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Abstract

To function in the fluctuating higher education context and to implement their vision and strategic direction for a library, one that is adaptable and establishes a vital and amplified institutional role, managerial leaders may need to influence, shape, and even create organizational cultures. For an organization to accomplish its mission, vision, and strategic goals, managerial leaders must understand the macro-cultures, subcultures, or micro-cultures of the organization. In addition, they must also comprehend the context of organizational cultures within the overall institutional cultures. Further, they must be able to recognize the levels of culture within the organization: artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions. Ultimately, these leaders must grasp the crucial interactions among leadership influence, macro-cultures, institutional, or organizational cultures, and adaptability that may contribute to, or impede, the radical transformation of a library.

While experiencing and responding to changing external and internal forces, managerial leaders may struggle to adapt and transform libraries. The study examined the key relationships and symbiotic elements that contribute to a library transformation (namely, leadership influence, macro-cultures, institutional or organizational cultures, and adaptability through creativity and innovation). An understanding of these interdependent elements may allow managerial leaders to cultivate sustainable and relevant libraries for the future. Further, university library directors may seek to influence organizational cultures to transform libraries, and for that reason, this study examined how they engage with and shape organizational cultures within the context of existing institutional and library cultures. The study explored the types and levels of culture present in the library including how a leader influences organization cultures using leadership embedding and culture change mechanisms.
Using narrative inquiry, the investigator explored the research questions at three academic library case study sites through structured interview questions about critical incidents, leadership embedding mechanisms, and adaptability through creative and innovative initiatives. Using the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) from the Competing Values Framework (CVF), the investigator determined the culture types and dimensions for the three libraries.

The results for this dissertation revealed that leadership influence was foundational, along with the symbiotic interaction among the key transformation elements to the radical transformation of a library. Library leaders could benefit from a greater understanding of the interaction among these essential library transformation elements. A better appreciation of the interdependent elements may allow leaders to influence and transform organizational cultures and create agile, high performance libraries that add value to their institutions, the library profession, and higher education. The research study implications indicated that well-led libraries will have the advantage of agility and adaptability in response to internal and external forces; and, that managerial leaders may need to accept greater responsibility for, and actively engage with, organizational cultures.
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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

Background and Context

The 21st century presented opportunities and challenges to institutions of higher education and, in turn, to the managerial leaders of academic research libraries. According to Barber, Donnelly, and Rizvi (2013):

Deep, radical and urgent transformation is required in higher education. The biggest risk is that as a result of complacency, caution or anxiety the pace of change is too slow and the nature of change is too incremental. The models of higher education that marched triumphantly across the globe in the second half of the 20th century are broken. (p. 5)

To function in the fluctuating higher education context and to implement their vision and strategic direction for a library, one that is adaptable and establishes a vital and amplified institutional role, managerial leaders may need to influence, shape, and even create organizational cultures. Based on his extensive research on organizational culture and leadership, Schein (2010), wrote “. . . culture is ultimately created, embedded, evolved, and ultimately manipulated by leaders . . . . These dynamic processes of culture creation and management are the essence of leadership and make you realize that leadership and culture are two sides of the same coin” (p. 3).

For an organization to accomplish its mission, vision, and strategic goals, managerial leaders must understand the macro-cultures, subcultures, or micro-cultures of the organization. They must also comprehend the context of organizational cultures within the overall institutional cultures. Further, they must be able to recognize the levels of culture within the organization and institution: artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions (Schein,
Ultimately, these leaders must grasp the crucial interactions among leadership influence, organizational cultures, institutional cultures, and adaptability (see Figure 1.1) that may contribute to or impede the radical transformation of a library.

**Figure 1.1**

**Library Transformation Elements**

![Library Transformation Elements](image)

**Institutional and Organizational Cultures**

Academic libraries cannot function in isolation. Each library must maneuver within the parent institution’s vision, mission, and organizational cultures. Overall institutional cultures may impact a library’s ability to adapt and transform. External economic, environmental, political, technological, and cultural matters influence institutional cultures. Internally, these same forces affect an organization’s ability to remain viable and succeed. While some might

---

1Figure 1.1 is a visual representation of the schema or key elements used in this research study.
think of organizational culture as a single entity, in fact, culture is more a complex phenomenon and includes macro-cultures, subcultures, and micro-cultures. Also, cultures may be distinguished by their values to be collaborative, creative, controlling, competing, or a combination of the four (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p. 53). Likewise, organizational cultures may be defined as strong or weak, which may lead to positive or negative consequences for the institution including an organization’s ability to adapt, change, and perform. According to Schein (2010), “Group and organizational theories distinguish two major sets of problems that all groups, no matter what their size, must deal with: (1) Survival, growth, and adaptation in their environment; and (2) Internal integration that permits daily functioning and the ability to adapt and learn” (p. 18).

To build an organizational culture that is focused on a strategic direction and transformation, managerial leaders must develop within the organization an external orientation to the parent institution that focuses on adaptability and mission. Further, they must foster internal or library organizational alignment and integration that consists of involvement and consistency. Research has shown that external adaptability and internal involvement are directly related to an organization’s flexibility and ability to change. That research also indicated the need for leaders to address both outside and in-house cultural matters to build a flexible organization with the ability to transform in response to external and internal forces (Denison & Mishra, 1995; Schein, 1990).

To transform organizational cultures, a leader must understand the complexity of overall institutional and organizational cultures. Cultures are composed of subcultures and micro-cultures. Subcultures are “occupational groups within organizations” and micro-cultures are
“microsystems within or outside organizations” such as a “taskforce that cuts across occupational groups” (Schein, 2010, p. 2). However, some institutional and library cultures, subcultures, or micro-cultures may become entrenched, dysfunctional, and resistant to change and evolution. Budd (2012) emphasized that subcultures and micro-cultures, within large libraries, may “speak different languages and have different objectives” (p. 49). Leaders must be attuned to both institutional and organizational cultures and cultural elements. With improved cultural understanding, leaders could influence organizational and institutional cultures to enable adaptability leading to the transformation of a library.

**Leadership Influence**


> The ultimate dilemma for the first-generation organization with a strong founder-generated culture is how to make the transition to subsequent generations in such a manner that the organization remains adaptive to its changing external environment without destroying cultural elements that have given it its uniqueness, and that have made life fulfilling in the internal environment. Such a transition cannot be made effectively if the succession problem is seen only in power or political terms. The thrust of this analysis is that the *culture* must be analyzed and understood, and that the founder/owners must have sufficient insight into their own culture to make an intelligent transition process possible. (p. 28)

Furthermore, he outlined ten mechanisms used by leaders to embed and transmit culture; and, he especially noted the following three as most powerful:
Deliberate role modeling, teaching, and coaching by leaders.
What leaders pay attention to, measure, and control
Leader reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises (times when organizational survival is threatened, norms are unclear or are challenged, insubordination occurs, threatening or meaningless events occur, and so forth).

Bringing together experts in the field of corporate cultures, Kilmann, Saxton, and Serpa (1985) assembled extensive work on managing corporate cultures. In their view, “culture is to the organization what personality is to the individual—a hidden, yet unifying theme that provides meaning, direction, and mobilization” (p. ix). They emphasized “the surest way to kill an organization is to have all members follow every written rule to the letter. The best way to make a company successful is to have a culture that influences all members to adopt, by tacit agreement, the most effective approach, attitude, and behavior on the job” (pp. ix-x). Further, they identified five key issues for leaders to understand culture:

1. “Does culture have impact: direction, pervasiveness, strength?
2. How deep-seated is culture?
3. Can an organization have more than one culture?
4. Can culture be changed?
5. Can culture alone be changed?” (pp. 3-16)

Concentrating on change once a founder culture has been acknowledged, Dyer (1985) outlined a cycle of cultural evolution in organizations that focused on the role of crises, leadership changes, and conflict:

- The leadership’s abilities and current practices are called into question
- Breakdown of pattern-maintenance symbols, beliefs and structures
- New leadership emerges with an alternative set of assumptions
- Conflict-struggle for control between proponents of old and new cultures
• The new leadership solves the crisis and becomes the new cultural elite

• New symbols, beliefs, and structures institutionalize the new culture. (pp. 210-220)

Building on their work studying organizational cultures through rites and ceremonies, Trice and Beyer (1984, 1991, 1993) described elements of cultural leadership and explicitly two types of cultural leadership: innovation and maintenance. Within innovation, they defined the ability to “create” and “change” cultures. In maintenance, leaders used elements of cultural leadership to “embody” and “integrate” cultures to remain vital (1993, p. 264). When they described leadership that alters cultures they meant “…leadership that consciously promotes different ideologies and cultural forms” (p. 270).

Through their studies to determine if there is a relationship between corporate culture and organizational performance, Kotter and Heskett (1992) indicated while cultures are difficult to change they can be made “more performance enhancing.” Further, they emphasized that culture change “…requires leadership, which is something quite different from even excellent management” (pp. 10-12).

In their four-frame model of organizational leadership, Bolman and Deal (2008) underscored the importance of organizational symbols and culture as a part of the symbolic frame that leaders must address. Using leadership examples they revealed “…how a positive, cohesive culture can be fashioned and perpetuated” (p. 269). Working with four experts, three from the health care field and one from a baseball organization with a 17-year losing culture, Campbell (2009) investigated and clearly articulated the development of the different cultures; and, he documented the significance of values, norms, vision, mission, goals, and leadership styles in creating a winning organizational culture. He emphasized that “good leaders must link
the values, norms, and philosophies of the organizational culture to those of the individual, to enact organizational change” (p. 341).

Building on the extensive research on transformational leadership, Hartnell and Walumbwa, (2011) presented a model that called for both differentiated and integrated views of organizational culture and subcultures to explain the connection between leadership influence and culture. Yukl (2013) confirmed that the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of a corporation has more influence on the organizational culture than other leaders in the organization. He noted that “the potential influence of leaders on corporate culture increases in a crisis that requires major changes, but the CEO is not the only source of this influence.” He emphasized that aspects of critical subcultures in a corporate turnaround may become a part of an overall corporate culture (p. 287).

From the LIS literature and based on the competing values framework by Quinn (1988), Faerman (1993) adapted Quinn’s structure and suggested managerial leadership roles for library leaders to adopt to promote change in response to the shifting library landscape and to operate from a user viewpoint. From the perspectives of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) directors, Hernon, Powell, and Young (2001, 2002, 2004) documented present and future attributes desirable in ARL directors. In particular, “changes/shapes the library’s culture” is one attribute they categorized as leading; but, it was not one of the top ranked attributes in their research study (2002, pp. 79-81). From their research on the activities of academic library directors, Hernon, Powell, and Young reported that “directors adapt to the cultures already in place, but those cultures are subject to change.” They concluded “a new director is influenced by the culture more than he or she can change it” (2004, p. 560).

**Adaptability through Creativity and Innovation**
Confirming the importance and need for adaptability and consistency, Heifetz and Laurie (2001) emphasized the crucial role a leader must play to motivate and support individuals throughout an organization to adapt to external and internal challenges and “to clarify their values, develop new strategies, and learn new ways of operating” to thrive (p. 132). Creativity leading to innovation may stimulate adaptability that leads to evolution of an organization. Amabile (1988) highlighted the connection between creativity and innovation specifically defining creativity as “. . . the production of novel and useful ideas by an individual or small group of individuals working together. Innovation is built on creative ideas as the basic elements” (p. 126).

Library leaders play a critical role in the creation of cultures that encourage creativity leading to innovation. Using structured interviews, Jantz (2012b) documented university librarians’ views on the complexity and importance of innovation in academic libraries. He noted leadership as one of the key dimensions of innovation and highlighted the role of a leader in pinpointing innovation as a strategic direction and in supporting multiple and competing cultures and goals (pp. 10-11). Castiglione (2008) also emphasized the role of the library leader in creating cultures and stressed that leadership choices about experimentation, risk taking, and autonomy may encourage or prevent creativity and innovation. Specifically, he connected a vital culture component of “shared values” to “creative synergies” (p. 167). Similarly stressing the importance of individual and organizational creativity, Michalak (2012) outlined the successful transformation of a research library’s organizational culture to one that is responsive to external forces and adaptive to the institutional environment. She asserted that “a transformed library anticipates altered environments, new user needs, and fluctuations in funding levels, and it makes effective changes and adjustments as a natural way of operating” (p. 422).
Problem Statement

While experiencing and responding to changing external and internal forces, managerial leaders may struggle to adapt and transform libraries. Understanding the key relationships and symbiotic elements that contribute to a library transformation (namely, leadership influence, organizational cultures, institutional cultures, and adaptability through creativity and innovation) may allow managerial leaders to cultivate sustainable and relevant libraries for the future. University library directors may seek to influence organizational cultures to transform libraries, however, no study has examined how they engage with and shape organizational cultures within the context of existing institutional and library cultures. This study filled that void by exploring the types and levels of institutional or macro-cultures present, how a leader influences organization cultures, and how cultures shape the leader and the ability of the organization to evolve.

Conclusion

A greater appreciation of the interdependent relationships among institutional and organizational culture(s), leadership influence, and adaptability may allow libraries more quickly to adapt and produce thriving organizations. Knowledge of successful practices, mechanisms, and roles for leaders to employ to create and evolve cultures may add value to the institution and overall library profession. As the higher education environment becomes more unpredictable, libraries will need to demonstrate adaptability, added value, and a return on the investment for the institution and key stakeholders. The study results established best practices for transformation of organizational cultures in libraries in response to external and internal forces influencing libraries. In addition, the investigator provided criteria for library directors to employ as they endeavor to integrate more deeply creativity, innovation, and adaptability into the
organizational culture(s) of the institution. In particular, she provided methods for new and experienced directors to evaluate institutional and organizational cultures. Managerial leaders could benefit from an increased understanding of how organizational cultures transition through stages of growth and success followed by the possibility of stagnation or decline. Enriched comprehension of work cultures within the context of the lifecycle of an organization and institution could offer leaders the capacity to renew continuously and to invigorate a library, its programs, services, and human resources. Further, the investigator documented best practices for managerial roles, activities, and strategies to transform successfully and continuously library cultures.
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Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Culture

The literature of organizational culture is extensive and often uses the terms climate and culture interchangeably. Schneider (1990) documented the research on organization culture as a concept as it evolved from the mid-1970s up to 1990. Schneider cited Pettigrew (1979) as one of the first to research organizational culture. In an empirical study of a British boarding school during the seventies, Pettigrew (1979), studied critical incidents beginning with the birth of the school and used anthropology and sociology research methods to learn more about how cultures are developed in new organizations. Later, Deal and Kennedy (1982, 2000) described the values, rites, ritual, and heroes important to corporate success. Peters and Waterman (1982, 2006) established the significance of an organization’s stories, myths, and legends in transmission of an organization’s common values or culture. Demonstrating the growth of research in the field, a 1983 issue of Organizational Dynamics focused on culture as a practice for managers. Investigating the concept of organizational culture from a variety of viewpoints and research methods, the special issue of Administrative Science Quarterly in the same year explored “culture as a root metaphor for organization studies” (Jelinek, Smircich, & Hirsch, 1983, p. 331). In a review of the research literature, Smircich (1983) demonstrated the intersection of culture and organization theory. Building on this concept, Ott (1989) provided a historical and extensive analysis of organizational culture and advocated for an organizational culture perspective to organizational theory and research. Martin (1992, 2002) considered the extensive organizational culture research from three social science perspectives: integration, differentiation, and
fragmentation. Martin contended that a multi-perspective approach to culture research is vital to the legitimacy of the field.

Schneider (1990) provided an in-depth overview of the development of, and research on, the concepts of organizational climate and culture, and noted: “culture and climate are both attempts to identify the environment that affects the behavior of people in organizations. Culture exists at a higher level of abstraction than climate, and climate is a manifestation of culture” (p. 29). Further, he highlighted the parallel but separate development of organizational climate and culture research, with research on climate being primarily quantitative and on research on culture being qualitative. Adding evidence to the important relationship between climate and culture, Ashkanasy and Jackson (2001) provided an extensive review of the research and “conclude that culture and climate are overlapping and complementary constructs, amenable to multimethod research that cuts across disciplinary boundaries” (p. 399).

While there is extensive research on organizational culture in the social sciences, there is a scarcity of research on organization culture in the LIS literature. In a descriptive, non-research article, Sannwald (2000) described four roles of organizational culture, described by Kreitner and Kinicki (1998), as:

1. “giving members of the organization identity;”
2. “providing collective commitment to the organization;”
3. “building social system stability;” and
4. “allowing people to make sense of the organization” (pp. 8-9).

Sannwald identified libraries as “functional-traditional cultures” and stressed that the library “is enduring because the culture is so strong that it is embedded into all the practices and policies of the library. . . . However, one must be sure that the culture is flexible enough to allow
needed change” (p. 9). He noted that libraries with strong cultures are resistant to change. He emphasized, therefore, the need for strong political skills for a new leader to survive and succeed in an organizational culture. In a research article on organizational culture as a strategic resource in libraries, Kaarst-Brown, Nicholson, Von Dran, and Stanton (2004) also linked culture to change and organizational success. They asserted “organizational cultures and values are important resources that need to be managed like other resources” (p. 50). Further, they encouraged cultural assessment as a tool “. . . to align diverse intra-organizational cultures while facilitating change and organizational transformation” (p. 50). Compiling practicing librarian viewpoints, experiences, and research, Blessinger and Hrycaj (2013) co-edited a multi-chapter volume that addresses various aspects of workplace culture along with techniques to improve cultures in academic libraries.

Moving to an international perspective, predominant in Europe, where there are so many national cultures, Hofstede (1980, 2001) put forward five dimensions of culture:

1. “Power distance, which is related to the different solutions to the basic problem of human inequality;”

2. “Uncertainty avoidance, which is related to the level of stress in a society in the face of an unknown future;”

3. “Individualism versus collectivism, which is related to the integration of individuals into primary groups;”

4. “Masculinity versus femininity, which is related to the divisions of emotional roles between men and women;” and

5. “Long-term versus short-term orientation, which is related to the choice of focus for people’s efforts: the future or the present” (2001, p. 29).
Contrary to the findings of Peters and Waterman (1982), Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, and Sanders (1990) discovered from their research that “shared perceptions of daily practices to be the core of an organization’s culture” rather than the shared values of individuals. They explained that the values of an organization’s founder may influence the culture but they do not alter the values of individual employees. However, through a leader’s influence the values become the practices of the employees at work (p. 311). For example, as members of an organization, individuals follow group practices or values. In further research on attitudes and culture, Hofstede (1998), found “it is only in the area of communication and cooperation where management actions affecting the culture also affect employee attitudes negatively or positively” (p. 491). Updating more than forty years of research (Hofstede 1991, 1997) in over seventy countries, Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010) underscored the difference between organization and national cultures. They provided evidence from an employee perspective that values varied more by gender, age, education, and nationality than by association with an organization.

House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta, (2004) expanded on the international work of Hofstede and others in the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) research program and advanced nine dimensions of culture associated with the concept of leadership:

1. **Power Distance**: The degree to which members of a collective expect power to be distributed equally.

2. **Uncertainty Avoidance**: The extent to which a society, organization, or group relies on social norms, rules, and procedures to alleviate unpredictability of future events.

2 See Hernon and Pors (2013), especially chapters 1, 3, 4, and 9 for a review of the literature on United States and European leadership and culture studies on an international basis, including works relating to GLOBE.
3. *Human Orientation:* The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring, and kind to others.

4. *Collectivism I (Institutional Collectivism):* The degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action.

5. *Collectivism II (In-Group Collectivism):* The degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families.

6. *Assertiveness:* The degree to which individuals are assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in their relationships with others.

7. *Gender Egalitarianism:* The degree to which a collective minimizes gender inequality.

8. *Future Orientation:* The extent to which individuals engage in future-oriented behaviors such as delaying gratification, planning, and investing in the future.

9. *Performance Orientation:* The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence. (p. 30)

The research of House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta, (2004) validated the culturally endorsed implicit leadership theory (CLT) comprised of six global dimensions:

1. *Charismatic/Value-based.* A broadly defined leadership dimension that reflects the ability to inspire, to motivate, and to expect high performance outcomes from others on the basis of firmly held core values.

2. *Team Oriented.* A leadership dimension that emphasizes effective team building and implementation of a common purpose or goal among team members.

3. *Participative.* A leadership dimension that reflects the degree to which managers involve others in making and implementing decisions.

4. *Humane oriented.* A leadership dimension that reflects supportive and considerate leadership but also includes compassion and generosity.

5. *Autonomous.* This newly defined leadership dimension has not previously appeared in the literature. This dimension refers to independent and individualistic leadership.
6. **Self-Protective.** From a Western perspective, this newly defined leadership dimension focuses on ensuring the safety and security of the individual or group member. (p. 675)

The GLOBE group of 170 social science researchers applied the cultural and leadership dimensions to the study of leadership, organization, and culture. The research confirmed “. . . organizations mirror societies from which they originate . . . Although we showed the interactive effects of society and industry on organizational culture, organizational cultures seem to be more of a reflection of their societal context rather than their industry context” (p. 726).³

Demonstrating the significance of macro-culture or national context to the comprehension of organizational culture, Awan and Mahmood (2010) explored the relationship among leadership style, organizational culture, and employee commitment in Pakistan university libraries through the perceptions of 115 professional librarians. They noted high employee commitment, perception of achievement, a bureaucratic culture, and an awareness of autocratic leadership. However, they documented a lack of concern, from the library professionals, about the connections among leadership style, organizational culture, and job commitment (p. 253).

Looking at managerial leadership roles rather than at national cultures within different societies and dimensions, Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2011) assembled a competing values framework (CVF) for understanding the managerial leadership types and capabilities necessary for compatibility and success in the prevailing organizational culture: clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, or market. Their research built on earlier work (Cameron & Ettington, 1988; Cameron & Freeman, 1991; Quinn & Cameron, 1983; Quinn & Kimberly, 1984; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1981, 1983) and

³ Robert J. House initiated the idea for the GLOBE research study. Collecting data from 62 countries between 1994 and 1997, a series of researchers compiled an extensive dataset to repeat Hofstede’s 1980 breakthrough study on culture, leadership and society. Building on the previous, substantial research, Chhokar, Brodbeck, House, and Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program (2007) provide an in-depth study on culture and leadership in 25 societies.
documented the orientation of a clan culture as collaborative with corresponding values of commitment, communication, and development. For the adhocracy culture, the orientation was one of creativity with innovative outputs, transformation, and agility as values. In a hierarchical culture, the orientation was controlling with values of efficiency, timeliness, consistency, and uniformity. The fourth culture type, market, oriented toward competition and values market share, goal achievement, and profitability. Through their extensive research on competing values and leadership, Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2011) confirmed “. . . a congruence hypothesis between culture and competencies. When leadership strengths of an individual are congruent with the dominant organizational culture, those leaders tend to be more successful, as are the units they manage” (p. 53).

In the last two decades, the competing values framework (CVF) (Brooks, 2007; Faerman, 1993; Kaarst-Brown et al., 2004; Shepstone & Currie, 2008, 2013; Varner, 1996) received some exposure in the LIS literature. Connecting managerial leadership roles and styles to organizational performance, Faerman (1993) described the potential for applying CFV within library organizational cultures to achieve improved performance and user-centered libraries. Specifically, Faerman urged managerial leaders to become more comfortable with all eight CVF managerial roles and to develop “. . . an ability to look at the whole” (p.76).

In an exploratory study, Varner (1996) used the CVF to examine the organizational culture of an academic library. While helping one organization understand its values and underlying assumptions, limiting the research to the study of one library did not allow for generalization of the findings across different academic libraries. In another CVF research study, Brooks (2007) used the framework to identify and compare perceived culture and
leadership roles of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) library directors to non-ARL directors.

In another single case study, Shepstone and Currie (2008) used the CVF to assess the organizational culture, subcultures, correspondence between subcultures and the dominant culture, and methods to promote organizational transformation at the University of Saskatchewan Library. The results emphasized the importance of understanding “. . . both the leadership and managerial responsibilities of librarians and the critical role distributed leadership can play in creating meaningful organizational change, the study also considers the behaviors leaders and managers should adopt in order to engage in a successful culture change effort” (p. 364). They expanded their research (2013) to three Canadian academic libraries and “. . . assessed current and preferred cultures and proposed action based on current cultural strengths” (p. 21).

In a review article, Alvesson (2011) distinguished among organizational culture, discourse, and identity in organizational research. Differing from Cameron and Quinn (2011), Alvesson (2001, 2013) emphasized the need to understand the various definitions of leadership and specifically differentiated between the role of the leader and the manager to influence culture. He described leaders as “transmitters” of culture rather than “masters” of culture and managers as “cultural engineers” (2013, p. 121). Building on his extensive research and work on organizational culture, Alvesson reaffirmed his six metaphors for understanding organizational culture:

1. Exchange regulator, functioning as a control mechanism in which the informal contract and the long-term rewards are regulated, aided by a common value and reference system and a corporate memory;

2. Compass, in which culture gives a sense of direction and guidelines for priorities;
3. Social glue, where common ideas, symbols and values are sources of identification with the group/organization and counteract fragmentation;

4. Sacred cow, where basic assumptions and values point to a core of the organization which people are strongly committed to;

5. Affect regulator, where culture provides guidelines and scripts for emotions and affections and how they should be expressed; and

6. Mental prison, referring to how un- or non-conscious aspects of culture, culture as taken-for-granted ideas leading to blind spots and ideas and meanings creating a fixed world within which people adjust, unable to critically explore and transcend existing social constructions. (2013, p. 31)

From the higher education literature on organization culture within the academy, Chaffee and Tierney (1988) explained, “an organization’s culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it. It concerns decisions, actions, and communication both on an instrumental and a symbolic level” (p. 7). Further, Tierney (1988) provided a context in which administrators may analyze college and university cultures and understand the role culture plays in management and change. He emphasized, “Institutions certainly are influenced by powerful, external factors such as demographic, economic, and political conditions, yet they are also shaped by strong forces that emanate from within” (p. 3). He noted “. . . administrators tend to recognize their organization’s culture only when they have transgressed its bounds and severe conflicts or adverse relationships ensue” (p. 4). Further, he described “. . . we frequently find ourselves dealing with organizational culture in an atmosphere of crisis management, instead of reasoned reflection and consensual change” (p. 4). In addition, Tierney (1990) justified the study of culture within the academy “. . . to understand how ‘decisions and actions’ are culturally influenced so that we might utilize our newfound understanding to create more effective organizations” (p. 1).
Bergquist (1992) identified four cultures found in North American higher education: collegial, managerial, developmental, and advocacy. Bergquist and Pawlak (2008) expanded the earlier work to include two additional cultures, virtual and tangible. They defined the six cultures as:

1. **The collegial culture**: A culture that finds meaning primarily in the disciplines represented by the faculty in the institution; that values faculty research and scholarship and the quasi-political governance processes of the faculty; that holds assumptions about the dominance of rationality in the institution; and that conceives of the institution’s enterprise as the generation, interpretation, and dissemination of knowledge and as the development of specific values and qualities of character among young men and women who are future leaders of our society.

2. **The managerial culture**: A culture that finds meaning primarily in the organization, implementation, and evaluation of work that is directed toward specified goals and purposes; that values fiscal responsibility and effective supervisory skills; that holds assumptions about the capacity of the institution to define and measure its goals and objectives clearly; and that conceives of the institution’s enterprise as the inculcation of specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes in students so that they might become successful and responsible citizens.

3. **The developmental culture**: A culture that finds meaning primarily in the creation of programs and activities furthering the personal and professional growth of all members of the higher education community; that values personal openness and service to others as well as systematic institutional research and curricular planning; that holds assumptions about the inherent desire of all men and women to attain their own personal maturation, while helping others in the institution become more mature; and that conceives of the institution’s enterprise as the encouragement of potential for cognitive, affective, and behavioral maturation among all students, faculty, administrators, and staff.

4. **The advocacy culture**: A culture that finds meaning primarily in the establishment of equitable and egalitarian policies and procedures for the distribution of resources and benefits in the institution; that values confrontation and fair bargaining among constituencies, primarily management and faculty or staff, who have vested interests that are inherently in opposition; that holds assumptions about the ultimate role of power and the frequent need for outside mediation in a viable
academic institution; and that conceives of the institution’s enterprise as either the undesirable promulgation of existing (and often repressive) social attitudes and structures or the establishment of new and more liberating social attitudes and structures.

5. **The virtual culture**: A culture that finds meaning by answering the knowledge generation and dissemination capacity of the postmodern world; that values the global perspective of open, shared, responsive educational systems; that holds assumptions about its ability to make sense of the fragmentation and ambiguity that exists in the postmodern world; and that conceives of the institution’s enterprise as linking its educational resources to global and technological resources, thus broadening the global learning network.

6. **The tangible culture**: A culture that finds meaning in its roots, its community, and its spiritual grounding; that values the predictability of a value-based, face-to-face education in an owned physical location; that holds assumptions about the ability of old systems and technologies being able to instill the institution’s values; and that conceives of the institution’s enterprise as the honoring and reintegration of learning from a local perspective. (pp. 15, 43, 73, 111, 147, 185)

Differing from Cameron and Quinn (1999) who focused on diagnosing and changing organizational cultures, Bergquist and Pawlak (2008) offered their framework from a different perspective and purpose. They suggested higher education organizations “must determine how to work with and use the strengths and resources of the existing organization culture to accomplish our goals. We must, in other words, learn to appreciate rather than annihilate cultures” (p. x).

**Macro-cultures, Subcultures, and Micro-cultures**

Multiple cultures, subcultures, micro-cultures, and counter cultures within an organization are central to a comprehensive understanding of overall organizational culture (Gregory, 1983; Louis, 1985; Riley, 1983; Sathe, 1983; Schein, 1990, 1992, 2004, 2010, 2017). Macro-cultures denote nations, ethnic and religious groups; organizational cultures refer to private, public, nonprofit, and government organizations; subcultures are occupational groups
within organizations; and micro-cultures are “small coherent units within an organization”
sometimes called Microsystems (Schein, 2010, p. 2).

Documenting the necessity to recognize subcultures, Wilkins (1983) outlined the
usefulness of cultural audits for managers to comprehend and impact organizational culture. He
noted three instances when organizational culture is exposed:

1. When employees change roles (become members, get promoted, change
functions, and so forth);  
2. When subcultures conflict or assign stereotypical characteristics to one
another; and  
3. When top management makes and implements critical decisions about
company direction and style. (p. 34)

Through research on the “organizational politics” facets of culture, Riley (1983)
acknowledged “. . . that organizational culture should be viewed as a system of integrated
subcultures, not as a unified set of values to which all organizational members ascribe” (p. 414). In contrast, Gregory (1983) argued “. . . multiple cultures are not simply subcultures, dominated
by an organizational culture, but usually cross-cut several organizations as do occupational
cultures” (p. 374). Gregory proposed the value of a “multicultural perspective” using
anthropological native viewpoints or internal voices rather than external views of culture to
document patterns of multiple cultures and the resulting culture conflicts in large organizations.

Martin and Siehl (1983) described three types of subcultures: enhancing, orthogonal, and
countercultural. An enhancing subculture is one “. . . in which adherence to the core values of
the dominant culture would be more fervent than in the rest of the organization.” In an
orthogonal subculture, “. . . members would simultaneously accept the core values of the
dominant culture and a separate, unconflicted set of values particular to themselves.” In a
countercultural subculture, “. . . some core values . . . should present a direct challenge to the
core values of a dominant culture. Thus a dominant culture and a counterculture should exist in an uneasy symbiosis . . .” (pp. 53-54).

Focusing on leader activities, preferred values, visual artifacts, and organizational stories, Martin and Siehl (1983) reasoned that “a counterculture can serve some useful functions for a dominant culture, articulating the boundaries between appropriate and inappropriate behavior and providing a safe haven for the development of innovative ideas” (p. 63). Encouraging attention on dysfunctional rather than nonthreatening subcultures within an organization, Louis (1985) called for research on the “pervasiveness, consistency, and stability of shared understandings” and the “orientation” or “targeted direction” of the subcultures (p. 135).

**Adaptability and Performance**

There are differing views on the linkage of strong cultures to the efficiency, effectiveness, and performance of organizations (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Denison, 1990; Gordon, 1985; Kotrba, Gillespie, Schmidt, Smerek, Ritchie, & Denison, 2012; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Sackmann, 2011; Schein, 1984; Trice & Beyer, 1984; Wilkins & Ouchi, 1983).

Emphasizing the importance of understanding culture as a way to influence employee performance, Deal and Kennedy (1982) noted:

> whether weak or strong, culture has a powerful influence throughout an organization; it affects practically everything—from who gets promoted and what decisions are made, to how employees dress and what sports they play. Because of this impact, we think that culture also has a major effect of the success of the business. (p. 4)

Studying rites and ceremonies to determine the interaction of several cultural practices, Trice and Beyer (1984) documented the value of more inclusive, integrated research on concepts of organizational culture to determine the consequences that may include organizational effectiveness and adaptability. Their results showed that “. . . organizations may need to have
strong cultures to be able to adapt and change. Somehow strong cultures must be managed so as to facilitate and not hamper change efforts” (p. 666). Linking industry characteristics, marketplace, organization culture, and performance, Gordon (1985) suggested that these factors illuminate the right culture to ensure success.

Dennison (1990) outlined a theory of culture and organizational effectiveness based on quantitative and qualitative research. With additional case studies and surveys, Denison and Mishra (1995) advanced a model of organizational culture and effectiveness grounded in four traits: involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission (p. 204). To build organizational cultures that encourage successful performance, leaders must develop both an external orientation, including adaptability and mission, and improve internal integration that consists of involvement and consistency. Specifically, involvement and adaptability are related directly to an organization’s ability to change (Denison & Mishra, 1995; Schein, 1990).

Kotter and Heskett (1992) explored the connection between corporate culture and long-term economic performance of organizations, specifically how different types of cultures, (strong, strategically appropriate, and adaptive) either positively or negatively influence performance. Through research on almost 200 corporate organizations, they documented that strong cultures do not necessary correlate with great performance. They showed the role top leadership plays in the creation of unhealthy corporate cultures, performance-enhancing cultures, and the preservation of performance-enhancing cultures (pp. 145-150).

Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky (2009) provided advice on building an adaptive culture so that organizations are prepared to respond to adaptive challenges. They suggested that adaptability should become the “norm” for an organization to perform and be successful. They outline five key features of an adaptive culture:
1. “Elephants on the table are named;”
2. “Responsibility for the organization is shared;”
3. “Independent judgment is expected;”
4. “Leadership capacity is developed;” and
5. “Reflection and continuous learning are institutionalized” (p. 165).

Providing a comprehensive review of the research between 2000 to 2009 connecting organizational culture to performance, Sackmann (2011) highlighted that “culture may play different roles—influencing, being influenced, and providing a context for action. Given the multifaceted nature of organizational culture, no single study will be able to capture all facets or dimensions and levels of culture, for example, artifacts-practices, norms, values, and assumptions” (p. 218). Understanding the complexity, dimensions, and levels of organization cultures within the context of institutional cultures is key to understanding cultures and their impact on organizational performance.

Moving beyond the research linking organizational culture to effectiveness, Kotrba, et al. (2012) built on the previous research of Denison (1990). They used the Denison Organizational Culture survey to gather data from 88,879 people in 137 public companies. Based on the data, they found a connection between consistency and high performance to three cultural traits (mission, adaptability, and involvement). They emphasized the significance of the relationship among the three traits and noted that “… it is necessary to have strong mission, adaptability, and involvement traits” for consistency to convert to performance results (p. 258).

**Creativity and Innovation**

Amabile, (1988) noted that “organizational innovation is the successful implementation of creative ideas within an organization” (p. 126). Working with colleagues, Amabile (1996)
developed and validated the instrument, KEYS: Assessing the Climate for Creativity, to evaluate individuals’ perceptions of influence on creativity at several levels in businesses. Building on her seminal work, *The Social Psychology of Creativity*, Amabile (1983) showed that the work environment is key to encouraging or deterring the creativity which leads to organizational innovation (Amabile, 1996). Woodman, Sawyer, and Griffin (1993) explored the literature related to individual, group, and organizational creativity and further developed an interactionist model of creativity, specifically noting culture as one of an organization’s characteristics which influences the creative process and transformation.

Incorporating extensive creativity and innovation research literature, Ford (1996) developed a multiple social domains theory of creativity that emphasizes individual creative actions to influence creativity and innovation across “. . . group, organization, institutional, and market domains” (p. 1112). Ford also documented research that a nurturing organizational culture “. . . positively influences creativity” (p. 1123).

Ekvall (1997) affirmed Amabile’s (1988) research documenting that innovation is a creative idea realized. He emphasized the need to understand the organization conditions that promote creativity and the levels of creativity, “one [of which] is radical and revolutionary, the other adaptive and confirmatory” (p. 195). He stressed the need to be mindful of the problem of competing values and beliefs of adaptors and innovators.

In a thorough research review on managing creative people, Mumford (2000) described human resources practices that may influence the capability for creativity and innovation, including leadership influence through providing vision for the organization. He also notes that “. . . culture can, like structure, create a subtle and pervasive effect on the organization’s
willingness and capability for pursuing new ideas by shaping staffs’ capabilities and
organizational learning” (p. 337).

Studying a non-profit service organization, Jaskyte (2002) demonstrated that a “strongly
shared culture may not be appropriate for fostering innovation . . .” and she encourages leaders to
create “cultural changes” to encourage innovation (p. xii). Jaskyte (2004) built on her earlier
work and found evidence of connections among leadership, organizational culture, and
innovativeness. Her results showed that transformational leadership may not be associated with
innovativeness (p. 162).

In another research review, Martins and Terblanche (2003) outlined the factors of
organizational culture that influence creativity and innovation: strategy, structure, support
mechanisms, behavior that encourages innovation, and communication. Strategy includes vision,
mission, and purposefulness. Flexibility, freedom, and cooperative teams and group interaction
make up structure. Support mechanisms embrace reward, recognition, and the availability of
resources. Behaviors that encourage innovation are mistake handling, idea generating,
continuous learning culture, risk taking, competitiveness, support for change, and conflict
handling. Finally, they stressed open communication as a key factor (p. 70). They argued: “the
values, norms and beliefs that play a role in creativity and innovation in organisations can either
support or inhibit creativity and innovation, depending on how they influence the behavior of
individuals and groups” (p. 73).

Focusing on the role of the leader, Basadur (2004) stressed that “leaders can use
creativity as the deliberate tool to lead their organizations to achieve adaptability” (p. 104). This
required the leader to have the ability and skills to guide others to “think innovatively—leading
others to continuously discover new disruptive problems and implement new disruptive
solutions” (p. 120). Likewise, Cameron, Quinn, DeGraff, and Thakor (2006) endorsed a model for creating value through different leadership behaviors or competencies (see Figure 2.1). They outline three rules for fostering innovation:

1. “Pull people apart; put people together”
2. “Monitor and prod”
3. “Reward multiples roles” (pp. 147-149).

**Figure 2.1**

*Rules for Fostering Innovation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATE</th>
<th>CREATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Put people together.</td>
<td>Reward idea champions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward sponsors and mentors.</td>
<td>Reward rule breakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>COMPETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor.</td>
<td>Pull people apart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward orchestrators.</td>
<td>Prod.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Outlining elements of innovative cultures, Dombrowski, Kim, Desouza, Braganza, Papagari, Baloh, and Jha (2007) emphasized the importance of integrating these fundamentals within the organizational culture. The eight elements were:

1. “innovative mission and vision statements”
2. “democratic communication”
3. “safe spaces”
4. “flexibility”
5. “collaboration”
6. “boundary spanning”
7. “incentives”
8. “leadership” (p. 190).

Amabile and Khaire (2008) described the results of a two-day colloquium at Harvard Business School that brought together business leaders from organizations that thrive on creativity such as Google, IDEO, and Norvartis to respond and deliberate on research presented by leading scholars in the field. Participants highlighted the need “. . . to create a culture in which creativity can thrive, repeatedly returning to the image of a gardener who prepares the creative soil and nurtures the seedlings of ideas” (p. 105). Presenting her research in the music industry at the colloquium, Elizabeth Long Lingo of Vanderbilt University described leaders as producers that “. . . operate at the center of the storm without being the focus of attention and are proactive without being controlling. The glory comes from helping others realize their unique talents and reach a collective goal – a hit record.” She accentuated the need for the “producer” to incorporate the work of many different individuals, organizations, and teams and “create a shared purpose” (p. 109).

Hill, Travaglini, Brandeau, and Stecker (2010) summarized the results of their collaborative project on “leadership for innovation.” One of their conclusions is that leadership is about “. . . creating a world to which people want to belong—one in which individuals are affirmed in their identity (unleashing their slices of genius and values) and able to be a part of and contribute to something larger than themselves (harnessing the diverse slices of genius to develop innovative solutions for a collective)” (pp. 612-613).

Bringing together experts from across fields in the social sciences, Mann and Chan (2011) provided key principles and policy implications for understanding the impact and
possibilities resulting from creativity and innovation. They documented that “it is possible to foster creativity and manage and improve innovation across settings and domains . . . (p. 256). Further, they emphasized that companies “. . . struggle with the challenge of how best to design their organisational structures and culture to support creative and innovative activity” (p. 258).

Also identifying organizational challenges, Alonzo (2012), in a single case study, examined the relationship between leadership and the design process to nurture a culture of innovation. Specifically, he identified the need for support and communication systems for project leaders (p. iii). Studying Iranian auto companies, Sharifirad and Ataei (2012) found a correlation between innovation culture (IC) and organizational culture (OC). Their findings showed that adaptability and involvement are the components of OC that influence IC.

Similarly, Yates (2012) explained the importance of organizational culture in cultivating innovation. She emphasized, “Innovation thrives in an environment that values it. The organization’s culture either supports or rejects changes to existing systems and thereby encourages or inhibits innovation” (p. 129). Most importantly, her conclusions demonstrated “that innovation, at its core, is a system change that affects the organizational culture” (p. 130).

The LIS literature on innovation and creativity is limited. Howard (1977) and Howard, Hage, and Aiken (1981) explored the relationship between certain organizational variables and the rate of innovation in four university libraries. Musmann (1982), provided a review of the literature on the diffusion of innovation in libraries, documented the dearth of LIS literature on organizations and innovation. However, from his brief survey, he noted “. . . an innovative organization may be able to deal more successfully with the vagaries of a turbulent environment” (p. 273).
Gathering papers on creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship in different types of libraries for the first time, a 1989 issue of the *Journal of Library Administration* demonstrated the differences and interactions among the three concepts. Kruger (1989) highlighted the importance of the leadership style of a “top administrative team in the organization” that will “. . . support creative behavior in other employees . . . to realize flexibility, innovativeness, and progress—the characteristics of a strong, effective organization” (p. 6).

Neal (2001) urged libraries to understand “. . . the nature of entrepreneurship and innovation, and their relevance to library advancement” (p. 2). In the context of innovation and entrepreneurship, he highlighted stimulants and obstacles to creativity which according to Amabile (1983, 1988, 1996, 1999) lead to innovation. Connecting innovation to creativity, Riggs (2001) wrote, “Innovation dates back to creative leadership, and the library world tends to view innovators initially with suspicion and, if the new product/service is successful, subsequently heaps praise and commendation on the innovator” (p. 12). Providing a review of the creativity literature in LIS literature, Castiglione (2008) identified the factors needed for intrinsic motivation of employees as the same needed for organizational learning, adaptation and transformation: “open communication and collaboration between and among workgroups; employee participation in management decisions; experimentation; and opportunities for experimentation and growth” (p. 168).

Neal (2010) called for libraries “. . . to pursue primal innovation, risk and experimentation at the fundamental core of the organization mission and culture. And not just during periods of financial duress, or in response to grant opportunities but as a fundamental value and capability” (p. 3). Based on a thorough examination of the limited LIS literature on innovation in libraries, Jantz (2012a) put forward a theoretical framework for studying
organizational innovation in research libraries based on Rogers’ *Diffusion of Innovations*. He emphasized that: “leadership is clearly important in the creation and articulation of vision and strategy and the resulting impact on structure and culture” (p. 538). Building upon his previous research, Jantz (2016) documented in his book *Managing Creativity: The Innovative Research Library*, key factors that impact innovation in organizations, specifically university research libraries. (p. xi) Jantz emphasized that “the innovation process begins with creativity and how ideas are generated and preserved in the organization. Questions for library leadership relate to whether new ideas are being generated in sufficient numbers and how ideas are acted upon” (p. 132).

**Transformation**

From an organizational perspective, Ackerman (1997) defined transformation as “emergence of a new state, unknown until it takes shape, out of the remains of the chaotic death of the old state” (p. 47). In a different definition, Aldrich and Ruef (2006) described transformation as “. . . a major change in an organization involving a break with existing routines and a shift to new kinds of competencies that challenge organizational knowledge” (p. 134). In addition, from an organizational perspective, Newman (2000) connected organizational change, organizational learning, and institutional theories to the likelihood of organizational transformation. Her research focused on Central and Eastern European economic conditions and upheaval after the fall of communism. She noted, “. . . institution-level change encourages organizational transformation to a point, but too much institution-level change inhibits organizational transformation by inhibiting organizations’ ability to learn” (p. 602).

---

4In a classic work first published in 1962, Everett M. Rogers provides a model for diffusion of innovations and includes a history and critique of diffusion research. He defines “diffusion of innovations” in the context of four elements: innovation, communication channels, time, and social system.
In a single case study of a private Catholic University, Wong (2002) examined the role of leadership in organizational transformation and the impact on organizational culture. Results of the study indicated the significance of the leader’s vision in the process of transformation. In addition, she noted, “The pace of change plays a crucial factor in organizational transformation” (pp. 102-103).

From the perspective of the leader role, McGuire and Rhodes (2009) connected adaptation of organizational culture to transformation of the leadership culture. They defined transformation as “movement from one leadership logic to the next” (p. 298). They provided three frameworks for transformation or culture change: inside-out, readiness, and headroom. For inside-out, the source of transformation is a leader’s “. . . internal, intuitive, emotional, creative spirit realm . . .” (p. 23). Readiness is a “… preparedness of a leader to face the challenges of change” (p. 23), and headroom is “. . . the space and time created to allow systemic development of the leadership culture” (p. 24).

**Higher Education Context**

To understand the ability of a library leader to influence organizational cultures, one must have an understanding of the higher education context and academic macro-cultures in which leaders of universities and libraries must navigate and operate. Hutchins (1936) contended that “our erroneous notion of progress has thrown the classics and the liberal arts out of the curriculum, overemphasized the empirical sciences, and made education the servant of any contemporary movement in society, no matter how superficial” (p. 65). Further, he outlined what he sees as three dilemmas for higher education in America: professionalism, isolation, anti-intellectualism (pp. 54-55). Professionalism refers to preparing individuals for a vocation and causes the second dilemma of isolation. Isolation signifies the fact that certain faculty, engaged
in preparing students for “a specific trade,” are isolated from faculty devoted to other professions or to general education (p. 54). Third, anti-intellectualism is driven by “the professions and the public demand people trained according to their idea of what that training should be” and the focus on employment for individuals rather than becoming “learned” (p. 55). To resolve the dilemmas, Hutchins argued for a strong higher education general educational program built on the “greatest books of the western world” (p. 85).

Wilson and Tauber (1945) described the role of the library in the context of the university and external communities or macro-cultures. Specifically, they wrote:

Whatever the controversialists may consider the true functions of institutions of higher learning in the United States, a historical analysis of the objectives and activities of universities will reveal that they have been and are now concerned primarily with six functions or activities. These may be described as (1) conservation of knowledge and ideas, (2) teaching, (3) research, (4) publication, (5) extension and service, and (6) interpretation. Each of the functions is not wholly discrete and may be dealt with from the point of view of both the university and the university library. (p. 9)

Kerr (1991) reviewed the transformation of higher education from 1960-1980 in the context of his essays written from his perspective of both a participant within and as an observer of higher education. Differing from Hutchins’ and others’ idealistic or “pure” approaches to higher education, Kerr’s views were more pragmatic, emphasizing the “... overall goal of education is to serve the people as they wish to be served or can be persuaded to be served, and this leads to several, sometimes conflicting, functions—but they should be kept in some reasonable balance” (p. 5). He emphasized that “systems of higher education cannot be understood without reference to the nature of the larger society in which they are a part. Higher education more follows than leads society” (p. 91). In describing governance and leadership under pressure in higher education, he labeled the campus as a group of “estates” including: the
administration, the faculty, the students, the external authority, the alumni, and finally the ‘associated enterprises’ including the professions and industries (p. 200). According to Kerr:

- No major estate can succeed or even survive for long without the other estates.
- Each state controls or influences something, but no estate controls or even influences everything.
- All estates are held together by a rich mixture of individual choice, conciliation, mediation, and arbitration.
- The totality of governance contains similarities to other types of organizations but has no close counterparts in all of organized life. (p. 200)

Further, Kerr described the transformational period of American higher education as one of “much innovation, little reform” (p. 280). Specifically, he says “few of the innovations survived, and those few had little general impact on higher education—everything was tried; nearly everything failed” (p. 280). However, he noted:

Higher education met the test of action from 1960 to 1980 overall quite well, and emerged from this period clearly larger and mostly better. In particular, it was providing more services to more people [sic] in the American society than ever before. It had, in many ways, been transformed, and in the process, it had become a more central aspect of the life of the nation and was, consequently in turn, a greater potential source of transformation for the nation. (p. 376)

Describing external societal changes driving the urgent need for higher education transformation, Keller (2008) argued “it therefore seems imperative that everyone concerned about U. S. higher education recognize two things: that the society has been going through revolutionary changes and that new, outside forces require educators to rethink and redesign some of their operations” (p. xi). Specifically, he identified population shifts, technological changes including communication, and shifting economic conditions as key forces. He proposed four higher education structures be reconsidered. First he cited the need to “adjust to segmentation” and “to respond to the country’s dogged emphasis on access for everyone possible to enroll in some form of collegiate and continuing education” (p. 111). Second, he noted the need for institutions to “accommodate adult learners” and serve “dual roles: to educate the young
and to teach an enlarging number of older students, too” (pp. 117-118). Third, he urged higher education institutions to “rethink departments and disciplines” to “. . . become more entrepreneurial and international” and “. . . to serve society more directly, and to be more effective in turning out competent, flexible, and creative workers” (pp. 119-120). Fourth, he documented the need to “revise cost structures” and emphasized, “Educators need to be more imaginative in finding ways to slow or reduce the alarming rise in costs at U.S. colleges and universities” (p. 121).

Altbach, Gumport, and Berdahl (2011) also referenced the importance of understanding academic institutions in the context of societal forces and described a particular focus on access, attrition, affordability, and accountability as a public agenda for higher education in 2011 (p. 2). They outlined “finance, technology, graduate education, the curriculum, race, and what Derek Bok has termed the” and the ‘commercialization of higher education’” as key concerns (p. 3). Specifically, they emphasized, “unraveling the web of relationships between higher education and society is paramount to understanding the academic enterprise and all that goes on within it” (p. 10).

**Conclusion**

The preceding literature review affirmed the need for further LIS research to document the crucial relationships and interdependent components that may contribute to the transformation of a library (specifically, leadership influence, organizational cultures, institutional cultures within the higher education context, and adaptability through creativity and innovation). Further understanding of the complexity of the relationships among these synergetic elements is vital to the ability of leaders to influence organizational cultures and achieve transformation in response to external forces.
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Chapter 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS AND PROCEDURES

Theoretical Frameworks

For the research study the investigator used Edgar Schein’s theory of organizational culture and leadership (1985, 1992, 2004, 2010, 2017) as the theoretical framework in combination with the competing values framework (CVF) of leadership and organizational theory by Kim S. Cameron and Robert E. Quinn (1999, 2011). These two frameworks provided the appropriate contexts to delve into the various culture types and aspects, study different leader types within the dominant culture types, and probe if, and how, leaders are able to create, embed, and transmit cultures.

Edgar Schein’s Theory of Organizational Culture and Leadership

Through extensive inquiry, Edgar Schein, a leading theorist in organizational psychology, culture, and leadership, linked leadership influence to organizational culture. Emphasizing social learning, he defined organizational culture as

... a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (2010, p. 18).

regularities when people interact, group norms, espoused values, formal philosophy, rules of the
game, climate, embedded skills, habits of thinking, mental models, and/or linguistic paradigms,
shared meanings, ‘root metaphors’ or integrating symbols, and formal rituals and celebrations”
(pp. 14-16).

Using anthropological methods to observe forces that impact and change organizational
culture, Schein (2010) stressed the crucial connection between leadership actions and evolution
of organizational cultures. Further, he underscored the importance of leaders using embedding
mechanisms to influence and create culture. Schein stated:

*Primary embedding mechanisms* are (a) what leaders pay attention to, measure,
and control; (b) how leaders react to critical incidents and organizational crises;
(c) deliberate role modeling and coaching; (d) operational criteria for the
allocation of rewards and status; (e) operational criteria for recruitment, selection,
promotion, retirement, and excommunication.4 (Schein, 1990, p. 115)

Schein (2010) maintained that leaders should be “pushing cultural evolution” to create
cultures that are “learning oriented, adaptive, and flexible” to ensure organizations’ ability to
respond to unforeseen challenges, survive, and thrive for the future (p. 365). As presented in
Table 3.1, he delineated three organizational stages, founding and early growth, midlife, and
maturity and decline and the respective change mechanisms for leaders to employ for each stage
(p. 273). The respective change mechanisms for leaders to employ included:

**General and specific evolution.** The general principle of this evolutionary
process is that the overall corporate culture will adapt to changes in its external
environment and internal structure. . . . Specific evolution involves the adaptation
of specific parts of the organization to their particular environments and the
impact of the subsequent cultural diversity on the core culture. (pp. 275-276)

---

4In the context of this research study the word *excommunicate* means removal or exclusion and is from
Edgar Schein’s theory of organizational culture and leadership. Schein (2010) expressed that “. . . basic
assumptions are further reinforced through who does or does not get promoted, who is retired early, and
who is, in effect, excommunicated by being fired or given a job that is clearly perceived to be less
important, even if at a higher level (being ‘kicked upstairs’)” (p. 249).
Insight. Members of the organization can collectively achieve insight if they collectively examine their culture and redefine some of the cognitive elements. Such redefinition involves either changing some of the priorities within the core set of assumptions or abandoning one assumption that is a barrier by subordinating it to a higher-order assumption. (p. 277)

Promotion of hybrids within the culture. One mechanism of gradual and incremental change is the systematic promotion of insiders whose own assumptions are better adapted to the new external realities. Because they are insiders, they accept much of the cultural core and have credibility. But, because of their personalities, their life experiences, or the subculture in which their career developed, they hold assumptions that are to varying degrees different from the basic paradigm and thus can move the organization gradually into new ways of thinking and acting. (p. 279)

Systematic promotion from with selected subcultures. The strength of the midlife organization is in the diversity of its subcultures. Leaders can therefore evolve midlife organizations culturally by assessing the strengths and weaknesses of different subcultures and then biasing the corporate culture toward one of those subcultures by systematically promoting people from that subculture into key power positions. (p. 283)

Technological Seduction. One of the less obvious but more important ways in which the leaders of midlife organizations change cultural assumptions is through the subtle, cumulative, and sometimes unintended consequences of new technology that they introduce deliberately or take advantage of. (p. 284)

Infusion of outsiders. Shared assumptions can be changed by changing the composition of the dominant group or coalitions in an organization . . . The most potent version of this change mechanism occurs when a board of directors brings in a new CEO from outside the organization . . . (p. 287).

Scandal and explosion of myths. When incongruities exist between espoused values and basic assumptions, scandal and myth explosion become primary mechanisms of culture change. Nothing will change until the consequences of the actual operating assumptions create a public and visible scandal that cannot be hidden, avoided, or denied. (p. 291)

Turnarounds. Turnaround as a mechanism of cultural change is actually a combination of many of the preceding mechanisms, fashioned into a single program by a strong leader or team of change agents. In turnaround situations, the replacement of key people with internal hybrids and/or outsiders combined with major changes in technology become central elements of the change process . . . (p. 293).
Mergers and Acquisitions. When one organization acquires another organization or when two organizations are merged, there is inevitable culture clash because it is unlikely that two organizations will have the same cultures. The leadership role is then to figure out how best to manage this clash. (p. 294)

Destruction and Rebirth. . . . a culture or at least some key elements of a culture can be destroyed by removing the key culture carriers. Some turnaround managers simply fire the top one or two echelons of the organization and bring in new people with new assumptions. (p. 295)

Table 3.1

Cult Change Mechanisms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Stage</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Founding and early growth   | 1. Incremental change through general and specific evolution  
|                             | 2. Insight                                     
|                             | 3. Promotion of hybrids within the culture     |
| Midlife                     | 4. Systematic promotion from selected subcultures 
|                             | 5. Technological seduction                     
|                             | 6. Infusion of outsiders                       |
| Maturity and decline        | 7. Scandal and explosion of myths              
|                             | 8. Turnarounds                                 
|                             | 9. Mergers and acquisitions                    
|                             | 10. Destruction and rebirth                    |


Further, Schein (2010) defined critical incidents or crises as “. . . what is perceived to be a crisis and what is defined as a crisis by founders and leaders. Crises that arise around the major external survival issues are the most potent in revealing the deep assumptions of the leaders” (p. 243). During the pilot case visit for this dissertation, the investigator observed some confusion about the definition or designation of a critical incident; therefore, for the actual study
participants, she clarified that the incident could be a major event, experience, catalyst, or turning point.

According to Schein (1990), “by reconstructing the history of critical incidents in the group and how members dealt with them, one can get a good indication of the important cultural elements in that group” (p. 115). The structured interview questions allowed the interviewees to develop narratives around a critical incident and the resulting impact on institutional and organizational cultures. Further, the investigator used these narratives to identify types and levels of cultures, leader embedding mechanisms, and culture change mechanisms within the University and the Library. Schein (2010) identified four categories of culture: macro-cultures, organizational, subcultures, and micro-cultures. Specifically, he classified macro-cultures as “nations, ethnic and religious groups, occupations that exist globally,” organizational cultures “as private, public, nonprofit, government organizations” and subcultures as “occupational groups within organizations. In addition, he defined micro-cultures as “microsystems within or outside organizations” (p. 2). Further, he specified that micro-cultures “. . . evolve in small groups that share common tasks and histories” (p. 67).

Schein (2010) recognized the importance of understanding the relationship and alignment among the different types of subcultures:

These subcultures reflect the functional units, the rank levels in the hierarchy, isolated geographic units, and any other groups that have a shared history. All organizations also operate with three generic subcultures that reflect the operations of the organization, the design of the organization, and the executive/financial function of the organization. For organizations to be effective, these subcultures must be in alignment with each other because each is needed for total organizational effectiveness. (p. 68)

**Operator.** Schein (2010) described the operator subculture as the employees who produce and sell an organization’s products and services (p. 58). The subcultures run the various
operations of an organization. Schein (2010) emphasized the operator subculture is grounded in human communication, trust, and collaboration (p. 59).

**Design.** Members of design subcultures do not work on the front lines but work behind the scenes using technologies and systems to develop products, processes, and structures to ensure organizational effectiveness (Schein, p. 62).

**Executive.** According to Schein (2010), the generic executive subculture focuses on survival and growth and in particular the financial health of the organization (p. 63).

Further, Schein (2010) categorized three levels of culture: artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions (p. 24). He stressed the importance of understanding that the level of culture is “. . . the degree to which the cultural phenomenon is visible to the observer. . . . These levels range from the very tangible overt manifestations that you can see and feel to the deeply embedded, unconscious, basic assumptions that I [Schein] am defining as the essence of culture” (p. 23). Specifically, Schein (2017) noted:

“artifacts include the visible products of the group, such as the architecture of its physical environment; its language; its technology and products; its artistic creations; its style, as embodied in clothing, manner of address, and emotional displays; its myths and stories told about the organization; its published lists of values; and its observable rituals and ceremonies. (p. 17)

Schein (2017) categorized three categories of espoused beliefs and values: ideals, goals, values, aspirations; ideologies; and rationalizations. He emphasized that rationalizations “may or may not be congruent with behavior and other artifacts.” Further, he defined basic underlying assumptions as “unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs and values” that “determine behavior, perception, thought, and feeling” (p. 18).

**Competing Values Framework**
Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2011) offered a competing values framework (see Figure 3.1) for understanding the managerial leadership types and capabilities necessary for compatibility and success in the prevailing organizational culture types: clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, or market. Their framework connected culture types to purpose: collaboration, creativity, control, and competition. The framework offered managerial roles and values that correspond to success in each culture type.

For a clan culture, the orientation is collaborative; the values are commitment, communication, and development; and the leader types are facilitator, mentor, and team. The theory of effectiveness for a clan culture is that “human development and participation produce effectiveness.” In an adhocracy culture, the orientation is creative; the values are innovative outputs, transformation, and agility; and leader types are innovator, entrepreneur, and visionary. The theory of effectiveness for an adhocracy culture is innovativeness, vision, and new resources produce effectiveness. In a hierarchy culture, the orientation is controlling; the values are efficiency, timeliness, consistency, and uniformity; and leader types are coordinator, monitor, and organizer. The theory of effectiveness for a hierarchy culture is “control and efficiency with capable processes produce effectiveness.” In a market culture, the orientation is competing; the values are market share, goal achievement, and profitability; and leader types are hard driver, competitor, and producer. The theory of effectiveness is “aggressively competing and customer focus produce effectiveness” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 53).
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**Research Objectives and Questions**

This research study focused on the transformation of libraries within the context of institutional and organizational cultures. The investigator probed types and levels of cultures, managerial leadership roles, leader embedding mechanisms, and culture change mechanisms in library organizations. The investigator grounded the study components reflected by Figure 3.2 in the problem statement, literature review, and theoretical frameworks.
**Figure 3.2**

**Study Conceptual Representation**

- **LIBRARY TRANSFORMATION**
- **Managerial Leadership**
- **Institutional and Organizational Cultures**

**Types of Cultures**
- Macro-cultures
- Organizational Culture
- Subcultures
- Micro-cultures
- Clan
- Adhocracy
- Hierarchy
- Market

**Levels of Culture**
- Artifacts
- Espoused Beliefs and Values
- Basic Underlying Assumptions

**Leader Embedding Mechanisms**
1. Pay attention, measure and control
2. Reaction to critical incidents and organizational crises
3. Allocation of resources
4. Deliberate role modeling and coaching
5. Operational criteria for the allocation of rewards and status
6. Operational criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and excommunication

**Culture Change Mechanisms**

*Founding and early growth*
1. Incremental change through general and specific evolution
2. Insight
3. Promotion of hybrids within the culture

*Midlife*
4. Systematic promotion from selected subcultures
5. Technological seduction
6. Infusion of outsiders

*Maturity and decline*
7. Scandal and explosion of myths
8. Turnarounds
9. Mergers and acquisitions
10. Destruction and rebirth
Based on the study components, the investigator outlined the research objectives and questions delineated in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2**

Research Objectives and Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To identify the types of institutional or macro-cultures that influence the library</strong></td>
<td>What types of institutional and macro-cultures influence the library organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To identify the types of cultures existing within the library</strong></td>
<td>What types of cultures exist within the library organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overall organizational culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subcultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Micro-cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adhocracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More than one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To identify the levels of culture existing within the library organization</strong></td>
<td>What levels of culture exist within the organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cultural artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• espoused beliefs and values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• basic underlying assumptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To identify the extent to which directors employ certain primary leader-embedding mechanisms to create and adapt cultures within the organization</strong></td>
<td>What do leaders pay attention to, measure and control?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do leaders react to critical incidents and organizational crisis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do leaders allocate resources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do leaders role model, teach, and coach?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do leaders allocate rewards and status?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do leaders select, promote, and excommunicate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To identify the extent to which directors use creative and innovative initiatives to encourage adaptability within organizational cultures</strong></td>
<td>What creative and innovative initiatives have the directors initiated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the creative and innovative initiatives encourage adaptability within the organizational cultures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| To identify the developmental stage of the organizational culture | At what stage is the overall organizational culture?  
- Founding and early growth  
- Midlife  
- Maturity and decline |
| --- | --- |
| To identify the extent to which library leadership employs certain culture change mechanisms which correspond to the organization’s stage of growth | What culture change mechanisms do the library leadership employ?  
*Founding and early growth*  
1. Incremental change through general and specific evolution  
2. Insight  
3. Promotion of hybrids within the culture  
*Midlife*  
4. Systematic promotion from selected subcultures  
5. Technological seduction  
6. Infusion of outsiders  
*Maturity and decline*  
7. Scandal and explosion of myths  
8. Turnarounds  
9. Mergers and acquisitions  
10. Destruction and rebirth |
| To identify which leader embedding mechanisms and culture change mechanisms work for directors to influence organizational cultures | Which leader embedding mechanisms work for the leaders to influence organizational cultures?  
Which culture change mechanisms work for the leaders to influence organizational cultures? |
| To identify how well leader embedding mechanisms and culture change mechanisms work for directors to influence organizational cultures | How well do the leader embedding mechanisms allow leaders to influence organizational cultures?  
How well do the culture change mechanisms allow leaders to influence organizational cultures? |

**Procedures**

**Research Design**

The research study used a mixed-method research design and a multiple case study protocol. Yin (2009) defined a case study as an in-depth empirical inquiry that investigates a “contemporary phenomenon” in a “real-life context.” The borders between the “phenomenon” and the “context” may not be clearly defined. The case study relies on multiple sources of
evidence and uses “the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis” (p. 19). Cases studies are appropriate in situations that are too complex for survey or experimental strategies, require further description and illustration within the context of the situation, and need explanation of an intervention that does not have one set of outcomes (pp. 19-20). Case studies also enable probing at different levels of an organization.

**Case Studies.** According to Stake (2006):

The benefits of multicase study will be limited if fewer than, say, 4 cases are chosen, or more than 10. Two or three cases do not show enough of the interactivity between programs and their situations, whereas 15 or 30 cases provide more uniqueness of interactivity than the research team and readers can come to understand. But for good reason, many multicase studies have fewer than 4 or more than 15 cases. (Selecting cases, para 1)

Creswell (2012) suggested, “The researcher seeks to develop an in-depth understanding of the case by collecting multiple forms of data . . . .” Therefore, this “. . . requires only a few cases be studied because for each case examined, the researcher has less time to devote to exploring the depths of any one case” (p. 465).

**Case Study Test Site.** The researcher conducted a pilot case study at an ARL institution, led by a professional colleague, to test the study instruments in advance of the other case study site visits. The pilot case study site, similar to other eligible institutions, met some but not all the established criteria of the research study.

The investigator pre-tested the structured interview collection instruments at an ARL institution, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (VA Tech.) during a site visit in spring 2014. The investigator used the interview protocol outlined in Appendix B. In advance of the visit, the investigator shared the dissertation proposal with the Director and arranged interview appointments. To ensure data quality, the pre-test included a semi-structured interview (Appendix C) with the Director using narrative inquiry about a critical incident; semi-structured
interviews with the Provost and a University faculty leader to probe the critical incident (Appendix D); a semi-structured interview with senior leadership team to probe the critical incident (Appendix E); and administration of the OCAI (Appendix F) to the Library Leadership Team. The researcher recorded, transcribed, and analyzed the results of the structured interviews at VA Tech. and established data collection practices to ensure strong analysis of the data, trustworthiness of data, and ease of access to the data. Further, the investigator clarified and streamlined structured interview questions based on personal observations and transcriptions from the pilot site visit.

Case Study Site Selection. At the onset of this research study, the researcher intended, to use a purposeful sample and to select the case studies for this dissertation from research libraries in the United States whose institution hold membership in the Association of Research Libraries and whose library had received the Excellence in Academic Libraries Award given by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). The case study sites were selected randomly from six eligible ARL institutions. Due to turnover in leadership at the eligible ARL institutions, timing, and scheduling issues, only one of the initial eligible case sites agreed to participate. With the approval of the dissertation chair, the investigator expanded the

5The criteria for the ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award are:
• Demonstrate how academic librarians and staff work together as a team to develop an academic library that is outstanding in furthering the educational mission of its parent institution.
• The criteria for recognizing excellence will emphasize "outcomes" rather than "inputs" as the best measures of quality. "Outcomes" are defined by the ACRL Task Force on Academic Library Outcomes and reflected in the philosophy of Standards for Libraries in Higher Education. Potential nominees are referred to these documents. An academic library may demonstrate excellence as a team of librarians and staff in furthering the educational mission of its institution through one or more of the following, or in other ways that reflect the purpose and philosophy of this award:
  o Creativity and innovation in meeting the needs of their academic community.
  o Leadership in developing and implementing exemplary programs that other libraries can emulate.
  o Substantial and productive relationships with classroom faculty and students.
• Agree to take responsibility for organizing and funding a recognition ceremony on campus to receive the award. (Excellence, Guidelines, n.d.)
eligible pool to all institutions whose library had received the Excellence in Academic Libraries Award and specifically included a private institution upon the recommendation of one committee member.

**Recruitment.** The investigator sent to the library director of each potential site an introductory e-mail that outlined the research study, its role, and value. In the e-mail letter (Appendix A), the investigator asked each director to respond and express the interest for his/her institution to participate in the study. The researcher followed up with a phone call to answer questions or concerns about the research study and to make arrangements for acceptable dates and times for the site visit. In advance, the researcher sent individuals participating in the research study the structured interview questions, the OCAI instrument, and a consent to participate in research form to sign. (Appendix H) The researcher confirmed three case study sites by December 2014 and completed the site visits by the end of March 2015.

**Confidentiality.** The researcher took every precaution to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the records and data pertaining to the participants in particular, and the research study in general, disclosure of which could contribute to identifying participants to other persons not related to this research study. She identified the case study sites in the study by a letter of the alphabet and coded individuals and groups associated with each site in the same manner. The researcher took notes during each interview and recorded the dialog. She secured the digital interview recordings in a safe, encrypted location. Only the researcher and a professional transcriptionist listened to and transcribed the information from the interviews. She sent the transcripts, with identifying information removed, to study participants for review and the opportunity to make changes or corrections. To test the coding method for inter-coder reliability, two research colleagues read, coded, and returned one printed transcript to the
investigator. Lastly, the investigator will destroy documents, recordings, transcripts, and surveys, obtained specifically for the research study, after three years.

**Methodology**

The investigator employed a multi-method approach with in the context of frameworks developed by Schein (2010) and Cameron, and Quinn (1999, 2011) that established positive correlations among organizational cultures, transformation, and leadership influence and actions. Employing these frameworks, this dissertation explored types and levels of culture, leadership embedding mechanisms, and culture change mechanisms to determine how and if leaders are able to influence institutional and organization culture(s) to transform libraries.

Specifically, the investigator probed critical incidents and used Schein’s (2010) framework to identify types and levels of cultures within an organization, the developmental stages of an organization, and the extent to which directors employ and are successful with leadership embedding mechanisms and culture change mechanisms. Further, the investigator used the CVF by Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2011) to identify types of cultures (i.e., clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, or market) that exist within or influence an organization. This study built upon previous research using CVF to examine library organizational cultures and leadership (Brooks, 2007; Faerman, 1993; Kaarst-Brown et al., 2004; Shepstone & Currie, 2008, 2013; Varner, 1996).

In preparation for each case study site visit, the investigator reviewed the ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award application, strategic plan, annual report, web site, and other information provided by the library. For each case study, the investigator used this information as context and to identify possible critical incidents at the institutional and organizational levels. For each of the case studies, the researcher used two methods of data collection:
1. Structured interviews with Director, Provost, University faculty leader, and library senior leadership team using narrative inquiry to probe critical incidents

2. Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) completed by the library senior leadership team

**Structured interviews using narrative inquiry to probe critical incidents**

Using narrative inquiry techniques, the investigator completed a structured interview with each Director to select and probe a critical incident identified by the Director or through a review of the ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries application, annual report, or strategic plan. The investigator then explored the identified critical incident through semi-structured interviews with the Provost, a university faculty leader, and the senior leadership team of each library. In some cases, the interviewees designated another important event and that incident was then probed using the structured interview questions.

Creswell defined narrative research as “a distinct form of qualitative research, a narrative typically focuses on studying a single person, gathering data through the collection of stories, reporting individual experiences, and discussing the meaning of those experiences for the individual” (p. 502). The study of critical incidents can be used to probe organizational cultures. According to Schein (1990), “by reconstructing the history of critical incidents in the group and how members dealt with them, one can get a good indication of the important cultural elements in that group” (p. 115). Webster and Mertova (2007) noted, “Narrative inquiry is set in human stories of experience. It provides researchers with a rich framework through which they can investigate the ways humans experience the world depicted through their stories” (p. 1).

Describing a critical events approach to narrative research, they noted that some researchers use
the terms critical events and critical incidents interchangeably and others differ on the definition of the two. Specifically, Webster and Mertova (2007) expressed critical events:

- exist in a particular context, such as formal organisational structures or communities of practice;
- impact on the people involved;
- have life-changing consequences;
- are unplanned;
- may reveal patterns of well-defined stages;
- are only identified after the event; and
- are intensely personal with strong emotional involvement (p. 83).

Schein (2010) defined critical incidents or crises as “. . . what is perceived to be a crisis and what is defined as a crisis by founders and leaders. Crises that arise around the major external survival issues are the most potent in revealing the deep assumptions of the leaders” (p. 243). Schein (1984) described analyzing responses to critical incidents from an organization’s past to determine “an organization’s cultural paradigm” (p. 13).

**Data Quality.** The investigator used Riessman’s (1993) four criteria to validate the narrative inquiry work of the research study: persuasiveness, correspondence, coherence, and pragmatic use. Persuasiveness determined if the interpretation is “reasonable and convincing” (p. 65). Correspondence involved the investigator verifying transcriptions and interpretations with the study participants (p. 66). The third criterion is coherence, which is composed of three types: global, local, and themal. Global referred to “the overall goals a narrator is trying to accomplish by speaking” (p. 67). Local coherence is “what the narrator is trying to effect in the narrative itself, such as the use of linguistic devices to relate events to one another” (p. 67).
Thermal coherence encompassed repeated themes found within the content (p. 67). The fourth criterion, pragmatic use, is the extent to which the narrative inquiry results are used as the basis for future studies (p. 68).

Polkinghorne (as cited in Webster & Mertova, 2007) stated: “. . . reliability in narrative research usually refers to the dependability of the data, while validity typically refers to the strength of the analysis of that data, the trustworthiness of the data and ease of access to that data” (p. 89). Webster and Mertova (2007) emphasized, “. . . reliability refers to the consistency and stability of measuring instruments” (p. 93). To improve the consistency and stability of the instruments used in the narrative inquiry portion of this research study, the researcher tested the structured interview questions during a pre-test site visit at Virginia Polytechnic Institute (VA Tech.).

In describing validity of narrative research, Webster and Mertova (1997) emphasized that “narrative research does not claim to represent the exact ‘truth’, but rather aims for ‘verisimilitude’ – that the results have the appearance of truth or reality” (p. 4). Huberman (as cited in Webster & Mertova, 2007) offered access, honesty, verisimilitude, familiarity, transferability, and economy as measures of reliability and validity for narrative research. The researcher applied these measures to the narrative inquiry portion of the research study. Access by readers of the research study was defined as the “cultural context and process of construction of knowledge between the researcher and participants of the study. In addition, access referred to the “availability and representation” to the reader of “research notes, transcripts and data on which the researcher has based the findings” (p. 94). The investigator ensured honesty, also referred to as trustworthiness, by allowing participants in the research study to verify their documented stories (Webster & Mertova, 2007).
Verisimilitude or truthfulness had three aspects:

Research and reporting of stories and their critical events should resonate with the experience of the researcher. Second, the reporting should appear to have a level of plausibility. And third, when using a critical events approach, the truthfulness of accounts and reporting results will be confirmed through like and other events. (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p. 99)

The researcher ensured Authenticity, also considered a component of verisimilitude, by including sufficient information to persuade the reader “that the story is told in an honest and serious way” (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p. 100). In addition, Webster and Mertova (2007) noted the importance of understanding the effect of familiarity in the study of narratives to remain aware that “things do not stay constantly the same” (p. 100). Through the “richness of detail and accessibility,” transferability in the study of “critical, like and other events” should allow individuals to apply findings to other situations (p. 100). Finally, Webster and Mertova (2007) suggested that concentrating on critical events in the analysis of often extensive, narrative inquiry data provides economy or efficient means for the researcher to focus the data analysis and findings (p. 100).

Specifically, the researcher used restorying and thematic analysis to confirm access for the research study. Citing the benefits of restorying, De Long (2012) shared “restorying of the critical events that are related by the interviewees allowed the researcher to capture elements of time, challenge, and change, and aided in helping to understand the critical nature of the events that were related to the researcher” (p. 69).

Document Analysis and Coding

Klenke (2008) noted, “content analysis in leadership research highlights the importance of language as words, sentences and paragraphs form the unity of analysis. Language is a
fundamental aspect of the leadership process, shaped by both leaders and followers as they interact” (p. 89).

The investigator reviewed the transcripts using thematic analysis. Boyatzis (1998) defined thematic analysis as

... a process to be used with qualitative information. It is not another qualitative method but a process that can be used with most, if not all qualitative methods. Thematic analysis is a process for encoding qualitative information. The encoding requires an explicit ‘code.’ This may be a list of themes; a complex model with themes, indicators, and qualifications that are causally related; or something in between these two forms. (p. 4)

**Data Quality.** Boyatzis (1998) emphasized the need for the investigator to develop “a good code” to be used in “the analysis, interpretation, and presentation of the research” (p. 31). In addition, he documented the importance of the code for the “maximum probability of producing high interrater reliability and validity” (p. 31). Further, he stressed that:

A good code should have five elements:
1. A label
2. A definition of what the theme concerns (i.e., the characteristic or issue constituting the theme)
3. A description of how to know when the theme occurs (i.e., how to ‘flag’ the theme)
4. A description of any qualifications or exclusions to the identification of the theme
5. Examples, both positive and negative, to eliminate possible confusion when looking for the theme (p. xi)

The investigator developed a code grounded in the research questions and Schein’s theoretical framework of organizational culture and leadership. In addition, she compiled a corresponding codebook, incorporating the Boyatzis’ five elements, to assist with the thematic analysis of the collected data. Further, the investigator asked two colleagues from the Simmons doctoral program, experienced with coding, to test the coding scheme and to determine inter-coder reliability. The investigator sent a print copy of the interview transcript for Case A Dean
to the two individuals, along with the code book and instructions. The investigator followed up with a phone call to each colleague to answer any clarifying questions about the test coding. The individuals completed and returned the manual coding of the transcript to the investigator. The investigator compared her coding with the results of the two test coders and determined that coding scheme and corresponding results were reliable.

Originally, the investigator intended to use NVIVO, a qualitative, data analysis, software program; however, the electronic process proved to be difficult and caused the investigator to focus more on the software rather than analysis of the data. Weighing the benefits and difficulties of manual and electronic coding, Basit (2003) concluded, “the choice will be dependent on the size of the project, the funds and time available, and the inclination and expertise of the researcher” (p. 43). Saldaña (2013) added two additional criteria, “. . . the research goals of the enterprise and the emergent satisfaction with the electronic coding system” (p. 26). Further, Saldaña (2013) expressed that “there is something about manipulating qualitative data on paper and writing codes in pencil that give you more control over and ownership of the work” (p. 26). Based the research literature and a previous, successful research experience with manual coding, the researcher decided to use manual coding for the research study.

Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)

Using Schein’s (1985) framework of organizational culture and leadership in combination with the Competing Values Framework (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Quinn & Kimberly, 1984; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1981, 1983) as a “cultural lens,” Kaarst-Brown et al. (2004) developed four prototypical library scenarios: academic, public, small institutional, and digital. The researchers described the scenarios in the context of six dimensions of the OCAI
(Cameron & Quinn, 1999) including “dominant organizational characteristics, leadership style, management of employees, organizational glue, strategic emphasis, and criteria for success” (p.39-40). Building on the scenarios, Kaarst-Brown et al. (2004) outlined the potential for using the OCAI to assess organizational cultures along with consequences for library leadership. They stressed, “organizational cultures and values are important resources that need to be managed like other resources” (p. 50).

The research investigator asked the senior leadership team of each case study site to rate their organization for the six dimensions on the OCAI (Appendix D) for the current state (Now) and the desired future and successful state (Preferred). The investigator used the OCAI worksheet (Appendix G) to score the assessment instruments and perform a gap or discrepancy analysis.

Data Quality.

According to Cameron and Quinn (2011) the OCAI “is based on the Competing Values Framework, a theoretical model that is now the dominant framework in the world for assessing organizational culture” (p. 35). They provided evidence of the reliability and validity of the OCAI through the use and analyses of the instrument in numerous organizational research studies. Specifically, “reliability refers to the extent to which the instrument measures culture types consistently. That is, do the different items that purport to assess a culture type really assess it” (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p. 176)? They cited several research studies in which “reliability coefficients exceeded satisfactory levels” (p. 177). Further Cameron and Quinn (2011) stated that “sufficient evidence has been produced regarding the reliability of the OCAI to create confidence that it matches or exceeds the reliability of the most commonly used instruments in the social and organizational sciences” (p. 178).
Also defined by Cameron and Quinn (2011), “validity refers to the extent to which phenomena that are supposed to be measured are actually measured” (p. 178). They cited studies that confirmed the concurrent, convergent, and discriminant validity of the OCAI and established that “. . . empirical evidence suggests that the OCAI measures what it claims to measure: key dimensions of organizational culture that have a significant impact on organizational and individual behavior. Moreover, it measures these dimensions in a reliable way” (p. 183).

**Limitations of the Study**

Stake (2006) noted that when less than four cases are involved the research results could be limited; and, this research study comprised just three cases. However, the pilot case study provided observations that guided improvement of the structured interview questions and time schedule for the actual case study site visits. Further, Creswell (2012) emphasized that incorporating fewer cases along with collecting multiple forms of data allowed the researcher more time to cultivate in-depth knowledge from each case.

It is important to note, that the investigator compiled types and levels of cultures, leadership embedding mechanisms, and the culture change mechanisms from the interview transcripts only; therefore, the assembled results are not all-inclusive and don’t contain information or perspectives from individuals in lower levels of management or all staff within each library organization.

Further, only the leadership teams completed the culture assessment instrument; and the investigator determined that the number of participants limited the OCAI results for this research study. She concluded that more inclusive results could be achieved with responses from lower levels of management and employees across each organization to obtain additional perspectives
about the cultures. In addition, the investigator determined that a comparison of OCAI results from each organization over a period of years might be valuable to understand the change or transformation of the organizational cultures.

**Conclusion**

This research study used Edgar Schein’s theory of organization culture and leadership along with the competing values framework by Kim S. Cameron and Robert E. Quinn as the theoretical frameworks. The frameworks provided relevant contexts for delving into the various culture types and aspects, studying different leader types within the dominant culture types and examining how, and if, leaders were able to create, embed, and transmit cultures.

Specifically, the study focused on the transformation of libraries within the context of institutional and organizational cultures. The investigator probed types and levels of cultures, managerial leadership roles, leader embedding mechanisms, and culture change mechanisms in library organizations. To accomplish the research objectives, the investigator used a mixed-method research design and a multiple case study protocol. Specifically, the investigator queried critical incidents and used Schein’s (2010) framework along with the CVF by Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2011) to probe the research questions. The researcher selected three case study sites from the winners of ACRL’s Excellence in Academic Libraries Award. The investigator used narrative inquiry techniques and completed structured interviews with the Dean, Library Leadership Team, Provost, and Faculty Leader for each case. Further, the leadership team for each library completed the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI). The researcher compiled and analyzed the research results. Transcripts were prepared; and the investigator applied thematic analysis using manual coding to obtain qualitative data for further analysis and comparison of the three case study results.
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Chapter 4

CASE STUDY A

Overview of Case Study Site

Case Study A is a public university with a student enrollment of over 25,000 that is 87 percent undergraduate. The Carnegie Classification for the university is M1 for Master’s Colleges and Universities: Larger Programs (see Table 4.1).\(^6\) Established in 1960, the university has grown from an enrollment of 6000 students to approximately 25,000 during a rapid period of growth in the 1980s. The university is student-centered, committed to liberal education, and motivated by the positive impact of college-educated citizens on the community, region, and state.

| Table 4.1 |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| **Institutional and Organizational Demographics: Case A** | |
| **Carnegie Classification** | 4-year or above Public M1 Master’s Colleges and Universities: Larger Programs |
| **Enrollment Profile** | 25,000 + Very high undergraduate (87%) |
| **Tenure of the Dean of the Library at the time of the site visit** | 10+ years |

In 2005, the recently hired Provost appointed a new Dean of the Library. With a directive from the Provost to rebuild the culture of the Library, the Dean brought a new vision and focused on transforming its culture, operations, and services. Further, the Dean worked collaboratively with a new Leadership Team and completed a comprehensive restructuring of the library that encouraged collaboration, flexibility, and new programs to connect library faculty

\(^6\)The Carnegie Classifications for the three case studies were identified from the Institution Lookup webpage hosted by Indiana University Bloomington’s Center for Postsecondary Research.
roles more closely to the teaching and research mission of the university. The Provost and Dean used the new library vision, services, and a corresponding elevated perception of the library as catalysts to raise funds to build a new library facility for the university. With funding in place, the university decided to build a new library in 2008. The new library facility opened in fall 2013.

**Critical Incidents**

At the institutional level, the Dean identified the decision to build a new library for the university and acknowledged the “excellent service campaign,” in which all library staff were required to participate, as a critical incident at the organizational [library] level (see Table 4.2). The Leadership Team agreed with the Dean that the “excellent service campaign” was a key incident for the library. However, the Leadership Team recognized the hiring of both a new Provost and the Dean of the Library as a critical incident at the institutional level. The Provost and Faculty Leader were asked to identify incidents only at the institutional level. The Provost described the unlikely prospect for state funding to build a new library facility for many years, as a catalyst for a new vision for library programs, services, and facilities. The university used this vision to excite and encourage donors to fund the new library. The Faculty Leader emphasized that the new library enabled the evolution of co-location and collaboration among university services such as the Writing Center, the Speech Center, and Research Consultation Program.

**Table 4.2**

**Critical Incidents at the Institutional and Organizational Level: Case A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Institutional Level</th>
<th>Organizational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of the Library</td>
<td>Decision to build a new library</td>
<td>Excellent Service Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Team</td>
<td>New Provost and the decision to hire a new Library Dean</td>
<td>Excellent Service Campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Types of Cultures that Influence the Library

#### Macro-Cultures

From the content analysis of the structured interview transcripts for Case A, the investigator identified the *external library profession* as a strong macro-culture that influenced the library organizational culture. For example, the Dean encouraged external recognition through the application for the ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award. In addition, the Dean strongly supported professional development including the ability of staff to travel to national conferences and participate in ACRL committees. Further, the Dean hired a number of new librarians to bring new leadership qualities to the organization. In fact, the Dean hired not for a specific skill set but for aptitude, attitude and ways of thinking, flexibility, entrepreneurship, and excitement for the future of libraries (Leadership Team A, personal communication, February 11, 2015).

#### Organizational Cultures

The content analysis of transcripts for Case A revealed nine organizational cultures that influenced the culture of the *library* (see Table 4.3).
In the context of the critical incident to build a new library, the Dean managed the relationships among the various organizational cultures at the institutional [university] level to accomplish project goals. For example, the Dean soothed university faculty groups that did not understand the shift in the vision from a traditional library. When University Institutional Marketing released fundraising materials, the Dean reassured different organizational cultures that the new library would be student-centered. The Dean reflected that the new library was built without state government funding; however, the University Senior Leadership committed to support and improve the library. The Dean noted that the new library was “. . . a reflection of the university’s intention and culture” (Dean of the Library A, personal communication, February 11, 2015).

University Finance and Facilities wanted to build a smaller, less creative library and then direct a portion of the library funding to other university capital projects. However, the Dean successfully worked through the Provost and President to keep the library project intact and to build an iconic building as the living room for the campus.

The Case A Library Leadership Team described a university culture that welcomed partnerships with the library on various projects. For example, the library faculty worked with
university faculty to incorporate information literacy outcomes into the General Education curriculum. In addition, the Library Leadership Team described an efficient university that did not like to duplicate services. Specifically, relationships with University Information Technology and University Institutional Marketing cultures helped move the library culture forward. Further, as the library organizational culture advanced, the university asked the library to take the lead on certain projects such as data visualization.

Types of Cultures within the Library Organization

Subcultures

As one of the research objectives of this study, the investigator revealed 18 library subcultures; further, analysis of transcripts identified 18 university subcultures (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Team/Department</th>
<th>University Team/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Services Team</td>
<td>Academic Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Professionals</td>
<td>Academic Success Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogers</td>
<td>Campus Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Librarians)</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Librarians</td>
<td>Faculty Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Council</td>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Executive Team</td>
<td>Greek Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Humanities Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Support Staff</td>
<td>Information Technology Help Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services Team</td>
<td>Office of Undergraduate Research and Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Librarians</td>
<td>Speech Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Instructional Services</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections and Archives</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employees</td>
<td>Student Writing Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Research Consultants</td>
<td>Tutoring Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologists</td>
<td>University Senior Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Information Services</td>
<td>Writing Across the Curriculum Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Experience Team</td>
<td>Writing Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the library, the investigator identified a number of traditional occupational groups such as catalogers, library faculty, reference librarians, student employees, and paraprofessionals. Newer occupational groups were technologists and user-experience team members. For the university, the analysis revealed occupational subcultures that included faculty, humanities faculty, students, graduate students, staff, architects, writing across the curriculum fellows and student writing consultants.

**Operator.** For Case A, the investigator identified library operator subcultures comprised of access services, public services, research and instruction, and information services. At the university level, she documented a few operator subcultures such as the academic success center, faculty advising, the information technology help-desk, undergraduate research and scholarship, speech center, tutoring center, and writing center.

**Design.** According to Schein (2010) members of design subcultures do not work on the front lines but work behind the scenes using technologies and systems to develop products, processes, and structures to ensure organizational effectiveness (p. 62). For the library, the investigator found design subcultures comprised of catalogers, technologists, and user experience experts. From the transcripts, she discovered just one design subculture, architects, at the university level.

**Executive.** The investigator identified the Executive Team that consists of five individuals as the primary executive culture. At a broader level, the Library Council served as another executive subculture that includes the Executive Team and other Department Heads within the organization. The investigator discovered that the University Senior Leadership Team was the highest executive subculture at the university.

**Micro-cultures**
The investigator found examples of micro-cultures such as taskforces or teams across organizational cultures or subcultures. Through the content analysis of the transcripts, she identified seven micro-cultures at the library and university levels. (See Table 4.5)

**Table 4.5**

**Micro-cultures: Case A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc Library Teams</td>
<td>Faculty Library Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Single Service Point Committee</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education Core Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Services Model Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Levels of Culture within the Library Organization**

**Cultural Artifacts**

For Case A, the investigator identified cultural artifacts that included both *visible structures and processes* and *observed behaviors* (see Table 4.6). The transcripts revealed cultural artifacts illustrated by the campus *physical environment* such as the iconic architecture and high quality of the library building, campus buildings decorated with art, and a single service point that encouraged collaboration among university and library services. Specific *language artifacts included:

- a common language about excellent service;
- robust library liaison job descriptions focused on pedagogical work;
- upgraded job descriptions for library professional support staff;
- general education core competencies which include information literacy; and
• a memorandum of understanding for the new library service point.

Further, the investigator discovered artifacts categorized as technology and products of the culture:

• a vision for the new library;
• the library as a centerpiece for the University capital campaign;
• the ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award;
• an excellent service initiative for all staff;
• implementation of innovative services and systems such as a new library discovery system; and,
• student employees serving on the front lines at the library single service point.

In addition, the investigator discovered artifacts considered myths and stories of the culture such as building for the students, the value of the new library on campus, public speeches on behalf of the library, the library as the living room for the campus, and the library at the table of the University. Further, she identified style artifacts such as the Dean’s open door policy and a flexible organization with lots of interest and curiosity.

Table 4.6

Cultural Artifacts: Case A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible Structures and Processes</th>
<th>Observed Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award</td>
<td>Building for the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus buildings decorated with art</td>
<td>Common language about excellent service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education core competencies include information literacy</td>
<td>Dean’s open door policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent service initiative for all staff</td>
<td>Flexible organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First library to implement a particular discovery system</td>
<td>Lots of interest and curiosity from library staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconic and high quality library building</td>
<td>Library as the living room for the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Services</td>
<td>Library at the table within the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library as centerpiece for the capital campaign</td>
<td>Public speeches on behalf of the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo of understanding for new library service point</td>
<td>Value of the new library on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New library single service point designed to foster collaboration across the University and beyond just library services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded job descriptions for library professional support staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust library liaison job descriptions focused on pedagogical work with librarians off the service/reference desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student employees on the front lines of service points in the library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for the new library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Espoused Beliefs and Values**

From analysis of the transcripts, the investigator categorized five themes from the library’s espoused beliefs and values. The themes covered the university mission, role of the new library, library work ethos, role of liaison librarians, and allocation of resources. Interviewees described a teaching university committed to liberal education with an undergraduate focus. Specifically, the Dean of the Library described an espoused belief that “. . . college-educated citizens will make a better community, and the University’s entire culture is rooted in that deep belief” (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015).

The investigator determined that the new library is a reflection of the University’s intent and culture. The Dean affirmed a “. . . commitment to build students a place where they could be more successful in their studies . . .” (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015). Further, the Dean emphasized that the new library would be different with students, not collections, at the center. Explicitly, she noted: “. . . we allowed for the whole range of student behaviors, some social, mainly academic certainly, but the more communal aspects of learning,
collaboration, fewer rules, an environment that more reflected their style and their preference” (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015).

The investigator discovered espoused beliefs and values that encompassed the work ethos of the reorganized library as:

- healthy and positive;
- outward focused;
- people-oriented;
- committed to excellent service both internally and externally;
- fluid and flexible; and,
- demonstrating a deep respect and integration among the employee classes with all voices heard and valued.

Relating another aspect of the reorganized library, the Dean of the Library outlined values that guide priorities for the allocation of resources; specifically, expenditures should follow commitments. As an example, the Dean noted the promise to fund collections. Somewhat contradictory, the Dean recounted a university value “... to do more with less” (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015). However, the university allocated the necessary funds to design and construct the new library with style and excellence.

In the context of the teaching and student centered principles of the university, the investigator discovered another group of espoused beliefs and values which described the changing role of liaison librarians. Specifically, the librarians’ responsibilities must be relevant and make an impact; and, librarians must collaborate with faculty in the classroom on curriculum. In particular, the Dean stated that librarians “... need to be working directly with
the academy on pedagogical issues and concerns, and issues of scholarship and research” (Dean A, personal communication, (February 11, 2015).

**Basic Underlying Assumptions**

The investigator identified six basic underlying assumptions of the organizational culture of Case A. These included:

1. collaboration
2. excellence
3. forward thinking
4. change ready
5. student focus
6. humaneness

From the structured interviews with the Dean of the Library, the Provost, and the Faculty Leader, the investigator learned that the overall university is a collaborative community. Further, there is deep respect and *collaboration* across the university cultures. Within the library organization, there is a commitment to excellent service. The Dean expressed a common goal of *excellence* and doing good work with pride, energy, and commitment for working at a special university.

Because of the reorganized library, the investigator found a staff that is *forward thinking*, conditioned to change, innovative, and risk tolerant. They easily get onboard with new initiatives and like to do important things quickly and progressively. Throughout the culture, there is a willingness to find ways to make things work.

*A focus on students* is a basic underlying assumption throughout the university. Both the Provost and the Dean emphasized the student-centeredness of the institution. Further, they
indicated that the shift to a different type of library from the traditional model was key to
supporting how students learn.

The Provost of Case A described the institution as very *human* e. Confirming this basic
underlying assumption, the investigator found trust, civility, and caring in both the University
and the Library cultures. The Dean emphasized the need to: “. . . act out the culture we want to
have” (Dean A, personal conversation, February 11, 2015). Further, the Dean recognized the
importance of understanding and tolerance for the different work throughout the library; in
particular, collective wisdom is better. The Leadership Team outlined the reliance on talent and
expertise of others including the need to “let ideas come from anywhere” (Leadership Team A,
personal communication, February 11, 2015).

**Leadership Embedding Mechanisms**

What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control on a Regular Basis

Through interviews with the Dean and Leadership Team, the investigator determined that
the Dean regularly paid attention to five areas:

1. a healthy organizational culture;
2. the hiring and development of a strong leadership team, library faculty, and staff;
3. a steady library vision;
4. excellent service; and,
5. visibility and impact of the library on campus.

Building a healthy culture was a top priority; and, the Dean cited the importance of
building an organization of trust with safe places for people with differing views to work things
out. In disagreements, she described her role was “to hold the middle.” Explicitly, the Dean
emphasized:
So my thought has always been that the first thing you’ve got to do is to win the culture war. Without a culture that is healthy, you can’t do anything. So culture was my first priority when I came here, to build a healthy culture. That basically means curb the bullies, empower your talent, and get people talking to each other in a reasonable way, describe the work you want to do together, and organize to do it. But all in a culture of civility” . . . (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015).

The Leadership Team confirmed that the Dean closely monitored what is happening in the different units and constantly observed the health of the culture. Especially, they noted that the Dean is available and listens to anyone in the organization. The team described the Dean’s focus on building and developing a leadership team, staffing the organization, and then regularly meeting and supporting staff at all levels after they are hired. In addition, the Dean managed the tension around the new model to use student employees to staff the library’s single service point.

The investigator determined that providing a steady vision for the library was vital for the Dean to control. To support the vision, the Dean provided space for individuals to try out ideas, enabled ideas by paying attention to them, and embraced new technologies. The Leadership Team confirmed that the Dean expected individuals to do their job until there is evidence they did not. Highlighting the “excellent service campaign” as a key component of the vision for the library, the Dean emphasized that the effort was not just about improving the job performance of a few people. The Dean stressed the importance of internal and external excellent service for all.

The Leadership Team indicated that the Dean paid significant attention to building a positive relationship with the Provost. In this role, the Dean made the work of the library visible to the campus and achieved credibility for the library within the university. Specifically, the Leadership Team cited the Dean’s work to embed the library
more in the academic and curricular efforts of the university as key to developing standing within the university.

**Leadership Reactions to Critical Incidents and Organizational Crises**

The Dean used the decision to build a new library facility as a catalyst to elevate the library vision, mission, programs, and services within the university. While protecting the vision with excitement and enthusiasm, the Dean engaged the entire library in the development and implementation of that vision. The Dean embraced the planning for a new library facility as a method to achieve consensus around a new organizational structure; a commitment to excellent service; and enhanced librarian and staff engagement in the student-centered mission of the university. Choosing not to battle with university faculty about the shift from a traditional library model, the Dean, calmly, and with ease, reassured them about the new vision.

**How Leaders Allocate Resources**

Using another embedding mechanism, the Dean allocated resources using the following caveats:

- resources follow priorities and intentions;
- decision making by the Leadership Team using collaboration, transparency, and consensus; and,
- flexibility to fund unanticipated special projects

The Dean and Leadership Team emphasized that funding priorities are set by the leadership team based on both library and university priorities. Some examples included merit salary increases every year; professional development for librarians and support staff; protection of the collections budget; special collections; and university initiatives such as scholarly communications. While not micromanaging the budget, the Dean described the importance of
making sure the Leadership Team received the necessary resources. Further, the Leadership Team confirmed the collaborative, thoughtful conversations and processes to reallocate or obtain new funds aligned with library priorities. Both the Dean and the Leadership Team stressed the need for flexibility and fluidity with the aim to set aside funding for unexpected, special projects or urgent, tough budget decisions.

**Deliberate Role Modeling and Coaching**

The Dean, Leadership Team, and Provost transcripts revealed that the Dean valued role modeling and coaching as crucial to building a positive organizational culture. The Dean focused on these approaches:

- **Act out the culture we want to have.** To demonstrate, the Dean moderated personal behavior including a strong, personal passion to eliminate fear and encourage feedback from staff. Specifically, the Dean modeled how to treat people because

  . . . the way you handled yourself in the organization mattered more than the work you did in the organization. That you had to be civil, collaborative, bully behavior not tolerated, not empowered, not rewarded. There had to be respect. (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015).

- **Address problems that need to be addressed.** The Dean encouraged and supported others to resolve challenges but gave “tough love” when required to make something happen.

  **Appreciate.** The Provost shared that the Dean showed appreciation to the staff and reiterated that the place was very humane. In addition, the Dean described the importance of being available, reassuring, and appreciative.

  **Coach the leadership team on the side.** The Dean stressed her role to support, encourage, and enable the efforts of the leadership team. Further, the Dean indicated a willingness to “step in” if a potential conflict was not noticed or handled by a leader.
Explain the vision and welcome ideas, feedback, and discussion from all. The Dean consistently sold and explained the new vision for the library repeatedly. The Dean was accessible and built a culture in which all voices were heard and valued. According to the Provost, “the Dean was very good about taking everybody’s ideas in and having a robust conversation” (Provost A, personal communication, February 11, 2015).

Meet regularly to share information and coach others on changes, processes, and culture. The Dean scheduled regular times to meet, strategize and share information. Specifically, the Dean met with support staff twice a semester to coach on how to handle tensions and stress about changes, the new library, processes, and culture.

Use best practices. The Dean acknowledged not being an expert on everything and relied on talent, experience, and expertise of others. Upon arrival at the university, the Dean established the standard of using best practices in all library operations and processes.

How Leaders Allocate Rewards and Status

The Dean stressed the importance of allocating rewards and status carefully to make sure those distributed are deserved, proportionate, and fair. Further, the Dean stressed the requirement for staff and librarians to cooperate and contribute to receive rewards and status.

The Dean implemented an open and transparent merit salary increase process. To ensure equity for all librarians and staff, the Leadership Team worked together to determine equitable performance classifications and merit salary increases across divisions.

To reward performance, contributions, and positive behavior, the Dean used various types of rewards and status. The Dean stated:

. . .whatever you have that people desire, those are the rewards. And I think you both have to be very savvy about what those are, and very aware that the small things add up to big things, and that rewards include time and attention, calling a name, asking about a child, a parent. (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015)
In addition, the Dean distributed the rewards and status including:

- annual merit increases;
- annual service awards;
- public recognition about special accomplishments and publications;
- ability to travel to conferences such as ACRL;
- introductions to people;
- service on special committees;
- opportunities to be at the table when interesting things are happening and discussed;
and,
- being listened to and trusted.

**How Leaders Recruit, Select, Promote, Retire, and Excommunicate**

The Dean emphasized the need to “manage people for the outcome you want” (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015). In addition, the Dean stressed the obligation to embody the desired healthy culture for the organization.

**Recruit.** The Dean and the Leadership Team did not outline specific recruitment strategies for the library organization. However, they indicated an ongoing effort to hire newer graduates from library and information science programs.

**Select.** The Dean expressed the desire to hire for leadership potential, emotional balance, talent, and teamwork; and, explicitly stated, “Skills can be taught, those other things cannot” (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015). The Leadership Team confirmed that the Dean hired for aptitude, attitude, ways of thinking, flexibility, entrepreneurship, excitement for the direction in which libraries are going, and not for a specific skill set. Further, the Leadership Team documented that the Dean interviewed all library faculty and administrative
professional candidates, provided feedback to the search committee, and made the final decision on selection.

**Promote.** The Dean expressed that “you promote those who excel at what they are doing. And many times, more for the qualities of leadership than for accomplishing a specific feat” (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015). In addition, the Dean worked to develop an enhanced understanding of peer review for librarian re-appointments in different departments with diverse responsibilities.

**Retire.** The Leadership Team noted that the Dean used the university’s phased retirement program to help some staff retire. In addition, the Dean worked with human resources to enable individuals to retire even if they did not have enough time in the retirement system.

**Excommunicate.** Dean A clearly articulated the importance of retiring and removing individuals who cannot contribute to the organization and do not accept the new culture. The Dean took the responsibility for articulating vital, healthy norms for the culture; therefore, people separated themselves out of the organization. Further, the Dean stressed that leaders should not diminish, disrespect, discount, or gossip about people. However, without hesitation, the Dean called individuals on inappropriate behavior; and, most problem individuals made the decision to leave the organization by themselves. For difficult individuals who chose not to leave the organization on their own accord, the Dean noted the need to “build a baffle around the problem people” to prevent the person from having the power to bully, poison, and control the culture. (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015)

**Culture Change Mechanisms**

The Provost for Case A hired a new Dean of the Library and gave the Dean a charge to rebuild the library culture. Upon arrival, the Dean discovered a lack of organizational structure
that caused decision making to be difficult. The Dean used a variety of culture change mechanisms to destroy and rebuild the existing library organizational culture into a positive, healthy, and productive one. The Dean used culture change mechanism from all three organizational stages: founding and early growth, midlife, and maturity and decline to transform the culture over a period of ten plus years. At the time of the site visit, the investigator determined that the Dean had completed an organizational turnaround, a culture change mechanism that indicated a mature culture for the library. However, the Dean and the Leadership Team continued to use culture change mechanisms from the other two stages to influence, develop, and maintain the culture.

**Founding and Early Growth**

**Incremental Change through General and Specific Evolution.** The Dean arrived and put a new organization in place. Through general evolution, some of the worst performing librarians decided to leave the organization on their own. According to the Leadership Team, the “Dean was creating huge change and . . . just saying this is the direction we’re headed, and come be on board, be part of it; and people didn’t want to get on board with that” (Leadership Team A, personal communication, February 11, 2015).

Documenting specific evolution, the Leadership Team noted that the Dean established new management structures, developed new library services and programs, and changed the focus of liaison librarians to more external, collaborative work with the faculty. According to the Provost,

> The librarians had to break out of their more linear thinking about how everything would be, let there be some ambiguity so it [the vision for the new library] could develop. It put people off their routines in a way that, I think, for the vast majority of the people inside the library, became an exciting adventure. And they realized what they could do when they had something to create. (Provost A, personal communication, February 11, 2015)
**Insight.** The Dean defined a vision of a healthy library culture including precisely how an academic library should support the university mission. Specifically, the Dean used insight or self-guided evolution to change the library culture. At first, the Dean was the keeper of the vision; however, through library reorganization, the culture evolved to allow everyone to make comments and contribute to the vision. Using the new vision, the library organization changed basic assumptions to remain vital and to improve the reputation and value of the library on campus. Working collaboratively with a focus on the vision, the organization developed new priorities that included:

- a flexible organization;
- a focus on collaborative services for students;
- an excellent service campaign;
- a single library service point; and,
- librarians working on pedagogy within the academy.

**Promotion of Hybrids within the Culture.** In the early stages of organization culture change, the Dean supported individuals who understood and supported the new vision. Specifically, the Dean promoted those individuals who demonstrated the “...ability to lead people forward on good ideas and accomplish good things” (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015).

**Midlife**

**Systematic Promotion from Selected Subcultures.** As the organization moved into midlife, the Dean promoted from selected subcultures. The Dean differentiated and elevated roles for both the librarians and public services staff. The Dean envisioned a library in which librarians would spend no time at the service desk and more time working with faculty on
pedagogy. Further, the Dean determined that librarians would not manage the operations of the new library facility and elevated professional support staff and paraprofessionals to manage the single service point. The Dean, Leadership Team, and Faculty Leader confirmed that student employees were promoted to staff the single service point and were encouraged to provide input to develop services in the new collaborative environment.

**Technological Seduction.** According to the Leadership Team, the Dean liked, embraced, and supported new technologies. Using technology seduction, a *midlife* organizational change mechanism defined by Schein (2017), the Dean added extra emerging technology roles in the Library Technology Division including more librarian positions. Further, the library developed and expanded the relationship with University Information Technology and took the lead on data visualization for the University. In addition, the library invested in an institutional repository and was the first library in the world to go live with a particular library discovery system.

**Infusion of Outsiders.** Also during the midlife stage, the Dean employed librarians new to the field and hired new staff to bring leadership abilities, emotional balance, talent, and teamwork into the organizational culture. Specifically, the Dean recruited two new associate deans to join the Library Leadership Team.

**Maturity and Decline**

**Scandal and Explosion of Myths.** The transcripts revealed that the library for Case A had not experienced a scandal and the resulting explosion of myths.

**Turnarounds.** The Dean established a culture of best practices and built a relatively flat organizational structure to encourage effective decision-making. The Dean noted that once
the decision to build the new library was made the culture was beginning to thrive. The Dean stated:

I think by the time I had been here five years, we really had a healthy culture. Not perfect by any stretch, but we had a healthy culture. And I think most people were thriving, and we were pretty much, by then, conditioned to change, to risk taking, to doing things quickly and progressively when we made up our minds that they needed to be done. (Dean A, personal communication, February 11, 2015)

The Leadership Team built a dynamic organization and created a culture favorable to transformation of the library culture. As one member of the Leadership Team observed:

I think we’ve built a lot of momentum in that rethinking what we’re doing or it’s almost part of what we do now is that we don’t consciously think that we’re doing something differently . . . we are now so engaged in and rethinking not one thing but everything that we are doing across the board and in all areas which is unique . . . . (Leadership Team A, personal communication, February 11, 2015)

Mergers and Acquisitions. The investigator determined that the library was not involved in a merger or acquisition such as taking charge of information technology during the Dean’s tenure.

Destruction and Rebirth. The President of the University hired a new Provost and the Provost brought a new Dean of the Library to campus. Specifically, the Provost charged the Dean of the Library to rebuild the culture of the library.

Extent to which Library Dean Used Creative and Innovation Initiatives to Encourage Adaptability within Organizational Cultures

The Dean and the Leadership Team for Case A acknowledged that creative and innovative initiatives stimulated adaptability within the organizational culture. Specifically, they noted that the initiatives encouraged constant learning and pushed individuals to think differently
about ways of working with students and faculty, both inside and outside the library. The initiatives included:

- a new library organizational structure;
- inventive methods and roles for librarian pedagogical work and outreach to faculty;
- an exceptional, creative, and innovative library facility;
- new library programs to operate within the new library spaces; and,
- a collaborative service model for university student support services operating in the new library.

**Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) Results**

The investigator used a second method to identify organizational cultures types for the Case A Library. Using the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument, the investigator asked the Leadership Team to respond to six items on the instrument (see Appendix F) that included dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, management of employees, organizational glue, strategic emphasis, and criteria for success. For each section, the leadership team member divided 100 points among the four alternatives for “now” and “preferred.” The “now” rating indicated how the responder thought the organization was at the time of the site visit. The “preferred” scores reflected “... your organization as you think it should be in five years in order to be spectacularly successful” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 29). After compiling the “now” and “preferred” scores for each of the six items and calculating the overall culture results, the investigator compared and graphed the results. The results revealed if there was a gap between the organizational culture types at the time of the site visit and the Leadership Team desire for changes in the culture styles to be more successful in five years.

**Dominant Characteristics**
For Case A, the OCAI results indicated the *dominant characteristics* for the culture type, both “now” and “preferred,” as predominantly adhocracy and therefore encompassing dynamic and entrepreneurial aspects (see Figures 4.1 and 4.2). In addition, the *dominant characteristics* showed a balance between clan (personal) and market (results oriented) aspects of the culture. The gap analysis indicated a negligible preference for more hierarchy or control in the culture’s *dominant characteristics* (see Figure 4.3).

**Figure 4.1**

Dominant Characteristics (Now) Case A
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**Figure 4.2**

Dominant Characteristics (Preferred) Case A
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Organizational Leadership

In the area of *organizational leadership*, Case A “now” results showed a balance between clan and adhocracy characteristics and consequently reflected leader types that were both team
builders and visionaries (see Figure 4.4). The leadership team responses indicated the “preferred” organizational leadership type to remain balanced between clan and adhocracy with a small desire to shift toward hierarchy leader types of coordinator, monitor, and organizer (see Figures 4.5 and 4.6).

**Figure 4.4**

Organizational Leadership (Now) Case A

![Diagram showing the preferred leadership types with clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and market orientations.](image)

**Figure 4.5**
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Organizational Leadership (Preferred) Case A

Management of Employees
Case A *management of employees* results (see Figure 4.7) revealed a predominantly clan management style, focused on “. . . teamwork, consensus, and participation.” Also, scores (see Figure 4.8) showed a clan management style moderated somewhat by an adhocracy focus that “. . . is characterized by individual risk taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 31). The analysis indicated a minuscule gap between the “now” and “preferred” management style for the library (see Figure 4.9).

**Figure 4.7**

Management of Employees (Now) Case A
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**Figure 4.8**
Management of Employees (Preferred) Case A

Figure 4.9

Management of Employees (Gap Analysis) Case A

Organizational Glue
The organizational glue aspects of Library A’s culture acknowledged a predominant focus on adhocracy (see Figure 4.10); therefore, “the glue that holds the organization together is commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being on the cutting edge” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 31). In addition, scores (see Figure 4.11) confirmed that the adhocracy aspects of the organizational glue for Case A were moderated most by the clan culture and to a lesser extent by the market and hierarchy cultures. In the clan aspects of the culture, “the glue that holds the organizational together is loyalty and mutual trust” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p.31). The gap analysis for organizational glue indicated a minute gap between the “now” and “preferred” aspects of the culture (see Figure 4.12).

Figure 4.10
Organizational Glue (Now) Case A
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Figure 4.11
Organizational Glue (Preferred) Case A
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Figure 4.12
Organizational Glue (Gap Analysis) Case A

Strategic Emphasis

The OCAI results indicated that Library A’s strategic emphasis is balanced closely between clan and adhocracy culture types (see Figure 4.13). Therefore, the library concentrated
on human development, trust, openness, and participation but also on obtaining new resources, trying new things, and creating new challenges. (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 32) The graphs showed a negligible gap between the “now” and preferred” areas of strategic emphasis (see Figures 4.14 and 4.15).

**Figure 4.13**

Strategic Emphasis (Now) Case A
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**Figure 4.14**
Strategic Emphasis (Preferred) Case A

Criteria of Success
Criteria of success results for Case A revealed more of a balance among all four culture types (see Figure 4.16). With strong clan and adhocracy criteria, the library culture defined the clan characteristics for the criteria for success by “. . . the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people.” For adhocracy aspects of the culture, the library established success as “. . . having the unique or the newest products” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 32). Again, the results indicated a negligible gap between the “now” and “preferred” criteria for success for Case A (see Figures 4.17 and 4.18).

Figure 4.16
Criteria of Success (Now) Case A
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Figure 4.17
Criteria of Success (Preferred) Case A

![Criteria of Success (Preferred) Case A](image)
Overall Culture

For the overall culture type, the results (see Figure 4.19) revealed a balance between the clan and adhocracy types and indicated a library culture that is both collaborative and creative.
In addition, the graphs reflected lesser amounts and a balance between hierarchy and market cultures. These results indicated a desire for some control and competition in the organization. The graphs (see Figures 4.20 and 4.21) showed virtually no gap between the “now” and preferred” overall organizational culture signifying leadership satisfaction with the library’s culture at the time of the site visit.

**Figure 4.19**

*Overall Culture Type (Now) Case A*
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**Figure 4.20**

*Overall Culture Type (Preferred) Case A*
Conclusion

To identify the types of cultures that influenced and existed within the library, the investigator analyzed transcripts of structured interviews with the Dean of the Library, Library
Leadership Team, Provost, and a Faculty Leader. The investigator discovered the external library profession as a macro-culture that influenced the overall library organizational culture. The investigator found nine organizational cultures that influenced the library such as the university, academic affairs, the state government, and the library. In addition, the investigator discovered 18 different library subcultures and 18 university subcultures. The subcultures included traditional and newer occupational groups. Further, the transcripts revealed operations subcultures such as access services or research and instruction; engineering or design subcultures including technologists and architects; and executive subcultures comprised of the Library Executive Team and the University Senior Leadership Team. The investigator found seven micro-cultures or taskforces across organizational cultures or subcultures at both the library and university level. Some examples included the library Single Service Point Committee and the General Education Core Curriculum Committee.

The investigator used a second method, OCAI, to identify the types of cultures in the library culture. The results indicated that the overall organization culture for Case A was balanced between the clan and adhocracy culture types and specified a culture that was both collaborative and creative. Further, the results showed virtually no gap between the “now” and “preferred” overall organizational culture at the time of the site visit. This absence of a gap demonstrated leadership satisfaction with the library’s culture at the time of the site visit.

In addition, the investigator identified levels of culture that existed within the library including cultural artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions. The transcripts revealed at the top, most visible level, cultural artifacts categorized as visible structures and processes and observed behaviors. Some artifacts of the physical environment included the iconic and high quality library building and the new, collaborative, library single
service point. *Language* artifacts encompassed the common language around excellent service and a memorandum of understanding for the new library service point. Examples of artifacts that demonstrated the *myths and stories* of the culture included constructing facilities for the students, and the library as the living room for the campus. *Technology and products of the culture* incorporated the vision for the new library; implementation of a new library discovery system; and the library as the centerpiece of the capital campaign. Finally, the investigator identified *style* artifacts such as the Dean’s open door policy and a flexible organization with lots of interest and curiosity from librarians and staff.

The investigator identified and categorized espoused beliefs and values that encompassed five themes including the *university mission*, *role of the new library*, *library work ethos*, *role of liaison librarians*, and *allocation of resources*. For example, the interviewees described a liberal arts, teaching university mission focused on undergraduates. The *role of the new library* affirmed a commitment to build for the students. For espoused beliefs and values about the *library work ethos*, the study participants confirmed the importance of being healthy and productive; outward focused; people oriented; committed to excellent service; fluid and flexible; and, committed to listening to and valuing all employee classes.

At the deepest level of the library culture, the investigator discovered five basic underlying assumptions comprised of *collaboration*, *excellence*, *forward thinking*, *change ready*, *student focus*, and *humaneness*.

The Dean of the Library for Case A actively used all six of Edgar Schein’s (1985, 1992, 2004, 2010, 2017) *leadership embedding mechanisms* to transform the culture of the library. For example, the Dean regularly *paid attention to* five areas: a healthy organizational culture; the hiring and development of a strong leadership team, library faculty and staff; a steady library
vision, excellent service; and visibility and impact of the library on campus. Further, the Dean responded to critical events and used the decision to build a new library facility as a catalyst to elevate the library within the university.

Using another embedding mechanism, the Dean allocated resources using transparent criteria that was clearly understood and used by the Library Leadership Team. The Dean strongly valued the embedding mechanism of deliberate role modeling and coaching and focused on: acting at the culture we want to have; addressing problems that need to be addressed; appreciating; coaching the leadership team on the side; explaining the vision and welcoming ideas, feedback and discussion from all; meeting regularly to share information and coach others; and using best practices from the library profession.

The Dean stressed the importance of allocating rewards and status and in particular, to make sure those rewards are deserved, proportionate, and fair. Further, the Dean concentrated on recruitment, selection, and promotion to change the organizational culture. The Dean emphasized the personal responsibility to embody the desired healthy culture for the organization. Further, with respect and grace, the Dean encouraged individuals to retire or remove themselves from the organization to alter and improve the library culture.

The Provost for Case A hired a new Dean of the Library and presented the charge to rebuild the library culture. The Dean used a variety of culture change mechanisms from all three organizational stages defined by Schein (1985, 1992, 2004, 2010, 2017), founding and early growth, midlife, and maturity and decline to transform the culture over a period of ten-plus years. At the time of the site visit, the investigator determined that the Dean had completed an organizational turnaround, a culture change mechanism that indicated a mature culture.
However, the Dean and the Leadership Team continued to use culture change mechanisms from the other two stages to influence, develop, and maintain the culture.

Further, the Dean and the Leadership Team acknowledged that creative and innovative initiatives stimulated adaptability within the library organizational culture; explicitly, they noted that the initiatives encouraged continuous learning and forced diverse ways of thinking and working both within the library and at the university level.
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Chapter 5

CASE STUDY B

Overview of Case Study Site

Case Study B is a private university with a student enrollment of over 7500 that is 63 percent undergraduate. The Carnegie Classification for the university is R2 for Doctoral Universities: Higher Research Activity (see Table 5.1). Established in 1834, the university has six colleges and schools. Undergraduate students experience the personal attention of a liberal arts college within the context of the rich resources of a research university. The university is committed to public service, engagement in the world, and improving the lives of others.

Table 5.1

Institutional and Organizational Demographics: Case B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>4-year or above Private not-for-profit R2 Doctoral Universities: Higher Research Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Profile</td>
<td>7500+ Majority Undergraduate (63 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of the Dean of the Library at the time of the site visit</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Dean of the Library described changes in top university leadership that happened over a period of three years beginning in 2004. The Director [now Dean] of the Library arrived in 2004; and, a new President was appointed in 2005. A new Provost arrived in 2007 and changed the title of the Director to Dean. The Provost added the Library Dean to the Council of Deans and consequently elevated the position of the library at the university. In this higher role at the “university table,” the Dean shared a university-wide perspective and influenced other
Critical Incidents

At the institutional level, the Dean identified “faculty status for librarian” as a critical incident that impacted the library and its organizational culture (see Table 5.2). The Leadership Team affirmed the incident but preferred to call the change to “faculty status” a “process” not an incident. The Dean initiated and led the effort for librarians to become faculty. This work resulted in elevated status for librarians and an equal role with other faculty in university governance. Neither the current Provost nor the Faculty Leader were at the university at the time of the change; but, they witnessed the outcome and confirmed the positive impact of faculty status on the library culture and the university. At the organizational [library] level, the Dean and the Leadership Team acknowledged that the establishment of the new library mission statement, “to help students, faculty, and staff succeed,” influenced the library cultures significantly.

Critical Incidents at the Institutional and Organizational Level: Case B

Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Institutional Level</th>
<th>Organizational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of the Library</td>
<td>Faculty Status for Librarians</td>
<td>Establishment of new mission statement for the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Team</td>
<td>Faculty Status for Librarians</td>
<td>Establishment of new mission statement for the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Faculty Status for Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Leader</td>
<td>Faculty Status for Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Cultures that Influence the Library Organization

Macro-Cultures
Using content analysis of the transcripts for Case B, the investigator identified the external library profession and higher education as two macro-cultures that influenced the library organizational culture. With the elevated expectations for library faculty, the Dean encouraged professional achievement and scholarship that included travel to national conferences, leadership of national library committees, and presentation and publication of papers. According to the Dean, “they [the librarians] started going out and they started hearing other people and they started taking our best practices out and bringing other best practices in, and the whole library just got better” (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015).

Also, the Dean stimulated conversations about the higher education context and impact on the future of libraries and universities. Specifically, the Dean initiated a campus-wide symposium on the imminent transformation of higher education to encourage adaptability and change at the university and within the library.

Organizational Cultures

The investigator discovered nine organizational cultures that influenced the library culture for Case B (see Table 5.3). The Dean orchestrated the process to change the status of librarians to faculty through the various levels of governance at the university. Even though the library worked most closely with the faculty of the undergraduate college, the Dean invited librarians from other schools including the divinity school, the law school and the medical school to explore the possibility of faculty status along with the other librarians. Also, the Dean worked with academic affairs to change the library’s relationship with faculty from one of service into a collaborative partnership with a focus on educational and research enterprise. To help students succeed, the library worked closely with the student life organization to plan creative programming and to increase student engagement with the library.
Table 5.3
Organizational Cultures: Case B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Cultures within the Library Organization

Subcultures

The investigator identified 14 library subcultures as a research objective. Also, the analysis of the transcripts revealed 15 university subcultures (see Table 5.4).

Table 5.4
Subcultures: Case B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Services</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogers</td>
<td>College Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Management</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Librarians</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Faculty (Librarians)</td>
<td>Greek Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Leadership Team</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Resource Services Unit</td>
<td>Permanent Faculty (Contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Staff (paraprofessionals)</td>
<td>Permanent Faculty (Tenure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Librarians</td>
<td>Professors of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professionally Active Librarians</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally Active Librarians</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Instruction</td>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections and Archives</td>
<td>Undergraduate Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologists</td>
<td>University Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the library, the investigator identified traditional occupational subcultures such as catalogers, medical librarians, and law librarians. For the university, the analysis revealed occupational subcultures that included different types of faculty, students, and staff.

**Operator.** The investigator found library operator subcultures including access services, the library resource services unit, collection management, and special collections. At the university level, the analysis revealed just two operator subcultures, the writing program and facilities.

**Design.** The transcripts revealed catalogers and technologists as two design subcultures in the library but showed none at the university level.

**Executive.** The investigator found a Library Leadership Team consisting of eight individuals, including the Dean of the Library, as the principal executive culture of the library. At a higher level, the University Leadership Team served as another executive subculture at the institution.

**Micro-cultures**

The investigator discovered micro-cultures or taskforces and teams across organizational cultures or subcultures, including five at the library level and eight at the university level (see Table 5.5).

**Table 5.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-cultures: Case B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians’ Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians’ Assembly Mentoring Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Peer Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Strategic Planning Team A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Strategic Planning Team B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural artifacts

For Case B, the analysis of the transcripts uncovered cultural artifacts that included both visible structures and processes and observed behaviors (see Table 5.6). The artifacts encompassed representations of the physical environment such as the coffee shop in the library and the 24-hour library operations. Specific language artifacts included the:

- library faculty governing document;
- library mission statement;
- library strategic plan;
- written and posted library values; and,
- the university mission statement.

Artifacts categorized as technology and products of the library culture were:

- ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries award;
- national recognition and participation for the library;
- faculty status for librarians;
- a library seat at the “university table” including University and Faculty Senates;
- library faculty involved in assessment and institutional research at the university level;
- a low library faculty and staff turnover rate;
- unique student events in the library; and,
• ten percent of the indirect research funds allocated to the library.

*Observed rituals and ceremonies* included internal recognition and attention, the annual library recognition lunch and the bi-annual meeting each year where all library staff and faculty were given the opportunity to discuss issues and express appreciation. The Dean shared a new employee’s testament from one of these meetings:

I just want to say, I have never seen a better place to work. You all like each other; you all work together; you don’t criticize; and, you pitch in and help each other. I’ve just never seen this; and, I’ve worked in a lot of jobs. (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015)

Also, the investigator discovered artifacts considered *myths and stories* of the culture such as the great service reputation and the library as the beloved, cherished place that is the heart of the campus.

### Table 5.6

**Cultural Artifacts: Case B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible Structures and Processes</th>
<th>Observed Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee shop in the library</td>
<td>Great service reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National recognition and participation for the library: ALA Emerging Leaders and <em>Library Journal</em> Movers and Shakers; ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award</td>
<td>Internal recognition and attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty status for librarians</td>
<td>Library is beloved, cherished place, heart of campus; proud of our library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Faculty Governing Document</td>
<td>Recognition lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library faculty involved in assessment, and institutional research</td>
<td>Bi-annual staff speak-outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library values; posted and voted on by all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low library faculty and staff turnover rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique student events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New library hours; 24 hour operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians on all major university committees including University and Faculty Senates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ten percent of indirect research funds came to the library from the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Mission Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Espoused beliefs and values

After the analysis of the interview transcripts, the investigator classified the identified espoused beliefs and values into five themes. The themes were university mission, role of the library within the university, library work ethos, teaching role of the librarians, and embracing change. The Dean and the Library Leadership Team emphasized that all faculty, staff, and students throughout the university, including the library, could recite—and understood—the university mission to serve others.

Based on that mission, the library articulated its new mission and the role of helping students, faculty, and staff succeed. The Dean stressed the importance of thinking of new ways and aspects in which the library could be more relevant. Further, the library used its mission statement to inform decisions. The library developed a strategic focus to make the building the heart of the campus by increasing library hours, adding a coffee shop, and moving technology services and the Writing Center into the building. With the change to faculty status, the library embraced the value of librarians taking on more teaching roles within the academic programs of the university. According to the Provost,

the [library] remains a center of intellectual and social engagement and the fact that this significant transformation took place in that heart of the institution, the library, was I think quite meaningful and rewarding for me to see as an alumnus and as a provost. (Provost B, personal communication, February 16, 2015)

The investigator found the following espoused beliefs and values that reflected the work ethos of the library. All were confirmed by both the Dean and the Library Leadership Team:

- it is not about us;
• play to strengths;
• work together to accomplish the mission and goals;
• try to get to “yes” before saying “no”;
• don’t operate in silos or be territorial; and,
• empower staff to make decisions.

Both the Dean and the Leadership Team espoused the value of embracing change. The Dean stressed that success in embracing change led to adaptability and flexibility within the organization. Confirming the importance of change, the Leadership Team mentioned that the Dean “never wastes a good crisis” (Leadership Team B, personal communication, February 16, 2015). For example, the Dean used the economic downturn to switch journal subscriptions from print to electronic.

**Basic underlying assumptions**

The investigator identified four basic underlying assumptions in the organizational culture for Case B. These included:

1. collaboration;
2. work hard but have fun;
3. recognition; and,
4. adaptability.

The Dean described the culture of the library as *collaborative*, cooperative, and unselfish. Specifically, “. . . they [the librarians and staff] truly are extremely friendly, extremely giving, very collaborative; that was just, through whatever miracle, the people who ended up working here” (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015).
Also, the Dean developed an organizational culture where it was important to work hard but to have fun too. According to the Dean, “if you talk to the leaders out there, they love their work. The love their people; they love this library; they love this university; and they do it for love” (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015). The Leadership Team affirmed that people enjoy coming to work and emphasized that the library was a happy, sane, healthy, and supportive workplace. Further, the Leadership Team confirmed a supportive and encouraging workplace that encompassed a culture of recognition within and external to the library. They described an annual staff event where people can call out other staff, specifically teams, who have done extra things. Also, they noted the Dean’s emphasis on external recognition such as ALA’s Emerging Leaders and the ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award.

The analysis of the transcripts revealed that adaptability was another basic underlying tenet in the library organizational culture. The Leadership Team highlighted that adaptability and flexibility were key to saying “yes” instead of “no” to new initiatives. They stressed that the Dean “. . . is really good at shifting where we need to be able to do initiatives and take care of things that come up on the short and that you might not have anticipated a year ahead” (Leadership Team B, personal communication, February 16, 2015).

Leadership Embedding Mechanisms

What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control on a Regular Basis

The Dean described paying attention to everything but not at a very detailed level; and, the Dean expressed an inclination for monitoring long-term trends rather than measuring the nitty-gritty details. Further, the Dean articulated a dislike for the word “control” and indicated a preference for broad oversight for everything except the budget. The Leadership Team
confirmed that the Dean controlled the budget for the library and persistently worked on salary equity issues.

In confirming the hands-off approach of the Dean, the Provost described him/her as

. . . the central player, but part of that role, unlike too many leaders, was to keep hands off, to an extent . . . help put decisions before them, but not insist on or tell them . . . this [faculty status for librarians] would be better for you and the university. (Provost B, personal communication, February 16, 2015)

In the context of broad oversight, the Dean regularly paid attention to the following five areas:

1. a healthy organizational culture;
2. the library mission, growth, and stretch goals;
3. the students;
4. university issues and politics; and
5. higher education.

To encourage and support a healthy organizational culture the Dean reflected that

I pay attention to how people feel about their jobs, if they are enjoying their jobs. If they are enjoying their jobs that means I know they’re doing good work, because they’re getting good feedback, and if they’re not happy then that’s a clue to me that I need to figure out why. (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015)

While monitoring and working to build a healthy and positive organizational culture, the Dean focused on working collaboratively, within the library, to develop a strong mission statement with stretch goals and growth. According to the Leadership Team, the Dean “took an organization that was very internally focused and has re-steered the ship to where we’re all rowing toward that mission statement” (Leadership Team B, personal communication, February 16, 2015).
Aligned with the mission of the library, the Dean paid substantial attention to student success by expanding library services and implementing student ideas for unique events. At the same time, the Dean monitored university issues and politics to position the library within the university in positive ways. These areas of attention encompassed student politics, the board of trustees, and the various schools such as business, law, and medical. At a higher level, the Dean observed the higher education environment and brought that perspective to the library and the university.

**Leadership Reactions to Critical Incidents and Organizational Crises**

The Dean documented a critical event, the process in which librarians became faculty at the university, and described the positive impact of that event on the organizational culture. In a non-dictatorial way, the Dean introduced, supported, and shepherded the process through the university governance structure. The Dean clarified the benefits and the additional responsibilities of the change for librarians and noted the importance of an equal role in university governance, the value of increased status for librarians, and the impact of extra responsibilities for librarianship, scholarship, and service. Underscoring the significance of the elevated the role of the library at the university, the Dean endorsed a peer review process for librarians that shifted power from the Dean to the peer review committee for appointment, renewal, and promotion decisions.

**How Leaders Allocate Resources**

The Dean managed and allocated resources using the following approaches:

- the budget is managed centrally by the Dean;
- staff are encouraged to request funds for creative initiatives;
- flexibility is key to funding unanticipated initiatives; and,
• securing new sources of funding is a priority for the library.

The Leadership Team confirmed that the budget is managed centrally by the Dean. Individuals and departments usually received what they needed but had to ask for funds each time. The team believed that this level of control enabled the Dean to stay informed about everything. The Dean encouraged staff to request funds for new initiatives but sometimes asked staff to go back, think more creatively, and then present enhanced project requests. The Dean’s detailed oversight of the budget provided flexible funding to address these unanticipated projects. Further, the Dean committed to finding new sources of funding for the library that provided discretionary income. During the Dean’s tenure, the university allowed the library to fundraise and participate in the capital campaign. Also, the university allocated ten percent of the indirect research funds to the library. Further, the Dean initiated the effort to become the library of record for the business school bringing in additional funding to support new library initiatives.

**Deliberate Role Modeling and Coaching**

The investigator determined that the Dean effectively used a number of role modeling and coaching techniques to build a positive and healthy organizational culture.

**Be positive and encouraging.** The Dean displayed a positive attitude and encouraged leaders, librarians, and other staff in small but constructive ways. The Dean only chose individuals for a leadership positions if they demonstrated a positive attitude.

**Be transparent.** The Dean underscored the importance of being transparent and was willing to answer any question from the staff unless it was confidential.

**Build on individual strengths.** The Leadership Team indicated that the Dean was a proponent of building on each individual’s strengths in the organization. Each member of the
Leadership Team completed an individual strength assessment; and, the team shared and discussed results. Later, all the departments in the organization completed the assessment and used the results to understand individual strengths in the context of teamwork. The Leadership Team shared the Dean’s opinion that “we all have parts of our job we don’t like. So it’s not like we can cater to everybody’s strengths; it’s play to the strengths and understand how their strengths may inform their behavior” (Leadership Team, personal communication, February 16, 2015).

**Let people save face.** The Dean described the importance of not just modeling behavior but coaching the library leaders about their visible behaviors that may have an impact on the organizational culture. The Dean stressed that

> another thing I try to coach on, and I had to coach a little more strongly with some individuals than others, is basic things like let people save face, always take the high road, even if somebody is wrong and everybody in the room knows that they’re wrong, don’t make them feel bad. Just offer them a graceful way out of it, and thank them and recognize them for what they do. (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015)

**Recognize individual and team successes.** The Dean consistently acknowledged individual and team accomplishments within the library, at the university, and external to the university. Also, the Dean said the leaders in the organization modeled the same behaviors to the staff in their respective departments. Specifically, “they recognize people. They reward people with attention” (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015).

**Welcome comments and feedback on mission, values, goals, and initiatives.** The Dean shared initial ideas for the new library mission and values but insisted that everyone have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback. In some cases, the Leadership Team recognized that they were able to change the Dean’s preconceived ideas by presenting a strong argument based on solid evidence.
Work hard but have fun. The Dean admitted to having a strong work ethic and shared that “I really work hard, and they know I work hard, and they want to work hard too” (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015). The Leadership Team confirmed the work ethic and noted that the Dean’s life was very integrated with the job; however, the Dean liked to have fun and provided enjoyable retreat opportunities outside of the library.

How Leaders Allocate Rewards and Status

The Dean and the Leadership Team described a “culture of recognition” within the library organization in which the Dean lets librarians and staff take credit for successful initiatives including the ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award. Each and every staff member in the organization received a small bonus upon receipt of this award.

Also, the Dean mentioned “. . . what I notice and what I recognize becomes a reward to them” (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015). The Leadership Team documented that the Dean gives rewards and status for excellent performance and innovation. Specific rewards included:

- the ability to travel to conferences;
- external nominations and recognition for awards such as ALA Emerging Leaders and Library Journal “Movers and Shakers”;
- professional development opportunities for librarians and staff;
- public recognition about special accomplishments and publications; and,
- salary initiatives for librarians and staff.

How Leaders Recruit, Select, Promote, Retire, and Excommunicate

The Leadership Team indicated that the Dean had high expectations for staff, always strived to be fair and honest, and was consistent in dealing with individuals.
Recruit. The Dean balanced hiring by using a regular search and application process but when necessary reached out to find and recruit the right person, with the appropriate abilities, for a position. The Leadership Team stressed that the Dean never settled if they couldn’t find the right person for a position; and, the Dean was willing to leave a position open. Also, the leaders noted that in filling empty positions, the Dean didn’t just recruit for the same responsibilities and abilities of the past incumbent but used open jobs for creative hiring opportunities.

Select. The Leadership Team indicated that the Dean selected and hired individuals who were flexible, adaptable, and willing to embrace change. Also, the Dean stressed that an individual must have a positive attitude to be selected for a leadership position.

Promote. Both the Dean and the Leadership Team confirmed that they used the library faculty peer review process as a rubric for librarian promotions. They emphasized that the peer review committee made tough decisions for non-renewal when appropriate. The Dean stressed that if a support staff member attained a Master’s degree they must truly merit a promotion into a library faculty position. Also, the Dean expressed concern that there wasn’t much of a career path for staff positions.

Retire. Upon arrival at the university, the Dean realized that several people were instigators, high maintenance, and did not contribute in positive ways to the organizational culture; however, the Dean chose not to fire them but to wait and let them retire.

Excommunicate. In one case, a staff member, ineligible for retirement, caused significant negativity within the organization culture. When the person chose not to leave the organization on their own accord, the Dean followed a careful process, made a difficult decision, and eliminated the individual’s position. The Dean was honest with the team about the need to
fire the unproductive and destructive staff member. However, the Dean reassured staff that the library was not cutting additional library positions.

**Culture Change Mechanisms**

The Dean of the Library for Case B arrived at the university in 2004. At the time of appointment, the position title was Director of the Library. Senior leadership for the university changed over the next few years with a new President appointed in 2005 and a new Provost in 2007. The new Provost elevated the role of the library on campus. First, the Provost changed the title from Director to Dean of the Library. At the same time, the Provost appointed the Dean of the Library to the university Dean’s Council. Further, the Provost strongly supported the change in status for librarians to faculty. Using this elevated status for librarians over a period of ten plus years, the Dean completed a turnaround of the library organizational culture using culture change mechanisms primarily from *founding and early growth* and *midlife* to accomplish the transformation.

**Founding and Early Growth**

**Incremental Change through General and Specific Evolution.** New senior leadership at the university level and in the library set the stage for incremental change in the organizational culture. The Dean elevated the role of librarians; promoted and hired new leaders for the library; and established new standards of work behavior to create a positive, productive, and fun work environment. Gradually, some problem individuals in the library organization chose to retire.

**Insight.** The Provost, Faculty Leader, and the Leadership Team all confirmed that the Dean brought a strong vision for the library. With the support of the senior leadership, and specifically the Provost, the Dean brought a robust vision to the library organization. The Dean’s vision encompassed changing the status of librarians to faculty; altering the role of
librarians at the university; and thereby, elevated the reputation of the library on campus. On the topic of faculty status for librarians, one leadership team member stressed “that we really put our trust in the Dean. The Dean was coming from a place that had successfully done it. The Dean had already proven, in three or four years, that [the Dean] was taking us in a good direction” (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015).

While working on elevating the role of the library on campus, the Dean initiated internal conversations about the core mission of the library. The Dean provided the initial concept for the mission and guided the organization through discussion and opportunities for input. To shift the focus, the Dean reiterated to the staff that “it is not about us” (Dean B, personal conversation, February 16, 2015). Collaboratively, the organization confirmed a mission that was focused on student, faculty, and staff success; and, through implementation of various programs to support student and faculty achievement, the library gained the substantial, devoted support of the students and faculty.

**Promotion of Hybrids within the Culture.** Upon arrival, the Dean promoted several individuals who demonstrated positive work behaviors to leadership positions. Also, internal leaders took on leadership roles in the process to change the status of librarians to faculty. Further, the Dean asked certain individuals to attend national conferences and to bring back innovative ideas to the organization. To reinforce certain acceptable and desired work behaviors, the Dean nominated and set up effective employees to receive rewards and recognition both internally and externally.

**Midlife**

**Systematic Promotion from Selected Subcultures.** With the change to faculty status, the Dean encouraged librarians to heighten their role in the academic, teaching mission of the
university. According to the Faculty Leader, the librarians expanded research and outreach opportunities and specifically, “the librarians have taken on more instructional roles probably as a consequence of that [faculty status] in certain ways” (Faculty Leader B, personal conversation, February 16, 2015).

The Dean recognized and promoted innovative librarians and emerging leaders. Further, the Dean nudged librarians to participate in scholarship and service for the profession at the national level. The Dean noted “they stepped up; they joined organizations; they started to write papers, to present, and help each other along the way; because, it’s scary to give a presentation at a national conference if you have never done it before” (Dean B, personal conversation, February 16, 2015).

**Technological Seduction.** The Dean described the library’s leadership role for technology and innovation at the university. For example, the library developed a MOOC for the university alumni. In a collaborative venture, the library and information technology staff formed a single service point in the library to provide technology support, instructional technology support, videography, and multimedia services.

**Infusion of Outsiders.** An infusion of outsiders both at the university and within the library contributed to significant organizational culture change. One leadership team member shared that

> I think the whole campus was in a transforming state when the President came, followed by the Provost, and then the Dean in the middle, so it was like everybody was turning the page, and we were going someplace different. (Leadership Team B, February 16, 2015)

Recruiting for flexibility and a willingness to embrace change, the Dean hired several new leaders from outside the library and specifically recruited a collection management librarian from another university. To bring new expertise into the library,
the Dean engaged consultants and when necessary hired for distinctive abilities such as technology or special collections. According to the leadership team, the Dean “. . . targets people now. [The Dean] doesn’t wait for people to come to us but goes out and finds the right people” (Leadership Team B, personal communication, February 16, 2015).

Maturity and Decline

Scandal and Explosion of Myths. The structured interviews for Case B did not reveal a scandal and the resulting explosion of myths.

Turnarounds. The Dean indicated that the library organization had come a long way since 2004 and explained “the university respects us, the administration gives us money . . . [the library is] valuable to the university” (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015). The Provost confirmed that the library experienced extraordinary success and a significant, positive transformation. Specifically, the Provost ascribed that the faculty status for librarians caused a positive difference in the library organizational culture. The Faculty Leader corroborated the healthy culture of the library and emphasized that librarians now have a clear career path, opportunities for professional development, and are involved on campus and in national organizations with initiatives such as assessment and institutional research.

Mergers and Acquisitions. The investigator determined that Case A Library was not involved in a merger or acquisition during the Dean’s tenure.

Destruction and Rebirth. From the evidence, the investigator determined that the library organization did not experience a destruction and rebirth; but, the leadership transformed the organization using culture change mechanisms from founding and early growth and midlife to accomplish a more gradual evolution and turnaround of the organizational culture.
Extent to which Library Deans use Creative and Innovation Initiatives to Encourage Adaptability within Organizational Cultures

The Dean and the Library Leadership Team confirmed that creative and innovative initiatives caused flexibility and adaptability within the library organization. The Dean emphasized the importance of not only embracing change but being “change agents for the campus.” Explicitly the Dean said “let’s think of ways to be relevant in new ways” (Dean B, personal communication, February 16, 2015). Some of the initiatives included:

- Unique and inviting student outreach events;
- Student celebration events;
- Off-site collection storage to free library space for new initiatives;
- Creative and different library spaces making the building the heart of the campus (coffee shop, auditorium, technology spaces); and,
- Library initiated university events on the transformation of higher education

Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) Results

Dominant Characteristics

OCAI results for Case B indicated the “now” dominant characteristics of the organizational culture as predominantly clan or collaborative (see Figure 5.1). The leadership team specified a preference for the dominant characteristics to be more balanced between clan and adhocracy characteristics (see Figure 5.2). The gap analysis (see Figure 5.3) demonstrated a desire for both collaboration and creativity characteristics in the organizational culture (see Figure 5.2 and 5.3).
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Organizational Leadership

In the area of organizational leadership, Case B “now” results showed a balance between clan and adhocracy characteristics; therefore, the leaders in the organization are both team oriented and visionary (see Figure 5.4). For the “preferred” type of organizational leadership, the results reflected a desire for more hierarchy or control (see Figure 5.5). Further, the gap between the “now” and “preferred” showed a preference for shifting some clan and adhocracy leadership types to hierarchy styles of coordinator, monitor, and organizer (see Figure 5.6).
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Management of Employees

Case B management of employees “now” results revealed a strong clan management style that is focused on teamwork; however, the clan style is moderated by both adhocracy and hierarchy management types which reflect risk taking and stability (see Figure 5.7). The “preferred” results (see Figure 5.8) indicated a desire to shift some of the management style away from hierarchy (control) to adhocracy (risk taking) and clan (consensus). The gap analysis (see Figure 5.9) confirmed that the leadership team sought small shifts in management styles in more than one area.
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Organizational Glue

The *organizational glue* “now” results for Case B revealed a predominantly clan oriented culture which reflects a library organization with loyalty and mutual trust (see Figure 5.10). However, the “preferred” results (see Figure 5.11) indicated that the leadership team sees a need to reduce the clan aspects of the *organizational glue* and add more market (achievement and goal accomplishment), and hierarchy (formal rules and policies) characteristics. The comparison of “now” and “preferred” ratings showed the largest gap in the clan area indicating a preference for lessening the impact of the clan culture (see Figure 5.12).
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**Strategic Emphasis**

The OCAI “now” results indicated the *strategic emphasis* for Library B was predominantly clan oriented and emphasized human development (see Figure 5.13). The “preferred” outcomes demonstrated the leadership team’s desire to reduce the clan emphasis and place more importance on adhocracy aspects of acquiring new resources, trying new things, and creating new opportunities or challenges (see Figure 5.14). The gap analysis between the “now” and “preferred” *strategic emphasis* showed a preference for slightly less hierarchy or stability and more of a balance between clan and adhocracy (see Figure 5.15).
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Criteria of Success

The “now” criteria of success results for Case A revealed a strong clan focus on human resources that is moderated by adhocracy measures of success such as new products and innovation (see Figure 5.16). The “preferred” results (see Figure 5.17) exposed a desire for slightly more adhocracy (innovation) and hierarchy (control and efficiency). The gap analysis indicated that the leadership team would like to see a lesser amount of the clan standards of success for the organization (see Figure 5.18).
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Overall Culture

The “now” overall culture type results for Case B (see Figure 5.19) indicated an organizational culture with strong clan (collaborative) aspects that is moderated by adhocracy (creative) characteristics and to a lesser degree market (competition) and hierarchy (control). The “preferred” results showed that the leadership team would like to see slightly less clan culture and slightly more adhocracy and market overall culture features (see Figure 5.20). The gap analysis revealed a negligible expectation for a change in the overall culture for Case B (see Figure 5.21).
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Conclusion

To identify the types of cultures that influenced and existed within the library, the investigator analyzed transcripts from structured interviews with the Dean of the Library, Library Leadership Team, Provost, and a faculty leader for Case B. She identified the external library profession and higher education as two macro-cultures that influenced the library organizational culture. Further, she discovered nine organizational cultures such as the university, academic affairs, and the library that impacted the accomplishments of the library. Also, the investigator found 14 library subcultures; and, the analysis of the transcripts revealed 15 university subcultures. The subcultures included occupational groups such as catalogers, medical librarians, and law librarians. Further, the investigator found operations subcultures such as access services, the library resources services unit, and collection management; design subcultures included catalogers and technologists; and executive subcultures were the Library Leadership Team and the University Leadership Team. From the transcripts, the investigator discovered five micro-cultures in the library and eight at the university level. Examples of these
taskforces and teams, comprised of individuals from different organization cultures or subcultures, included the Library Peer Review Committee and the University Senate.

The investigator used a second method to identify the library organizational culture types for Case B; consequently, she analyzed the results of the OCAI. The Case B results for the overall culture type at the time of the site visit indicated an organizational culture with strong clan (collaborative) aspects that is moderated by adhocracy (creative) characteristics and to a lesser degree market (competition) and hierarchy (control) features. The results showed that the leadership team would like to see slightly less clan culture and slightly more adhocracy and market features in the overall culture. The gap analysis revealed a negligible desire by the Leadership Team to change the overall culture for Case B.

Also, the investigator identified levels of culture that existed within the library including cultural artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions. She analyzed the transcripts and categorized at the top, most visible level, cultural artifacts classified as visible structures and processes and observed behaviors. Artifacts of the physical environment included the coffee shop in the library and the 24-hour library operations. Examples of language artifacts were the library faculty governing document, the library mission statement, and the university mission statement. Some illustrations of technology and product artifacts of the culture encompassed faculty status for librarians; national recognition and participation for the library; and unique library events. Observed rituals and ceremonies included internal recognition and attention, the annual library recognition lunch, and the bi-annual library speak-outs.

Further, the investigator discovered artifacts considered myths and stories of the library culture such as the great service reputation and the library as the beloved, cherished place that is the heart of the campus.
The investigator identified and categorized the espoused beliefs and values into five themes. The themes included the university mission, the role of the library within the university, a library work ethos, the teaching role of the librarians, and embracing change. For example, the Dean and the Library Leadership Team emphasized that all faculty, staff, and students throughout the university could recite and understood the university mission “to serve others.” Based on that mission, the library articulated its new mission and the role of helping students, faculty, and staff succeed. The Dean stressed the importance of thinking of new ways and aspects in which the library could become more relevant. The Dean and the Leadership Team confirmed espoused beliefs and values that comprised the work ethos of the library. These included “it is not about us;” play to strengths; work together to accomplish the mission and goals; try to get to “yes” before saying “no;” don’t operate in silos or be territorial; and empower staff to make decisions. At the deepest level of the library culture, the investigator discovered four basic underlying assumptions: collaboration, work hard but have fun, recognition, and adaptability.

The Dean of the Library for Case B actively used all six of Edgar Schein’s (1985, 1992, 2004, 2010, 2017) leadership embedding mechanisms to influence the culture of the library. For example, the Dean regularly paid attention to five areas: a healthy organizational culture; the library mission, growth and stretch goals; the students; university issues and politics; and higher education. Further, the Dean responded to critical events and used the process to change the status of librarians to faculty to influence and change the library organizational culture in positive ways.
Using another embedding mechanism, the Dean allocated resources and managed the budget centrally; encouraged creativity; ensured flexibility to be able to fund unanticipated initiatives; and secured new sources of funding for the library.

The Dean understood the positive impact of deliberate role modeling and coaching to influence the library organizational culture and concentrated personal efforts to be positive and encouraging; be transparent; build on individual strengths; let people save face; recognize individual and team successes; welcome comments and feedback on mission, values, goals and initiatives; and work hard but have fun.

The Dean emphasized the importance of allocating rewards and status and understood that individuals within the organization valued what the Dean noticed and then recognized in some manner. The Dean and the Leadership Team described a “culture of recognition” within the library for internal and external accomplishments. Also, the Dean focused on recruitment, selection, and promotion to change the organizational culture. The Dean augmented the normal hiring process, reaching out when necessary, to find and recruit the right person for the organization. Further, the Dean hired and promoted individuals who were flexible, adaptable, positive, and willing to embrace change. When necessary, the Dean made tough decisions to encourage retirement or remove individuals from the organization when they did not contribute to a positive organizational culture.

The Dean indicated that the library organization had come a long way since 2004. The Provost confirmed that the library experienced extraordinary success and a significant, positive transformation. Specifically, the Provost ascribed that implementing faculty status for librarians caused a positive difference in the library organizational culture. The Faculty Leader corroborated the healthy culture of the library and emphasized that librarians now have a clear
career path. Using this elevated status for librarians over a period of ten plus years, the Dean completed a turnaround of the library organizational culture which indicated a mature culture at the time of the site visit. The Dean and the Leadership Team continued to use culture change mechanisms from founding and early growth and midlife to influence and maintain the library culture. Also, the Dean and the Library Leadership Team confirmed that creative and innovative initiatives produced flexibility and adaptability, allowed the library organization to embrace change, but also influenced change at the university level.
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Chapter 6

CASE STUDY C

Overview of Case Study Site

Case C is a public university with a student enrollment of over 33,000 that is 71 percent undergraduate. The Carnegie Classification for the university is R1 for Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity (see Table 6.1). Established in 1887, the university has 12 colleges representing all major academic fields. The Dean of the Library described the numerous changes in top university leadership that transpired over a period of many years. Specifically, the Dean reported to numerous provosts during a tenure of 20 plus years. During the Dean’s tenure, the faculty and students strongly advocated for the libraries at the university.

Table 6.1

Institutional and Organizational Demographics: Case C

| Carnegie Classification | 4-year or above  
| Public  
| R1 Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity |
| Enrollment Profile | 33,000+  
| High Undergraduate (71 %) |
| Tenure of the Dean of the Library at the time of the site visit | 20+ years |

Critical Incidents

For a critical incident at the institutional level, the Dean identified the state legislature’s decision to allow the university to raise tuition for the first time on its own for either faculty salaries or library support (see Table 6.2). In the past, tuition increases were always controlled by the legislature. However, the legislature responded to pressure from the university to address inadequate faculty salaries and library resources. They approved the $300 tuition increase per
student with the stipulation that the additional funds must go to either faculty salaries or the library. The Dean described a three-month process of trying to decide, as a campus, what to do. After much discussion, the faculty senate voted unanimously for the tuition increase to go to the library. According to the Dean, the faculty “. . . had a sense of what the library could be and they really wanted to see that. They said it would make more difference in their work, in their sense of a great university, to forego the salary increase” (Dean C, personal communication, March 25, 2015). The increase resulted in a significant 35 percent increase in the overall library budget. The Leadership Team confirmed that the incident conclusively impacted the library organizational culture in progressive ways.

The Provost and Faculty Leader differed on the critical incident at the institutional level that impacted the library culture. They both believed that the university’s ability to recruit the Dean of the Library along with the Library Leadership Team was critical to the positive changes in the library organization. Further, the Provost noted the crucial university commitment to keep the library as a high capital priority and protect the library from budget cuts. At the organization [library] level, the Dean and the Leadership Team acknowledged that the establishment of a library fellows program influenced the library culture significantly.

Table 6.2

| Critical Incidents at the Institutional and Organizational Level: Case C |
|--------------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| **Interviewees** | **Institutional Level** | **Organizational Level** |
| Dean of the Library | 35% Increase ($300 per student) in library budget from tuition increase | Decision to have a fellows program |
| Leadership Team | 35% Increase ($300 per student) in library budget from tuition increase | Decision to have a fellows program and to build the new library |
| Provost | Ability to recruit the current Dean of the Library and Leadership Team colleagues | |
Types of Cultures that Influence the Library Organization

Macro-Cultures

Using the content analysis of the transcripts for Case B, the investigator identified the external library profession and commercial business as two macro-cultures that influenced the library organizational culture. Specifically, the Dean invested in professional development and provided opportunities for librarians and staff to contribute locally, regionally, and nationally in professional library organizations. Further, the library leadership looked outside the library world for ideas and solutions that could be adapted from other industries or commercial business.

Organizational Cultures

The investigator discovered eight organizational cultures that influenced the library culture for Case C (see Table 6.3). For example, the state legislature responded to the requests to expand library resources and increase faculty salaries. Further, the faculty within the various colleges and academic departments advocated for the library to receive additional tuition dollars to augment library resources and services. During the Dean’s tenure, the university protected the library from budget cuts and committed to keeping the library capital project as a top priority.

Table 6.3

Organizational Cultures: Case C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Academic Departments</th>
<th>Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; strong university commitment to keep the library a high capital priority and to protect the library from budget cuts</td>
<td>Ability to recruit the current Dean of the Library and Leadership Team colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Leader |
Types of Cultures within the Library Organization

Subcultures

The investigator identified 27 library subcultures for Case C reflective of a large academic library organization. Also, the analysis of the transcripts revealed seven \( w \) subcultures (see Table 6.4). Within the library, the investigator found traditional occupational subcultures such as archivists, preservation, human resources, and finance.

Table 6.4

Subcultures: Case C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archivists</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Subject Libraries</td>
<td>Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Management</td>
<td>Emeriti Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Library Group</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Access and Delivery</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Acquisitions and Discovery</td>
<td>University Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Clerks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Digital Scholarship and Copyright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library External Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Facilities Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Fellows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Finance and Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Graduate Student Assistants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Peer-to-peer Student Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Research and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Support Staff (Paraprofessionals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operator. The investigator found library operator subcultures including access and delivery, interlibrary loan, collection management, and acquisitions and discovery but discovered none in the transcripts at the university level.

Design. The transcripts revealed the digital library group, fellows, and library information technology as design subcultures in the library but showed none at the university level.

Executive. The investigator found the Library Leadership Team composed of seven individuals including the Dean of the Library as an executive subculture in the organization. At a higher level, the University Leadership Team served as another executive subculture at the institution.

Micro-cultures

The investigator discovered micro-cultures or taskforces, teams, and committees across organizational cultures or subcultures, including six at the library level and seven at the university (see Table 6.5).

Table 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-cultures: Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Administrative Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Directors’ Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Fellowship Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Management Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Levels of Culture within the Library Organization

Cultural artifacts

For Case C, the analysis of the transcripts uncovered cultural artifacts that included visible structures and processes and observed behaviors (see Table 6.6). The artifacts included representations of the physical environment such as makerspaces, the new library, library learning spaces, and extended 24-hour library access. Specific language artifacts incorporated the brand for the library, press releases, and the strategic plan.

Artifacts categorized as technology and products of the library culture were:

- ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award
- a contract system for library faculty;
- the Dean of the Library on the University Deans’ Council;
- external awards for the library, librarians, and staff;
- faculty/library collaborations;
- a fellows program
- an intellectual property attorney in the library;
- investment in the digital library environment;
- a technology incubator;
- a management training initiative;
- opportunities for librarians and staff to contribute locally, regionally, and nationally;
- recurring new positions;
- significant financial resources to improve support staff salaries;
• succession plans;
• tuition increase allocated to the library budget;
• 24 to 48-hour turnaround for book delivery;
• the vision for the new library; and,
• the vision for a great library system.

*Observed rituals and ceremonies* included supervisors meeting regularly with their staff and rewarding people through notes of appreciation, public recognition, and salary increases. Also, the investigator discovered artifacts considered *artistic creations* such as cutting edge initiatives, a technology incubator, and internal competition for creative initiatives. Further, she found artifacts categorized as *myths and stories* of the culture such as the library at the center of faculty work and the historic investment in the library by the university.

**Table 6.6**  
**Cultural Artifacts: Case C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible Structures and Processes</th>
<th>Observed Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand for the library</td>
<td>Cutting edge initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract system for library faculty (librarians)</td>
<td>Internal competition for creative initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of the Library on the University Deans’ Council</td>
<td>Library at the center of faculty work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/library collaborations</td>
<td>Rewarding people: notes of appreciation, public recognition, and salary increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended 24-hour library access</td>
<td>Supervisors meet regularly with their staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External awards for the library, librarians, and staff</td>
<td>Technology incubator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellows program</td>
<td>University investment in libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property attorney in the library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in the digital library environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makerspaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management training initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Espoused beliefs and values

Through analysis of the interview transcripts, the investigator classified the documented espoused beliefs and values into six themes:

1. hiring criteria;
2. developing people;
3. solving problems and issues in a collaborative manner;
4. the university’s commitment to the library
5. students and faculty as the top priority; and,
6. agility for creativity and innovation.

The Dean of Case C believed that intentional hiring was a core value. The Dean emphasized the importance of hiring individuals who have a passion for their work; enjoy working in collaborative teams; like to have fun and inspire; and put the institution and the library first. Relating the importance of employing the best and the brightest individuals who are ready to move the library forward, the Dean stated:
I long ago learned that as hard as it is, you hire people who are smarter and better than you are, if you can, and let them go, give them resources, but also ultimately, it’s a better thing for yourself because you’re doing the right thing and you look like you have the competence, even though you sometimes look and think maybe they should be the director. (Dean C, personal communication, March 25, 2015)

To ensure the best hires, the Dean expected individuals on search committees to be positive, welcoming and represent the library and university well. Most important, the Dean stressed that being on a search committee was not a perk and that the committee members must be engaged in the recruitment process. In addition to hiring the best, the Dean recognized the key role of developing, believing in, and helping people succeed and grow. Specifically, the Dean encouraged and empowered librarians and staff to engage outside of the library, go to conferences, make presentations, and write papers.

As another core value, the Dean stressed the importance of dealing with problems and addressing big issues with the Library Leadership Team as a whole. Specifically, the Dean believed in reaching out to other departments on campus, such as academic affairs to accomplish the goals of the library. Through these collaborative relationships, the Dean built strong support and financial commitment to the value of the library within a large complex university.

Building on these cooperative relationships, the Dean believed in putting students and faculty as the top priority for the library, specifically,

Everyone on the staff has kind of learned that faculty and students are what we’re here for and you need to engage with them, to get their ideas, and do things with their ideas. There is so much engagement with the people who use the library. People are out in departments and they’re always trying to get our people onto university committees and they [librarians] see a lot of respect for what they do. (Dean C, personal communication, March 25, 2015)
Specifically, the students pushed for additional library services; and, the Dean responded in a positive manner, welcomed their input, and committed to “doing things in student time” (Dean C, personal communication, March 25, 2015).

As another core value, the Dean and the Leadership Team expressed that the library must have the agility to allow for creativity and innovation. They stressed that the organization must always be ready to invest in a way that is visible and show value to the community; stop doing some things; start new initiatives as pilots or trials; and implement new initiatives quickly. To be able to implement new ideas rapidly, the leadership team affirmed the need to “. . . always have capital free to seize opportunities. Never tie up all your money in what you’re doing now, or ongoing expenditures.” Also, the group emphasized the organization’s willingness to “. . . look outside the library world for ideas and solutions to adapt from other industries” (Leadership Team C, personal communication, March 25, 2015).

**Basic underlying assumptions**

The investigator identified six basic underlying assumptions in the organizational culture for Case C. These included:

1. collaboration;
2. creativity and innovation;
3. high expectations;
4. honesty;
5. investment in the best people; and,
6. pride, enthusiasm, and excitement.

Emphasizing the core assumption of *collaboration* within the library and across the university, a Faculty Leader said “we are a university and we can do more together
collaboratively, to help us all do things better” (Faculty Leader C, personal communication, March 25, 2015). The Dean and the Leadership Team confirmed the collegiality with faculty and the collaborative attitude of the library organization.

The investigator determined that creativity and innovation was pervasive throughout the library organization culture. The Leadership Team confirmed the entrepreneurial features of the culture that included:

- significant learning and experimentation;
- a sense of fun and loving to develop new ideas;
- people can try stuff on a small level;
- permission to fail;
- ambiguity is accepted;
- technology people are everywhere; and,
- documentation and process are not the top priority.

Along with creativity and innovation, the investigator found high expectations for responsibility, accountability, and due diligence. The Leadership Team explained that the organization was a meritocracy and that “. . . doing okay is not good enough” (Leadership Team, personal communication, March 25, 2015).

The Leadership Team confirmed that the organization was not a consensus organization but there was the expectation for honesty within the group and the ability to ask for help. Connecting the basic underlying assumption of honesty with students, the Dean accentuated that “the library is straight with them [students] and that they’re listened to and treated like adults” (Dean, personal communication, March 25, 2015).
The Leadership Team underscored the significance of *investing in the best people* and noted that the organization assumed that human effort was a budgetary resource. Further, the team indicated that the organization hired for traits, talents, potential, adaptability, flexibility, and a diversity of background and skills. Also, they employed “. . . bright, energetic people with a bit of fire” (Leadership Team C, personal communication, March 25, 2015).

Throughout the interviews, the investigator perceived a strong sense of *pride, enthusiasm, and excitement* underlying the organizational culture for Case C. Specifically, the Dean described that

You got so you loved to come to work. You were so proud of the people you work with, you liked them so much, respected them and they were really sharp. I mean they had great ideas. I was learning probably more than they were. (Dean C, personal communication, March 25, 2015)

**Leadership Embedding Mechanisms**

**What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control on a Regular Basis**

The Leadership Team for Case C established that the Dean paid attention to everything; explicitly, they said the “Dean has fingers in a lot of pies” (Leadership Team C, personal communication, March 25, 2015). The Dean and the Leadership Team provided evidence of that attention and noted the following areas of attention:

- big projects such as the new library;
- budget;
- emerging digital library and pedagogy trends;
- external relationships; and,
- development of the organization.
The Dean admitted to shifting focus away from external university commitments while shepherding the new library to completion. Within the library, the Dean watched for weak areas in the organization that required investment and lobbied for greater support for the library. The Dean articulated the importance of robust external attention that included engagement with other academic libraries in the state and involvement with national and international high profile organizations and projects. Also, the Dean related the significance of reading business literature such as the *Harvard Business Review* in addition to library literature. Further, the Leadership Team indicated that the Dean focused on the role of digital media in teaching and learning and watched for emerging digital library opportunities. The Dean worked closely with students and faculty and paid attention to publicity and the image of the library. Further, the Dean focused on development of the organization, and explicitly, worked to hire the right people; built a strong team; shaped the organizational structure; developed leaders and talent; managed big issues to ensure the library was advancing in all the important areas; and compensated individuals appropriately for their work.

**Leadership Reactions to Critical Incidents and Organizational Crises**

The Dean reflected on the critical incident in which the library received a significant increase in the library budget from a tuition increase. The Dean believed it was vital to engage, educate, and empower students and faculty in decisions about the library, especially in setting priorities for the expenditure of the tuition funds. Further, the Dean indicated the importance of persistence and observation to make sure people were on board with the library vision.

**How Leaders Allocate Resources**

The Leadership Team noted that the Dean did not allocate the budget and that they worked as a team to apportion resources for the organization. The investigator determined that
the Dean’s primary role in the budget was to advocate for resources from the university and from donors. Further, the Dean used the following budget philosophies:

- stop doing some things so resources may be shifted to new initiatives;
- free capital to seize opportunities quickly;
- expend money in ways that are visible and show value to the community;
- invest in competitive salaries;
- never shortchange the collections; and
- do not worry about the small stuff such as supplies and temporary help.

The Dean believed in the importance of keeping resources “loose and available” to be able to respond to exciting initiatives throughout the year, “. . . new ideas that you have to move fast on, you can’t wait for the next budget cycle and so there’s a lot of ad hoc allocation that goes on” (Dean C, personal communication, March 25, 2015). Also, the Dean understood the value of asking students and faculty to provide input on new budgetary initiatives especially when designated library funding came from tuition increases.

The library did not receive automatic additions to the collections budget. Therefore, the Dean described the necessity to reallocate funds within the library resources budget to protect the collections. As another top priority, the Dean invested in staff salaries to provide a living wage for all employees in the library. Further, the Dean determined the salaries for librarians and professional staff to ensure competitive compensation and the ability to recruit the best talent for the organization.

**Deliberate Role Modeling and Coaching**

The Dean expressed that role modeling and coaching was “. . . not a conscious thing” and “I try to always let people know the values that I think we have as a library” (Dean C, personal
communication, March 25, 2015). Through analysis of the transcripts, the investigator learned that the Dean was a model of:

- accessibility;
- accountability;
- camaraderie and collegiality with students and faculty;
- decisiveness;
- giving others the spotlight and credit;
- openness to the opinions of others;
- transparency; and,
- consideration of others as true colleagues and partners.

To prepare the next generation of library leaders, the Dean modeled transparency and met with the Leadership Team as a group to make sure they were all hearing the same things and understood the values of the library. In an effort to develop new leaders, the Dean gave others the spotlight and credit and expected the Leadership Team to do the same with their staff. In particular, the Dean modeled accessibility had a strong camaraderie and collegiality with students, faculty, and the Leadership Team that included talking to people a lot, asking for opinions, and listening.

When asked how the Dean deliberately role modeled and coached, a member of the Leadership Team reflected:

Implicitly comes to mind for me, it’s just kind of a natural part. I can just talk about my own experience for a minute. [The Dean] just acted like it was a natural thing to ask my opinion about things, and respect it and listen to it, and have a one-on-one conversation, and really be frank about [the Dean’s] own ideas or questions, and just explore together. So you’re treated as a true colleague and partner. (Leadership Team C, personal communication, March 25, 2015)
Further, the Leadership Team described the Dean as hard-driving, decisive, and accountable. They especially noted the Dean’s willingness to be open and honest when questioning a personal decision. Frequently, the Dean asked each person on the team to verbally provide his/her opinion on a particular issue or initiative to vet decisions thoroughly at the leadership level.

**How Leaders Allocate Rewards and Status**

The Dean insisted that top performing individuals should get the most reward; and specifically, allocated merit salary awards based on real distinction in performance. Further the Dean used a number of approaches to reward employees, especially when salary increase funds were not available. The methods included:

- assignment to high-profile initiatives, committees, and university roles;
- new position titles that indicated elevated status;
- additional responsibilities for potential leaders in the organization;
- elevated roles for support staff;
- professional development opportunities including leadership and management academies;
- opportunities to contribute locally, regionally, and nationally;
- external nominations and public credit for awards such as ALA Emerging Leaders and Library Journal “Movers and Shakers;”
- personal and public acknowledgement of achievement by the Dean; and,
- appreciation for people who typically don’t get recognized such as facilities and office staff.

**How Leaders Recruit, Select, Promote, Retire, and Excommunicate**
To ensure a healthy and positive library organizational culture, the Dean emphasized and invested a significant effort on recruitment, selection, promotion, and addressing employee performance issues.

**Recruit.** The Dean invested substantial time and money in recruitment and especially focused on finding individuals who brought a diversity of backgrounds and explicit skills such as digital technologies. As another recruitment method, the Dean maintained that every person on a search committee had to be positive, engaged, and welcoming to potential employees. To aid recruitment of the best people, the Dean gave librarians opportunities for internships and fellowships and insisted on compensating fellows more than beginning librarians, provided stipends for travel and development, and attempted to retain fellows in permanent positions.

**Select.** The Dean interviewed every finalist for a librarian position and hired individuals with emotional intelligence and a love of their work, students, faculty and collaboration. The Leadership Team confirmed that the Dean hired the best and the brightest and selected individual for emotional intelligence, traits, talents, adaptability, flexibility, and energy.

**Promote.** As a core philosophy, the Dean invested in the best people even if it required the organization to have fewer staff. To prevent employees from being recruited to another library, the Dean always observed and thought about an individual’s potential for new and different positions or leadership opportunities within the library organization.

**Retire.** Upon arrival at the institution, the Dean articulated a new vision for the library. Some individuals supported the vision but chose to retire or leave the organization to enable the accomplishment of that vision. The Dean believed in dealing with problem employees even if it was a long and arduous process. In some cases, the Dean used retirements or reassignments to eliminate or reduce the impact of a problem employee on the library organization.
**Excommunicate.** The Dean emphasized that struggling employees should be supported and valued. The Dean along with the Leadership Team counseled and provided honest feedback to employees to help them make their own decisions about continued employment. The Leadership Team acknowledged that performance issues potentially determined which positions were eliminated during a reduction in force. For librarians, the Dean documented the need to diagnose performance problems early and to use the contract system to determine if reappointment was appropriate or not for each situation.

**Culture Change Mechanisms**

The Dean was persistent over the years and changed the organizational culture of the library. The Dean completed a turnaround by using culture change mechanisms primarily from *founding and early growth* and *midlife* to accomplish the transformation. At the time of the site visit, the investigator determined that the organization had a mature culture and leadership team but continued to implement change mechanisms from earlier stages of growth. Both the Provost and the Leadership Team indicated that the library was experiencing some stress in the organization due to top talent being recruited by other organizations and a reduction in budgetary resources.

**Founding and Early Growth**

**Incremental Change through General and Specific Evolution.** According to the Leadership Team, the Dean realized the culture transformation could not happen overnight. “[The Dean] had to develop a strategy that would play out over the years, go from one area to the next, and work with the manager at the administrative level, and try to get people in those roles” (Leadership Team C, personal communication, March 25, 2015). According to the Leadership Team, the Dean used a set of organizational principles to guide the work of the organization over
the long haul and explicitly invested in considerable learning and experimentation with service models, technologies, and spaces and demonstrated what could be done on a small scale to gain support.

Insight. The Faculty Leader indicated that the Dean arrived at the university with fresh ideas and articulated the needs for the library and a vision for how those needs could be met. The Provost affirmed the Dean’s vision for a library as a space for interaction, collaboration, and stimulation. According to the Leadership Team, the Dean sold the faculty and students “on a vision of a great library that could be of real value and enhancement for the university and received the funding to support that vision.” Also they noted that the Dean talked about the vision in the present tense; for example, “we are the university’s competitive advantage” (Leadership Team C, personal communication, March 25, 2015). Further, the Dean used that vision and transformed the organizational culture, created a brand for the library, and placed a great deal of value on risk, innovation and new initiatives.

Promotion of Hybrids within the Culture. According to the Leadership Team, the Dean promoted internally for department head positions to create a pipeline into management and administration. Further, the Dean elevated young librarians to the Directors Council. The Dean recalled:

I looked for a couple of people within our staff who had what I thought was a clearer sense of where we needed to be going, were really smart, were respected by the staff, had a passion for their work, and people where I felt I had a chemistry. I made them assistant directors and put them on that senior team, to bring perspectives from a range of experiences and backgrounds. And so that helped me. I realized how important it was to build a strong team, but I probably didn’t accomplish that fully until eight years ago. (Dean C, personal communication, March 25, 2015)

Midlife
**Systematic Promotion from Selected Subcultures.** With the implementation of new service models, the organization elevated the roles and job responsibilities of librarians, support staff, and student employees. Since librarians were no longer staffing the service points, they focused their time on creative ideas, new initiatives, professional development, scholarship, and service much like faculty. Related to the removal of librarians from the service points, the support staff received advanced responsibilities and more opportunities for career development in the operation of the library. Further, the student employees were given peer-to-peer work opportunities with higher level responsibilities.

**Technological Seduction.** As a primary culture change mechanism, the Dean incorporated a considerable amount of technological seduction in the library to transform the organizational culture. Some examples included:

- early investment in electronic resources, online learning, and digital publishing;
- building a digital library with a focus on using digital media in teaching and learning;
- building digital technology skills rather than traditional information technology skills;
- sandboxing new technologies;
- implementation of a search and discovery system;
- makerspaces;
- gaming; and,
- GIS (geographic information systems) and data visualization.

**Infusion of Outsiders.** With the significant increase in library funding from the tuition initiative, the library doubled the number of librarians in the organization. A Leadership Team member reflected “I do think those recurring new positions put us over the edge on really sort of
changing the culture and the make-up of the permanent staff” (Leadership Team C, personal communication, March 25, 2015). Specific initiatives in this area included:

- hiring people with new ideas, emotional intelligence, service orientation, user-friendliness;
- bringing in new librarians for interesting positions and initiatives through internships and fellowships; and,
- employing individuals from outside the library profession.

**Maturity and Decline**

**Scandal and Explosion of Myths.** The structured interviews for Case C did not reveal a scandal and the resulting explosion of myths.

**Turnarounds.** At the time of the site visit, the Dean reflected on the turnaround of the library organization and noted that they had built a strong leadership team by 2006. Further, they significantly changed the physical environment of the library over a period of years. The Dean explained:

> In the beginning most of the ideas were coming from the top down. And then we went through a time when it was more coming through middle management and now it’s anywhere in the organization and I bet I don’t know half the things that people are up to and I don’t care, because I trust them and they’re doing such unbelievable things. It’s very exciting. They have a real sense of responsibility and accountability. (Dean of the Library C, personal communication, March 25, 2015)

**Mergers and Acquisitions.** The investigator determined that Case C Library was not involved in a merger or acquisition during the Dean’s tenure.

**Destruction and Rebirth.** From the evidence, the investigator determined that the library organization did not experience a destruction and rebirth; however, the leadership
transformed the organization using culture change mechanisms from founding and early growth and midlife to accomplish a continuing evolution and turnaround of the organizational culture.

**Extent to which Library Deans use Creative and Innovation Initiatives to Encourage Adaptability within Organizational Cultures**

The Leadership Team indicated that the organizational culture inspired new ideas as much as creative and innovative initiatives encouraged adaptability within the library. One Leadership Team member shared:

> . . . they seem to go together, creation, innovation, and adaptability. You have to be willing to constantly move and change to sort of foster that. I guess we don’t have real rigid lines in the organization, would be one key piece so that people can try stuff. The can fail, they can work together on something, they can try something. We are a big proponent of trying things at a small level and throwing them out there and seeing what happens. (Leadership Team C, personal communication, March 25, 2015)

They articulated fundamental principles for the organization that encouraged adaptability:

- the ability to consciously handle ambiguity;
- looking outside the library world for ideas and solutions to adapt from other industries;
- deciding to be in the digital realm and be a technology incubator; and,
- doing what is best to effectively meet the needs of students and faculty.

**Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) Results**

**Dominant Characteristics**

For Case C, the OCAI results indicated the *dominant characteristics*, for both “now” and “preferred,” as predominantly adhocracy or dynamic and entrepreneurial (See Figures 6.1 and 6.2). However, the results showed that the adhocracy elements of the culture were moderated by strong market, results-oriented features and some clan and hierarchy characteristics. The gap
analysis showed a negligible preference by the Leadership Team for less hierarchy or control (see Figure 6.3).

Figure 6.1
Dominant Characteristics (Now) Case C

Figure 6.2
Dominant Characteristics (Preferred) Case C
Organizational Leadership

In the area of organizational leadership, Case C “now” and “preferred” results showed a predominantly adhocracy culture including leader types such as innovator, entrepreneur, and
visionary (See Figure 6.4 and 6.5). The organizational leadership components of the culture also reflected a balance between clan and market aspects, with even smaller quantities of hierarchy types. The gap analysis (see Figure 6.6) showed a negligible shift in the “preferred” outcomes to more adhocracy and less market indicating general satisfaction with the leadership aspects of the library culture.

**Figure 6.4**

Organizational Leadership (Now) Case C

**Figure 6.5**

Organizational Leadership (Preferred) Case C
Management of Employees

The Case C management of employees results for “now” reflected a mixture of all four types with adhocracy being the strongest, followed closely by market, clan, and then hierarchy.
(see Figure 6.7). Therefore, the Leadership Team recognized management components that included risk taking, innovation, and uniqueness; competitiveness, high demands, and achievement; teamwork, consensus, and participation; and, in much smaller amounts, predictability and stability. The “preferred” results indicated that the Leadership Team desired a slightly more clan or consensus management style and even less hierarchy (see Figure 6.8). The gap analysis results revealed the Leadership Team’s desire for small changes in the management of employees (see Figure 6.9).

**Figure 6.7**

Management of Employees (Now) Case C
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**Figure 6.8**

Management of Employees (Preferred) Case C
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Organizational Glue

The “now” organizational glue aspects of Library C’s culture revealed a predominant focus on adhocracy with a commitment to innovation, development, and being on the cutting
edge (see Figure 6.10). Also, the results indicated strong market (goal accomplishment) and clan (loyalty and mutual trust) organizational glue components. For the “preferred” results, the Leadership Team scores showed a desire for slightly less adhocracy and market and additional clan components (see Figure 6.11). The gap analysis showed hierarchy scores that were exactly the same in both the “preferred” and “now” results; however, the leadership team indicated an aspiration to shift slightly away from market and add some clan organizational glue aspects (see Figure 6.12).

Figure 6.10
Organizational Glue (Now) Case C

Figure 6.11
Organizational Glue (Preferred) Case C
Strategic Emphasis

Both the “now” and “preferred” OCAI results revealed that Library C’s *strategic emphasis* is predominantly adhocracy; therefore, the organization concentrated on acquiring new
resources, creating new challenges, and looking for new opportunities (see Figures 6.13 and 6.14). Also, the adhocracy strategic emphasis is moderated by clan (human development) and market (competition and achievement) aspects. The gap analysis results revealed a negligible difference in the “now” and “preferred” strategic emphasis with the hierarchy scores remaining exactly the same along with an equal balance between market and clan focus (see Figure 6.15).

**Figure 6.13**

**Strategic Emphasis (Now) Case C**
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**Figure 6.14**

**Strategic Emphasis (Preferred) Case C**
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Criteria of Success

The “now” and “preferred” criteria of success results for Case C indicated a culture predominantly focused on adhocracy; therefore, the measure of effectiveness included new or
unique products and innovation (see Figures 6.16 and 6.17). Also, the results revealed equal amounts of clan (development of human resources) and market (competition and leading in the marketplace) as criteria of success in the library culture. The results showed a negligible gap in the “now” and “preferred” success criteria (see Figure 6.18).

Figure 6.16
Criteria of Success (Now) Case C
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Figure 6.17
Criteria of Success (Preferred) Case C
Overall Culture

The “now” and “preferred” overall culture type results for Case C revealed an organizational culture that is predominantly adhocracy or creative (see Figures 6.19 and 6.20).
The *overall culture* encompassed similar amounts of clan (collaborative) and market (competing) culture aspects with a smaller amount of hierarchy or control. The gap analysis showed a negligible difference in the “now” and “preferred” culture signifying leadership satisfaction with the library’s culture at the time of the site visit.

**Figure 6.19**

*Overall Culture (Now) Case C*
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**Figure 6.20**

*Overall Culture (Preferred) Case C*
Conclusion

The investigator identified the external library profession and commercial business as two macro-cultures that influenced the library organizational culture. Further, she discovered
eight organizational cultures such the university, academic affairs, and the colleges that impacted the library culture and its success. Indicative of a larger university library, the investigator found 27 library subcultures. The subcultures incorporated occupational groups, for example, archivists, preservation, and human resources. Further, the investigator found operations subcultures such as access and delivery, interlibrary loan, and collection management; design subcultures included the library information technology and the digital library group; and executive subcultures were the Library Leadership Team and the University Leadership Team. From the transcripts, the investigator discovered six micro-cultures in the library and seven at the university. Examples of these taskforces, teams, and committees included the Library Management Council and the Faculty Senate.

The overall OCAI results for Case C revealed an organizational culture that is predominantly adhocracy or creative. The overall culture encompassed similar amounts of clan (collaborative) and market (competing) culture aspects with a smaller amount of hierarchy or control. The gap analysis showed a negligible difference in the “now” and “preferred” cultures signifying leadership satisfaction with the library’s culture at the time of the site visit.

Through analysis of the transcripts, the investigator discovered and categorized artifacts of the culture. Representations of the physical environment included makerspaces, the new library, and library learning spaces. Examples of language artifacts were the library brands, press releases, and the strategic plan. Instances of technology and products of the library included external awards for the library, investment in the digital library environment, and faculty/library collaborations. Observed rituals and ceremonies involved supervisors meeting regularly with their staff and rewarding people through notes of appreciation, public recognition, and salary increases. Also the investigator discovered artifacts considered artistic creations such
as cutting edge initiatives and internal competition for creative initiatives. Further, she found *artifacts* categorized as *myths and stories* of the culture such as the library at the center of faculty work and the historic investment in the library by the university.

The investigator identified and categorized the *espoused beliefs and values* of the culture into six themes: hiring criteria; developing people; solving problems and issues in a collaborative manner; the university’s commitment to the library; students and faculty as the priority; and agility for creativity and innovation. At the deepest level of the organizational culture, the investigator discovered six *basic underlying assumptions*: collaboration; creativity and innovation; high expectations; honesty; investment in the best people; and pride, enthusiasm, and excitement.

The Dean of the Library for Case C actively used all six of Edgar Schein’s (1985, 1992, 2004, 2010, 2017) leadership embedding mechanisms to influence the culture of the library. The Dean regularly *paid attention* to five areas: big projects such as the new library; budget; emerging digital library and pedagogy trends; external relationships; and development of the organization. Further the Dean *responded to critical incidents* and used the significant increase in library funding from tuition to engage, educate, and empower students and faculty in decisions about the library, especially in setting priorities for the expenditure of the tuition funds.

While not *allocating resources* personally, the Dean worked with the leadership team to apportion resources for the library. The Dean’s primary role in the budget was to advocate for resources for the library from the university and donors. Further, the Dean implemented and used the following budget caveats: stop doing some things so resources may be shifted to new initiatives; free capital to seize opportunities quickly; expend money in ways that are visible and
show value to the community; invest in competitive salaries; never shortchange the collections; and do not worry about the small stuff.

The Dean expressed that role modeling and coaching “. . . was not a conscious thing,” however, through analysis of the transcripts the investigator learned that the Dean demonstrated: accessibility; accountability; camaraderie and collegiality with students and faculty; decisiveness; giving others the spotlight and credit; openness to the opinions of others; transparency; and consideration of others as true colleagues and partners.

The Dean insisted that the allocation of rewards and status be given to the top performing individuals in the organization; specifically, the Dean distributed merit salary increases based on real distinction in performance. When salary increase funds were not available, the library used a number of approaches to reward employees such as assignment to high-profile initiatives, committees, and university roles; new position titles that indicated elevated status; elevated roles for support staff; and personal and public acknowledgement of achievement by the Dean.

To ensure a robust and positive library organizational culture, the Dean emphasized and invested a significant effort on recruitment, selection, promotion, and addressing employee performance issues. The Dean invested substantial time and money in recruitment and especially focused on finding individuals who brought a diversity of backgrounds and explicit skills such as digital technologies. The Dean was actively involved in the selection of individuals for professional positions; and, the Leadership Team confirmed that the Dean hired the best and the brightest and chose individuals for emotional intelligence, traits, talents, adaptability, flexibility, and energy. The Dean believed in promoting excellent talent and always observed and thought about an individual’s potential for new and different positions or leadership opportunities within
the library. Upon arrival at the institution, the Dean articulated a new vision for the library. Some individuals supported the vision but chose to retire and leave the organization. In some cases, the Dean used retirements or reassignments to eliminate or reduce the impact of a problem employee on the library organization. Further, the Dean along with the Leadership Team counseled and provided honest feedback to employees to help them make their own decisions about continued employment. For librarians, the Dean documented the need to diagnose performance problems early and to use the contract system to determine if reappointment was appropriate.

The Dean of Case C was persistent over the years and changed the organizational culture of the library. The Dean completed a turnaround of the culture by using change mechanisms primarily from *founding and early growth* and *midlife* to accomplish the transformation. At the time of the site visit, the organization had a mature leadership team and culture but continued to implement change mechanisms from the earlier stages of growth to influence and maintain the library culture. Both the Provost and the Leadership Team indicated that the library had experienced some stress in the organization due to top talent being recruited by other institutions and a reduction in budgetary resources.

The Leadership Team emphasized that the organizational culture inspired new ideas as much as creative and innovation initiatives encouraged adaptability within the library culture. They articulated fundamental principles for the organization that encouraged adaptability: the ability to consciously handle ambiguity; looking outside the library world for ideas and solutions to adapt from other industries; deciding to be in the digital realm and to be a technology incubator; and doing what is best to effectively meet the needs of students and faculty.
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Chapter Seven

CROSS-CASE FINDINGS AND THEMES

Overview of the Case Study Sites

This research study involved three case study sites, two large public research universities and one small private university (see Table 7.1). The enrollment profile for each of the institutions is more than 60 percent undergraduate with total populations ranging from more than 7,500 to just over 35,000 students. One of the public universities is M1, Master’s Colleges and Universities: Larger programs, and the other is R1, Doctoral Universities, Highest Research Activity. According to the Carnegie Classification, the private university is R2 for Doctoral Universities: Higher Research Activity. From the case study site visits, the investigator confirmed by analysis of the qualitative research data that all three universities and their respective libraries demonstrated a student-centered focus.

Table 7.1

Institutional and Organizational Demographics Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carnegie Classification</strong></td>
<td>4-year or above Public M1 Master’s Colleges and Universities: Larger Programs</td>
<td>4-year or above Private not-for-profit R2 Doctoral Universities: Higher Research Activity</td>
<td>4-year or above Public R1 Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Profile</strong></td>
<td>25,000+ Very high undergraduate (87 %)</td>
<td>7500+ Majority Undergraduate (63 %)</td>
<td>33,000+ High Undergraduate (71 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure of the Dean of the Library at the time of the site visit</strong></td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>20+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Incidents

The investigator used narrative inquiry to probe critical incidents identified by the participants in each case study. Through structured interviews, she explored types and levels of culture, leadership embedding mechanisms, culture change mechanisms, and creative and innovative initiatives to determine organizational adaptability and leadership ability to influence and transform library organizational cultures.

Prior to the structured interviews, the investigator explained that a critical incident could be a major event, experience, or turning point. For Case A, the provost described the incident at the institutional level as more of a catalyst rather than an incident. Noting the unlikely prospect for state funding to building a new library, the Provost reflected that the new vision for library programs, services, and facilities encouraged donors to fund the new library. While the Dean thought the decision to build a new library was the most significant critical incident at the institutional level, the library leadership team believed a new Provost and the decision to hire a new and creative Library Dean were more important.

For Case B, all interviewees conveyed that the most important institutional critical incident was the move from staff to faculty status for librarians which led to greater professionalism of the library team. However, the leadership team preferred to call the change in status a “process” not an incident. For Case C, the Dean and the Library Leadership Team confirmed that the substantial library budget increase from student tuition as a momentous critical incident at the institutional level. However, the Provost and the Faculty leader stressed that the ability to recruit the Dean of the Library and the Library Leadership Team was more significant.
For all three cases, the respective Deans and the Leadership teams agreed upon the same critical incident at the organization level; for Case A, an excellent service campaign, for Case B, the establishment of a new mission statement for the library, and for Case C, the decision to have a fellows program.

Types of Cultures that Influence the Library Organizations

Macro-cultures

The investigator determined that the organizational cultures for all three libraries were influenced by the external library profession. Specifically, each Dean encouraged professional development, scholarship, participation, and contribution to professional library organizations at the local, regional, and national levels. Further, the Dean for Case B initiated a campus-wide symposium on the transformation of higher education to encourage adaptability and change at the university and within the library. At Case C, the library leadership looked outside the library world for ideas and solutions that could be adapted from other industries or commercial business.

Organizational Cultures

The investigator discovered a number of organizational cultures that influenced the library cultures of all three case study sites (see Table 7.2). The comparison reflected the influence of the university and academic affairs cultures in all three cases. For the two public institutions, the transcripts revealed the impact of the state government. Further, the analysis revealed the influence of colleges and schools for one public university and the private institution. The investigator compiled organizational cultures found only in the interview transcripts; therefore, the list of cultures was not all-inclusive.

Table 7.2

Organizational Cultures Comparison
Types of Cultures within Library Organizations

Library Subcultures

Through analysis of the transcripts, the investigator found numerous library subcultures. The investigator categorized the library subcultures according to occupations, operations, design and executive types. Again, the investigator compiled the subcultures found only in the interview transcripts; therefore, the list of subcultures is not all-inclusive.

**Occupations.** From all three cases, the investigator identified a number of traditional library occupation subcultures such as archivists, catalogers, librarians, paraprofessionals, and student employees (see Table 7.3). Newer occupational subcultures included technologists and user experience librarians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Professionals</td>
<td>Catalogers</td>
<td>Archivists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogers</td>
<td>Law Librarians</td>
<td>Clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Librarians)</td>
<td>Library Faculty (Librarians)</td>
<td>Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Finance and Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Support Staff</td>
<td>Medical Librarians</td>
<td>Graduate Student Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Librarians</td>
<td>Non-professionally Active Librarians</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3

Library Subcultures: Occupations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Employees</th>
<th>Professionally Active Librarians</th>
<th>Information Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Research Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologists</td>
<td>Peer-to-peer Student Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Experience</td>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Other Professionals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operator.** For all three cases, the investigator found typical library operator subcultures such as access services, research and instruction, and special collections (see Table 7.4).

Different operator subcultures included discovery, digital scholarship, and a digital library group.

**Table 7.4**

**Library Subcultures: Operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Services Team</td>
<td>Access Services</td>
<td>Access and Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Librarians</td>
<td>Collection Management</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services Team</td>
<td>Library Resource Services Unit</td>
<td>Branch Subject Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Instructional Services</td>
<td>Research and Instruction</td>
<td>Collection Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections and Archives</td>
<td>Special Collections and Archives</td>
<td>Digital Library Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Information Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Scholarship and Copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance and Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Librarians Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Collections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design.** From the three cases, the transcripts revealed catalogers, technologists, and user experience as common design subcultures.
Executive. The investigator determined that all three case study sites exhibited a primary executive subculture demonstrated by the Library Leadership Team which included the Dean of Library.

Micro-cultures

The investigator discovered micro-cultures or taskforces, teams, and committees comprised of individuals from across organizational cultures or subcultures. Example micro-cultures included ad hoc library teams, a single service point committee, strategic planning teams, a library management council, and a student advisory board.

Levels of Culture within Library Organizations

Cultural artifacts

For all three cases, the investigator identified and categorized cultural artifacts comprised of visible structures and processes and observed behaviors. The transcripts revealed artifacts reflected by the architecture of the physical environment, language, technology and products, artistic creations, style, myths and stories, and observed rituals and ceremonies.

Architecture of the Physical Environment. The interviews from all three case study sites revealed an emphasis on new and creative library spaces either through new construction or renovation of existing library facilities. Specific examples included two new state-of-the-art libraries with a variety of learning spaces and innovative features, coffee shops in all three libraries, and 24-hour access to library facilities.

Language. The investigator discovered language artifacts such as strategic plans and mission statements (see Table 7.5). Some of the language artifacts reflected changes in the organization cultures and included artifacts about excellent service, posted library values, and the library brand. Others specifically documented changes in job expectations for librarians and
staff and involved revised liaison librarian job descriptions focused on pedagogical work, upgraded position description for paraprofessional staff, and a library faculty governing document.

Table 7.5
Cultural Artifacts: Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common language about excellent service</td>
<td>Library faculty governing document</td>
<td>Library brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison job descriptions focused on pedagogical work</td>
<td>Library Mission Statement</td>
<td>Press releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded job descriptions for library professional support staff</td>
<td>Library Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Library Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education core competencies which include information literacy</td>
<td>Written and posted library values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of understanding for new library service point</td>
<td>University mission statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technology and Products. The investigator found numerous technology and product artifacts through the analysis of the transcripts (see Table 7.6). Technology artifacts were evident in two of the cases and included library discovery systems, a technology incubator, and investment in the digital library environment. Artifacts identified as products of the three libraries reflected five themes: vision; investment in the libraries; the libraries at the “university table;” excellent service and programs for students and faculty; and national recognition and participation.

Table 7.6
Cultural Artifacts: Technology and Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision for a new library</td>
<td>National recognition and participation for the library</td>
<td>ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library as the centerpiece for the University Capital Campaign</td>
<td>ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award</td>
<td>External awards for the library, librarians, and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award</td>
<td>Faculty status for librarians</td>
<td>Contract system for library faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent service initiative for all staff</td>
<td>Library “seat” at the “university table” including the University and Faculty Senates</td>
<td>Library Dean on University Deans’ Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of innovative services and systems such as a new library discovery system</td>
<td>Library faculty involvement in assessment at institutional research at the university level</td>
<td>Faculty/librarian collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student employees serving on the front lines at the library single service point</td>
<td>Low faculty and staff turnover rate</td>
<td>Fellows program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unique student events in the library</td>
<td>Intellectual property attorney in the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ten percent of the indirect research funds allocated to the library</td>
<td>Investment in the digital library environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology incubator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management training initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for librarians and staff to contribute locally, regionally, and nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recurring new positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant financial resources to improve support staff salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Succession plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition increase allocated to the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24-48 hour turnaround for book delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision for a great library system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision for the new library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Myths and stories.** From analysis of the case studies, the myths and stories reflected the significant value placed on the library by all three universities. The narrative inquiry results
highlighted stories such as building for the students, the library as the beloved, cherished place that is the heart of the campus, the library at the center of faculty work and student life, and historic investment in the library by the university.

**Observed Rituals and Ceremonies.** The observed rituals and ceremonies at two of the case studies focused on internal recognition and appreciation of the library faculty and staff. Also, the libraries rewarded individuals and teams through notes of appreciation, public recognition events, and salary increases.

**Style and Artistic Creations.** The investigator found style and artistic creation artifacts in the transcripts from two of the three cases. For Case A, the Dean’s style was reflected by an open door policy and an organization with lots of interest and curiosity. Case C revealed artistic creations including cutting edge initiatives, a technology incubator, and internal competition for creative initiatives.

**Espoused beliefs and values**

The investigator compiled the espoused beliefs and values into themes for each case study site (see Table 7.7). An analysis of the themes revealed commonalities across the three case studies. For all three libraries, the investigator found a commitment to the library; and expressly, the role of the library within the university was valued. Further, all three library leadership teams focused on developing a positive work ethos that included hiring and developing the best people and encouraging collaborative problem solving. Two of the libraries espoused a strong connection to the university mission; and, they intentionally elevated and emphasized the essential role of librarians working collaboratively with faculty on teaching, learning, and research. Also, two organizations espoused the importance of embracing change and fostering agility for creativity and innovation.
Table 7.7
Espoused Beliefs and Values: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Mission</td>
<td>University Mission</td>
<td>Hiring criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the new library</td>
<td>Role of the library within the university</td>
<td>Developing people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library work ethos</td>
<td>Library work ethos</td>
<td>Solving problems and issues in a collaborative manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of liaison librarians</td>
<td>Teaching role of librarians</td>
<td>Students and faculty as the top priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of resources</td>
<td>Embracing change</td>
<td>Agility for creativity and innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University’s commitment to the library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic underlying assumptions

The investigator distilled the compiled basic underlying assumptions into themes for each case study site (see Table 7.8). Further analysis revealed similar themes across the three cases studies. Common themes included collaboration; change and adaptability; high expectations and excellence; and recognition and humane treatment of people.

Table 7.8
Basic Underlying Assumptions: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>Work hard but have fun</td>
<td>Creativity and innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward thinking</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>High expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change ready</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Investment in the best people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humaneness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pride, enthusiasm, and excitement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership Embedding Mechanisms

Through the structured interviews, the investigator explored leadership embedding mechanism used by the three library Deans to influence the library organizational. The research
study results documented that the Deans actively thought about and intentionally incorporated the following mechanisms in substantial ways to transform the library organizational cultures:

- what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control on a regular basis;
- leadership reaction to critical incidents and organizational crisis;
- how leaders allocate resources;
- deliberate role modeling and coaching;
- how leaders allocate rewards and status; and,
- how leaders recruit, select, promote, retire, and excommunicate.

**What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control on a Regular Basis**

Each of the Deans regularly paid attention to five main areas (see Table 7.9). All three actively worked to develop his/her library organization and improve its health through hiring and development of the leadership team, librarians, and staff. Further, each Dean articulated strong, inspired vision, mission, or goals and vigorously pursued those unique ideas to elevate the role of the library within the university. At the same time, each Dean regularly paid attention to the external library environment to ensure the visibility and impact of the library within the university.

**Table 7.9**

**Areas Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy organizational culture</td>
<td>Healthy organizational culture</td>
<td>Big projects such as the new library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring and development of a strong leadership team, library faculty, and staff</td>
<td>Library mission, growth, and stretch goals</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady library vision</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Development of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent service</td>
<td>University issues and politics</td>
<td>Emerging digital library and pedagogy trends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership Reactions to Critical Incidents and Organizational Crises

In each of the three cases, the Dean used a critical incident or event at the university as a catalyst to elevate the library and its vision, mission, programs, and services within the university. The critical events included planning and building a new, innovative library, faculty status for librarians, and increased library funding through additional tuition dollars. Even though the incidents or catalysts were different, each Dean successfully influenced the library organizational culture in positive ways through constructive and productive responses to the events.

How Leaders Allocate Resources

For the two larger universities, the Deans allocated resources in a collaborative manner at the library leadership level; however, the Dean of the smaller, private university library managed the budget centrally and with more personal control (see Table 7.10). For all three cases, the Deans stressed the importance of flexibility to fund unanticipated but essential library initiatives. Further, the study results indicated that, in all three cases, the resources followed priorities such as creative initiatives, competitive salaries, protecting the collections, and adding library value and visibility to the community.

Table 7.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources follow priorities and intentions</td>
<td>Budget is managed centrally by the Dean</td>
<td>Stop doing some things so resources may be shifted to new initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making by the Leadership Team using</td>
<td>Staff are encouraged to request funds for creative initiatives</td>
<td>Free capital to seize opportunities quickly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliberate Role Modeling and Coaching

The Dean for each of the cases valued and effectively used a number of role modeling and coaching techniques to build a positive and healthy organizational culture (see Table 7.11). All three demonstrated common practices such as appreciation and recognition of others; openness to the opinions of others; transparency, accessibility, and sharing information; and being positive, considerate, and supportive of leadership team members. Further, two of the Deans signified the importance of being decisive and addressing problems that need to attention. Also, each Dean mentioned one of the following: acting out the desired culture, displaying camaraderie and collegiality with students and faculty; and working hard but having fun.

Table 7.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliberate Role Modeling and Coaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act out the culture we want to have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address problems that need to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach the leadership team on the side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the vision and welcome ideas, feedback, and discussion from all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet regularly to share information and coach others on changes, processes, and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use best practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How Leaders Allocate Rewards and Status**

The investigator determined that each of the Deans intentionally developed a culture of recognition within their respective organizations. In addition to salary increases, they employed various approaches to allocate rewards and status. Some of these included: opportunities to travel and contribute locally, regionally, and nationally; assignments to high-profile initiatives and committees; external nominations and public credit for awards; public recognition for special accomplishments, publications, and presentations; personal and public acknowledgement by the Dean; professional development opportunities; new position titles that indicate elevated status; additional responsibilities for potential leaders; and, appreciation for people who typically don’t get recognized. Further, the Deans stressed the importance of fairness and specified that rewards should be given based on distinction in performance.

**How Leaders Recruit, Select, Promote, Retire, and Excommunicate**

The investigator determined that all three Deans actively used recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and removal of individuals to develop and sustain healthy, positive, and productive organizational cultures.

**Recruit.** Each Dean devoted substantial time to recruitment to ensure that the organization found the best people with the right abilities for the organization. Specifically, the Deans recruited newer graduates from library and information science programs with specific
aptitudes; provided opportunities for internships and fellowships to new graduates; and attempted to retain fellows in permanent positions. One Dean, when necessary, reached out to find and recruit the right person with the appropriate abilities for positions. Another Dean noted the importance of making sure search committee members were positive, engaged, and welcoming to potential employees.

Select. All three Deans actively participated in the interview and selection process for all library faculty and professional positions. Further, the Deans emphasized hiring for emotional intelligence, flexibility, adaptability, and excitement for the work rather than a specific skillset.

Promote. All three libraries used their specific peer review guidelines for the promotion and renewal of library faculty. Further, the Deans articulated the importance of promoting for excellence and leadership potential.

Retire. Two of the Deans used their respective retirement programs to help individuals retire and therefore eliminated or reduced the impact of problem employees on the library organization. At one library, individuals supported the new vision for the library but chose to retire or leave the organization to enable the accomplishment of the vision.

Excommunicate. Each Dean underscored the importance of dealing with problem employees upfront even if it was a long and arduous process. Further, they treated individuals with respect and provided support. Proactively, the Deans addressed employee issues especially if the individual caused significant negativity within the organizational culture. In all cases, the Deans took responsibility for providing feedback, counseling individuals, and articulating vital, healthy norms for the culture. As a result, some employees separated themselves from the organization. In other situations, the Deans made difficult decisions based on performance to remove the employees from the organization.
Culture Change Mechanisms

The Deans recognized that culture change takes time; however, they were persistent over a period of years and changed their respective libraries into positive, productive, and healthy cultures. Specifically, they recognized the fundamental responsibility, as Dean, to actively influence, alter, and improve the library culture. Without awareness of the culture change mechanism framework, the Deans incorporated mechanisms from all three stages, founding and early growth, midlife, and maturity and decline to accomplish the transformations.

Founding and Early Growth

**Incremental Change through General and Specific Evolution.** In all three cases, the Dean was in his/her position for ten or more years. During their tenure, the Deans used incremental change through natural turnover, retirements, new leaders, and implementation of improved organizational work principles and decision making methods to alter the library cultures. Specifically, all three Deans elevated the role of librarians from service to more dynamic work with faculty on teaching, learning, and research.

**Insight.** Each Dean brought a strong, inspired vision for how the library could add value, improve its reputation, and become vital to the university. Working collaboratively with the organization to embrace the vision, the Deans influenced the cultures, established new values, and modified basic underlying assumptions. Along with their new leadership teams, the Deans articulated and implemented new priorities, service models, and programs that contributed to the accomplishment of the visions.

**Promotion of Hybrids within the Culture.** Soon after arrival on campus, each Dean promoted individuals into leadership positions who were smart; understood the vision; supported the new direction for the library; demonstrated positive work behaviors; and were respected by
the staff. This promotion of credible insiders from within the organization assisted in constructive ways with the transformation of the library culture.

**Midlife**

**Systematic Promotion from Selected Subcultures.** All three libraries used systematic promotion from selected subcultures within the library. In all cases, the roles of librarians were heightened; specifically, they were assigned to creative roles and innovative initiatives. Librarians assumed responsibility for full engagement with faculty in the academic, teaching, and research missions of the university. As librarians were removed from service points to focus on their new roles, the libraries elevated paraprofessional staff to run the day-to-day operations of the library. Consequently, the libraries assigned higher level responsibilities to student employees.

**Technological Seduction.** All three Deans used technological seduction to some degree to change the organizational culture of their library; and, they each liked, embraced, and supported new technologies. Specific examples included the libraries taking the lead within the university on technology initiatives and innovation; investing in new technologies such as discovery systems; building digital technology skills; advancing digital publishing; and building digital libraries.

**Infusion of Outsiders.** In all three cases, the Dean used the infusion of outsiders to change the library organizational culture. Specifically, the Deans hired outsiders for leadership positions; employed people with new ideas, emotional intelligence, talent, teamwork, and service orientation; and recruited librarians for different and exciting positions.

**Maturity and Decline**
Scandal and Explosion of Myths. From the data analysis, the investigator determined that none of the libraries experienced a scandal and the resulting explosion of myths.

Turnarounds. According to Schein (2010)

Turnaround as a mechanism of cultural change is actually a combination of many of the preceding mechanisms, fashioned into a single program by a strong leader or team of change agents. In turnaround situations, the replacement of key people with internal hybrids and/or outsiders combined with major changes in technology become central elements of the change process . . . (p. 293)

All three Deans completed a turnaround of the library culture using mechanisms primarily from founding and early growth and midlife. Even after the turnarounds, the Deans continued to use these methods to influence, develop, and maintain the transformed cultures.

Mergers and Acquisitions. From the data analysis, the investigator determined that none of the libraries were involved in a merger or acquisition such as taking charge of information technology during the Dean’s tenure.

Destruction and Rebirth. One of the case study libraries experienced a destruction and rebirth through a directive from the Provost for the new Dean to rebuild the library organizational culture.

Extent to which Library Deans use Creative and Innovative Initiatives to Encourage Adaptability within Organizational Cultures

All three case study sites provided evidence of creative and innovation initiatives. Two of the three sites confirmed that the initiatives stimulated adaptability within the organizational culture. For example, one leadership team noted that the initiatives encouraged constant learning and pushed individuals to think differently about ways of working. For another case, the leadership team reflected that organizational values, including the conscious ability to handle
ambiguity, inspired new ideas, as much as creative and innovation initiatives encouraged adaptability.

Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) Results

The investigator compiled a cross-case comparison of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) results (see Figure 7.12). For each case, she categorized the culture types overall along with the different culture dimensions including dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, management of employees, organizational glue, strategic emphasis, and criteria of success. Further, she determined the prevalent culture types, strength, congruence, and gaps or discrepancies for each of the cases.

Table 7.12

OCAI Results: Cross-Case Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Characteristics</td>
<td>Predominantly adhocracy</td>
<td>Predominantly clan</td>
<td>Predominantly adhocracy moderated by market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>Negligible preference for more hierarchy</td>
<td>Small desire for less clan and more adhocracy</td>
<td>Negligible preference for less hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>Balance between clan and adhocracy</td>
<td>Balance between clan and adhocracy</td>
<td>Predominantly adhocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>Small desire for more hierarchy and less clan</td>
<td>Small desire for more hierarchy and less clan</td>
<td>Negligible preference for more adhocracy and less market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Employees</td>
<td>Predominantly clan</td>
<td>Strong clan moderated by adhocracy and hierarchy</td>
<td>Strong adhocracy moderated by market and clan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>None; miniscule gap between “now” and “preferred”</td>
<td>Moderate desire for less hierarchy and more adhocracy and clan</td>
<td>Small desire for more clan and less hierarchy and market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Glue</td>
<td>Predominantly adhocracy</td>
<td>Predominantly clan</td>
<td>Predominantly adhocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>None; miniscule gap between “now” and “preferred”</td>
<td>Moderate desire to reduce clan and add</td>
<td>Small desire for more clan and less market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more hierarchy and market</td>
<td>Predominantly clan</td>
<td>Predominantly adhocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Emphasis</strong></td>
<td>Balance between clan and adhocracy</td>
<td>Predominantly clan</td>
<td>Predominantly adhocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>Negligible preference for more hierarchy and less clan</td>
<td>Moderate desire for more adhocracy and less hierarchy and clan</td>
<td>Negligible preference for more clan and less market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria of Success</strong></td>
<td>Balance between clan and adhocracy</td>
<td>Strong clan moderated by adhocracy and hierarchy</td>
<td>Predominantly adhocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>Negligible preference for more hierarchy</td>
<td>Small desire for less clan and more adhocracy and hierarchy</td>
<td>Negligible preference for more clan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Culture</strong></td>
<td>Balance between clan and adhocracy</td>
<td>Strong clan moderated by adhocracy and to a lesser extent hierarchy and market</td>
<td>Predominantly adhocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>None; miniscule gap between “now” and “preferred”</td>
<td>Negligible preference for less clan and more adhocracy</td>
<td>Negligible preference for more clan and less market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dominant Characteristics**

The dominant culture characteristics for Cases A and C were predominantly adhocracy meaning the “organization is a dynamic and entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.” The results indicated that the dominant characteristics for Case B were predominantly clan and therefore “the organization is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 30). For all three cases, the results indicated a negligible or small desire for changes in the dominant characteristics indicating general satisfaction with this aspect of the organizational culture.

**Organizational Leadership**

The OCAI results revealed adhocracy leadership aspects in all three cases. For Cases A and B, the investigator found the organizational leadership reflected a balance between clan (facilitator, mentor, team builder) and adhocracy (innovator, entrepreneur, visionary) types.
Results indicated that the organizational leadership for Case C was predominantly adhocracy meaning that “leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify entrepreneurship, innovation, or risk taking” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 30). For all three cases, the results showed a negligible or small desire for changes to the organizational leadership style reflecting general satisfaction with this aspect of the culture.

Management of Employees

The OCAI results revealed clan management aspects in all three library cultures; and, the leadership for Case A used predominately clan styles. Case B results showed a strong clan management style moderated by adhocracy and hierarchy; and, Case C exhibited a strong adhocracy style moderated by clan and market aspects. The clan style according to Cameron and Quinn (2011), “. . . is characterized by teamwork, consensus and participation” while the adhocracy “management style is characterized by individual risk taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness” (p. 31). The investigator found that Cases B and C showed a preference for small and moderate changes to the management style of the respective organizations. The leadership team for Case B desired less hierarchy and for Case C additional clan management aspects. The leadership team indicated a preference for no change in the management style of Case C which reflected notable satisfaction with the management style of the organizational culture.

Organizational Glue

The OCAI organizational glue results for Cases A and C revealed predominantly adhocracy features meaning that “the glue that holds the organization together is a commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being on the cutting edge.” For Case B, the results revealed predominately clan organizational glue traits or “the glue that holds the
organization together is loyalty and mutual trust. Commitment to this organization runs high” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 31). Results for Case A revealed that the leadership team expressed no preference for changes in the organizational glue aspects of the library which indicated a notable satisfaction with this portion of the culture. For Case B, the leadership team preferred a moderate reduction in clan features and wished to add more hierarchy and market aspects. For Case C, the team expressed a small desire for more clan and less market traits for the organizational glue.

**Strategic Emphasis**

The strategic emphasis results for Case A reflected a balance between clan and adhocracy. The results for Case B showed the importance of clan or human development, high trust, openness, and participation in the culture; however, the analysis revealed a moderate desire for more adhocracy as a strategic emphasis. Further, the results for Case C indicated a predominantly adhocracy emphasis meaning “the organization emphasizes acquiring new resources and creating new challenges. Trying new things and prospecting for opportunities are valued” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 32). The results for Cases A and C demonstrated a negligible preference by the leadership team for changes in the strategic emphasis of the culture. Further, the Case B results reflected a preference for moderate changes including more adhocracy and less clan and hierarchy emphasis.

**Criteria of Success**

For all three cases, the OCAI results for the criteria of success revealed some level of adhocracy. For adhocracy criteria, “the organization defines success on the basis of having unique or the new products. It is a product leader and innovator” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 32). Case C used predominately adhocracy criteria; and Case A reflected a balance between
adhocracy and clan measures. Case B showed strong clan criteria moderated by adhocracy and hierarchy. For a clan culture, “the organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people” (Cameron and Quinn, 2011, p. 32). The results for all three cases indicated a negligible or small preference for a change in the criteria of success for the library culture.

**Overall Culture**

The overall culture for all three cases reflected aspects of an adhocracy or creative culture with different levels of strength. Case C was predominantly adhocracy; and Case A results indicated a balance between adhocracy and clan. Case B exhibited a strong clan culture moderated by adhocracy and to a lesser extent hierarchy and market culture types. Results from all three cases reflected satisfaction by the library leadership with the overall culture type.

**Prevalent culture types**

Through the analysis of the OCAI results, the investigator discovered that adhocracy and clan were the two primary culture types found in the three case study site libraries. Therefore, the results revealed evidence of and a desire to have creativity and collaboration at some level in all three organizational cultures. According to Cameron and Quinn (2011), respondents to the OCAI usually rated adhocracy scores the lowest and specifically noted “fewer firms are dominated by the adhocracy culture than are dominated by each of the other three culture types” (p. 92). Market and hierarchy culture aspects were found in all three libraries but to a much lesser extent than adhocracy and clan. Case C exhibited more market aspects than the other two case study sites.
The investigator determined that the three case study sites are in the minority of organizations that reflect substantial adhocracy and clan dimensions of organizational culture. From their analysis of more than one thousand organizations, Cameron and Quinn (2011) shared:

Over time, companies tend to gravitate toward an emphasis on the hierarchy and market culture types. Once their culture profiles become dominated by those lower two quadrants, it seems to be difficult for them to develop cultures characterized by the upper two quadrants. It’s almost as if gravity takes over. The lower quadrants have a tendency to remain dominant the longest. It takes a great deal of effort and leadership to make the change to a clan or adhocracy culture. (p. 92)

Despite the difficulty described by Cameron and Quinn, the investigator determined that the leaders of the three libraries were able to successfully develop adhocracy and clan cultures to address the desire for creativity and collaboration, to accomplish the respective visions for the libraries, and to transform the library cultures.

**Strength**

The investigator determined the strength of each culture by calculating number of points allocated by the leadership team to a specific dimension or culture type. Cameron and Quinn shared:

The higher the score, the stronger or more dominant that particular culture is rated to be. Research has revealed that strong cultures are associated with homogeneity of effort, clear focus, and higher performance in environments where unity and common vision are required. (p. 83)

In all three cases, the OCAI results reflected dominant culture dimensions and types. Indicative of the strongest culture, Case C results revealed predominantly adhocracy or creative culture across the culture aspects. Reflective of the second strongest culture, Case B results showed strong clan culture aspects. Suggestive of a balance of culture strengths, Case A results scored predominantly clan in two aspects and predominantly adhocracy in another with an
overall culture balance between clan and adhocracy. Even with differing levels of dominance, the leaders cultivated strong cultures, aligned the leadership team with those cultures, and encouraged high performance and success.

**Congruence**

Cameron and Quinn (2011) explained:

> cultural congruence means that the various aspects of an organization’s culture are aligned. That is, the same culture types are emphasized in various parts of the organization. For example, in a congruent culture, the strategy, leadership style, reward system, approach to managing employees, and dominant characteristics all tend to emphasize the same set of cultural values. . . . Our research has found that congruent cultures, although not a prerequisite for success, are more typical of high-performing organizations than incongruent cultures are. (pp. 84-85)

From the OCAI results for Case C, the investigator determined that the library demonstrated the most congruent culture with predominantly adhocracy results for dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, organizational glue, strategic emphasis, and criteria of results. Also, the management of employees aspect reflected a strong adhocracy style.

Also reflective of a congruent culture, Case B scores across the culture dimensions reflected predominant or strong clan for all aspects except organizational leadership which was a balance of clan and adhocracy. Indicative of a slightly less congruent culture, the results for Case A demonstrated a predominant adhocracy culture in dominant characteristics and organizational glue; a predominant clan culture in management of employees; and a balance of clan and adhocracy for organizational leadership, strategic emphasis, and criteria of success. The investigator determined that the congruent nature of the organizational cultures for all three case study sites contributed to high performance of the libraries.
Gap or discrepancy analysis

Cameron and Quinn (2011) noted the importance of paying attention to the difference in the “now” and “preferred” scores for the OCAI results. Reflective of their work with numerous organizations, they explained that “differences . . . between five and ten points usually indicate the need for a substantial culture change” (p. 82-83). For all three cases, the overall culture scores showed a miniscule or negligible difference between the “now” and “preferred” cultures indicating leadership satisfaction with the three cultures at the time of the site visits. Indicative of the smallest desire for culture change, the Case A results revealed negligible or no preference for change for all culture aspects except one. Specifically, the results for organizational leadership showed a small desire for more hierarchy and less clan focus.

Reflective of the leadership team’s preference for little change in the culture dimensions, Case C results revealed a negligible preference for change in the dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, strategic emphasis, and criteria of success. The “preferred” scores showed a small desire for more clan aspects in the management of employees and organizational glue.

The Case B results reflected the largest desire for change across all six dimensions and specifically revealed a desire for less clan orientation in the dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, organizational glue, strategic emphasis, and criteria of success.

Conclusion

The research study involved three case study sites, two large public research universities and one small private university. The investigator used narrative inquiry to probe specific critical incidents identified by the participants for each case study site. Even though the incidents or catalysts were different, each Dean successfully influenced the library organizational
culture in positive ways through constructive and productive responses to the events. Further, using structured interviews, the investigator explored types and levels of culture, leadership embedding mechanisms, culture mechanisms, and creative and innovation initiatives to determine organizational adaptability and leadership ability to influence and transform library organizational cultures.

Also, the investigator compiled a cross-case comparison of the Organizational Culture Assessment (OCAI) results. For each case, she categorized the culture types overall along with the different culture dimensions including dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, management of employees, organizational glue, strategic emphasis, and criteria of success. Further, she determined and compared the prevalent culture types, strength, congruence, and gaps or discrepancies for each of the cases.

The investigator discovered that adhocracy and clan were the two primary culture types found in all three libraries. Further, the investigator determined that the cases are in the minority of organizations that reflect substantial adhocracy and clan dimensions of organizational culture. Despite the leadership and effort required to successfully develop adhocracy and clan cultures that encourage creativity and collaboration, all three Deans were able to do so. Also, the Deans cultivated strong cultures, aligned the leadership team with those cultures, and encouraged high performance and success. Further, investigator determined that the congruent nature of three case cultures contributed to the high performance of the libraries.

The study results documented that all three Deans actively thought about and intentionally incorporated the six leadership embedding mechanisms in substantial ways to transform the library organizational cultures. Further, the Deans recognized that culture change takes time; however, they were persistent over a period of years and changed their respective
libraries into positive, productive and healthy organization cultures. Specifically, they recognized their fundamental responsibility, as Dean, to actively influence, alter, and improve the library culture. Without awareness of the culture change framework, the Deans incorporated mechanisms from all three stages, founding and early growth, midlife, and maturity and decline to accomplish the turnaround and transformation of the cultures. Even after the turnarounds, the Deans continued to use these methods to influence, develop, and maintain the transformed cultures.
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Chapter Eight

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

While experiencing and responding to changing external and internal forces, managerial leaders may struggle to adapt and transform libraries. This study examined the key relationships and symbiotic elements that contribute to a library transformation (namely, leadership influence, macro-cultures, institutional or organizational cultures, and adaptability through creativity and innovation). An understanding of these interdependent elements may allow managerial leaders to cultivate sustainable and relevant libraries for the future. Further, university library directors may seek to influence organizational cultures to transform libraries; for that reason, this study examined how they engage with and shape organizational cultures within the context of existing cultures. Also, the investigator explored the types and levels of cultures present in the library and how a leader influences organization cultures using leadership embedding and culture change mechanisms.

Conclusions

Using narrative inquiry, the investigator explored the research questions through structured interview questions about critical incidents, leadership embedding mechanisms, and adaptability through creative and innovative initiatives. Referring to the literature on qualitative research, the investigator determined that generalizations to other libraries, typical of quantitative research studies, should not be made from the case study results. According to Klenke (2008), “the ability to generalize deals with knowing whether the findings derived from a case study are generalizable beyond the immediate case study in which the data were collected” (p. 70). However, Klenke (2008) established that “case study researchers . . . attempt to generalize a particular set of results to some broader theory thereby establishing analytic generalization” (p. 70). Therefore, managerial leaders in the library profession may be able use the study results in

**Research Objective: Types of Macro-Cultures and Institutional Cultures that Influence the Library**

This research identified types of macro-cultures or institutional cultures that influenced the academic libraries. The investigator concluded that the library organizational cultures for the three case study sites were influenced by macro-cultures and institutional or organizational cultures. Macro-cultures, occupations that exist globally, included the external library profession, higher education, and commercial business. All three libraries were impacted by institutional cultures, identified as organizational cultures, such as the state government, university, various schools and colleges within the university, and university departments.

Explicitly, each Dean understood their fundamental responsibility for shaping productive culture relationships within and external to the university. They built and sustained the critical library awareness and connections with other institutional cultures and macro-cultures to respond to critical incidents but also to add value to the university proactively. In all three cases, the investigator observed substantial alignment between the Provost and the Dean on library matters. Even more noteworthy, the Deans in two of the cases effectively managed and maintained these essential relationships throughout the tenure of more than one provost.

**Research Objective: Types of Cultures within the Library Organizations**

This research identified the types of cultures existing within each library. The investigator used two methods to identify the types of cultures that included content analysis of
the structured interview transcripts and analysis of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) results. Through analysis of the qualitative data compiled from the transcripts, the investigator concluded that each library had many library subcultures inclusive of occupations, operations, design, and executive types; and, the two larger institutions contained even more subcultures of the various types. Typical of many libraries, the cases also reflected multiple micro-cultures or taskforces, teams, and committees comprised of individuals from across organizational cultures and subcultures. The number of library subcultures and micro-cultures assembled through the study was substantial, but not all-inclusive, and required awareness of and attention to a wide variety of cultures. Especially, each Dean needed to comprehend the relationships, interactions, complexity, and impact of subcultures and micro-cultures to create, embed, and change the library’s overall organizational culture.

Using the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI), the investigator determined the overall culture types for the three cases. Further, the study results revealed cultural dimensions comprised of dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, management of employees, organizational glue, strategic emphasis, and criteria of success for each of the three cases. The overall culture types for all three cases reflected adhocracy or clan cultures with different levels of strength; and, adhocracy and clan cultures were the prevalent culture dimensions found in the libraries. Consequently, the investigator determined that all three Deans placed significant value on creativity and collaboration within their organization. Specifically, all three leaders valued innovative outputs, transformation, and agility; but, they also appreciated commitment, communication, and development of people. (Cameron & Quinn, p. 53). The investigator concluded that the combination of culture types and corresponding leadership styles within the libraries may have contributed to organizational success.
To have the ability to develop and sustain adhocracy and clan cultures along with some aspects of market and hierarchy cultures, the investigator concluded that the three library organizations embraced more than one leadership type. For example, Cameron and Quinn (2011) confirmed that

When the organization is dominated by the clan culture, the most effective leaders are parent figures, team builders, facilitators, nurturers, mentors, and supporters. Effective leaders in organizations dominated by the adhocracy culture tend to be entrepreneurial, visionary, innovative, creative, risk oriented, and focused on the future. (p. 52)

Further, Cameron and Quinn (2011) established a congruence hypothesis between culture and competencies. Specifically, they noted that “when the leadership strengths of an individual are congruent with the dominant organizational culture, those leaders tend to be more successful, as are the units they manage. Congruence predicts success” (p. 51). Therefore, the investigator concluded that the congruence of leadership strengths with the dominant cultures contributed to the success of the three libraries.

Based on data from Cameron and Quinn (1999, 2011), the investigator determined that the three case study sites were in the minority of organizations that reflect substantial adhocracy and clan dimensions of organizational culture. The small number of organizations with adhocracy and clan cultures may be caused by the considerable leadership effort required to create and maintain adhocracy and clan cultures. Especially noteworthy, the three Deans established a congruence between the desire for creative and collaborative cultures and the essential leadership styles and cultural dimensions to achieve those culture types.

Also, the leaders cultivated strong, dominant cultures linked to common vision, shared work, and focus which encouraged high performance. (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p. 83) Subsequently, each Dean successfully aligned the leadership team with the desired adhocracy
and clan culture dimensions; positively transformed the library’s organizational culture; achieved his/her respective vision; and stimulated high performance and achievement by his/her respective library. Also, the investigator concluded that leadership satisfaction with the overall culture type at the time of the site visit contributed to a successful and dynamic organizational culture for each library. Further, the alignment and satisfaction with culture types by the library leadership teams could be a causal factor to the effective collaboration, creativity, productivity, and success of all three library organizations.

Research Objective: Levels of Culture within the Library Organization

This research identified the levels of culture existing within the library organization, specifically, artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions. For all three levels of culture, the transcripts revealed substantial alignment between the Dean and Leadership Team members for each library. Further, the investigator discovered common themes in the levels of culture across all three cases. Schein (2010) acknowledged that “. . . culture change, in the sense of changing basic assumptions, is difficult, time-consuming, and highly anxiety-provoking—a point that is especially relevant for the leader who sets out to change the culture of an organization” (p. 33). Based on the study results, all three Deans accomplished a difficult and time-consuming culture transformation for their respective library. Over ten or more years, they successfully established new beliefs and values and worked with their leadership teams to cultivate strong, shared assumptions for the organization.

Artifacts. The investigator concluded that the physical environment of the library was an important artifact of the culture for each of the three case study sites. Clearly, physical space was important for the libraries; but, the emphasis of the space was on people and programs rather than collections. Specifically, the unique features of the new and renovated spaces along with a
variety of creative and innovative spaces reflected the student-centered and creative nature of the cultures.

Also, the investigator determined that language artifacts such as elevated and different position descriptions for librarians and paraprofessional staff and a new library faculty governing document demonstrated changes in the cultures, especially the espoused beliefs and values around the essential role of librarians in the academic enterprise. Other language artifacts from the case study libraries reflected library values such as excellent service and a focus on student and faculty success.

The investigator established that artifacts, recognized as products or key outcomes of the three libraries, reflected six themes representing values and beliefs of the organization cultures. These espoused beliefs and values included vision; investment in the libraries; the libraries at the “university table,” excellent service and programs for students and faculty; and national recognition and participation. Other artifacts, represented by the myths and stories of the libraries, confirmed the significant value placed on the library by all three universities. Further, the investigator concluded that artifacts from all three libraries reflected the basic underlying assumption of recognition in the organizational culture. However, she determined that artifacts of style and artistic creation were not as evident or easy to identify from the transcripts.

**Espoused Beliefs and Values.** From the analysis of the espoused beliefs and values themes from all three cases, the investigator confirmed commonalities. For example, all three universities demonstrated a commitment to the library and valued the role of the library within the institution. Based on the evidence, the investigator concluded that each Dean’s understanding of and focus on building relationships with external cultures contributed to the value and esteem of the library.
Also, the investigator determined that all three library leadership teams believed in and valued a positive work ethos that included hiring and developing the best people and encouraging collaborative problem solving. The investigator established that these espoused beliefs and values could be associated with the clan or collaborative aspects of the organizational culture including clan culture value drivers of “commitment, communication, and development” (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p. 53).

**Basic Underlying Assumptions.** The investigator established common basic underlying assumptions upheld by the library cultures. These assumptions included collaboration; change and adaptability; high expectations and excellence; and recognition and humane treatment of people. She determined that the basic underlying assumption of change and adaptability could be directly connected to the adhocracy aspects of the three cultures. Also, the collaboration and recognition and humane treatment of people reflected clan culture dimensions. Further, both the clan and adhocracy culture dimensions could contribute to the high expectations and excellence of the three libraries.

**Research Objectives: Leadership Embedding Mechanisms**

This research identified which leadership embedding mechanisms library directors employed, and how well and to what extent, the tools worked to influence, create, and adapt cultures within the library. According to Schein (2010) leadership embedding mechanisms are “. . . the major ‘tools’ that leaders have available to them to teach their organizations how to perceive, think, feel, and behave based on their own conscious and unconscious convictions” (p. 236). Noting the most powerful leadership embedding mechanisms, Schein (1983) emphasized deliberate role modeling, what leaders pay attention to, and how they react to critical incidents. (p. 22)
The investigator concluded that each Dean actively used all six leadership embedding mechanisms to influence and transform the library organizational culture. Also, all three Deans deliberately and consciously paid attention to, measured, and controlled certain aspects of the organization on a regular basis. Some of these areas included development of the organization, healthy cultures, vision, and the external library environment. Further, the Deans intentionally reacted to critical incidents using constructive and productive responses to successfully create and adapt the library culture in positive ways and achieve success.

The investigator determined that the Deans, both deliberately and instinctively, served as role models and coaches for the organizations; consequently, they used these influential embedding mechanisms to build positive and healthy organizational cultures. All three demonstrated common practices such as appreciation and recognition of others; openness to the opinions of others; transparency, accessibility, and sharing information; and being positive, considerate, and supportive of leadership team members. In addition to role modeling for and coaching the leadership team members, each Dean expected the leadership team members to be coaches and role models for others in the organization.

The investigator established that each Dean consciously allocated resources to accomplish the library vision, mission, and values. Specifically, each Dean stressed the importance of flexibility to fund unanticipated but essential library initiatives allowing for agility, flexibility, adaptability and creativity, all hallmarks of an adhocracy culture. Further, the investigator determined, in all three cases, that the resources followed priorities such as creative initiatives, competitive salaries, protecting the collections, and adding library value and visibility to the community. All three Deans intentionally established a culture of recognition and reward within their respective libraries. Finally, all three Deans purposefully used recruitment,
selection, promotion, retirement, and removal of individuals to develop and sustain healthy, positive, and productive organizational cultures.

Conclusively, each Dean used all six leadership embedding mechanisms to influence, adapt, transform, and create constructive and successful organizational cultures. The investigator established that each leadership team unmistakably observed, understood, and applied the same embedding mechanisms in their respective leadership roles in support of the overall organizational culture. Also noteworthy, the investigator determined that the alignment of the Dean and Leadership Team was crucial to the organization’s ability to embed, create, and transform the culture.

**Research Objective: Culture Change Mechanisms and Organizational Stage of Growth**

This research identified the developmental stage of the organizational culture and the extent to which library leadership employed certain culture change mechanisms which correspond to the organization’s stage of growth: founding and early growth, midlife, and maturity and decline. Just one library specifically experienced a destruction and rebirth when the Provost directed the new Dean to rebuild the library culture; however, the investigator found no evidence of scandal and explosion of myths or mergers and acquisitions for any of the three cases. Remarkably, the investigator determined that each Dean used all of the other culture change mechanisms from each stage of organizational growth. At the time of each site visit, the investigator determined that each library exhibited a mature culture and had completed a turnaround. Explicitly, the investigator concluded that each turnaround reflected a combination of mechanisms from all three stages—and that the Dean coordinated this singular effort working with an effective leadership team considering that “...the replacement of key people with internal hybrids and/or outsiders combined with major changes in technology become central
elements of the change process . . .” (Schein, 2010, p. 293). Even though each library reflected a mature organizational culture, the investigator concluded that the Dean and the Leadership Team continued to implement change mechanisms from founding and early growth and midlife to sustain the positive and productive cultures.

Research Objective: Which, and How Well Do, Culture Change Mechanism Work for Directors (Deans) to Influence Organizational Cultures

This research objective concentrated on which, and how well do, culture change mechanisms work for Directors to influence organizational cultures. Convincingly, the Deans recognized that culture change takes time; however, they were persistent over a period of years, used incremental change through general and specific evolution, along with other culture change mechanisms and changed their respective library cultures into positive, productive, and healthy organizations. Bringing strong vision and insight into the organizations, they recognized their fundamental responsibility, as Dean, to actively influence, alter, and improve the library culture. Especially noteworthy, the investigator found that each Dean completed organizational turnarounds which incorporated change mechanisms from all three stages, founding and early growth, midlife, and maturity and decline without any awareness of the culture change mechanism framework.

Directly connected to the leadership embedding mechanism involving the recruitment, selection, promotion, and removal of individuals from the organizations, each Dean balanced the elevation of credible individuals from within the organization, promotion of individuals from selected subcultures, and infusion of outsiders into the organization. Along with using these explicit methods to build and develop the human resources of the organization, each Dean specifically hired for emotional intelligence, flexibility, adaptability, and excitement for the work...
rather than a specific skillset. Further, each Dean chose to intentionally handle tough employee issues when an individual could not contribute to a positive and healthy organizational culture. To build a healthy and positive culture, each Dean understood the importance of having constructive behavior and emotional intelligence in the organization. Golman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2001) confirmed this importance and emphasized “high levels of emotional intelligence . . . create climates in which information sharing, trust, healthy risk-taking, and learning flourish” (p.44).

**Research Objective: Creative and Innovative Initiatives to Encourage Adaptability**

This research identified the extent to which directors used creative and innovative initiatives to encourage adaptability within organizational cultures. The investigator found evidence of creative and innovative initiatives in all three cases. Further, she documented in two of the cases that the leadership team believed that these initiatives encouraged adaptability of the organization. However, one leadership team described that organizational values, including the conscious ability to handle ambiguity and inspire new ideas, as much as creative and innovative initiatives encouraged adaptability. The investigator concluded that the relationship between adaptability and creative and innovative initiatives may be more symbiotic and require a greater understanding of the interactions among adaptability, organizational culture types and levels, and leadership styles and influence. Through analysis of the research results, the investigator confirmed the need to comprehend adaptability in the context of the various external and internal culture types and relationships. Underscoring the need for external and internal cultural awareness along with adaptability, Heifetz and Laurie (2001) emphasized the crucial role a leader must play to motivate and support individuals throughout an organization to adapt to external and internal challenges and “to clarify their values, develop new strategies, and learn
new ways of operating” to thrive. (p. 132) More specifically, the investigator determined that understanding the Competing Values Framework (CVF) culture and leader types, specifically adhocracy and clan, may provide a greater comprehension of the relationship between collaboration, creativity, and adaptability.

**Implications of the Study**

**Organizational culture and leadership**

The research study confirmed a fundamental connection between leadership and organizational cultures that may allow leaders to create, embed, manage, and transform library cultures. Schein (2010) established that “these dynamic processes of culture creation and management are the essence of leadership and make you realize that leadership and culture are two sides of the same coin” (p. 3).

The investigator recognized that leaders may influence culture using leadership embedding and culture change mechanisms either intentionally or by instinct. Library leaders may benefit from awareness of these specific mechanisms that could result in the powerful ability to change cultures in constructive ways. Consequently, a capacity for positive culture transformation may allow libraries to adapt and thrive in the context of external and internal forces and cultures. Further, a greater understanding of culture change mechanisms which correspond with the lifecycle of an organizational culture could provide leaders with methods to continuously renew and invigorate the library’s human resources, programs, and services which may contribute to the overall performance and success of the library.

Also, the OCAI study results confirmed the link between leader types and corresponding organizational culture types of clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy. Better knowledge of the leader types that encourage the desired organizational cultures may allow leaders to deliberately
develop leadership teams and build successful library organizations. Further, the study results confirmed that when leadership strengths are congruent with the dominant culture types then the library may be more effective in accomplishing a desired vision.

**Leadership responsibility for the culture**

In each of the three cases, the Dean embraced personal responsibility for and influenced the culture in the context of external and internal cultural forces. Specifically, each Dean focused on building relationships with external cultures which contributed to the value and esteem of the library. Further, the Deans were accountable for positive and healthy internal organizational cultures. In an issue brief on *Library Leadership for the Digital Age*, Deanna Marcum (2016) highlighted that it is essential for libraries to recruit leaders who are the right “fit” for the culture and specifically noted that leaders should be willing to take charge and build cultures that are collaborative and innovative:

> Organizational cultures that promote innovation and collaboration, minimize functional silos, and focus on the customer are more likely to thrive in a digital world. Libraries are compelled to find and empower leaders who can advance digital objectives, given the pace, values, intensity, structure, decision-making process and role of digital in our libraries. Effective leaders are willing to jolt an entrenched culture when necessary. The jolt should be inspirational rather than threatening . . . (p. 7)

For libraries to be successful and thrive, managerial leaders may need to accept greater responsibility for the culture. Libraries may need to recruit, select, promote, and develop leaders who understand and have a desire and capacity to influence organizational cultures to be more collaborative and innovative. Further, library organizations and the profession more broadly, may benefit from an increased number of effective leaders who comprehend the complexity of organizational cultures and intentionally strive to influence cultures in constructive ways to build high performance and change ready libraries. Consequently, leadership development institutes
and LIS programs could augment their curricula to enhance knowledge of organizational cultures, effective leadership types, leadership influence, and the ability to transform organizational cultures.

**Leadership engagement with the culture**

The study results demonstrated that it is possible for library leaders to influence organizational cultures in positive and constructive ways to create productive libraries. The investigator clearly documented that, in each of the three cases, the Dean dynamically engaged with the organizational cultures. Further, they purposefully or in some cases instinctively used techniques or mechanisms to influence library cultures. The study results could inform current and potential leaders of the attendant benefits of engagement with organizational cultures. With knowledge of the ability to influence cultures, library leaders may benefit from a broader awareness of leadership embedding and culture change mechanisms as explicit and productive library leadership tools. Consequently, leaders may be able to learn from and adopt best practices such as paying attention to vital aspects of the culture; addressing problems, such as employee issues, that negatively impact the cultures; modeling and expecting other leaders to be strong, positive role models and coaches; deliberate and focused hiring for emotional intelligence and behaviors; allocating resources to allow for flexibility, agility, adaptability, and creativity; and cultivating intentional cultures of recognition, transparency, communication, and collaboration. Further, these best practices could inform and improve leadership development programs and LIS courses on management and leadership.

**Well-led libraries will have the advantage**

If libraries are going to thrive in the future, the profession will need to develop managerial leaders with the skills and abilities to develop, encourage, and maintain organizations...
that grow and flourish in unforeseen circumstances. Further, well-led libraries will have the advantage of agility and adaptability in response to internal and external forces. The New Media Consortium *Horizon Report Library Edition* (2017) documented the difficult challenge for libraries to adapt library organization design to future workplaces. Specifically, the report explained that

> There is increasing attention to the organizational structure of academic and research libraries to better align them with the agile and 21st century practices of the future workplace. Technology, shifting information demands, and the evolving roles of librarians are forcing them to rethink the traditional functional hierarchy. Libraries must adopt more flexible, team-based matrix-like structures to remain innovative and responsive to campus and patron needs. (p. 28)

To adapt and change library organizational structures to be successful in the future, library leaders will need the ability and willingness to understand and influence organizational cultures. Further, as documented by the *Horizon Report* (2017) libraries will need to be collaborative and team oriented but also innovative and agile. Practical application of the results of this research study, including best practices, may allow library leaders to transform libraries for the future and demonstrate value and a return on investment for university or overall institution. Specifically, leaders could benefit from, not only the knowledge and ability to influence organizational cultures, but also an understanding of the clan (collaborative) and adhocracy (creative) cultures with the associated leadership types. The results of this research study could inform hiring, promotion, and development of library leaders to ensure that the future leaders of academic libraries have the capacity to influence organization cultures constructively and transform libraries effectively.

**Library transformation essentials**

Through analysis of the research study results, the investigator determined all three Deans understood that interactions among macro-cultures, institutional or organizational
cultures, subcultures, and micro-cultures were key to the successful accomplishment of the library mission, vision, and strategic goals. Also, they recognized and developed the levels of cultures within the library; and they actively used leadership embedding mechanisms and culture change mechanisms to influence the library organization in positive ways. Further, the research results revealed that adaptable and flexible cultures may support creative and innovative initiatives as much as the initiatives encourage adaptability within an organization. Ultimately, each leader dynamically applied leadership influence within the context of the various types and levels of culture, creative and innovative initiatives, and adaptability; and consequently, the Deans accomplished a transformation of the library’s organizational culture.

Figure 8.1 shows the intersection and overlapping relationships of the key elements used in this research study. Ultimately, the study results revealed that leadership influence was foundational, in addition to the interaction of all essential elements to accomplish the radical transformation a library. Library leaders could benefit from a greater understanding of the interaction among, and symbiotic relationship of, these essential library transformation elements. A better appreciation of the interdependent elements may allow leaders to influence and transform library organizational cultures and create agile, high performance libraries which add value to their institutions, the library profession, and higher education.

Figure 8.1
Library Transformation Essentials

Suggestions for Further Research

As noted in the problem statement for in Chapter 1, this research study filled a void in the LIS research literature about how leaders engage with and influence organizational cultures within the context of macro-cultures, institutional, or organizational cultures. Further the study examined types and levels of culture present in the library organizations and determined which leadership embedding and culture change mechanisms the leaders used, and how well, and to what extent, the methods worked to transform organizational cultures in academic libraries.

The research study used three case studies of libraries that received a national award for excellence in academic libraries. In each place, the Dean had a tenure of ten or more years. The same research objectives could be pursued with non-award winning libraries to see if similar results could be confirmed. Also, a study of leaders with shorter tenure could determine if length of time in a position contributed to or detracted from successful organizational culture
transformation. Further, after turnover in leadership for the case study libraries, it would be informative to return and reexamine the research questions in a longitudinal study to determine changes caused by new leadership. Does the new leader sustain or change the library organizational cultures? Do the predominant library culture types, clan and adhocracy, remain the same?

The research study focused only on leadership team responses to interview questions and the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument; therefore, research to explore the same objectives with lower level managers, librarians, and staff would provide additional perspectives on the organizational culture and the ability of leaders to influence organizational cultures.

The libraries in this research study reflected clan (collaborative) and adhocracy (creative and innovative) culture types and dimensions; and, all three libraries created healthy and productive organizational cultures that were extremely successful. As noted by Marcom (2016), libraries which are collaborative and innovative are more likely to flourish. The library profession could benefit from additional research to determine if clan and adhocracy cultures, along with the corresponding leader types, contribute to the positive transformation of an organizational culture. Does the balance of clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy cultures and leader types matter? If so, what is the appropriate balance of culture types required to create high performance organizations? Is there a connection between the Competing Values Framework (CVF) and the leadership embedding and culture change mechanisms that leaders employ to influence and transform organizational cultures? Do the CVF management traits correspond to the embedding and culture change mechanisms? Finally, the study included only three cases; and research to determine the prevalence and success of clan and adhocracy cultures...
in a larger number of academic libraries would be informative for library leaders focused on library transformation.

**Conclusion**

This study examined how university library directors engage with and shape organizational cultures within the context of existing cultures. Also, the investigator explored the types and levels of cultures present in the library and how a leader influences organizational cultures using leadership embedding and culture change mechanisms. Using narrative inquiry, the investigator explored the research questions through structured interview questions about critical incidents, leadership embedding mechanisms, and adaptability through creative and innovative initiatives.

The investigator concluded that the library organizational culture for all three case study sites was influenced by macro-cultures and institutional or organizational cultures. Explicitly, each Dean understood their fundamental responsibility for shaping productive culture relationships within and external to the university. They built and sustained the critical library awareness and connections with other macro-cultures and institutional cultures and to respond to critical incidents but also to add value to the university. Further, each Dean needed to comprehend the relationships, interactions, complexity, and impact of numerous subcultures and micro-cultures to create, embed, and change the library’s overall organizational culture. The study results indicated that in all three cases, the Dean accomplished a difficult and time-consuming culture transformation of the library. The Dean successfully established new beliefs and values and worked with their leadership teams to cultivate strong, shared assumptions for the organization.
Using the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI), the investigator determined that the overall culture types for the three cases reflected adhocracy or clan cultures. Further, the study results revealed adhocracy and clan as the prevalent culture dimensions for the libraries. Consequently, the investigator determined that all three Deans placed significant value on collaboration and creativity with the organization.

Through the structured interview questions, the investigator identified which leadership embedding mechanism the Deans employed, and how well, and to what extent, the tools worked to influence, create, and adapt cultures within the library. Conclusively, each Dean used all six leadership embedding mechanisms to influence, transform, and create constructive and productive organizational cultures. The investigator established that each leadership team unmistakably observed, understood, and applied the same embedding mechanisms in their respective leadership roles in support of the overall organizational culture.

The investigator determined that each Dean used a combination of culture change mechanism from all three stages of growth to accomplish a turnaround of the library organizational culture. Even though each library reflected a mature organization at the time of the site visit, the study results indicated that the Dean and the leadership team members continued to implement change mechanisms from founding and early growth along with midlife techniques to sustain the positive and productive culture of a high performance library.

As a key element of library transformation, the study results showed evidence of creative and innovative initiatives in all three cases. The investigator concluded that the relationship between adaptability and creative and innovative initiatives may be more symbiotic and require a greater understanding of the interactions among adaptability, organizational culture types and levels, and leadership styles and influence. More specifically, the investigator determined that
understanding the Competing Values Framework (CVF) culture and leader types, specifically adhocracy and clan, may provide a greater comprehension of the relationship between collaboration, creativity, and adaptability.

The research study confirmed a fundamental connection between leadership and organizational culture that may allow leaders to create, embed, manage, and transform library cultures. The investigator determined that leaders may influence culture using leadership embedding and culture change mechanisms either intentionally or by instinct. Library leaders and the library profession could benefit from broader awareness of these specific tools that may result in the powerful ability to change cultures in constructive ways and transform libraries. Further, enhanced knowledge of leader types that encourage a desired organizational culture type may allow leaders to intentionally develop leadership teams and build successful library organizations.

In each of the three cases, the Dean embraced personal responsibility for, and influenced, the culture in the context of external and internal forces. For libraries to be successful and thrive, managerial leaders may need to accept greater responsibility for the culture. Further, library organizations, and the profession more broadly, may benefit from an increased number of effective leaders who comprehend the complexity of organizational cultures and intentionally strive to influence cultures in constructive ways to build high performance and change ready libraries.

In each case, the Dean actively engaged with the organizational cultures; and, the study results demonstrated that it is possible for library leaders to influence organizational cultures in positive and constructive ways to create productive libraries. The study results could inform
current and potential leaders of the attendant benefits of deliberate engagement with organizational cultures.

Further, if libraries are going to thrive in the future, the profession will need to develop managerial leaders with the skills, abilities, and vision to develop, encourage, and maintain organizations that grow and flourish in unforeseen circumstances. To adapt and change libraries, library leaders may need to demonstrate the disposition and enthusiasm to comprehend and influence cultures. Further, well-led libraries, with cultural awareness, may have the distinctive advantage of agility and adaptability in response to internal and external forces.

The study results for this dissertation revealed that leadership influence was foundational, along with symbiotic interaction among the key transformation elements, to the radical transformation of a library. Library leaders could benefit from a greater understanding of the interaction among essential library transformation elements including leadership influence, macro-cultures, institutional or organizational cultures, subcultures, micro-cultures, creative and innovative initiatives, and adaptability. A better appreciation of the interdependent elements may allow leaders to influence and transform organizational cultures and create agile, high performance libraries which add value to their institutions, the library profession, and higher education.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A

LETTER OF INTEREST

Dear ARL Director,

I am writing to determine the interest for your institution to participate in a dissertation study: *Leadership Influence to Transform Organizational Cultures*. The dissertation is for my PhD program in Managerial Leadership in the Information Profession at Simmons College.

Although there are no direct benefits to you and your organization, a greater appreciation of the interdependent relationships among institutional and organizational culture(s), leadership influence, and adaptability may allow libraries more quickly to adapt and produce thriving organizations. Knowledge of successful practices, mechanisms, and roles for leaders to employ to create and evolve cultures could add value to the institution and overall library profession.

Your organization has been chosen as a possible participant because your institution holds membership in the Association of Research Libraries and your library received the Excellence in Academic Libraries Award given by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL).

I realize your time is valuable – your organization’s commitment to the research study would involve:

- Providing copies of your ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award application, strategic plan, and annual report for document analysis by the researcher
- Completion of semi-structured interviews by the investigator with Director (1-2 hours in length), University level position (Provost, Provost designate, 45 minutes-1 hour), University faculty leader (Chair of the Library Committee, 45 minutes-1 hour) and library senior leadership team using narrative inquiry to probe critical incidents (2 hours)
- Completion of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) by your library’s senior leadership team

If you are willing to participate, please respond to this e-mail and I will follow up with the next step.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me or my dissertation advisor, Michele Cloonan, Dean Emerita & Professor, Graduate School of Library & Information Science, Simmons College, michele.cloonan@simmons.edu, (1-617-521-2806).

All my best,

Kitty McNeill
Associate Dean and College Librarian
Oxford College of Emory University
libkmn@emory.edu (1-770-784-8403)
Appendix B

Interview Protocol

Pre-Interview

- Obtain signed “Written Consent to Participate in Research” (Appendix H)
- Schedule site visits and arrange interview schedules
- Obtain documents and complete content analysis to determine “critical incidents”
- Distribute structured interview questions and OCAI surveys in advance of the interviews

Interview Outline

- Thank individuals for participation
- Document name and position of individuals participating in the structured interview
- Explain purpose of the study
- Confirm confidentiality
- Confirm duration of the interview
- Confirm that the investigator will digitally record the interview, take notes, and transcribe following the interview
- *Ask structured interview questions (Appendix C, D or E)*
- Thank individuals for their participation
- Let participants know they will be sent a draft of the interview transcript for their review with the opportunity to make changes for accuracy and to ensure confidentiality
Appendix C

Director Structured Interview Questions

A critical incident could be a major event, experience, or turning point. A critical incident or crisis is defined by Edgar Schein (2010): What is defined as a crisis is, of course, partly a matter of perception. There may or may not be actual dangers in the external environment, and what is considered to be dangerous is itself often a reflection of the culture…. a crisis is what is perceived to be a crisis and what is defined as a crisis by founders and leaders.

What is a critical incident (major event, experience, turning point) at the institutional level that has impacted the library and its organizational cultures during your tenure?

- Could you describe the incident? When did it happen? Who were the key players?
- Which institutional cultures were impacted?
- How did the different institutional cultures respond to the critical incident and to what extent?
- How did you respond?
- Why did you respond in a particular way?
- Which institutional cultures within the library were impacted?
- How did the different institutional cultures within the library respond and to what extent?

From the document analysis, critical incidents at the organizational level were identified that likely impacted the organization’s cultures

- Could you describe one of these incidents or suggest another critical incident you would like to describe? When did it happen? Who were the key players?
- Which organizational cultures within the library were impacted?
- How did the different organizational cultures within the library respond to the critical incident and to what extent?
- How did you respond?
- Why did you respond in a particular way?

Moving away from the critical incidents and the organizational cultures in those contexts, I have some remaining questions about how you, as a leader, might influence organizational cultures:

- Could you describe the organizational cultures of the library when you became director?
- Could you describe the organizational cultures now?
- What do you, as a leader, pay attention to, measure, and control within the organization?
- How do you, as a leader, allocate resources?
- How do you, as a leader, role model, teach, and coach?
- How do you, as a leader, allocate rewards and status?
How do you, as a leader, select, promote, retire, and excommunicate individuals in the organization?

What creative and innovative initiatives have you initiated during your tenure?

To what extent did the initiatives encourage adaptability within organizational cultures?

How were organizational cultures impacted or changed?
Appendix D

University Level Administration and University Faculty Leader (Chair of Library Committee) Structured Interview Questions

A critical incident could be a major event, experience, or turning point. A critical incident or crisis is defined by Edgar Schein (2010): What is defined as a crisis is, of course, partly a matter of perception. There may or may not be actual dangers in the external environment, and what is considered to be dangerous is itself often a reflection of the culture. … a crisis is what is perceived to be a crisis and what is defined as a crisis by founders and leaders.

During my interview with the library director, he/she identified the following critical incident (major event, experience, turning point) at the institutional level that has impacted the library and its organizational cultures:

If you were characterizing an institutional level critical incident that is relevant to the library and its organizational cultures would you select the same one? If not, which one would you identify?

Could you describe the incident? When did it happen? Who were the key players?

Which institutional cultures were impacted and to what extent?

How did the different institutional cultures respond?

How did you respond?

Why did you respond in a particular way?

From your viewpoint, what was the impact on the library’s organizational cultures?
A critical incident could be a major event, experience, or turning point. A critical incident or crisis is defined by Edgar Schein (2010): What is defined as a crisis is, of course, partly a matter of perception. There may or may not be actual dangers in the external environment, and what is considered to be dangerous is itself often a reflection of the culture. A crisis is what is perceived to be a crisis and what is defined as a crisis by founders and leaders.

During my interview with the library director, he/she identified the following critical incident (major event, experience, or turning point) at the institutional level that has impacted the library and its organizational cultures:

1. Could you describe the incident? When did it happen? Who were the key players?
2. Which institutional cultures were impacted?
3. How did the different institutional cultures respond to the incident and to what extent?
4. How did the director respond to the critical incident?
5. How did you, as a leadership team, respond?
6. Why did you, as a leadership team, respond in a particular way?
7. Which organizational cultures within the library were impacted?
8. How did the different organizational cultures within the library respond and to what extent?

During my interview with the library director, he/she identified the following critical incident at the organizational level that has impacted the library and its organizational cultures:

1. Could you describe the incident? When did it happen? Who were the key players?
2. Which organizational cultures within the library were impacted?
3. How did the different organizational cultures within the library respond and to what extent?
4. How did the director respond?
5. How did you, as a leadership team, respond?
6. Why did you, as a leadership team, respond in a particular way?

Moving away from the critical incidents and the organizational cultures in those contexts, I have some remaining questions about how the leader of an organization might influence organizational cultures:

1. Could you describe the organizational cultures of the library when the director arrived?
Could you describe the organizational cultures now?
What does the director pay attention to, measure, and control within the organization?
How does the director allocate resources?
How does the director role model, teach, and coach?
How does the director allocate rewards and status?
How does the director select, promote, retire, and excommunicate individuals in the organization?
What creative and innovative initiatives has the director introduced during his/her tenure?
To what extent did the initiatives encourage adaptability within organizational cultures?
How were organizational cultures impacted or changed?
Appendix F

Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Dominant Characteristics</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The organization is very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The organization is a dynamic and entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The organization is very results oriented. A major concern is with getting the job done. People are very competitive and achievement oriented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The organization is a very controlled and structured place. Formal procedures generally govern what people do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Organizational Leadership</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, facilitating or nurturing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify entrepreneurship, innovation, or risk taking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify a no-nonsense, aggressive, results-oriented focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify coordination, organizing, or smooth-running efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Management of Employees</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The management style in the organization is characterized by teamwork, consensus, and participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The management style in the organization is characterized by individual risk taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The management style in the organization is characterized by hard-driving competitiveness, high demands, and achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The management style in the organization is characterized by security of employment, conformity, predictability, and stability of relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Organization Glue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is loyalty and mutual trust. Commitment to this organization runs high.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being on the cutting edge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is the emphasis on achievement and goal accomplishment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smoothly running organization is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 5. Strategic Emphases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes human development. High trust, openness, and participation persist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes acquiring new resources and creating new challenges. Trying new things and prospecting for opportunities are valued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Hitting stretch targets and winning in the marketplace are dominant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes permanence and stability. Efficiency, control, and smooth operations are important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6. Criteria for Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of having unique or the newest products. It is a product leader and innovator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of winning in the marketplace and outpacing the competition. Competitive market leadership is key.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of efficiency. Dependable delivery, smooth scheduling, and low-cost production are critical.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Appendix G

**Worksheet for Scoring the OCAI***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Now” Scores</th>
<th>“Preferred” Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum (Total of A Responses)</td>
<td>Sum (Total of A Responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (Sum divided by 6)</td>
<td>Average (Sum divided by 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Now Scores”</th>
<th>“Preferred” Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>6B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum (Total of B Responses)</td>
<td>Sum (Total of B Responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (Sum divided by 6)</td>
<td>Average (Sum divided by 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Now Scores”</th>
<th>“Preferred” Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>5C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>6C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum (Total of C Responses)</td>
<td>Sum (Total of C Responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (Sum divided by 6)</td>
<td>Average (Sum divided by 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Now Scores”</th>
<th>“Preferred” Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>2D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>5D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>6D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum (Total of D Responses)</td>
<td>Sum (Total of D Responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (Sum divided by 6)</td>
<td>Average (Sum divided by 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix H

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Leadership Influence to Transform Organizational Cultures
Kitty McNeill
Spring 2014

Invitation to Participate
Kitty McNeill, a doctoral student at Simmons College in Boston, Massachusetts, is conducting a research study for her doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. Michele Cloonan at Simmons College. The study will explore the practice of leadership influence to transform organizational cultures in ARL (Association of Research Libraries). You and your organization are invited to participate in this study because you are the Director of an ARL library that is known for having an organizational culture and leadership that is creative, innovative, adaptable, and transformative.

Purpose
The objectives of this research study are to:
- To identify the types of institutional or macro-cultures that influence the library
- To identify the types of cultures existing within the library
- To identify the levels of culture existing within the library organization
- To identify the extent to which directors employ certain primary leader embedding mechanisms to create and adapt cultures within the organization
- To identify the extent to which directors use creative and innovation initiatives to encourage adaptability within organizational cultures
- To identify the developmental stage of the organizational culture
- To identify the extent to which library leadership employs certain culture change mechanisms which correspond to the organization’s stage of growth
- To identify which leader embedding mechanisms and culture change mechanisms work for directors to influence organizational cultures
- To identify how well leader embedding mechanisms and culture change mechanisms work for directors to influence organizational cultures

Description of Benefits
Although there are no direct benefits to you and your organization, a greater appreciation of the interdependent relationships among institutional and organizational culture(s), leadership influence, and adaptability may allow libraries more quickly to adapt and produce thriving organizations. Knowledge of successful practices, mechanisms, and roles for leaders to employ to create and evolve cultures could add value to the institution and overall library profession.

As the higher education environment becomes more unpredictable, libraries will need to demonstrate adaptability, added value, and a return on the investment for the institution and key stakeholders. The results could establish best practices for transformation of organizational cultures in libraries in response to external and internal forces impacting libraries of all types. This study could provide a framework for library directors to employ as they endeavor to more deeply integrate creativity, innovation, and adaptability into the organizational culture of the
institution. In particular, the findings could provide new and even experienced library directors with methods to evaluate institutional and organizational cultures. Also, the results could document best practices for managerial roles, activities, and strategies to successfully and continuously transform libraries.

**Procedures**

For each of the organizational case studies, the researcher will use three methods of data collection:

- Document analysis of ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award application, strategic plan, and annual report
- Semi-structured interviews with Director (1-2 hours in length), University level position (Provost, Provost designate, 45 minutes-1 hour), University faculty leader (Chair, Library Committee, 45 minutes-1 hour), and library senior leadership team using narrative inquiry to probe critical incidents (2 hours)
- Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) with library senior leadership team

Notes will be written during the interview and the dialog will be recorded. Only Ms. McNeill and a professional transcriptionist will have access to the recordings. Interview responses will not be linked to your name or institution. A transcription will be made following the interview. You will be invited to review the transcript and make any changes that you believe are necessary to ensure the accuracy of your responses. At the end of three years, all recordings will be destroyed.

**Risks and Inconveniences**

There are minimal risks attached to this study. Your survey and interview responses will be kept confidential. If the length of the interview is inconvenient for you, you may leave at any time without any consequence to you.

**Voluntary Participation**

Participation as a human subject in this research study is completely voluntary, and your participation, or non-participation, will not affect other relationships. You may discontinue your participation as a human subject in this research study at any time without penalty or costs of any nature, character, or kind.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**

Every precaution shall be taken to protect your privacy and the confidentiality of the records and data pertaining to you and your organization in particular and the research study in general, disclosure of which may contribute to identifying you specifically to persons not related to this research study.

---

I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at Simmons College. I have read and understand the explanation provided and have had all of my questions answered to my satisfaction. I have been given a copy of this consent form.
Questions
If you have questions about the research or your rights as a participant, you should contact the Simmons College Human Protections Administrator in the Office of Sponsored Programs at 617-521-2414 or Dr. Michele Cloonan of Simmons College; email: michele.cloonan@simmons.edu