

AWARD BOOKS VS. CHILDREN'S CHOICES:  
MIDDLE GROUND ON THE PLAYGROUND?

THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate Committee of the  
Department of Curriculum and Instruction  
State University College at Brockport  
in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Science in Education

by

Carol Cox Gursslin

State University College at Brockport

Brockport, New York

December, 1984

SUBMITTED BY:

Carol Cox Gussler

APPROVED BY:

Robert W. Blake 12-30-84  
Thesis Advisor Date

Robert B. Pille 12/30/84  
Second Faculty Reader Date

Robert B. Pille 12/30/84  
Chairman, Graduate Policies Committee Date

## VITA

The author was born in [REDACTED]

She received her Bachelor of Science Degree from the State University of New York, College at Brockport, in 1976. Her area of specialization was English.

She received her Master of Science in English Education from the State University of New York, College at Brockport, in 1985 upon completion of the study herein.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks her two mentors who advised and reassured her in 1984: Dr. Robert W. Blake and Dr. Robert Ribble. Special thanks are extended to Mrs. Virginia Campling and her group of first-graders who were all enthusiastic and eager to assist this researcher. In addition, the author thanks Mary Wilson who so diligently judged the picture books. And for their assistance at Parma Library, I thank Sue Henderson and Doug Beal.

The author also thanks her friends who gave of themselves to further this study: Janice Marlow for her encouraging words and faith in a worthy project and Drs. David Cohen and Jack Caton for lending their offices and typewriters.

Her husband, Larry Gursslin; her son, Justin, and her daughter, Katie were especially helpful and understanding throughout the duration of the study. An enormous thank you to these three. Thanks, lastly, to her father, Benjamin R. Cox, who unknowingly inspired the author most.

## ABSTRACT

Past research has indicated that Award books like the Newbery and Caldecott Award books are not always favorites of children. Instead, picture books chosen by youngsters for their peers are often more readily received and enjoyed by this elementary age group.

The purpose of this study was to test the judgments of 20 first-grade students and three educators where 24 picture books were concerned. Ten of the books were Caldecott Award books chosen by a librarian, and fourteen of the books were selected by a six-year-old boy.

Several considerations were studied. Interrater agreement among the children was determined as well as the accuracy of prediction of the educators in their attempt to pinpoint which books they believed the children would like most and least. Also, the educators rated the overall quality of the books, looking specifically at content, illustrations and theme/moral. The intent was to determine whether or not these teachers would rate the Award books the highest as had panels of judges and critics from years past.

The 24 book covers were hidden so the children and adults would not see any of the Caldecott medals.

Results showed that, while they have minds of their own and think on the same lines, the children were well understood by the educators where book preferences were concerned. That is, the Award books were found to be liked equally as well as the nonawardwinners by the

children. The percentage of agreement among the children for each book was generally high: two-thirds of the class agreed on 16 of the 24 books or 67% of the choices given them. Yet the teachers had an almost perfect agreement with the children ( $r_s = .99$ ) when they judged which books they believed the children would like most and least.

Finally, the three educators proved to be very fine judges of quality picture books, assuming that the Caldecott Award books were truly deserving of the medals. The mean ratings showed that seven of the ten Award books were ranked in the top fiftieth percent with the remaining three placing 13th, 14th and 15th. The nine lowest-rated books were all nonawardwinners. It was noted, however, that the adults recognized a few of the books as Award books based on their past usage of them with students or their own children. Nonetheless, each adult remained as objective as possible during the ratings.

The investigator concluded that first-grade students will agree quite often on books they prefer. They show no significant preference for Award books over books without the honors given by critics. The educators in the study had an excellent vision of which books the children would prefer, and they were quite adept in their selection of quality picture books worthy of Awards. Teachers should consider the choices of children where literature is concerned, continue to understand children's interests and search for a balance between the generations when choices must be made in the classroom and library.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	2
Definitions . . . . .	3
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	5
Reliability of Judgments Among Critics of Children's Literature . . . . .	5
Children's Interests and Needs . . . . .	12
The value of picture books . . . . .	14
Knowing the children's choices . . . . .	16
III. METHODOLOGY	21
Research Design . . . . .	21
Selection of books . . . . .	21
Preparing the books and rating charts . . . . .	21
Presenting the project to the children . . . . .	23
Presenting the project to the educators . . . . .	24
Instrumentation . . . . .	25
Hypotheses . . . . .	25
Data analysis . . . . .	26
IV. RESULTS	28
Children's Preferences . . . . .	28
Percentages of Agreement Among the Children . . . . .	28

Chapter	Page
Accuracy of Educators' Predictions . . . . .	31
The Choices of the Educators . . . . .	33
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	36
Summary of Results . . . . .	36
Limitations on the Study . . . . .	37
Suggestions for Further Study . . . . .	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY	41
APPENDICES	45
A. FIRST-GRADERS' RATING SHEET . . . . .	46
B. CRITERIA AND SCALE FOR MEASURING LEVEL OF EXCELLENCE OF SELECTED PICTURE BOOKS . . . . .	47
C. EDUCATORS' RATING SHEET . . . . .	48
D. TABULATIONS OF PERCENTAGES OF AGREEMENT . . . . .	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Picture Books Ratings Chart Used by First-Graders . . . . .	22
2. First-Graders' Favorite Picture Books . . . . .	29
3. Coefficient of Interrater Agreement, Percentage of Agreement . . . . .	30
4. Correlation Coefficient of Educators and First-Graders . . . . .	32
5. Overall Quality of the Books as Rated by the Educators . . . . .	34

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of the Problem

Adults engage in recreational reading according to their own individual tastes. They have maturity and a familiarity with their own reading interests that it takes to make selections of literature for recreational reading. Of course, the range of reading interests is as wide among adults as are their interpretations of and appreciation for literature.

Without all this wisdom of the years, how then can a child, at the first-grade level, for example, proceed to select books for recreational reading? By the pictures or the cover? By scanning quickly or reading the first few pages? Surely, children do these things instinctively as they learn how to discern which books they may enjoy and those that will have little or no appeal.

The greatest influence, however, on children's choices of literature for recreational reading comes from adults, especially teachers, librarians and critics. Very often it is the books recommended by these adults that find their way into the hands of youngsters. Whether in the classroom or library or at home, adults have influenced the reading behaviors of children, particularly in the last 60 years when critics have given annual awards to picture books.

Researchers are increasingly concerned that adults' opinions of children's literature are not always as objective or considerate of children's interests and needs as they should be. They question the criteria used to judge children's books, and they seek solutions that will insure careful selection of literature for use in libraries and schools. They ask whether Award books, such as the Newbery and Caldecott Award winners, truly appeal to youngsters. In fact, research findings (Pace Nilsen, Peterson & Searfoss, 1980) indicate that "even when several respected critics and evaluators agree that a particular children's book is distinctive, its popularity with young readers is not guaranteed" (p. 530).

#### Purpose of the Study

This research study attempted to explore further this premise by finding the accuracy of the prediction by three educators of which picture books would appeal to a group of 20 first-graders. All three educators are parents with children of varying ages from toddlers to adults. The study also attempted to find the percentage of agreement on favorite picture books read by the first-graders. The researcher, in addition, attempted to determine how the same children would rank ten Caldecott Award books, compared to 14 books selected at random by a peer. Lastly, this study attempted to assess the opinions of the three educators, regarding the overall quality of the 24 books being studied.

### Definitions

For the purpose of this study, picture books, Caldecott Medal, and Newbery Medal will be defined. With so much literature available to youngsters, parents are served well by librarians who separate their books according to reader's age. Pre-teens and adolescents can choose from books marked by a "J" that indicates reading material for "juveniles." There is much more text in these books than in a picture book, and the subject matter relies on the reader's ability to imagine the characters and action without the visual aid of illustrations. Not so with picture books.

In the last 60 years, more picture books than ever before have found their place in libraries, schools and homes around the world. They are noted for their variety of illustrations and appeal to early readers. Woodcuts, pop art, realism, collages and even the grotesque are some of the styles of art found in today's picture books. Most have a related text, but some are wordless picture books that tell a story through the child's imaginative interpretations of the illustrations. Most picture books are read by children between the ages of three and eight.

The Caldecott Medal was introduced in 1938 in honor of the illustrator, Randolph Caldecott. It is awarded annually in the United States to the book most deserving for its excellence in illustrations and overall appeal to children. This is determined by a selected Awards committee.

The Newbery Medal was introduced in 1922 in honor of John

Newbery, the first English publisher of a children's book. While the judges are concerned with illustrations, they place greater emphasis on the books' content. The award is given annually in the United States to the most distinguished contribution to American literature for children.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Reliability of Judgments Among Critics of Children's Literature

For the purpose of this study, the assumption was made that children's books judged to be the best by critics are not consistently the books most enjoyed by children.

In their study, Pace Nilsen et al. (1980) found evidence to support the former theory. They found a negative correlation between the praise of respected critics and the reaction of the majority of children to children's books most highly acclaimed by critics during the years from 1950-1975. Included in the list of 263 books were many books that had received honors such as the Notable Children's Books, Best Books of the Year, Outstanding New Books, the Newbery and Caldecott Medals and many others. The other titles judged by 800 children in Phoenix were selected by a librarian there who knew which books were well liked by children.

To help explain these differences between reactions of adult critics and child readers, Pace Nilsen et al. (1980) offered a schema to help explain the differences between reactions of adult critics and child readers. The schema identified three levels of reacting to literature: at the verbal level, at the behavioral level and at the transcendent level.

The problem, say these researchers, is that critics react to children's books from the opposite end of the schema than do children. That is, critics tend to want the book to illuminate them first, involve and teach them secondly, and lastly to engage them at a simple, verbal level. On the other hand, children react to picture books mostly at a simple, verbal level and rarely reach a transcendent level of illumination. Thus, it seems the critics are left wanting more after reading a book that usually delights a child by its mere simplicity.

The findings of Pace Nilsen et al. (1980) support the conclusions of Kimmel (1982) that some children have not given attention to the more recent Maurice Sendak books that, to some adults, seem deserving of awards. On the other hand, Beverly Cleary proved to be the most popular author with children, according to Pace Nilsen et al. (1980), while only one of her ten books used in their study, The Mouse and the Motorcycle, was cited as an outstanding book of the year by three or more critics. The researchers say that Cleary's success lies in her expertise at keeping her readers engaged while creating stories that truly involve the reader. Illuminating the young reader is rare, they imply, because the child's level of maturity is not conducive to revelations about concepts they have barely learned.

In 1971 Sendak showed his own concern for what is important in a successful children's book according to Haviland (1973). He spoke against the high level of importance some book illustrations are given over content. As a juror of children's book illustrations

in Eastern Europe, Sendak saw there a tendency for illustrations to "take on a dominance and importance which I, as an illustrator, do not approve of." He continued, "The books become showplaces for artists" (p. 170).

Haviland (1973) says Sendak went on to emphasize the importance of purpose in illustrations and stressed that the pictures should help the author and that the book, when finished, "should mean more than it did when it was just written" (p. 170).

But six years later, says Kimmel (1982), Sendak suggested to Walter Lorraine in an interview that he is not taken seriously as an artist/illustrator and that he was "infuriated" and "insulted" that a "serious work is considered only a trifle for the nursery" (p. 39).

Kimmel (1982) goes one step further by challenging book publishers with the statement that what they often create is "children's books for adults" (p. 41). He believes children's interests in literature should be analyzed through alternatives based on "developmental psychology and child study rather than on purely literary research" (p. 42). He noted that librarians and teachers can hardly evaluate the 2,500 plus children's books published annually. They should learn to take the critics' choices less seriously, Kimmel says, and that "the yardstick by which the university measures excellence may not be that of the playground" (p. 42).

Englishman and educator Myles McDowell (1973) defended children's literary tastes and their literature in an article about the essential differences between adult and children's fiction. He maintained that the two can be enjoyed by all if one learns to accept the fact that

our life experiences or lack of them influence our responses to literature.

McDowell's metaphor for adult and children's fiction is that they are like two pots of green and orange paint. When spilled, they both still have a yellow base in common. Where they merge, a brown is formed that "doesn't happily belong to either pot, but he is a fool who cannot distinguish the green from the orange" (1973, p. 51).

Author Fredelle Maynard (1973) says it well:

Some of the most beautiful juvenile books on the market have minimal value for children. Some gorgeously illustrated children's books make their principal appeal to artistically oriented parents. (p. 278)

One parent who is undeniably artistically oriented is Peter Spier, author/illustrator of Noah's Ark published in 1978. In his Caldecott Award acceptance speech for that book, Spier (1978) expressed his own concerns as a critic of children's literature. They were many and mixed.

For example, according to Chenery (1978), Spier shows his books to his children when they are completed. He has learned to ask for their comments only, not advice, ever since one of them quipped, "Do something nice with lots of violence in it!" (p. 381).

As a past judge of picture books for the Book World's Children's Spring Book Festival Awards, Spier had been regretful. He remembered that his "choices were made solely by personal taste and preference (p. 377). He expressed his doubts about the basis on which book

prizes are awarded, and he suggested that awards might be passed up in years when no book is really outstanding. He named the Laura Ingalls Wilder Award as an example; it is given to an author or illustrator for his or her contribution to children's literature over a period of years.

The confusion over which children's books are truly worthy of awards is expressed by Spier in his closing remarks:

I do not for a single moment believe that my Noah's Ark is the most distinguished picture book of the year.

I believe, with a few exceptions, that such a book does not exist. There are almost always a handful of books worthy of the distinction. (p. 377)

Another annual award that has been questioned by educators is the Newbery Award. Kromann Kelly and Sager (1970) attempted in their study to provide information regarding:

1) readability of selected Award books, 2) the extent to which the books are comprehensible to elementary school children, and 3) the depth at which children are able to react to characterization, style, plot and theme. (p. 50)

Their major conclusions proved contrary to previous negative findings and were published by the International Reading Association in Children and Literature (1970). They were as follows:

1) . . . the books under investigation were read with comparative ease by average to superior sixth

grade readers. The books were understood, accepted, and enjoyed by a majority of the subjects who participated in the study.

2) The ten Newbery Award books utilized in this study are suitable for placement in elementary school libraries because they can be read, understood, and appreciated by a number of sixth grade students of average and above average reading ability.

3) Elementary school librarians and classroom teachers should acquaint themselves with each of the Newbery books so that they can introduce them in a meaningful fashion to potential readers. (p. 57)

Yet some of the previous research had been less encouraging. One such example is Zeligs' article, "Children's Opinions of the Newbery Prize Books" (1940) cited by Kromann Kelly and Sager (1970). Zeligs found that only a small number of elementary age children were reading the 18 Newbery Award books chosen through 1940; an even smaller number of children liked the books. She concluded that "most of the Newbery books seem, on the whole, too literary for the average child and often also for the superior child" (p. 49).

In 1943, Mehringer published "Appeal of the Newbery Prize Books to Children in the Elementary Grades," according to Kromann Kelly and Sager (1970). Mehringer investigated the number of children reading the Newbery Award books and the grade level at which they were read in grades four through eight in Terre Haute, Indiana. She

reported that "the books were not generally read by elementary age school children but that more eighth graders had read them than had children in the other four grades" (p. 49).

Another negative find came by way of Marjorie Rankin. Her 1944 article, "Children's Interests in Library Books of Fiction," is also cited by Kromann Kelly and Sager (1970). Rankin's study revealed that "the Newbery books were not so well received by children as by adults" (p. 49). This is exactly what Kimmel (1982) and Maynard (1973) had suggested: that so-called children's books hold the interest of adults more often than the children's.

Lastly, Kolson, Robinson and Zimmerman (1962) substantiated Rankin's findings as cited by Kromann Kelly and Sager (1970). Their article, "Children's Preferences in Publishers" appeared in 1962, and it told of their research that "demonstrated that books given high preference by adults were frequently given low preference by children" (p. 49).

But Kromann Kelly and Sager (1970) were not alone in their positive findings on the merits of Award books for children. They cited the works of two researchers, Walter Leon Chatham (1967) and Mary Townes (1935).

Chatham's unpublished doctoral dissertation was entitled, "Reading Grade Placement of the John Newbery Prize Books from 1945 through 1965." Using readability formulas with 21 Award books from 1945 through 1965 and administering a Newbery Comprehension Test, he found that all but two of the books "were appropriate for the

fifth and sixth grade subjects" in Meridian, Mississippi (p. 50).

Townes' research is explained in her 1935 article, "The Popularity of Newbery Medal Books," and is somewhat startling. Utilizing questionnaires with 26 librarians and 62 children, Townes found a contradiction. The "librarians, two to one, judged the Award books to be unpopular with children. However, the children in general indicated that the books were liked as well as, or better than, other books read" (p. 50).

There is evidence, then, that the findings of researchers since 1935 have conflicted where the question of children's choices in literature is concerned. Additionally, it seems doubtful that adults are exclusively the best judges of what books children will most often enjoy.

#### Children's Interests and Needs

Children's interests have probably changed very little since the first printed book intended to be read by children was published in 1487. Called Les Contenances de la Table, the French courtesy book was written in rhymed quatrains. The subject matter was table manners, and the book serves as a perfect example of literature that would have little appeal to children of any era. Written by an adult to teach etiquette, the book could hardly have been called a children's choice!

In this twentieth century, however, many attempts have been made by educators to determine what subject matters children most often enjoy. Interest inventories are made in the classroom to

better understand each child's individual preferences in reading, and appropriate books are then made available to the children for recreational reading.

In 1964, the National Council of Teachers of English published Children's Literature Old and New. Author W. A. Jenkins attempts to define children's literature therein. About books with large appeal to children, Jenkins says "some of the best children's books have the spirit to ask the right questions" (p. 188). No matter what the subject is, Jenkins believes a book well received by children will be short in length, have good moral sense, use concrete terms and a short, repetitive plot. It will also introduce characters with whom the children can identify, and the story will make some connection with childhood tasks.

While identifying children's needs is an ongoing study, some researchers and educators have been able to pinpoint closely which needs can be met through books. In Children and Books, (1977), Sutherland and Arbuthnot list the following children's needs that they believe can be met through recreational reading, whether the child reads independently or is read to by another: physical well-being, to love and be loved, the need to belong, the need to achieve, the need for change, the need to know, the need for beauty and order and the need for good books.

We can also help children meet their individual needs by talking about books with them according to Sutherland and Arbuthnot (1977). They suggest allowing the child to finish a story so that they become

more a part of the plot or feel what the characters might feel. The authors say today's kids read in order to dream, learn, laugh, enjoy the familiar, explore the unknown and for sheer pleasure.

The value of picture books. The value of quality picture books to our children is unquestionable. For the non-reading preschooler, the illustrations alone awaken the senses and motivate him or her to read. The visual aid of pictures lends to the success of a well-planned book and makes the reading experience more enjoyable. With modern printing techniques, vivid colors and unusual graphics have become appealing to all age groups. Yet it is this very sophistication in graphic art that seems to have led to the confusion over which books are truly works of art in a literary sense. Educators are striving to learn which books are most appealing to a young audience on the merits of the illustrations and the text taken as a whole.

Sutherland and Arbuthnot (1977) suggest that a good picture book is characterized by six things: a very simple plot line, one or two main characters, a clear pattern, lots of repetition, introduction of new words and some alliteration.

Yet Award books have more than that. They are usually unique in themselves, and often that newness and individuality is determined by the quality of the illustrations.

Patricia J. Cianciolo's research findings were published in the 1983 Children's Choices: Teaching with Books Children Like. She explains why most children declare particular books as their favorites, and it has little to do with the science of the illustrations. She says their choices are made on "the basis of how much pleasure and

enjoyment they get from the stories and illustrations" (p. 27). Their feelings, sensations and sensory images determine which books they will continue to read and enjoy most. She says that rarely do children refer precisely, or vaguely, even in the most simplistic terms, to the artistic values of the texts or the graphics in the books they like. Rarely do children elaborate on how these artistic elements might affect their responses to a selection, how the artistic elements determine the content to which they experience pleasure and enjoyment from a literary selection. (p. 27)

Maynard (1973) speaks of the value of illustrations in picture books and suggests that illustrations affect the child's comprehension in a subconscious way. She says it

may seem obvious that the illustrations in children's books afford a great amount of pleasure, and a child who assiduously pores over a book will not cease to find new things in illustrations well done. For poor readers, illustrations extend the story. For non-readers, illustrations lead them to books. (p. 42)

Both authors, then, understand that children will not normally analyze artwork, but will simply appreciate it on a surface level. And Maynard (1973) doesn't hesitate to defend children's tastes in all books:

A book is a good book for children only when they

enjoy it; a book is a poor book for children, even when adults rate it a classic, if children are unable to read it or are bored by its content. (p. 5)

Knowing the children's choices. Knowing the psychological and physical needs of children helps in the selection of children's literature, but it has proven to be a far from foolproof manner by which adults can select literature most suitable to children.

Tibbets (1975) proposed the use of standardized procedures to determine children's interests in literature. She said past studies "seem to have no common criterion, either of content or of procedure" (p. 503). Eleven previous methods of study were cited by Tibbetts with eleven limitations on them overall.

Other researchers have agreed. Tibbetts (1975) cites Friedman and Nemzek (1936). "The methods of investigation, the selection of subjects, and the analyses of the data make it impossible to compare the findings of various researchers" (p. 503).

By 1966, conditions hadn't improved much. Tibbetts (1975) cites Sara Zimet's "Children's Interest and Story Preferences: A Critical Review of the Literature:"

The differences in the findings point up a major difficulty of the research in this area. Each study used a different type of population sample and different methods of assessing children's interests, with the result that it is almost impossible to compare results. (p. 503)

Joseph Leibowicz, in his 1983 article, "Children's reading interests," echoes what his colleagues had said about the importance of careful selections of children's books:

Determining what interests children requires serious, ongoing research, and giving children 'what they want' cannot simply supersede the teacher's obligation to guide students toward quality reading. (p. 184)

He mentions specifically the "Children's Choices" project begun in 1973 as the "most visible and perhaps most directly useful information on children's interests" (p. 184). The project is sponsored by the International Reading Association/Children's Book Council Joint Committee. Each year, through the Committee, at least 10,000 children in the United States select the books that become the "Children's Choices" list. The selections are made after the children read and vote on over 300 books. Then the list is reprinted and distributed to teachers, librarians and other educators.

"Children's Choices" has been used by researchers, too, in an attempt to further define which qualities make certain books most appealing to children. Leibowicz (1983) cites Richard F. Abrahamson's 1979 article, "Children's Favorite Picture Storybooks: An Analysis of Structure and Reading Preferences" as an example. Abrahamson used 50 books from the 1979 "Children's Choices" list to help reveal children's preferences. He found them to be:

- 1) books in which main characters confront a problem and seek a solution;
- 2) plots that are episodic, revealing the

stories incident by incident; 3) plots that focus on characters with different points of view or characters who experience the same thing in contrasting ways; 4) the genre of fantasy, followed by realistic fiction and folktales; 5) books that give animals human qualities; 6) books that contain humorous characters and situations; and 7) books by author/illustrator Tomie de Paola. (p. 185)

Abrahamson (1979) found these results were "encouraging" and concluded that "the common assumption that children will always lean toward easy, comic book, faddish choices devoid of literary quality is the opposite of the truth" (p. 185).

In April of 1981, cites Leibowicz, three researchers presented their findings in a paper presented at the National Conference on Language Arts in the Elementary School thirteenth annual meeting. Called "Story Structure in Children's Book Choices," the paper identified the components of books that children prefer. Authors Sebesta, Calder and Cleland (1981) observed that:

no single story structure was an exclusive favorite, although most choices did include a focus and a connected sequence of events. Although children did not invariably demand true narrative structure, they did respect an author's integrity. (p. 185)

Sebesta et al. (1981) concluded that parents and teachers should "use variety and integrity in story structure rather than adherence to critically approved true narrative as the criteria for selecting

literature for children," according to Leibowicz (p. 185).

Still another researcher recorded children's reactions to books successfully without the help of special book lists drawn up by children. Her name is Barbara Kiefer (1981), and her study focused on first and second grade children in their natural classroom setting. She recorded a variety of responses to a wide range of books over a period of ten weeks. Her findings were many:

that children looked at books in different ways--in groups, with other children and by themselves . . . the children . . . seemed to have special areas of focus . . . often seeing small details or focusing on similarities . . . . They reread, talked about, or wrote about the book . . . . aspects of the picture books they read seemed to appear somewhat unconsciously in their language and in the products they created . . . . Children seemed to need time, a variety of materials and, most important, a teacher or other adult who was able to develop their early responses instead of stifling them. (pp. 19-20)

The study herein was undertaken to determine the picture book choices of first-graders when presented with Award books selected by a librarian and books selected at random by a peer. How closely three educators could predict the children's choices was another facet of the study. Also, this study was undertaken to allow the three educators an opportunity to be critics of children's literature. They

were asked to judge the overall quality of the 24 books being studied.

Information about the children's choices, their rate of agreement, the accuracy of the educators' predictions and the latter's assessments of picture books would add to the existing research that has already shown that adults play a vital role in the selection of children's literature for recreational reading and classroom use.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Research Design

Selection of books. The researcher asked two people to help choose the 24 picture books to be rated by first-graders and three educators.

First, the head librarian at Parma Public Library was asked to select ten Award books she believed would be enjoyed by a beginning reader.

Next, a six-year-old boy was asked to select 14 picture books at random for recreational reading. It was assumed by the researcher that he would make his choices based on one or more of several variables: by glancing at the cover, by scanning the text, by looking at the pictures quickly, or by remembering and preferring a certain author.

Lastly, a library aide covered the 24 books' covers with blank sheets of paper. The purpose was to hide any Award medals that may or may not have been on the covers. This procedure would help eliminate biases towards the books during the ratings by both the children and the educators. The aide then gave the 24 books to the researcher who was completely unaware of which books were chosen by whom.

Preparing the books and ratings charts. The researcher created a ratings chart for the group of 20 first-graders at the Hazel Jenkins School in Hilton, New York. She used green stickers for color and

appeal and adjectives she believed they would understand. (Table 1)

Table 1

Picture Books Ratings Chart Used by First-Graders

Points				
1	2	3	4	5
0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
		0	0	0
			0	0
				0
YUK!	NOT BAD	GOOD BOOK	GREAT BOOK	SUPER!

A cardboard box was covered with wallpaper, and the words "Read," "React," and "Register" were written on one side in large print. The 24 books were placed inside and delivered by the researcher to Virginia Campling's first-grade class.

Presenting the experiment to the children. The researcher spent 30 minutes with the 12 boys and 8 girls. She explained how they could be of help to her in determining what kinds of books children like to read most. They could do this first by reading and rating the books in the box, she explained. They were told how important reading is and how their opinions count to teachers. The rating scale from one to five was explained as were the three "Rs." The children were told that all their answers were right, that no answers were wrong and that it was their turn to be judges. Since the experiment was conducted just after the 1984 Winter Olympics, the researcher used that sports event as an example to the children. Instead of judging an athletic performance, the children would be judging how much they liked each of the 24 books, she explained. They would be a special panel of judges in their own right.

The researcher gave them a chance to be judges right away. She read aloud from one of the books, Ookie-Spooky; and the children recorded their ratings of it on their individual rating sheets. (Appendix A is a sample of the rating sheets used with the children.) The children were told that their teacher would read a few more of the books aloud to them, but the other books were for reading silently.

It was next stated by the researcher that reading and rating the 24 books should be done only when all other classwork was finished. They were asked to keep their ratings a secret by whispering them to Mrs. Campling, whereupon she would record the points for each of

them. This was encouraged to prevent any influence on ratings by peers.

It was explained by the researcher, lastly, that rewards would be given to all the children and that a special reward would be given to anyone who read and rated all 24 books.

The researcher gave the children five weeks to react to the picture books. Neither the children nor the teacher were aware of which books were selected by the librarian and which were selected by the six-year-old boy.

Presenting the experiment to the educators. On two different evenings, three educators spent approximately three hours rating the same 24 books. They first read and rated the books from one to five to indicate their own enjoyment of the books--the equivalent of what the children were doing. Then they gave a second rating from one to five which indicated how much or how little they believed a first-grader would enjoy each book. The researcher hoped the educators would make their predictions based on their familiarity with children's interests. Finally, the educators rated the quality of each book from one to twenty in three separate categories: content, illustrations and moral/theme. Appendix B shows the criteria used for making the latter judgments, and a sample rating sheet is shown in Appendix C.

The rating sheets were collected immediately after the ratings were made. The educators were not made aware of which books were selected by the librarian as Award books and which were selected by the six-year-old boy. However, because they were familiar with

children's literature, in some instances it was obvious that a book was an Award book. The researcher knew this was inevitable, but kept the books' covers hidden nonetheless.

Instrumentation. The rating scales used by the first-graders and the rating scales used by the educators became the instruments by which both age groups rated the 24 picture books.

Hypotheses. (null and alternative)

$H_0^1$  = First-graders enjoy Award books as much as they enjoy non-awardwinning books.

$H_a^1$  = First-graders enjoy Award books more than they enjoy non-awardwinning books.

$H_0^2$  = First-graders will show no significant percentage of interrater agreement when rating 24 picture books.

$H_a^2$  = First-graders will show a significant percentage of interrater agreement when rating 24 picture books.

$H_0^3$  = There will be no significant accuracy of prediction by educators when they rate picture books in order of how they predict first-graders will enjoy those books.

$H_a^3$  = There will be a significant accuracy of prediction by educators when they rate picture books in order of how they predict first-graders will enjoy those books.

$H_0^4$  = Overall quality of picture books as deemed by three educators has no significant relation to the books' potential as Award books.

$H_a^4$  = Overall quality of picture books as deemed by three educators has a significant relation to the books' potential as Award books.

Data analysis. The data compiled from the raters was used in the following ways:

1. to determine the order in which the children as a group rated the 24 picture books,
2. to determine the percentage of agreement among the first-graders (coefficient of interrater agreement),
3. to measure interrater agreement of book rankings between the first-graders as a group and the educators as a group, and
4. to determine the educators' mean scores for each book where overall quality was concerned and, in particular, quality of content, illustrations and theme/moral.

The ratings by the children were studied for each book in the process of finding the percentage of agreement among the children. For each book the maximum difference in ratings was first found (numerator); then the total maximum difference was found (denominator). The quotient became the percentage of disagreement, and the difference between the quotient and 100 became the percentage of agreement.

Also, the Spearman rank-correlation coefficient ( $r_s$ ) for measuring interrater agreement of rankings was used to find the correlation between the first-graders' ratings of the books and the educators' ratings of the same books. The "x" values represented the childrens' mean ratings, and the "y" values represented the

adults' mean ratings for each book. The formula used was:

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \sum (x_i - y_i)^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Children's Preferences

The picture books were rank-ordered from favorite to least favorite after finding the mean ratings of the books by the children. The results are shown in Table 2. The adults' individual and mean ratings are also shown there for comparative purposes.

Of the top 12 books chosen, only six were Award books, indicating that the children enjoyed the non-awardwinners almost as well. Also, the top three books were non-awardwinners. However, since ten of the 24 books were Award books and only four fell into the lower half, there is an indication that suggests a slight preference for Award books. It isn't significant enough, however, to accept alternative hypothesis 1.

Therefore, the data in Table 2 led to the acceptance of:

$H_0^1$  = First-graders enjoy Award books as much as they  
enjoy non-awardwinning books.

#### Percentages of Agreement Among the Children

The first-graders' ratings were compiled and analyzed to determine the percentages of agreement among the children for each individual book. (See Appendices D, Tabulations of Percentages of Agreement). The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 2

First-Graders' Favorite Picture Books

Book Title	Children's Mean Ratings	Educators' Mean Ratings
A Worm for Dinner	4.65	2.00
Jim Meets the Thing	4.39	5.00
ABC Santa Claus	4.33	3.67
*Once A Mouse	4.22	3.33
Terrible Things Could Happen	4.21	3.00
*A Snowy Day	4.18	4.67
*Where the Wild Things Are	4.13	4.33
It Does Not Say Meow	4.11	4.33
Ookie-Spookie	4.05	3.67
*The Biggest Bear	3.94	4.00
*Nine Days to Christmas	3.91	2.67
*Noah's Ark	3.83	4.00
Halloween Parade	3.77	4.00
*A Story, A Story	3.70	3.55
*Why Mosquitoes Buzz in People's Ears	3.70	3.33
The Christmas Wolf	3.69	3.33
*Madeline's Rescue	3.60	4.33
Hooray For Ma!	3.62	1.67
Two Dog Biscuits	3.58	3.00
Rabbit Finds a Way	3.50	3.33
*Fables	3.42	3.67
Elephant's Child	3.36	2.67
Dinner at Alberta's	3.25	3.67
Madeline in London	2.90	4.00

Table 3

Coefficient of Interrater Agreement, Percentage of Agreement

Book Titles in Rank Order	Children's Mean Ratings	Percentage of Agreement
A Worm For Dinner	4.65	91%
Jim Meets the Thing	4.39	85%
ABC Santa Claus	4.33	84%
*Once A Mouse	4.22	81%
Terrible Things Could Happen	4.21	80%
*A Snowy Day	4.18	80%
*Where the Wild Things Are	4.13	80%
It Does Not Say Meow	4.11	67%
Ookie-Spookie	4.05	76%
*The Biggest Bear	3.94	73%
*Nine Days to Christmas	3.91	73%
*Noah's Ark	3.83	71%
Halloween Parade	3.77	69%
*A Story, A Story	3.70	67%
*Why Mosquitoes Buzz in People's Ears	3.70	67%
The Christmas Wolf	3.69	75%
*Madeline's Rescue	3.60	62%
Hooray For Me!	3.62	65%
Two Dog Biscuits	3.58	65%
Rabbit Finds A Way	3.50	62%
*Fables	3.42	60%
The Elephant's Child	3.36	59%
Dinner at Alberta's	3.25	55%
Madeline in London	2.90	47%

\* indicates the Award books

Several observations are noteworthy. The highest percentage of agreement (91%) was on the favorite book, A Worm for Dinner, as determined by the mean rating of 4.65. It Does Not Say Meow, although it received a high 4.11 mean rating, fared less favorably where agreement was concerned (67%). On the other hand, The Christmas Wolf received a fair to low mean rating with a high percentage of agreement (75%).

Aside from these exceptions, the mean ratings and percentages of agreement were generally related. That is, when the children rated a book high (4.05-4.65), the percentage of agreement was generally high also (76%-91%). The books rated as average (3.62-3.94) generally saw a fair or average rate of agreement (65%-73%). And the books that were rated low (2.90-3.58) saw a low rate of agreement (47%-65%).

In every case but one, 55% or more of the class agreed on the books they liked most and least. Two-thirds of the class agreed on 16 of the 24 books or 67% of the choices made available to them.

While there wasn't perfect agreement, there was an indication that first-graders agree more often than not on which books they do or don't prefer. This led to the acceptance of:

$H_a^2$  = First-graders will show a significant percentage of interrater agreement when rating 24 picture books.

#### Accuracy of Educators' Predictions

The data in Table 4 was compiled and analyzed to find the correlation between the first-graders mean ratings of the 24 books and the adults' mean ratings of the same books.

The Spearman rank-correlation coefficient ( $r_s$ ) was .99, an almost perfect agreement. Not only was there a high quality of agreement,

Table 4

Correlation Coefficient of Educators and First-Graders

	Children's Mean Ratings (x)	Adults' Mean Ratings (y)	x-y	(x-y) <sup>2</sup>
A Worm For Dinner	4.65	2.00	2.65	7.0225
Jim Meets the Thing	4.39	5.00	-.61	.3721
ABC Santa Claus	4.33	3.67	.66	.4356
Once A Mouse	4.22	3.33	.89	.7921
Terrible Things Could Happen	4.21	3.00	1.21	1.4641
A Snowy Day	4.18	4.67	-.49	.2401
Where the Wild Things Are	4.13	4.33	-.20	.0400
It Does Not Say Meow	4.11	4.33	-.22	.0484
Ookie--Spookie	4.05	3.67	.38	.1444
The Biggest Bear	3.94	4.00	-.06	.0036
Nine Days to Christmas	3.91	2.67	1.24	1.10000
Noah's Ark	3.83	4.00	-.17	.0289
Halloween Parade	3.77	4.00	-.23	.0529
A Story, A Story	3.70	3.55	.15	.0225
Why Mosquitoes Buzz in People's Ears	3.70	3.33	.37	.1369
The Christmas Wolf	3.69	3.33	.36	.1296
Madeline's Rescue	3.60	4.33	-.73	.5329
Hooray For Me!	3.62	1.67	1.95	3.8025
Two Dog Biscuits	3.58	3.00	.58	.3364
Rabbit Finds A Way	3.50	3.33	.17	.0289
Fables	3.42	3.67	-.25	.0625
The Elephant's Child	3.36	2.67	.69	.4761
Dinner at Alberta's	3.25	3.67	-.42	.1764
Madeline in London	2.90	4.00	-1.10	1.2100

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6(28.5594)}{24(575)} = .99$$

but there was a high frequency of agreement overall too. This data, therefore, led to the acceptance of:

$H_a^3$  = There will be a significant accuracy of prediction by educators when they rate picture books in order of how they predict first-graders will enjoy those books.

#### The Choices of the Educators

The three educators' ratings of the overall quality of the books were analyzed as follows: The mean score for each book was found by compiling the scores for content, illustrations and theme/moral. Since each category was worth 20 points, the highest potential mean score for a single book was 60; the lowest potential score was 3.

A tabulation of the results is shown in Table 5. It's important that the scores be viewed as mean scores stemming from the opinions of three different educators. Had the educators been actual judges of possible Award books, their individual ratings may or may not have been more closely examined before an Award was given.

The results suggest that the educators in this study, as a team, truly were good judges of quality in picture books. Of the 24 books read by both age groups, seven of the ten Award books were rated in the top 50 percent by the educators (37-53.7 points). The other three Award books followed close behind in the top quarter of the lower 50 percent (33-37 points), which means that the nine books with the lowest mean ratings were non-awardwinning books (17.7-32.7 points).

However, five of the fourteen non-awardwinners were rated high by

Table 5

Overall Quality of the Books as Rated by the Educators

	Overall Mean Ratings	Content	Illustrations	Theme/ Moral
*Madeline's Rescue	53.7	57	54	50
Jim Meets the Thing	52.3	54	47	56
*The Biggest Bear	49.3	46	51	51
Madeline in London	48.7	49	56	41
*Noah's Ark	45.7	40	56	41
Dinner at Alberta's	44.7	47	39	48
*Where the Wild Things Are	41.7	42	50	33
*Why Mosquitoes Buzz in People's Ears	41.3	42	45	37
*Fables	40.7	26	54	42
Rabbit Finds A Way	39.7	39	44	36
It Does Not Say Meow	39.3	43	47	28
*Nine Days to Christmas	37.0	34	41	36
*A Story, A Story	37.0	32	42	37
*A Snowy Day	34.3	38	39	26
*Once A Mouse	33.0	40	40	19
Halloween Parade	32.7	36	37	25
Terrible Things Could Happen	30.0	29	36	25
Ookie-Spookie	30.0	29	38	23
The Christmas Wolf	29.0	29	37	21
ABC Santa Claus	28.3	33	31	21
The Elephant's Child	25.7	18	49	10
A Worm for Dinner	24.3	22	29	22
Hooray For Me!	19.7	14	29	16
Two Dog Bisquits	17.7	18	20	15

\* indicates Award books

the educators (in the top 50 percent) suggesting that they may be potential Award books or were overlooked by the critics. The children's scores showed both agreement and disagreement. Two of the five books were given high mean ratings: Jim Meets the Thing (4.39) and It Does Not Say Meow (4.11), but two others were at the very bottom of their list: Dinner at Alberta's (3.25) and Madeline in London (2.90). In sum, the children showed a notable agreement with the adults in two cases and a notable disagreement with the adults in two other cases.

Specifically to the study, though, the adults rated the Award books high (33-53.7 points). Therefore, the data in Table 5 led to the acceptance of:

$H_a^4$  = Overall quality of picture books as deemed by three educators has a significant relation to the books' potential as Award books.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The main purpose of this study was to test the judgments of first-graders and educators where picture books are concerned in order to determine which age group is the better judge of books that appeal to children. Four questions, specifically, were dealt with:

1. How would the first-graders rank ten Caldecott Award books compared to 14 books selected by a peer?
2. How closely would the first-graders agree on their book selections?
3. How accurately could three educators judge which picture books would appeal to 20 first-graders?
4. Would the three educators judge the Award books with high ratings, thus indicating their ability to recognize a quality work of children's literature?

#### Summary of Results

The three favorite books of the children as a group were non-awardwinners. Six of the Award books, though, were placed in the top 50 percent, indicating a strong interest in the Award books. Still, six of the top twelve favorites were non-awardwinners, indicating no special preference for the books stamped with medals over those without kudos.

The youngsters showed a significant percentage of interrater agreement on the 24 books. For all the books except one, 55% or more of the class agreed on the books they favored or disliked. Furthermore, two-thirds of the class agreed on 16 of the 24 books or 67% of the choices given to them.

The three educators were highly accurate in their predictions of which picture books they felt first-graders would enjoy most or least. The Spearman rank-correlation was .99, an almost perfect agreement. There was a high quality of agreement as well as a high frequency of agreement overall which contributed to the near-perfect agreement.

Finally, the educators as a group were good judges of which picture books deserved to receive Awards. Of the 24 books read by them, seven of the ten Award books were rated in the top 50 percent. The other three Award books were rated in the top quarter of the lower 50 percent, and the nine books with the lowest ratings were all non-awardwinners. If, in fact, the critics had done a good job of selecting these particular Award books, then the educators had been good critics too of the same books.

#### Limitations on the Study

As elementary as their rating chart may have appeared, it may have posed a problem to the children because they lack, for the most part, an understanding of what might be considered "average," "poor," or "outstanding." This is suggested in Table 4 where the indication is that giving a score of "1" or "2" was rare: only one of the 24 books

received a mean score below 3.25.

Also, only seven children read all the books. Seven others read most of the books (13-21 books), while six children read only some of the books (1-11 books). Moreover, teaching procedures and peer pressure may have affected the children's ratings. For example, Mrs. Campling read three of the books aloud for everyone to enjoy and rate. It's possible that her dramatic presentation of the stories caused the children to rate the books higher than they would have if they had read them quietly to themselves. In addition, the children may have discussed the stories and how they judged them. While this is a good practice normally and one to encourage, for the purpose of this study it may have affected the ratings in a negative or biased manner.

Finally, the children and teacher had little time to make use of the "Comment" column of the rating sheets. Had the children verbalized their opinions and recorded them in the written word, ratings may have been affected to better represent their reactions.

The educators had one obvious disadvantage: They were all well read in children's literature! While this is normally considered an asset to any teacher, for the purpose of this study it presented a slight problem: the Award books became apparent even though all the book jackets were hidden. This was true in some of the cases, such as The Snowy Day and Madeline to the Rescue because the teachers had had past experience with the books either in the classroom or with their own children. However, some of the Award books were not

remembered as Award books; and, in any case, the educators tried their best to remain objective when rating each book.

#### Suggestions for Further Study

The researcher sees two possibilities for future work.

The first deals with story presentation and individual differences among children. Knowing why a child likes a given book would help teachers select the appropriate books for her classroom. While we know certain themes and topics are already favorites in the elementary schools (e.g. animal stories, family situations), there is more to learn about the presentation of the actual stories. Questions to consider include: Does a child like narrative or poetry? Pictures with detail or pictures that are simple? Which stories offend the gifted child by their oversimplified style? What modern themes are just beginning to interest our children, and which traditional themes need to be reevaluated for the child of the eighties? The research would best be conducted throughout an entire year in several classrooms throughout a wide geographic area so all children from various backgrounds would be represented.

The second suggestion deals with the use of Caldecott Award books with children in a gifted program and children in a special education class for slower learners. The end goal would be to see if the Award books are appealing mainly because of their illustrations. The two groups could react to the books with the narrative covered over first and then with the narrative read and the illustrations covered. The children could judge if the stories were enjoyable without

the pictures or whether the two artforms--illustrations and narrative--truly need each other to make the book enjoyable. The illustrations in some Award books would probably evoke some very interesting reactions from these seemingly opposite groups.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aardema, V. (1975). Why mosquitoes buzz in people's ears. New York: The Dial Press.
- Bemmelmans, L. (1961). Madeline in London. New York: Doubleday.
- Bemmelmans, L. (1951). Madeline's rescue. New York: Junior Literary Guild and Viking.
- Brown, M. (1961). Once a mouse. New York: Scribners.
- Catterson, J. H. (Ed.). (1970). Children and literature. Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Charlie, R. (1975). Hooray for me! New York: Parents' Magazine Press.
- Chenery, J. D. (1978). Peter Spier. The Horn Book Magazine, 54(4), 379-381.
- Cianciolo, P. J. (1983). A look at the illustrations in children's favorite picture books. In N. Roser & M. Frith (Eds.), Children's choices: Teaching with books children like (pp. 27-38). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Cleary, B. (1965). The mouse and the motorcycle. New York: W. Morrow.
- Cleary, B. (1961). Two dog biscuits. New York: W. Morrow.
- Cohen, M. (1981). Jim meets the thing. New York: Greenwillow Books.
- DeLage, I. (1978). ABC Santa Claus. Champaign, Illinois: Gerrard Publishing Company.
- Delaney, N. (1977). A worm for dinner. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Delaney, N. (1983). Terrible things could happen. New York: Lothrop.
- Delton, J. (1975). Rabbit finds a way. New York: Crown Publishers.
- DeRegniers, B. (1972). It does not say meow. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Ets, M. H. (1959). Nine days to Christmas. New York: Viking.

- Gay, M. (1983). The Christmas wolf. New York: Greenwillow Books.
- Ginsburg, M. (1979). Ookie-Spooky. New York: Crown.
- Haley, G. E. (1970). A story, a story. New York: Atheneum.
- Haviland, V. (1973). Children and literature: Views and reviews. New York: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard.
- Hoban, R. (1975). Dinner at Alberta's. New York: Crowell.
- Jenkins, W. A. (1964). What is children's literature? Illustrators and illustrations. In V. M. Reid (Ed.), Children's literature: Old and new (pp. 36-43). Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Keats, E. J. (1962). The snowy day. New York: Viking.
- Kiefer, B. (1983). The responses of children in a combination first/second grade classroom to picture books in a variety of artistic styles. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 16(3), 14-20.
- Kimmel, E. A. (1982). Children's literature without children. Children's Literature in Education, 13(1), 38-43.
- Kipling, R. (1983). The elephant's child. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Kromann Kelly, I., & Sager, P. J. (1970). The appropriateness of the Newbery Award books. In J. H. Catterson (Ed.), Children and literature (pp. 49-58). Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Leibowicz, J. (1983). Children's reading interests. Reading Teacher, 37, 184-187.
- Lobel, A. (1980). Fables. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lystad, M. H. (1973). Halloween parade. New York: Putnam.
- Maynard, F. (1973). Guiding your child to a more creative life. New York: Doubleday.
- McDowell, M. (1973). Fiction for children and adults: Some essential differences. Children's Literature in Education, 10, 50-62.
- Pace Nilsen, A., Peterson, R., & Searfoss, L. W. (1980). The adult as critic vs. the child as reader. Language Arts, 57(5), 530-539.

- Reid, V. M. (Ed.). (1964). Children's literature: Old and new.  
Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Roser, N. & Frith, M. (Eds.). (1983). Children's choices: Teaching  
with books children like. Newark, Delaware: International  
Reading Association.
- Sendak, M. (1963). Where the wild things are. New York: Harper  
& Row.
- Spier, P. (1978). Caldecott Award acceptance. The Horn Book Magazine,  
54(4), 372-381.
- Spier, P. (1978). Noah's ark. New York: Doubleday.
- Sutherland, Z., & Arbuthnot, M. H. (Eds.). (1977). Children and  
books. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman.
- Tibbetts, S. (1975). Research in children's literature: A need for  
standardized procedures. Elementary English, 52(4), 503-504.
- Ward, L. K. (1952). The biggest bear. Boston: Houghton.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix A

First-Graders' Rating Sheet

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Age \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Book Title</u>	(1-5) <u>Rating</u>	<u>Comments</u>
The Christmas Wolf		
Hooray for Me!		
Fables		
ABC Santa Claus		
A Story, A Story		
It Does Not Say Meow		
The Snowy Day		
Jim Meets the Thing		
A Worm for Dinner		
Once A Mouse		
Where the Wild Things Are		
Why Mosquitoes Buzz in People's Ears		
Terrible Things Could Happen		
Two Dog Biscuits		
Ookie-Spooky		
Nine Days to Christmas		
Rabbit Finds a Way		
Dinner at Alberta's		
The Elephant's Child		
Madeline's Rescue		
The Biggest Bear		
Halloween Parade		
Madeline in London		
Noah's Ark		

APPENDIX B

Criteria and Scale  
for Measuring Level of Excellence  
of Selected Picture Books

DIRECTIONS: Keep pre-schoolers in mind as well as K-3 when reading these books. Rate the books after reading them, studying illustrations and thinking about any theme (moral or lesson). Use the scales from 1-20 after reading what the numbers in the scales represent. DO NOT READ THE BOOK JACKET OR OBSERVE THE COVER. You should read each story and study illustrations, but do not try to guess if the book is an Award book or random selection made by a six-year-old child.

CONTENT (what the story is about, generally):				
1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20
Boring. You wonder if any pre-schooler or K-3 would even finish reading this book. Same old story told in usual way.	Ordinary but subject matter is of some interest to some children. Characters and action are nice but treatment of story could have been more unique.	Average. It's about something/ someone that really matters to a child. They would show enjoyment and maybe even learn something.	Above average. Story is unique in its subject matter and treated in a unique way. We need more of these stories!	Superior. Liked by children everywhere. Delightful, imaginative, educational. to be remembered by a child.
ILLUSTRATIONS:				
1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20
Boring. You find it hard to connect the pictures with the story and wonder if illustrator should have studied the story more closely.	Ordinary but gets by. Illustrator uses pictures to help tell story but in a way you've seen many times before. Some appeal to kids, but they won't study the pictures.	Average and nice pictures. Appeals to most kids K-3 and related to subject matter so pics help tell story. Might be simple, but really help tell the story.	Above average. There's something unique about these illustrations e.g. facial expressions. A child would react emotionally and verbally to these pictures.	Superior. Illustrations tell story on own! Text is related too! Child can't stop exclaiming about pics. Appeals to kids worldwide.
MORAL/THEME (lesson implied/value system suggested):				
1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20
Seems to be none. If there is a moral or theme, can't find it easily.	Difficult to tell. If any there, it seems petty. Child would find it hard to draw conclusions about a moral or lesson.	Worthwhile lesson implied or stated. Child learns from story and enjoys as well. Acts favorably.	Significant moral or value handled in a new and interesting way so child grasps readily and with interest.	Exciting, modern way to teach an important lesson about life. Kids everywhere will benefit & react favorably.

Appendix C

Educator's Ratings Sheet

Evaluator's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Is Evaluator a Parent? \_\_\_\_\_ If so, # of children \_\_\_\_\_  
 (yes) (no)

Has Evaluator Ever Taught Gr. K-3? \_\_\_\_\_ No. of years \_\_\_\_\_  
 (yes) (no)

Book Title	My Level of Enjoyment (1-5)	Predicted Level of Chld. Enj'mt. (1-5)	Content (1-20)	Illus. (1-20)	Moral/Theme (1-20)	TOTAL (3-60)
The Christmas Wolf						
Hooray For Me!						
Fables						
ABC Santa Claus						
A Story, A Story						
It Does Not Say Meow						
The Snowy Day						
Jim Meets the Thing						
A Worm for Dinner						
Once a Mouse						
Where the Wild Things Are						
Why Mosquitoes Buzz in People's Ears						
Terrible Things Could Happen						
Two Dog Biscuits						
Ookie-Spooky						
Nine Days to Christmas						
Rabbit Finds A Way						
The Biggest Bear						
Halloween Parade						
Madeline in London						
Noah's Ark						

APPENDIX D  
TABULATIONS OF PERCENTAGES OF AGREEMENT

A WORM FOR DINNER

	1	2	3	4	5
1.				X	
2.					X
3.					X
4.				X	
5.			X		
6.					X
7.					X
8.					X
9.					X
10.					X
11.			X		
12.					X
13.					X
14.					X
15.					X
16.					X
Maximum difference:	6				
					9% disagree
Total maximum difference:	64				
					91% agree

JIM MEETS THE THING

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.				X	
3.					X
4.	X				
5.				X	
6.					X
7.					X
8.					X
9.		X			
10.					X
11.					X
12.					X
13.					X
14.					X
15.			X		
16.					X
17.					X
18.					X

Maximum difference: 11                      15% disagree

Total Maximum difference: 72              85% agree

A B C SANTA CLAUS

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.					X
3.					X
4.				X	
5.	X				
6.					X
7.					X
8.					X
9.			X		
10.				X	
11.					X
12.					X
13.			X		
14.					X
15.					X
16.					X

Maximum difference: 10

16% disagree

Total maximum difference: 64

84% agree

ONCE A MOUSE

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.					X
3.				X	
4.	X				
5.	X				
6.				X	
7.					X
8.					X
9.				X	
10.			X		
11.				X	
12.					X
13.					X
14.					X
15.					X
16.					X
17.					X
18.					X

Maximum difference: 14                      19% disagree

Total maximum difference: 72              81% agree



THE SNOWY DAY

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.					X
3.					X
4.					X
5.			X		
6.				X	
7.					X
8.	X				
9.			X		
10.					X
11.					X

Maximum difference: 9

20% disagree

Total maximum difference: 44

80% agree

WHERE THE WILD THINGS ARE

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.		X			
3.					X
4.			X		
5.					X
6.		X			
7.					X
8.					X
9.					X
10.					X
11.				X	
12.				X	
13.					X
14.	X				
15.					X
16.					X

Maximum difference: 13                      20% disagree

Total maximum difference: 64              80% agree

IT DOES NOT SAY MEOW

	1	2	3	4	5
1.				X	
2.					X
3.					X
4.				X	
5.		X			
6.		X			
7.					X
8.					X
9.					X
10.				X	
11.		X			
12.				X	
13.					X
14.					X

Maximum difference: 13

33% disagree

Total maximum difference: 40

67% agree

OOKIE - SPOOKIE

	1	2	3	4	5
1.				X	
2.					X
3.					X
4.				X	
5.			X		
6.	X				
7.	X				
8.					X
9.				X	
10.			X		
11.					X
12.					X
13.					X
14.					X
15.				X	
16.			X		
17.					X
18.					X
19.					X
20.				X	

Maximum difference: 19                      24% disagree

Total maximum difference: 80              76% agree

THE BIGGEST BEAR

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.					X
3.					X
4.	X				
5.			X		
6.				X	
7.					X
8.					X
9.	X				
10.				X	
11.				X	
12.	X				
13.					X
14.					X
15.					X
16.					X

Maximum difference: 17                      27% disagree

Total maximum difference: 64              73% agree

NINE DAYS TO CHRISTMAS

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.					X
3.					X
4.					X
5.		X			
6.	X				
7.					X
8.	X				
9.					X
10.				X	
11.					X

Maximum difference: 12

27% disagree

Total maximum difference: 44

73% agree

NOAH'S ARK

	1	2	3	4	5
1.				X	
2.					X
3.					X
4.	X				
5.		X			
6.					X
7.					X
8.					X
9.					X
10.	X				
11.				X	
12.				X	

Maximum difference: 14                      29% disagree

Total maximum difference: 48              71% agree

HALLOWEEN PARADE

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.		X			
3.					X
4.	X				
5.			X		
6.					X
7.	X				
8.					X
9.		X			
10.					X
11.					X
12.					X
13.					X

Maximum difference: 16

31% disagree

Total maximum difference: 52

69% agree

A STORY, A STORY

	1	2	3	4	5
1.				X	
2.					X
3.					X
4.	X				
5.	X				
6.					X
7.					X
8.					X
9.				X	
10.			X		

Maximum difference: 13                      33% disagree

Total maximum difference: 40            67 % agree

WHY MOSQUITOES BUZZ IN PEOPLE'S EARS

	1	2	3	4	5
1.				X	
2.					X
3.					X
4.					X
5.	X				
6.	X				
7.					X
8.					X
9.			X		
10.			X		

Maximum difference: 13                      33% disagree

Total maximum difference: 40            67% agree

THE CHRISTMAS WOLF

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.				X	
3.					X
4.	X				
5.		X			
6.	X				
7.					X
8.					X
9.				X	
10.				X	
11.					X
12.					X
13.	X				
14.					X
15.					X
16.					X
17.					X

Maximum difference: 17                      25% disagree

Total maximum difference: 68            75% agree

MADLINE'S RESCUE

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.				X	
3.					X
4.		X			
5.	X				
6.	X				
7.			X		
8.					X
9.					X
10.					X

Maximum difference: 15

38% disagree

Total maximum difference: 40

62% agree

HOORAY FOR ME

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.					X
3.					X
4.				X	
5.			X		
6.	X				
7.	X				
8.					X
9.					X
- 10.	X		X		
11.					X
12.				X	
13.					X

Maximum difference: 18

35% disagree

Total maximum difference: 52

65% agree

TWO DOG BISQUITS

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.	X				
3.					X
4.		X			
5.		X			
6.			X		
7.					X
8.	X				
9.				X	
10.					X
11.					X
12.					X

Maximum difference: 17

35% disagree

Total maximum difference: 48

65% agree



FABLES

	1	2	3	4	5
1.				X	
2.			X		
3.					X
4.					X
5.	X				
6.					X
7.					X
8.					X
9.	X				
10.	X				
11.	X				
12.					X

Maximum difference: 19                      40% disagree

Total maximum difference: 48              60% agree

THE ELEPHANT'S CHILD

	1	2	3	4	5
1.				X	
2.			X		
3.					X
4.	X				
5.		X			
6.					X
7.					X
8.					X
9.					X
10.		X			
11.		X			
12.	X				
13.		X			
14.					X

Maximum difference: 23                      41% disagree

Total maximum difference: 56              59% agree

DINNER AT ALBERTA'S

	1	2	3	4	5
1.				X	
2.					X
3.					X
4.	X				
5.	X				
6.	X				
7.	X				
8.					X
9.			X		
10.				X	
11.				X	
12.					X

Maximum difference: 21                      44% disagree

Total maximum difference: 48              55% agree

MADELINE IN LONDON

	1	2	3	4	5
1.					X
2.					X
3.					X
4.		X			
5.	X				
6.	X				
7.					X
8.	X				
9.			X		
10.	X				

Maximum difference: 21                      53% disagree

Total maximum difference: 40              47% agree