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**Abstract**

Along with the development and implementation of the Common Core State Standards comes confusion on what texts middle grades teachers are supposed to use to support students’ learning. Discussions on the existence of a middle school canon are inconclusive. To examine this issue, a survey was implemented asking English/Language Arts middle grades teachers to identify common literary titles they use in their classrooms. This article discusses the identification of the population, the survey design and data collection techniques used to collect data from a large sample of middle grade teachers, and the challenges faced in the administration and initial analysis of the survey. This article hopes to inform and assist other researchers who plan to complete similar studies.
Is there a Middle Grades Canon? A Survey Methodology

Along with the development and implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2012) comes confusion on what texts middle grades teachers are supposed to use to support students’ learning. Are they supposed to follow their existing curriculum and infuse the CCSS into what they already teach? Are they supposed to analyze their curriculum and currently used texts to be sure they provide a balance of informational and fictional texts? Should they replace their current texts with the suggested or guiding exemplar texts listed in Appendix B of the CCSS? The CCSS propose a 50/50 split between informational and narrative text in the third grade moving towards a 70/30 split in the tenth grade with 70% of the suggested texts being informational. In January 2013, Gerwetz stated, “some English/language arts teachers are finding themselves caught in a swirl of debate about whether the new standards require them to cut back on prized pieces of the literary canon to make room for nonfiction” (para 1). Others, including Pimental & Coleman, authors of the CCSS for English Language Arts, have stated that the literary canon is a staple to teaching the CCSS standards, and that canonical novels are listed in Appendix B (Gerwetz, 2012; Pimental & Coleman, 2012) as suggestions of exemplar texts. Others still provide commentary on the middle school canon and suggest possible books to rethink and books to swap (Hudson, 2012). These statements all imply that there is, in fact, an accepted middle grades canon, but whether or how to include canonical titles is still up for debate. This confusion leads to the following questions: a) What books are currently being used in English/Language Arts middle grades classrooms identified as grades 4-9? b) Is there an accepted middle school canon? and c) Do these books fit the English/Language Arts text complexity requirements stated in the CCSS?

In order to begin answering these questions, we administered a survey asking English/Language Arts middle grades teachers to identify common literary titles they use in their classrooms. The survey was first distributed during the summer of 2012 through a purposeful national sampling. This article discusses the identification of the population, the survey design and data collection techniques used to collect data from a large sample of middle grade teachers, and the challenges we faced while administering and initially analyzing the survey. In sharing these challenges we hope to inform other researchers who plan to complete similar studies.

Literary Canons: An Exploration

According the Oxford English Dictionary, a canon is “a body of literary works traditionally regarded as the most important, significant, and worthy of study.” Titles in a canon, often used in education, are typically collected works and authors who have approval by those in academic and cultural circles such as professors, scholars, teachers, and administrators. These texts represent the significant literary works within a “national literature and/or historical period” (Beach, Appleman, Hynds & Wilhelm, 2011, p. 64). Canonical texts are those that everyone is expected to read and appreciate and that will ultimately provide a well-rounded view of literature and a common knowledge base. Canonical texts are considered significant to our cultural heritage and are highlighted and/or referred to in a variety of contexts beyond the walls of the classroom. For instance, themes and key words from Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet are repeated in many pop culture texts, such as Disney television shows aimed at Tweens (A.N.T. Farm, episode replicANT, season 1, episode 8), the Twilight series aimed at young adults,
(Meyer, 2005), and an accepted classic, *West Side Story*. However, literary canons are not formally written down, but rather a group of accepted titles known to many and considered of high quality and merit. The canon is always changing, and often parallels ongoing trends in a field (Bloom, 1994; Pryor, 2003).

It has long been believed that there is a Western literary canon (Bloom, 1994) and that canonical texts are being taught in high school classrooms (Bushman & Haas, 2006; Crowe, 2001; Santoli & Wagner, 2004). Over the years there has been continued debate over the proper content of the high school English curriculum. Scholars have argued that many canonical texts have been authored by White European males, thereby marginalizing women and people from other cultural backgrounds, and that the range of titles taught needs to be expanded (Bennett, 1988, & Hirsch, 1987, in Applebee, 1992). Others have argued that tradition is needed in education and adding additional texts will dilute the common American knowledge base (Bennett, & Hirsch, in Applebee, 1992). Applebee’s study showed that the traditional canon of classic literature remained solidly situated in the high school English curriculum with numerous titles remaining unchanged, such as texts authored by Shakespeare and Dickens. He found that relatively few authors represented were female or from a non-White cultural background, and that few recent titles were added over the years, resulting in titles growing more consistently dated. The study also suggested that the range of titles reported were fewer and more narrowed rather than increasing and potentially diluting the sample. Overall, the range of titles decreased, but inclusion of diverse authors showed a very slight increase.

Some recent studies confirmed Applebee’s findings that traditional canonical texts remained in English high school classrooms (Hale & Crowe, 2001; Herz, 1996, in Knickerbocker, 2002), but it was also noted that since 1989 there has been an increasing number of young adult literature titles included (Bushman, 1997; Hale & Crowe; Moore, 1997, in Knickerbocker, 2002). Alternatively, two more recent 2010 studies found little consistency in the texts used in high schools across the U.S. and concluded that there is no longer a consistent high school canon (Stotsky, Goering, & Jolliffe, 2010; Stotsky, Traffas, & Woodworth, 2010). They found that although there was minor overlap on key texts, each school and even each teacher appeared to be teaching in isolation without consistency within and across schools.

These studies all focused on high school, grades 9-12, and suggest that traditionally accepted canonical texts are changing and being supplemented with additional texts. Is the same true for the middle grades? Is there an accepted middle grades literary canon? What titles are currently being taught in American middle grades and are they a consistent body of work? Do these titles overlap the exemplar texts as featured in the CCSS’s Appendix B? The survey described in this paper explores and attempts to answer these questions. With the survey, we sought to analyze the responses of middle grades English/language arts teachers to discover whether or not there are common texts taught across the middle grades and if such texts could be considered a literary canon. This article will describe the procedures and processes used to develop and implement the survey, as well as explore the issues that arose as we tried to answer the question, “Is there a middle grades canon?”
Determining Methodology

The first question to ask when conducting research is, “Which methodology is most appropriate for answering the research question?” We chose survey methodology because, according to Wallen and Fraenkel (2000), a survey is the most suitable design for obtaining information “from a group of people in order to describe some aspects or characteristics” (p. 376) of a group, and allows researchers to reach out to a large predetermined population. It was appropriate for this study because the data needed to answer our primary research question “Is there a middle grades canon?” required that a large number of participants share the texts that are part of their middle grades classrooms, and that the responses to the survey questions reflected a large range of teachers. Specifically, a national cross-sectional survey was conducted by the researchers because the data collected would provide information about a specific population at one fixed point in time (Lavrakas, 2008). Schools and teachers have periodic opportunities to purchase and implement new texts in their schools and classrooms, therefore the data collected during this study only reflects the texts teachers had at the time that they complete the survey. Cross-sectional surveys allow for a variety of data collection procedures (Lavrakas, 2008). Thus, the choice of this methodology allowed for flexibility in the techniques used for data collection.

The initial step in designing the cross-sectional survey was to define the participant population. For this study, the population surveyed was teachers who implement full-length texts in the middle grades. First, we needed to identify what age and/or grade span makes up the middle grades. Then we reviewed techniques for identifying teachers of the middle grades to be sampled.

Determining the Population

In determining the makeup of the middle grades, both the common definition of middle grades as defined by state teaching licensure programs and the intellectual development of the identified age span were considered. According to the Association for Middle Level Education, the middle grades include young adolescents, typically children ages 10 to 15. Adolescence begins as children experience rapid growth similar only to the growth that occurs during infancy. During this time, children undergo rapid physical and intellectual changes. Caskey and Ruben (2007) discuss the growth spurt that occurs in the brain as the period of “pruning,” when some neurological connections or pathways in the brain are strengthened and/or disconnected. The connections lead to changes in thinking. These intellectual changes include the physical structure of the brain and how young adolescents conceptualize their world. Middle grades students are also moving from concrete to abstract thinking (Piaget, 1970); as they become more proficient in grasping abstract problems they also begin developing the ability to think about their thinking. Understanding these cognitive changes is critical when considering the population and creating the curriculum for adolescents, in that development does not occur simultaneously.

Due to the variability between students during this developmental period, the range of grades considered middle grades is delineated differently across states according to their teacher certification and licensure requirements. State requirements are not consistent across America. For instance, Ohio, Maryland, Washington, and Nebraska have middle level licensure for grades four through nine; Louisiana, Georgia, Connecticut, and Alabama include grades four through
eight; and, Florida, Kentucky, Michigan, and New York include grades five through nine (McEwin, n.d.). Table 1 provides an overview of middle grades licensure patterns across the United States.

Table 1. Summary of Licensure Patterns by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Bands</th>
<th>Number of States with Licensure in Band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 to 8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data compiled based on (McEwin, n.d.).

Based on the information in Table 1, it was determined that the widest range of grade levels identified as middle grades was grades 4-9. We used this range in our study to best capture the range of text used across middle grades across the country.

Once the definition of middle grades was determined, we next had to consider which teachers of this population might teach full-length texts that could comprise a middle grades canon. There was a wide range of possible teacher participants, from self-contained fourth grade teachers to ninth grade English teachers. Within this range, there are reading teachers who instruct middle grades students in courses specifically designated as reading and middle grades teachers teaching Language Arts blocks. To capture the variety of classrooms in which full-length literary texts might be taught, teacher participants surveyed included English teachers, Language Arts teachers, Reading teachers, and self-contained teachers who teach across grades 4-9.

Survey Design

In order to remain consistent with seminal canon survey methodology, this study sought to replicate some of the guiding survey questions used by Anderson (1964) and replicated by Applebee (1989). Additionally, although the previous studies focused on literary works used in high school classrooms, it allowed us some basis of comparison to texts that have been used in the past.

The current study included a total of eight demographic questions and three open-ended questions. The demographic questions sought to discern the context of the respondents’ schools, grade levels, years of experience, school contexts, and teaching positions. The three open-ended questions were:

1) “List for each grade in your school the book-length works of literature which all students in any English/Language Arts class study” (Applebee, 1989).
2) List any books that you think students in your school should read but that are not a part of the previous list.

3) Are you able to add books to the list of books taught at your school? If so, please describe the process in order to do so.

As mentioned earlier, the first question is directly from the Applebee study and was used to assure that the information uncovered followed the parameters of prior research. The second question was designed to see if there were books teachers believed should be a part of their teaching but that they did not have access to or that were not currently a part of their school curriculum or approved list of titles. The final question was exploratory and aimed at determining if teachers had a role in choosing full-length texts for their classroom and/or school.

**Data Collection**

A central part of this study and key focus for this article was the process utilized for collecting the data. After determining the population and writing the survey, we reviewed methods of data collection that would assure a nationwide sample could be collected. First, we compiled a list of listservs and professional organizations that target middle grades Reading and Language Arts teachers, as defined above. Then we considered finding teachers who may not be active in professional organizations and concluded that the most efficient way to contact them would be through email. The process for collecting the email addresses is described in detail below. Potential participants were contacted using two techniques: sharing a web link to the survey and email.

The web link was shared primarily through organizations focused on reading education. The Middle School Reading Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association posted a web link to the survey on their website and in their Fall 2012 newsletter, *Reading in the Middle*. *Reading Today*, a monthly publication of the International Reading Association, shared the link in their October 2012 edition. Finally, the web link was posted and shared on the middle school literature yahoo group listserv. When sharing the link the following message was included:

“Calling all Middle Grades English/Language Arts/Reading teachers: We want to learn what books your students are reading in your classrooms. Please take a moment to complete a brief 10 question survey by going to _______________ to participate.”

Contacting teachers through email invitation was a more complex endeavor. In order to contact the teachers, a list of middle grades English/Language Arts teachers with publicly accessible e-mail accounts was compiled. The list started with an alphabetical listing of all fifty states, including the District of Columbia. Then an analysis of the public school districts was conducted within each state to assure that there were urban, suburban, and rural districts represented. Finally, a Google search of the school districts was conducted to determine if the teachers’ email addresses were publically accessible. If the addresses were accessible, emails of teachers identified as meeting the population criteria were added to an Excel worksheet according to state. If there were no publically accessible email addresses, a new district from the same state meeting the same criteria was chosen. In order to assure that teachers in private and
parochial schools also received invitations to participate, a secondary search for schools and email addresses was also conducted. The private school search utilized the website private school review (http://www.privateschoolreview.com/). This website lists private schools by county, size, and population. Private and parochial schools with at least 200 students who met the population parameters were included in a Google search to determine if the teachers email addresses were publically accessible. If the addresses were accessible, the email addresses were added to the spreadsheet by state. This sampling was conducted to assure that teachers from a variety of settings and geographical considerations were included. This technique assured a combination of simple random sampling and complex sampling procedures. The hope was that utilization of both techniques would generate a wide range of responses.

Once the email addresses were collected, the addresses were imported into Survey Monkey and Survey Monkey sent the invitation to potential participants. The following was the email sent to potential participants:

To: [Email]
From: researcher’s email via surveymonkey.com
Subject: Calling all Middle Grades (4-9) English/Language Arts/Reading teachers
Body: We are conducting a survey, and your response would be appreciated. The Middle School Reading Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association wants to learn what books your students are reading in your classrooms. Please take a moment to complete a brief 12 question survey by going to https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx
This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.
Thanks for your participation.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx

Challenges We Encountered

Email Collection and Response Rate

Sheehan (2001) discussed issues of response rate and the effectiveness of email surveys for gathering data. In her discussion, she reviewed issues that affect response rate including survey length and follow-up requests. In designing our survey, length was taken into consideration since the results of Sheehan’s meta-analysis demonstrated that length was a dependent issue with variable results. A shorter length survey is more likely to have more respondents. Sheehan’s meta-analysis of follow-up requests was more effective in obtaining responses to the survey. She found that multiple follow-up requests are more likely to lead to higher response rates with email surveys. No follow-up requests were sent during the initial course of data collection reported in this study because of a concern regarding the privacy of the participants. Sheehan also found that as emails surveys become more prevalent, response rates have dropped over time. The use of email as a source for collecting responses has the lowest response rate when compared to traditional mail methods, emails that include web links, and a
combination of methods (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004). Based on this information, we used a combination of methods including emails with web links embedded and the posting of the web link in newsletters, mailings, and on listservs.

One major challenge of this study was the process of searching and identifying email addresses. This process was significantly time consuming, an average of 16 hours per state, and ultimately limited the number of emails we were able to send out. A minimum of 500 emails were collected for each state according to population; more populated states having more than 2000 email addresses collected. A total of 21 states and the District of Columbia was surveyed using the methods described above. This large sample was determined adequate because it included states with significant populations, i.e., Florida and California, as well as more rural states, i.e., Alaska, Colorado, and Idaho. Emails were sent to over 13,000 addresses. A small percentage of the emails, 3.6%, bounced back and 1% of the email participants chose to opt out of the survey once receiving the email invitation. This left a pool of 12,518 potential participants presented with the web link via email. However, from this significant pool of participants only 4.7%, or 671, responded. Not all of the participants who responded to the email completed the survey, dropping the response rate to 3% for email respondents.

In addition to the survey requests sent out via email, the web link was shared with a total of three groups, readers of Reading Today, Reading in the Middle, and the middle school literature yahoo group listserv. These participants accessed the web link independently and the response rates were reviewed separately from the group of email respondents. There were a total of 355 responses to the web link from this population; however, only 50% of those who accessed the web link completed the survey. This group of respondents made up close to one-half of the total responses to the overall survey data collected.

Overall, 760 people accessed the survey, but of those 760 only 548 completed the survey in its entirety. This leads us to believe that revisions need to be made to both our initial means of recruiting participants, including finding ways to gather more emails and identifying additional publications and organizations to distribute our web link, and revising our survey to encourage survey completion.

**Question Phrasing**

The types of responses received to the three qualitative questions question whether the participants understood what we were asking. In reviewing responses collected, it was clear that a significant number of respondents did not understand the first question: “List for each grade in your school the book-length works of literature which all students in any English/Language Arts class study.” Specifically, approximately 14% of all respondents (email and web link) who answered this question replied with some form of confusion or explicitly stated that they did not understand the question. Some in this group responded to the question by providing a series of page numbers or chapter totals. It can be inferred that they interpreted the question as asking the total number of pages or chapters read by students rather than titles of books. Other respondents included the titles of basal reader series as part of their full-length texts. In designing the survey, we defined full-length literary texts as texts read in their entirety as originally published. This would include short stories, novels, and informational texts that teachers use as part of their
curriculum and not selections found in basal readers. However, it is evident that the phrasing of the question may have made our definition difficult to understand and thus minimized our analyzable responses.

Although the purpose of using the question as asked by Applebee was to assure content validity, the confused responses of 14% of the respondents indicate that the question needs revision. In future iterations of the study it will be important to rephrase this question to identify what is meant by full-length texts while still preserving the integrity of Applebee’s question. Presenting the question with a definition of full-length texts or including key terms such as novels and/or trade books could accomplish this. In replicating this study, researchers may want to write a series of questions for this topic and engage in full validity and reliability analysis to determine the best question for the desired results.

**Excel© Formatting**

The initial review of the data collected involved both quantitatively and qualitatively analyzing demographic and open-ended questions. The demographic questions were straightforward; respondents’ answers were closed and analyzing the data did not provide any issues. The open-ended questions presented a more difficult task. When exporting the open-ended responses a number of issues arose.

The first was the format of the responses. When writing the questions, we were unclear in how we wished participants to format their responses. Thus, participants listed the texts in a variety of ways. Some separated texts by writing each text on a new line, some used commas or semi-colons between each text, and others did not use any punctuation between the texts. Therefore, before being able to review the texts we had to organize them into a common format. Each response needed to be hand coded and separated by commas in order to use the sorting features of the Excel© program.

The second issue was consistency in how titles were entered. Again, our instructions were unclear. Some titles had spelling and/or capitalization errors, others were abbreviated, i.e., 451 vs. *Fahrenheit 451*, and others were included with or without articles, i.e., Giver vs. *The Giver*. When using a computer program such as Excel© to analyze data, it is important that the data be entered consistently to assure that counts conducted are accurate. Therefore, each title and response again had to be individually reviewed and altered for consistency. Once the formatting of all responses to the three open-ended questions was completed, the list became the ‘codebook’ for the data. The data was reanalyzed using the codebook to assure that each title entered followed the required formatting. This process required additional repeated reviews of the data. We recognize that repeated analysis is common in survey responses, but the process would have been less unwieldy had our instructions been clearer.

In replicating this study it is suggested that the questions be phrased in a manner that could assist the researchers in analyzing the data. This could be accomplished by describing to the participants how to enter their responses. For instance, asking the participants to separate titles by commas and not to include beginning articles such as ‘A’ or ‘The’ when listing titles.
Next Steps

The survey creation, data collection, and data cleanup has been completed and initial analysis is underway. Our next steps are to continue analyzing the data, revise the survey to clarify our questions and desired responses, and send out additional surveys in order to achieve a higher response rate.

We began our analysis by sorting data through Excel© for percentages of titles provided. The most frequently listed titles have been identified and sorted by number of responses. This will help us explore our question of whether or not there is a middle grades canon. We are also in the process of further analyzing the titles both in terms of the text complexity requirements provided in the CCSS Appendix A and identifying the gender and cultural backgrounds of the texts’ authors. Additionally, we are further sorting the data by grade levels and will ultimately cross reference grade level titles to specific CCSS grade level standards, separating our data into more defined grade level bands.

We will be following the suggestions above to revise our survey based on our initial results. First, we will alter our phrasing of the open-ended questions to make them more understandable and provide instructions for our desired formatting. Two additional open-ended questions will be added to further tie our survey to the CCSS. Since the impetus of this study was concern over the effect of the CCSS on texts chosen for use in the middle grades classroom, we wish to ask teachers if a) there were any texts added to their classroom curriculum, or b) removed from their classroom curriculum, as a result of implementation of the CCSS. Prior to sharing this question with the large group of respondents, it is important that we conduct reliability and validity analysis to assure that the question generates desired responses.

Lastly, we will continue to work on finding alternative methods of distributing the survey web link and acquiring more email addresses. Additional emails will make our results more reliable and generalizable.

Initial Findings

Initial responses indicated that no one text was identified by a majority of the respondents (See Table 2 below) and that there was no apparent middle grades canon. The texts documented were varied, although there was some overlap. Two texts, The Giver and The Outsiders, were mentioned more often than other texts, with The Giver mentioned 107 times and The Outsiders mentioned 92 times. The reported numbers dropped after those two, with the following 8 titles mentioned only between 30-60 times. In addition, two of our top ten responses were “none” or “basal.” This indicated that some teachers do not use full-length texts in their classrooms. The combination of “none” and “basal” received 100 mentions, the second overall highest number of responses.
Table 2. Top 10 Reported Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title or Program Reported</th>
<th># of Times Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Giver</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Outsiders</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basal Reader</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Kill a Mockingbird</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romeo and Juliet</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Diary of Anne Frank</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hunger Games</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis by grade-level bands (grades 4-5, 6-7, 8-9) may provide more overlap and present a clearer picture of titles used in classrooms; titles reported for grades 4-5 cannot be compared to grades 6-7 or 8-9 as the developmental levels and reading levels vary quite a bit over this range. Once additional responses to our survey are collected, titles will be analyzed across grade-level bands to identify if higher percentages of titles within bands are reported.

We chose to analyze our most frequently reported titles to look for apparent patterns for use in future analysis. For this step we included all titles mentioned a minimum of 20 times, not including “none” or “basal.” Nineteen titles fit this criterion. Of the 19 titles, 18 were published prior to 1990, showing that few newer texts have been added to the curriculum, which fits the definition of a canon and ascribes concerns about the relevancy of texts being shared with students. Only one text in this grouping, *The Hunger Games*, was published within the last 10 years. All of these 19 texts were narratives, with only two falling into the nonfiction category. Both of these two were autobiographies, showing a significant lack of informational text. We also noted that 13 or the 19 books had Lexile levels lower than 1000, strongly indicating that books used are not meeting the CCSS text complexity quantitative requirements.

**Conclusion**

In presenting the techniques and initial findings used in our survey design and data collection, we hope to share with readers more than simply methodology but what we have learned and challenges we have faced using this methodology. By describing the steps we took and our issues with email collection and response rates, question phrasing, and Excel® formatting, researchers can become aware of and address these issues as they design their own surveys for future research. Additionally, we share our next steps to continue providing guidelines and suggestions in the purpose and analysis methods used.

In addition, our initial findings present a unique look at the texts used in the classrooms of our participants. It appears that although there is not a strong middle grades canon, the adoption of newer texts is not commonplace. Furthermore, the responses provided may cause some concern about the use of the existing texts to meet the CCSS.
Overall, this study has demonstrated that collected data regarding a middle grades canon is a complex process. The findings presented here are significant because they not only demonstrate issues of methodology, but highlight the variety of texts used in the middle grades.
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