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America has long been known for its freedom of speech and its championship of literacy. However, there is an unseen epidemic that runs rampant -- though largely undetected -- throughout the entire country: book banning in public schools and libraries. Many of us might find it hard to believe that book banning could occur in this country, where freedom of speech and expression is not only a constitutional right, but a way of life. Yet, according to the data found in Figure 1, censorship is happening in nearly every state across the nation. For most Americans, the term “book banning” immediately brings to mind images of oppressive regimes out of George Orwell’s 1984 or scenes from Nazi Germany, when books were thrown into a fire-pit by the dozen. Rarely do parents come to mind as the ones to blame; however, data suggests that it is parents who are in fact the driving forces behind book banning in schools across the country.

Censorship in the U.S. often evolves through concerned parents who do not want their children exposed to a worldview other than their own. American classics such as The Adventures of Tom Sawyer, The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, The Catcher in the Rye, and To Kill a Mockingbird are some of the hundreds of books challenged by parents each year. The main reasons that parents push for the banning of a book include: suggestive language, violence, sexuality, religion, and controversial historical contexts such as slavery. These parents, most often a vocal minority, rally and persuade school boards to ban books in individual schools and districts.

Censorship in schools can lead to a narrow worldview with gaping holes in the cultural and international education of our children. If children cannot learn about very real topics like slavery in novels such as Uncle Tom’s Cabin, where will they turn to instead in order to learn about topics such as these? Rather than learning about sensitive topics from books with the consultation and guidance of teachers, children may instead get their information from inferior sources such as peers, television, and the Internet if book banning continues.

Therefore, in order to combat the plague of book censorship, our campaign directly targets teachers and school administrators through priming their pre-existing negative attitudes towards book banning, which will indirectly target our secondary audience of parents who are pushing book censorship. The calls for censorship may come directly from the parents, but those with the power to actually take books off of the reading lists and out of school curriculums and
libraries are the administrators and school boards. Most data and case histories show that school boards have been largely ineffective at repelling the vocal parent minorities who call for censorship. In order to cease book banning, we need to affirm to teachers and school boards that they can deny parents’ demands for book censorship.

Figure 1: Censorship Incidents by Outcome Across the United States
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Source: Chris Peterson; Data compiled from American Library Association records, 2012

Background

Before we examine the specifics of our proposed campaign for change, we must first examine the current status of book censorship in American schools, as well as the current research that exists to support our plans for combatting book banning. Some of the most comprehensive reports concerning school censorship are compiled each year by the human rights advocacy group the People for the American Way (PFAW). Their annual PFAW report, titled “Attacks on the Freedom to Learn,” made the following statement regarding censorship trends in America:

“The last several years have witnessed an apparent diminution of American’s appreciation and willingness to defend freedom of speech and expression… The result has been a series of compromises on freedom of expression, each of which has sent the message to Americans that speech and expression are free, but only within certain
parameters. That message, badly at odds with the First Amendment, has fed the wave of curricular attacks in our public schools.” (“Attacks on the Freedom to Learn,” PFAW report, 1991-1992)

Their reports go on to show that the three most common reasons that books are challenged are that the material is considered “anti-Christian,” “New Age,” “satanic,” or generally at odds with the challengers’ religious beliefs; that it contains objectionable language; or that it portrays sexuality in an offensive manner. Their studies have also illustrated that this is not a federal problem; while it is undisputed that governmental censorship exists, the censorship which happens in local schools and libraries is exponentially more common – and thus, is the focus of our campaign for change.

The following figures, compiled by the American Library Association, show: frequency distributions for the types of material challenged, where books are challenged most often, and who most frequently does the challenging. Parents are by far the most prevalent group of challengers, and their attacks most often taken place in public schools and libraries.

Figure 2: Book Challenges in the United States by Reason for Challenge
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Figure 3: Book Challenges in the United States by Challenge Initiator
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Figure 4: Book Challenges in the United States by Institution where Challenge Occurred
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Findings and case studies on censorship events throughout history reveal another clear pattern: these strident and often unconstitutional demands for book banning are made by well-organized, highly vocal minorities -- rather than whole communities or large groups of protesters -- who often win out in a fight against overwhelmed, unprepared school districts and teachers.

In his work *Battle of the Books: Literary Censorship in the Public Schools*, author Lee Burress discusses one famous case study that reflects these common censorship patterns, and shows the uphill battle that teachers and administrators must fight when combating censorship requests. The incident occurred in 1980 in Montello, Wisconsin, where challenges were filed against the novel *The Magician* by Sol Stein after a high school English teacher decided to add the book to her curriculum. In a preemptive measure to alleviate parental concerns, the English teacher took the precaution of sending home a brief description of the book and a parental permission slip with each student in the class before beginning any lessons on the material. Of the 25 total students, 20 returned with signed permission slips, and the teacher readily made alternate assignments available for those whose parents objected to their children reading *The Magician*.

Yet, as is often the case in such scenarios, these actions were considered insufficient by the objecting parents. Not only did they object to their own children reading the material, they extended their objections to the rest of the class – despite the fact that the objectors were a very small minority, and that the other parents had already given permission for their children to read the material. The objecting parents issued a formal challenge insisting that the book be removed from the curriculum, and went so far as to photocopy and distribute so-called “objectionable” excerpts from the book among the community to further illustrate the apparent need for censorship and to incite tension between school officials and community members.

Though the excerpts were taken out of context and completely misrepresented the book’s overall themes and messages, their distribution still managed to create an uproar within the small community, drawing media attention and stirring up unwanted controversy. The book was quickly labeled as “trash,” “filth,” “un-American,” “un-Christian,” “filled with obscenity,” and “pornographic” (Burress, 1989). Several anonymous community members went so far as to raid the local libraries and remove all copies of *The Magician* from the school libraries so that no one had access to them anymore. Burress notes that this, unfortunately, is a common occurrence. He states, “One of the things that frequently happens when a book is challenged is that copies of the
book get very hard to find” (Burress, 1989). In direct response to the blatant attacks on his novel and in hopes of eliminating this problem, author Sol Stein offered to send one paperback copy of *The Magician* to every household in the affected school district.

The book was eventually retained for use after a lengthy and extremely public process that put the entire community at odds, but this case study nevertheless serves as an example of the fierce opposition that school boards and teachers face. The challenge became a community-wide source of tension, despite the fact that it came from such a small group of parents whose children were not forced to read the material, but were instead provided with an alternate assignment.

Our campaign ultimately hopes to arm teachers and administrators against such attacks from pressure groups -- specifically, from parents who wish to “protect” not only their own children, but *every* child, by removing the questionable material from circulation altogether.

Despite common misconceptions about the rarities of censorship -- most people, when questioned, would greatly underestimate the number of challenges that occur in the United States -- the map in Figure 1 clearly illustrates that these attacks are occurring nationwide and are certainly not a thing of the past. Data as recent as 2012 shows that in the past 20 years alone there have been hundreds of attacks on books and materials in schools and libraries across America, which makes this problem not only national, but also extremely current.

Ellen Hopkins, young adult author of *New York Times* bestseller *Crank*--the story of a young, once-ambitious girl’s downward spiral and growing addiction to crystal meth--has experienced censorship firsthand. *Crank* has been banned, challenged, and labeled as pornography many times throughout Hopkins’ career, and Hopkins herself has been prohibited or uninvited from attending author events and book fairs, solely because of the content in her books (Nye, 2012). In the past, Hopkins, a staunch advocate for literacy, has organized several author-based social media campaigns to combat such censorship efforts. She is quick to point out that the battle being waged against book banning is ongoing and immediate, with each year bringing new adversaries.

Hopkins notes, ‘The year 2010 brought new challenges. In Stockton, Missouri, by a 7-0 vote of the school board, Sherman Alexie’s brilliant *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* was pulled from bookshelves. In another corner of Missouri, a university professor complained about ‘dirty young adult literature,’ likening Laurie Halse Anderson’s hugely
important book, *Speak*, to soft porn” (Nye, 2012). This illustrates the ongoing attacks that controversial books receive throughout the nation.

Worse still is the fact that the data concerning book challenges may actually be an underrepresentation of the censorship attacks. In *The Magician* case study, Burress noted that further investigation after the Montello incident revealed that many nearby schools in the neighboring districts had quietly made the decision to remove their own copies of *The Magician* from their libraries, in hopes of avoiding an incident like the one that occurred in Montello. If anything, scenarios like that illustrate the need for intervention in our schools. Teachers, school boards, and librarians need the necessary support and resources to resist pressure groups who demand that books are banned. Hopkins fights her own censorship battles by trying to change the minds of censoring parents as well as school boards and administrators. She pleads her case:

“As bottom line. No book is right for every reader. So fine. Don’t read my books if they offend you or you hate poetry or need a fairy-tale ending. If you don’t want your own children to read them, tell them they can’t … But don’t make that decision without reading them first. Don’t scan for offenses. Read in context. You might decide the messages they carry are positive, if strong. You might even find a way to open communication with your kids. Words can’t damage them. But ignorance surely can” (Ellen Hopkins in Nye, 2012).

Unfortunately, as Hopkins has discovered in her decade-long battle against book banning, it is extremely difficult to change the minds of opposing, uncompromising, pro-censorship parents. Thus, our campaign treats parents as an obstacle who must be overcome by those who would take a stand against censorship -- teachers and school boards. Ultimately, we seek to bolster teacher and administrator’s anti-censorship attitudes through priming, undermine the influence of pressure groups such as parents, and give teachers and school boards increased perceived behavioral control over the entire process.

**Theoretical mechanism**

The premise of our campaign, titled Operation A.B.C., is founded upon the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). TPB seeks to explain how attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived
behavioral control about a subject can predict behavior under certain circumstances. Developed by Ajzen in the year 1991, TPB is an extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA).

The theory argues that behavior is highly linked to an individual’s attitude toward the behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. The model assumes that “people rationally calculate the costs and benefits of engaging in a particular action and think carefully about how important others will view the behavior under consideration.” The model is heavily based off the emphasis on “conscious deliberation.” TPB has five major components to the theory (Perloff, 2013). The first component is attitude toward the behavior. An attitude is “a person’s judgement that performing the behavior is good or bad.” The second component, subjective norms, refers to “the person’s perceptions of the social pressure put on him to perform or not to perform the behavior.” The third aspect to the theory that differentiates TPB from TRA is perceived behavioral control (PBC). PBC is “the individual’s perception of how much control he or she has over the behavior; it is a subjective estimate of how easy or difficult it will be to perform the behavior” The fourth component of TPB is behavioral intention, or rather, “the intent or plan to perform the behavior” (Perloff, 2013). The final component is the behavior itself.

As demonstrated through the flowchart below (Figure 5), an individual's beliefs about the attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control (PBC), each, respectively, affect the attitude, subjective norm, and PBC in question. Thus, “each behavioral belief is multiplied by the corresponding evaluation, and results are summed up across items” (Perloff, 2013). The TPB model then argues that an individual’s attitudes towards a behavior, the subjective norms about said behavior, and perceived behavioral control about performing the behavior all combine to result in the intention of performing the behavior, which leads to the behavior itself.

Figure 5: Theory of Planned Behavior Model
As a group, we found that in order to change the behavior of book censorship, we must first place the current behavior in the context of TPB (Figure 4). After deciphering the behavior in terms of TPB, we noticed a few critical components. Firstly, attitudes about book censorship were thought to be generally against the act of censorship. Attitudes about the behavior would then correlate to our goal and did not need to be altered. Secondly, we looked into subjective norms. Although we found that the subjective norms did not correlate with our goal behavior, we decided that these subjective norms did not need to be altered, but primed. Because the parents who possessed these negative subjective norms were of the minority population, as previously discussed, it would not be realistic and valuable to utilize our resources on such a small portion of the population, when in actuality, the majority of the population was against book censorship. We realized that our campaign would be most successful if we primed the pre-existing negative attitudes of teachers and school boards towards book banning through repetition and accessibility theory, which would then increase the salience of these attitudes and consequently increase teachers’ PBC against the vocal minority pressure groups. In the behavior of book censorship, we found that it was the school administration’s perceived lack of agency in the face of vocal pressure groups that was the major factor in determining their behavioral intent and, therefore, their actual behavior in being unable to oppose book banning in their schools.
Operation A.B.C. is based on the goal of changing the PBC of school boards, administrations, and teachers. Through our program, we hope to facilitate the idea that the power to stop book banning does ultimately rest within school boards, administrations, and teachers. By providing tools that will hopefully encourage these factions to resist the minority of pro-book-banning parents, we hope to positively alter PBC against book censorship. Thus, the combined weight of altering PBC and positive attitudes against the censoring of books will lead to changed behavior as school boards, administrations, and teachers will ultimately decide not to ban books.

Our Campaign

In crafting the details of our campaign proposal, we first heavily considered our target audience of teachers and school boards, focusing particularly on the attitudes that motivate them. As mentioned, teachers and school boards are inherently against book censorship but have little control when facing vocal pressure groups, such as concerned parents pushing to ban certain books in schools. The attitudes of these teachers and school board members are already working in the right direction, but they are facing on the ground challenges that interfere with their perceived behavioral control; because of this, we will specifically use priming strategies in our
campaign methods to build upon teachers’ and school board members’ pre-existing positive attitudes against book banning.

In using the aforementioned research and theories, our proposed campaign endeavors to convey several distinct arguments. Firstly, we wish to demonstrate how book censorship prompts children to find controversial information in less-educational outlets—such as risqué television shows, the Internet, or their peers. If children are curious about sexual education but know that it is a forbidden topic because it is discussed in books that they are not allowed to read, they might instead turn to television shows where sex is displayed in a visual, explicit manner, rather than a more formal, educational setting where children can discuss the content with an adult. Additionally, if students are learning about a controversial historical topic such as slavery in their history class but are then prohibited to read *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* or *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* in their English class, there is a serious disconnect in their education.

Another argument that our campaign will convey is that banning books limits students’ critical thought processes. It is quite possibly more dangerous to ban controversial books than to allow them, because when students do encounter the issues raised in these books, they will not have easy access to a teacher’s guidance to help them understand these issues. According to the Cognitive Apprenticeship model, “the ultimate point of education is to prepare students for effective functioning in nonschool settings” (Berryman 1). Rather than avoid the controversy, students should be learning how to think critically and address the controversial topics found in banned books, with the aid of a teacher if necessary. Not only does banning books divert teachers’ energy from encouraging reading towards discouraging reading the “wrong thing,” book censorship does not prepare students for the real world. As Berryman puts it, “Control over learning in the hands of the teacher undercuts the student’s development of cognitive management skills…and their opportunities to learn from experience are highly constrained” (Berryman 2). Thus, book censorship fails students and the education system, because it bypasses the point of education and ultimately limits children’s ability to learn at all.

The final message that our campaign will illustrate is how book censorship dissuades children from reading altogether, with potentially extreme consequences. In this aspect of our campaign, we will portray a futuristic dystopia where children do not know how to read or cannot even comprehend what a book is. Obviously there are extreme circumstances, but we hope to use this “worst case scenario” situation to illustrate how truly dire the situation can
become due to the effects of book banning. This aspect of our campaign will feature books such as Ray Bradbury’s *Fahrenheit 451*—a novel in which books are prohibited—which invokes an ironic meta-aspect to our campaign, since this book itself is often censored by schools and libraries. By presenting this dystopian world where books do not exist, our campaign will utilize fear appeal to effectively relay our message. Our target audience of teachers and school boards would not want the situation to become so dire that children are illiterate, so presenting this severity information will spur them into action, even if realistically they understand that book banning is not likely to have such extreme consequences in the near future.

So, now that we have determined the focus of our campaign, how do we propose to effectively convey these messages? Our campaign is two-fold: we will utilize a combination of both mass communication and interpersonal communication strategies to ensure that our audience is receiving the full force of our campaign. In doing so, we hope to increase the salience of the negative effects of book banning in the minds of teachers and school board members. Because our campaign utilizes several different tactics, we hope to prime the attitudes of our target audience through repetition, as described in accessibility theory. The more frequently book banning is brought to the forefront of our audience’s mind through repeat construct activation, the more likely that the topic will come to mind in the future, so teachers and school board members will take advantage of their pre-existing attitudes against book banning and start working to change their perceived behavioral control.

The first layer of our campaign is a mass media approach. One part of this strategy includes a series of bookmarks to illustrate the negative effects of book censorship. The bookmarks will illustrate the positive lessons taught in each “controversial” book, and then emphasize that students are missing out on these important life lessons when these books are banned. For example, a bookmark could show how adolescent readers can relate to angsty Holden Caulfield as he gallivants around New York City, but then on the flip-side of the bookmark, we would see that same reader lost and uncertain because, without the positive influence of Holden in his life, he feels as though no one understands him. There is a meta-aspect to this as well, as students can use these “controversial book” bookmarks as they read novels that parents want to ban. This idea would tap into teachers and school board members’ attitude construct, priming their recognition of the positive lessons these books offer.
The second aspect of our mass media approach will include print ads in educational magazines, such as *Education Week Teacher*. We felt that this was a more effective way to reach our audience of teachers and school board members, because they would be more likely to read a periodical directed at them than watch a television commercial. Additionally, a media commercial would undermine the message of a campaign, since it would be promoting watching television rather than reading. These ads would directly address some of our aforementioned key messages; for example, we could portray a classroom setting where children in a history classroom do not know what slavery is because they were forbidden to read about it in English class. Additionally, these ads would provide an avenue to present a dystopia reminiscent of *Fahrenheit 451*—where students are illiterate or are unfamiliar with what a book is. Since these ads would be featured in educational periodicals, they would help prime teachers’ attitudes towards the salience of book banning, and encourage them to take action in the face of vocal pressure groups.

In addition to our mass communication tactics, our campaign also includes an interpersonal approach through knowledgeable, on-the-ground speakers. As Lazarsfeld and Merton address in their “Limited Effects” model, mass communication messages must be supplemented with interpersonal communication. We hope to use our on-the-ground speakers to provide this supplementation, and also to make teachers feel as though they have increased perceived behavioral control because of the support they receive from the Operation A.B.C. liaison. We will assess which areas need the most immediate attention, and then send our trained speakers to travel from school to school in the district and act as a liaison between parents and teachers when discussing book censorship matters. These liaisons will attend PTA meetings, work with English teachers and school board members, and hold seminars for both teachers and parents to convey the negative effects of book banning and explain why it must be stopped. The speakers could also hold book talks about controversial books. In these sessions, parents would read the book in question and voice their concerns, and the liaison would explain the positive lessons that the book could teach their child, illustrating its value in aiding their child’s learning process. Finally, the liaison would physically go into the schools and public libraries of censorship-riddled districts to ensure that these controversial books can be found on the shelves.

The last aspect of our campaign includes a website with follow-up resources for parents to address their questions or concerns. The website would explain potentially controversial
aspects of certain books, but then detail why these topics are crucial to the child’s learning process. Additionally, the website would provide a place for parents to submit questions or concerns for our representatives or school liaisons to address. The purpose of this website would be to provide parents with agency in the situation, which will lessen their demands of the teachers and amplify the teachers’ perceived behavioral control. Overall, we will incorporate each aspect of our message into these various techniques, with the intention of increasing attitude salience through priming, which consequently will increase our audience’s perceived behavioral control.

**Evaluating Campaign Success**

As discussed previously, our goal with this campaign is to prime the attitude and resultant behavior of teachers and school boards to oppose book censorship because they are the ones who can enact change in the classroom. We believe that censoring books in the current manner limits literacy and discourages critical thought in students, and in so doing, essentially undermines the goal of education. Where would we rather students hear about racism and sexism? From pop culture, or from literature in the classroom, where it is accompanied by discussion and helps to facilitate critical thought? Ultimately, we do not want to indoctrinate students; we want to teach them to think for themselves. Banning books, such as *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, deprive students of invaluable life lessons. In our appeal to school boards, we hope to return banned classics to the classroom, and to empower teachers and school boards to resist pressure to ban a book school-wide at the sound of a single complaint.

**Items and Procedures**

Once we have carried out the campaign detailed above, we will use these items and procedures to measure its success. In particular, we will examine the effect of our campaign on teachers’ and school boards’ attitudes and behaviors pertaining to banned books and the return of previously banned books. While we anticipate that teachers oppose book censorship, we want to increase their level of opposition and demonstrate the importance of their resistance. We want to prime their attitudes to empower them to take a stance.
Attitudes Measured

To identify any change in attitude, we hope to measure the attitudes of teachers and school boards both before and after the implementation of our campaign. On the most general level, we want to confirm whether teachers and school boards are for or against banning books in schools, and if this stance changed or intensified with exposure to our campaign. Additionally, do teachers and school boards consider the banning of classics such as Huck Finn and the Diary of Anne Frank as discouraging literacy in children and adolescents? If not, is it because they disagree, or because the thought was never proposed to them prior to our campaign? Do they change their stance after being exposed to our campaign? Do we see their stance strengthened? Further, do teachers and school boards see a link between putting banned books back in schools and teaching critical thinking skills to their students? Conversely, do they see a correlation between banning books and discouraging critical thought? Another interesting attitude to examine would be whether teachers and school boards see knowledge as socially and culturally constructed, as supported by the cognitive apprenticeship model. Do they see schools as influencing this socially- and culturally-constructed knowledge in students? What does the banning of classics like To Kill a Mockingbird do to students’ knowledge-base?

Behaviors Measured

To evaluate any change in behavior, we likewise would measure and compare the behaviors of teachers and school boards regarding banned books before and after our campaign. Much of this would be measuring teacher advocacy for or against banning books. Do teachers and school boards advocate returning banned classics to schools? Does their advocacy affect the banning of books in schools? Are the teachers and school boards on the same page? It would be important to examine if teachers do actually have a say, by looking at whether they take a stance, what stance they take, and if school boards listen to the teachers’ arguments. Specifically, do teacher voices increase as a result of the campaign; do school boards listen more intently? How much does this change over the course of the campaign?

Methods Used

To measure these attitudes and behaviors, we will use a variety of tools/methods. The most widespread measure will be a survey of teachers and school boards, inquiring about their
attitudes and behaviors towards book banning before the campaign and after. For the most comprehensive data, we would conduct a pre-test survey to measure teachers’ and school boards’ attitudes and behaviors before they have even seen the campaign. The main survey would follow the pre-test, during or after their exposure to the campaign, which would again evaluate their attitudes and behaviors towards book banning. A post-test survey could be distributed in a few months to a year, evaluating whether there was a lasting attitude and/or behavior change. The significance of these surveys would be in comparing the data from each survey to see how the responses evolved with exposure to the campaign. Part of measuring the behavior of teachers and school boards would include measuring their intended behavior and their perceived behavior control, and seeing whether that affected their enacted behavior.

Further, we will survey the parents/website visitors to measure the impact of the follow-up resources disseminated through the campaign. This survey will evaluate parents’ attitudes and planned behavior towards book censorship, including their utilization of provided resources and comprehension of the material. Primarily, this will include examining the attitude change that precedes behavior change.

In addition to conducting these surveys, we will do a data analysis of the books in school libraries both before, during, and after our campaign. We will also examine teachers’ curricula, both by means of the surveys and by reviewing published curricula, to see if banned books are returned to schools as a result of our campaign. We will also use liaisons in schools—placed there as a result of the campaign—to monitor the presence of controversial books in classroom curricula. To measure this, we must know first what books were removed, what books were returned to the libraries, what books were added to curricula, and if the addition of a previously banned book to the curricula led to the inclusion of that book in school libraries.

Another helpful measure would be to interview teachers and school boards, preferably both before and after implementing the campaign, to evaluate campaign effectiveness in a more qualitative manner. In doing this, we would get a sense of the atmosphere surrounding school boards and pressure groups regarding book banning and regarding the reversion of book censorship in schools. This would allow for exploring different dynamics that the surveys will inevitably miss, and will paint a more holistic picture of what book censorship does to the classroom, and how that changed with our campaign. It would explore whether the issue was in
the teachers’ and school boards’ attitudes, subjective norms, or perceived behavior control, and would describe qualitatively how the issue evolved.

**Anticipated Results**

In examining the data retrieved from the above methods of evaluation, we anticipate an increased level of awareness among teachers and school boards about book censorship and its consequences. This will raise their perceived behavioral control against vocal minority groups such as parents, and enable teachers to stand up in opposition to book banning. Further, we hope that these teachers and school boards facilitate increased awareness among parents and students. We expect that this awareness will result in teachers and school boards advocating for the return of banned books, and hopefully, actual return of these banned classics to school libraries. Additionally, we anticipate that previously banned books will be implemented in new curricula to encourage critical thought. Stemming from the modified curricula, we anticipate that students will learn to think critically about sensitive and relevant subjects such as racism and sexism, because they will learn how to dialogue about it from a healthy school environment, rather than from pop culture.
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