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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND RELATED FIELDS

The arithmetic textbook is an essential medium on which the classroom activities are based. Whether the teacher follows the processes in the textbook in the order in which the subject matter is introduced by the authors, or whether he uses his own method of sequence, the textbook is a basic assistant in determining the effectiveness of his teaching. He finds it one of the foremost instruments upon which to rely to give the students the best instruction in the field.

To deprive an average teacher of the textbook may be inviting poor teaching, for the unified technique, based on the text, must be superseded by information supplied by the teacher. This often becomes fragmentary with little or no tie-ups of ideas.

Much has been written about a resourceful teacher enriching his program by making use of related materials. A text is no obstacle to such procedure, but it would be well to select one so constructed that such resourcefulness would be reduced to a minimum. Searching for material is time consuming, and a teacher's day is full without such added endeavor. If a text does not meet the requirements for which it is intended, there is need for developing adequate basic texts.
Usually the financial situation in school systems is such that only one basic text is permitted in each classroom. To adopt books with discretion is a task that requires a knowledge of content as well as a knowledge of the course of study requirements.

Textbook publishers are continually exploring the various fields of learning in order to meet the changing demands of the schools. This leads to competition in textbook production and the need for evaluation on the part of those who are responsible for adopting texts for school use.

From a student’s point of view, a text should contain the information he hopes to attain from the course. Many of the new textbooks contain methods as well as subject matter, so they are, in themselves, a kind of teacher. If we are to give the student the best instrument for learning, then we must be selective in our choice, and before we can select, we must evaluate.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. Are the junior high school textbooks in arithmetic so carefully prepared and selected that they meet the needs of the students and teacher adequately?

A. How do publishers evaluate the books they publish?
B. Do publishers influence textbook adoption?

C. How are textbooks selected by the Textbook Commission of the state of Nevada?

D. Can a weighted score card be devised that would prove valuable as a guide in the evaluation of textbooks?

The purposes of this study are (1) to secure data on how publishers select materials and authors for their junior high school arithmetic texts; (2) to compare the evaluation of textbooks by the publishers with the evaluation by the State Textbook Commission; (3) to determine the effect of outside influence on the members of the State Textbook Commission in their choice of texts; and (4) to devise a weighted score card from the information secured in this study.

Importance of the study.

The typical teacher of the United States still follows the textbook closely... In the schools of the United States the textbook frequently determines what is taught and the order of presentation of the subject matter; it is the course of study for the subject.¹

Arithmetic, to some degree, is essential to everyday living. All individuals are confronted with some type of computation in acquiring the necessities of life.

Arithmetic, from the lower elementary levels and culminating in the eighth grade, develops a foundation on

which all mathematics can be built. An understanding of the principles involved in arithmetic develops confidence in the ability to do algebra and in meeting the daily problems of life.

One of the responsibilities of the eighth grade teacher is to seek out the factors that have not been acquired by the students in the seventh grade, re-teach them, and teach, in addition, all the requirements of the eighth grade course of study. To prepare students for higher mathematics and to prepare "drop-outs" for vocational needs are duties of the eighth grade teacher.

In order to determine the responsibilities born by the states in textbook selection, the author made a survey of the forty-eight states on how textbooks are selected for school use in each state. The response was one hundred percent.

The results of the survey have been tabulated and placed in Appendix A on page 57. This information is arranged in three columns. The first column contains the alphabetical list of states; the second indicates the type of adoptions practiced in each state and discloses that four states have single adoptions, twenty-five states have open adoptions, and nineteen states have multiple adoptions; and the third differentiates between state and local
adoptions, which reveals that twenty-three states have state adoptions and twenty-five have local adoptions.

The significance of the tabulation lies, not only in the interest exhibited in textbooks for schools, but in the method of choice. One can infer that each state practices the method most suitable to its problems. To develop this further would involve another study.

Scope of study. This study has been limited to twenty publishers who have been selected for their prominence in textbook publication and have the recognition of the Textbook Commission of the State of Nevada, whose members are responsible for the textbooks selected for adoption in that state.

The junior high school was selected for this study because there is a transition there from arithmetic to algebra, or higher mathematics. Algebra will not be included in this study because it involves a different technique in selection and different purposes for study than those of arithmetic. This study has been concentrated on the eighth grade text in the subject.

The survey covering the forty-eight states was undertaken to establish related state interests on the field of textbook selection.
Steps in the investigation.

1. A vast amount of literature was surveyed in order to determine the extent of similar studies.

2. Literature and types of evaluation materials were studied in order to devise points for a weighted score-card.

3. A survey of publishing houses was undertaken in order to select those who were prominent in textbook publication and who have shown an interest in selling their textbooks in the state of Nevada. As a result, twenty publishers were selected.

4. A ten-point questionnaire was formulated dealing with the fundamentals of textbook production and the techniques used in salesmanship. The points were constructed so as to get an insight into the publisher's plan of the textbook he produced. In order to sell, a book must have points of value, and so the background was the foundation on which to build in order to gain information on what the publisher considered the strong points in his textbook. In Chapter III, each point will be discussed separately and, to avoid duplication, they will not be enumerated here.

5. The evaluation sheet which was constructed to accompany the questionnaire has point values. After sifting materials in order to construct a form not so detailed that it would be laborious to use, and yet inclusive enough to cover all major factors of an arithmetic textbook, the
one-thousand point score sheet was devised. This score sheet was mailed to each publisher in order to obtain a weighted evaluation of his textbook and to the members of the Textbook Commission in order to obtain valued opinions for the construction of a score card.

6. A questionnaire was constructed to determine the effect of salesmanship on the reaction of the members of the Textbook Commission to the books offered for adoption. It was a means by which bias could be determined in the choice of books. This questionnaire was mailed to each member of the Textbook Commission. It has been placed in Chapter IV, so it will not be duplicated here.

7. The ten-point questionnaire which was prepared for the publishers was mailed with the evaluation sheet to each of the twenty publishers selected for this study.

8. Chapter III of this study is devoted in its entirety to the responses from the publishers to the questionnaire and the evaluation sheet. This includes methods of tabulation, final results, and conclusions.

9. Chapter IV includes tabulations of the responses from the State Textbook Commission on the questionnaire and graphic illustrations of the responses on the evaluation sheet. A comparison of the averages from the publishers' evaluation and that of the Textbook Commission is illustrated in graph form.
10. The survey of the states regarding textbook adoption laws has been tabulated and placed in Appendix A. Official data concerning the State Boards of Education to whom this survey was directed also have been placed in Appendix A.

11. The names and addresses of the publishers surveyed for this study have been placed in Appendix A.

12. The names and addresses of the Nevada Textbook Commission have been placed in Appendix A.

13. Copies of the letters to the publishers, members of the Textbook Commission of the State of Nevada, and the State Boards of Education requesting participation in this survey have been placed in Appendix A.

14. This survey began in January of 1957 and continued through June of 1958. The responses in some cases were difficult to secure. As many as five follow-ups were necessary in one case in order to secure the information needed.

15. Much of the information on the operation of the Nevada Textbook Commission was secured by private interviews with the author's principal, Mrs. Ruby Thomas, who was a member of the Textbook Commission.

Significance of study.

1. This study is an attempt to devise a set of
standards by which arithmetic texts may be evaluated. The employment of such a set will eliminate hasty judgment and an evaluation based only on general observation.

2. The set of standards devised by this study is the average obtained from the evaluations of the publishers and those of the Textbook Commission. The purpose of this set is to assure that the textbooks will be compared on all important factors.

3. The employment of a set of standards in textbook judging is taking an analytical approach to the problem and provides the same basis for judging by everyone.

4. Teachers are often called upon to evaluate books in their teaching fields. They are usually inexperienced in textbook evaluation since they have not been trained in that field. Also, teachers are busy people, and the process of evaluating is an additional responsibility. A standard of values will eliminate uncertainty and ease the task of judging.

5. Prior to textbook adoption by the state, publishers present their books to the members of the Textbook Commission. There are many books and many features. A guide is almost a necessity.

6. This study is an attempt to improve procedures in textbook selection.
Fundamental assumptions. A study of this type is obviously subject to limitations. Psychological principles are involved since such a study deals directly with individual thought. Human nature is not infallible and, with that in mind, it would be well to consider the following assumptions before inferences are drawn:

1. The questionnaire sent to the publishers had the following purposes:
   a) To determine the extent to which the publishers secure data for their publications.
   b) To secure an understanding of the qualifications required of the personnel who are engaged in the compilation and sales of the textbooks.

2. Each publisher completed the evaluation sheet in good faith and the tabulation is a valid representation of his judgment.

3. The questionnaire sent to the Textbook Commission members of the State of Nevada reveals adequately the effect of salesmanship on their choice of books.

4. Each member of the Textbook Commission completed the evaluation sheet in the same manner and with the same reasoning that he would apply to a text in judging it for adoption.
Of the publishers of textbooks, the twenty selected for this study are an adequate representation of those who are engaged in textbook sales in Nevada.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The basic terms used in this study are defined as follows:

**Single textbook adoption** is used to designate a system of textbook adoption in which a state department of public instruction selects one textbook for use in particular classrooms of all the schools of the state.

**Open textbook adoption** is used to designate a system of textbook adoption to which each school unit is free to select its own textbook for its own classes.

**Multiple textbook adoption** is used to designate a system of textbook adoption in which a state department of public instruction makes a list of several textbooks and each school unit (county, district, individual school, special committees, or other divisions) selects from this list the textbook it desires for use in its schools.

**State adoption** is used to designate a system in which textbooks are adopted by the State Board of Education and the schools select from the adopted list the books they desire for use.
Local adoption is used to designate the system in which the local boards or organizations of the school system may adopt books. These divisions may represent the county, city, individual districts, special committees, or whatever local unit the particular school system decides upon.

A weighted score card is one on which each item has been assigned a number. The number indicates the value allotted to the item.

A textbook is a book used by a student as a foundation for the specific subject studied. In this study it is the arithmetic book.

Mathematics is the tool of all sciences. It is a science concerned with logical deductions.

Arithmetic is a branch of mathematics dealing with computation and mensuration. In arithmetic, numbers are represented by Arabic numerals.

Algebra is a branch of mathematics which is characterized by symbols. It is a higher degree of abstraction and generalization than arithmetic.

III. ORGANIZATION OF REMAINING PAPER

Chapter II is made up of the orientation of the problem, which includes a historical account of arithmetic texts, a survey of related literature, and an analysis of related subjects.
Chapter III consists of the role the publishers play in book selection and evaluation.

Chapter IV is concerned with the work of the Textbook Commission of the State of Nevada.

Chapter V contains the summary and conclusion of the study.

The Bibliography and Appendixes A and B follow Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA

I. HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF ARITHMETIC TEXTS

The earliest written record of arithmetic is the Ahmes papyrus of Egypt dating back to about 1700 B.C. These papers disclose a knowledge of fractions, simple algebraic equations, and geometric progressions and so are based upon mathematics of greater antiquity.¹

The Arab arithmetic became known to the Christian world in 1202. In 1478, the first printed arithmetic appeared anonymously at Treviso, Italy. In 1482, Germany published its first arithmetic text at Bamberg. Late in the sixteenth century, France produced many commercial arithmetics. The first to be printed in England was the work of Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall in 1522, and about the middle of the century Robert Recorde published his commercial textbook. Due to the great mercantile activity of Holland between 1575 and 1650, a large number of arithmetics appeared in that country early in the seventeenth century. These publications materially influenced the textbooks of England. The

first arithmetic to be printed in America was Hodder's popular English works, which was re-published in Boston in 1719. Greenwood's arithmetic was published in 1788. He was followed by Daball with his "Schoolmaster's Assistant" in 1799. For many years this was one of the most popular arithmetics in use in our schools. Benjamin Greenfield, 1786-1864, published three arithmetics. Those were in the primary, elementary, and practical field. Other early compilers were Daniel Fish and Charles Davies.

The present period is marked as beginning in 1911, for it was that year that a new force, the survey usage, began to operate. The present period of arithmetic may be designated as the Survey-of-Usage period. Processes with little or no practical value are listed for non-drill treatment. The fundamental viewpoint is strongly urged.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

How shall an arithmetic textbook be selected for classroom use? On what basis should the choice depend?


In the early days, when only one arithmetic book was on the market, choice was no problem. Competition in the sales strategy began as soon as more than one book suited to the same purpose was placed on sale. Now textbook production has reached a peak where evaluation is of keen significance.

Much has been written about textbooks, but this study shall be denoted only to a few works with related interests.

DeYoung distinguishes between two techniques in textbook selection. The first is subjective judgment which involves a casual examination of a book and which might have been preceded by a talk from a field representative or the receipt of a folder or letter from the publishing company. The second is objective appraisal and involves the use of a score card or check list. He makes no attempt to paint out the advantages of either, though he does emphasize that content, format and suitability are the three big items to be judged.

Reeder, in his study, develops the theory that a textbook (1) prepares an individual for independent thinking

---


6Ibid.
because it makes him less dependent on the teacher; (2) con-
tains the most pertinent information available in the subject;
and (3) is a great time saver for both the teacher and the
pupil. He modifies these statements by saying that even the
best textbook is likely to possess limitations of presenting
too much or too little material, of being colored too much by
the author's views, and of lacking adaptation to the needs
of the individual pupil. He says, "The textbook should be
made a helpful servant, but it should not be permitted to
become the master of teacher and pupil."  

Cronbach relates that if there were a tested theory
for judging textbooks, then persons could be trained as
experts in the use of theory. They could select material by
using relative exact criteria. The absence of tested theory
leads to selling books rather than selecting; it perpetuates
the selection of books because many others are using them;
and it leads to diversity in procedure for selecting.

Waterman cautions against the use of score cards in
evaluating books before a general survey has been made in
order to eliminate any textbook that fails to meet a

7Ward G. Reeder, The Fundamentals of Public School
8Ibid., p. 631.
9Lee J. Cronbach, Text Materials in Modern Education
specific criterion, for it is possible that a book might be entirely lacking in some essential feature and yet be so superior in other points as to receive the highest total score. After the elimination, then use the score card for rating those that are at least satisfactory in all parts. He states that the score card, though based on opinion, has definite values in that it reflects the judgment of the evaluating body as to the relative importance of each standard and it assumes the judges will use the same measuring stick for determining the relative merits of textbooks under consideration.¹⁰

Many types of score cards and check lists have been published. The one constructed by E. M. Otis and published by Reeder is typical of many weighted scales.¹¹

III. LIMITATION OF STUDIES

This survey has been limited to the literature which relates specifically to the problem of this study.

The absence of an accepted theory on what constitutes an adequate textbook leaves the choice open for individual decision.

Of the techniques involved in evaluating textbooks, the objective appraisal outweighs the subjective, for it


¹¹Reeder, op. cit., p. 639.
provides a uniformity on which judges base their decisions.

No tested theory has been accepted so the determination of an appropriate text for a specific study is often left to casual judgment or good salesmanship, though objective appraisals are considered more reliable.
CHAPTER III

THE PUBLISHERS' PART IN TEXTBOOK SELECTION

I. WHY THE PUBLISHERS ARE INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY

"The very nature of the work necessary to produce a desirable text in a given subject, links the textbook makers to the educational program of our state in a most definite way." ¹

"Publishers consider themselves full time partners with educators in the educational process."²

The theory of textbook sales has its inception in the mind of a publisher when he feels that his present textbook does not meet the requirements of the schools. The follow-up of this theory is a new or revised textbook which ultimately, by means of salesmanship, reaches the prospective buyers. So the fundamental principle of textbook production and the evaluation that each publisher places on his product form a part of the cycle which leads to


textbook adoption. The influence conveyed through the sales media may be the deciding factor in the choice of books.

The Questionnaire

The unit which was mailed to the publishers contained, in addition to the questionnaire, an evaluation sheet and a letter explaining the purpose of the survey and asking them to comply. The evaluation sheet will be discussed following this study, and the letter has been placed in Appendix A.

From the ninety percent of publishers who responded to the inquiry, eleven questionnaires were completed and returned. The reasons for not complying with the request were as follows: Two companies had recently merged; two stated that much of the material asked for was confidential; one did not publish eighth grade arithmetic textbooks; one sent its own criteria for judging; one sent a publication from the American Textbook Publishers Institute; and one stated that the questionnaire would only reveal the publisher's thorough belief in his own text.

The eleven completed questionnaires evince that the publishers concerned were sincere in their responses and, as such, have been of definite help in this study.

The ten questions comprising the questionnaire are:

1. As a publisher, what principles do you employ to determine the need for a new and revised textbook?
2. How do you secure authors to write manuscripts?
3. How do you determine the material that should go into the textbook?
4. If a revision of a manuscript is necessary before you accept it for sponsoring, who does the revising?
5. What qualifications do you require of those who do the revising?
6. Who writes the briefs and outlines that you use in advertising your text?
7. How do the duties of your field representative differ from those of your demonstrator?
8. What qualifications do you require of the representatives you send out into the field to interview school people in the interest of your books?
9. What qualifications do you require of your authors as to education and profession?
10. Do you prefer your textbooks to be written by one author or by joint authors?

The statements made by the publishers in answer to the questions were in such form that they could be summarized and tabulated without losing content. For that reason, the questions have been converted into statements, and each forms a caption for a table. The tables consist of the response statements from publishers, the responses to each statement tabulated in number, and the responses to each
The purpose of the tabulation is to obtain a generalization based on the publisher's basic philosophy in textbook production. Beginning with the inceptive theory and continuing through the salesmanship technique such a generalization is possible.

Table I indicates that, in determining the need for a new or revised textbook, the research method is preferred, since the responses were 72.7 percent for research, 18.2 percent for a study of the curriculum, and 9.1 percent for the acceptance of the present text. There may seem to be an overlapping of thought in the items of this table, but research covers a broader field than either of the other two, and so has been placed as a separate alternative.

Table II indicates that the majority of publishers search for authors who merit recognition in the field. Tabulation indicates that 90.9 percent of the publishers search for authors whereas 9.1 percent have authors come to them.

Table III discloses that, in determining the subject matter that should be included in the textbook, 45.4 percent of the publishers favor the surveying of teaching trends and the contacting of experts in the field, 36.4 percent
prefer the authors to determine the content, and 18.2 percent determine the content by a careful check of the courses of study on a nationwide basis.

Table IV, which represents the publishers' method of revising manuscripts, shows that 63.6 percent of the publishers have the revising done by the author in cooperation with the editorial staff, 18.2 percent allow the author to do the revising, 9.1 percent authorize that it be done by the editorial staff, and 9.1 percent have the revisions done on a cooperative basis, including editors and others competent in the field.
TABLE I
STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES EMPLOYED BY PUBLISHERS TO DETERMINE THE NEED OF A NEW AND REVISED BOOK, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The acceptance of our present series determines our decision to investigate a new series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A study of the curriculum throughout the country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What research reveals about the changes needed in the subject</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II
STATEMENT OF HOW PUBLISHERS SECURE AUTHORS TO WRITE MANUSCRIPTS, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors come to us with ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for men and women who merit recognition in the field</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE III
STATEMENT OF HOW PUBLISHERS DETERMINE THE TYPE OF MATERIAL THAT SHOULD GO INTO A TEXTBOOK, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The authors determine this</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful study of courses of study on a nationwide basis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of teaching trends and contact experts in the field</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV
STATEMENT OF WHO DOES THE REVISING ON MANUSCRIPTS, SHOWING RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author and editorial staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative, including authors, editors, and others, such as teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The author</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V, on the qualifications required of those who do the revising, reveals that publishers prefer the expertise of an author in the revising process, since 63.6 percent of the publishers indicate the requirement of such qualifications. The other alternative, which includes teaching experience at the grade level for which the revision is made plus writing ability and outstanding ability in the arithmetic field, has the concurrence of 36.4 percent of the publishers.

Table VI, on who wrote the briefs and outlines for advertising purposes shows that 45.4 percent of the publishers employ the home and division offices, salesmen, consultants, and people in the educational service for that purpose; 18.6 percent of the publishers have the briefs and outlines prepared by the editorial staff; and each of the remaining four categories are employed by 9.1 percent of the publishers. The four categories are: (1) those who employ the advertising department, (2) those who have a textbook promotion department, (3) those who indicate that these are written by editors and members of the research department, and (4) those who state that the professional staff of educational consultants is responsible for that service.
### TABLE V

**STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS REQUIRED BY PUBLISHERS OF THOSE WHO DO THE REVISIING, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The same expertness as authors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience at the grade level for which the revision is being done plus writing ability and outstanding ability in the field</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VI

**STATEMENT OF WHO WRITES THE BRIEFS AND OUTLINES THAT PUBLISHERS USE IN ADVERTISING, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The advertising department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and division offices, salesmen, consultants, and people in the educational service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial staff and author</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of textbook promotion department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial and research departments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff of educational consultants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VII, on the differences of duties of field representatives and demonstrators, indicate an unanimity in responses, namely, that the sales representative is responsible for all activities relating to the textbook in the assigned area and the demonstrator is concerned with helping the school systems get the best of their materials.

Table VIII, on the qualifications of a field representative, reveals that 54.5 percent of the publishers require a thorough knowledge of material and educational practices; 27.3 percent requires teaching experience, intelligence and a winning personality; and 18.2 percent requires a B. A. or M. A. degree and the experience of a teacher or administrator.

Table IX, relating to qualifications of authors, indicates that 54.5 percent of the publishers surveyed require the best possible people in the field; 18.2 percent require leadership, experience in the field, and ability to write; 18.2 percent require natural leadership in the field; and 9.1 percent require no standard qualifications.

Table X, on the preference of single or joint authors, denotes that 81.8 percent of the publishers generally joint authorship, and 18.2 percent have no general preference.
### Table VII
STATEMENT OF HOW DUTIES OF FIELD REPRESENTATIVES AND DEMONSTRATORS DIFFER, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The field representative is responsible for all activities related to the textbook in his area and the demonstrator is concerned with helping school systems get the best use of the material</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table VIII
STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS OF FIELD REPRESENTATIVE, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience, intelligence, and a winning personality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorough knowledge of material and educational practices</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must have B. A. or M. A. degrees and must have been a teacher or administrator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IX
STATEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS
OF AUTHORS, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES
AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership, experience in the field and ability to write</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best possible people in the field</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No standard qualifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural leaders in the field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE X
STATEMENT ILLUSTRATING PREFERENCE OF SINGLE OR JOINT AUTHORS, SHOWING RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint authorship, generally</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No general preference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The ulterior motive in all textbook production is the sale of the product.

The following conclusions drawn from the replies to the questionnaire may well justify this statement.

1. Publishing companies are continually alert to the changing needs in the educational system.

2. The need for a new or revised text is established through the research department and the demand for new material for the teaching field.

3. Each publisher attempts to secure the best men or women in the field to establish authorship to the book they wish to sponsor.

4. All departments in each company are well staffed with qualified people who can offer keen competition in production and advertising.

5. Concentrating on sales technique is one of the most effective means of securing textbook adoption.

These justifications are lacking in one respect, for the textbook, in order to sell, must have points of value. How does the publisher evaluate his own text in the light of its educational purpose? This question leads us to the second part of this chapter, the evaluation sheet.
II. EVALUATION PROCESSES

This part of the study constitutes: (1) the construction of an evaluation sheet in order to obtain point values from the publishers on the factors which made up their books and (2) the construction of a score card from the averages of those evaluation sheets.

**Development of Evaluation Sheet**

The evaluation sheet was constructed after similar material, courses of study, and textbooks had been surveyed. In the survey of literature many types of score cards were uncovered, and it was discovered that many such score cards were too detailed. Evaluation from such detailed cards would constitute a tedious task. Others were too simple to provide adequate criteria for judging.

In constructing the evaluation sheet for this purpose, much detail was eliminated. Main factors on what constitutes an adequate textbook were decided upon and the following sheet is the result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Sheet</th>
<th>Total 1000 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. General Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Style suited to grade

Copyright

2. Mechanical Make-up
   Appearance, cover and design
   Durability of binding
   Quality of paper
   Size of type
   Size of text

3. Aims of instruction
   Understanding (rationalization)
   Abilities (acquisition of skills)
   Appreciation of arithmetic

4. Processes presented
   Unity of organization
   Psychological arrangements
   Correlation - arithmetic, algebra, geometry

5. Methods of Instruction
   Teaching steps
   Illustrations

6. Problem Material
   Quantitative relationship
   Analysis of problem
   Problems

7. Psychological Principles
   Motivation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vocabulary and Sentence Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Measurement of Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teaching Aids to Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer keys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publishers' Responses**

The evaluation sheet and questionnaire were mailed as a unit to the publishers selected for this survey. The responses represented ninety percent of those surveyed. However, only ten completed evaluation sheets were returned. The reasons for not completing the questionnaire were also, in most cases, directed to the evaluation sheet. In addition, one publisher stated that he did not believe in point scores for various factors in any analysis of textbooks, and another stated that the editor in charge of textbook
preparation could be nothing less than completely enthusiastic about his own product.

**Tabulation of Responses**

Each evaluation sheet has been graphed separately and placed in Appendix B as Figures 5 through 12. The average of all responses has been graphed in order to secure weighted measures for a score card. The scale, as taken from this graph are as follows:

- General Factors: 75
- Mechanical Make-up: 75
- Aims of Instruction: 100
- Processes Presented: 115
- Methods of Instruction: 145
- Problem Material: 140
- Psychological Principles: 95
- Vocabulary and Sentence Structure: 75
- Measurement of Achievement: 80
- Teaching Aids to Instruction: 100

**Total**: 1000

By placing the above points on the evaluation sheet which appears on pages 33 through 35 of this study, a score card will have been devised which may be used as a basis for further evaluations.

The graph, Figure 1, from which the above values have been obtained follows on page 37.
FIGURE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE FACTORS
COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT
(BASED ON THE AVERAGE OF THE TEN PUBLISHER EVALUATIONS)
Conclusion

The publisher gave the highest rating to the methods of instruction. Closely following this was problem material. Therefrom, we may deduct that, since methods of instruction include teaching steps and illustrations, they are the means by which a student secures an understanding of what is taught. We may further deduct that, from the publishers' point of view, comprehension is the key to problem solving, and this key is more important than application, which is what problem material produces. In addition to assisting the teacher on how to teach the mastery technique, methods of instruction produce a means by which a student can do independent work. Third in point value was processes presented and this was closely followed by aims of instruction and teaching aids to instruction. Aids to instruction include answer keys and manuals. We conclude, then, that the publishers have the teacher and student in mind when compiling arithmetic texts. An overall view of the point values indicates that all factors have been given a high rating. There is no inferior factor. This indicates that each publisher places on the market, according to his judgment, a product of the highest standards.

From the preceding section of this chapter, page 32, we find the statement that "the ulterior motive in all textbook production is the sale of the product." In this the
publisher is not in variance with producers in other fields. To produce a text of high standards is an accomplishment, but it must sell in order to prove its worth.
I. HISTORY OF THE TEXTBOOK COMMISSION

The adoption of textbooks in Nevada dates back to March 20, 1865, when statutes were enacted for the maintenance of schools. This law which established a board to adopt textbooks to be used in the public schools of Nevada was amended in 1907, and the State Textbook Commission was created with the authority to select and adopt textbooks for use in all the public schools of the state. Subsequent revisions have been made. In the 1956 School Code and the Nevada Revised Statutes of 1957 the wording "all the elementary schools of the state" replaced "all the public schools" and so restricted the adoption to elementary schools only.\footnote{Byron F. Stetler, "Nevada State Textbook Commission," \textit{Nevada Educational Bulletin} (Carson City: State Department of Education, May, 1958), pp. 5-6.} This elementary division includes the eighth grade.

The Textbook Commission consists of the State Board of Education and six additional members appointed by the Governor for a term of four years. Nevada is divided into six educational districts and, of the appointive members, one must be appointed from each district. Each appointive
member must be actively engaged in school work, and each
must take the constitutional oath of office and file it in
the office of the secretary of state before he or she is
qualified to proceed officially in the selection of books.
The Governor serves as the ex-officio president and the
Superintendent of Public Instruction is the ex-officio
secretary.

The Commission shall hold regular meetings in the
office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to adopt
textbooks for the State of Nevada. These regular meetings
are held not later than the third Tuesday in March of each
year. It is required by statute that the Commission meet
regularly, but it is not mandatory that they adopt textbooks.2

The Nevada Revised Statutes of 1957 made the annual
textbook adoption possible. In order to comply with the
statutes, the Commission must revise the present procedure.
This is a gradual process. Annual adoptions are expected
to be in effect by 1962.

On or before November 10 of each year, if the Commission
plans to make changes in the adopted list, notices are sent
to publishers who have indicated a desire to submit pro­
posals of supplying the state with textbooks.

---

2Ibid., p. 7.
After the formalities of signing contracts and filing bonds have been completed, the Superintendent of Public Instruction has a list of the textbooks and supplementary books, including guaranteed prices, printed and distributed to the superintendents of schools and the board of trustees. These must be made available in each building.\(^3\)

The Textbook Commission has been empowered by the Nevada Revised Statutes of 1957 to designate one or more depositories within the state where the adopted texts may be purchased. To date, only one such depository has been established. This is the Armanko Office Supply Company of Reno, Nevada. Here the state adopted texts are stored on consignment by the publishers and are available to schools upon order.\(^4\)

II. EFFECT OF SALESMANSHIP ON CHOICE OF BOOKS

The Survey

As has been stated the Textbook Commission is composed of the Board of Education and six members appointed by the Governor. Only the six appointed members are actively engaged in textbook selection. The Board of Education accepts or rejects the adoptions made by the six members.

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 8-9.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 9.
Consequently, after a private interview with one of the appointed members of the Commission, only the six members were surveyed in this study.

Each of the six members was sent a questionnaire with the purpose of determining the effect of salesmanship on the choice of textbooks. The factors in the questionnaire were established after a study of the salesmanship technique commonly used by publishers and a survey of related literature.

The response to this survey was one hundred percent.

The questionnaire follows:

The Salesmanship Technique in Choice of Books

I. What do you do with the advertising materials, such as outlines and briefs of textbooks in arithmetic sent to you by publishers? (Check only one.)

A. Refer them to the teacher of that particular subject or grade. 
B. Review and refer to teachers. 
C. Throw them into the wastepaper basket. 
D. File them. 
E. Others.

II. Does this type of advertising help you in the selection of textbooks? (Check only one.)
A. It is of value.  
B. It is of no value.  
C. It is of major value.  
D. The value is questionable.  
E. Others.

III. Do you consider the publisher's representative an asset or a liability to your textbook committee? 

IV. Do you expect the publishers to furnish free copies for examination by each member of the committee?  
(Yes or No) 

Tabulation

In Table XI we find that 66.7 percent of the Textbook Commission members reviewed the advertising materials sent out by publishers and then referred the materials to the teachers, whereas, 33.3 percent of the members referred the advertising materials to the teachers without reading them.

Table XII, on the value of advertising materials to textbook adoption, indicates that every member found values in advertising materials.

Table XIII, shows that all members of the Commission consider the influence of the field representative an asset.

Table XIV, on furnishing free textbook copies to members of the Commission by publishers, points out that
83.3 percent of the Commission members expected furnished copies for inspection, while 16.7 percent did not expect free copies for inspection. This is a ratio of five to one in favor of free copies.

The above tables are tabulated on the following pages.
### TABLE XI
**METHOD OF DISPOSAL OF ADVERTISING MATERIAL, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Used</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Refer them to the teacher of subject</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Review and refer to teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Throw them into the wastepaper basket</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. File them</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XII
**VALUE OF ADVERTISING MATERIALS TO TEXTBOOK ADOPTION, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. It is of value</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. It is of no value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. It is of major value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The value is questionable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIII
INFLUENCE OF FIELD REPRESENTATIVE ON COMMISSION, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Liability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XIV
INDIVIDUAL TEXTBOOK COPIES FURNISHED MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION, SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Copies</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publishers expected to furnish free copies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers not expected to furnish copies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

In the light of this survey we can draw the following conclusions:

1. The acceptance of the publishers' advertising techniques by the Textbook Commission demonstrates the need for clues to help evaluate books.

2. The publishers' advertising campaign is effective because:
   a. All Commission members see values in advertising materials.
   b. All members refer the advertising materials to the teachers.
   c. The teachers influence the members of the Commission by suggestions gained through the study of advertising materials.
   d. All members consider the field representative an asset.

3. The publishers' advertising campaign may have a negative effect on evaluation since:
   a. The sales technique of the field representative may be so persuasive that it overshadows the value of the text.
   b. The publisher may have certain sections in his text on which he wishes to stress superiority. Focus on these sections may hold
other sections in obscurity. The Commission must consider the whole text, not only parts.

Advertising of any sort may cause bias within the individuals responsible for evaluation.

4. The ultimate goal of the publisher is to sell and to produce a text that will stay on the market. A good reputation is built on good products.

III. EVALUATIVE STUDY

Method of Survey

The evaluation sheet used in this study was an identical copy of the one sent to the publishers. The method of survey was also the same. Although the response to the questionnaire was one hundred percent, the response to this evaluative study was only eighty-three percent. One member of the Textbook Commission failed to comply. As a result only five sheets were available for tabulation.

Tabulation

Line graphs have been selected for this study. The five graphs representing individual tabulation have been placed in Appendix B as Figures 13 through 17.

The three graphs representing the averages, Figures 2 through 4 follow this tabulation. They are: (1) the one representing the average of the evaluations from the Commission
members; (2) the one representing the average secured from the combination of the total Commission average and the total average of the publishers; and (3) the one representing the comparison of the publishers' rating to that of the Commission. The three graphs have been constructed similarly. Reading horizontally from left to right, we find the factors placed in the same order as on the evaluation sheet. The vertical scale indicates point values.

Table 15 pictures the evaluation factors as scored by the Textbook Commission and the publishers. The fourth column denotes the averages of the two scores.
DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT (BASED ON THE AVERAGE OF TEXTBOOK COMMISSION MEMBERS' EVALUATIONS)
FIGURE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT (BASED ON THE AVERAGE OF THE COMBINED TEXTBOOK COMMISSION AND PUBLISHER EVALUATIONS)
COMMISSION AND PUBLISHERS

COMPARING THE AVERAGE EVALUATIONS OF THE TEXTBOOK
FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN

Fig. 4

Evaluation points allotted to each factor
(Total of 1000 points to the 10 factors)
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TABLE XV
FACTORS OF EVALUATION, AS COMPARED BY THE TEXTBOOK COMMISSION AVERAGE, PUBLISHER AVERAGE, AND THE AVERAGE OF THE COMBINED COMMISSION AND PUBLISHER RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Textbook Commission</th>
<th>Publishers</th>
<th>Commission Publishers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Factors</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Make-up</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims of Instruction</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes Presented</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of Instruction</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Material</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Principles</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary and Sentence Structure</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Achievement</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Aids of Instruction</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluations on the following score card are the averages of the combined Commission and publishers' ratings.

1. General Factors
   - Author
   - Style, suited to grade
   - Copyright
   - 80

2. Mechanical Make-up
   - Appearance, cover and cover design
   - Durability of binding
   - Quality of paper
   - Size of type
   - Size of text
   - 75

3. Aims of Instruction
   - Understanding (rationalization)
   - Abilities (acquisition of skills)
   - Appreciation of arithmetic
   - 120

4. Processes Presented
   - Unity of organization
   - Psychological arrangement
   - Correlation—arithmetic, algebra, geometry
   - 120

5. Methods of Instruction
   - Teaching steps
   - Illustrations
   - 130
6. Problem Material
   Quantitative relationship
   Analysis of problem
   Problems

7. Psychological Principles
   Motivation
   Individual differences
   Remedial measures
   Supplementary problems

8. Vocabulary and Sentence Structure

9. Measurement of Achievement
   Review
   Summary
   Tests

10. Teaching Aids to Instruction
    Answer keys
    Guides
    Others

Totals

The above is a weighted score card. The points represent a standard by which arithmetic texts may be measured. Judges may assign point values to the factors in comparison to the standards on the card.

The points representing the Commission averages may
also be used as a standard. The average of the publishers' rating have been given score card possibilities in Chapter III.

In comparing the ratings of the Textbook Commission with that of the publishers we find that:

1. The range, or the difference between the high and low scores is the same.
2. There are no extremes in either rating.
3. The allotment of points indicate a high regard for all factors.
4. Opinions vary on what is considered the most important factors.
5. There is a general agreement on low point values.

The combined rating of the Commission and publishers is the average of the two rounded off to the nearest five. This denotes, in comparison to the other two that:

1. It is more compact.
2. The range is fifty-five.
3. The extremes have been reduced.
4. All factors are important.

Conclusion

We may draw several inferences from this study which may be of significance to those who are, in any way, responsible for arithmetic textbook selections. These inferences are:
1. Textbook selection takes time and analytical study.

2. Point values, constructed by experienced people in the field, are of value in helping to weigh factors which constitute the composition of a book.

3. Casual observation is only a hap-hazard method of selecting books.

4. All factors that go into the general make-up of a book are important.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings of the two surveys, to draw conclusions, and to offer suggestions for further study.

I. SUMMARY

There is an underlying purpose that influences the efforts of the publishers in compiling, publishing, and selling textbooks; this same purpose is the guiding principle by which the Textbook Commission members work. The youth of today are the citizens of tomorrow; they are the aims to which all activities are directed. The books produced and the books selected must meet the needs of future citizens in subject matter and method. This survey has uncovered the intent and sincerity of those who are concerned with textbook production, selling, and selecting. With this in mind, the responses developed in this paper are important.

The replies of the publishers to the questionnaire classify into five activities, viz., all publishers (1) are continually surveying the educational field in order to keep in touch with the teaching trends; (2) are always alert to competition in their fields; (3) select authors with discrimination so as to place on the market a product that will
meet the greatest demand; (4) retain a well qualified staff capable of meeting the problems of textbook production; and (5) are usually willing to assist in the study of their product.

The results of the textbook evaluation, as appraised by the publishers, group into two related phases, viz., (1) the publishers conscientiously scored their books by assigning values to the factors indicated on the evaluation sheet; and (2) the completed sheet is a picture of the book in point value.

The data gathered from the questionnaire on salesmanship tactics practiced by the publishers, as applied to the members of the Textbook Commission and teachers, sums up to the effect that the circulated advertising materials and the information presented by field representatives are helpful in evaluating textbooks. Since the purpose of the advertising materials and the field representatives are to clarify and stress that which the publisher thinks is outstanding in textbook content and method, the information thus obtained by the Textbook Commission and teachers often point out features that might otherwise be overlooked.

Each evaluation sheet, as rated by the Textbook Commission members, is, per se, a copy of a textbook's worth.
II. CONCLUSION

In the light of the results obtained in this survey, the following conclusions come into perspective:

1. The textbook publishers are continually surveying the field in order to produce a textbook that will meet the demand of the schools.

2. Textbook adoption is influenced by publishers through their representative and advertising literature.

3. Teachers, though usually unskilled in the practice, influence textbook selection by their evaluations.

4. In the absence of tested theory and expert evaluations, other means must be devised for textbook selection.

5. Supplementary materials should not be excluded from the classroom though an adequate text is at hand. Such material is a curricular enrichment to classroom activities.

6. Practical application of the techniques acquired from the text often clarifies arithmetical processes and helps to show the value of such knowledge, e.g., a problem involving interest may be made meaningful by having the students figure the amount of interest earned on their savings accounts.

7. The mean of the evaluations from the publishers, should be an adequate basis for score card values. Since
the publishers are producers, they should be experts in evaluating their product.

8. The mean of the evaluations from the Textbook Commission should be adequate as a basis for point values on score cards. Since these members are responsible for textbook adoptions, they should be acquainted with selection techniques and standards of value.

9. The score card, when used in textbook evaluations, makes selection an analytical and psychological process.

10. We are living in a technological age. Comprehension of its complexities is secured through mathematics. We must select textbooks to meet new demands.

III. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

For verification, this study might be extended to the textbook committees in various states in order to secure evaluations from those who are actively engaged in that type of work and who should be experts in the field.

For further verification, this study might be extended to the teachers who are actively engaged in teaching arithmetic. A consensus of opinions submitted by them should be very significant in textbook selection policies.

Teachers and others who are responsible for textbook selection and who are not trained in evaluation should investigate the possibility of enrolling in a college course
where such technique is taught.

The majority of our states have Commissioners of Education or Chairman of Textbook Committees in the State Department of Education. Their opinions on how to evaluate texts should be worthy of soliciting.
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A. BOOKS
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B. PUBLICATIONS


C. ENCYCLOPEDIAS


D. PERIODICALS


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of Adoption</th>
<th>State or Local Adoptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Frank Stewart, Executive Assistant</td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>Montgomery 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>C. L. Hawkins, Superintendent</td>
<td>State Department of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>H. E. Steele, Director of Instructional Materials</td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>Bureau of Textbooks and Publications</td>
<td>Sacramento 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Clifford Bebell, Director</td>
<td>Division of Curricular Service</td>
<td>Denver 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Paul Collier, Director of Instructional Services</td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>Dover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>T. G. Walker, Director of Publications</td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>C. S. Hubbard, Assistant Superintendent of Education</td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>Atlanta 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Malcom Allerd, Supervisor of Textbooks and Instructional Program</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Boise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illinois
I. A. Palmer, Supervisor of Textbooks and Publications
State Department of Education
Springfield

Indiana
Wilbur Young, State Superintendent
State Department of Education
Indianapolis

Iowa
Arthur Carpenter, Assistant Superintendent
State Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines 19

Kansas
George E. Watkins, Textbook Analyst
State Department of Public Instruction
Topeka

Kentucky
Ishmael Triplett, Director of Division of Free Textbooks
Department of Education
Frankfort

Louisiana
L. L. Dean, Director of Materials of Instruction
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge 4

Maine
Philip A. Annas, Executive Director of Division of Instruction
State Department of Education
Augusta

Maryland
Gladys T. Hopkins, Supervisor of Curriculum
State Department of Education
Baltimore

Massachusetts
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education
Boston 16

Michigan
Karl R. Kramer, Consultant
State Department of Education
Lansing

Minnesota
T. C. Engum, Section Chief of Elementary and Secondary Schools
State Department of Education
St. Paul 1
Mississippi  R. W. Griffith, Assistant State Superintendent
            State Department of Education
            Jackson

Missouri  H. Kenneth, Assistant Commissioner
            Department of Education
            Jefferson City

Montana  State Superintendent of Public Instruction
            Helena

Nebraska  Floyd A. Miller, Assistant Commissioner
            State Department of Education
            Lincoln 9

Nevada  Not surveyed, due to the author's acquaintance with the procedure.

New Hampshire  Roland B. Kimball, Acting Chief Division
                of Instruction
                State Department of Education
                Concord

New Jersey  Eric Groezinger, Director of Elementary
            Education
            State Department of Education
            Trenton 25

New Mexico  Tito Valdez, Director Textbook Division
            State Department of Education
            Santa Fe

New York  Ernest A. Frier, Director
            State Department of Education
            Albany

North Carolina  Flossie Marshbanks, Administrative Assistant
                Superintendent of Public Instruction
                Raleigh

North Dakota  M. F. Peterson, Superintendent
              Department of Public Instruction
              Bismarck

Ohio  Glenn A. Rich, Director
      State Department of Education
      Columbus 15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oliver Hodge</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>B. L. Simmons</td>
<td>Supervisor of Curriculum</td>
<td>Salem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Maurice E. Trusal</td>
<td>Director of Curriculum Development</td>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Elaine J. Petralca</td>
<td>Secretary to Commissioner of Education</td>
<td>Providence 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Jesse T. Anderson</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Education</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Olive S. Berg</td>
<td>Supervisor of Elementary Education</td>
<td>Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>R. R. Vance</td>
<td>Director Instructional Administration</td>
<td>Nashville 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Department of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>W. A. Glass</td>
<td>Director of Textbook Division</td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>W. N. Ball</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Department of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Commissioner of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Montpelier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Z. T. Kyle</td>
<td>Supervisor of Schools, Library and Textbooks</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington
John L. Tea, Supervisor of Instructional Materials
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Olympia

West Virginia
H. K. Baer, Secretary
State Board of Education
Charleston 5

Wisconsin
Irene Newman
Supervisor of School Libraries
Madison 2

Wyoming
Warren M. Brown
Commissioner of Education
State Department
Cheyenne
PUBLISHERS SELECTED FOR THIS STUDY

Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
San Francisco 5, California

American Book Company
San Francisco, California

Benjamin H. Sanborn and Company
Chicago, Illinois

Charles E. Merrill Books
San Francisco 5, California

Charles Scribner's Sons
San Francisco, California

D. C. Heath and Company
San Francisco 5, California

D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc.
Princeton, New Jersey

Ginn and Company
San Francisco 3, California

Houghton Mifflin Company
Palo Alto, California

Iroquois Publishing Company
Syracuse, New York

John C. Winston Company
Los Angeles, California

Laidlaw Brothers
San Francisco, California

MacMillan Company
San Francisco 5, California

San Francisco 4, California

Prentice-Hall, Inc.
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
Row, Peterson and Company
Evanston, Illinois

Scott Foresman and Company
San Francisco, California

Silver Burdett Company
San Francisco, California

Webster Publishing Company
Pasadena, California

World Book Company
Chicago 16, Illinois
The World Book Company
Chicago 16
Illinois

Gentlemen:

I am writing a professional paper on "Evaluation of the Methods Used in Selecting Arithmetic Texts for the Junior High Schools for the State of Nevada," and would greatly appreciate your filling out the evaluating sheet and questionnaire and returning them to me as soon as possible.

The data secured from the forms will be used as a basis for developing a weighted score card which will be based on your evaluation and that of other publishing companies. It will also be used in evaluating our present method in book selection.

I thank you sincerely for your cooperation.

Yours very truly,

Enclosures: 1 questionnaire
1 evaluation sheet
1 stamped, self-addressed, return envelope
205 South Seventh Street
Las Vegas, Nevada
January __, 1958

Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Montpelier, Vermont

Dear Sir:

I am making a survey on how elementary and junior high school textbooks are selected for school use in each of the forty-eight states. I shall appreciate hearing from you on how the textbooks are selected in your state.

I thank you for an early reply.

Yours very truly,

Clara R. Strand

Enclosure: 1 stamped, self-addressed, return envelope
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles H. Russell, Governor</td>
<td>Carson City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron F. Stetler, Supt. of</td>
<td>Carson City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction, Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Edna Patterson, First</td>
<td>Carson City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Howard Gray, Second</td>
<td>Carson City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudolph Schwartz, Third</td>
<td>Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emile J. Gezelin, Fourth</td>
<td>Paradise Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. Shaver, Fifth</td>
<td>Reno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Fulstone, Sixth</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Wendell Vine, Principal</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sadie Elliott, Principal</td>
<td>Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Nora Roberts, Principal</td>
<td>Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Paille, Principal</td>
<td>Winnemucca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Ruby Thomas, Principal</td>
<td>Reno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles O. Ryan, Principal</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six principals are the active members of the Textbook Commission. They do the selecting of books. The others constitute the Board of Education and it is their duty to accept or reject the books selected by the principals.
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DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT
(BASED ON RATING OF PUBLISHER NO. 1)
### Figure 6

**Distribution of the 1000 Evaluation Points Among the Ten Factors Comprising the Eighth Grade Arithmetic Text (Based on Rating of Publisher No. 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Evaluation Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Factors</td>
<td>xxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Make-up</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims of Instruction</td>
<td>xxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Prin.</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary-Sentence Structure</td>
<td>xxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas. of Achievement</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Aids</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>140</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>180</th>
<th>200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation points allotted to each factor**

(Total of 1000 points to the 10 factors)
DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT (BASED ON RATING OF PUBLISHER NO. 3)

FIGURE 7

Evaluation points allotted to each factor (Total of 1000 points to the 10 factors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Factors</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Make-up</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims of Instruction</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Prin.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary-Sentence</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas. of Achievement</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Aids</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT
(BASED ON RATING OF PUBLISHER NO. 4)
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**Figure 9**  
DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT  
(BASED ON RATING OF PUBLISHER NO. 5)
FIGURE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT
(BASED ON RATING OF PUBLISHERS NOS. 6 AND 7)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
FIGURE II

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT (BASED ON RATINGS OF PUBLISHERS NOS. 8 AND 9)
FIGURE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT
(BASED ON RATING OF PUBLISHER NO. 10)
**Figure 13**

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT (BASED ON RATING OF TEXTBOOK COMMISSION MEMBER NO. 1)
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Figure 14

Distribution of the 1000 Evaluation Points Among the Ten Factors Comprising the Eighth Grade Arithmetic Text
(Based on Rating of Textbook Commission Member No. 2)
Figure 16

(DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS)
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FIGURE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT (BASED ON RATING OF TEXTBOOK COMMISSION MEMBER NO. 4)
FIGURE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1000 EVALUATION POINTS AMONG THE TEN FACTORS COMPRISING THE EIGHTH GRADE ARITHMETIC TEXT (BASED ON RATING OF TEXTBOOK COMMISSION MEMBER NO. 5)