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ABSTRACT
Using discourse analysis, this article explores three questions: (a) Why was “principled, transformational leadership” the leadership style added to Core Competences? (b) What was the discourse of leadership in the profession surrounding the development of the Core Competences? (c) How might this competence affect LIS education? And what measures, if any, have MLIS programs taken to address it? Informants involved in the development of the Core Competences indicated that leadership was added because it is an important issue for LIS professionals and it links “transformational” to professional change; however, they were unable to provide a clear explanation for the descriptor “principled.” Discursively, leadership is strongly tied to discourses of management, change, and youth. Preparing leaders is a stated goal of most ALA-accredited LIS programs; however, the discourse on leadership within the profession indicates that schools of LIS may be paying more attention to leadership within their curricula, specifically in management classes.

Leadership is a topic of growing interest for librarians. In 2005, The Future of Human Resources in Canadian Libraries identified leadership potential as the most important competency (yet the most difficult to fulfill) when hiring (Ingles 2005, 59). Management and leadership skills were identified as the two areas most in need of improvement in LIS programs (Ingles 2005, 120), and 88 percent of librarians reported that they felt the demand for leadership skills would increase over the next five years. The American Library Association (ALA) has an Emerging Leaders Program that focuses on the leadership development of librarians with fewer than five years of professional practice. In her presidential platform, ALA past president Leslie Burger cited leadership as a quality all librarians need to possess to move the profession forward and to meet patron demands (Burger, n.d.).

In 2006, Burger appointed the Presidential Task Force on Library Education to create a set of core competences that addressed the perceived gap between the skills taught in schools of LIS...
and the skills needed by working professionals (Hayden 2009b). The initial desire to have a statement of core competencies for LIS professionals was articulated at the first Congress on Professional Education in 1999. The intent of the congress, as Simmons (2000, 43) reported, was “to examine the initial preparation of professional librarians as a first step in studying the broader issues or education and training for librarians and other library workers.” A series of task forces was created to address these issues, including a Task Force on Core Competencies (Powell, Baker, and Mika 2002) and a Task Force on Core Values (Buschman 2000). Although draft versions of competencies documents were written by the Task Force on Core Competencies, no final version was submitted to the ALA Executive Board and Council for approval. In 2006, the Presidential Task Force on Library Education was created by Burger and chaired by Carla Hayden (see the appendix for a complete list of task force members). By October 2008, this task force prepared a core competences document that met with approval at the executive board and was presented to the ALA Council at the January 2009 midwinter meeting. In the task force’s final report, Hayden states that all previous draft versions of the competences were taken into account when drafting the final version and that various versions of the competences document were circulated both within and outside the ALA for comments and suggestions (Hayden 2009a). This resulted in a set of competences across eight areas of knowledge: Foundations of the Profession, Information Resources, Organization of Recorded Knowledge and Information, Technological Knowledge and Skills, Reference and User Services, Research, Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning, and Administration and Management (ALA 2009b). Leadership, as opposed to the budgetary, human resources, and assessment and planning activities normally associated with management, was not mentioned in this initial draft. Rather, the leadership competence was an amendment to the main document made at the ALA Council’s 2009 midwinter meeting. The minutes read: “Councilors (sic) Charles Forrest and Sandra Barstow moved and Council [voted], [t]o add the following sentence to ALA [Core Competences document]: 8E. The concepts behind, issues relating to, and methods for, principled, transformational leadership” (ALA 2009a). Due to the attention leadership was receiving in reports such as The Future of Human Resources in Canadian Libraries and through the ALA’s own Emerging Leaders Program, it is perhaps not surprising that this addendum was made. However, the apparent choice to name a specific leadership style, “transformational leadership,” instead of a broader competence that allowed for flexibility, was unusual; the addition of “principled” as a descriptor for leadership is also something that is not addressed, commonly, in the LIS leadership literature.

Transformational Leadership
There is no single definition of leadership. For example, Kenneth Leithwood and Daniel L. Duke, in an analysis of leadership in educational administration journals (1999), counted twenty different models and concepts of leadership in over 120 articles. Even the entry for “leadership” in the Oxford English Dictionary demonstrates the lack of coherence the concept has:
“The dignity, office, or position of a leader, esp. of a political party; ability to lead; the position of a group of people leading or influencing others within a given context; the group itself; the action or influence necessary for the direction or organization of effort in a group undertaking.” Within this single definition at least three different concepts of leadership are included: political leadership, organizational leadership, and group leadership. Often, when describing organizational leadership, as opposed to political leadership, leadership is linked to, but differentiated from, management. Management is most often associated with the day-to-day activities and tasks that are necessary for the maintenance, control, and continuance of an organization, whereas leadership is associated with organizational change, goal setting, and the emotional development of organizational members (English 2008).

In 1978, James MacGregor Burns put forth what was at the time a groundbreaking new understanding of leadership. Before Burns, leadership was associated with the rule of law. Military generals, monarchs, and other people in positions of power, like politicians, were considered to be leaders. Leadership was about wielding power and bending people to one’s will. Burns, in contrast, posited an understanding of leadership that placed the leader in a position of communal influence with his followers. In other words, “leaders act as agents of their followers” (Burns 1978, 3). Leadership, in this understanding, is transformational. Working together, leaders and followers strive to attain collective and individual goals, or end-values, that are based on liberty, justice, and equality. Leaders harness the collective goals of followers to satisfy their followers’ higher-order, moral, needs. Transformational leaders, therefore, are charismatic and use challenge and persuasion to encourage followers to explore their abilities (Bass and Riggio 2006).

Bernard M. Bass and Ronald E. Riggio (2006) argue that, because transformational leadership transcends the personal goals of the leader in favor of the collective goals of the followers, this leadership style is not only the most popular style of leadership but potentially a universal way of leading, meaning it has the potential to transcend contexts and cultures and to be equally effective everywhere. Recently, however, critiques of transformational leadership have emerged. Helen S. Timperley (2005, 399), for example, has argued that transformational leadership focuses on the “heroic solo-leader construction of leadership,” while Nicholas M. Allix (2000) argues that it cannot be sustained over time because its conception of the leader-follower relationship is undemocratic.2

Research into leadership in education and business has focused primarily on the effectiveness of various leadership styles. As a result, research is very outcomes-based (Heck and Hallinger 1999). A typical research question is, for example, “What leadership behaviors positively affect follower performance?” Typical methods include surveys, interviews, and observations.

---

2. For a more complete examination of the development of transformational leadership and its impact on the field of leadership studies, see Hunt (1999).
(Immegart 1988). Approaches to the study of leadership in the LIS literature focus on developing future leaders (e.g., by exploring ways to engage new professionals in leadership [De Long 2009] or reviewing the impact of leadership development programs [Kalin 2008; German et al. 2009]). Typical methods include surveys (Rooney 2010) and interviews (Lakos 2007). This study, then, is the first in LIS to apply a discourse analytic approach to the study of leadership.

Study Design
This study explored three questions related to the development of the core competences: (a) Why was “principled, transformational leadership” the style of leadership added to the Core Competences? (b) What was the discourse of leadership in the profession surrounding the development of the Core Competences? (c) Since the Core Competences will be incorporated into the standards of accreditation, how might the leadership competence affect LIS education? And what measures, if any, have MLIS programs taken to address it?

The study involved two phases: (1) a discourse analysis of key documents related to developing the competences and (2) interviews with individuals involved in the process. In phase 1, documents, outlined below, were examined for discursive claims on the development of the “principled, transformational leadership” competence. For Bronwyn Davies and Rom Harré (1990), discourses are the institutionalized use of language. This institutionalization can occur at many levels, the individual to the cultural, and it can develop around specific topics. Leadership, and its use within the “institution” of library and information studies, then, is its own discourse.

This study used Jonathan Potter’s (1996) definition of rhetoric to analyze the discourse. Potter argues that knowing the rhetorical use of language is important for understanding the overall nature of a discourse. According to Potter, rhetoric is a “pervasive feature of the way people interact and arrive at understanding” (Potter 1996, 106). By exploring rhetoric in language, attention is paid to the “alternative claims or arguments being undermined” (106). In this study, attention was paid to how certain claims or arguments were being presented in the literature, on the listservs, and in mission statements. Throughout the analysis of the leadership discourse, certain claims were typically undermined in favor of other claims.

The documents analyzed included publicly available reports submitted to and the minutes of ALA’s Council and Executive Board in regard to the Core Competences; publicly available presidential documents, including articles and websites; and the publicly available online archives of listservs,3 including (dates indicate archival holdings for each listserv included in this analysis):

- JESSE@listserv.utk.edu, a listserv devoted to issues relating to LIS education (January 1999 to December 2010);

3. The review of listserv contents was limited in some cases due to varieties in archival practices of each individual listserv. Although every effort was made to review the earliest post on the listserv, if the listserv archive did not start or
• coe@ala.org, the ALA’s listserv for the Committee on Education (January 2000 to December 2010);
• alacoun@ala.org, the ALA Council listserv (January 1999 to December 2010);
• libadmin@ala.org, the LLAMA Administration Discussion list (January 2006 to December 2010).

Literature on leadership, mission statements of leadership development institutes (e.g., the Northern Exposure to Library Leadership Institute, http://www.ls.ualberta.ca/neli/), and mission statements, course descriptions, and course syllabi from ALA-accredited schools of library and information studies were also analyzed. The selection of documents was intended to be representative of the discourse, not exhaustive. Gaining the perspectives of as many stakeholders as possible (from professionals to ALA insiders to faculty members) was considered when selecting documentary sources.

Documents from January 1999 through December 2010 were examined, since a call for the creation of a core competences document occurred at the first Congress on Professional Education in 1999 (Hayden 2009a). The task force struck by Leslie Burger in 2006 was responsible for the final Core Competences document submitted to ALA Council in 2009, which based its final document on drafts arising from previous development stages. December 2010 closed the analysis period, as this allowed time following the formal adoption of the Core Competences for outside stakeholders (e.g., the Association of Library and Information Science Education [ALISE]) to react publicly.

As stated previously, this study uses Potter’s definition of rhetoric to study the discourse of leadership in these documents. The analysis was completed by first reviewing the selected sources for the word “leadership” and for mentions of the Core Competences using Potter and Margaret Wetherell’s close reading techniques (1987). They recommend that researchers constantly ask the following questions: “Why am I reading this passage in this way? What features produce this reading?” (Potter and Wetherell 1987, 168). Attention was also paid to the intended function and consequence of the language choices. Language, here, is understood to be indexical; therefore, the meaning of a word choice is dependent on the context of its use (Potter and Wetherell 1987). In this sense, both the intended meaning of the author and the understanding of the reader are important aspects to consider during analysis. After sources have been read closely, hypotheses around the function and consequence of language can be made and linguistic evidence can be found.

For the second phase of the study, insiders were interviewed regarding their memories and experiences in relation to discussions and debates about the inclusion of leadership as a core
The intent of these interviews was to provide insider information about the decision-making process that surrounded the development of the competences. Using the membership list of the task force (see the appendix for a complete list of task force members), as listed by Hayden in her “Final Report, Library Education Task Force” to the ALA Executive Board on the activities of the task force (Hayden 2009b) and the minutes of the 2009 ALA Council meeting (ALA 2009a), a list of twenty-five insiders into the creation of the Core Competences was created. Eight task force members and two other key stakeholders were contacted via e-mail and asked to participate in the study; in the end, five insiders were interviewed for approximately thirty minutes each. Three were members of the task force, and two were the councillors who moved to have the leadership competence added to the document. Two participants asked that their identity be protected, while the remaining three waived their right to remain anonymous. Participants were asked questions related to how the Core Competences were developed, why leadership was not included in the initial draft presented to ALA Council, and why, from the perspectives of the insiders, “principled, transformational leadership” was identified as the type of leadership with which librarians should be competent. Ethics approval for this study was granted by the University of Alberta’s Faculties of Education, Extension, Augustana and Campus Saint Jean Research Ethics Board.

Results and Discussion
Leadership Discourse in LIS: Leadership versus Management
Leadership, in the ALA’s Core Competences of Librarianship, is only explicitly mentioned in the section devoted to “Administration and Management,” which is only one of eight areas covered in the Core Competences. The other competences in this section cover topics ranging from organizational planning and budgeting to human resources development to the assessment of public services and working with community stakeholders (ALA 2009b). The leadership competence was the only competence added from the floor when the Core Competences were adopted (other competences, however, were amended from the floor). The minutes do not document any discussion around this addition to the “Administration and Management” section, nor do they document any discussion of leadership, specifically “principled, transformational leadership.” From a discursive point of view, the placement of the competence within the Core Competences document indicates that leadership is considered to be a component of the administration and management of libraries as organizations. By implication, although all librarians need to be familiar with the “concepts behind, issues relating to, and methods for” (ALA 2009b, 5) leadership, the enactment of this competence will only occur when a librarian is in a management role; leadership, therefore, will not necessarily occur in a “Reference and User Services” or a “Technological Knowledge and Skills” role. The placement of this competence also has the potential to impact leadership training and education both for MLIS programs and for professional development training. Although the implications for LIS programs will be ex-
explored in detail later in this article, this placement does suggest that leadership should be taught in a management class. Heting Chu (2010) found that, in 2005, only thirty of forty-five LIS programs required their students to take a management class; limiting leadership education to management classes would, therefore, limit leadership education to elective courses in some schools. Additionally, leadership professional development opportunities would be limited to only those who have demonstrated an interest in becoming a library manager.

The task force members interviewed for this study indicated that leadership was not a topic they discussed. Task force members described leadership as a skill best developed outside LIS programs through professional development and experience. Said Michael Gorman: “What in essence 8.E [the leadership competence] says to the LIS programs . . . is ‘You will teach this. The graduates of your programs are not acceptable unless they know the concepts behind, issues relating to, and methods for, principled, transformational leadership.’” Many of the task force members noted that the Core Competences were intended to be the “competences that new graduates needed to be successful [professionals],” as Sophie (a pseudonym) stated. As a result, all of the task force members questioned the need for every new graduate to be a leader. Katherine (a pseudonym), for example, stated: “It’s hard for me to say that [leadership] is a core [competence] because that means that it should be everybody. And I believe that you can have a perfectly fine career as a librarian without necessarily being a leader.” Gorman even questioned if leadership could be taught and noted that leadership training went “beyond the remit” of LIS programs: “To my mind, leadership is not something you know. It is an attribute, a quality. It can be developed. There’s a question about whether it can be taught or not, in the way that administration can be taught.” Sophie argued, “You need experience before you can be a leader.”

Interviews with Charles Forrest and Sandra Barstow, the ALA councillors who moved for the addition of the competence during the 2009 midwinter meeting, indicated that the amendment was an initiative of Library Leadership and Management Association (LLAMA). Forrest was, and is, an elected division councillor for LLAMA, and he made the motion on its behalf. Forrest recalled: “We [LLAMA] were surprised [leadership] was not called out in the Core Competences. . . . It seemed like an oversight.” According to Forrest, the reason for the addition was this: “Leadership has emerged in the last several years at least as an important issue in the profession, as an important responsibility for staff at all levels and in all types of libraries.” The addition of leadership to the Core Competences was, therefore, seen as a recognition of the importance of leadership as a characteristic that helps the LIS professional be more successful.

Of the participants interviewed, only Sophie, Gorman, Forrest, and Barstow were at the ALA council meeting. Sophie, Forrest, and Barstow did not recall any debate or comment from the floor of the meeting regarding the leadership amendment. Said Sophie: “It was one item cast with a lot of other items that we had to vote on.” However, Gorman did recall some debate over
the addition of the competence to the management section, stating: “My memory is that it was first thought to [belong] to the first element [Foundations of the Profession].” Barstow recalled that there was debate over other proposed (and ultimately defeated) amendments but that “this one was so benign in comparison that it just sort of flew through.” All the participants in attendance were surprised at the ease of passing the leadership amendment. According to Forrest: “There was no debate on this [addition], . . . People may have stood up in support of it, but I don’t remember any debate. . . . I think our timing was good.” Barstow echoed Forrest’s recollection: “Everyone was like ‘oh yeah! That’s alright! That makes sense.’” The lack of debate around the amendment to the Core Competences and the fact that any proposed changes were not sent back to the task force for discussion indicates the strength of the leadership discourse in LIS. The discourse is so prominent that its omission is seen as a mere oversight and not a purposeful exclusion.

The placement of leadership with the “Administration and Management” competences reflects the discourse of leadership within the LIS professional literature around the development of the Core Competences. Leadership, specifically transformational leadership, was being discussed within the professional literature at this time; however, rhetorically, it was being separated from management. Writers often made clear that, while managers are bound hierarchically to particular positions within an organization, leaders can be found at any organizational level (Riggs 2001). This separation, however, is merely rhetorical, as the discourse of leadership implies that leaders must be in positions of organizational influence to implement their visions and goals. The rhetorical undermining of management can be clearly seen in Riggs’s division between leadership and management (taken from Warren Bennis [Bennis 1989, 6], On Becoming a Leader):

The manager administers; the leader motivates.
The manager is a copy; the leader is an original. . . .
The manager imitates; the leader originates.
The manager accepts the status quo; the leader challenges.
The manager does things right; the leader does the right thing.

In this example, the manager is seen as someone who is timid; who hides behind rules; who does not care about people; who is controlling, unoriginal, and boring. The leader, by contrast, is a person who is curious, inspiring, creative, future-oriented, and perhaps even fun.

In the leadership discourse, therefore, the concept of leadership undermines management. But, at the same time, leadership is often directly referring to people in management positions. In many ways, the word “leadership” is now conflated with the word “management.” Occasionally, leadership and management principles are combined into a form of “leadership management.” Pat McAbee (2002), for example, offers advice to managers that mixes leadership principles, such as involving employees in the goal setting of the organization, with more
management—or human relations–related goals, like providing clear job descriptions. This intermingling of leadership and management is often done unwillingly. Felix E. Unaeze, for example, in his article on “leadership management” in a reference department (2003), separates management and leadership rhetorically. Following Donald E. Riggs, Unaeze distinguishes between leadership as a forward-looking, goal-setting activity and management as a task-oriented, controlling activity. However, Unaeze’s focus is heads, or managers, of reference departments. In his conclusion, the two concepts become inescapably intertwined with each other: “It takes a good and effective head of reference to lead the troops and to steer the department wheel in the right direction” (Unaeze 2003, 115). The tension between management and leadership, at least when they are considered as mutually exclusive terms, occurs when management activity of status quo maintenance and the transformative intent of leadership, especially transformational leadership, intersect. The changes brought about by rapid technology shifts and varying user demands, plus a desire to maintain the status of libraries as a reliable source of information, sees librarians balancing the need for transformational change with a tradition of service delivery and professional expertise.

The Discourse of Transformational Leadership
Perhaps the most public supporter of transformational leadership during the development of the Core Competences was Leslie Burger. Leadership was a core tenet of Burger’s presidential platform. Central to Burger’s proposed presidential initiatives was the development of “strong, focused and visionary leadership” (Burger, n.d., par. 7) as the key to transforming libraries to meet the information needs of library users. Burger called upon library leaders to work together to transform libraries in the information age. Burger created the Emerging Leaders Program in an effort to provide newer librarians, librarians under the age of thirty-five or with fewer than five years of experience, with leadership experience within the ALA (ALA 2012). Burger’s presidential initiatives and Emerging Leaders Program are representative of the two undercurrents of the transformational leadership discourse in LIS: a current on developing leaders capable of guiding librarianship into a future of uncertain change and a current on focus on leadership as a generational issue.

Transformational Leaders as Guides for an Uncertain Future
Perhaps the most dominant discourse in librarianship for the past two decades has been the discourse of change. Although not the subject of this investigation, the change discourse requires some attention to shed light on the role of transformational leadership in LIS. Change brought about by technological innovation, changes in organizational structure, and service expectations of library users have been constant topics of discussion within the LIS literature for decades. During the 1990s, however, the discourse on change accelerated, primarily as a result of the impact of the Internet and the possibilities afforded to libraries in response to electronic
resources. Change, however, is not always understood to be positive. Amazon, Google, and Wikipedia, for example, have been viewed as challenging, or threatening, traditional library services (Coffman 1999; MacColl 2006; Shachaf 2009). In this context, transformational leadership is not connected to the formal definition offered previously. Instead it is linked in this discourse to a broad understanding of the concept of “change.” Change, whether positive or negative, is understood to have transforming effects on libraries. Transformational leaders are, therefore, needed to guide the profession into this unknown future, or as Burger stated: “The challenges faced in libraries today are changing at a rapid pace and require an agile workforce of problem-solvers, team players, leaders, and articulate spokespeople” (2006, 3).

The goals and missions of most leadership institutes for library and information professionals reflect this understanding that transformational leaders are needed to lead the profession into an unknown future. The mission statement of The Pacific Northwest Library Association (PNLA) Leadership Institute, for example, reads: “Like a phoenix, we rise transformed. We soar to meet our challenges with a renewed and reignited passion to serve, empower and inspire our communities” (PNLA 2010, par. 1). This vision statement is written on top of an image of a phoenix rising from the ashes. It is a curious statement that implies that library services, and perhaps even the profession at large, are in ruins and that current leaders are passionless and unable to meet the challenges of transformational change. Although other leadership institutes do not use such vivid imagery, many do reflect the need to focus on transformational change and leadership. The Northern Exposure to Leadership Institute, for example, aims to prepare leaders “to create, articulate and achieve organizational visions for the benefit of library service, initially, and society at large, ultimately” (2011), evoking Burns’s (1978) and Bass and Riggio’s (2006) descriptions of transformational leadership. And the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Research Library Leadership Fellows program wants to develop leaders who can support the ARL’s own goals to “support, enable, and enrich the transformations affecting research and research-intensive education” (Association of Research Libraries 2011).

When asked about the use of the word “transformational” in the ALA competence, insiders all responded that, for them, the concept of transformation was about change. None of the informants referred to Burns (1978) or any other transformational leadership scholars or concepts. Forrest recalled that transformational leadership was Burger’s presidential theme and that the notion of transformation was another foundational document for the ALA, such as the Core Values or the Strategic Plan: “It’s out there somewhere! We all know that we’re in this transitional, sort of unsettled kind of time in the history of libraries so that seemed to be one of the key concepts.” Gorman echoed Forrest’s assessment that the wording was related to the changing nature of libraries and even took it a step further to note that many library staff need leaders to guide them through these changing times: “The transformation referred to is the transformation of library services. It’s not transformational leadership, it’s leadership towards [transformation].” Barstow said that for her transformational leadership meant “working with
change and changing situations.” Although none of the insiders intended to allude to the specific leadership style of transformational leadership when they proposed, and subsequently voted to approve, the competency, the choice to use the phrase “transformational leadership” is still discursively significant. Language is indexical—itits meaning depends on the context of its use (Potter and Wetherell 1987). Within the context of the development of the Core Competences, transformational leadership referred specifically to change; however, the choice to use the phrase “transformational leadership” evokes the larger leadership concept. A reader, unaware of the specific intentions of the authors, may read the Core Competencies and presume a link between the intention of the authors and the large amount of literature written on the subject of transformational leadership. The meaning of “transformational leadership,” in this case, is a product of both the authors’ intention and the reader’s understanding.

Transformational Leadership as Generational Concern

The leadership discourse, in the LIS literature, in listserv discussions, and in the documents inviting librarians to attend leadership institutes, is focused on developing future leaders for the profession. The addition of the leadership competence itself to the Core Competences is an indication of this generational aspect of the leadership discourse, for the competences were intended to define “the basic knowledge to be possessed by all persons graduating from an ALA-accredited master’s program in library and information studies” (emphasis added; ALA 2009b, 1). “Generational” here is being used not solely in a manner that implies age, although there is certainly a youth undertone to this aspect of the discourse. Instead “generational” is being used to highlight the differences between those newer to the profession and those with more experience. Task force members in this study spoke about how the underlying goal of the Core Competences was to improve (in the words of Sophie) the “quality of the [LIS] candidates.” Generational concerns are also related to the discourse of leadership as management (or, perhaps more precisely, management as leadership). Succession planning and focusing on “growing your own leaders” (Hentshel 2008; Nixon 2008) and mentoring new professionals for leadership and management roles (Hwang 2008) are common topics within the LIS leadership literature; similarly, discussion groups on why new librarians do not want to manage are being held at conferences.

A rhetorical examination of the transformational leadership discourse demonstrates that “change” and “new” are undermining concerns over “tradition” and the views of more experienced librarians. The combination of the themes of transformational leadership and new librarians implies that the transformational change being sought by the profession will only be achieved through the actions and abilities of newer librarians. The status quo is no longer

enough to ensure that librarianship, as a profession, will survive the changes it faces as a result of technology and emerging new user demands. The profession needs new, maybe even young, leaders to help manage these changes and make libraries and the profession relevant in today’s Google-, Amazon-, and Wikipedia-dominated information world. Newer librarians are associated with more risk-taking behaviors and, as a result, are understood to be more willing to take the risks necessary to transform the profession; one article compared the risk-taking associated with transformational leadership to playing—a child’s activity (Kirby and Moore 2003). Transformational change and leadership, it seems, are supposed to be fun. More commonly found is the notion that transformational leadership is a messy, chaotic, and demanding experience that requires energy and dedication from leaders—perhaps two qualities, it is assumed, more commonly found in new librarians (Lachance 2004).

“Principled,” Transformational Leadership
There is no indication in the professional or academic literature, in the listserv postings examined, in the presidential platforms reviewed, or in the leadership institute mission statements about why the descriptor “principled” was added to the leadership competence. The Oxford English Dictionary defines “principled” as both “having good or right principles; acting in accordance with morality, showing recognition of right and wrong; upright, honourable” and “based on principles or rules; . . . guided by technical principles.” Examples of both usages appear in the LIS literature. For example, there are principled, or rules-based, approaches to selecting automated library systems (Manifold 2000) and sharing online listings of resources (Ringersma et al. 2010), as well as discussions about the “principled” Enlightenment-informed stance of the profession toward freedom of information (e.g., as it stands in opposition to indigenous knowledge; Byrne 2005) and the principled nature of the ALA’s Library Bill of Rights (Sheerin 1991).

Within the Core Competences themselves, principles are mentioned throughout, and both usages of the definition occur. For example, the first definition of “having good or right principles” appears in the first two competences that focus on foundational knowledge: “1A. The ethics, values, and foundational principles of the library and information profession” (ALA 2009b, 1). Examples of the second, rules-based definition can be found in the competences dealing with the organization of knowledge, technology, advocacy, and administration, for example: “3A. The principles involved in the organization and representation of recorded knowledge and information” (ALA 2009b, 2); and “8B. The principles of effective personnel practices and human resource development” (ALA 2009b, 5). Given the multiple usages of “principled” and

6. Ibid.
“principles” throughout the Core Competences, and in the literature, it is unclear what was intended by adding this descriptor to the leadership competence.

Members of the task force interviewed for this study, as well as the movers of the motion, noted that, for them, “principled” indicated many different things. For Sophie, it meant “somebody of good character, someone who’s trustworthy.” For Gorman, perhaps inadvertently evoking Burns’s understanding of transformational leadership (1978), it was a person who leads toward a common goal: “It’s not just leadership as ‘do what I tell you’ but leadership based on principles like bring library service to the masses.” Katherine thought it meant ethical, and that a leader should be ethical; however, she also felt it was redundant, because “the opening statement [of the Core Competences] refers to ethics, so ‘principled’ was already there.” Barstow and Forrest both agreed with Katherine’s assessment of “principled” meaning “ethical,” although they did not mention if they felt it was redundant. Barstow added that it meant “teaching people how to know what’s right from wrong in the profession.”

“Principled, Transformational Leadership” and LIS Education

Preparing leaders is a stated goal of the majority of ALA-accredited LIS education programs. A review of course descriptions, as stated on the websites of fifty-five of the fifty-seven accredited programs in the United States and Canada, indicates that leadership is most often taught as part of a management of libraries and information organizations course. Some LIS programs offer individual courses in leadership, as a concept that is separated from management; however, there was no indication if these courses focused specifically on transformational leadership or if they had a broader topicality. A few programs extended the concept of leadership outside of strictly organizational concerns.

The addition of the leadership competence to the Core Competences document did not appear to get any attention from LIS educators in the literature and on LIS education-related listservs like coe@ala.org and JESSE@listserv.utk.edu. LIS educators were members of the task force; the members interviewed for this study indicated that the task force was aware that it should not try to prescribe course work to LIS programs. There is no record of the task force consulting ALISE directly during the development of the Core Competences, and none of the task force members interviewed indicated any communication with ALISE during the Core Competences creation. However, the Core Competences as a whole did get some attention on both listservs when the draft version (i.e., without the leadership competence) was brought forward for comment in July 2008. In the public comments on the Core Competences, including those found on the ALA’s Committee on Accreditation’s blog on the review of the accred-

7. The University of Montreal and the University of Puerto Rico were excluded from this review as their materials are not published in English.
iteration standards (ALA Committee of Accreditation 2009), there is no comment on the omission of leadership. Nor was there any comment on the addition of the leadership competence after the January 2009 ALA Council meeting. This may be because the revised competences (and a discussion of changes posed from the floor) were not posted to these lists after their adoption at the ALA meeting; as many LIS educators do not attend these meetings, it is unclear whether or how they were informed of this change.

The Core Competences will have an impact on LIS education, although the impact of the leadership competence specifically is unclear. Renée D. McKinney found that 95 percent of all LIS programs addressed the Core Competences as they were initially drafted by the task force (2006). Although McKinney’s study was completed before the addition of the leadership competence, at least half of the LIS programs reviewed for this study explicitly mentioned leadership as a topic covered in a management class or as a class in and of itself in available course descriptions. This number may appear low, as all LIS programs offer at least one course devoted to the management of libraries and other information organizations. However, due to the lack of accessible syllabi and limited course descriptions, it is possible that leadership is also being taught in the remaining programs. And, because of the flexibility inherent in the standards for accreditation, each program will continue to approach the teaching of leadership differently. It is also worth noting that none of the syllabi reviewed for this study used the phrase “principled, transformational leadership” or other terms that might make clear how this concept will be enacted in curricula.

Conclusion
This discourse analysis provides insight into how leadership broadly, and transformational leadership more specifically, is understood within the LIS community. Leadership is linked to management in the Core Competences, in the LIS literature, and in how the concept is taught in LIS programs. Rhetorically, however, these two concepts are often separated into discrete sets of activities and characteristics. Management is related to the negative and non-people-oriented qualities of day-to-day organizational tasks, controls, and systems. Leadership, in contrast, is people-focused, motivating, and future-directed. The positive qualities associated with leadership undermine the so-called negative qualities of management. The word “leadership” was observed to be replacing the word “management” in the literature. The linking of leadership to management practices, however, means that the transformational change sought by the profession can only be enacted at a managerial level. Yet leadership possibilities are limited, rhetorically, to the young and new. However, these are exactly the people who are probably least likely to hold management positions. The concept of transformation was primarily linked to professional change, yet it evoked the theory of transformational leadership, both in descriptions of how leadership could potentially help guide the profession through this transforma-
tional time and in the choice to use the phrase “transformational leadership” in the Core Competences.

There was no clear explanation for the addition of the descriptor “principled” to the leadership competence. Within the Core Competences, “principled” and “principles” were used to refer to both acting honorably and as a set of rules. Further exploration into why this word was chosen as a descriptor needs to be completed. What events or discourses influenced the choice to add this descriptor? If this descriptor refers to acting honorably, we need to ask if there is such a thing as “unprincipled leadership.” If the concept refers to a set of rules governing leadership, further articulation of these rules must be completed. To uncover the reasons behind the addition of “principled” to the leadership competence, interviews are needed with key informants in the development of the Core Competences and those involved in the 2009 ALA Council’s midwinter meeting.

There was no public reaction to the addition of the leadership competence from LIS educators. This may be because preparing leaders is a stated goal of most of the LIS programs accredited by the ALA. The task force members interviewed for this study indicated that they believed there was a disconnect between the education of an LIS professional and the needs of the profession. Gorman (2004a, 2004b), for example, is well known for his opinions about LIS education. The findings of both this study and McKinney’s study (2006) indicate that LIS programs are in fact teaching the skills outlined by the Core Competences, including leadership. The role that the Core Competences may play in the review of the accreditation process may impact LIS education. The discourse on leadership within the profession indicates that schools of LIS may be paying more attention to leadership within their curricula. Following the discourse as it currently exists, leadership will become an even more prominent curricular item in LIS courses, specifically in management classes. Movement toward a leadership-focused student body and curriculum is being pursued by some schools. Dalhousie University in Halifax, Canada, for example, explicitly states that it is seeking applicants who will be potential leaders in the field (Dalhousie University 2012).

Given the prominence of leadership in the professional and academic literature, the abundance of leadership institutes for LIS professionals, and the discourse of change and its link to new librarians, further investigation into certain aspects of the leadership discourse is needed. Why, for example, was leadership excluded from the draft version of the Core Competences submitted to ALA Council? Is the description of leadership offered in the Core Competences really the discourse the profession wants to have about leadership? Should the LIS community be discussing alternative understandings of leadership? Given the close discursive relationship between management and leadership in LIS, research into how these roles are enacted in the LIS workplace should be completed. Are individuals in leadership roles always managers? Are there nonmanagerial leadership roles in libraries and other information organizations? Does the
enactment of leadership within LIS differ from other professions? These, and other questions, are rich areas for future research and debate.

Appendix
Presidential Task Force on Library Education, Task Force Members

As Listed in “Final Report, Library Education Task Force (Special)” (Hayden 2009b):

Karen Adams (director of libraries, University of Manitoba)
John N. Berry III
John M. Budd (professor, University of Missouri)
Leslie B. Burger (director, Princeton Public Library)
Yvonne Chandler (associate professor, University of Texas)
Michele V. Cloonan (dean GSLIS, Simmons College)
Trevor A. Dawes (circulation services director, Princeton University Library)
Mary W. Ghikas (staff liaison, senior associate executive director, member programs and services, American Library Association)
Joan R. Giesecke (dean of libraries, University of Nebraska)
Michael Gorman
Romina Gutierrez (Princeton Public Library)
Michael C. Habib
Tracie D. Hall (consultant, The GoodSeed Consulting Group)
Edward C. Harris (dean of School of Communication, Information, and Library/interim director, Southern Connecticut State University)
Carla D. Hayden (chair; executive director, Enoch Pratt Free Library)
Luis Herrera (city librarian, San Francisco Public Library)
Terry Ann Jankowski (University of Washington Health Science Libraries)
Robert S. Martin
Sharon McQueen (lecturer, University of Wisconsin–Madison)
Brenda Pruitt-Annisette (Fulton County School System Media Services)
Rebecca Vargha (librarian/SILS-SLA president, University of North Carolina)
Holly G. Willett (associate professor, Rowan University)
Jennifer A. Younger (director of libraries, University of Notre Dame)
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