



Volume 57 | Issue 1

Article 5

2014

Christian Librarians and the Library Bill of Rights: A Survey of Opinions and Professional Practice

Scott Kaihoi
Bethel University

The Christian Librarian is the official publication of the Association of Christian Librarians (ACL). To learn more about ACL and its products and services please visit <http://www.acl.org/>

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/tcl>

 Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kaihoi, Scott (2014) "Christian Librarians and the Library Bill of Rights: A Survey of Opinions and Professional Practice," *The Christian Librarian*: Vol. 57 : Iss. 1 , Article 5.
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/tcl/vol57/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Christian Librarian by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolf@georgefox.edu.

Christian Librarians and the Library Bill of Rights:

A Survey of Opinions and Professional Practice



Scott Kaihoi, Library Specialist
Bethel University

ABSTRACT

This study used a survey methodology to discover how Christian librarians working in academic libraries responded to the American Library Association's (ALA) ethical standards as embodied in the Library Bill of Rights (LBR). The results showed that while the Christian librarians surveyed largely support the LBR and adhere to it professionally, their interpretation of its sometimes ambiguous language is made through the lens of a Christian worldview and can conflict with the ALA's interpretation. Of particular concern to the respondents were issues of collection development and access to content like pornography, violence, or other similar material that conflicts with Christian morality.

Introduction

The American Library Association (ALA) operates from a set of ethical presuppositions rooted in humanism and subjectivism, and puts a special emphasis on equal representation of and access to all information regardless of any individual's personal views or objections to certain content. These ethical presuppositions can be readily seen in the stances the ALA takes on issues like censorship and access, and they undergird its official documents (e.g., the Library Bill of Rights and Code of Ethics).

However, individual librarians sometimes hold to worldviews with ethical presuppositions that can come into conflict with those of the ALA. The Christian faith is one such worldview in that it is objectivist with a belief in absolute truth rooted in the character of God and the teachings of the Bible. The differences between the objectivist worldview presented by Christianity and the subjectivist worldview commonly promoted by the ALA can lead to tension for Christian librarians in situations in which the value and appropriateness of content must be judged. For the Christian, the fact that truth and morality are rooted in God's character provides an objective way to judge between good and evil, valuable and worthless, decent and

vulgar, and potentially an obligation to make such judgments in certain situations. This is in contrast to the worldview of the ALA according to which no one ought to judge the standards or truths of another.

Research Problem

Given this potential for conflict, this study was designed to discover how Christian librarians, especially those working in libraries at Christian universities in the United States, think about and respond to the Library Bill of Rights (LBR), and in particular: (a) the extent to which Christian librarians agree with the LBR either in part or on the whole, (b) whether their agreement or disagreement with the LBR affects how they make professional decisions, and (c) if they believe that Christian librarians working in public libraries ought to follow the ethics of their faith or of the LBR when there is a perceived conflict between the two.

An immediate question that may occur to the reader is why the Library Bill of Rights was chosen for this purpose since it is most often seen as having been written for publicly-funded libraries. This is a fair question. There are a number of documents that could have been selected to engage with Christian librarians on the ALA's ethics, including the ALA's Code of Ethics, but the Library Bill of Rights was selected for its history, its brevity, and most of all because of its implicit claim as a "Bill of Rights" to be a set of basic and self-evident ethical truths that run deeper than a commitment to agreed upon ethical standards adopted by a professional organization. While the ALA's Code of Ethics embodies an agreed upon set of norms for librarians, the LBR seems to go further, basing its statements on what its authors clearly perceived to be basic truths. There is much discussion about this both in and out of Christian circles, but it is the Christian librarian's interpretation and response that is of particular interest here since in it can be seen the Christian response to some of the ethical presuppositions of the ALA.

Literature Review

There have been many critiques and defenses of the ethical presuppositions underlying the LBR since its adoption in 1939. A comprehensive summary of them will not be undertaken here, though it is worth noting that the conflicts with the Christian worldview are by no means the only basis for critiques of the LBR. The summer issue of *Library Trends* from 1996 focused on the LBR, and the bibliography by Schladweiler that appears in that issue is extremely useful for getting a good sense of what was published in the United States in the last half of the twentieth century on this subject (Schladweiler, 1996).

In addition to the bibliography, a critique by Baldwin (1996) in the same issue of *Library Trends* offers an excellent discussion of the LBR's often-discussed legal issues, often seen as one of the document's major shortcomings. Baldwin notes that the LBR is a vague, ambiguous document that makes promises and asserts rights that it cannot defend either legally or philosophically (p. 7). Specific examples he discusses include the requirement that libraries should contain material from "all points of view," which he recognizes as both impossible and impractical, a prohibition against discrimination based on age that is not constitutionally defensible, and an unrealistically broad call to oppose censorship that is neither completely in line with the First Amendment nor practical to try and carry out (pp. 18-27).

In the same issue of *Library Trends*, Wiegand (1996) agrees with Baldwin's legal assessment and builds on it by suggesting that the LBR may be trying to do a bit more than a single document can do. It attempts to be both a statement of patrons' legal rights as they relate to libraries, as well as a professional code of ethics to which librarians can look for guidance in making professional decisions. In attempting to be both, the LBR fails to do a good enough job at being either, and the ambiguity and grandiose promises in it are a result of the fusion. Wiegand suggests that if it were split into two documents, a statement of rights that actually conforms to U.S. law, and a statement of philosophy that reflects the ethics of the ALA, it might better accomplish what it sets out to do (p. 75).

For the Christian librarian, most of the critiques of the LBR's ambiguity and lack of legal grounding are consistent with the views summarized above. However, the disagreement on ethical grounds is substantially different and focuses mainly on how the basic epistemological and ethical presuppositions of Christianity necessitate a distinctly Christian answer to the LBR. J. Ray Doerksen's (1999) critique of the LBR from a Christian perspective is a representative example of this, and in it Doerksen calls Christian librarians to reject one of the basic tenants of the LBR: that freedom and personal autonomy are the most important rights librarians are in charge of protecting. He states "The assumptions beneath the Library Bill of Rights have no validity beyond the opinions or biases of the people advocating those rights," and the ALA's humanistic elevation of "personal autonomy" to the chief value on which a librarian's ethics ought to be based is something a Christian librarian cannot accept (p.15). He asserts that truth and using freedom to do right is far more important than freedom itself, and that Christian librarians should make sure their priorities are in a proper order, possibly sacrificing freedom in situations where truth and the responsibility to do right supersede it.

These sentiments are echoed in much of the literature on the subject written by Christians, of which Smith (2002b) has compiled a useful and concise summary in writing about the philosophy of Christian librarianship (pp. 71-72). Smith's

summary shows Christians offering an objectivist Christian perspective on issues like censorship, intellectual freedom, collection development, values in children's literature, and access rights. *Christian Librarianship*, the collection in which Smith's article appears, contains additional articles and an extensive bibliography that are useful for covering these topics in more depth (Smith, 2002b).

What emerges when looking at these articles together is that while Christian librarians may differ on the exact practical implications of a Christian worldview on librarianship, those who write on the subject seem largely to be in agreement with Doerksen: Christianity's ethical presuppositions necessitate at least some practical differences between Christian librarianship and the vision of librarianship the ALA promotes, even when Christians are working in a public library setting. What is unclear from this literature is the extent to which Christian librarians whose opinions are not in print tend to agree or disagree with the interpretation of Christian librarianship represented in collections like *Christian Librarianship*. The majority of Christian librarians' opinions are not published, and there is very little research on whether these unpublished opinions match up with the published ones.

The only research on the subject this author could find was a twenty-year-old study by Craighton Hippenhammer (1993) that touches on the ethics of the LBR while focusing on Christian college librarians' opinions on questions of censorship and intellectual freedom in Christian college libraries. Hippenhammer surveyed 122 librarians at Christian institutions of higher learning and found that 45.3% supported the LBR fully, with another 46.5% that supported it in part. Only 8.1% said they definitely did not support it. Those who opposed it or supported it only in part listed among their reasons for disagreement things such as the LBR's inapplicability to private libraries, its requirement to cooperate with groups of unlike mind, and its requirement to include in a library collection things that a private academic library at a Christian school might find useless, dangerous, or morally objectionable. Since this study was conducted twenty years ago, it is useful to see if the views of Christian librarians have changed.

Method

Sampling Method

Though the limitations of this study will be discussed at greater length below, it is important to note why academic librarians were chosen for the sample. Not only do Christian college libraries present a high concentration of easy-to-identify Christian librarians, but those librarians are working in an environment where the policies and practices are governed by the Christian worldview. While undoubtedly it would be useful in a future study of larger scale to include a much broader sampling of Christian librarians working in all kinds of different library contexts, the author

felt that Christian librarians working in a Christian context might offer a better sense for what the Christian idea of librarianship looks like when its practice and practitioners are not governed by policies and expectations developed by the ALA, a public school board, or a government.

The sample for this study was chosen from schools belonging to the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU) using a systemic sampling method in which three librarians were randomly chosen from forty randomly-selected CCCU schools. Email addresses for the individual librarians were then retrieved from each library's website, apart from one school that only listed a general email address (which was used to get the three email addresses). In total, the sample size was 119 librarians from 23 states and one Canadian province (one of the chosen schools only employed two librarians).

It should also be noted that word "librarian" is used slightly more liberally than it sometimes is, and while the sample was composed largely of librarians with an MLS or MLIS, full-time staff with a supervisory role (e.g., circulation supervisors) were also included since their perspectives on certain portions of the LBR, particularly Articles V and VI dealing with issues of access and use of library spaces, are highly relevant.

Survey Design

The librarians were all emailed a link to a sixteen-question survey prepared and delivered using Qualtrics, and they were asked to respond to it online. A copy of the survey can be found in the appendix. A follow-up email was sent after one week to encourage participation. The questions were focused on librarians' personal agreement with the Library Bill of Rights, the extent to which they adhered to its principles in their professional practice of librarianship, and whether they thought a Christian librarian working in a public library ought to abide by its ethics. A copy of the LBR's text was included in the survey for reference.

Respondent Profile

There were 39 surveys started, and of those, 31 were completed. The answers for any survey that was not completed were discarded, giving an overall response rate of 26%. Of the respondents, 68% were female and 32% were male. All but two of the respondents had at least an MLIS, and all indicated that they considered themselves members of the Christian faith. A breakdown of respondents' years of experience in the field can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1
Respondents' Years of Experience

Experience	Respondents	Percentage
Less than 5 years	8	26%
5-10 years	6	19%
11-15 years	1	3%
16-20 years	2	6%
20+ years	14	45%
Total	31	100%

Results

Personal agreement with the Library Bill of Rights was strong. The majority of respondents indicated that they either strongly supported or supported all six articles of the LBR (see Table 2), though it is worth noting that strong support was less common. Only for Article V did the overwhelming majority of respondents answer *strongly support*, and half of the articles did not even have a majority indicating strong support. That being acknowledged, Articles IV and VI were the only two articles to which more than 10% of respondents either objected or strongly objected, though Articles III, IV, and VI each had a significant amount of respondents who marked *neutral*.

Table 2
Personal Agreement with the Library Bill of Rights

LBR Article	Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Object	Strongly Object
Article I	52%	39%	3%	6%	0%
Article II	55%	42%	0%	3%	0%
Article III	39%	39%	19%	3%	0%
Article IV	23%	47%	20%	7%	3%
Article V	87%	10%	0%	3%	0%
Article VI	30%	33%	17%	20%	0%

Personal adherence to the LBR regardless of personal support of it was similarly strong. However, in the responses to the question about personal adherence, reservations started to appear. For all but one of the articles (Article V) there was an increase in those who marked *always adhere* over those who marked “strongly support” in the first question, but even so there was a very high percentage of respondents for each article that adhered with at least some exceptions. In fact, only three articles had a majority that adhered without exception (see Table 3).

Table 3
Adherence to LBR Regardless of Personal Agreement With It

LBR Article	Always Adhere	Adhere With Some Exceptions	Sometimes Adhere	Occasionally Adhere	Rarely or Never Adhere
Article I	53%	40%	3%	3%	0%
Article II	57%	30%	10%	3%	0%
Article III	47%	30%	10%	3%	10%
Article IV	43%	37%	7%	3%	10%
Article V	77%	19%	0%	0%	3%
Article VI	47%	43%	10%	0%	0%

Each respondent who chose anything other than *always adhere* for any of the LBR articles was presented a follow-up question asking for an explanation or examples of situations in which they did not adhere to the LBR. Twenty respondents gave answers, and all six articles were mentioned at least once in the resulting answers, with the highest concentration of answers relating to Articles I, II and VI (see Table 4). Many answers mentioned more than one article or gave more than one reason for less than complete adherence to a particular article, so responses in Table 4 outnumbered the actual number of respondents.

Table 4
Reasons for Less Than Complete Adherence to LBR

Article I		
Exclude materials based on content or views if irrelevant or useless to library's community	5	25%
Exclusion of certain views based on community's disagreement with or perception of harm in those views	5	25%
Exclusion of certain views or authors based on budget constraints	3	15%
Other	1	5%
Article II		
Librarians should control quality and omit fringe or nonsensical views	5	25%
Cannot represent ALL views	4	20%
Private libraries cater to needs of their parent institution	4	20%
Certain views are not appropriate in a Christian context (examples given: pornography, racism, holocaust denial, illustrated acts of sexual deviancy)	4	20%
Exclude views potentially harmful to students' faith	1	5%
Article III		
Has never come up	3	15%
Censorship in a Christian context is sometimes appropriate	2	10%
Not a part of my job description	1	5%
Article IV		
Article's language too strong or broad	2	10%
Don't have time or motivation to cooperate with such groups	2	10%
Article V		
Age can or should be a basis for denial of service or access	2	10%
Article VI		
Not applicable to private libraries	4	20%
Preference must sometimes be given based on need	3	15%
Display content violating community standards should be excluded	1	5%
General Reasons		
Language of document (e.g., "all" in certain places) is too inclusive	1	5%
ALA doesn't practice what it preaches, is selective in censorship resistance	1	5%
Professional standards do not trump ethical standards of institution	1	5%

To get a sense for the extent to which library policy might influence the responses of the above answers, respondents were asked the degree to which their employing library's policies support the LBR. The responses are documented in Table 5, and they show a significant drop off in support across all six articles of the LBR compared to the support and adherence to the LBR given by individual librarians.

Table 5

Degree to Which Library In Which Respondent Works Supports the LBR

LBR Article	Completely Support	Largely Support	Partially Support	Largely Do Not Support	Do Not At All Support
Article I	37%	50%	13%	0%	0%
Article II	30%	53%	13%	3%	0%
Article III	30%	40%	23%	3%	3%
Article IV	31%	38%	17%	7%	7%
Article V	60%	37%	0%	0%	3%
Article VI	40%	37%	20%	3%	0%

The survey also asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the statement "A Christian librarian working in public library setting should always abide by the professional and ethical standards outlined in the Library Bill of Rights even if his or her Christian convictions do not line up with it." Of the 29 people who answered the question, 66% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, 10% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 24% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Those who disagreed or strongly disagreed were asked why they disagreed. Only six gave an answer. Three indicated that they thought personal convictions ought to be able to trump professional standards where the two were in conflict (two used language similar to "follow God not man"), two cited situations involving material that could harm children or others (bomb-making and pornography), and one simply said that there were some views that he or she would not purchase for a public library.

The survey included two questions dealing with content-based acquisitions decisions in libraries supporting Christian institutions. When asked whether or not the official policies of academic libraries serving Christian institutions should ever limit access to, filter or refuse to acquire materials based on their content or viewpoint, 60% of respondents answered "yes," while 40% answered *no*. Those who answered *no* were presented with a follow up question asking what sort of content or viewpoints they thought should not be acquired or at least limited in an academic library supporting a Christian institution. Similar responses were grouped together and recorded in Table 6. A number of respondents gave more than one type of content or viewpoint, so the total number of answers exceeded the number of respondents.

Table 6*Content That Should Be Filtered, Limited, or Not Acquired (Private Christian Libraries)*

Content	Number of Responses	Percentage
Pornography or materials with sexually explicit content	9	53%
Materials that do not support academic programs	8	47%
Materials that promote or depict gratuitous violence or abuse	4	19%
Material potentially harmful to students' faith	3	25%
Materials that are too expensive	2	12%
"How to" information for bomb building, undermining the government, etc.	2	12%
Materials promoting satanic worship or occult	1	6%
Materials that promote human trafficking	1	6%
Materials that promote criminal actions	1	6%

There were varying reasons respondents gave for placing such limitations on a collection at a library supporting a Christian institution, and some did not give any reason. Two respondents indicated that they answered *no* to the previous question not on the basis that the institution was Christian, but because academic libraries focus on collecting materials that support academic programs and therefore limit acquisitions based on relevance to curriculum and excellence of thought. One respondent indicated that Christian colleges and universities "are still acting somewhat 'in loco parentis'" and therefore should limit certain content on this basis, with two other respondents giving similar answers of concern for students' well-being.

The final two questions focused on content-based acquisitions decisions in public libraries. When asked whether or not the official policies of public libraries should ever limit access to, filter, or refuse to acquire materials based on their content or viewpoint, 53% of respondents answered *yes*, and 47% answered *no*," though one respondent indicated that she only answered *no* because her current library's policy dictated limiting "smut" materials and that if she worked in a public library she would not limit materials based on viewpoint or content.

Those who answered *yes* were presented with a follow-up question asking what sort of content or viewpoints they thought should not be acquired or at least limited in a public library. Sixteen gave answers to this, and most of them included relatively

detailed responses with several kinds of content included. The responses were coded according to content categories as shown in Table 7. A number of answers had more than one type of content, and some did not specify a certain type of content.

Table 7

Content That Should Be Filtered, Limited, or Not Acquired (Public Libraries)

Content	Responses	Percentage
Pornography or sexually explicit content	10	63%
Material promoting violence	4	25%
Material harmful to children	4	25%
“How to” information for bomb building, acts of terror, etc.	3	19%
Racism	2	13%

As to the “why” behind the content omissions and limitations outlined in Table 7, there were three major reasons among those who included reasons in their responses: (a) the responsibility to be good stewards of public funds (three people mentioned this), (b) the protection of children (seven people mentioned or alluded to this), and (c) the matching of the library’s holdings to the values and interests of community it serves (four people mentioned this).

Discussion

At first glance, there seemed to be little conflict between Christian librarians’ ethical presuppositions and those of the ALA since such an overwhelming majority either supported or strongly supported all six articles of the LBR. However, there were many respondents who, while agreeing with the LBR on the whole, had less than strong support for it and adhered to it with at least some exceptions. It is in these answers that the real difference between the ethics of the ALA and the ethics of Christianity can be seen. Articles I and II were either supported or strongly supported by 91% and 97% of respondents respectively, and a majority of respondents indicated for both articles that they always adhered to them (53% for Article I and 57% for Article II). Even so, when asked about public libraries (for which the LBR is presumably most applicable) a 53% majority indicated that they thought official policies should include content-based decisions about the selection of materials. The sorts of materials this majority cite as worthy of omission, particularly the focus on pornography, reflects a conservative moral sensibility that seems more distinctly Christian when taken alongside the answers to the questions about what materials respondents indicated are omitted from their own libraries serving Christian institutions (e.g., things like material harmful to students faith, occult materials, etc.).

In this contrast it can be seen that there may be significant differences between the ALA's interpretation of Articles I and II of the LBR and the interpretations of Christian librarians. Indeed, it is the role of interpretation in the way that the LBR is viewed that may be the most important conclusion from this study. Both the literature and the rest of the survey's results seem to show that interpretation of the document among Christians tends to involve filtering it through the lens of Christian ethical priorities and worldviews, for many of the responses to the LBR noted that it was the overly-strong and inclusive language (e.g., "all") in the LBR that causes the main problems. Such language elevates free speech, resistance of censorship, and free access of information ahead of all other ethical concerns, and this is where Christians differ. They support those ethics generally, but this study and the relevant literature indicate that these must be taken within the context of the more important guiding ethical principles of Christianity. This can perhaps be summed up best in one respondent's reason for not fully adhering to the LBR:

I do not believe our convictions would be in conflict with the Library Bill of Rights... I can see where our convictions might be in disagreement with some people's *interpretation* of the Library Bill of Rights (The Library Bill of Rights really leaves no room for the selection process, but it doesn't acknowledge that – but I don't know any library that buys everything without some kind of selection process or procedure, so we know it has to happen to some extent.) But regardless – if there is a place where our beliefs were in conflict, then yes, we would need to “follow God rather than man.”

In addition to the above, it is also interesting to note other ways in which the current study's results are quite similar to Hippenhammer's study from 1993. The objections to the LBR given in the two studies were quite similar, with things like restrictions on meeting rooms in private libraries, working with outside groups of different minds (with respect to Article IV's exhortation to cooperate with all groups resisting censorship), concerns about pornography, concerns about content-based collection development, and concerns about age restrictions showing up in the answers to each survey. Both also had respondents indicate their general support for the document “depending on how it is interpreted,” in Hippenhammer's (1993) words.

This study also showed that personal adherence to the LBR exceeded personal agreement with it; for all articles but Article V, the percentage of respondents who indicated they *always adhere* to the LBR exceeded the percentage who indicated they strongly agree with it. This could suggest that even where Christian librarians disagree with the ethical standards outlined in the LBR they feel a professional obligation to adhere to them, though given the discussion above it seems more likely that at least some who claim to “always adhere” to the LBR do so according to their own interpretation of it.

Finally, the study showed a very low number of respondents who indicated their employing library's policies supported the LBR relative to the support and adherence individual librarians gave to it. Only for Article V did a majority of respondents indicate that their libraries' policies completely supported the LBR, suggesting that on the whole the librarians in this survey perceived their own support and adherence to the LBR as stronger than that of their own libraries. This may indicate that perhaps the parent institutions of Christian academic libraries have an influence over library policy that is more conservative than the librarians themselves might choose if left to themselves, and seems to imply that it is not due to library policy that librarians adhere to the LBR.

Limitations & Further Research Needs

It must be acknowledged that this study is quite limited in its scope, and while the results are consistent with what literature exists on this subject, a study of much wider scope will be needed to accurately generalize Christian librarians' opinions on these matters. The response rate was low enough that the final sample ended up being less than 10% of the CCCU librarians, to say nothing of the Christian librarians working in libraries outside of the CCCU. This author will be undertaking such a study in the spring of 2014 to try to achieve a sample size that will be more useful for generalizing Christian librarians' opinions on the ALA's ethical assumptions.

Another limitation of this study is its focus on academic librarians. Including Christian librarians in school and public libraries would be useful to see whether or not a librarian's context influences opinion or interpretation of the ALA's ethics. A snowball method of sampling seems most likely to succeed in this since in these contexts organizational affiliation reveals nothing about religious belief.

It should also be noted that the study did not ask questions about denominational affiliations. The CCCU is an organization with evangelical membership, and the study therefore reflects the opinions of that segment of the Christian library population. Including members of the Catholic Library Association and including a demographic question about denominational affiliation in a study of broader scope would likely also be instructive.

Finally, some of the opinions revealed in this study may well be mirrored in librarians of other faiths, or in librarians without a particular faith commitment but strong personal morals. This study was particularly interested in the Christian interpretation of the LBR, but a study including librarians of other faiths or even of librarians in general would provide an interesting comparison.

Conclusion

While much has been written by individual Christian librarians arguing for a distinctly Christian interpretation of professional ethics in librarianship, the ethical views of Christian librarians as an entire population have been studied very little. The survey sent to academic librarians working at CCCU schools in this study was designed to discover how Christian librarians responded to the ALA's ethical standards as embodied in the Library Bill of Rights, including whether they agreed with it and how their personal views affected both how they made professional decisions and how they think Christian librarians working in public library settings ought to make professional decisions. The results showed that while Christian librarians in this survey on the whole supported the LBR and adhered to it professionally, their interpretation of its broad and ambiguous language is perhaps somewhat different from how the ALA would have it interpreted, especially when considering collection and access issues related to content like pornography, violence, or other similar material that conflicts with Christian morality. †

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Scott Kaihoi is Library Specialist at Bethel University. He can be contacted at sakaihoi@uwm.edu

WORKS CITED

- Baldwin, G. B. (1996). The Library Bill of Rights – a critique. *Library Trends*, 45(1), 7-28.
- Doerksen, J. R. (1999). The Y factor. *The Christian Librarian*, 42, 15.
- Hippenhammer, C. (1993). Patron objections to library materials: A survey of Christian college libraries part I. *The Christian Librarian*, 37(1), 12-17.
- Schladweiler, C. (1996). The Library Bill of Rights and intellectual freedom: A selective bibliography. *Library Trends*, 45(1), 97-126.
- Smith, G. A. (Ed.). (2002a). *Christian Librarianship*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Smith, G. A. (2002b). A philosophy of Christian librarianship. In G. A. Smith (Ed.), *Christian Librarianship* (pp.69-84). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Wiegand, S. A. (1996). Reality bites: the collision of rhetoric, rights and reality and the Library Bill of Rights. *Library Trends*, 45(1), 75-87.

APPENDIX

Survey Design

Q1. Please indicate the age range into which you fall.

- 18-30 (1)
- 30-45 (2)
- 45-60 (3)
- 60+ (4)

Q2. Please indicate your gender.

- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Q3. Please indicate your highest level of education:

- Certificate or Associate's degree (1)
- Bachelor's degree (2)
- MLS or MLIS (3)
- Second master's (or other advanced degree) (4)
- Doctorate (5)

Q4. Please indicate how long you have been a librarian

- Less than 5 years (1)
- 5-10 years (2)
- 11-15 years (3)
- 16-20 years (4)
- 20+ years (5)

Q5. Choose the option that best describes the university for which you work:

- Denominational (1)
- Non-denominational / interdenominational (2)
- Other (3)

Q6. Do you consider yourself a member of the Christian faith?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q7. Looking at the text of the ALA Library Bill of Rights above, please indicate whether you personally support or object to the following portions of the document (i.e., indicate whether your own ethical or spiritual convictions are consistent with the statements made in the Library Bill of Rights):

	Strongly Support (1)	Support (2)	Neutral (3)	Object (4)	Strongly Object (5)
Library Bill of Rights Article I (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article II (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article III (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article IV (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article V (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article VI (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8. Whether you personally support or object to the Library Bill of Rights, please indicate the degree to which you adhere to the standards outlined in each of its articles in your professional practice of librarianship.

	Always adhere (1)	Adhere with some exceptions (2)	Sometimes adhere (3)	Occasionally adhere (4)	Rarely or never adhere (5)
Library Bill of Rights Article I (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article II (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article III (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article IV (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article V (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article VI (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q9. If you chose anything other than “Always adhere” for any of the options in the above question, please explain or give examples of situations in which you do not adhere to the standards of the Library Bill of Rights.

Q10 In the library in which you work, please indicate the degree to which the official library policies (e.g., Internet filtering, collection development, patron challenges, etc.) support the articles of the Library Bill of Rights.

	Completely Support (1)	Largely Support (2)	Partially Support (3)	Largely Do Not Support (4)	Do Not At All Support (5)
Library Bill of Rights Article I (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article II (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article III. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article IV (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article V (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library Bill of Rights Article VI (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q11 Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement: “A Christian librarian working in public library setting should always abide by the professional and ethical standards outlined in the Library Bill of Rights even if his or her Christian convictions do not line up with it.

- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

If “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” are selected for Q11, display the following:

Q12 If you selected “disagree” or “strongly disagree” for the previous question, please explain when you think Christian librarian’s convictions could or should supersede the Library Bill of Rights in a public library setting.

Q13 Should the official policies of academic libraries that support Christian institutions ever limit access to, filter, or refuse to acquire materials (print or electronic) based on the content or viewpoint of the materials?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

If “Yes” is selected for Q13, display the following:

Q14 What sorts of content or viewpoints would warrant the filtering, refusal to acquire, or limitation of access to materials in a library at a Christian institution?

Q15 Should official policies of public libraries ever limit access to, filter, or refuse to acquire any materials (print or electronic) based on the content or viewpoint of the materials?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

If “Yes” is selected for Q15, display the following:

Q16 What sorts of content or viewpoints would warrant the filtering, refusal to acquire, or limitation of access to materials in a public library?