Challenges to Library Materials From Principals in United States Secondary Schools—A "Victory" of Sorts

Dianne McAfee Hopkins

School of Library and Information Studies
University of Wisconsin—Madison

Challenges to school library materials initiated by principals in public middle, junior, and senior high school libraries in the United States are examined. The article provides a discussion of research and professional practice literature emphasizing the leadership of the principal; the role of the principal in school library program development; and the principal and school library censorship. The study revealed that challenges initiated by principals are likely to result in removal or restriction, and differ in several ways from challenges initiated by others. Challenges resulting in restriction may be viewed as a "victory" of sorts for both the principal and the librarian.

Introduction

Professional literature in education and library and information studies indicates the importance of resources used in K-12 student learning. The resources include, but are not limited to, materials found in school libraries. Continuing questions over the years have been the following: (a) What library materials are appropriate for school-age children? (b) Who decides what library materials are available to students in school libraries? (c) Should materials, once selected, be removed from the library? By whom? This article examines the nature of challenges to library materials initiated by public junior, middle, and senior high school principals in the United States as reported by school librarians.

The view that a wide range of materials in school libraries is critical to student learning is well articulated in a report of the American Association of University Professors' Commission on Academic Freedom and Pre-College Education (1986). The report emphasizes its recognition that freedom in the public schools is central to the quality of what and how students learn. The report indicates that in order to accomplish the purpose of proper functioning in our free society, more freedom, not less, is needed in the classroom and the school library. It argues that students taught by teachers and librarians whose exercise of professional responsibility is nourished by independence and critical judgment in transmitting knowledge of even the most basic skills will become better citizens. The central premise of the report is that resistance to censorship in schools cannot be left only to its victims because of the broad educational implications of such actions. Restrictions on free inquiry and

learning are viewed as a major concern to educators at all levels including higher education.

Review of the Literature

It is useful before discussing the findings of the study of principals as initiators of challenges to examine the research literature in selected areas. Research and professional literature in the following areas are summarized: educational administration with an emphasis on the leadership of the principal; the role of the principal in school library program development; and the principal and school library censorship.

A detailed review of the library research literature in intellectual freedom and related research in fields of educational administration, behavioral science, and communications has been provided by Hopkins (1989, 1991b). The review that follows builds on that review, reemphasizing only those areas that are believed to be a critical basis for the study discussed in this article.

The research and professional literature review provided here is not, therefore, intended to be exhaustive. It is intended to identify major theories and accepted professional practices that are indicative of some strands of thought. For research outside librarianship in particular, major summary sources that analyze and summarize the research rather than primary sources are used.

Educational Administration and Leadership of the Principal

The research and acceptable professional practice in educational administration is discussed as summarized by Hoy and Miskel (1991), DuFour and Eaker (1992), and Lipham, Rankin, and Hoeh, Jr. (1985).

Discussions from Hoy and Miskel (1991) are based on the research of Gross and Etzioni (1985), Weber (1947), Simon (1957), Blau and Scott (1962), Commons (1924), Kotter (1978), Thomas (1976), Scott (1981), and Janis (1985). Gross and Etzioni (1985) indicate that although all social organizations control their participants, the problem of control is especially important in formal organizations. In formal organizations, members cannot be relied on to perform their obligations without additional incentives. Such incentives, through rewards and sanctions, encourage behavior consistent with organizational norms.

Power, the essence of organizational control, is seen as the ability to get others to do what you want them to do. Power may be coercive or nonthreatening through persuasion and suggestion. Weber (1947) sees authority as narrower in scope than power. Weber defines authority as "the probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) from a given source will be obeyed by a given group of persons" (p. 324). According to Weber, authority in a school typically does not involve coercion. Two criteria for authority in schools are seen as crucial in superior-subordinate relations, based on the work of Simon (1957): (a) voluntary compliance to legitimate

commands; (b) suspension of the subordinates' own criteria for decision-making and the acceptance of the organizational command. Blau and Scott (1962) add a third criterion: that authority is legitimized by a value that is held in common by the group.

Commons (1924) indicates that when administrators, teachers, and students join a school organization, they do so and agree within certain limits to follow directives that officials issue for the school. Kotter (1978) found that a large portion of any administrator's time is directed at power-oriented behavior, that is, behavior that is directed at developing or using relationships in which other people are to some degree willing to defer to others' wishes.

Hoy and Miskel (1991) indicate that power and organization politics inevitably produce conflict, and that administrators often face confrontations between individual needs and those of the organization. Administrators, therefore, spend a substantial amount of time attempting to mediate conflict. Thomas (1976) suggests five styles of conflict management. They are: avoiding, compromising, competitive, accommodating, and collaborative. The compromising, competitive, and collaborative styles are discussed. In compromising, the focus of the style is on negotiating or searching for middle ground solutions that satisfy or are acceptable to both parties. In the competitive style, a win-lose situation is created, and the administration is assertive and uses power to achieve submission. The collaborative style is assertive as well as cooperative. Integrative solutions, where everyone wins, are sought.

Scott (1981) discusses an area of conflict, that between professional expertise and autonomy and bureaucratic discipline and control. Scott notes that professionals have been taught to internalize a code of ethics, supported by colleagues, that guides their activities. On the other hand, control in bureaucratic organizations is in the hands of the authority, whose concern is to act in the best interest of the organization.

Research summaries (Hoy & Miskel, 1991) indicate that administrators spend a substantial amount of time attempting to mediate conflict. These situations probably require decision-making under stress. Using a model of conflict developed by Janis and Mann, Janis (1985) identified five basic patterns of coping with psychological stress. Those patterns are: unconflicted adherence to what has begun; unconflicted change or acceptance of most salient/popular action; defensive avoidance; hypervigilance; and vigilance, which is careful searching for information and evaluating alternatives. Janis suggests that in hypervigilance the decision-maker panics while searching frantically for a solution, seizing on a hastily contrived solution that promises immediate relief. With the exception of vigilance, these patterns of responses to stress are seen as dysfunctional and as leading to defective decisions.

Thus the research on the educational administrator suggests that there may be an expectation that the principal will be in control; that decisions that

are conflict-based are made continually; and that conflict-based decisions may produce stress and will not necessarily result in appropriate decisions.

Recent discussions of the importance of the school principal can be found in what has been termed *effective schools research*. It is summarized here through the writings of DuFour and Eaker (1992), and Hoy and Miskel (1991). DuFour and Eaker summarize the prevailing attitude of the 1960s and 1970s as being that schools made very little difference in student achievement. They credit the research of Edmonds (1979a) on school effectiveness with contributing greatly to a recognition that schools do affect the achievement of students. Hoy and Miskel (1991) also discuss Edmonds (1979b), and summarize five factors normally included in effective schools research. The first factor listed is strong leadership by the principal. Others include high teacher expectations, basic skills emphasis, orderly environment, and frequent, systematic evaluation. Although the research on effective schools and the role of principals is not without its critics, most factors relating to effective schools include a focus on the importance of the school principal.

DuFour and Eaker (1992) focus on school improvement through the principal. They stress the importance of consensus decision-making in the school's vision involving teachers, administrators, and parents. Further, they discuss what they term to be a new definition of the principalship. They examine the definition through four roles. The roles are as follows: empowerment of teachers; promoter and protector of values; instructional leader; and manager of climate. Of particular interest in this article is the principal's role as promoter and protector of values. DuFour and Eaker indicate that schools seeking excellence should base their efforts on widely understood vision and values statements. They argue that the principal's promotion and protection of these values is an essential responsibility.

DuFour and Eaker (1992) suggest that any assessment of a principal's effectiveness in communicating values should include the question, "What behavior is the principal willing to confront?" In discussing this question from the standpoint of leaders in excellent companies, it is indicated that these leaders insist that core values be observed and are willing to confront those who disregard such values.

Another perspective on the important leadership role of the principal can be found in an analysis of the principal as provided by Lipham, Rankin, and Hoeh (1985). Like DuFour and Eaker they indicate that the principal's role in reaching consensus on educational values and translating them into meaningful schoolwide goals and objectives is crucial to the success of schools. Further, they indicate that values that exist in the larger society, the local community, and the school must be ascertained and translated into specific goals, objectives, and programs with which all can identify. Thus they see an essential leadership role of the principal as helping teachers reach consensus on educational values and giving them meaning in practice. Going beyond educational values, they share the views of Thomas and Melvin (1981, cited

in Lipham et al., 1985) that even in a pluralistic society, schools have a major responsibility for shaping students' moral and ethical values. Lipham et al. indicate that the principal and staff work as "values witnesses" in demonstrating their own and the school's prevailing value orientations. "Educators, therefore, should always keep in mind their professional and personal responsibilities for teaching the core or sacred level of values to which our society subscribes" (Lipham et al., 1985, p. 14).

In a discussion on the principal's decision-making, Lipham et al. (1985) return to values. They identify three purposes that values serve. First, they serve as a perceptual screen in the awareness and screening of information. Second, they affect whether possible alternatives will be congruent with the value system of those affected by a decision. Finally, values serve as criteria against which higher-order goals are assessed and projected. The principal is thus seen as simultaneously serving as a values analyst, a values modifier, and a values witness in the process of making decisions.

Lipham et al. (1985) make a final point that is important to the focus of this article. When a principal makes a decision that is rational in terms of his or her own value system, others holding different values may find that decision indefensible or irrational. They conclude that rationality in decision-making is largely determined by the extent of similarities in values.

In summary, effective schools research summaries of factors contributing to excellence in schools usually include the strong leadership of the principal. The principal is also viewed as being important in consensus decision-making. The principal serves as promoter and protector of values and must be willing to confront those who disregard such values. Values are seen as going beyond education-based values to include values in shaping students' moral and ethical values. Educators are seen as having professional and personal responsibilities in teaching the core or sacred level of values to which society subscribes. Principals make decisions based in part on their own value system. Although rational to that principal, the decision may be viewed as irrational or indefensible to others with different values.

School Library Programs and Principals

Effective schools research has been used to establish the perceived importance of the principal in influencing excellence in schools. How important is the principal to school library programs? In *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988), the national guidelines of the American Association of School Librarians and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, the principal is seen as the primary instructional leader in the school. The principal is viewed as being responsible for communicating expectations of the library program for all staff and for assuring full participation of the school librarians on the teaching team. Thus the principal facilitates the full integration of the library program into the curriculum. The principal provides adequate resources and necessary cleri-

cal staff, supports inservice activities, and encourages relationships with other community agencies.

The librarian is seen as working under the direction of the principal. Indeed, the primary responsibility for evaluating building-level librarians is said to rest with the principal. Extensive participation of administrators as well as teachers and students is seen as being vital to the library program. The principal is vital to budget planning and development as well as facilities planning. In fact, according to the national guidelines, the principal is involved in every important aspect of the library program.

In *Administering the School Library Media Center* (Morris, 1992), a textbook for prospective school librarians, the importance of the principal and the commonalities shared by the principal and the school librarian are stressed. Both are said to have a broad view of the school's instructional program. Both are required to deal effectively with the entire faculty and staff on a daily basis. A cooperative partnership is encouraged between the principal and the school librarian. Through it the librarian is said to gain administrative and financial support for the school library program. Principals and librarians are viewed as needing each other to accomplish their shared goals and to build partnerships with teachers. Communication with the principal is viewed as crucial if the library program is to flourish.

In summary, the school principal is viewed as a critical link to the success of the library program and the link between the librarian and the teaching team. The principal needs to participate in all aspects of the library program. Although the relationship of the principal and librarian may be encouraged as that of a cooperative partnership, the school librarian works under the direction of the principal and is primarily evaluated by the principal.

The Principal and Censorship

The well-known Fiske study (1959) of book selection, challenges, and censorship that focused on selected California school and public libraries in the 1950s is considered the most influential research on intellectual freedom in United States libraries (Serebnick, 1979). Studies by Fiske (1959), Farley (1964), and Busha (1972) all include a focus on the influence of the administrator in the challenge. Fiske (1959) found that school librarians tended to reflect their supervisor's attitude; and that because of feelings of isolation and second class citizenship, school librarians were likely to be highly susceptible to the influence of their administrators. Farley (1964) too, in a study of precensorship, circulation, and use of books in senior high schools in Nassau County, New York, found librarians subject to the demands of the school principal. Busha's study (1972) of midwestern public librarians in the US found a positive relationship between the librarians' agreement to or acceptance of authoritarian beliefs and their agreement to restrictive measures in the library.

Attention to the role of the principal and censorship is also provided in two recent Canadian studies. In a study of school librarians in public and private schools, Jenkinson (1985) found that complaints initiated by principals resulted in removal 83% of the time, restriction 13% of the time, and retention 4% of the time. In a study of school principals in public and private schools, Rainey (1989) reported that 53% of principals believed they should have the authority to unilaterally remove materials from the school library; 68% believed that a school library collection with materials recognized as good could occasionally include objectionable language. Finally, 53% believed it acceptable to shelve materials where access would be restricted as an alternative to the permanent removal of materials from the school library collection. Rainey also summarized an investigation by Poole (1986, cited in Rainey, 1989). Poole found that, in most cases, principals made judgments on content rather than on educational bases such as appropriateness, reading level, and comprehension.

An article from the journal of the National Association of Secondary School Principals focuses on precautions principals can take to avert censorship protests (Lee, 1988). Lee, a professor of education, indicates that much modern literature is salacious and trashy. She suggests that students need values about faith, hope, and confidence in the present and the future, and that these values need to be found in assigned reading as well as library books. Lee indicates that the ethical and practical stance of principals in a dispute includes working for consensus before, during, and after a controversy. She stresses that principals can help all involved learn that there is a time for compromise. Thus Lee focuses on the support of common values and the need for consensus building and compromise in dealing with censorship challenges.

In summary, this literature review suggests that principals can have a profound impact on the outcome to challenges to materials. Challenges initiated by principals may be likely to result in removal of materials. Principals may believe that they have the authority to unilaterally remove materials, although restrictions of materials may be an acceptable alternative. The reason for the challenge may be similar to reasons given by other challengers, rather than educationally based. The principal can find written support for the belief that there is a need to influence students' personal values as well as the need for consensus building and compromise when challenges to material arise.

Discussion of the Literature Review

The literature review includes the repeated use of two terms: *value(s)*, and *consensus* or *compromise*.

The word *value(s)* is used in the following ways:

- as a critical criterion in maintaining successful authority over subordinates;

- as a part of the new definition of the role of the principal as a promoter and protector of values for schools seeking excellence;
- as an important basis for confrontation with those who disregard the values believed to be important;
- as an important basis of consensus for meaningful schoolwide goals and objectives;
- as a basis for the development of specific goals, objectives, and programs with which all can identify when values for the larger society, the local community, and the school are examined;
- as important in shaping students' moral and ethical development;
- as the basis for the principal's decision-making, even when others with different value systems find the decisions indefensible or irrational;
- as important in assigned reading as well as library books for the development of faith, hope, and confidence in the present and future.

Thus value(s) discussions have reflected educationally based values as well as personally based values held by the principal.

A second term found in the literature review is *consensus* or *compromise*. The term is used in the following ways:

- as one of five possible responses of a principal to conflict (compromise);
- as a critical factor in the full acceptance of the school's vision by teachers, administrators, and parents (consensus);
- as crucial to the success of schools in adopting educational values and translating them into meaningful schoolwide goals and objectives (consensus);
- as a useful ethical and practical stance before, during, and after a controversy (consensus).

The literature on the librarian or on the subordinate to the principal suggests that within limits, teachers and others expect to follow directives. The librarian retains attributes of both the principal and teachers. It suggests that the principal is critical to the school library program and that communication between the principal and the librarian is vital. Literature suggests that, as the primary evaluator of the librarian, the principal may influence the actions of the librarian. Finally, it suggests that a conflict may exist between bureaucratic discipline and control, and the education and code of ethics supported by the profession.

What, then, does this review of the literature suggest about the outcome of challenges to library materials that have been initiated by the principal? Research suggests that the influence and power of the principal is likely to be a factor in influencing the outcome of challenges. It suggests that the principal may have the expectation that his or her directives will be followed. Yet the emphasis in the literature on compromise or consensus suggests that a compromise, such as restriction of material, may be an acceptable alternative

to the complete removal of material. Research suggests that personal values are likely to play a role as a basis of the challenge and that the principal may feel justified in initiating a challenge that she or he believes is congruent with society's norms.

Research suggests that, for the school librarian, the challenge may be in conflict with the teachings of the library profession including its code of ethics or, in the case of United States librarians, its Library Bill of Rights. However, the school librarian is likely to view the principal as critical to the success of the library program and is likely to accept directives of the principal. The principal is also the primary evaluator of the librarian. Thus, although the librarian is striving to have a collaborative relationship with the principal, it is likely that the librarian may be less likely actively and vigorously to support intellectual freedom and challenged materials when a principal suggests or demands otherwise.

Introduction to the Study

A study of challenges to library materials in US public middle, junior, and senior high schools was conducted in spring 1990. The study was conducted in two parts. Part one consisted of a proportionate, stratified random sample of 6,557 schools in grades 7 or higher from each state of the United States. Through the use of a one-page questionnaire, schools with library challenges between 1986-1989 were identified. There were responses from 72% of those receiving the questionnaire, with 35.9% of 1,661 librarians reporting one or more challenges.

In part two of the study, those indicating challenges received a second questionnaire asking about the most recent resolved challenge occurring between September 1987 and spring 1990. Of the 1,171 or 70% who responded, 739 reported challenges, and of this group, 606 indicated that challenges resulted in retention, restriction, or removal of the challenged materials.

The study examined the question, "What factors influence whether challenged library material is retained, restricted, or removed?" Overall, six factors were found to influence the outcome of challenges to school library materials:

- the existence of a school board-approved district materials selection policy and the degree to which it was used when library materials were challenged;
- the school environment, including the influence and power of the school principal and the support of classroom teachers;
- the community environment, through support received from outside the school district in which a challenge occurred;
- the initiator of the challenge;
- particular characteristics of the librarian, including gross degrees of dogmatism and internal/external locus of control;

- complaint background, including whether there was active support for retention or removal of materials, and whether the challenge was oral or written (Hopkins, 1991b).

The study yielded much useful information that has been reported in the research and professional literature (Hopkins, 1991a, 1991b, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c, 1993a, 1993b). The rich data also provided opportunities to examine particular aspects of the data more carefully. One of these aspects relates to the school principal, particularly from the standpoint of the principal as the initiator of challenges. The primary questions addressed in this analysis are as follows:

1. What are the characteristics of challenges initiated by principals?
2. Do challenges initiated by the school principal differ from those of others challenging the appropriateness of school library materials? In what ways?
3. What factors influence whether challenged material is retained, restricted, or removed?

Summary of Relevant Findings

The overall study focused on the surveys of 739 librarians who reported challenges to materials occurring in one or more years between 1987 and 1990. The overall findings indicated that the role of the principal was important in influencing the outcome of challenges.

The principal was viewed as a source of support when materials were challenged. The support of the principal made a difference in whether material was retained, restricted, or removed. Challenges were more likely to result in retention and less likely to result in removal or restriction when principals were viewed by the librarian as supportive. In addition, principals were listed overwhelmingly most frequently as the person from whom assistance was received when a challenge occurred.

However, principals were themselves a cause for concern. Although the majority (76%) of responding librarians indicated that they felt little or no pressure in the selection of materials, those that did feel pressure listed the principal second only to parents as a source of pressure.

In the logit regression statistical analysis performed to identify those factors making the greatest difference to the outcome to challenges, two factors were especially relevant. There was a greater probability of nonretention, that is, restriction or removal, when the principal was the challenge initiator. There was a greater probability of nonretention when the librarian showed a tendency to follow the principal's directives without question.

In some instances, the principal was said to be the actual initiator of a challenge to material in the school library. About 7% (47 respondents) named the principal as the initiator of the challenge.

Challenges initiated by the principal were more likely to result in restriction or removal than in retention. Of the 47 challenges, 37 resulted in reten-

tion, restriction, or removal, whereas 10 challenges resulted in other action such as transfer to another school. Of the 37 challenges, nine (24.3%) resulted in retention, 13 (35.1%) resulted in restriction, and 15 (40.5%) resulted in removal. Overall, 75.6% of challenges initiated by principals resulted in restriction or removal. This compares with an overall result for all other challenges of 308 or 54.3% of materials retained, 117 or 20.6% of materials restricted, and 142 or 25% of materials removed (χ^2 (2, N=604), p<.05).

These results pointed to the need to examine challenges initiated by principals more closely.

Characteristics of Challenges Initiated by Principals

The characteristics of challenges initiated by principals are provided below. Where these characteristics differ at the p<.05 level of significance from other challenges, results of a chi square or analysis of variance are provided.

Oral Challenges

Challenges initiated by principals were oral challenges. Of 47 challenges, 44 (93.6%) were oral, whereas only three (6.4%) were oral initially and later submitted in writing. These three written challenges resulted in one retention and one restriction (the third challenge had not yet been resolved at the time of the study).

For challenges initiated by persons other than principals, of 672 responses, oral challenges accounted for 479 or 72.8% of challenges. There was a statistically significant difference in the number of oral challenges initiated by principals in comparison with those of all other challengers (χ^2 (2, N=719), p<.05).

Reasons for Complaints

An examination of reasons cited for challenges from principals shows a similarity to those cited for other challengers. In fact the first three reasons were the same. Principals were cited as challenging materials for the following reasons: sexuality (21); obscenity (12); profanity (11); nudity (8); immaturity of users (7); human reproduction (6); morality (6); pornography (5); homosexuality (4); occult (4); and witchcraft (4). Principals were more likely to suggest pornography as a reason than other complainants (χ^2 (1, N=718), p<.05).

For all other challenges initiated by persons other than principals, primary reasons cited were: sexuality (220); profanity (202); obscenity (161); morality (137); witchcraft (86); family values (74); other (72); nudity (68); occult (68); and violence (64).

Thus reasons for complaints from principals differed little from those of all other challengers.

Information Media

Information media were not aware of challenges initiated by principals. Of 45 responses to whether local information media were aware of the chal-

lenge, one (2.2%) responded that media·were fully aware, whereas 44 (97.8%) responded that local media knew nothing of the challenge. This finding is similar to that for challenges initiated by persons other than principals. Of 654 responses, 616 (94.2%) indicated that information media had no knowledge of the complaint. In the one instance in which the media were fully aware of the principal's challenge, the challenged material was retained.

Use of Policy During Complaint
The selection policy was used less fully when principals initiated challenges. Of 41 respondents with a selection policy who answered this question, more than half (i.e., 27 or 65.9%) indicated that the policy was not used at all, whereas only three (7.3%) indicated that the policy was used fully. For all other respondents (610), 213 (34.9%) indicated the policy was not used at all and 162 (26.6%) indicated that the policy was used fully (see Table 1).

What Was Challenged
Principals' challenges to materials differed somewhat from those of others. In terms of types of materials challenged by principals, fiction books were checked 20 times; nonfiction books were checked 15 times; magazines were checked 16 times; and a video once. Magazines named were indicated only once, except *Sports Illustrated*, which was mentioned four times, and *Rolling Stone*, mentioned three times.

For all other respondents, most materials challenged were books, with fiction books checked 447 times, and nonfiction books checked 220 times. Magazines were checked 73 times; films/videos were checked 29 times; "other" checked nine times; other audiovisual materials checked seven times; newspapers were checked three times.

Principals were more likely to challenge magazines than all others (χ^2 (1, N=722), p<.05). Initiators other than principals were statistically more likely to challenge fiction books (χ^2 (1, N = 722), p<.05).

Support of Teachers
Librarians indicated generally that where teachers were aware of challenges to materials by principals, they were supportive. However, fewer than half or only 19 of the respondents answered this question out of a possible 47. An additional 18 respondents indicated that teachers were not aware of the challenges. Ten respondents left this question blank. For all other challengers, teachers were generally viewed as supportive.

Relationship with the Principal
Not surprisingly, the relationship of the librarian with the principal during the challenge period was seldom one of partnership. Of 43 respondents to this question, nearly half, 19 (44.2%), indicated that the principal was not supportive, yet 11 (25.6%) described the level of support to be that of a partnership role (see Table 2).

Size of School District
Although school districts of all sizes were reported as having challenges initiated by principals, small school districts with enrollments between 500 and 999 were more likely to have challenges initiated by principals than others (χ^2 (4, $N = 726$), $p<.05$).

Pressure from Administrators
Librarians in schools where complaints had been initiated by principals were less likely to indicate that they felt no pressure in the selection of library materials. They were also more likely than librarians with challenges from others to list the district administrator (χ^2 (1, $N=713$), $p<.05$) or the principal (χ^2 (1, $N = 713$), $p<.05$) as a source of pressure (see Table 3).

Internal Assistance Not Sought or Received
Librarians with challenges initiated by principals were less likely to seek assistance within the school or district than librarians who had challenges initiated by any others (see Table 4).

Librarians were less likely to receive assistance within the school or district when challenges were initiated by principals than when others initiated challenges. Twenty-eight (59.6%) of 47 respondents indicated that no assistance was received. This compares with 189 (27.8%) of other respondents who reported no assistance when challenges were initiated by others (χ^2 (1, $N=726$), $p<.05$).

Thus librarians dealing with challenges from principals were less likely to seek or receive assistance within the school or district during the challenge process.

Little Support for Retention
When principals initiated challenges, there was less active support for retention than when others initiated challenges. Librarians were more likely to indicate that there was support for retention when someone other than the principal initiated the challenge. Because the librarian sought or received little support, and because fewer people were even aware that a challenge had occurred, the possibility of active support for retaining material was remote (see Table 5).

Statements About Challenges and Environment
Part of the questionnaire related to perspectives of the school librarian in terms of professional experience as well as perceptions about the school, community, and national environment. Respondents were asked to respond to 36 statements using a scale of 1-6, where one was "strongly disagree" and six was "strongly agree." The factors included in this section were district materials selection policy, characteristics of the school librarian, school environment, and community environment. Within characteristics of the librarian, psychological measures were included that related to the areas of locus of control, dogmatism, and self-esteem.

Although librarians with challenges initiated by principals were in general agreement with other statements in the section, they differed in statistically significant ways on statements related particularly to school environment. Although they tended to agree overall with the statements, librarians with principals reported as initiating challenges were less likely to agree in four areas. There was less agreement that library materials were more likely to be retained when the principal and faculty worked well together, and that teachers would be more supportive where school librarians worked well with the faculty on a day-to-day basis. There was also less agreement on statements involving the principal. Librarians with principals reported as initiating challenges were less likely to agree that principals would be supportive during a challenge when the librarian worked well with the principal on a day-to-day basis, and less likely to agree that the principal was critical in the retention of challenged material (see Table 6).

In summary, challenges initiated by principals differed in several ways from challenges initiated by other people. Challenges were overwhelmingly oral, and the materials selection policy was less likely to be used. Teachers were less likely to be aware that the principal had initiated a challenge. In addition, the librarian was more likely to report that relationships with the principal during the challenge period were less supportive. Librarians were also more likely to report feeling under pressure from the principal or the district administrator in selection; and support from others in the school or district was less likely to be sought or received. Thus there was less active support for retention when principals initiated challenges. These librarians also differed from other respondents in their agreement on statements about school relationships and their influence on challenge outcomes.

The reasons given for challenges initiated by principals were similar to those of other challengers. Local information media were also not likely to be aware of the challenge. Finally, although the types of materials challenged were similar, principals were more likely to challenge magazines, whereas others were more likely to challenge fiction books.

Outcomes

Most challenges to school library materials are resolved in one of three ways, that is, retained, restricted, or removed. These outcomes were examined more closely in challenges initiated by principals. Of the 47 respondents, 37 indicated that the outcome was retention, restriction, or removal. Analysis of variance statistical tests were performed on the responses. In most instances, statistical significance was not found. Where statistical significance was found, Scheffe tests were used to determine which of the groups was statistically different. Statistically significant differences are discussed below.

Assistance Sought Within the School or District
One of the characteristics of challenges initiated by principals was that assistance from within the school or district was less likely to be sought. A

one-way analysis of variance found that those librarians who sought assistance, within the district were most likely to have material restricted (see Table 7).

Assistance Sought Outside the District
Respondents indicated that very little assistance was sought outside the district when the principal challenged material. Of 36 respondents to this question, 31 (86.1%) said no assistance was sought, whereas only two (5.6%) indicated that quite a bit of assistance was sought.

A one-way analysis of variance found that those who indicated most strongly that they sought assistance outside the district were most likely to have retained the challenged material (see Table 8).

Active Support for Retention
Respondents indicated that in many instances there was no active support for the retention of material challenged by the principal. Of 22 respondents, nine (40.9%) indicated no active support for retention, whereas only three (13.6%) indicated a high level of support for retention. Of these three, two reported restriction of the material and one reported removal.

A one-way analysis of variance found that those who indicated the most active support for retention were more likely to have challenged materials either retained or restricted (see Table 9).

Perspectives of the Librarian
The part of the questionnaire related to perspectives of the school librarian in terms of professional experience as well as perceptions about the school, community, and national environment was also examined. These perspectives were examined in terms of the outcome to challenges initiated by principals as reported by librarians. A few statements showed statistical significance based on complaint outcome at the $p>.05$ level and are discussed here.

There was overall agreement with the statement that school librarians who work well with faculty members on a day-to-day basis would find teachers supportive during a challenge. Those who reported material restricted agreed most, followed by those with material retained. There was also overall agreement with the statements that a materials selection policy is effective in dealing with library material complaints. Those who reported material restricted showed the greatest agreement, followed by those with material retained. A locus of control statement on the role of chance or luck in one's life found general agreement from those whose challenges resulted in retention or removal, and greatest disagreement from those who reported challenges resulted in restriction (see Table 10).

In summary, those seeking the greatest level of support within the school or district were more likely to report materials restricted. Those seeking the greatest level of assistance outside the district were more likely to report

materials retained. Those indicating some active level of support for retention from any source reported materials retained or restricted.

In terms of perspectives of librarians, there were few differences in the responses of librarians dealing with challenges to materials that were initiated by principals. Yet differences found should be noted. Those who showed greatest agreement on the value of teacher support had materials restricted or retained (in that order). Those who showed greatest agreement on the value of materials selection policies had materials restricted or retained (in that order). Those who were most likely to disagree with a statement supporting internal locus of control had material restricted.

Discussion

The discussion of research relating to the educational administrator demonstrated that the administrator engages in decision-making that may be conflict-based. The decision to challenge orally the appropriateness of library material and seek the removal of the material may be an example of a conflict-based decision. That request may be in conflict with the librarian's professional code of ethics. The librarian may be torn in deciding how to respond, particularly because the librarian recognizes the critical role played by the principal in the success of the library program. The literature review suggests that the librarian may be less likely to actively and vigorously support intellectual freedom and challenged materials when the school principal initiates the challenge. The literature suggests that the principal might also draw on personal values as a basis for complaints and that a style of consensus-building or compromise might be employed in the resolution of the challenge.

In the study, reasons cited by librarians as the basis for challenges initiated by principals were the same as those cited as the basis for challenges from others. Challenges from principals appear to be based on personal values, although it could be argued that challenges made for reasons of sexuality, obscenity, and profanity may be educationally based. Challenges from principals did not differ substantially from those made by others, the majority of whom were outside the school environment. This finding supports the study of Poole (1986) that reported that principals were more likely to base judgment on the material's content rather than educational bases.

The responses of the librarians in the study support the suggestion, based on the research literature, that the librarian might be less likely actively and vigorously to support intellectual freedom and challenged materials if the principal initiates the challenge. Fiske (1959) found librarians susceptible to the influence and demands of principals. The librarian appeared to be more alone than with other challenges. The supportive relationship with the principal, normally important in the retention of materials, is obviously lacking. Internal support is less likely to be sought or received. Thus teachers, although usually supportive, are often unaware of the challenge. Outside

support is also less likely to be sought or received. Thus information media and community usually have no opportunity to respond to the challenge.

The response in the findings of restriction under certain circumstances is worthy of note. Active support for retention resulted in retention or restriction. Greatest assistance sought within the district resulted in restriction. Highest agreement on selected perspective questions varied between restriction and retention. These findings suggest that restriction of materials takes on a greater emphasis when challenges are initiated by principals. An examination of the literature relating to principals' professional practice shows that this is not surprising. Removal of challenged material is likely to be the principal's desired outcome. However, because of a day-to-day administrative emphasis on consensus and compromise, restriction of materials may be viewed as a "victory of sorts" for both the principal and the librarian. The research summaries of Hoy and Miskel (1991) and DuFour and Eaker (1992) discuss compromise and consensus-building. For the principal, the questionable material is less accessible. For the librarian, the questioned material has not been removed. Standing up for material, even with the result being restriction, probably requires great strengths. Doob's summary of research on power and authority (1983) suggests that where the principal exhibits a strong viewpoint in whatever direction, the librarian who dissents is required to have strengths, among them self-confidence and self-control.

Finally, an examination of the factors influencing the outcome of materials points to one important area: support. Support of the librarian from within the district, support of the librarian from outside the district, and support for the retention of materials is vital in increasing the likelihood of retention of materials.

The results of this analysis characterize challenges from principals as oral and being dealt with outside provisions of the materials selection policy and less known to teachers and community members. Challenges from principals are less likely to be met with support for retention. Clearly more research focusing on library material challenges initiated by principals is warranted.

References

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (1988). *Information power: Guidelines for school library media programs.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Blau, P.M., & Scott, W.R. (1962). *Formal organizations: A comparative approach.* San Francisco, CA: Chandler.

Busha, C.H. (1972). *Freedom versus suppression and censorship: With a study of attitudes of midwestern public librarians and a bibliography of censorship.* Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Commission on Academic Freedom and Pre-College Education. (1986). *Liberty and learning in the schools: Higher education's concerns.* Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.

Commons, J.R. (1924). *Legal foundations of capitalism.* New York: Macmillan.

Doob, L.W. (1983). *Personality, power, and authority: A behavioral science review.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1992). *Creating the new American school*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Edmonds, R. (1979a). Some schools work and more can. *Social Policy, 9*(5), 28-32.

Edmonds, R. (1979b). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 38*(1), 15-18, 20-24.

Farley, J.J. (1964). *Book censorship in the senior high school libraries in Nassau County, New York*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.

Fiske, M. (1959) *Book selection and censorship*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gross, E., & Etzioni, A. (1985). *Organizations in society*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hopkins, D.M. (1989). Toward a conceptual model of factors influencing the outcome of challenges to library materials in school settings. *Library and Information Science Research, 11*(3) 247-71.

Hopkins, D.M. (1991a). Challenges to materials in secondary school library media centers: Results of a national study. *Journal of Youth Services, 4*(2), 131-140.

Hopkins, D.M. (1991b). *Factors influencing the outcome of challenges to materials in secondary school libraries: Report of a national study*. Prepared under Grant #R039A9004-89, US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Library Programs. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, School of Library and Information Studies.

Hopkins, D.M. (1992a). Perspectives of secondary library media specialists about material challenges. *School Library Media Quarterly, 21*(1), 15-24.

Hopkins, D.M. (1992b). School library media centers and intellectual freedom. In *Intellectual Freedom Manual* (pp. 155-161). Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Hopkins, D.M. (1992c). Why school book challenges succeed or fail. *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom, XLI*(1), pp. 1, 19-20.

Hopkins, D.M. (1993a). A conceptual model of factors influencing the outcome of challenges to library materials in secondary school settings. *Library Quarterly, 63*(1), 40-72.

Hopkins, D.M. (1993b). Put it in writing: What you should know about challenges to school library materials. *School Library Journal, 39*(1), 26-30.

Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Janis, I.L. (1985). Sources of error in strategic decision making. In J.M. Pennings & Associates (Eds.), *Organizational strategy and change* (pp. 157-197). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jenkinson, D. (1985). The censorship iceberg: The results of a survey of challenges in school and public libraries. *School Libraries in Canada, 6*(1), 19-30.

Kotter, J.P. (1978). *Organizational dynamics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Lee, H. (1988). Precautions principals can take to avert censorship protests. *NASSP Bulletin, 72*(508), 70-75.

Lipham, J.M., Rankin, R.E., & Hoeh, J.A., Jr. (1985). *The principalship: Concepts, competencies, and cases*. New York: Longman.

Morris, B.J. (1992). *Administering the school library media center* (3rd ed.). New Providence, NJ: Bowker.

Poole, D. (1986). *Veiled knowledge: Censorship in the public schools of British Columbia*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of British Columbia.

Rainey, M.D. (1989). A study of the role of school administrators in the censorship of school library materials. *School Libraries in Canada, 10*(1) 16, 18-21, 23-24.

Scott, W.R. (1981). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Serebnick, J. (1979). A review of research related to censorship in libraries. *Library Research* (now *Library and Information Science Research*) 1, 95-118.

Simon, H.A. (1957). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organization*. New York: Macmillan.

Thomas, K. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 889-936). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Thomas, M.D., & Melvin, A.I. (1981). Community consensus is available on a moral valuing standard. *Phi Delta Kappan, 62,* 479-482.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations* (T. Parsons, Ed.). New York: Free Press.

Table 1
Analysis of Variance: Use of Policy

	N	Mean*	SD
Principal	41	2.0976	1.7579
All others	610	3.2508	2.0776
Total	651	3.1782	2.0767

$F(1, 649)$, $p<.05$.
*Scale of 1-6 where 1 = not used at all and 6 = used fully.

Table 2
Analysis of Variance: Librarians's Relationship With Principal

	N	Mean*	SD
Principal	43	2.9535	2.1376
All Others	603	4.9535	1.7134
Total	646	4.5139	1.7920

$F(1, 644)$, $p<.05$.
*Scale of 1-6 where 1 = not supportive and 6 = partnership role.

Table 3
Analysis of Variance: Pressure in Selection of Materials

	N	Mean*	SD
Principal	47	2.3830	.9902
All Others	671	2.0224	1.0429
Total	718	2.0460	1.0427

$F(1, 716)$, $p<.05$.
*Scale of 1-6 where 1 = no pressure and 6 = extreme pressure.

Table 4
Analysis of Variance: Internal Assistance Sought

	N	Mean*	SD
Principal	46	1.8696	1.5436
All Others	656	2.6372	1.8721
Total	702	2.5869	1.8612

$F(1, 700)$, $p < .05$.
*Scale of 1-6 where 1 = no assistance sought 6 = much assistance sought.

Table 5
Analysis of Variance: Support for Retention

	N	Mean*	SD
Principal	30	2.5333	1.6344
All Others	427	3.4215	2.1108
Total	457	3.3632	2.0931

$F = (1, 455)$, $p < .05$.
*Scale of 1-6 where 1 = no support for retention and 6 = high level of support for retention.

Table 6
Perspective Statements: Analysis of Variance

Statement	Initiator	Mean	SD	Total
42. When a principal and faculty work well together, you can expect library media center materials to be returned when a challenge occurs $F(1,718)$, $p < .05$	Principal All others	4.0426 4.7548	1.5030 1.2762	47
43. Library media specialists who work well with faculty members on a day-to-day basis will find teachers supportive when LMC material is challenged. $F(1,722)$, $p < .05$	Principal All others	4.7872 5.1595	1.0822 1.0354	47 677
60. Library media specialists who work well with the principal on a day-to-day basis will find the principal supportive when LMC material is challenged. $F(1,716)$, $p < .05$	Principal All others	4.3191 4.9896	1.0654 1.0687	47 671
72. The support of the principal is critical in the retention of challenged LMC material. $F(1,715)$, $p < .05$	Principal All others	4.7872 5.1164	1.2672 1.0366	47 670

Table 7
Analysis of Variance:
Assistance Sought Within School or District

	N	Mean*	SD
Retain	9	1.8889	1.7638
Restrict	12	2.9167	1.9752
Remove	15	1.0000	.0000
Total	36	1.8611	1.6240

$F(2, 33)$, $p<.05$.
*Scale of 1-6 where 1 = no assistance sought and 6 = much assistance sought.

Table 8
Analysis of Variance:
Assistance Sought Outside District

	N	Mean*	SD
Retain	9	2.3333	2.0616
Restrict	12	1.2500	.8660
Remove	15	1.0667	.2582
Total	36	1.4444	1.2293

$F(2, 33)$, $p<.05$.
*Scale of 1-6 where 1 = no assistance sought and 6 = much assistance sought.

Table 9
Analysis of Variance: Active Support for Retention

	N	Mean*	SD
Retain	6	3.5000	1.6432
Restrict	8	3.5000	1.4142
Remove	8	1.2500	.7071
Total	22	2.6818	1.6442

$F(2, 19)$, $p<.05$.
*Scale of 1-6 where 1 = no support for retention and 6 = much support for retention.

Table 10
Perspective Statements: Analysis of Variance

Statement	Outcome	Mean	SD	Total
43. Library media specialists who work well with faculty members on a day-to-day basis will find teachers supportive when LMC material is challenged. $F(2,34)$, $p<.05$	Retain Restrict Remove	4.8889 5.1538 4.1333	.9280 1.0682 1.1255	9 13 15
51. A materials selection policy is effective in dealing with LMC complaints. $F(2,33)$, $p<.05$	Retain Restrict Remove	5.1251 5.3846 4.3333	.9910 .8697 1.1751	8 13 15
76. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life. $F(2,33)$, $p<.05$	Retain Restrict Remove	4.0000 2.4167 3.6000	.5000 1.3790 1.4041	9 12 15