

**Kathleen De Long**  
**PhD Candidate, Simmons College**  
**& Associate Director, University of Alberta Libraries**

**[Kathleen.delong@ualberta.ca](mailto:Kathleen.delong@ualberta.ca)**

## **The Engagement of New Library Professionals in Leadership**

### **Abstract**

Using data collected via a Web survey instrument, this study examines the leadership engagement of new professionals in Canadian libraries and explores their interest in and willingness to take up leadership roles as well as the barriers and opportunities to leadership that they perceive to exist within the workplace.

### **Introduction**

Leadership is not just a matter of position or authority; it should occur at multiple levels within an organization. Leadership is fluid and often without guiding precedents; however, it adheres to a guiding vision and focuses on the future. Librarians in leadership roles today are challenged to maintain a strategic vision while coping with ubiquitous and ever advancing technologies, fluctuations in budget and staffing; increasing, sometimes conflicting, expectations and demand for access to information and services; and myriad other issues. Complicating matters, demographic studies of the library workforce (e.g., Wilder 2003) suggest that large scale retirement will occur as the baby boomers exit the ranks of the profession, and library employers have begun to express concern about their ability to renew their professional staff complements and replace leadership skills lost through retirement.

Given the importance of staff renewal and leadership capacity during a time of great change in libraries, it is also important to note that there is some evidence that a cohort of new library and information science (LIS) professionals is expressing interest in filling leadership roles. A Canadian national survey (8Rs Research Team 2005), supported by a number of Canadian library associations and large academic and public library employers, found that 57% of recent librarian entrants (working for five years or less) agreed that it was important to them to have a job that allowed them to perform a leadership role. The survey explored a belief among employers that there was increased need for librarians to assume leadership roles in various Canadian library sectors. While the study did not investigate in any detail how new professionals

were being prepared for leadership roles, 28% of all professionals surveyed reported that they had received some leadership training.

Development of LIS leaders has become the focus of continuing professional development in many countries and a number and variety of leadership institutes have been established for librarians. North American institutes have been analyzed and reported in the LIS literature (e.g., Mason & Weatherbee 2004). The literature has also identified recent initiatives aimed at a new generation of library leaders. Examples include the Emerging Leaders Program, which Leslie Burger began during her presidency of the American Library Association (Burger 2006), and the Canadian Librarians without Borders (LWB) movement which is providing a platform for the perspectives of emerging leaders in Canadian libraries (Sellar 2007).

Although it is important to have an adequate pool of professionals developed or preparing to assume leadership roles, leadership is not just about numbers. Individual engagement and continuing commitment are necessary conditions in filling leadership roles. And, while leadership is necessary to the health of library organizations and should be nurtured and developed, it can be stymied and discouraged in the workplace.

### **Problem Statement**

As new professionals make the transition from LIS programs to a changing work environment, they are likely to find opportunities to engage in leadership, either within teams or in managerial positions. Some new professionals will view leadership roles as stimulating, exciting, and challenging, and they will be willing to engage in them as soon as the opportunity arises. Others may be interested but may perceive such roles as beyond their current capabilities, and demanding talents that they do not possess. The willingness and the interest of new professionals to engage in leadership roles may not necessarily coincide with one another. It is also possible that some new professionals will not be interested at all. The perceptions and viewpoints of new professionals will undoubtedly determine their level of interest and shape their decisions about their willingness to engage in leadership roles. No study has examined new entrants to the

profession and the extent of their leadership engagement, which is viewed in terms of their interest in and willingness to take up leadership roles, as well as the barriers and opportunities to leadership that they perceive to exist within the workplace. The purpose of this study is to fill that void by examining the engagement of new librarians in leadership roles, to address their definition of the concept of *leadership*, and to highlight their perceptions of leadership practices that they observe in the workplace.

The findings of an examination of the leadership engagement of recent entrants into the profession have interest to those coping with staffing and organizational change as well as professional development of staff, particularly those employers who perceive that a leadership gap exists because it is difficult to replace leadership skills lost through retirement. It is important that the new professionals who are interested and willing to take up leadership opportunities be developed and nurtured in these roles, and that they are engaged in the strategic thinking and planning necessary for organizations to thrive in a continuously changing work environment. The results of this study will contribute to strategizing both on the part of new professionals who are interested and willing to engage in leadership and of the organizations which need to develop leadership capacity. It also has relevance to those educating students through LIS graduate programs and continuing education.

### **Literature Review**

The focus of leadership research in libraries has tended to be on those in upper management, especially those serving as library directors or deans (Weiner 2003). Young, Herson, and Powell (2004) reported on the attributes needed by the next generation of academic public and academic library directors as suggested by the current generation of directors. Their perceptions caused an outcry by a number of newer professionals self-identified as Gen X librarians (Reader Forum: Letters and comments 2004) who felt that the research did not address their perspectives on

leadership of library organizations.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps emboldened by this reaction, new professionals have continued to express to the library community how they would like to be managed and what they think of some of the managerial and leadership practices they see, including negative perceptions (Singer Gordon 2004-2005).

In the opinion of some new professionals, some library organizations are *unhealthy* (Edmonson 2004; Singer Gordon 2004-2005). Cunningham (2001) outlines the characteristics of emotionally unhealthy libraries, most of which relate to the leadership and management of libraries. These include:

- complaints ignored or used against the staff member who complains,
- double standard for performance by library administrators and staff,
- imposition of one person's views on the rest of the library,
- invisible administration – library administrators are not in the library but are busy at conferences and other duties outside the library,
- lack of clear direction from library administration,
- lack of mission and vision articulated by the administration,
- lack of respect for the staff by the library administration,
- library administration not held responsible by stakeholders, and
- passive library administration that seeks no conflict or resolution to unhealthy situations.

The question that arises is why newer professionals should be willing to move into managerial or leadership positions given the examples of poor management and leadership they claim to see day to day (Singer Gordon 2004-2005). At the same time there is a sense that, given the chance, new professionals believe that they can do better than their predecessors at leading

---

<sup>1</sup> It merits mention that Young et al. (2004) only examined the perceptions of the directors. The views of the Gen-X respondents require a separate investigation. Such a study is needed; however, it is beyond the scope of the present research.

and managing library organizations (Young & Casburn 2004). New professionals seem to be expressing interest in leadership roles but are they willing to assume them?

While research has not focused on the leadership engagement of new LIS professionals and the opportunities for and barriers to playing leadership roles that they perceive within their workplaces, there are many indicators in the LIS literature that can be pieced together into a framework of factors that might represent an interest and willingness to engage in leadership, as well as the opportunities and barriers that new professionals encounter. Table 1 is a summary of those factors.

[insert Table 1 about here]

Rossiter (2007) has identified several of the factors that could be used to establish the interest and willingness of future library leaders, including:

- self assessment of leadership skills to identify strengths and weaknesses,
- interest and willingness to participate in graduate or post-graduate internship programs,
- interest and willingness to participate in leadership training programs,
- interest and willingness to participate in mentor programs /relationships, and
- interest and willingness to participate in professional development opportunities such as conferences and workshops.

An additional factor has emerged from the interest generated by the ALA Emerging Leaders Program, namely the interest and willingness to be involved in a leadership capacity in professional associations (Burger 2006).

Singer Gordon (2004-2005) also suggests factors that could have an impact on the interest and willingness of new professionals to take leadership roles. She ascribes lack of interest on the part of new professionals in assuming management and leadership roles to negative views of library management, perceived lack of a balance between work and home life, and the impact

of perceived unhealthy workplaces. Some of these factors are echoed by Mosley (2005) who also points to new professionals' lack of tolerance for the bureaucracies and the hierarchical structures found in many libraries.

Iannuzzi (1992) points to many ways to provide workplace opportunities for new professionals to develop in leadership roles. These include:

- participation in task forces and committees (encourages participation in decision-making, learning to appreciate diversity and manage conflict),
- coordinator roles (allow exercise of influencing skills, opportunity to build confidence in oneself and earn the trust of others),
- alternative staff assignments, such as projects, acting positions, job rotations, and internships (allow broader knowledge of operations leading to development of visionary potential, opportunity to develop interpersonal skills and ability to take risks),
- organizational design and reorganization (allows new librarians to work across traditional organizational lines and build networks throughout the organization), and
- access to staff development programs (allows development of team building, active listening, conflict management and problem solving skills in addition to acquisition of technical skills).

Iannuzzi also highlights the point that these opportunities should be substantial in nature. For example, the task forces and committees could deal with strategic planning processes or promotion and reward systems.

Renaud and Murray (2003), who focus on factors that should be present for future leaders to develop, emphasize the importance of recognizing the need for leadership, building the understanding that it is a professional responsibility to develop leaders and leadership capacity within library organizations and the profession as a whole, and then building institutional strategies to accomplish this. They confirm many of the opportunity factors also described by

Iannuzzi (1992), such as the importance of having opportunities for professional development. The importance of organizational structures that promote or impede future leaders is also highlighted, as are opportunities to engage in project-based work that allows ownership and demonstration of leadership abilities in meeting project outcomes.

Renaud and Murray (2003) describe factors that act as barriers to leadership engagement. In addition to the lack of any of the opportunities listed above, they point to lack of clear performance measures as inhibiting the ability of new professionals to display their leadership promise. Other organizational factors that act as barriers to leadership engagement include compensation and reward systems that are based upon rank and seniority rather than professional growth and performance, and recruitment and promotion practices that value degrees and years of experience over performance. A lack of opportunity or power to command resources for ideas and projects can also be added to the list of barriers.

## **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

### **Research Questions**

- How do new LIS professionals define the concept of *leadership*?
- To what extent are new LIS professionals interested in assuming leadership roles?
- To what extent are new LIS professionals willing to assume leadership roles?
- To what extent do new LIS professionals perceive workplace opportunities to engage in leadership roles?
- To what extent do new LIS professionals perceive workplace barriers to engaging in leadership roles?
- To what extent do new LIS professionals perceive various practices associated with leadership in their workplaces?

## Hypotheses

- There is no statistically significant difference (at  $p=.05$ ) between the extent of new LIS professionals' interest in leadership and the extent of their willingness to assume leadership roles.
- There is no statistically significant difference (at  $p=.05$ ) in the level of interest in leadership between new professionals by:
  - age as defined by generational range: Baby Boomers (1943-1960), Generation X (1961-1980), and Millennials (1981-2000)
  - gender
  - years of professional library experience
  - years of professional managerial library experience
  - library sector
- There is no statistically significant difference (at  $p=.05$ ) in the level of new professionals' willingness to assume a leadership role and:
  - age as defined by generational range: Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials
  - gender
  - years of professional library experience
  - years of professional managerial library experience
  - library sector

## Procedures

### Research Design

The population<sup>2</sup> is composed of new professionals who are members of the Canadian Library Association (CLA) and who have five or fewer years of professional experience in

---

<sup>2</sup> The total size of the population of new professionals is not known. New professionals may not be members of CLA, NEL participants, or identified through the other listservs that were used.

Canadian libraries. CLA is a national, non-profit voluntary organization of academic, public, special (corporate, non-profit and government), and school libraries. CLA provided e-mail addresses for those members who had joined the association as students since the year 2000. Also provided was the list of current members of the New Librarians and Information Professionals Interest Group (NLIPIG) of CLA.<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, e-mail addresses for the participants of the Northern Exposure to Leadership (NEL) Institute were added if they were not already identified on the CLA list.<sup>4</sup> And finally, the CLA listservs were used to solicit responses from new professionals who had not been identified through these other means. Using these e-mail lists, new LIS professionals were contacted and given the option of participating and contributing data to the study. The study was conducted from December 2007 to March 2008.

## **Methodology**

Data were collected via a Web survey instrument (developed in Survey Monkey). Data were analyzed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software and open-ended responses to questions were analyzed using content analysis. Content analysis is a useful methodology for translating qualitative data into meaningful themes or concepts.

The Internet has provided a convenient way to survey human subjects; however the same legal and ethical requirements to ensure informed consent and protect individual privacy and confidentiality still apply. To ensure compliance with these requirements the research proposal was examined by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Simmons College.

---

<sup>3</sup> New professionals at the researcher's home institution will not be included in the survey.

<sup>4</sup> The Institute's mission is to assist professional librarians who have a desire to develop their leadership potential to develop, strengthen, and exercise their leadership skills so that they may be better equipped to formulate, articulate, and achieve the future changes required by libraries into the 21st century. Participants will have received their library degrees generally within the past seven years and have a minimum of two year's professional library experience.

Kittleson and Brown (2005) advise that response rates are affected by making Web surveys easy, relatively short, and considering the respondent's lack of time. They also point to the importance of taking steps to make a Web survey stand out and they give examples such as the use of incentives, formatting an introductory e-mail to increase interest, clearly stating the nature of the contact so as to not be confused with spam, and matching respondents with survey topics in which they will be interested. All of these factors were addressed in the proposed study. The question of incentives for a professional group is an interesting one and it was decided that study participants would be offered the opportunity to participate in a draw for a year's membership to CLA. Study participants were directed to contact an individual unconnected with the study to be put into the draw; one individual's name was drawn and a membership purchased.

Kaczmirek (2005) recommends a number of practical guidelines and recommendations for conducting Web surveys. This study followed his recommended guidelines and recommendations (unless exceptions were appropriate).

### **Data Quality**

Once the data collection instrument was developed, it was submitted to two professors in the Simmons College program on managerial leadership to ensure that all of the objectives are covered. Fellow doctoral students in the Simmons College program pre-tested the data collection form according to instructions developed by the researcher. Based on the results and the review of study objectives, the instrument was revised. Once the instrument was placed on the Web, two master's students from the investigator's home institution were asked to complete the form and report any problems that they encountered. Additionally, an independent researcher was asked to complete the form and provide advice on the data collection instrument.

### **Limitations**

A major limitation of this study was representativeness. In the first instance it was limited to those new professionals who are members of the CLA (and possibly NEL). It did not include the

entire population of new professionals working in Canadian libraries, and some of those identified and then contacted may have chosen to opt out of the study. This self-selection could have lead to bias. Also, the study used the mechanism of self-reporting and asked new professionals for their perceptions; it does not capture their actions or activities in actuality. The coding of open-ended responses to questions, such as definition of the term *leadership*, could have been subject to coding bias. Another possible limitation was access to technology. Not all the study group may have had Web access, though it was highly unlikely that they would not.

### **Findings**

A total of 190 responses were received as a result of the Web survey; 170 of them were usable. As shown in Table 2, the vast majority of the study group identified themselves as Generation X (n= 142), female (n=138) and most respondents had three years or less of professional library experience (n=115) and no management experience in libraries (n=105). Roughly two-thirds of respondents identified themselves as working in university (n=59) or public libraries (n=54) and college, special, school, consortium or regional libraries, and non-traditional workplaces made up the rest of the workplaces represented.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

### **Defining Leadership or Leadership Is....**

Phrases identified with the concept or theory of transformational leadership (Northouse 2007) were the most common of the 141 individual definition statements that new professionals provided in describing their definition of leadership. The definitions of transformational leadership focused upon leadership vision, shared goals, and a workplace environment that encouraged innovation and change through development and recognition of all members of staff. Some respondents provided definitions that were more allied with other theories of leadership, such as theories dealing with leadership traits, skills or styles, and a few respondents supplied statements more consonant with a definition of management than of leadership.

## **Interest and Willingness in Assuming a Leadership Role**

As can be seen in Table 3, the majority of new professionals was interested and a slightly higher percentage was willing to engage in seven of the eight factors that were used to establish interest and willingness in assuming a leadership role: self-assessment, mentor relationships and programs, leadership training programs, professional development, professional associations, management roles and leadership roles. The one exception was interest and willingness to engage in internship programs. When respondents were asked directly of their interest to engage in a leadership role, 45.9% (n=78) were very interested and 50% (n=85) were very willing. This stands in contrast to the 33.1% (n=56) of individuals very interested and 36.5% (n=62) willing or very willing to take a management role.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Chi-square tests were performed on all *interest* and *willingness* variables and the level of significance was less than  $p = .05$  for all tests. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the new professional's interest in leadership and their willingness to assume leadership roles is not supported. The strength of the association between *interest* and *willingness* variables, as measured by the Cramer's V value, was medium to strong for seven of the eight factors. Thus, the strength of the relationship between almost all of the interest and willingness variables is worthy of note.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

*Interest* and *willingness* variables were also subjected to tests of linear regression. In all cases there were moderate to strong relationships found between the predictor variable (interest) and the dependent variable (willingness) with the level of significance less than  $p = .05$  for all tests.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Two multiple regressions were run with the predictor variables of: *age as defined by generational range, gender, years of professional experience, years of management experience and type of library*, and with *interest in a leadership role* and *willingness to take a leadership role* acting as dependent variables. There was a weak relationship found ( $R^2=.044$ ) between the predictor variables and the dependent variable of *interest in a leadership role* but the level of significance was greater than  $p=.05$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference (at  $p=.05$ ) in the level of *interest in leadership* between new professionals and the predictor variables is supported. There was also a weak relationship found ( $R^2=.070$ ) between the predictor variables and the dependent variable of *willingness to take a leadership role* and this relationship was significant at  $p=.046$ . In checking coefficients, only the predictor variable, *years of management experience*, can be used to predict *willingness to take a leadership role* ( $p=.003$ ) and there is a slight indication ( $B=-.166$ ) that the fewer the years of management experience, the greater the willingness to take a leadership role. However, this relationship is weak and can't be compared to the other predictor variables as the other variables did not contribute to predicting the willingness of new professionals to take a leadership role. The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference (at  $p=.05$ ) in the level of new professionals' *willingness to take leadership role* and the predictor variables is not supported but a very weak relationship with only one of the predictor variables, *years of management experience*, has been found and thus the relationship must be interpreted with caution.

### **Perceptions of Leadership Practices**

New professionals were asked about their perceptions of the leadership practices that they observed in others. The majority of respondents agreed or highly agreed that the leaders they observed projected a positive image ( $n=102, 60\%$ ), maintained visibility within the library ( $n=104, 61.2\%$ ), articulated a clear mission and vision for staff ( $n=93, 55\%$ ), dealt with conflict ( $n=104, 61.1\%$ ) and worked with members of staff when complaints were made ( $n=105, 61.8\%$ ),

were responsible to stakeholders (n=104, 61.1%), were held to performance standards (n= 102, 60%), gave clear direction (n=90, 52.9%) and showed respect to members of staff (n=132, 77.7%). However, respondents did not show high levels of agreement that leaders make decisions and then communicate them to the rest of staff (n=82, 48.3%), maintain a work-life balance (n=65, 38.2%) or that they worked in front-line services, such as at a public service point (n=49, 28.8%).

(Insert Table 6 about here)

### **Opportunities and Barriers to Leadership Engagement**

New professionals were also asked the extent to which they perceived that various factors associated with leadership opportunity or barriers existed within their workplaces. The majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that opportunities existed to participate in decision-making through task forces or committees (n=110, 64.7%), to work in coordinator positions (n=93, 54.7%), to participate in staff development programs (n=119, 70%), and that the workplace recognized the need for leadership on the part of staff (n=86, 50.6%). However lower levels of agreement were found that other opportunities existed. Respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their workplaces allowed participation in alternative staff arrangements (n=75, 44.1%), had an organizational structure that encouraged development of leaders (n=52, 30.6%), had a strategy for identifying (n=20, 11.9%) or developing and training (n=22, 12.9%) potential leaders, provided funding for leadership training (n=48, 28.8%), encouraged those acting as leaders (n=53, 31.1%), had a recruitment strategy that identified leadership as a selection criteria (n=40, 23.9%), had a performance evaluation system that encouraged leadership (n=49, 29.0%) or a performance evaluation system (n=31, 18.4%) or a tenure and promotion system (n=28, 16.6%) that recognized and rewarded leadership, had a compensation and reward system that recognized and rewarded leadership (n=19, 11.2%), or that the workplace provided resources for ideas and projects (n=56, 33.7%) .

[Insert Table 7 about here]

Respondents were asked to choose the top five opportunities that were most important for their leadership engagement as well as the top five strongest barriers to leadership engagement that they perceived in their workplace. In rank order, the most important opportunities were: resources (such as budget, staffing, and technology) for ideas and projects, the opportunity to participate in decision-making through task forces or committees, a workplace strategy for developing and training potential leaders, the opportunity to participate in alternative staff assignments (coordinating roles or acting positions), and encouragement to those acting as leaders. The strongest workplace barriers were perceived as lack of a strategy for developing and training potential leaders, lack of resources for ideas and projects, an organizational structure (dispersal of authority, layers of management and supervision) that discouraged the development of leaders, lack of a compensation and reward system that recognizes and rewards leadership; lack of a strategy for identifying potential leaders and lack of encouragement of those acting as leaders tied in last place of the top five strongest barriers.

### **Discussion**

Despite some suggestion in the professional literature that new professionals are not interested or willing to engage in leadership roles, the majority of new professionals in this study is clearly interested and even more willing to provide leadership within the workplace and the profession as gauged by the leadership engagement factors identified in Table 1. Interest and willingness to engage in internship programs is the exception but may be explained by the very small number of internship opportunities available to Canadian library school graduates. In open-ended responses, new professionals most often indicated that they were not interested in internship opportunities when regular positions were available, so interest is clearly affected by the job market as well as possibly the availability of internship positions

A small number of respondents provided responses to open-ended questions about why they lacked interest in the identified leadership engagement factors or why they were interested

but not willing to engage in the various leadership engagement factors. The majority of responses related to interest and/or willingness to engage in internship programs or in management roles. Management roles were described as difficult and not part of the front-line service or work with the public that was the preference of the respondents. As a follow-up to questions on interest and willingness, new professionals were also asked why they had not taken up leadership engagement opportunities if they had been offered. While the majority of new professionals had taken advantage of any opportunity given, a disinclination to engage in formal mentoring programs along with lack of time and money to engage in professional associations and in professional development were mentioned by a few respondents. These responses point to the value of asking new professionals how they would like to be engaged and supported. For the most part interest and willingness can be assumed but organizations should still be prepared to ascertain the preferences of those new to their professional corps.

Interestingly, the perceptions of new professionals of the leadership practices they observe in others in the workplace are positive in the main, the only exceptions are those of work-life balance on the part of leaders and that leaders also do not act as service providers. This would seem to indicate that most new professionals do not perceive 'unhealthy' leadership practice to the extent that it would influence their decision to take up a leadership role at some point in their career.

It is also noteworthy that new professionals distinguish between leadership and management opportunities and that some new professionals are clearly not as interested or willing to engage in management opportunities. This is worthy of further study and the few open ended comments that were received point to a preference for front-line positions and a perception of management that is removed from the satisfaction of working with the public.

There is evidence that many new professionals are being given workplace opportunities to test themselves in leadership roles through decision-making on committees and because of alternative work arrangements within workplaces and that this is important to them and in

keeping with the perception that their workplaces are recognizing the need for leadership on the part of all staff. However, it can equally be said that there are many structural barriers that new professionals encounter within organizations. Many of these structural barriers, from recruitment to performance evaluation to recognition and compensation, seem to reflect outdated thinking on the part of institutions and relate to the value placed upon seniority or rank rather than leadership potential or ability. It also seems contrary that new professionals experience workplaces that recognize a need for leadership but are not experiencing workplaces that encourage those acting as leaders. Structural barriers must be uncommonly strong and resistant to allow this and may be buttressed by out-dated collective agreements or policies as well as organizational culture and practice. As a majority of new professionals also provided a personal definition of leadership in keeping with a transformational model of leadership, it is hopeful that this view will come to dominate as new professionals mature within their organizations and lead the changes that they want to see.

As Table 1 indicates, the concept of leadership engagement of new library professionals is clearly delineated in the library literature. However, coverage of the concept has not been explored in the research literature as the focus of leadership research in libraries has tended to be on those in upper management and has not extended to examination of the LIS workforce by generation or age group. When new professionals were asked to comment about factors other than those identified in Table 1 that were important to leadership engagement, organizational culture was clearly indicated as a major factor in the development of leaders. Resistance to change and entrenched power structures as well as lack of respect for junior colleagues were all mentioned as influencing new professionals in their decision or their ability to engage in leadership within the organization. The data collected in this study on leadership engagement of new library professionals have ensured a fuller picture of leadership engagement based on years of experience and age as defined by generational range of the respondents.

## **Conclusion**

Library organizations that have new professionals in their ranks have an interest in ensuring that this group is recognized for the leadership potential that they represent. New professionals are interested in moving into leadership and are willing to take up leadership roles; they view themselves as present and future leaders. There is value to this study because previous research has not asked new professionals about their viewpoints and perspectives on leadership engagement and the opportunities and barriers that they perceive within their workplaces. The results of this study should allow greater understanding of these factors for both new professionals and their organizations and allow development of strategies to ensure leadership capacity is developed within institutions and for the profession as a whole.

## References

- Burger, L. 2006. President's message. *American Libraries* 37 (10): 3.
- Cunningham, N. 2001. In search of an emotionally healthy library.  
[http://liscareer.com/cunningham\\_eiq.htm](http://liscareer.com/cunningham_eiq.htm).
- Edmonson, E. 2007. Checking out her options. *Chronicle careers: The chronicle of higher education*. <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2004/09/2004093001c.htm>.
- 8Rs Research Team. 2005. The future of human resources in Canadian libraries.  
<http://www.ls.ualberta.ca/8rs/8RsFutureofHRLibraries.pdf>.
- Iannuzzi, P. 1992. Leadership development and organizational maturity. *Journal of Library Administration* 17: 19-36.
- Kaczmarek, L. 2005. Web surveys: A brief guide on usability and implementation issues.  
<http://www.websm.org>.
- Kittleson, M. J., and S. L. Brown. 2005. E-mail versus web survey response rates among health education professionals. *American Journal of Health Studies* 20: 7-14.
- Mason, F. M., and L. V. Wetherbee. 2004. Learning to lead: An analysis of current training programs for library leadership. *Library Trends* 53: 187-218.
- Mosley, P. A. 2005. Mentoring gen X managers: Tomorrow's library leadership is already here. *Library Administration & Management* 19: 185-92.
- Northouse, P. G. 2007. *Leadership: Theory and practice*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Reader forum: Letters and comments. 2004. *American Libraries* 35 (7): 35-6.
- Renaud, R., and A. Murray. 2003. Organizing for leadership: How university libraries can meet the leadership challenge in higher education. In *Leadership, higher education, and the information age*, ed. C. E. Regenstein and B. I. Dewey, 55-65. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Rossiter, N. 2007. Preparing the next generation of directors and leaders. In *Making a difference: Leadership and academic libraries*, ed. P. Hernon and N. Rossiter, 219-227. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Sellar, M. 2007. The emerging leadership landscape: Six perspectives. *Feliciter* 53 (2): 85-9.

- Singer Gordon, R. 2004-2005. Nurturing new leaders by demonstrating quality leadership. *JLAMS [Journal of the Library Administration and Management Section of the New York Library Association]* 1 (2): 23-38.
- Weiner, S. G. 2003. Leadership of academic libraries: A literature review. *Education Libraries* 26 (2): 5-18.
- Wilder, S. A. 2003. *Demographic change in academic librarianship*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.
- Young, A., and S. Casburn. 2004. Gen X bites back. *American Libraries* 35 (8): 43-5.
- Young, A., P. Herson, and R. Powell. 2004. What will gen next need to lead? *American Libraries* 35 (5): 33-5.

**Table 1**  
**Leadership Engagement Factors Identified in the LIS Literature**

<b>Interest in Leadership/ Willingness to Lead</b>	<b>Opportunities for Leadership Engagement</b>	<b>Barriers to Leadership Engagement</b>
Self assessment of leadership skills (Rossiter, 2007)	Participation in decision-making through task forces or committees (Iannuzzi, 1992)	Lack of recognition of the need for leadership (Renaud & Murray, 2003)
Participation in internship programs (Rossiter, 2007)	Acting in coordinator positions (Iannuzzi, 1992)	Organizational structure and design, including: recruitment, promotion, tenure, performance evaluation practices (Renaud & Murray, 2003)
Participation in mentor opportunities (Rossiter, 2007)	Participating in alternative staff assignments such as projects, Acting positions, job rotations, internships (Iannuzzi, 1992)	Lack of ability or power to command resources (Renaud & Murray, 2003)
Participation in leadership training programs (Rossiter, 2007)	Access to staff development programs (Iannuzzi, 1992)	
Participation in professional development (Rossiter, 2007)	Organizational design and reorganization (Iannuzzi, 1992)	
Involvement in professional associations (Burger, 2006)		
Positive or negative view of library management (Singer Gordon, 2004-2005)		
Perceived lack of ability to retain work/life balance (Mosley, 2005; Singer Gordon, 2004-2005)		
Positive or negative perception of 'Unhealthy' library workplaces (Edmonson, 2004; Singer Gordon, 2004 -2005)		
Positive or negative perception of organizational structure and design (Mosley, 2005)		

**Table 2**  
**Profile of New LIS Professionals in Canada**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>
<b>Gender (n=170)</b>			
Female	138	81.2	81.2
Male	32	18.8	100.0
<b>Generation (n=168)</b>			
Baby Boomers	9	5.4	5.4
Generation X	142	84.5	89.9
Millennials	17	10.1	100.0
<b>Yrs Professional Experience(n=169)</b>			
One	47	27.8	27.8
Two	40	23.7	51.5
Three	28	16.6	68.0
Four	21	12.4	80.5
Five	33	19.5	100.0
<b>Yrs Management Experience (n=170)</b>			
None	105	61.8	61.8
One	31	18.2	80.0
Two	20	11.8	91.8
Three	8	4.7	96.5
Four	3	1.8	98.2
Five	3	1.8	100.0
<b>Type of Library (n=163)</b>			
University	59	36.2	36.2
College/Technical Institute/University College	17	10.4	46.6
Public	54	33.1	79.8
Consortium or Regional System	3	1.8	81.6
Special	28	17.2	98.8
School	1	.6	99.4
Non-Traditional Workplace (e.g. vendor, consulting firm, research project)	1	.6	100.0

**Table 3**  
**Leadership Engagement Factors- Interest and Willingness**

<b>Engagement Factor:</b>	<b>1 Strongly Interested/Very Willing</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5 Not Interested/Willing At All</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Mean Value</b>
<b>Self Assessment</b>							
Interested **	52 (30.8%)	70 (41.4%)	31 (18.3%)	9 (5.3%)	5 (3.0%)	2 (1.2%)	2.11
Willing *	84 (49.4%)	62 (36.5%)	14 (8.2%)	7 (4.1%)	1 (.6%)	2 (1.2%)	1.74
<b>Internship Programs **</b>							
Interested	38 (22.5%)	30 (17.8%)	38 (22.5%)	26 (15.4%)	33 (19.5%)	4 (2.4%)	2.99
Willing	46 (27.2%)	30 (17.8%)	39 (23.1%)	27 (16.0%)	21 (12.4%)	6 (3.6%)	2.79
<b>Mentor Relationships/ Programs *</b>							
Interested	69 (40.6%)	57 (33.5%)	32 (18.8%)	9 (5.3%)	3 (1.8%)	-	1.94
Willing	87 (51.2%)	54 (31.8%)	20 (11.8%)	8 (4.7%)	-	1 (.6%)	1.72
<b>Leadership Training Programs **</b>							
Interested	72 (42.6%)	49 (29.0%)	34 (20.0%)	9 (5.3%)	5 (2.9%)	-	1.97
Willing	90 (53.3%)	51 (30.2%)	21 (12.4%)	6 (3.6%)	-	1 (.6%)	1.69
<b>Professional Development *</b>							
Interested	117 (68.8%)	48 (28.2%)	4 (2.4%)	1 (.6%)	-	-	1.35
Willing	129 (75.9%)	36 (21.2%)	4 (2.4%)	-	-	1 (.6%)	1.29
<b>Professional Associations</b>							
Interested *	67 (39.4%)	69 (40.6%)	28 (16.5%)	5 (2.9%)	1 (.6%)	-	1.85
Willing **	89 (52.7%)	55 (32.5%)	20 (11.8%)	4 (2.4%)		1 (.6%)	1.66
<b>Management Role</b>							
Interested **	56 (33.1%)	60 (35.5%)	29 (17.2%)	17 (10.1%)	7 (4.1%)	-	2.17
Willing *	62 (36.5%)	66 (38.8%)	24 (14.1%)	13 (7.6%)	4 (2.4%)	1 (.6%)	2.02
<b>Leadership Role *</b>							
Interested	78 (45.9%)	66 (38.8%)	20 (11.8%)	6 (3.5%)	-	-	1.73
Willing	85 (50.0%)	65 (38.2%)	14 (8.2%)	5 (2.9%)	-	1 (.6%)	1.66

\* n=170

\*\*n=169

**Table 4**  
**Leadership Engagement Factors – Interest and Willingness Variables**  
**Chi Square and Cramer’s V Values**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Chi Square (<math>\chi^2</math>)</b>	<b>Cramer’s V</b>
<b>Self Assessment</b>	$\chi^2(4, n=166) = 71.655$ p=.000	.465
<b>Internship Programs</b>	$\chi^2(4, n=158) = 1.308E2$ p=.000	.643
<b>Mentorship Programs</b>	$\chi^2(4, n=169) = 1.306E2$ p=.000	.622
<b>Leadership Training</b>	$\chi^2(4, n=167) = 88.131$ p=.000	.514
<b>Professional Development</b>	$\chi^2(2, n=169) = 9.096$ p=.011	.232
<b>Professional Associations</b>	$\chi^2(4, n=168) = 73.491$ p=.000	.468
<b>Management</b>	$\chi^2(4, n=168) = 1.509E2$ p=.000	.670
<b>Leadership</b>	$\chi^2(4, n=169) = 1.586E2$ p=.000	.685

**Table 5**  
**Leadership Engagement Factors – Interest (Predictor) and Willingness (Dependent)**  
**Variables**  
**Linear Regressions**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>R Square (R<sup>2</sup>)</b>	<b>Level of Significance (p)</b>	<b>Unstandardized Coefficient</b>
<b>Self Assessment</b>	.468	.000	.581
<b>Internship Programs</b>	.717	.036	.826
<b>Mentorship Programs</b>	.643	.000	.698
<b>Leadership Training</b>	.529	.000	.574
<b>Professional Development</b>	.318	.000	.497
<b>Professional Associations</b>	.501	.000	.659
<b>Management</b>	.783	.000	.800
<b>Leadership</b>	.703	.000	.789

**Table 6**  
**Leadership Practices Observed in the Workplace**

<b>Library Leaders:</b>	<b>1 Strongly Agree</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5 Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>Mean Value</b>
<b>Retain work/life balance *</b>	22 (12.9%)	43 (25.3%)	36 (21.2%)	47 (27.6%)	14 (8.2%)	8 (4.7%)	3.07
<b>Project a positive image of leadership*</b>	41 (24.1%)	61 (35.9%)	43 (25.3%)	22 (12.9%)	2 (1.2%)	1 (.6%)	2.33
<b>Work in public service *</b>	14 (8.2%)	35 (20.6%)	42 (24.7%)	45 (26.5%)	32 (18.8%)	2 (1.2%)	3.31
<b>Made decisions and communicate them *</b>	28 (16.5%)	54 (31.8%)	52 (30.6%)	31 (18.2%)	4 (2.4%)	1 (.6%)	2.60
<b>Maintain visibility within the Library **</b>	43 (25.3%)	61 (35.9%)	36 (21.2%)	20 (11.8%)	7 (4.1%)	3 (1.8%)	2.39
<b>Articulate a clear mission/vision *</b>	36 (21.3%)	57 (33.7%)	45 (26.6%)	23 (13.6%)	6 (3.6%)	2 (1.2%)	2.48
<b>Deal with conflict/seek resolution *</b>	39 (22.9%)	65 (38.2%)	24 (14.1%)	28 (16.5%)	8 (4.7%)	6 (3.5%)	2.52
<b>Work with staff members to resolve complaints *</b>	38 (22.4%)	67 (39.4%)	35 (20.6%)	20 (11.8%)	4 (2.4%)	6 (3.5%)	2.43
<b>Are held responsible by stakeholders *</b>	48 (28.2%)	56 (32.9%)	39 (22.9%)	11 (6.5%)	6 (3.5%)	10 (5.9%)	2.42
<b>Are held to performance standards as other staff *</b>	42 (24.7%)	60 (35.3%)	25 (14.7%)	17 (10.0%)	16 (9.4%)	10 (5.9%)	2.62
<b>Show respect to staff members *</b>	63 (37.1%)	69 (40.6%)	23 (13.5%)	8 (4.7%)	6 (3.5%)	1 (.6%)	1.99
<b>Give clear directions to staff members *</b>	41 (24.1%)	49 (28.8%)	46 (27.1%)	22 (12.9%)	10 (5.9%)	2 (1.2%)	2.51

\*n=170

\*\*n=169

**Table 7**  
**Leadership Engagement - Workplace Factors Acting as Opportunities or Barriers**

<b>Workplace Factors as Opportunities or Barriers:</b>	<b>1 Strongly Agree</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5 Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Mean Value</b>
Participation in Decision-Making through Taskforces/Committees *	48 (28.2%)	62 (36.5%)	32 (18.8%)	15 (8.8%)	8 (4.7%)	4 (2.4%)	1 (0.6%)	2.32
Work in Coordinator Positions *	42 (24.7%)	51 (30.0%)	32 (18.8%)	22 (12.9%)	12 (7.1%)	7 (4.1%)	4 (2.4%)	2.59
Participation in Alternative Staff Arrangements *	26 (15.3%)	49 (28.8%)	48 (28.2%)	26 (15.3%)	11 (6.5%)	7 (4.1%)	3 (1.8%)	2.81
Participation in Staff Development Programs *	44 (25.9%)	75 (44.1%)	32 (18.8%)	12 (7.1%)	2 (1.2%)	2 (1.2%)	3 (1.8%)	2.16
Organizational Structure that Encourages Leadership Development *	18 (10.6%)	34 (20.0%)	44 (25.9%)	41 (24.1%)	22 (12.9%)	9 (5.3%)	2 (1.2%)	3.25
Recognition of Need for Leadership on Part of all Staff*	36 (21.2%)	50 (29.4%)	36 (21.2%)	33 (19.4%)	9 (5.3%)	4 (2.4%)	2 (1.2%)	2.65
Strategy for Identifying Potential Leaders ***	7 (4.2%)	13 (7.7%)	30 (17.9%)	52 (31.0%)	27 (16.1%)	29 (17.3%)	10 (6.0%)	4.05
Strategy for Developing and Training Potential Leaders *	8 (4.7%)	14 (8.2%)	28 (16.5%)	55 (32.4%)	27 (15.9%)	30 (17.6%)	8 (4.7%)	4.04
Funding for Leadership Training ****	21 (12.6%)	27 (16.2%)	31 (18.6%)	38 (22.8%)	23 (13.8%)	21(12.6%)	6 (3.6%)	3.48
Encouragement to Those Acting as Leaders *	14 (8.2%)	39 (22.9%)	44 (25.9%)	30 (17.6%)	20 (11.8%)	18 (10.6%)	5 (2.9%)	3.35
Recruitment Strategy that Identifies Leadership as Selection Criteria ***	10 (6.0%)	30 (17.9%)	32 (19.0%)	31 (18.5%)	25 (14.9%)	28 (16.7%)	12 (7.1%)	3.74
Performance Evaluation System that Encourages Leadership **	14 (8.3%)	35 (20.7%)	37 (21.9%)	28 (16.6%)	25 (14.8%)	29 (11.8%)	10 (5.9%)	3.47
Compensation/Reward System that Recognizes and Rewards Leadership *	2 (1.2%)	17 (10.0%)	32 (18.8%)	40 (23.5%)	50 (29.4%)	21 (12.4%)	8 (4.7%)	4.12
Tenure/Promotion System that Recognizes and Rewards Leadership **	5 (3.0%)	23 (13.6%)	28 (16.6%)	38 (22.5%)	39 (23.1%)	21 (12.4%)	15 (8.9%)	3.95
Performance Evaluation System that Recognizes and Rewards Leadership **	6 (3.6%)	25 (14.8%)	38 (22.5%)	33 (19.5%)	40 (23.7%)	20 (11.8%)	7 (4.1%)	3.84
Resources (budget, staffing, technology)for Ideas and Projects *****	16 (9.6%)	40 (24.1%)	49 (29.5%)	31(18.7%)	19 (11.4%)	9 (5.4%)	2 (1.2%)	3.15
Other (n=29)	1 (3.4%)	3 (10.3%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (6.9%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (10.3%)	20 (69%)	3.67

\* n=170                   \*\*\*\*n=167  
 \*\* n=169               \*\*\*\*\*n=166  
 \*\*\* n=168