Chapter 4

ETHOS OF LIBRARY SERVICE :
A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

1. INTRODUCTION

The term Ethos is used quite widely in library literature but it is rarely a topic of research in Library and Information Science. It is important to underline the fact that Ethos is an experiential, dynamic and multi-faceted concept. Therefore, a multiple perspective seems most appropriate. Both organizational and professional Ethos are studied in other professional disciplines such as Management, Education, Public Administration, Medicine, Nursing, etc. The frameworks applied in these disciplines can help in study of Ethos of library service as well. However, no single framework suits the need of another discipline in entirety because of its own peculiarities.

2. ETHOS : SOME DEFINITIONS

The Oxford English Dictionary online defines the word Ethos as "the characteristic spirit of a culture, era, or community as manifested in its attitudes and aspirations". The Merriam Webster online dictionary similarly explains it as “the distinguishing character, sentiment, moral nature, or guiding beliefs of a person, group, or institution”. Merriam – Webster’s Encyclopedia of Literature (1995) defines Ethos in the context of rhetoric as “the character or emotions of a speaker or writer that are expressed in the attempt to persuade an audience. It is distinguished from pathos, which is the emotion the speaker or writer hopes to induce in the audience” (p. 392). Baumlin defined Ethos broadly and tentatively as “character as it emerges in language” (as cited in Sloane, 2001, p. 263). In Organizational studies and Education, Ethos is defined as a “set of social, religious and traditional values contained within a society or an organisation” (as cited in Lopez, 2001, p.5). According to Donnelly (2000), “Ethos is a fashionable but nebulous term often employed by organisational theorists, educationists and theologists to describe the
distinctive range of values and beliefs, which define the philosophy or atmosphere of an organization” (p. 134).

In LIS, Rothstein (1968) referred to the components of Ethos as values, beliefs and goals; special abilities and knowledge; and tensions and dilemmas (p. 157). Froehlich (1997) explained ideal Ethos for library and information services in terms of a dynamic interplay among personal, professional and organizational and sometimes cultural values (p. 80).

2.1. EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT OF ETHOS

According to Baumlin (2001), “the term Ethos assumes several competing, even contradictory meanings throughout the history of rhetoric…. Hellenic Ethos…. differs palpably from the Ethos of the Roman orator and statesman Cicero, which differs in turn from Saint Augustine’s early Christian Ethos, Machiavelli’s Renaissance Ethos, Campbell’s Enlightenment Ethos, Burke’s modern Ethos, Barthes’s postmodern Ethos and so on” (p. 263). Plato’s Ethos was quite different from that of Aristotelian value neutral Ethos. Baumlin (2001) has explained Plato’s concept of Ethos (though Plato did not use the term) as “premised on the moral and, ultimately, theological inseparability of the speaker-agent from the speech-act….In Platonic fashion, Ethos defines the space where language and truth meet and are made incarnate within the individual” (p. 264).

Aristotle’s Ethos portrayed only through the medium of speech was not acceptable to the Romans. Cicerion and Quintilian Ethos deal more with emotions thus making Roman Ethos closely related to pathos. The Christian Ethos of Saint Augustine was a fusion of Classical and Ciceronian models. During the Renaissance, Machiavelli’s Ethos rendered all questions of morality irrelevant far exceeding Aristotle’s rhetoric of appearances. Since the late Renaissance, the concept of Ethos earlier based on oratory became more complicated due to popularity of writing and literacy and reduced importance of the live audience. By the end of nineteenth century the “rhetoric textbooks emphasize skills of written self-expression, literary – aesthetic discrimination… valuing clarity of communication over powers of persuasion”
(Baumlin, 2001, p. 271). By the early 20th century Ethos was reduced to “literary persona or a skill of stylistic adaptability at the same time eschewing questions of public morality and the traditional aims of civic discourse” though there were few exceptions such as Campbell who adapted the classical theory of Ethos taking into account both speech and writing (Baumlin, 2001, p. 272).

The concept of Ethos was applied to sociological context by Sumner in 1906 in his classic Folkways and used for denoting the characteristic traits of a group or community instead of an individual (Juby, 2001, p. 25). Referring to Greek usage, Sumner (2002) defined the term Ethos as “the sum of the characteristic usages, ideas, standards, and codes by which a group was differentiated and individualized in character from other groups” (p. 36). However, he preferred to use the term ‘mores’. The sociological interpretation of Ethos also influenced rhetorical research on Ethos.

During the 20th century influences of Marxism, linguistic theory of Saussure and psychology of Freud led to fragmentation of the self and ego as the discourse became “a point of intersection of various cultural, linguistic and psychic forces” beyond individual’s own control (Baumlin, 2001, p. 273). Post-structuralism questioned textualization of Ethos and upheld the loss of very identity of the body that writes. The advancement in technologies of mass media led to a revival of Aristotelian Ethos of artistic proof as speakers/writers can construct their self-image in media. Now “Aristotelian Ethos provides an instrument of cultural criticism as much as a means of rhetorical invention, teaching its students to analyze, critique and even resist a speaker’s manipulations of self-image” (Baumlin, 2001, p. 275).

2.11. Relationship of Culture, Ethos and Ethics

The term Ethos is sometimes used interchangeably with Culture, Climate, Ambience and Spirit (Solvason, 2005, p. 86-88). In fact occurrences of interchangeability of three terms Ethos, Culture and Climate are so high in literature on education that Glover and Coleman (2005) concluded their paper
titled “School Culture, Climate And Ethos: interchangeable or distinctive concepts?” asking the same question they began with (p. 265). Most remarkable is perhaps interchangeability of Ethos and Culture in popular perceptions and academic discourses as pointed out by Solvason (2005). Glover and Coleman (2005) noted that the term Ethos is used in British and European literature as the descriptor of social dynamics either in place or as a component of the broader term ‘culture’ (p. 252). Solvason (2005) believes that “culture has solidity where Ethos is more elusive” (p. 86). In her opinion culture is a tangible entity whereas Ethos is far more nebulous. One comprehends culture of an organisation (school) while one experiences Ethos (Solvason, 2005, p. 87). She disagrees with Donnelly’s (2000) concept of Ethos. Donnelly (2000) believes that Ethos is experiential but in her opinion it is a more specific term located and subsumed within the broader concept of culture (p. 136). The wide divergence of interpretations of these two terms is noticeable. However, Ethos is treated as an experiential concept and as a subset of culture by general consensus.

The relation of Ethos with Ethics is sometimes ambiguous. Sumner (1906/2002) stated that “Ethics were things which pertained to the Ethos” (p. 36-37). In Business Ethics few scholars explain differences between Ethics and Ethos in terms of distinctions between duty and virtuousness. Ethics are understood as duties only. Ethical rules (as found in codes of ethics) are seen as vulnerable ones by Giddens (1979) and Orlikowski (2000) due to their inevitable interpretative elements, ultimately defined by how people apply them (as cited in Caza, Barker & Cameron 2004, p. 172). Whereas Ethos is synonymous with virtuousness and is seen as a standard that extends beyond duty to the underlying ideal that motivates ethical rules and obligations. However, others in Business Ethics as Josephson and Walton see Ethos as an extension or expression of ethical principles (as cited in Caza et al., 2004, p. 173), the same approach is applied in this study.
2.2. PROFESSIONAL ETHOS

The term *Profession* lies in the core of professional *Ethos*, and professionalism shapes the character of a profession. A profession is differentiated from a vocation as it separates professional from personal concerns. In the late 19th century, a set of occupations organized along the intellectual disciplines such as, the Humanities, Natural and Social Sciences gained strategic importance as professions. The functional groups such as practitioners of Medicine, Law and Engineering became regulated and institutionalized (Parsons, 1968, p. 536). Professionalization depends on the developments related to the social division of labour, structures of authority and socio-cultural inequality. Higher the profession greater the complexities in terms of knowledge and theories.

When an occupation becomes a profession then ethical concerns become relevant. The values, beliefs and affiliations are central to identity of a profession since these ensure a social cohesion of the practitioners of a profession. This belief has roots in the works of Durkheim (1933). These characteristics of a profession are central to its *Ethos*. The articulation of the professional *Ethos* is what makes a profession a moral enterprise and distinguishes it from any other job category.

Professional *Ethos* has two features: the internal which has its roots in each individual professional; and the external in the credo of a professional organization. Bowman (2000) observes, “Taken alone neither personal conscience nor professional code is sufficient as an ethic….. This articulation in dialectical fashion, likely will inform and test personal conscience which in turn will lead to a dialogue about the code, a process that is crux of the professional *Ethos*” (p. 677). Thus, study of professional *Ethos* covers both the personal and professional organization’s ethical value systems.
2.3. **ETHOS OF LIBRARY SERVICE**

As noted above, the foundation of *Ethos* lies in the value system of a profession. The values of the profession are rooted in its underlying philosophy and are shaped by professionalism of the practitioners.

2.31. **Philosophical Context**

The philosophy of librarianship deals with the fundamental purposes of the library, whether in terms of service to the individual or to the larger goals of society (Rogers, 1984, p.18-19). The humanistic tradition of librarianship that upheld the role of library as a social agency predominated since the beginning as upheld by Bostwick (1907), Foss (1909) and in the 1920s Ranganathan’s Five Laws of Librarianship articulated the social role. In the 1930s, role of the library as a social institution increased further as clarified by Butler (1933) and Danton (1934) (as cited in Rogers, 1984, p.18-21). The humanistic tradition was reiterated by Sayers (1950) and Haines (1950) who dealt with librarianship’s mission to promote the reading of great literature and dealt with the role of good books in individual’s character formation, intellectual development and sensitivity (as cited in Rogers, 1984, p. 18).

On the other hand few other librarians accorded unparalleled primacy to the individual. In the post-War period McColvin (1949) and Broadfield (1949) and later more famously, Foskett (1962) took the line of thought further – “A good librarian must be able as a professional, to undergo rapid, chameleon like changes as an enquirer follows another. If he has no politics, no religion and no morals, he can have all politics, all religions and all morals” (p.10-11). The conflict between these two approaches to the philosophy of librarianship was heightened in the late 1960s and early 1970s. During this period the discussions on the nature of Information Science provided new dimensions to the study of philosophy of librarianship. Shera (1972) served as a bridge thinker with his concept of social epistemology, initiated by Egan in the early 1950s (Rogers, 1984, p. 21-23).

Further, the debates about philosophy of librarianship had become more sophisticated in the later half of 20th century, enriched by information theory
of Kaplan (1964), Wright (1976), Nitecki (1979), Yngve and others (Rogers & Mc Chesney, 1984 p. 24-5). Budd’s phenomenology and Radford and Radford’s post-structuralism were significant contributions to LIS thoughts during the 1990s and the first decade of 20\textsuperscript{th} century (Hjorland, 2005, p. 8).

2.32. Professionalism in Library Service

Professionalism of the practitioners influence \textit{Ethos} of that profession and library service is no exception. Professionalism of librarianship, like any other profession, is determined by criteria/characteristics. Froehlich (1997) identifies the following ‘fundamental characteristics’ of a profession and concludes that librarians and other information specialists clearly fit within these characteristics. He listed the criteria of profession following Bayles (1989) (as cited in Froehlich, 1997, p. 4):

i. it entails extensive training;

ii. it entails a significant intellectual component; and

iii. the trained ability puts one in the position to provide an important service to society

iv. the existence of a professional organisation

v. a process of certification of licensing

vi. autonomy in work, that is, freedom to exercise various details attendant to broad responsibilities

Those who questioned librarianship’s professional character such as, Butler (1933), Goode (1961), Shaffer (1968) (as cited in Jayaswal, 1990, p.21), Benge (1970), Atkinson’s (1974) and Asheim(1979) and Diamond and Dragich (2001) found it wanting in some of these characteristics as noted above. The selection of significant criteria for indicating professionalization of librarianship varies from practitioner to practitioner. For example, according to Froehlich (1997), the first three of the listed characteristics are integral, last three are common (p. 4). Shera (1970) highlights only two criteria of professionalism viz. service to society and intellectual content. He remarked that librarianship faces problem with the second element i.e., intellectual
content (Shera, 1970, p. 28). He provided the intellectual or sociological foundations of librarianship with the theory of *Social Epistemology*.

In India, practitioners cutting across all categories, generally accept the professional character of librarianship. Gopinath (1967) traced the growth of library profession through three phases – Scholarly period (roughly till 1850s), Vocational period (roughly from 1850-1950) and Professional period (roughly after 1950). He forcefully contested the arguments of Butler and Goode regarding absence of theoretical foundation or fundamental principles and cited Ranganathan’s Five Laws as providing the intellectual content for librarianship (as cited in Khanna, 1994, p…. ). The Indian professionals by and large follow Gopinath’s approach towards professionalism of library service. One exception is Jayaswal’s (1990) sociological perspective that categorizes library service as semi-profession (p.21).

3. **VARIOUS APPROACHES TO STUDY OF ETHOS OF LIBRARY SERVICE:**

*Ethos* has been studied both in its professional and organizational manifestations in library service for the purpose of this research. There are very few theoretical frameworks that emerge from the studies on *Ethos* of the libraries as organizations or of the professionals already discussed in chapter 2. Few notable frameworks for study of *Ethos* in LIS have been discussed below.

3.1. **ROTHSTEIN’S MODEL**

Samuel Rothstein, the Director of the Library School at the University of British Columbia, delivered a lecture in 1967 at the Canadian Library Association wherein he explained *Ethos* of the librarians with a very pragmatic approach. Gorman (2000) rated Rothstein’s declaration of principles among four of the greatest contributions to the history and philosophy of enduring library values (p.21-24). While criticizing the then ALA code of ethics, Rothstein proposed the declaration of principles comprising the following three components, which according to him,
constitute *Ethos* of the profession (Rothstein, 1968, p.156-157; Gorman, 2000, p. 21-24):

(i) A statement of values, beliefs and goals

(ii) Special abilities and knowledge, that constitutes special competence of librarians

(iii) Issues (tensions and Dilemmas)

Rothstein further enumerated the components of each of the three constituents of *Ethos* as follows:

(i) Components of values, beliefs, goals constitute of - a special commitment to reading; enlarging horizons and elevating the taste of the community, using discriminating selection of materials as a tool; Intellectual Freedom; helping people to secure the information they need

(ii) Components of special abilities and skills comprise of - Collection development; Bibliographic control; Reference and information services; Reader’s advisory work; A specialized field, where appropriate; Administration

(iii) Issues which are causes of tensions and dilemmas, viz, Are librarians really one group or congeries of related groups? Do books, libraries and librarians have a future or is librarianship as we know it to be phased out in favor of bits, databanks and documentalists? Are librarians educators or simply technicians or managers? Do we try to reach everybody or just that small percentage that appreciates our services? Do librarians set policy or execute policy set by others? What is the relationship of the chief librarian to the professional staff? Is he a first among equals or a general giving orders to subordinates?

Rothstein (1968) was the only scholar who presented such a comprehensive discussion on the concept of *Ethos* of librarianship, however, his approach was subjective. He did not discuss *Ethos* in historical or theoretical context of
development of the profession. Still all the values listed by him are quite relevant today except the one on elevating taste of the readers. About it Gorman (2000) has noted that “society doesn’t have a consensus about good taste and such a belief about elevation of taste may amount to elitism” (p. 22).

3.2. FROEHLICH'S MODEL

Froehlich (1997) has explained the ideal Ethos for library and information services in terms of a dynamic interplay among personal, professional, organizational and sometimes cultural values. He has explained Ethos in its ideal form and its absence. An ideal situation, according to him, is “when it is properly deployed, professional life should affirm, extend and develop many personal ethical values. The same could also be said of one’s organizational roles, that they should cultivate and nurture personal values” (Froehlich, 1997, p. 80). In the introduction of his report on major ethical and legal issues facing library and information services, he has presented a set of core values foundational for all professionals which are based on theory of human dignity and the values presented by Bayles (1989). These values are: Freedom and Self-determination; Protection from Injury; Equality of Opportunity; Privacy and Minimal Well-being (as cited in Froehlich, 1997, p. 10). The report also repeatedly emphasizes the roles of cultural, religious, social and ethnic environment in shaping of personal Ethos (Froehlich, 1997, p. 79). His observation “while ethical values and obligations can be shared, their articulation in a particular culture or society may differ from that of another culture or society” is noteworthy (p. 89). He has also discussed environmental issues in terms of specific organizational or professional contexts.

Froehlich (1997) has also explained absence of ideal Ethos as reflected in inevitable conflicts with special reference to developing countries. He has applied Maslow’s Theory of Hierarchy of Needs to identify different levels of ethics and determine ideal ethics, working pressure, subversive and survival ethics.

Though Froehlich (1997) did not study Ethos exclusively, however, his explanation of ideal Ethos can be applied to a framework. His survey aimed
“to delineate common or shared values and to establish ethical standards, principles and guidelines for library and information professionals worldwide” (Froehlich, 1997, p. 1). His approach has been interpretive; his observations about ideal Ethos are based on analysis of selective formal official statements such as international declarations of bills of rights, manifestoes of ALA, IFLA and UNESCO; and codes of library associations. His listing of values on this basis has its own limitations. Again, due to ambiguity in the usage of the term library and information services, it is not clear if we can classify Froehlich’s usage of the term Ethos as professional or organizational Ethos. However, in an earlier writing on ethical values of LIS, Rubin and Froehlich (1996) referred to five values of information professions that they felt could serve as the values of the profession, the individuals and the organization. On this basis, one can safely assume that in 1997 also Froehlich was referring to both professional and organizational Ethos. Again, despite taking note of interests of multiple stakeholders and cultural diversity and opposing cultural homogenization, on the whole Froehlich (1997) took the positivist perspective of searching for an ideal Ethos and viewing ‘inevitable’ conflict of values as a negative force (p. 80-81).

3.3. RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF ETHOS

Interpretive frameworks have been used by few scholars for analyzing rhetorical aspects of professional Ethos. A rare study from the rhetorical perspective of Ethos of librarians in interpretive paradigm in LIS is that of Stoddart and Lee (2005) who have applied the fantasy theme analysis of Bormann to Library Science literature. Bormann’s development of the theory of Fantasy-Theme analysis uses the idea of fantasy chains and “draws from the theory of symbolic convergence which relies on two assumptions. First, that communication or rhetoric creates reality; and second, that symbols not only create reality for individuals but that individuals’ meanings for symbols can converge to create a shared reality for the group of participants” (Stoddart & Lee, 2005, p. 6-7). Based on Bormann’s analysis, the authors have analysed the character or Ethos of the discipline constructed by academics or
professional scholars of LIS. They selected Library Science textbooks of Richard E. Rubin, William A. Katz, Richard Bopp and Linda C. Smith to validate the rhetorical construction of a fantasy theme for the librarian as the patron’s information champion. In the second part of the article they have made an analysis of librarian’s image in the popular media to find out the results of the fantasy theme. They have referred to versions of Star War films for popular image of librarians. Stoddart and Lee (2005) have argued that “the reality of the librarian as deployed by librarians is not in sync with the larger reality of the patron” (p. 9). They have concluded that “there is a schism between the people’s perception of the librarian and the internal rhetorical construction of the role of the librarian as developed in the literature of Library Science” (Stoddart & Lee, 2005, p. 5).

A rhetorical framework with historical perspective was applied by Harris (1976) to study professional Ethos of American librarianship in the next decade. He discussed American librarians’ commitments and priorities through a content analysis of literature. He specifically selected 3 collections of essays with around 40 essays on American librarianship published on the occasion of the centenary of ALA. He traces self-congratulatory attitudes of professionals towards achievements of the profession by quoting from their writings. The analysis is passionately self-critical as he has described the whole century as a history of a series of failed missions or crusades of the librarians (Harris, 1976, p. 284).

Bade (2009) has dealt with the Aristotelian rhetoric from a different perspective in the context of information communication in a library in his paper titled “Ethos, logos, pathos or sender, message, receiver?: A problematological rhetoric for Information Technologies”. This framework addresses the rhetorical aspect in LIS in the context of information communication. The author has presented a critique of the mathematical theory of information communication of Shannon and Weaver that treats all communication as transport of messages without taking into account their origins or meanings. Bade (2009) has contrasted this theory with that of
Michel Meyer’s rhetorical approach to communication and Roy Harris’ integrational philosophy of language (p. 612).

4. ETHOS MODELS IN OTHER DISCIPLINES

As noted above there is a dearth of theoretical frameworks available in LIS for study of Ethos, both professional and organisational. Therefore, the search for theoretical frameworks was extended to other professional disciplines such as, Organisational Studies, Educational Studies, Public Service Management, Business Communication, etc. The frameworks discussed below are on the basis of literature review in Chapter 2.

4.1. VIRTUOUSNESS MODEL IN ORGANISATIONAL STUDIES

The beginning of the 21st century witnessed emergence of the trend in organizational studies to treat virtuousness as Ethos of the organization due to frequent and rapid change in the business world. Technological and socio-economic developments and rise in corporate scandals and the global financial crisis brought ethical issues to the forefront.

Caza, Barker, Cameron and Bright (2004; 2006) presented logical and moral arguments for the organizational importance of Ethos equivalent to virtuousness, in addition to ethics and responsibility. The authors have concluded that effect of virtue in organizations derives from its buffering and amplifying effects. (Caza et al, 2004, p. 169-78). In 2006 two authors, i.e., Caza and Cameron, of the earlier paper with Bright took their research to a different level by empirically examining the buffering and amplifying effects of virtuousness in organizations affected by downsizing. According to them, “an organizational Ethos of virtuousness refers to the pursuit of highest aspirations in human condition… It is characterized by human impact, moral goodness, and unconditional societal betterment” (Bright, Cameron & Caza, 2006, p. 249). The study finds out that two types of virtuousness – tonic and phasic – are associated with the buffering and amplifying effects. The framework based on quantitative methods developed by the authors presents the differences between unethical, ethical and virtuousness-driven behaviours.
as a continuum of deviance from normal or acceptable behaviour as shown in Fig.1.

**Figure 1. Continuum Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
<th>Negative Deviance</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Positive Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Honoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Unethical</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>Virtuousness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The left end of the continuum refers to *Negative Deviance* characterized by harmful, unethical or dishonest behaviour. The middle point reflects acceptable *Normal* or *Ethical Behaviour* that is more concerned with prevention of wrong. The right end of the continuum describes *Positive Deviance* characterized by virtuousness i.e., development of excellence in human or organizational character. The continuum model is applicable, only if, *Ethos* is treated narrowly as virtuousness. It needs to be noted that this narrow approach to organizational *Ethos* does not differentiate among personal, professional and organizational virtues or values and the resultant conflicts which are very much the essence of *Ethos* as explained in educational literature.

### 4.2. ETHOS MODELS IN EDUCATION

Following two models for study of *Ethos* are from educational studies.
4.21. Donnelly’s Model

Donnelly (2000) applied organizational theory to develop measurable descriptors of school Ethos and defined organizational Ethos of a school in the context of positivist and anti-positivist approaches (Glover & Coleman, 2005; Solvason, 2005). She examined the linkages and relationships between the officially prescribed school Ethos and that which emerges from social interaction and found divergences between what was professed and practiced.

On the basis of her research, she developed a three dimensional framework for study of school Ethos which takes both positivist and anti-positivist perspectives in conjunction with a third one for greater conceptual clarity. Donnelly’s (2000) three dimensional Ethos are - Aspirational Ethos (superficial) manifested in documents/statements from school authorities such as Churches; secondly, Ethos of Outward Attachment manifested in school organizational structures, physical environment of the school and behaviour of individuals; and thirdly, Ethos of Inward Attachment (deep) manifested in individual’s deep-seated thoughts, feelings and perceptions (p. 151). While the first dimension of Ethos is purely official perspective, the second dimension takes into account the formal expressions of support mostly display or outward commitment of the staff. The third dimension includes the deep feelings of each towards the official Ethos, their dilemmas etc. She studied Ethos of all the members of the school including the management, teachers and the parents of the students.

4.22. Smith’s Model

Smith (2003) used Ethos of an educational organization to denote dynamics among several types of ecological factors (p. 463). He explained Ethos in terms of Bourdieu’s concept of habitus. “This concept (of habitus) develops the environmental relationships commonly ascribed to the environment of plants into an organisational context. The term means an ingrained disposition to act, think and feel in a particular way and is shaped by the process of
socialization” (Glover & Coleman, 2005, p. 258). Smith (2003) believed that Ethos of a school was resultant of two factors - firstly, school’s mix of pupils and the values, attitudes and behaviours they bring to the school; and secondly, formal expressions of the authorities’ aims and objectives expressed formally through the curriculum and the management and organizational processes provided by the authorities both within and beyond the school.

According to Smith, Ethos is distinct from organisational culture and is the interface of the school culture and climate with pupil’s experience of their schools (Smith, 2003, p. 468).

4.3. ETHOS MODEL IN BUSINESS COMMUNICATION

Application of Aristotelian theory of Ethos to Business Communication for enhancing credibility of companies is a late 20th century phenomenon. The three classical components of Aristotelian Ethos i.e., Intelligence, Character and Goodwill have been reformulated in Business Communication scenario. Thus Goodwill has been substituted by Dynamism, Intelligence has been relabelled as Competence and Expertise; and Character as Trustworthiness (Isaksson & Jørgensen, 2010, p. 125). In the later half of the first decade of 21st century, studying rhetorical aspects of communication of corporate or organizational Ethos through the websites became a trend.

Isaksson and Jørgensen (2010) studied credibility in the discourse of communicating Ethos through websites between the companies and its audience. They developed an Aristotle-inspired model to study communication of corporate Ethos. This model has been developed adopting three top level Ethos Qualities in corporate communication i.e., Expertise, Trustworthiness and Empathy, which according to the authors are reflections of Aristotle’s three qualities i.e., Intelligence, Character and Goodwill. The Ethos model at Fig.2. shows that the authors conceptualized a total of 11 different Ethos Appeals for communicating 3 Ethos Qualities as mentioned above. As per the model, 5 Ethos Appeals of Self-promotion are for expressing Expertise, 4 Ethos appeals of Self-Characterization for Trustworthiness, and 2

**Figure 2: Ethos Model for Analysis of Credibility in Corporate Discourse**

![Ethos Model Diagram](image)


### 4.4. ETHOS MODEL IN PUBLIC SERVICE MANAGEMENT

Historically, there were two dominant traditions in Public Administration (now Public Service Management) related to development of ethical standards in the West i.e., the bureaucratic and democratic *Ethos*. “The *Bureaucratic Ethos* (which includes efficiency, efficacy, expertise, loyalty and accountability) is grounded in Weber’s model of bureaucracy, Wilson’s politics/administration dichotomy and Taylor’s scientific management. The *Democratic Ethos* (which embraces regime values, citizenship, the public interest and social equity) is based on Rohr’s constitutional values, Cooper’s responsible administrator, Lippman’s public interest and Rawl’s social equity” (Bowman, 2000, p. 674). *Public Service Ethos* came to be increasingly characterized by a set of values identified in the report of the House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee, 2002 of UK (Rayner, Lawton and Allinson, 2010, p. 29).
In 2010, Rayner et al. developed a positivist framework for measuring of change of Ethos of Public Service. They have defined Ethos as “a way of life that includes a set of values held by the individuals, together with the organizational processes and procedures that shape and are shaped by those values” (Rayner et al., 2010, p. 29). Public Service Ethos is conceptualized by the authors as a three dimensional construct that encompasses Public Service Belief (motivations of individuals), Public Service Practice (delivery of duties) and Public Interest (perceived ends to endorse). This study aims to measure the change in Ethos due to induction of private sector management or corporate, also known as the New Public Management (NPM), values and principles. The allegiance of Public Service managers to NPM values were measured using a psychometric instrument. The framework has been developed in combination with Public Service motivational theory.

The limitation of Rayner et al.’s model is that though it is most suitable for testing attitudes and motivations of professionals, it does not offer adequate coverage to organizational influences. In this context it needs to be mentioned that, Rayner et al. (2010) were quite aware of inadequacies of empirical research for studying an experiential concept such as Ethos and suggested use of their framework with qualitative research to develop a comprehensive theory of Public Service Ethos (Rayner et al, 2010, p. 13).

5. CONCLUSION

In this study the approaches of Froehlich and Rothstein have been fused together, with a primacy to Froehlich’s contemporary value-centric approach to define the term Ethos as constituting of values including beliefs and dilemmas. Ethos is shaped by an interplay among professional, organizational and personal values that sometimes generate conflicts or dilemmas. Their explanations of Ethos are complementary and Froehlich’s (1997) definition is significant due to its value centrism. This centrality of values in Froehlich’s conception of Ethos also conforms to the current trend of research in ethos in other disciplines such as Organizational Behaviour, Education and Public Service Management.
The present research for analysis of change of *Ethos* of the library service in the context of special libraries has partially adapted theoretical frameworks from various professional disciplines. New research models have been developed on the basis of theoretical frameworks available in Education studies and Business Communication and have been applied to case studies of special libraries. While research methods inspired by those applied in Public Service Management have been used to analyze the change in professional *Ethos* of the community of special library executives of Delhi.
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