
Leadership in Librarianship

ALICE GERTZOG

ABSTRACT

TWO SURVEYS WERE ADMINISTERED to library professionals holding titular headships in order to develop a list of perceived library leaders. This list was used to learn the locus (subfield) of leadership and the degree of fieldwide integration as evidenced by the extent of shared perceptions by respondents. Results revealed that leaders tend to be associated most strongly with a category labeled "other" whose members may serve as professionals' professionals; that is, high status field members and directing professional associations. Some fieldwide integration is indicated by agreement on the nomination of two people by a significant portion of respondents from six subfields. Nominators in three subfields frequently concurred in their leader choices creating a de facto community of shared perceptions, and, by implication, shared values which, in turn, may influence the profession's agenda and priorities.

INTRODUCTION

Those who lament the "absence" of leadership in librarianship today inaccurately portray the field. Leadership is an integral part of any social system and is, therefore, always present. The absence, however, of a shared perception by members of a group about who its leaders are may indicate the absence of shared aims and goals for that group—in other words, the absence of a common agenda. Leaders draw strength from their ability to articulate common group goals and purposes. A group that does not share these goals and purposes is hard pressed to share its perceptions of who is providing leadership.

Identifying leaders is an important undertaking. By identifying those who are perceived as providing leadership, by learning who designates them as leaders, and by assessing the extent of their support, we gain understanding about the social structure in which these leaders operate and about the value system which guides the field at any moment in time.

Two important factors that constitute any social system are the nature of its social structure and the nature of its leadership (Rogers & Kincaid, 1981). Little consideration has been given to the relationship between the two, although it seems clear that they are intimately related. In this study, the structure of leadership in the library field is developed and then used to explore some aspects of its social structure.

Two surveys, described later, were administered to generate data that would shed light on the following research questions:

1. Where in the library field do questionnaire respondents perceive leadership to be located? Location, in this context, refers to the library subfield in which perceived leaders are currently working.

The first question is designed to address the following collateral questions:

Do institutional identifications of leaders indicate that leadership is perceived as residing in one or two subfields of librarianship or is leadership dispersed throughout the library community?

To what extent is there a relationship between the subfield identification of nominators and those of nominees?

Is there a group of leaders who can be termed field-wide, one which is broad-based, and whose members share recognition from people occupying a number of different subfields of the profession? The implications for agenda-setting of a profession whose leadership can be described as widely dispersed among its subfields would be different than for a profession whose leadership is monolithic or less widely shared. If agendas affect, and are affected by, leadership, then subfields with which leaders are associated may be revelatory of the field's current agenda.

The second research issue concerns what Abbott (1988) terms "connectivity" and poses the following question:

2. To what extent can the library field be considered integrated? Degrees of integration, for these purposes, are operationalized to mean the extent to which perceptions of leadership are shared, with subfields of the profession generally serving as units of analysis.

This research question examines survey responses regarding the relationships among subfields of the profession. The following

related questions were also given attention:

To what extent is there shared perception between and among occupants of subfields about who is providing leadership? Members of which subfields exhibit the greatest coincidence of nomination? Once a roster of field-wide leaders is developed, are those associated with some subfields more likely than are members of other subfields to nominate people whose names appear on that roster?

Broad intersubfield agreement on leader names might describe a well-integrated field. On the other hand, agreement between members of a group of, say, three subfields about those defined as field-wide leaders might signal the presence of a subset of the community which shares some values and priorities and other subsets which do not. Further, lack of connectivity may indicate a community in process of differentiating.

DEFINITION, ROLES, ELEMENTS, CONSTRAINTS: SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Social structure refers to the patterns generally discernible in social life (Blau, 1975) that are considered relatively enduring or permanent (Homans, 1975). Social structure describes not only the differentiated social positions, roles, or statuses, both formal and informal, in a group (Blau, 1975) but also the structural configurations of social relationships among them (Homans, 1975; Merton, 1975).

Other elements of a social structure include structures of socialization (education), economics, politics, kinship, communication, and organization (Barber, 1975). Reference groups, those groups Merton (1949) considered central to an individual's life, are integral parts of the social structure as well. Although some sociologists reserve ideology, science, religion, values, philosophy, language, and art to the province of "culture," here culture (ideas) and structure (role and behavior) are treated as one. They seem inextricably bound in a basic premise of the sociology of knowledge that the content of ideas is influenced by social structure and that there is an important relationship between the internal structure of a particular cultural institution and the cultural products developed and accepted within it (Crane, 1972).

The rise of interest in social systems theory, in the sociology of knowledge, in the sociology of science, and in organizational development has led to revived interest in social structures of both scholarly disciplines and formal organizations (see, for example, Mullins, 1973; Crane, 1972).

Applied science, in contrast with basic science, is concerned with problems whose solutions are perceived as having practical

applications (Crane, 1972), although professional/applied fields are not dichotomous with scholarly ones. They may be seen more profitably as falling along a continuum. Despite the substantial literature built around the sociology of professions, semi-professions, and occupations, few works describe the social structure of an entire applied field. Methodologically, the task of studying such a field seems less straightforward than it is for a formal organization or a scholarly discipline.

Analysis, for instance, of institutional hierarchies, a common practice in discovering the structure of formal organizations, is not as helpful when describing the structure of a profession. Citation analysis has been used successfully to analyze social and leadership structures of scholarly disciplines, but its application to an applied field has some limitations. In an academic field, study of who holds the major elective position in the national association may also be useful in understanding the discipline's social structure. The presidency is often considered "reward" for scholarship. Although this may also be true in some applied fields, Merton found that association headship has sometimes represented "compromise" between prevailing factions, a noncontroversial choice, or even, at times, the absence of an alternative choice.

What is known about the social structure of the library world that can be applied to this study? Unfortunately, research into field-wide structure and/or roles is sparse. Most studies tend to look at formal organizations within the profession—i.e., specific libraries or specific professional organizations, rather than at the profession as a whole. Concern with gender issues—representation, career patterns, and remuneration—has been responsible for much of the field-wide research that has occurred during the past few years.

Nevertheless, some common wisdom, along with inferences drawn from the few empirical studies, can be employed to begin to describe the social structure of the field. For instance, librarianship is generally seen as containing four institutional subfields—academic, special, public, and school—all of which operate within the aegis of a parent organization. Some critics argue that this classification scheme is too general and fails to distinguish the real differences within the subfields. Junior or community college libraries, they contend, bear little resemblance to large university research libraries. The same difficulties emerge in considering rural public libraries and large metropolitan ones in the same category. Special libraries often differ not only in size but also in subject matter.

The library field may also be thought of as organized into functional groups—technical services or public services, for instance—with such manifest roles as cataloger or reference librarian.

But many of the same difficulties emerge in connection with a functional classification as appear when an institutional approach is employed. Catalogers perform different tasks in research libraries than they do in community colleges; a category labeled manager would include the director of the Boston Public Library as well as the head of the library at the First District School in Meadville, Pennsylvania.

For purposes of this study, however, the traditional subfield divisions provide a useful, even if limited, method for describing the field since the distinctions among types of audience, environments, and measures of success are relatively sharper.

It is generally held that a hierarchy, a "caste" system according to Pauline Wilson (1983), exists that results in academic and special librarians being thought to hold higher status than public and school librarians. Abbott (1988), too, considers academic and special librarians to be of higher status and to be at the core of the library world. Empirical studies of monetary reward structures have tended to validate these claims.

DEFINITION, ROLE, ELEMENTS, CONSTRAINTS: LEADERSHIP

Leadership is a universal human phenomenon (Bass, 1990). All social structures have leaders (Havelock, 1975). Leadership refers to how people in groups organize themselves (Kellerman, 1984) and interact (Bass, 1990). Leaders are agents of change—i.e., persons whose acts affect other people more than other people's acts affect them (Stogdill, 1981). Leaders are involved in helping to crystallize what followers need, which of those needs should be addressed, and what methods should be used to adduce solutions (Burns, 1978). Leaders, therefore, may be said to articulate and shape the agenda.

Definitionally, the term *leadership* may be even more ambiguous than that of its parent, social structure. Cecil Gibb (1968), writing in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, makes this explicit with his contention that "the concept of leadership, like that of general intelligence, has largely lost its value for the social sciences...so diverse are [these] ways [of leading] that any one concept attempting to encompass them all, as leadership does, loses the specificity and precision necessary to scientific thinking" (Gibb, 1968, p. 91).

As far back as 1935, Pigors (in Gibb, 1968) distinguished between "headship" and "leadership." The prime difference he identified between the two is a function of the *source* of power to influence. In formal organizations with appointed heads, the authority has its source outside the group. Subordinates accept the head's influence on "pain of punishment derived from the larger organization." In

a voluntary group or association, the source of the authority is the group itself. The leader's authority is willingly accorded by fellow group members, the followers. Followership rests on the promise of positive satisfactions to be gained from shared goals. This is not to say that headship and leadership are mutually exclusive, only to maintain that they are not mutually coincident, as much of the current leadership and management literature about leadership seems to suggest. In this article, nonformally vested perceptual leadership will be termed *emergent* to differentiate it from headship and titular leadership.

Definitions of leadership emerging from different conceptual categories will produce, in any given field, different leader name lists. For instance, if we see leadership as the contribution of a specific idea or technology, the names that emerge are likely to be the Edisons, Bells, and Fords. On the other hand, if we talk about action and/or persuasion, the names may be Roosevelts, Wilsons, and Hearsts. Even within groups where operational definitions of the term *leadership* have been agreed upon, the question of who is providing leadership may be observer dependent and a product of selective perception, cognitive dissonance, and other psychological factors. On the other hand, who a society names as its leaders gives a strong indication of that society's values at that moment in time. A society which selects actors and sports heroes as its leaders reflects values or priorities different from a community which elevates philosophers and poets to leadership positions.

One common basis for designating a person a leader is expertise. Perceived expertise influences how people think and behave. They defer to expert opinions even to the point of contradicting their own judgments or values (Milgrim, 1974).

Patrick Wilson (1983) uses the concept of cognitive authority to describe how humans depend on second-hand knowledge to guide them in their understanding of the world. "Experience teaches," he says, "but not much. Most of us go through life occupying a narrow range of social locations. If all we could know of the world was what we could find out on the basis of first-hand experience, we would know little" (p. 9). So we use other's knowledge, the knowledge of authorities.

How do people determine cognitive authorities? Present reputation is the strongest practical test, particularly reputation among those we believe to have cognitive authority in the appropriate sphere.

"Opinion leadership," long considered a key to the diffusion of innovation, is a product of perceived expertise (cognitive authority) and reputational leadership. According to Rogers's (1983) opinion,

leaders are more exposed to external communication. They are more "cosmopolite." They have higher social status, and they are more innovative.

The distinction between cosmopolitan influentials and local influentials has been explored by Merton (1975a) in his study of communities. He labeled "cosmopolitans" as those whose orientation is to the wider world rather than to an immediate or proximate reference group. The terms *local* and *cosmopolitan* are used in this research to describe spheres in which perceived leaders are seen to exert their influence. "Cosmopolitans" are those who have been identified as leaders by several subfields of the profession, field-wide leaders. "Locals" are those whose influence seems to be more narrowly exerted and extends to only one or two subfields. The designations include no judgment about the quality of leadership but only about their domains.

The study of leadership in the social sciences has led to a major debate in both sociology and political science which centers on the character of the leadership structure within communities. Its participants argue about whether there is a power elite—that is, a monopolistic and monolithic group which has a generalized ability to influence most affairs—or whether community power is situational to the decision at hand and is therefore factional, coalitional, and, to some degree, amorphous. The debate is both theoretical and empirical, and how one stands on it determines to a large extent the investigative methods one employs. Those who subscribe to the "elite" position generally use a reputational method to identify power holders. On the other hand, those who adhere to the pluralistic position are more prone to study specific cases and analyze collective decisions retrospectively (see for instance, Dahl, 1961, and Hunter, 1953, as representative of the two postures).

One version of the reputational approach to the study of leadership was used by Kadushin (1974) in his investigation of American intellectual elites. As in science and the professions, he said that only colleagues can evaluate the qualifications of their peers. Thus, the operational definition of an elite intellectual becomes for Kadushin "a person whom other elite intellectuals believe to be an elite intellectual" (p. 7). Kadushin found that an intellectual was defined as "one who is expert in dealing with high-quality general ideas on questions of values and esthetics and who communicates his judgments on these matters to a fairly general audience" (Kadushin, 1974, p. 7). Similarly, in this study, leaders in the library field are those who other library leaders believe to be leaders.

Are those who are perceived as leaders really leaders? For purposes of this investigation, perceived leaders are, in fact, leaders. Because

they have been identified as leaders, they fit, definitionally, into someone's understanding of a leader and therefore function as one. Perception, in this case, creates reality.

The degree to which there is shared meaning among members of a group is a product of how similar their individual patterns of interaction have become. Smircich and Morgan (1982) contend that if a group situation embodies strongly held competing definitions of reality, no clear pattern of leadership evolves.

There is little research about "emergent" leadership as it relates to the library community as a whole, although there has been a spurt of interest and activity about leadership in recent years. Those research efforts which treat the concept travel two distinct paths: one group of studies defines leadership as management of administration, always within the context of headship of a specific organization. The other views leadership from a historical and or biographical perspective, and in terms of the provision of one or many specific contributions to the profession, in personal characteristics, or in qualitative analysis of how some titular leaders view leadership. Neither path seems to point toward leadership as an element of social structure of the library field, although they incorporate the notion of change and of leadership requirements (see, for instance Euster, 1987; Woodsworth & Von Wahle, 1988; Riggs, 1988; Sheldon, 1991).

THE METHODOLOGY FOR THIS STUDY

A serial nomination process was used to generate a list of perceived library leaders and to determine reasons for their selection. Two questionnaire instruments were distributed, one based on the other, with the results of the first used to construct the second.

Both surveys requested respondents to name up to fifteen people they perceived to be providing leadership to the American library field today. The first survey questionnaire was open ended with blank spaces for nominations. Respondents were required to recall the names of those who they believed were leaders. The second questionnaire included a list of the 101 names mentioned most frequently in response to the first survey. Respondents could choose from among them or supply additional names. Questionnaires were color coded to indicate the subfield of the profession with which respondents were associated.

One of two survey questionnaires was randomly distributed to a 1,208 member survey group. The survey universe used traditional library institutional subfields and included:

1. directors of large public libraries—those with budgets of over \$1 million;

2. heads of special libraries with at least six professional librarians on staff;
3. directors of academic libraries which contain more than a half-million books;
4. full-time library educators with the rank of associate or full professor;
5. a stratified, nonrandom sample of school librarians.

The process of selecting school/media librarians for the survey proved to be a formidable task. The intention had been to draw up a list of school/media librarians who were responsible for the largest number of libraries within districts. It was assumed that a threshold figure separating them from other libraries in the category would become manifest. However, none appeared after a time-consuming search.

The absence of a group of school librarians similar in character to those in other subfields constituted a major stumbling block to the research. Should school librarians be eliminated from the study or should a list be constructed which, though flawed, would nevertheless represent some portion of that subfield?

The latter course was chosen. The list for school librarians is not a universe. It is a sample and not a random scientifically constructed one whose limitations should be considered as the findings are presented (the specific methods used to draw the sample of school librarians appear in Gertzog, 1988).

6. A category labeled "other." After compiling the survey universe by subfields, a group of important library institutions remained for whom no category seemed appropriate. They included, among others, state libraries, publishers, associations, journals, and two libraries—The New York Public Library and the Library of Congress—which seemed to defy categorization in any single subfield. Governance, scope, and funding distinguish them from other institutions. They are the two largest libraries in the United States. Both are comprehensive in their approach to collection development. The New York Public Library straddles both the public and research fields in its funding, scope, and audience. The Library of Congress, while governmentally funded, is a special library for members of Congress as well as a research institution. In order to avoid both the Procrustean task of trying to fit them into a well-defined subfield and the controversies which might ensue from such placement, they have been labeled as "other."

Yet another important question about the "other" category related to its treatment as a subfield. This study explores the behavior of members of subfields acting in the aggregate rather than as individuals. For instance, the subfields represented by nominators

and nominees are cross tabulated in order to examine relationships among them. Members of the "other" category are not tied together by commonality in clientele, governance, or funding source to the degree that members of the other five subfields seem to be.

Yet it can be argued that "others" reside structurally in the same place within the library profession—that is, roughly between the fields of practice and the world of research (Havelock, 1975). Further, most members of this category function as boundary spanners inasmuch as the institutions with which they are associated are not concerned with a single subfield of the profession, but with several, if not all. Finally, most members placed in the "other" category do not mediate with the library client world but rather work in purely professional environments. For these reasons, "other" is considered to have some legitimacy as a subfield and is therefore accorded treatment similar to that given to the remaining subfields.

A large survey group was used in order to elicit as many names as possible and to allow for analysis by subfields. The large number of potential respondents, coupled with a need to protect anonymity, suggested the use of a mail survey. The decisions to limit the survey to American library leaders and to place it in the present time period were made in order to produce less ambiguous, more uniform data. In addition, the data thus generated would represent a benchmark and could serve as a basis for comparison with future similar studies.

The decision to use two types of instruments was made to take advantage of factors that seem to accompany each and that would enhance the usability of the findings. The first questionnaire, which asked that respondents supply names, represented an attempt to generate as spontaneous a list of names as possible and to negate the bandwagon or "Matthew Effect" in which rewards accrue on the basis of name recognition rather than current contribution. The second survey was designed to provide a structure, that is, a set of names from which to choose, in order to try to replace the limitations and difficulties of the recall process with the ease of one which involved recognition. This second approach might help to minimize the noise generated by momentary impressions and political considerations.

The most important criterion for inclusion in the universe of librarians destined to receive the survey was "bigness." Size, measured in dollars, volumes, staff, rank, or number of libraries for which a unit accepts responsibility, seems to be the basis on which financial benefits and prestige are conferred within the profession. Using size seemed to permit uniformity and ease of decision.

Other reasons for seeking the views of this group rather than those of a random sample of the entire profession were based on the following assumptions:

1. Librarians in higher positions are more apt to be involved in "boundary-spanning" activities and to be "cosmopolitans."
2. They bear heavy financial, personnel, policy, and programmatic responsibilities and are the persons most directly and immediately affected by leadership in the field. Members of this group are likely to be among the most knowledgeable about patterns of professional influence in the field.
3. Most librarians, like workers in other professions, devote only a fraction of energy to matters of diagnosis, planning, innovation, deliberate change, and growth. Day-to-day considerations demand that the major proportion of available effort be spent in carrying out routine goal-directed operations and maintaining existing relationships within the system (Miles in Havelock, 1969). The likelihood, then, of most library personnel being familiar with field-wide professional leaders, even reputationally, is small.
4. The library world is probably marked by a center-periphery structure which resembles those identified for other fields where most members are "outsiders" or, at best, marginally connected. Those in charge of the "biggest" institutions are most likely to be at the "center" of the field rather than on its periphery.
5. The exchange of ideas most frequently occurs between "tranceivers" who are "homophilous," that is, similar or linked in certain social characteristics (Rogers & Kincaid, 1981).
6. This group of titular leaders probably includes colleagues and peers of those who will be nominated as leaders and, as such, is the group which Kadushin (1974) asserts is best able to evaluate their qualifications.

METHODOLOGICAL LIMITS

The nomination process has some drawbacks. A large population is needed to isolate a small number of opinion leaders. Anybody can appear on the list. Ray Bradbury, for instance, was nominated by a California librarian; important colleagues can be overlooked; and local variations produced, for example, by geographic isolation, may influence the choices.

Drawbacks to constructing the list from a population should be mentioned as well. The library field is diverse. Six subfields cannot adequately describe all its parts. The relative homogeneity of the survey group caused by adherence to the criterion of "bigness" and that of titular headship may have been responsible for some of the results. It is conceivable that members of this group are more likely to be involved in the field's professional associations—in particular, the American Library Association—and, therefore, perceive leadership as emerging from that sector of the population. In addition,

this group on average is older than the profession's membership as a whole and therefore more likely to nominate older individuals than might be named by a cross-section of the field. And finally, this group may associate leadership with established structural and cultural considerations and positions and find leaders among their ranks, thereby screening out potentially restructuring ideas and leaders.

DETERMINING GROUPS FOR ANALYSIS

Frequency of mention governs much of the study's analysis. Leaders are identified as such because they receive the most nominations or are selected the greatest number of times. Responses about perceived leaders were analyzed to produce leader lists formed by aggregate frequency of mention and frequency of mention across subfields. Frequency of mention is the basis, too, for the composition of several subcategories of leaders used in the study.

Some analyses include all nominees and all nominators. Others utilize the group of 101 leaders who received four or more nominations on the first survey and whose names appear on the second survey instrument. The cut-off point at four or more nominations is arbitrary. It does represent, however, more than two-thirds (70 percent) of the nominations and does not include those mentioned infrequently or only once. A cut-off point of five nominations would have produced a list with twenty-two fewer names, and one which required three or more nominations would have included thirty-three additional people.

Another set of analyses utilizes the groups of sixteen most frequently named leaders produced by each survey. A group size of sixteen was dictated by the sharp difference in the number of nominations separating the sixteenth and seventeenth names on the first survey list. A similar, although less precipitous, hiatus appeared between the sixteenth and seventeenth nominations in the second survey.

A final group of leaders emerging from the study, and perhaps the most crucial one, includes those persons who have been designated as "field-wide" leaders—i.e., the "cosmopolitans." These are the leaders whose nominations are used to assess the degree of integration exhibited by the field.

Establishing this group required decision rules about the pool from which field-wide leaders would be selected, and the necessary level of field-wide support. Two related considerations are involved in the determination of field-wide support. One is the percentage of a subfield naming a nominee, and the other is the number of subfields achieving that percentage. The second consideration was more easily resolved. To claim field-wide leadership, nominated

leaders must be recognized as such by members of at least half of the subfield. The first consideration, the level of support within a subfield, was decided arbitrarily and for pragmatic reasons.

Using as a source the sixteen most frequently named leaders in each survey, two sets of rules for determining field-wide leadership were adopted. Individuals are termed field-wide leaders for the first survey if they have been so named by 10 percent of the respondents from three subfields. They are classed as field-wide in the second survey if they have received 20 percent of the selections of three subfields. Higher numbers of responses and a more limited choice of leaders accounted for a greater percentage of agreement on leader names in the second survey. Consequently, the threshold has been set at a higher point—20 percent rather than 10 percent. These 10 and 20 percent thresholds, combined with the three subfield requirements, produce a group large enough to investigate patterns of behavior.

RESPONSES

For the first survey, questionnaires asking for nominations were mailed to 574 library field members. Responses totaled 37 percent ($n = 211$). In order to achieve a return rate of at least 50 percent, a follow-up letter was sent to all those who had not responded after five weeks. A somewhat lower response rate for special and school librarians prompted a special individualized plea to those two groups. In all, 56 percent of the 574 recipients of the first survey responded, an additional 19 percent having completed questionnaires as a result of the follow-up mailing. Data produced by the first survey were used to create the perceived leader list needed to conduct the second survey.

Survey questionnaires containing the names of 101 members of the library field who had received at least four nominations in the first survey were mailed to 657 respondents. The questionnaires (58 percent) provided a yield large enough to make a follow-up unnecessary. Table 1 presents the rate of return by library subfield for the first and second surveys.

While special librarians and "others" were least likely to submit responses for the first survey, school librarians returned the smallest percentages of questionnaires in the second. Conversely, academic librarians were the most frequent respondents on the first round with a 69 percent rate of return, and public librarians responded at the greatest rate (66 percent) for the second. Approximately three-fifths of the survey members of the other three subfields—school, public, and library school—responded with 63 percent, 58 percent, and 57 percent respectively.

TABLE 1.
RATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN BY LIBRARY FIELD

<i>Responses</i>	<i>Subfield</i>						<i>Total</i>
	<i>LibEd</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Academic</i>	<i>Special</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>Other</i>	
First survey							
Percentage	57%	58%	70%	41%	63%	40%	56%
Number	(84)	(95)	(52)	(28)	(37)	(17)	(313)
Second survey							
Percentage	59%	66%	60%	52%	41%	60%	59%
Number	(110)	(127)	(52)	(42)	(26)	(28)	(385)
	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>					
Mean	59%	56%					
Median	59.5	57.5					
SD	8.4	11					

Methodologically, the rates of return indicate that the response to a checklist (second survey) compared with the response to an open-ended questionnaire (first survey) is both substantially higher and contains less variability among the subfields. This finding reinforces current behavioral research which suggests that a task requiring participants to recall names presents more obstacles to a high response than one which demands a recognition of names.

FINDINGS

The data generated by the two surveys were analyzed for two important manifestations of nominating behavior. First, they were examined to learn which subfields produced the most leader nominees. Second, they were studied to ascertain the extent to which nominations arose only or primarily from the nominees' own subfields or whether support for them also was apparent in other sectors of the profession.

Any survey as large as this one produces vast amounts of data that must be winnowed and distilled. Tables were generated to report the following information: (1) aggregate nominations and nominees by subfields; (2) percentages, by subfields, of nominations and nominees with controls for representation in the survey universe; (3) subfield distribution of leader names by all names submitted, 101 who received four or more nominations and the 16 most frequently chosen names; and (4) "field-wide" leader distribution. Unfortunately, the differences between findings in the first and second survey necessitate that both be reported, sometimes serially, making the narrative cumbersome.

Those who responded to the first survey most often chose leaders whose subfield coincided with their own. In addition, nominees in

each subfield, with the exception of "other," drew the greatest proportion of their support from colleagues in their own subfields.

This should come as no surprise. Public librarians would naturally gravitate toward other public librarians with whom they share an agenda, values, and/or culture. Selecting a leader from one's own subfield is, to some extent, like selecting a political candidate because of his or her party identification. It enables us to substantially cut information costs (Wildavsky, 1991). With that said, in which additional subfields did nominators identify leaders? Names emerge most often from the ranks of library educators, "others," and academic librarians. When controls to adjust for unequal representation in the survey universe are applied, "others" were 361 percent more likely to produce leaders than their numbers would suggest. Table 2 describes the relationship between nominations and nominees for the first survey.

From the pool of 559 names submitted by survey respondents, 101 received four or more nominations. These are the names appearing on the second survey instrument. Further refinement produced a list of sixteen most frequently mentioned leaders. Table 3 describes the distribution among subfields of the entire list, the 101 mentioned four or more times, and the sixteen most frequently named.

Selection behavior changed when respondents were more restricted in their choices. The second survey presented a list of 101 names from which respondents were to select those providing leadership. Data from the second survey indicate that, while nominees for the most part still receive their greatest support from nominators within their own subfield, only two subfields—library educators and "others"—vote most heavily in their own subfields. The remaining respondents most often cast ballots in the "other" category with the exception of school librarians who split their votes mainly between "others" and library educators.

TABLE 2.
DIFFERENCES IN REPRESENTATION OF NOMINEES AND NOMINATIONS BY
LIBRARY SUBFIELDS

Group	First Survey Library Subfields						Total
	LibEd	Public	Academic	Special	School	Other	
Nominees	665 (34%)	300 (15%)	275 (14%)	42 (2%)	56 (3%)	627 (32%)	1965 (100%)
Nominations	701 (36%)	589 (30%)	263 (13%)	153 (8%)	123 (6%)	136 (7%)	1965 (100%)
Percentage difference between nominations and nominees	-5	-49	+5	-73	-54	+361	

TABLE 3.
DISTRIBUTION OF PERCEIVED LEADER NAMES AMONG SUBFIELDS, FIRST SURVEY

<i>Nominees</i>	<i>Subfield of Nominee</i>						<i>Total</i>
	<i>LibEd</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Aca- demic</i>	<i>Special</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>Other</i>	
Aggregate							
Percentage	32	15	17	5	7	23	99*
Number	(181)	(86)	(93)	(30)	(41)	(128)	(559)
101 Leaders							
Percentage	30	21	15	1	2	32	101*
Number	(30)	(21)	(15)	(1)	(2)	(32)	(101)
16 Most frequently chosen							
Percentage	25	13	19	--	--	44	101*
Number	(4)	(2)	(3)	--	--	(7)	(16)

(*Not equal to 100% due to rounding)

TABLE 4.
DIFFERENCES IN REPRESENTATION OF NOMINEES AND NOMINATIONS BY
LIBRARY SUBFIELDS, SECOND SURVEY

<i>Group</i>	<i>LibEd</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Library Subfields</i>		<i>School</i>	<i>Other</i>
			<i>Academic</i>	<i>Special</i>		
Nominees						
Percentage	32	14	12	0	1	41
Number	(1453)	(656)	(567)	(2)	(26)	(1890)
Nominations						
Percentage	31	32	15	10	5	8
Number	(1424)	(1482)	(684)	(443)	(209)	(352)
Percentage difference between nominations and nominees	+2	-56	-17	-100	-88	+437

An application of controls, similar to that reported earlier, to adjust for unequal representation in the survey pool now reveals that "others" are 437 percent more likely to produce leaders than their numbers in the survey universe would suggest. Table 4 describes the differences in representation between nominations and nominees.

The sixteen most frequently named leaders from the second survey produces leaders from only three subfields—four (25 percent) library educators, one (6 percent) public librarian, and 11 (69 percent) "others." Table 5 illustrates the distribution of the sixteen most frequently selected names.

In Table 6, the two groups of sixteen most frequently mentioned leaders from each survey are conflated, leaving twenty-four remaining, since eight leader names overlap both lists of sixteen. More than half of the leaders are members of the "other" category.

TABLE 5.
DISTRIBUTION AMONG SUBFIELDS OF 16 MOST FREQUENTLY SELECTED
NOMINEES, SECOND SURVEY

<i>Nominees</i>	<i>LibEd</i>	<i>Subfields of Nominee</i>		<i>Total</i>
		<i>Public</i>	<i>Other</i>	
Percentage	25	6	69	100
Number	(4)	(1)	(11)	(16)

TABLE 6.
DISTRIBUTION AMONG SUBFIELDS OF 16 MOST FREQUENTLY SELECTED NOMINEES,
FIRST AND SECOND SURVEYS AND TOTALS

<i>Survey</i>	<i>LibEd</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Subfield of Nominee</i>			<i>Other</i>	<i>Total</i>
			<i>Academic</i>	<i>Special</i>	<i>School</i>		
First Number	4 (25%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (44%)	16 (101%)*
Second Number	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (69%)	16 (100%)
Totals	6 (25%)	2 (8%)	3 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (54%)	24 (100%)

(*101% results from rounding percentages)

Of the sixteen most frequently mentioned leaders emerging from the first survey, five were nominated by 10 percent or more of only two subfields. The remaining eleven had support from at least three subfields with two drawing support from five subfields. Two others were nominated by 10 percent of four subfields, and seven received at least 10 percent of the votes from three subfields.

The second group of sixteen most mentioned leaders includes two who received at least 20 percent of the vote from all six subfields, one who drew that level of support from five subfields, five who attracted a 20 percent selection rate from four subfields, and four more who were named by at least that percentage of three subfields. A total of twelve of the sixteen most frequently selected leaders from the second survey are included as "field-wide" leaders. In all, sixteen of the twenty-four in the original group met the criteria.

With those who have been termed "local" leaders excluded from the leadership group, there remain in the combined field-wide list produced by both surveys ten leaders from the "other" subfield which is 62 percent of the leader list. The other six leaders come equally from the library educator category and from among academic librarians and represent 38 percent of the list. No leaders who qualify as "field wide" are public, school, or special librarians. Table 7 describes the distribution of field-wide leaders.

TABLE 7.
DISTRIBUTION AMONG SUBFIELDS OF "FIELD-WIDE" LEADERS

	<i>LibEd</i>	<i>Subfield of Nominee</i>		<i>Total</i>
		<i>Academic</i>	<i>Other</i>	
Percentage	19	19	62	100
Number	(3)	(3)	(10)	(16)

THE LOCUS OF LEADERSHIP

With each successive distillation of the data, the locus of leadership is established more firmly in the "other" category. When unweighted data were used, nominations for perceived leaders were more numerous among library school faculty members. However, when controls for survey response populations were applied, the category labeled "other" was revealed as containing the largest number of perceived leaders. Library school educators accounted for the second highest number.

A similar pattern is apparent in the results of the second survey. Even the aggregate distributions show the "other" subfield as receiving the highest number of votes, with library school faculty members second. When controls for survey response population and unique nominations are applied, the choice of "other" nominees is still more pronounced.

The data strongly suggest that choices about perceived leaders were made, first, on the basis of the library subfields with which nominators identified. This was not true of special librarians, however. Otherwise, public librarians tended to choose public librarians, academic librarians tended to choose academic librarians, and so on. The same pattern emerged for both surveys, although voting according to reference group identification is less apparent in the second survey.

IMPLICATIONS

Survey respondents identified "others" as attracting the largest number of both nominees and nominations. Thirty-two of the 101

perceived leaders who received four or more nominations are a product of the "other" category. Of these, eight are association or consortium executives; seven are involved with publishing; six are state librarians; five are on the staffs of either the New York Public Library or the Library of Congress; four are full-time consultants; and two are associated with the federal government.

Partial explanation for the number of "others" in the leader group can be found in the decision to classify both The New York Public Library and the Library of Congress as "others." Their presence swelled that category's ranks. If leader nominees associated with those two institutions had been termed public or special librarians, for instance, the findings would have differed substantially.

Additional factors, however, contribute to the importance accorded "others" by this group of nominators. First, "others" are among the visible members of the library community. They head associations, publish journals, and speak to and for the profession. Second, some "others" may represent those in the library community who live, in Havelock's (1975) terms, between the worlds of practice and those of research and who are, therefore, known by both communities.

And finally, leadership is an aspect of role differentiation. Leaders of a group play roles with high status (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Some "others," along with library educators, may be among those who Abbott (1988) identifies as holding "high status" within the profession because they work only in professional environments and do not mediate with the client world. Abbott (1988) explains the esteem in which they are held:

Professions tend to withdraw into themselves away from the task for which they claim public jurisdiction. This pattern results from internal status rankings. The professionals who receive the highest status from their peers are those who work in the most purely professional environments. (p. 118)

INTEGRATION OF THE LIBRARIAN PROFESSION

The second research question addressed the degree to which the profession could be considered integrated or interconnected. It asked, further, whether members of some library subfields seem more attuned to field-wide leadership than members of other subfields and how much the selection of field-wide leaders coincides among subfields. Shared perceptions about who is providing leadership is the basis on which this judgment was made. The names of those identified as providing leadership were used to explore the relationships, the social structure, among work groups of the library community and the nominating behavior of subfield members to measure integration (for this segment of the analysis, findings about the first survey are

more revelatory, that is, percentages among subfields have wider ranges and greater dispersion than do findings about the second. Results for the second survey include narrower ranges and are more clustered).

About one-third of the total nominations remained in the pool of sixteen most frequently selected leaders in both surveys. Probably because of more limited choices, all subfields echoed field-wide behavior in numbers of nominees remaining for the second survey (the range was 33 percent to 38 percent), but there was considerable variation in the first survey. Table 8 indicates that school and special librarians were substantially below the median in nominating those who would eventually remain in the pool of sixteen most frequently nominated leaders and therefore seem less connected to the field as a whole.

Individual vote totals for nominees reveal that the most frequently chosen perceived leader in the first survey received votes from 20 percent of the survey respondents and the sixteenth most frequently selected names secured nominations from about 9 percent of those participating. The mean percentage of votes received was twelve. Percentages are virtually double for the second survey, ranging from a high of 40 percent for the top nominee to a low of 20 percent for the sixteenth member of this group. A mean of 25 percent is more than twice as high as the mean for the first survey (12 percent).

Using individual *respondents* instead of each nomination to learn the number of nominators correctly naming the same leaders, provides additional information about the extent to which the field may be considered integrated.

TABLE 8.
NOMINATIONS REMAINING IN POOLS OF MOST FREQUENTLY NAMED LEADERS,
BY SUBFIELDS (FIRST SURVEY)

Field of Nominator	Aggregate Nominations	101 Top Nominees		16 Top Nominees	
		Nomina- tions	Percent Nominations	Nomina- tions	Percent Nominations
	Survey	Remaining	Remaining	Remaining	Remaining
Totals	1,965	1,385	70	613	31
LibEd	701	491	74	247	36
Public	589	44	75	182	31
Academic	263	164	69	103	39
Special	153	76	50	33	22
School	123	33	27	7	6
Other	136	103	76	39	29
		Mean	70		31
		Median	72		31
		SD	19.7		11.5

Of the first questionnaire respondents, 21 percent named no leaders appearing on the final list, and another 18 percent contributed only one such leader. On the other hand, slightly more than 60 percent named at least one of the twenty-four member pool and almost half named three. At the other end of the spectrum, one library school educator named 50 percent of the leaders identified by the field as a whole, which, based on the wide range of possible responses, signals an intimate knowledge of the structure of leadership in librarianship.

Library educators, academic librarians, and members of the "other" category, more than librarians in the remaining categories, seem to share a common view with members of the field as a whole about the composition of leadership in the library community.

Substantially more respondents to the second survey voted for leaders whose names appear on the final lists. The differences in approach of the first and second survey are reflected in the results. Clearly, agreement is less frequent when one is asked to recall names of leaders than when one is asked to recognize them from a list.

Five respondents (1 percent) nominated no persons appearing on the final list and another twelve (3 percent) identified only one. On the other hand, 99 percent of those voting did nominate at least one leader name and almost half nominated five or more. One respondent in the "other" category named fifteen (63 percent) of the leader nominees who eventually comprised the list. Despite the different methods and different numbers of "correct" votes, similar patterns for the field as a whole and for the subfields prevail in the second survey. Again, library educators, "others," and academic librarians appear most in agreement with their library compatriots about who they perceive as providing leadership.

As stated earlier, eleven of the sixteen leaders from the first survey and twelve of the sixteen from the second qualified as field-wide leaders. Table 9 describes subfield members' success in predicting field-wide leaders.

TABLE 9.
SUBFIELD SUCCESS IN NAMING FIELD-WIDE LEADERS

Survey	Other	LibEd	Library Subfield		Special	School
			Academic	Public		
First Survey						
Percentage	82	82	82	55	55	0
Number	(9)	(9)	(9)	(6)	(6)	0
Second Survey						
Percentage	100	67	58	75	67	50
Number	(12)	(8)	(7)	(9)	(8)	(6)

Members of the "other" category identified the greatest number of field-wide leaders. In the second survey they successfully named *all* twelve perceived leaders. Library educators were the second most accurate group. Academic librarians were substantially more successful in naming leaders for the first survey than they were for the second. The reverse was true for public and special librarians whose accuracy rates were higher for the second survey than for the first. School librarians were least successful, although their combined list contained half of the field-wide perceived leaders.

The results of nominations for field-wide leaders from both surveys are combined in Table 10. Letters represent leader names and are placed under the subfields thereby providing requisite nominations.

TABLE 10.
DISTRIBUTION OF FIELD-WIDE LEADER NOMINEES AMONG SUBFIELDS
FIRST AND SECOND SURVEYS COMBINED

<i>LibEd</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Academic</i>	<i>Special</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>Other</i>
a	a	a	a	a	a
b	b	b	b	b	b
c	c	c	c		c
d	d	d	d		d
e		e	e		e
f		f	f		f
	g	g	g		g
h		h	h		h
	i		i	i	i
j		j			j
k		k			k
l		l	l		
m	m				m
n	n				n
	o			o	o
	p			p	p
12	10	11	10	5	15

Two leaders received support from *all* subfields. Two more are named by five subfields. Five have been nominated by four subfields and the remaining seven have constituencies among three subfields.

Patterns of choice in leader nominations among subfields reveal that academic librarians who participated retained a greater

percentage of their nominations in the open-ended first survey than did the other subfields.

When the degree to which individual respondents named leaders whose names appeared on the final tallies is tracked, library educators, academic librarians, and "others" nominated more leaders than did members of the other subfields.

The subfield naming the highest number of "field-wide" leaders for both surveys is "other." It seems possible to conjecture that shared perceptions about who is providing leadership may be a function of shared perceptions about the relative importance of problems currently facing libraries and about the future of the profession. Those whose work crosses subfields of practice—library educators and "others"—may be best situated to assess who is providing leadership. However, this does not account for the presence of academic librarians among those most attuned to the perceptions of their colleagues.

Abbott (1988) contends that "internal stratification and other kinds of internal differentiations can undermine jurisdictional strength" (p. 96). The varying perceptions among some subfields about who is providing leadership may signal differentiations within the profession and the lack of an integrated social structure. Without longitudinal comparative data, however, no judgment can be made about whether the findings represent a potential restructuring of the profession or whether they reflect a continuing behavioral pattern.

DEGREE OF SHARED PERCEPTION

Of the 1,965 nominations cast in the first survey, 69 percent remained in the pool of 101 most frequently named leaders and 32.5 percent were left in the group of sixteen most often selected names. For the second survey, the percentage of votes cast for the sixteen most heavily chosen leaders was 35.7 percent. Individual vote totals for nominees reveal that the most often chosen perceived leader in the first survey received votes from 20 percent of the survey respondents. The sixteenth most frequently selected name secured nominations from about 9 percent of those participating. The percentages are substantially greater in the second survey, ranging from a high of 40 percent for the top nominee to a low of 20 percent for the sixteenth member of this group. Within subfields, nominations for the most frequently named leader ranged from 42 percent to 13 percent in the first survey and from 72 percent to 50 percent in the second.

Without comparative data, it is difficult to assess whether 9 percent, 20 percent, or even 40 percent represents a strong degree of integration for the library community as a whole. Kochen et al. (1982), in their study of scholarly disciplines, also used a peer

nomination process. Despite methodological differences in approach, comparison of their findings with those revealed here sheds some light on the degree of library field integration. Two of the disciplines included in their survey, differential geometry and topology, contained several scientists who were acknowledged by more than 50 percent of the nominators. Two of the other fields, future studies and general systems theory, had two scientists who were nominated as experts by 25 percent of the respondents. The remaining two fields, information science and human systems management, had two scientists who were nominated by 18 percent and 11 percent of their groups respectively. The present study of perceived library leaders revealed that the most frequently nominated leader in the first survey received nominations from 20 percent of the nominators, a figure marginally higher than that received by the scientists in information science and human systems management and somewhat lower than that received by the most frequently named experts in future studies and general systems theory.

Bingham and Vertz's (1983) study of political science identifies eleven reputational contributors to the field. The most frequently named one received nominations from 18 percent of the respondents, the next highest received 10 percent, and the remainder ranged down to 5 percent. Interestingly, their findings are similar to those revealed by this study.

It would seem, therefore, that the extent of agreement on who is perceived as providing leadership in librarianship as indicated by respondents to this survey is not unlike that of political science, and to the two academic fields which Kochen et al. (1982) considered as relatively unstructured because they manifested a low degree of consensus about scientific expertise. These studies, however, are of scholarly disciplines and not of applied fields. Whether this group of librarians manifests a high or low degree of agreement on its perceived leaders cannot be determined in the absence of comparable data about other applied fields or professions.

IMPLICATIONS

The locus of leadership for survey respondents, as revealed by the various leader lists, has been identified as residing primarily within the "other" category, with more modest representation among library educators and academic librarians. Many members of the "other" subfield, as well as library educators, may be those who serve as the professional's professionals, a finding that lends support to Abbott's (1988) contention that high status field members do not mediate with client groups but rather do the work of the professional community. These perceived leaders write for national professional

journals, administer and participate in national professional organizations, socialize new entrants to the profession, produce new technologies that have ramifications for the entire field, and represent librarianship to the outside community. Because their orientation is to the wider community, they may be considered those who Merton termed "cosmopolitan." Their activities are boundary spanning, a factor that leads to their wide visibility across subfield lines. Their outputs may also be said to cross-fertilize the field, and their products can be considered integrative.

Perceived leadership does not appear to be dispersed throughout the entire library community. Field-wide perceived leaders do not emerge from among public, special, and school libraries. Findings about school librarians, however, suggest that they are on the periphery of the field both with regard to where they, as a group, perceive leadership to be located, and where representatives of the other subfields perceive leadership to lie. Although lack of consensus about leadership among school librarians may be an artifact of the list used to gather information, the lack of identification of school librarians as leaders by members of the subfields was not produced by the problematic nature of the survey universe. Therefore, the absence of school librarians on the perceived leader lists may be a sign of differentiation, or separation, either as a new or an ongoing phenomenon.

Among the most important assumptions prompting this study are that leaders affect change and that agendas emerge from a profession's social structure, of which leadership is an important ingredient. Crane (1972) contended that, for scholarly fields, the content of science is influenced by the relationship between the internal structure of a discipline and the cultural products developed and accepted by it. This generalization appears to be no less true for applied ones.

Perceived leaders emerged from the ranks of academic librarians, library educators, and "others." Nominators from those three subfields were most often in agreement about who they perceived to be providing leadership. To some extent, they seem to form an integrated community—i.e., they share identity, values, definitions of role and interests, as well as perceptions of who are the leaders of the field.

If this *de facto* community of common perspectives is sustained over time, the attention of the library field is likely to be drawn to those particular aspects of vocational concern which this segment of the profession finds worthy of consideration. We might anticipate, for instance, priorities being placed on management and technological activities, particularly as they affect research institutions.

One possible consequence of such circumstances is that emphasis might be placed on access to *all information*, in contrast with, say, attention to access to information for *all people*. Funds might be allocated to the preservation of unique documents rather than to widespread duplication of frequently requested materials. Whether and to what extent these considerations already govern decisions in the library field, particularly those related to the distribution of available resources, would seem an important research question and a likely next step toward understanding the relationship between leadership, social structure, and the agenda.

QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE RESEARCH

Public Libraries and Leadership

Librarians once looked to the public library for codes, cues, and leaders. The aims and goals of the public library became the guidelines of the profession. Lee Shiflett (1981) has written of the critical choice made by academic librarians in the late nineteenth century to embrace the public library mission as their own. A change has occurred. The results of this study suggest that the public library may be insular and inward-looking. If it were not, more of its practitioners would have been identified as leaders by peers in other subfields. One provocative question this study does not address is: Does the absence of field-wide leaders emerging from the public library sector indicate that its agenda differs from that which may be shared by the members of other subfields?

About School Librarians

This study revealed sharp divisions between school librarians and the rest of the profession and raised the following questions: (1) To what extent do school librarians identify themselves as educators rather than as librarians? (2) To what extent does nomenclature—"school librarian" rather than "media center director"—shape identity? (3) Do the findings of this research reveal a subfield in process of differentiating, or do they merely reflect a continuing condition of nonintegration?

School librarians may not have been well served by the population used in this study. If further efforts to locate a better source of names for a list are unsuccessful, consideration should be given to including a list with known bias (membership in AASL or subscribers to SLJ). Exclusion of school librarians as a subfield is another option.

About Methodology

Two Surveys. For this research, data have been collected from two types of survey questionnaires. Methodological factors may have influenced the findings. While results of the two surveys were similar, there were also marked differences in the outcomes: The percentage of people returning the questionnaires and the number of nominees appearing on each response were much higher when respondents were requested to use a checklist of names rather than supply them. The variation may result from the different tasks required by recognition and recall. Comparisons of performance on experiments involving the two tasks have shown a marked superiority of "recognition" over "recall." Current hypotheses conjecture that recall may be a two-step process which involves both a search and a decision about the suitability of retrieved information (Reynolds & Flagg, 1977). Recognition, on the other hand, may not involve a search process but only a decision one.

In other words, it is easier to recognize names believed to be appropriate to a circumstance than to recall them. Asking respondents to perform a simpler task probably helped to produce a larger response. Information stored in the memory may be inaccessible for recall, but it still is clearly present in memory, as shown by the fact that it can be recognized (Reynolds & Flagg, 1977).

On the other hand, educational psychologists contend that recall represents much deeper learning and the tasks involved in recall are both more complex and more difficult. Agreement on names is less frequent with recall; conversely, limited choice based on recognition produces greater consensus. In addition, there is less variation in nominating success among subfields when a checklist is used than when an open-ended questionnaire is employed. A checklist is more likely to indicate group likenesses; an open-ended survey is more revelatory of its differences.

Using a checklist approach serves the purpose of reminding respondents of names they may have forgotten or overlooked. On the other hand, it may result in a less spontaneously adduced list, one which is more retrospective, and, perhaps, more honorific. That is, a respondent may not have recalled an individual, but seeing his or her name on a checklist might feel compelled to choose it in deference to past contributions. Using both kinds of survey instruments in a piggy-back fashion is both cumbersome and time-consuming. It may, however, best serve the purposes.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. D. (1988). *System of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Barber, B. (1975). Toward a new view of the sociology of knowledge. In L. A. Coser (Ed.), *The idea of social structure: Papers in honor of Robert K. Merton* (pp. 103-116). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Bass, B. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*, 3d ed. New York: The Free Press.
- Bingham, R. D., & Vertz, L. L. (1983). The social structure of an academic discipline: Networks and prestige in political science. *Social Science Quarterly*, 64(2), 275-287.
- Blau, P. M. (Ed.). (1975). *Approaches to the study of social structure*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Crane, D. (1972). *Invisible colleges: Diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1961). *Who governs: Democracy and power in an American city*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Euster, J. R. (1987). *Activities and effectiveness of the academic library director*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Gertzog, A. (1988). *An investigation into the relationship between the structure of leadership and the social structure of the library profession*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University.
- Gibb, C. (1968). Leadership: Psychological aspects. In D. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, vol. 9 (pp. 91-101). New York: Macmillan.
- Havelock, R. G. (1969 [1975]). *Planning for innovation: A comparative study of the literature on the dissemination and utilization of scientific knowledge*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge.
- Homans, G. C. (1975). What do we mean by social "structure?" In P. M. Blau (Ed.), *Approaches to the study of social structure* (pp. 53-65). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Hunter, F. (1953). *Community power structure: A study of decision makers*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Kadushin, C. (1974). *The American intellectual elite*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Kellerman, B. (1984). Introduction. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. ix-xiii). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kochen, M.; Crickman, R.; & Blaivas, A. (1982). Distribution of scientific experts as recognized by peer consensus. *Scientometrics*, 4(1), 45-56.
- Merton, R. K. (1949). *Social theory and social structure* (rev. ed.). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Milgrim, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mullins, N. C., & Mullins, C. J. (1977). *Theories and theory groups in contemporary American sociology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Reynold, A. G., & Flagg, P. W. (1977). *Cognitive psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers.
- Riggs, D. E. (1988). *Libraries in the 90's: What the leaders expect*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (1983). *Diffusion of innovations* (3d ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Rogers, E. M., & Kincaid, D. L. (1981). *Communication networks: Toward a new paradigm*. New York: The Free Press.
- Sheldon, B. E. (1991). *Leaders in libraries: Styles and strategies of success*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Shiflett, O. L. (1981). *Origins of American academic librarianship*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 18(3), 257-273.
- Stogdill, R. (1981). *Handbook of Leadership*, 2d ed. New York: Free Press.

- Wildavsky, A. (1989). A cultural theory of leadership. In B. D. Jones (Ed.), *Leadership and politics* (pp. 87-113). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Wilson, P. (1985). *Second-hand knowledge: An inquiry into cognitive authority*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Wilson, P. C. (1982). *Stereotype and status: Librarians in the United States* (Contributions in Librarianship and Information Science Series, No. 41). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Woodsworth, A., & Von Wahlde, B. (Eds.). (1988). *Leadership for research libraries: A festschrift for Robert M. Hayes*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.