

CHAPTER 6

SHUTTING DOWN THE TENT REVIVAL: THE CALL FOR INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP IN LIS

Nicole A. Cooke and Lucy Santos Green

ABSTRACT

This chapter, inspired by the authors' experiences with racism and sexism in higher education leadership and frontier Protestantism, will interrogate the leadership models found in library and information science (LIS) through the lens of Judeo-Christian religious social structures and terminology, along with an examination of transitional and transformational leadership frameworks, to suggest a more productive and less abusive leadership model, equitable and inclusive to those who are not white men.

Keywords: Frontier Protestantism; misogyny; leadership; full range leadership; white privilege; diversity, equity and inclusion

INTRODUCTION

In the United States, 40% of corporate leadership positions are held by white men, with the percentage drastically increasing at each leadership level (Shelton, 2013). Anecdotally, this figure is not surprising, and plenty of performative effort has been publicly made by corporations and institutions of higher education to diversify leadership. In LIS, there are formal mechanisms celebrated for enabling the recruitment of women and People of Color into leadership positions, along

with frequent acknowledgment of LIS as a pink-collar profession historically dominated by white women. Despite these formal mechanisms (e.g., Spectrum Scholars, the Black Caucus of the American Library Association) and apparent professional awareness of its whiteness, a quick overview of leadership in North American iSchools quickly confirms and surpasses the 40% figure noted in the business world. In a sample of 40 schools of information granting degrees in LIS, 53% (21 schools) are led by white males. Of the remaining 19, white women hold 14 director or chair positions, while Black women hold none (iSchools, 2021).

It is no wonder that in this profession dominated by women, there is a great deal of misogyny from the white and male leaders who inexplicably rise to the top of LIS leadership echelons, often without significant library experience or the field's terminal degree. As part of this misogyny, women are belittled and gaslit (even by their subordinate male employees), they have their ideas ignored, stolen, and/or appropriated, they bear crushing and inequitable service loads, and in extreme (but not uncommon) cases they are verbally abused and scolded (Stark, 2019). And even though they face the misogynistic disdain of their white male colleagues, white women reflect many of the same leadership expectations, habits, and beliefs of white men, maintaining the status quo of white misogynistic leadership (Lopes, 2019; Smith, Hassan, Hatmaker, DeHart-Davis, & Humphrey, 2020).

Roberts et al. (2020) use religion to explore how North American society propagates an overwhelmingly popular vision of the Christian deity as a white man, demonstrating how the Western World is taught and socialized to unquestionably value white men, normalizing them in leadership roles irrespective of qualifications and experience. The normalization and prioritization of white, affluent, and Western Christian heteronormativity begins with young children as exemplified by Drs Kenneth Clark and Mamie Clark (1940), whose young Black and white participants consistently chose white dolls over Black dolls because the white dolls were prettier, good, or better. Minoritized groups that are not valued become "othered," marginalized, and not valuable. Unfortunately, this extends into adulthood, impacting people's unconscious perceptions of what leadership looks like; and even if the leadership proves to be faulty or harmful, rationalizations are made, and another white man is installed onto the seat of power (Lopes, 2019).

This socialization, threaded through Western religious traditions, also engenders implicit and explicit biases and hierarchies such that the field has fewer leaders of color and has noticeable difficulty retaining and promoting professionals of color. Those that do remain in the profession experience microaggressions, hostility, and mental abuse; they are the unwelcomed others (Ceja Alcalá, Colón-Aguirre, Cooke, & Stewart, 2017; Cooke, 2019; Gibson, 2019; Stark, 2019). As hierarchies are examined, Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color (BIPOC) often find themselves at the bottom of the proverbial heaps. In addition to the misogyny directed toward women, some women embody internalized misogyny and direct it at other women, especially marginalized women (Szymanski & Henrichs-Beck, 2014), BIPOCs experience outright racism (Mehra, 2019), and BIPOC women further endure misogynoir, defined by Bailey and Trudy (2018) as "the anti-Black racist misogyny that Black women experience" (p. 762).

This hierarchical pecking order, which decreases in power and increases in abuse, from white men down to Black women (Chancellor, 2019; Hill, 2019), is consistent with the historically white and elitist (white-IST) practices that comprise the infrastructure of LIS (Mehra & Gray, 2020).

While not a popular lens in LIS scholarship, the concept of Western religious tradition is not far removed from leadership management research and practice. “Workplace spirituality,” a megatrend that infiltrated corporate culture in the mid-1980s, popularized the use of Western religious terminology in leadership and management literature (Kessler, 2017). It is most evident in the use of adjectives such as “visionary,” and in the case of both Microsoft and Apple who used religious language in official job titles such as “evangelist” (Kawasaki, 1991). The use of this language results in leaders described as individuals expected to bring to their organization “the ability to inspire a shared vision” (Northouse, 2016, p. 174). An *evangelistic* leader can identify and verbalize a vision that is not immediately visible to the rest of the organization (Kawasaki, 1991). The ubiquitous use of such terminology, paired with Western society’s inclination to envision the Judeo-Christian deity as a white male, creates an impossible tension in attempts to apply traditional leadership models to the recruitment, empowerment, and retention of BIPOC women leaders in LIS.

Beyond a singular acknowledgment of systemic racism and patriarchy, it is necessary to pull back the curtain of the revival tent and explore what exactly attracts us to the tent revivalist, including his gender, his race, his “vision,” and his ability to quickly leave town once the show is over. It is necessary to delve into the ways religious structures and language such as *complementarianism* influence the roles and responsibilities assigned, accepted, and quietly completed by women and BIPOC faculty (Mattsson, 2015). This chapter, inspired by the authors’ experiences of racism and sexism in higher education leadership and frontier evangelical Christianity, interrogates the leadership examples found in LIS through the lens of Western religious social structures and terminology, to suggest a more productive and less abusive leadership approach – one more inclusive to those who are not white men.

INTRODUCING THE TENT REVIVALIST

Gregarious, entertaining, exuding an aura of confidence and dominance, and able to climb the ladder among new social acquaintances in the blink of an eye, the Western ideal of leadership describes people who “inspire great numbers of followers ... [they are] not only risk takers willing to get the job done, but also charmers who can convert the masses with their rhetoric” (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006, p. 622). More importantly, these “ideal” leaders hold a specific spot in the intersection of gender, class, and race. They are white males “who [are] totally dedicated to the work and who [have] no responsibilities for children or family demands other than earning a living” (Acker, 2006, p. 448). In picturing examples of such *revivalists*, men who attract large followings, convert masses, and exhibit complete dedication to the cause of work through an inspiring vision (with their

supportive and submissive wives standing behind and not beside them), it is easy to conjure up evangelists such as Billy Graham, Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, Jimmy Swaggert, or more recently, Joel Osteen. However, the tent revival's evangelist is a leadership model that has shown up in secular settings for decades:

In his 1980 acceptance speech for the Republican party nomination for president in Detroit, Reagan outlined his own revivalist agenda expressed through his revivalist campaign slogan. "Let's Make America Great Again ... Both before and during his presidency, Reagan's overt religious language gave his campaigns an especially revivalist flavor that was apparent to reporters *Newsweek* described him as a "missionary to be aggrieved" who ignited "visceral fire" in his fellow conservatives. "He's a man with a message who wants to make converts; one campaign staffer remarked ... Reagan's anger against Ford was righteousness – the President "had fallen prey to the heresies of deficit spending and ecumenical politics and Reagan aimed to "punish him for his apostasy. (Hummel, 2016, p. 13)

By the 1990s, the use of spirituality as a framework for management practices was well established, along with attempts to distance such practices from formal and intolerant religion. Even so, with the bulk of the literature coming from the United States, management practice was shaped by Protestant Christianity and Western Frontier Evangelism (apart from the Buddhist virtue of "mindfulness") (Kessler, 2017). Pattison (1997) described management as "a kind of religion" with "many of the characteristics and assumptions of a radical Christian sect" (p. 26). He posited that due to the United States' separation of church and state and subsequent lack of a government-sanctioned denomination, different religious movements competed when recruiting new members, establishing a de facto faith marketplace: "religion had to be sold – and thus religious activity was seen as a good preparation for business" (Pattison, 1997, p. 27).

Out of this spiritually infused leadership model, we see the tent revivalist emerge, the evangelist who sells his vision, his dream "by using fervor, zeal, guts and cunning" (Kawasaki, 1991, p. vii). Much like Steve Martin's character, Jonas Nightengale, in the film *Leap of Faith*, the tent revivalist is not responsible for seeing the vision through its fruition because he is motivated by self-interest and self-promotion, and not inclined to make difficult choices (Burns, 2017). Instead, he preaches a three-part sermon: (1) introducing the vision, (2) describing the path to achieving the vision, concluding with (3) the danger in not supporting the vision; identified by Kessler (2017) as "doom scenarios [that] resemble apocalyptic scenarios from early Christianity" (p. 6). Then, after fulfilling his role as a visionary and presenting the big picture, he leaves the examination, details, and implementation to others (Maccoby, 2000). The tent revivalist is not the most knowledgeable, nor the most capable. Rather, he speaks up frequently in a calm and lower-pitched voice, supremely confident that he is admired and listened to by those in the room. He overpromises, underdelivers, and rarely suffers as a result (Kay & Shipman, 2014). In fact, this approach typically results in additional promotions, opportunities, and accolades from those outside the organization.

His gender identity (male) and gender expression (tender warrior) reflect a softened patriarchal stance – a misleading and dangerous version of patriarchy that at first glance, seems emotionally open and supportive, "more relational within the community and family, embracing multiculturalism,

offering vigilant protection” (Perry, 2013, p. 396). Yet upon closer examination, is predicated upon a *complementarian ideology*, the Christian evangelical belief that men and women are divinely gifted with complementary roles and talents; men appointed leaders and women appointed submissive helpers. As the soft-patriarchal tender warrior, the tent revivalist is not capable of acknowledging his own sexism nor admitting his prejudice, because he believes “segregation is a function of ‘normal’ or ‘natural’ processes” (Broido, Brown, Stygles, & Bronkema, 2015, p. 598).

In the United States, the tent revivalist is white. His whiteness, along with his maleness, sets him up as the people’s choice, a choice made because as described by implicit leadership theory, we choose the leaders we perceive to be most “leaderlike” (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006); and here we find the most culturally insidious aspect of the tent revivalist’s identity. His whiteness raises him from leaderlike to godlike. His supporters “perceive [him] as superhuman, blindly believe [him], follow [him] unconditionally, and give [him] unqualified emotional support” (p. 625). Roberts et al. (2020) explain the impact of white Christ on our cultural definition of leadership:

Across seven studies we find a clear and consistent pattern: attributing a social identity to God predicts perceiving individuals who share that identity as particularly fit to lead ... the more participants conceptualized God as white and/or male, the more strongly they believed that white men were best fit for a supervisor position. This was true ... even after controlling for several attitudes and ideologies ... thus, across samples diverse in race, gender, and age, the extent to which God was conceptualized as a white man – the dominant U. S. depiction of God – predicted perceiving white men as particularly fit to lead. (p. 1310)

Historians trace the tent revivalist’s racial effect to mass-produced images of a forgiving white Jesus spread throughout the post-Civil War United States, in an attempt to pacify formerly enslaved Black Americans and remove the likelihood of retribution for horrors inflicted during enslavement (Blum & Harvey, 2012). Over time, the inundation of images featuring a white, male Christ resulted in a US culture that consistently associates whiteness with godliness and the top rung of the social hierarchy (e.g., a Google image search of God conducted in May 2022 results in almost exclusively white, male depictions of God, including an Elon Musk and a Donald Trump version of Christ). Finally, because he operates within a complementarian framework, the tent revivalist typically builds up his leadership network with a woman’s support, represented in *Leap of Faith* by Debra Winger’s character Jane Larson, Jonas Nightengale’s right-hand woman and manager.

Allow us to introduce the *Tent Revivalist’s Helpmate*.

THE TENT REVIVALIST’S HELPMATE

The Tent Revivalist’s Helpmate holds within her a deeply rooted, yet rarely voiced or acknowledged conviction, in her place as second-in-command. She does not deem to replace or supersede the Tent Revivalist, and carefully counters her professional or physical accomplishments with an *emphasized femininity* that

projects white, heterosexual, traditionally middle-class values such as motherhood, social hosting, quiet speaking tones, and subdued makeup and clothing (Mattsson, 2015). In her efforts to safeguard her position below the white male but above all others, she is “good and hard-working, but ... not too good or too successful in a way that might threaten the gender order in [her] field” (Mattsson, 2015, p. 692).

The Helpmate simultaneously holds a sense of shame, guilt, and inferiority to men, as well as a smug superiority over other women. Laura Robinson, a chaplain, PhD candidate, and New Testament instructor uses the framework of *complementarianism* to unravel the cognitive knot of gender issues nurtured in the Helpmate’s abdomen.

On one hand, girls and women are raised with a sense of shame, guilt, inferiority to men, inherent sense of things they can’t do, etc. but the flip side of being socialized to be under men is the coaching to be insanely smug Women who don’t participate in patriarchy are dumb, slutty, rebellious, undersexed, ugly whores whose children are getting molested in public school. You, participant in the patriarchy, are valuable, smart, enlightened, treasured and blessed. (Robinson, 2022)

Thus, the Helpmate upholds her identity and assigned place by countering her inferiority to men with a faux superiority over other white women who dare to emulate “masculine ideals by being intellectual, bold, and independent,” and hence, problematic (Mattsson, 2015, p. 692).

In a predominantly white and female profession, this *complementarian* patriarchal structure thrives in LIS, finding male information professionals in many of the few leadership roles. The leadership and privilege of white males is followed closely by that of white women. To be sure, white women also complain about a lack of opportunities and inequitable treatment by men, but their complaining has a limit. White women will engage in gaslighting nonwhite colleagues to expand patriarchy because they prize their skin tone’s privilege over their gender’s freedom.

Sexist discrimination has prevented white women from assuming the dominant role in the perpetuation of white racial imperialism, but it has not prevented white women from absorbing, supporting, and advocating racist ideology or acting individually as racist oppressors in various spheres of American life. (Hooks, 1981, p. 124)

In a pattern Mattsson (2015) refers to as *cloned, collective femininity*, white women in academic research units have been observed blocking the recruitment and advancement of BIPOC faculty, coding these individuals as “problematic, and positively less-skilled” (p. 697). White women may fall prey to misogyny, but their white privilege will be used to deny and suppress those deemed beneath them, especially People of Color. In this way, they are complicit in the oppression of others that is initiated by the white men to whom they are willfully and uncritically beholden. As white political commentator, Lucy Caldwell (2022), suggests, “It is good to be a white woman,” because,

They are feeling or participating in the same story of economic insecurity, or a right or a privilege that they believe their white husbands, sons, and fathers deserve is going to a person of color. They have a stake in the old paradigm that is harmful.

But it is a paradigm that benefits them. This is what essayist Rachel Cargle describes as “white supremacy in heels.” As Moon and Holling (2020, p. 253) write, “white women do not hold themselves and other white women accountable for their role in the reproduction of, and benefit from, white supremacy” and “white men are constructed as solely responsible for both racism and sexism which ignores white women’s allegiance to them” (p. 256).

Feminism has traditionally centered (white) women’s experience, yet when sex and gender are combined with race, feminism tends to lose its progressive edge. We argue that (white) feminism ideologically grounds itself in a gendered victimology that masks its participation and functionality in white supremacy. By erasing women of color, positioning women as victims of white male hegemony, and failing to hold white women accountable for the production and reproduction of white supremacy, (white) feminism manifests its allegiance to whiteness and in doing so commits “discursive violence.” (Moon & Holling, 2020, p. 256)

Cargle’s work also discusses the “toxic white feminist” microaggressions, the “tone policing” (wanting women of color to stop being aggressive or angry), the “spiritual bypassing” (demanding peace from communities in peril), the “white savior complex” (focusing only on what one has done for People of Color in the past), and “centering” (focusing on their own emotions and sensitivities). To this list Moon and Holling (2020, p. 256) add the “white woman tears” that occur when “white women are called into account by women of color,” and lean into their white victimhood. White tears are calculated and manipulative, designed to redirect criticism, curry favor from the sympathetic, and maintain their egos and power, however finite that power may be. Collectively, these behaviors are “discursive strategies” that derail productive conversation and stifle any real progress that strives toward equity and enhanced interracial understanding.

These discursive strategies epitomize “white victimhood,” an instantiation of a white epistemology, consequently recentering whiteness. Use of these strategies deflects from difficult dialogues between women of color and white women which, if pursued, might lead to genuine insight and potential coalition building. (Moon & Holling, 2020, p. 256)

These strategies also include complaining to the white male leaders that her nonwhite colleagues were “mean” to her (i.e., they rebuked her manipulation, aggression, condescension, etc.), resulting in reprimands or derision for the evangelist leader that in turn, blames the BIPOC colleagues resulting in further oppression, abuse, and microaggressions.

CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS TO BIPOC WOMEN LEADERS IN THE LIS TENT REVIVAL

Libraries, too, have been shown to be “complicit in the production and maintenance of white racial privilege” (Honma, 2005, p. 1). This behavior, whether implicit or explicit, is rooted in and maintains whiteness; whiteness is thus considered the norm, or that which is “not different” (Hussey, 2010, p. 669). This phenomenon has been facilitated and perpetuated by the history of whiteness in LIS.

In associating race with only those who are not white, LIS has largely failed to acknowledge that whiteness also is a feature – or as Michael Eric Dyson notes, something that can be understood

as an “identity, ... an ideology, and ... an institution” that functions to shape our profession. (Hussey, 2010, p. 669)

Twitter, especially #LibraryTwitter and #BlackTwitter, provides ample examples of the bullying, sexual assault, misogyny, and misogynoir that white women direct at Black women and other Women of Color. In February 2022, a Black genderqueer librarian asked for movie recommendations for a long weekend of binge watching. Without warning, a white female librarian made a suggestion, pre-emptively berating the original poster (OP), calling them a “posh person” who doesn’t regard the opinion of others.¹ When the OP and others called out her bad behavior, she went to her own Twitter account to complain that she was being bullied. She claimed a “bad day” and neurodivergence as the reasons for her remark and name-calling, and then went on to call the OP “uppity,” exhibiting all of Moon and Holling’s discursive strategies as her followers coddled and consoled her. To call a Black person “uppity” is a dog whistle and a highly offensive slur used to put Black people in their place. The white librarian claimed ignorance of the term and solicited more sympathy from her white librarian peers. To this, Black librarian and scholar Anastasia Collins responded with the following Twitter thread:

Uppity is such a specific go-to for white women. It’s a way to call a Black person arrogant (for not acting as if they’re less than a white person), when it’s actually the white women whose arrogance borders on unhinged to think Black people are required to prop up their self-importance. What must it be like for Black patrons who don’t show appropriate deference to a nice, racist white librarian? Who ask her for recommendations but then check out something else? Who have no interest in her programs “for them?” Who don’t need her help at all?

Uppity is also a white woman’s go-to when they think a Black person is being ungrateful. What, I wonder, are Black people supposed to be grateful to white strangers for? On Twitter? In our field and workplaces? What is it you think you’ve done for us that wasn’t actually for you? Also, if you’re an out-loud racist on bad days, you’re a quiet racist on good ones. Frankly that’s a “you” problem. White folks’ ideas about Blackness have nothing to do with Black people and is none of my concern. Until it affects my or my people’s treatment.

Is there a word for unsurprised disappointment? That’s where I’m at, where I’ve been at. I’m unsurprisingly disappointed that a white woman librarian decided she wasn’t getting the attention she deserves from a Black person and showed her entire ass (over Xanadu??). I’m unsurprisingly disappointed that, exactly on cue, white women rushed to coddle a racist white woman when she decided to play victim after saying uppity with her whole chest. And I get it. There but for the grace of God. But to be honest, it’s giving Frodo caping for Golum. Maybe reevaluate. So here we are.

Many of you think we should be lesser (whether you see it or not). Most of us think y’all should be better. So, the next time you find the audacity to throw uppity at a Black person for existing, I guess the response is “you could be up here too, beloved” (Collins, 2022).²

Collins continued by stating and educating:

- “I didn’t know I was being racist; I thought I was just being a snide bully without provocation” is a hell of a flex.³
- Nice racist white lady is not a neurodivergence.⁴

- It's worth noting that white feminists use uppity to exert power over Black people, while also using it to demand access to power from white cis men. Almost like they think they're the only ones who deserve an end to their oppression. Weird.⁵
- Folks, neurodivergence does not ever, in any circumstance, excuse/justify/explain racism or anti-Black violence. Neurodivergence does not make you racist or temporarily racist or "at this moment I'm not my best and I'm choosing racism." You know what makes you racist? Racism.⁶

When discussing the situation with Collins, the first author noted that even though they didn't see this conversation happen in real time, they knew the outcome because this is an age-old dynamic in libraries. Collins replied by saying, "counternarratives live in the spaces where marginalized folks are freest to express themselves. Twitter isn't perfect but there's no racist Reviewer 2" (A. Collins, personal communication, February 13, 2022). Creating and sharing these sometimes-blunt counternarratives (such as this chapter and parent volume) are the only way the harmful discursive strategies can be offset.

AN INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP APPROACH

Every time I type the words "equity leadership" I note that the reason we have to append "equity" onto "leadership" is that most popular leadership frameworks created by white people are silent on equity and justice. I also note that this is probably why they're popular.⁷

In higher education there have been positive steps taken toward the establishment of recruitment and mentorship networks to diversify faculty leadership. For example, in 2015, the University of South Carolina (UofSC) added a diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) director or associate dean position in each one of its colleges, the online campus, and the university library system. Reporting to the Office of DEI, and UofSC's first Vice-President of DEI, all unit DEI administrators meet monthly as part of the Council of Academic Diversity Officers to discuss university system challenges and solutions (O'Donnell, 2019). This institutional structure resulted in a democratic, decision-making responsibility for DEI, where in a majority white institution, the graduation for all student groups is equitable, and college-level impacts such as a targeted DEI training for faculty search committees, are applied consistently system-wide (Adserias, Charleston, & Jackson, 2017). UofSC's Grace Jordan McFadden Professors program, named after the first black tenured professor at UofSC after the reconstruction era, funds underrepresented doctoral students. It also supports their growth through a rich series of professional developments on furthering one's higher education career as a BIPOC faculty member in an overwhelmingly white institution (Danaher, 2021).

Such structures and programs also sporadically pop up in LIS. As mentioned in this chapter's introduction, there are formal mechanisms celebrated for enabling the recruitment into, and the mentoring of women and people of color in LIS faculty and leadership positions. However, these efforts remain separate from attempts to change the overall institution of LIS (and higher education in general), and so "we

arrive at the present reality that institutions of higher education can be diverse but not inclusive of diverse communities” (Aguirre & Martinez, 2002, p. 59). The few and far between examples of minority faculty in LIS leadership positions continue to remain marginalized as their role-model codification demands a homeostatic existence; “unchanging and non-critical of existing social relations and institutional practices” (p. 56). Therefore, any successful effort to foster and expand inclusive LIS leadership must address an institutional commitment to the threading of social justice, multiculturalism, and diversity leadership principles throughout the entire fabric of the organization (Aguirre & Martinez, 2006). This required institutional change is defined by Eckel and Kezar (2003) “as affecting institutional cultures, as deep and pervasive, as intentional, and as occurring over time” (p. 27).

Such a level of change cannot occur independent of targeted leadership efforts. It requires an application of leadership that enables a thorough examination of current institutional formal policies and structures, comparing these to research on the experiences of BIPOC faculty. This process should be followed by secondary and continuous examinations that employ methodologies like institutional ethnography, an inquiry framework that focuses on the day-to-day work life of individuals, while examining the impact of informal structures (e.g., intersection of work–family policy and economic assets such as family assistance) on retention of diverse faculty, particularly Women of Color (Castañeda et al., 2015). Thus, before a new generation of inclusive LIS leadership is established, current leadership (both formal and informal), must navigate a long overdue reckoning, facilitated by the combination of transformational and transactional leadership techniques.

TRANSFORMATIONAL, TRANSACTIONAL, AND FULL RANGE LEADERSHIP MODELS

Transformational leadership aims to transform both leaders and their subordinates by giving leaders three distinct roles: (a) teachers, (b) moral models, and (c) interpreters of organizational culture and symbols. Adserias et al. (2017) organize the characteristics of transformational leadership into four distinct tactics:

1. Leadership through example.
2. Motivation through inspiration: meaningful work, a distinctive vision, and tasking subordinates with new and creative challenges.
3. Supportive of creative thinking and problem-solving.
4. Unique and tailored coaching and mentoring addressing individual subordinate personal and professional goals and tying these to the organization’s mission.

Again, effectively addressing DEI in higher education requires meaningful and broad organizational and transformational change. Consequently, “transformational leadership has been identified as having greater potential for leading the type of large-scale, long-term organizational, and cultural changes necessitated by the diversity agenda” (p. 319). Transformational leadership approaches have been found to be applied successfully at high organization levels, and in corporate/business settings.

In higher education, a transactional style of leadership is more often preferred and applied. It has been argued that the transactional style of leadership is a better fit in higher education, where leadership is site-based, and traditions and discipline values specific to smaller units (e.g., departments, schools, and colleges). BIPOC higher education administrators also tend to prefer transactional leadership when advancing diversity agendas “because of the way that white stakeholders might perceive [their] choice [of pursuing the diversity agenda] as a personal agenda or self-interest rather than an institutional imperative” (Kezar & Eckel, 2008, p. 397). Bass (1985) described transactional leadership using three behavioral systems:

1. Contingent rewards – promising and rewarding good job performance (e.g. merit pay, tenure, and promotion).
2. Passive management – actions taken to correct a subordinate’s mistake, but only after the incident occurs.
3. Active management – accountability measures implemented to clarify expectations and keep subordinates accountable (e.g., annual faculty evaluations).

Within transactional leadership, power and influence is exerted “by the emphasis placed on setting expectations, monitoring and rewarding compliance and progress, and punishment or correction of deviation” (Adserias et al., 2017, p. 318). Although the transformational leadership style is an approach necessary for meaningful organizational change – a change dependent on self-reflection, challenges to long-held individual and institutional beliefs and modification of longstanding institutional traditions; transactional leadership is deemed more effective when implementing faculty diversification initiatives. Such initiatives have been found to be the most likely to face faculty resistance and pushback, so transactional steps such as using data to weaken arguments against diverse hires, financial incentives, and formal processes that hold faculty and administration accountable are highly effective leadership steps (Aguirre & Martinez, 2002).

Consequently, the crafting of a model for equitable leadership in LIS (whether higher education or other organizational infrastructures) is best predicated upon a combination of both transformational and transactional leadership styles. Both styles, while boasting distinctive approaches and characteristics, are not mutually exclusive. Rather, these can be applied interchangeably in an approach defined by Bass and Avolio (1994) as full-range leadership. Full-range leadership is the “style most closely aligned with the level of sophistication, complexity, and variation necessary to lead the organizational change necessitated by the diversity agenda” (Adserias et al., 2017, p. 322). By including the techniques pertinent to both transformational and transactional leadership, full-range leadership (sometimes referred to as situational leadership) allows for the selection and application of strategies most appropriate to a specific situation, culture, and audience (Kezar & Eckel, 2008).

FULL RANGE LEADERSHIP IN ACTION

Williams (2013) identified four stages that higher education completes when institutionalizing diversity. These stages are a useful guide for examination and

implementation of changes needed in iSchools and in LIS departments so that diverse faculty can topple the tent revivalist from his pulpit. These stages also establish the situation, culture, and audience necessary to select the most appropriate transformational or transactional leadership technique. During the first stage, *startup*, diversity is not on the horizon. It is not a priority, but instead is viewed as a disruption to a program's or a discipline's reputation for academic excellence. In stage two, *transitional*, discussions on diversity issues are held by leadership, but no formal plan, agenda, or mission statement is in place. *Implementation*, the third stage, is entered when a formal diversity agenda becomes a program priority, and leadership demonstrates a strong awareness of diversity issues. At this stage, diversity efforts are not labeled as inspiring meaningful and transformational institutional change. Instead, these are listed as incremental steps to be taken, along with measurable outcomes. The final stage, *inclusive excellence*, is entered when diversity "exists at the highest level of institutional importance as foundational to mission fulfillment and academic excellence and has become a cultural value that manifest itself in myriad ways" (p. 203).

Stage One: Startup

During the startup stage, consider that leadership on its journey toward inclusion, requires a personal reckoning – especially for white LIS faculty and administration, as the role of the LIS curriculum (including how the curriculum addresses valid research methodologies in its discipline) in propping up the tent revivalist is identified and called out. Challenge the notion of academic excellence. Are we identifying and highlighting the work of diverse faculty in our scholarly collaborations, our syllabi, our programming, and our outreach? Or does our discipline continue to prioritize teaching that centers white achievement? Lest this come across as a recent set of considerations, note that over a quarter of a century ago, [Alger \(1997\)](#) warned:

diversity in higher education has become an end in itself, rather than a means to a greater educational end ... universities have failed to establish a fundamental link between diversity and their educational missions. (p. 20)

Beyond course readings and activities, the journey toward inclusive LIS leadership must also begin with LIS faculty dismantling information science's definition of gold-standard research, and how this gold-standard is propagated with each new generation of students and scholars. In a clinical discipline where practice and research are intimately threaded, with one continually informing the other, it is long past time we stop idolizing quantitative methods "as a form of cultural capital with symbolic value ... while subordinating the less-accepted ones ... described as a complement to quantitative data" ([Mattsson, 2015](#), p. 693). Instead, let us heed [Mehra and Gray's \(2020\)](#) call:

[...] revisiting the "virtuous cycle" in its involvement of both educators and practitioners to ensure that we do not perpetuate the scholar's internalized biases and assumptions of what we consider legitimate research into the professional realm. Examples include exclusion of humanist and interpretive approaches, mixed methods, action research, qualitative narratology, ethnography, participant observations, and many others from the privileged black box categories of what we consider information science research. (p. 203)

As we reckon with our definition of LIS academic excellence, we start to shift from exclusionary to inclusive practices through a curriculum redesign that prioritizes multicultural worldviews over a Eurocentric or Western perspective, and contains “a fuller integration of action research, participatory design, and community engagement in all aspects of information-related work, be it research, teaching, service, or expanded scholarship” (Mehra & Gray, 2020, p. 223).

Stage Two: Transitional

Entering the transitional stage presents us with the opportunity to identify and discuss pre-existing program processes and policies that disproportionately impact women and BIPOC faculty, hindering their appointment to leadership positions. An obvious starting point is the known expectation by both men and women faculty that female faculty take on a larger service load. Anecdotally, it is easy to collect stories of overworked female faculty, and while one may dismiss such tales with examples of male faculty working 65+ hour weeks, studies consistently confirm women faculty accrue a larger list of service responsibilities. Not only is the list longer, but the greatest amount of service also shouldered by women is internal and not external service, where a female faculty members on-campus work duties far exceed any formal job descriptions (Broido et al., 2015; Guarino & Borden, 2017).

The service load for BIPOC women faculty is further exacerbated by a seemingly never-ending request cue for informal mentorship of BIPOC students, formal membership on BIPOC doctoral student committees (independent of a faculty member’s area of expertise), and unreasonable expectations regarding service on diversity initiatives, committees, and programs (Cobb-Roberts, 2012; Guarino & Borden, 2017; Mehra & Gray, 2020). This targeted service burden also inhibits BIPOC women faculty leadership advancement because it takes away from their ability to participate in campus service. O’Meara, Kuvaeva, and Nyunt (2017) inadvertently highlight this opportunity gap when describing the benefits of university-wide committees beyond diversity initiatives:

faculty use campus service to gain access to “system knowledge,” which may otherwise be unavailable to them, such as enhanced access to budget information, names and faces of senior leaders, operating data, potential mentors and sponsors outside their unit, and peer allies and alliances. (p. 693)

In considering the policies and processes that are in place, it is worthwhile asking if these reward the internal level of service completed by women faculty. It is also a good time to consider the ways policies and processes acknowledge (or do not acknowledge) the faculty role of intellectual leader, a visualization women faculty closely identify with and professionally prioritize (Macfarlane & Burg, 2019). When functioning as an intellectual leader, a faculty member influences and inspires others with their creativity and ideas instead of any formal institutional power. O’Meara et al. (2017) recommend an analysis of tenure and promotion criteria, as well as merit pay conditions for ways these documents can be expanded beyond the common list of achievements (e.g., publications, grants, presentations, students graduated), to acknowledge internal service and

intellectual leadership. Particular attention should be paid to the ways these documents impact tenure and promotion since service has been found to slow women faculty rank shifts from assistant to associate, and from associate to full (Acker & Armenti, 2004).

Stage Three: Implementation

Stage three, implementation, offers us the opportunity to begin identifying incremental steps to be taken, as we commit to an inclusive LIS leadership culture. At this stage, we offer a warning to avoid burdening women faculty with institutional housekeeping, “the invisible and supportive labor of women to improve women’s situation within the institution” (Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004, p. 195). Although it is a popular higher education institutional option, the creation of task forces to identify and develop solutions for institutional inequities, these efforts are ridiculously time-consuming, easily dismissed by senior leadership, and used as a substitute for institutional action (Guarino, & Borden, 2017). Instead, O’Meara et al. (2017) recommend four specific policy changes that can be immediately implemented to improve the professional lives of women faculty and faculty of color:

- Establish a public service dashboard that logs gender differences in categories, length, and amount of service loads, as well as all other faculty activities. Use this public tool to establish both accountability and equity in disbursement of institutional service duties and opportunities, merit pay, and annual evaluation.
- Revisit policies that determine committee membership. When policies require diversity on all committees, women and BIPOC faculty are quickly overburdened. Instead, save diversity requirements for committee membership and apply these when the committee’s work will be directly affected. For example, the composition of search committees has been shown to have a significant impact on hiring.
- The same concept applies to committee membership policies that exclude assistant and associate professors. As previously mentioned, campus-wide committees can provide faculty with powerful institutional knowledge and professional connections, both items that can help women faculty and faculty of color move up from assistant to associate and associate to full.
- When additional service requests are made of women faculty and faculty of color, establish a policy that re-balances service loads by re-assigning responsibilities to other faculty members.

Stage Four: Inclusive Excellence

Stage four presents a special danger, that of complacency. The achievement of inclusive excellence is not a singular event. It is the work of every day, of every semester, of every academic year. Williams (2013) outlined a series of focus areas that must be nurtured so that inclusive excellence is maintained at an institutional level. However, we argue these areas are also present and

in need of continued review at the unit and department level. First, intentional purpose in the form of a frequently reviewed declaration of DEI, and community containing measurable, short-term and long-term outcomes. To remain at stage four, maintain accountability through rigorous data collection and data analysis of those short and long-term outcomes. Then, update, modify, or expand the declaration as needed, at minimum on an annual basis, and never as an afterthought.

Second, prioritize diversity infrastructure, psychological support mechanisms, and culturally relevant applications in all areas of the unit. At stage four, inclusive excellence is threaded through all committee work, all procedure and policy development, all programming, all pedagogical initiatives, and let's not forget – financial incentives (e.g., sabbaticals, scholarships, travel, graduate student funding). Again, inclusive leadership does not blossom in siloed isolation or in the work of an ad hoc committee. It requires a shift and evolution in institutional culture. Third, DEI and community must be a formal presence in crisis management and social media plans both as a pro-active and as a re-active stance. This includes continued support for BIPOC faculty who more frequently face harassment and threatening behavior both online and in person. Finally, hold current leaders accountable for modeling and decision-making in accordance with the organization's mission of inclusive excellence. The dual force of expectation and accountability is key.

Today, at the beginning of summer 2022, we acknowledge the regressive trend US culture is manifesting through a Christian nationalistic backlash – an unsurprising response to the civil rights achievements of the #MeToo Movement, *Obergefell v. Hodges*, and Black Lives Matter (Empsall, 2002). Though such a backlash, with its efforts to codify racism through legislative educational bans, makes stage four, inclusive excellence, seem like a distant and unrealistic goal, we maintain it is a destination worthy of pursuit, for

when a collection of people works together, and one person makes an improvement, the others can often improve on this solution even further: Improvements build upon improvements. Diverse perspectives and heuristics apply sequentially: One gets applied after the other, and in combination. One plus one often exceeds two. (Page, 2008, p. 340)

CONCLUSION

Leadership does not occur in a vacuum, it is influenced by numerous contextual factors including geography, gender dynamics, religion, racism, capitalism, all of which can vary according to institutional context. But the overarching goals of leadership across institutions should include having healthy colleagues and a hospitable and welcoming organizational environment. These conditions don't just appear, they are created and maintained by good leaders. Good and diverse leadership in libraries does exist; however, to have so much evangelistic leadership in a female dominated profession that continuously screams about its lack of diversity is both ironic and problematic. In addition to transformational and inclusive leadership, the profession needs to *study* leadership and train potential leaders up

instead of settling on individuals with charisma, connections, and longevity, who always say “yes” and are content with the status quo. To achieve the diversity and systemic changes the field claims to want, we need to be purposeful, consistent, and cultivate leadership, instead of scrambling to fill vacancies.

Additionally, we need to ask questions of our professional organizations and accrediting bodies – what are their stances and requirements for professional leadership? Why is LIS so full of white male leaders? If their expectations and requirements are lacking, so will the expectations and requirements of our organizations. What role does professional development play? Should LIS leaders have earned and renewed credentials like medical librarians? Or should they have licenses like some public librarians? If we want our leaders to do better, *we* need to do better and demand better. This begins with identifying the gaps and having the hard and interdisciplinary conversations necessary to generate change.

NOTES

1. Stegemeyer, S. [@SStegemeyer]. (2022, February 12). As always, Xanadu. Of course, you’ll never even care what I suggest because you’re some posh person who asks for shit but never deems those who reply with anything ... but I’m also pissed off at the fucking world so there is that. Welcome to my world. Xanadu is fucking great.

[Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/SStegemeyer/status/1492671747736412163?s=20&t=_K_c-SZJx3t8AIRnSbXagA.

2. Collins, A. [@DarkLiterata]. (2022, February 13). Uppity is such a specific go-to for yt women. It’s a way to call a Black person arrogant (for not acting as if they’re less than a white person), when it’s actually the ww whose arrogance borders on unhinged to think Black people are required to prop up their self-importance. [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/DarkLiterata/status/1492877222113427460?s=20&t=5ikG5oCfklQp9t-e8238jA>

3. Collins, A. [@DarkLiterata]. (2022, February 13). “I didn’t know I was being racist; I thought I was just being a snide bully without provocation” is a hell of a flex. [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/DarkLiterata/status/1492930516798128132?s=20&t=5ikG5oCfklQp9t-e8238jA>

4. Collins, A. [@DarkLiterata]. (2022, February 13). Nice Racist White Lady is not a neurodivergence. [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/DarkLiterata/status/1492926137680506883?s=20&t=5ikG5oCfklQp9t-e8238jA>

5. Collins, A. [@DarkLiterata]. (2022, February 13). It’s worth noting that white feminists use uppity to exert power over Black people, while also using it to demand access to power from white cis men. Almost like they think they’re the only ones who deserve an end to their oppression. Weird. [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/DarkLiterata/status/1492926137680506883?s=20&t=5ikG5oCfklQp9t-e8238jA>

6. Collins, A. [@DarkLiterata]. (2022, February 13). Folks, neurodivergence does not ever, in any circumstance, excuse/justify/explain racism or anti-Black violence. Neurodivergence does not make you racist or temporarily racist or “at this moment I’m not my best and I’m choosing racism.” You know what makes you racist? Racism. [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/DarkLiterata/status/1492922538107805696?s=20&t=5ikG5oCfklQp9t-e8238jA>

7. Gorski, P. [@EquityLiteracy]. (2022, June 3). Every time I type the words “equity leadership” I note that the reason we have to append “equity” onto “leadership” is that most popular leadership frameworks created by white people are silent on equity and justice. I also note that this is probably why they’re popular. [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/EquityLiteracy/status/1532710056160108544?s=20&t=nbryBH8nd0jyqg3RXaVHFg>

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender and Society, 40*(4), 440–464. doi:10.1177/0891243206289499
- Acker, S., & Armenti, C. (2004). Sleepless in academia. *Gender and Education, 16*, 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0954052032000170309>
- Adserias, R. P., Charleston, L. J., & Jackson, J. (2017). What style of leadership is best suited to direct organizational change to fuel institutional diversity in higher education? *Race Ethnicity and Education, 20*(3), 315–331. doi:10.1080/13613324.2016.1260233
- Aguirre, A. J., & Martinez, R. (2002). Leadership practices and diversity in higher education: Transitional and transformational frameworks. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 8*(3), 53–62.
- Aguirre, A. J., & Martinez, R. (2006). Diversity leadership in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 32*(3), 1–13.
- Alger, J. (1997). The educational value of diversity. *Academe, 86*, 43–47.
- Bailey, M., & Trudy. (2018). On misogynoir: Citation, erasure, and plagiarism. *Feminist Media Studies, 18*(4), 762–768.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bird, S., Litt, J., & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating status of women reports: Institutional housekeeping as ‘women’s work.’ *NSWA Journal, 16*(1), 194–206.
- Blum, E. J., & Harvey, P. (2012). *The color of Christ: The son of God and the saga of race in America*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Broido, E. M., Brown, K. R., Stygles, K. N., & Bronkema, R. H. (2015). Responding to gendered dynamics: Experiences of women working over 25 years at one university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86*(4), 595–627.
- Caldwell, L. (2022, May 7). Are White women the key to midterms after abortion opinion leak? (Season 2, Episode 19) [TV series episode]. In T. Cross (Host), *The Cross Connection*, MSNBC.
- Castañeda, M., Zambrana, R., Marsh, K., Vega, W., Becerra, R., & Pérez, D. (2015). Role of institutional climate on underrepresented faculty perceptions and decision making in use of work–family policies. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 64*, 711–725.
- Ceja Alcalá, J., Colón-Aguirre, M., Cooke, N. A., & Stewart, B. (2017). A critical dialogue: Faculty of color in library and information science. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 13*(2). <https://doi.org/10.5070/D4132034399>
- Chancellor, R. L. (2019). Racial battle fatigue: The unspoken burden of Black women faculty in LIS. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 60*(3), 182–189.
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. K. (1940). Skin color as a factor in racial identification of Negro preschool children. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 11*(1), 159–169.
- Cooke, N. A. (2019). Impolite hostilities and vague sympathies: Academia as a site of cyclical abuse. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 60*(3), 223–230.
- Danaher, A. (June 2021). *Grace Jordan McFadden professors program carries a legacy of impact forward: A Q&A with the program’s director*, John McFadden. Retrieved from https://www.sc.edu/uofsc/po sts/2021/06/john_mcfadden_q_and_a.php#_YnaWFvPMIAf
- Eckel, P. D., & Kezar, A. J. (2003). *Taking the reins: Institutional transformation in higher education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.
- Empshall, N. (April 2022). Why good Friday a warning against far-right Christian nationalism. *NBC News: Politics & Policy*. Retrieved from <https://www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/donald-trump-good-friday-warning-far-right-christian-nationalism-rca24491>
- Gibson, A. N. (2019). Civility and structural precarity for faculty of color in LIS. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 60*(3), 215–222.
- Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education, 58*, 672–694. doi:10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2
- Hill, R. F. (2019). The danger of an untold story: Excerpts from my life as a black academic. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 60*(3), 208–214.

- Honma, T. (2005). Trippin' over the color line: The invisibility of race in library and information studies. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 1(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.5070/D412000540>. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4nj0w1mp>
- Hooks, B. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Hussey, L. (2010). The diversity discussion: What are we saying. *Progressive Librarian*, 34(35), 3–10.
- Hummel, D. (2016). Revivalist nationalism since World War II: From “Wake up, America!” to “Make America Great Again”. *Religions*, 7(11), 128–145.
- iSchools (2021). Directory. Retrieved from <https://ischools.org/Directory>
- Kawasaki, G. (1991). *Selling the dream: How to promote your product company, or ideas – And make a difference – Using everyday evangelism*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Kay, K., & Shipman, C. (2014, May). The confidence gap. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/05/the-confidence-gap/359815>
- Kessler, V. (2017). “Visionaries...psychiatric wards are full of them”: Religious terms in management literature. *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 38(2), 1–9.
- Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2008). Advancing diversity agendas on campus: Examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 11(4), 379–405. <https://doi-org.pallas2.tcl.sc.edu/10.1080/13603120802317891>
- Lopes, F. M. (2019). Perpetuating the patriarchy: Misogyny and (post-) feminist backlash. *Philosophical Studies*, 176(9), 2517–2538.
- Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros. The inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 69–77.
- Macfarlane, B., & Burg, D. (2019). Women professors and the academic housework trap. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 41(3), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10801360080X.2019.1589682>
- Mattsson, T. (2015). ‘Good girls’: Emphasized femininity as cloning culture in academia. *Gender and Education*, 27(6), 685–699.
- Mehra, B. (2019). The non-white man’s burden in LIS education: Critical constructive nudges. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 60(3), 198–207.
- Mehra, B., & Gray, L. (2020). An “owning up” of white-IST trends in LIS to further real transformations. *The Library Quarterly*, 90(2), 189–239.
- Moon, D. G., & Holling, M. A. (2020). “White supremacy in heels”: (White) feminism, white supremacy, and discursive violence. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 17(2), 253–260.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- O’Donnell, G. (2019, November). The University of South Carolina models a collaborative approach to diversity, equity, and inclusion. *Insight Into Diversity*. Retrieved from <https://www.insight-intodiversity.com/the-university-of-south-carolina-models-a-collaborative-approach-to-diversity-equity-and-inclusion/>
- O’Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., & Nyunt, G. (2017). Constrained choices: A view of campus service inequality from annual faculty reports. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 88(5), 672–700. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1257312>
- Page, S. (2008). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Perry, S. L. (2013). She works hard(er) for the money: Gender, fundraising, and employment in evangelical parachurch organizations. *Sociology of Religion*, 74(3), 392–415. doi:10.1093/socrel/srr024
- Roberts, S. O., Weisman, K., Lane, J. D., Williams, A., Camp, N. P., Wang, M., & Griffiths, C. (2020). God as a White man: A psychological barrier to conceptualizing Black people and women as leadership worthy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 119(6), 1290–1315.
- Robinson, L. (2022, August 6). *On one hand, girls and women are raised with a sense of shame, guilt, inferiority to men, inherent sense of things they can't do, etc. But the flip side of being socialized to be under men is the coaching to be insanely smug and fell superior to other women. You can pick up almost any complementarian book for women by women and hear it almost immediately. Women who don't participate in patriarchy are dumb, slutty, rebellious, undersexed, ugly whores whose children are getting molested in public school. You, participant in the patriarchy, are valuable, smart, enlightened, treasured, and blessed* [Tweet]. Twitter. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/LauraRbnsn/status/1555944724812513286?t=6bx_GQwRvZMOIOCz1lbfIQ&s=19

- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 617–633.
- Shelton, C. (2013). *The study on white men leading through diversity & inclusion: Executive summary*. Seattle, WA: Great Heart Leader Labs.
- Smith, A. E., Hassan, S., Hatmaker, D. M., DeHart-Davis, L., & Humphrey, N. (2020). Gender, race, and experiences of workplace incivility in public organizations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *41*(4), 674–699.
- Stark, C. A. (2019). Gaslighting, misogyny, and psychological oppression. *The Monist*, *102*(2), 221–235.
- Szymanski, D. M., & Henrichs-Beck, C. (2014). Exploring sexual minority women's experiences of external and internalized heterosexism and sexism and their links to coping and distress. *Sex Roles*, *70*(1), 28–42.
- Williams, D. A. (2013). *Strategic diversity leadership: Activating change and transformation in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.