: TILLOTSON Given Names: CLAYTON WALTER

Place of Birth: ST. CYR LAKE, SASK. Date of Birth: May 1, 1933

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving:

MEDICINE HAT COLLEGE, ALBERTA 1968 to 1969

UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA 1969 to 1973

UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA 1974 to 1979

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA 1980 to 1982

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., with Dates and Names of Institutions:

B. Ed. 1973 University of Lethbridge, Alberta

Dip. Ed. 1979 University of Lethbridge, Alberta

Honors and Awards:

University of Victoria Staff Associateship, 1980/81

Publications:

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation

SELECTION OF RESOURCES IN CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION:

AN APPROACH TO THE SELECTION OF RESOURCES FOR

ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Author [redacted]

CLAYTON WALTER TILLOTSON

September, 1982