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Errata

In volume 42, number 4, the table on page 709 of Ann Peterson Bishop's article, "The Role of Computer Networks in Aerospace Engineering," contained an error. On the following page is the corrected table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>% of USERS agreeing with statement</th>
<th>% of NON-USERS agreeing with statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The results of my work are integrated with the work of others</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spend my day working independently</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the people I need to communicate with are in my building</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I require a diverse range of information from a variety of sources</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time pressures are tremendous in my work</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work is routine, predictable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work discussions require having documents, devices and drawings in hand</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I examine physical devices, instruments, materials, processes, etc.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The products I design, develop, or produce are highly complex</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in a field that is extremely competitive</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization is hierarchically structured (not project-based)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organizational culture is rigid and authoritative</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work is classified</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of my work are proprietary</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of my work are stored in computerized form</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I started my professional career without networks</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to learn new computer things just for the fun of it</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking requires too much effort to learn and keep up with</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know all about networked information services relevant to my work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking help comes from formal training or support programs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network transmission is unreliable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing network applications are well-suited to my work</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the people, tools, resources I need are on the network</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking is not seamless—many unconnected incompatible systems</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking costs outweigh its benefits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network use is actively encouraged, rewarded by my organization</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of networking experience makes it hard to predict costs/benefits</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A networked computer is easily accessible to me</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers, clients, sponsors are demanding that I use networks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

IRENE B. HOADLEY

This issue of Library Trends came about one day when it occurred to me that what a director did today was very different from what they had done five, ten, or more years ago. Had the role of a director evolved into something different without it even being evident? I believe it has changed significantly. The articles in this issue address defining the role of the library director in the 1990s.

The diversity of how individuals chose to address the question of what a director does says something about the roles of library directors. Keith Cottam, in contrasting the role of directors today with that of five to ten years ago, concludes that there have been new responsibilities added, and there are definite shifts in the priorities of a director. The major change has been in the demands of external relations resulting in less time being devoted to the internal management of the library.

Herman Totten and Ronald L. Keys discuss management courses that are needed in a library education program to provide future managers the educational perspective they need to move through the management hierarchy. They provide quite a different perspective for the management courses taught in a library education program.

Following up on McAnally and Downes's (1973) findings, Dana Rooks reexamines the factors that were discussed in their original article. In addition, she identified four additional sources of strife which are confronting academic library directors today.

Richard Sweeney examines both what the post-hierarchical library will be like and the kind of individual needed to direct such
a library. David Henington addresses the issue of the influence of the library director and how placement in the organizational structure effects that influence.

Librarians no longer only direct libraries; an increasing number now head library-related organizations. Rebecca Lenzini and Bonnie Juergens examine the different roles of directors in library-related and nonlibrary settings.

Roberta Pitts focuses on defining the role of the one person library directors in public, academic, and special libraries. She also develops a profile of these directors and reveals career paths and demographic data.

Joanne Euster and Eric Solomon approach another increasing phenomenon of the directorship of libraries—the interim or acting director. The article looks at what should be expected of the acting director.

**Literature Review**

There has been an ongoing array of literature dealing with directors. It runs the gambit from anecdotal to research articles. The majority of articles deal with academic library directors. Coughlin and Gertzog (1992) provide an overview of the roles, responsibilities, and work patterns of directors. They also include brief coverage on the selection, evaluation, and termination of directors.

The seminal article on the role of the academic library director was by McAnally and Downes (1973). It was one of the first analytical articles to examine the role of the director. The findings at that point in time are almost the same today as they were twenty years ago. The role of the director has become increasingly difficult because of both internal and external pressures resulting in a loss of status of the library director. Suggestions are made for improving the situation. Hamlin (1980) followed up on McAnally and Downes's findings, again delineating the changes in the role of the director. He spoke on the increase of staff participation in administration and the importance of collection development as a responsibility of the position. He mentioned the increased requirement of dealing with staff matters, security issues, and technology.

Auret (1991) examined how library directors perceive their jobs, identifying strategic planning, policy formulation, personnel selection, resource allocation, control, and maintaining relationships as the major responsibilities of a director. He also found that the character of the individual molded the nature of the job.

There are three articles which deal with the career paths to being a director. Maag (1981) studied occupational mobility among recently appointed academic library directors. His basic finding was
that individuals are quickly typecast by type of library, making it difficult to move from one category to another. Heim and Perrault (1991) determined that women have made little progress in attaining top administrative roles in large academic libraries, and they go on to suggest ways to overcome the existing barriers. Karr (1983) studied both academic and public library directors at large institutions, arriving at a description of the typical library director in relation to undergraduate majors, library schools attended, degrees held, and first professional positions.

Mech (1982a, 1982b) and Tierney and Mech (1985) characterized directors in small college libraries in Arkansas, Texas, and the northeast by analyzing education, experience, job mobility, social origin, and job satisfaction. A composite sketch of the director in each of these situations is provided.

There are other articles that provide profiles of directors. Eng and Bevacqua (1988) interviewed female chief librarians and determined that they were models of success in part due to their positions. Karr (1984) compared characteristics of academic library directors in 1966 and 1981. Major changes were seen in regions of origin, library education, degrees, and career patterns. Olsgaard (1984) provides a composite profile of successful academic librarians. Evolutionaries and revolutionaries are the two styles of Canadian library directors characterized by Tague and Harris (1988).

In a more general sense, Moskowitz (1986) describes the managerial roles of academic library directors based on the Mintzberg model. Her study revealed that directors were primarily involved with the internal management of the library as opposed to external relations. Mech (1993) studied the managerial decision styles of 370 academic library directors. The results of the study showed that these individuals were idea- rather than action-oriented. He also found significant differences in decision styles based on the size and nature of the institution. Simon (1987) examines the effect of faculty status on library directors. The author notes the dual roles in such situations that require the director to balance the operational needs of the library with the collegial needs of directing a faculty.

The Business of Running a Library (Cirino, 1991) is a handbook for public library directors. It is a "how to" approach that is highly personalized, but there is some good advice for beginning directors in a small environment. There is a good chapter on evaluating directors in Young (1988) which could be used as a basic outline of the responsibilities of a library director. On the lighter side, Silence (1983) has provided a tongue in cheek guide to what one does once one becomes a director. There are twenty-eight rules for being a director and staying in that position. Kok and Strauble (1980) discuss
the career paths of special librarians in business, finance, and advertising who moved into officer positions in their organizations. The article provides suggestions for others who want to advance in the same way.

There are some articles that deal with "the boss." Euster's 1990 article deals with the place of the boss in libraries with flattened organizational structures. She discusses a new definition of leadership as well as a new paradigm for information-based organizations. The necessity of educating a nonlibrarian supervisor is the subject of Drake's (1990) article. He addresses the reporting lines beyond the library. Shaughnessy (1987) discusses the benefits of a successful director to the organization. His thesis is that it is in the organization's best interest, as well as that of the staff, for the director to succeed.

There is one last group of articles which need to be considered because the topic is one which is not covered by an article in this issue of Library Trends. These articles all deal with directors being fired or unwillingly leaving their positions. Only a few of the articles are mentioned here, but they are fairly representative. The first is an anonymous (1991) article describing an individual's reactions to being fired. The author discusses the telltale signs and what a director might do to avoid some of the inevitable problems of being a director. A second article (One Who Has, 1982) discusses how to maintain one's position in the face of adversity. Mutcher (1981) proposes obtaining legal advice and trying to get adequate compensation for being removed from the director's position. There are also many news reports in the literature which recount the removal of directors from positions.

THEMES

There are some common themes which run through the articles in this issue, and there are some issues which have really not been addressed. These comments are centered around the topics of the environment, preparation, disappearing roles, new roles, unfulfilled roles, and other related topics.

The internal environment of the library has changed and continues to change. As Richard Sweeney states, it is time to move beyond the current hierarchical structure to one that is more interactive. What he does not take into account is the spread on the continuum of where libraries are now. Some are still run as autocratic organizations while some have taken participation to mean complete delegated authority close to what Sweeney proposes. More libraries are closer to the participatory style than the autocratic model. Some
libraries have adopted total quality management (TQM), but it is too early to know if there will be real tangible results or if it will be a fad which is short lived and ineffective in libraries.

There is no question that those who work in libraries desire to be a part of the decision-making process if not the decision makers. Involvement produces better decisions, but there must still be some review of lower level decisions to be sure that the organization is moving in one direction toward a common goal. That is the responsibility of the director. It is also the responsibility of the director to find the right balance of guidance, involvement, and direction.

As libraries and directors struggle with finding the right management philosophy, they are also faced with increasing demands from users, stable or even declining budgets, indifference from administrators, a wider array of services and responsibilities, building programs, fund raising, and much more. The demands have raised the stress levels resulting in more frequent weariness and burnout, particularly for those who are really trying to evoke change. A statement by directors heard most frequently is "where has all the fun gone?" In many instances it has gone away. Management by reacting will tend to create more stress and less joy. Directors need to find ways to develop a balance so that a positive environment is maintained.

Henington's article deals with the status of the director in the public library, but the same is probably true in any type of library. Directors, and for that matter many other members of our profession, have devoted a lot of time and attention to the issue of status—faculty status or something else; dean or director or librarian; masters or doctorate. If as much effort was invested in doing what had to be done, libraries and librarians might have more status. Henington notes the importance of what is done and the librarian's relationship with upper-level administrators, rather than place in the hierarchy, as being important.

The career ladders of librarians seeking to be directors have changed some as evidenced by the slowly increasing number of female directors, especially of large libraries, but, in general, things are still much the same. Many males get on the fast track to administration while most women do it the old fashioned way by putting in their time and working their way up through the ranks.

And what are library education programs doing to educate those individuals who seek management positions? As Totten and Keys have pointed out, library management courses have not developed to the extent that they are ahead of what is actually happening in libraries. In many instances they are behind what is actually occurring. In fact, programs like the Senior Fellows have probably been more relevant to preparing individuals for being directors.
The list of characteristics developed by Richard Sweeney for being a director is more rigorous and broader than what was expected ten or twenty years ago. Also required are more management skills, stamina, human relation skills, and much more. Another requirement which has received some attention is the need for a doctorate. In public libraries, it is not a factor, and even though it is not required in most academic libraries, it does sometimes open doors that may not open otherwise. It also serves as an equalizing factor with other administrators and the faculty in an academic setting.

The question of credentials for directors is one that has not been seriously addressed. The issue of individuals who are not librarians heading libraries is not unique to libraries or library education programs. It is a phenomenon found in many disciplines. Many major corporations are headed by persons who have no background in that particular industry. In the corporate world this seems more prevalent than in libraries. This may be an indication that management skills are the most necessary criteria for being a director.

If management skills are the primary criteria for a director, there will have to be an increased emphasis in this area in library education programs. One general course on library administration/management will not be sufficient. It may be necessary to take a different approach and require a certain amount of management education as one advances through the professional ranks. Learning on the job can too often be a painful experience.

One issue that has been alluded to several times is the lack of time for some activities. There seems to be no question that the pace for a director has increased. Euster refers to it by saying that efficiency, knowledge, and delegation are all necessary to get the job done and then maybe it is not enough. When one considers the meetings, telephone calls, fax and e-mail messages, regular correspondence, and professional activities, there are no hours left in the day. The nine meeting day does not leave much time for anything else.

There are also some roles that are either disappearing or now have a lower priority. The scholar librarian is really a concept of the past. It is not that library directors do not have the ability to be scholars, they simply do not have the time. Another factor which probably influences the lack of scholar librarians is that more library directors have come to librarianship early in their careers and have not come from other established careers making it possible to maintain both. Time is again a factor since the demands on a director's time just to manage and lead the library is much more than a full-time job.

Another closely related role that seems on the decline is the director as a faculty member. The director on the academic campus
is an administrator and not a faculty member. A collegial role with faculty is not often present.

Building library collections has passed from the almost exclusive domain of the director to the specialists in that area. In many cases it is a matter of priorities and time which do not allow a director the luxury of the level of involvement required for building collections. This also reflects the priority of collection building in libraries because it is very often taken for granted. And since fewer librarians are also discipline scholars, there is probably less interest on their part.

There are also some new roles or roles that now have a much higher priority than they previously did. The first of these is as a campus or city policy maker. In the past, librarians were often not included in these groups, which probably did not present too much of a problem because the level of policy making was much lower, and there was less interaction of activities. Today, with libraries at the center of information activities, they must be involved—in fact, they should be taking the leadership role. This is happening in some situations but not in the vast majority.

Just as there is a need for an increased role as a policy maker on campus or in city government, there is also a need for an increased policy role in the larger arena of state, regional, and national activities. Libraries can no longer even propose self sufficiency; they must work together for the common good.

There are also roles that need to have a higher priority. Developing future directors who will also be leaders must be a priority of current directors. Mentoring is an ongoing process, but it is also a selective endeavor with limited involvement. Programs like the Senior Fellows and some state level leadership programs help fill the void. The more individuals are prepared for the responsibilities of being a director, the greater their chances of success which in turn benefits everyone. It is in everyone's best interest that the director succeed, because when that person does not, everyone loses—the individual, the staff, the organization, and the users.

Although placement in the organizational structure may not have much impact on a director's effectiveness, there are some other organizational factors which can affect the role of the director. Both unions and faculty status do have an effect on the role of directors. In the case of unions, other than involvement in negotiating the contract, which may or may not involve the director, many staff issues are predetermined leaving the director little or no flexibility in reassigning staff because of different job requirements, termination because of inadequate skills to do the job, restructuring positions,
or even changing work schedules. Lack of flexibility can lead to inertia in the organization.

A director in a library with faculty status has to balance the need to operate the library with providing a collegial environment to provide the flexibility and the time for a faculty member to fulfill those responsibilities. Time is needed for participation in campus and library governance as well as the pursuit of the scholarly endeavors of research, publication, and professional activities.

There are some other factors which are not easily categorized. One of those is pace. Because of the increased interrelationships and complexities of what has to be done, activities take more time. Participation and involvement take time. Nothing is simple. With a greater diversity of input, there is less focus, which also slows the process because efforts must be made to bring everyone who is involved to the same level of competence and understanding. Seizing the moment will become a concept of the past.

Another factor influencing pace is bureaucracy. As libraries have grown in size, they have developed increasing bureaucracies which are exacerbated by the bureaucracies of the parent organization. Having ideas or requests wind their way through an organization takes time and slows the pace of activities considerably. Flattening hierarchies will help this situation, but for any but internal procedures, there will inevitably continue to be a decision-making process because without it there can be chaos. Large libraries are bureaucratic organizations, but university and city governments are almost unmanageable bureaucracies which often do not facilitate change or innovation. Most bureaucracies thrive on the status quo.

Although there are some indirect references to the topic, no one really addressed the disadvantages of being a director. There were discussions of time demands and stress and even of not being able to please everyone even part of the time. What went unsaid is that almost everyone would rather be a director with all of the inherent problems than not be a director. It is success by status, but it is still the goal to which many aspire.

As was already noted, there is a long list of directors who have unwillingly left their positions and in many cases were fired or reassigned—the new term for removing someone from a position. McAnally and Downes noted this phenomenon twenty years ago, and things have not changed. Reassignment or unwillingly leaving a position has usually been judged as failure on the part of the individual. Many directors go on to other similar positions, but they carry this stigma with them (and it follows them professionally). From a cursory review of the literature, public library directors are
more likely to be fired; academic library directors are often reassigned or given a time to find another position so there is a semblance of normalcy.

Librarians do not differ from other professions in this regard. Heads of business organizations are often fired or promoted into some nonposition usually with increased financial rewards. Increased financial benefits are not always a part of a separation package for library directors. There are always reasons why an individual is separated from a position. Some obviously cannot handle the responsibilities of the position, some end up in a position where their talents do not match the needs of the organization, some are caught up in new administrations that want their own person in a position, some are the victims of a staff coup, and some are the victims of a changed political environment. For whatever reason such a change occurs, it is usually detrimental to the organization.

What does the future hold for directors of libraries? Or should the question be, is there a future? With management decisions being moved to the lowest possible level, along with a flat organization structure, what does that leave for the director to do? Will the role of the director become more focused on external affairs? What are the issues that will shape the future?

The evidence provided in the articles in this issue indicate that there is a future for the director although it is a different future. It is not as a manager but, it is hoped, as a leader. Most of the research that has been done on the role of the director shows that directors continue to be primarily managers. With the apparent interest in moving decision making to the lowest possible level, directors will have to find new ways of doing business which allows decision making at a lower level but providing some assurance that those decisions fit into the overall goal and direction of the library. For example, if it is a goal to improve services by increasing availability of library resources, but one unit decides that they will close over the lunch hour, there is obviously a conflict in this specific action with a goal of the library. It will be the responsibility of the director to be sure that the staff has bought into the library's goals. To be able to do this requires a strong management team who all support the library's goals.

Another question which needs to be addressed is the role of leadership in libraries. With the increasing need of staffs at all levels to be involved in decision making and the conservative administrative postures on most campuses and in most city governments, is leadership out of style? If leadership is characterized by creativity, risk taking, innovation, and intuition, is there a way to use these skills in a conservative or risk-averse environment where practically everyone
is involved in decision making? Increased involvement often means compromises so that as many participants as possible can be accommodated to be able to initiate a program. Does participation contribute to mediocrity if there is not strong leadership to provide focus and direction? Even with a general direction, there must be some high level involvement because each individual will have a personal interpretation of a vision, even one that is well articulated. How this happens will determine the success or failure of the director. It also leaves a lot of room for creativity, risk taking, innovation, and intuition because without exercising these characteristics there is little chance for the director to resolve the present and future problems and issues.

CONCLUSIONS

The role of the library director has been expanded, politicized, changed, and complicated, but it is a role that many continue to seek because of its status and its rewards. Library directors as a group have the most potential to influence the profession because, more than any other group, they are in a position to make things happen. As in any arena, some do and some do not.

As a new generation of library directors takes charge and current directors adjust, libraries are swaying between the past and the future. Many library directors find themselves wanting to preserve the past but at the same time wanting to move cautiously toward the future. Libraries have been in this same position for almost twenty years although there are probably now more directors on the future end of the continuum than at the opposite end.

With the societal changes taking place, library directors will find themselves in even more complex organizations. If the current trend toward decentralization continues and is ever fully realized, the role of the director stands to be transformed. It could revert back to more of an overseeing position rather than a managerial one. This could allow directors to become true leaders in the libraries they direct and in the profession by exhibiting their creativity, risk taking, innovation, and intuition in approaching both the goals and the operations of the library. These skills will become increasingly important as other organizations seize pieces of the information domain. It will take our best and brightest to maintain the long-term viability of the concept of libraries as something more than warehouses for printed materials. Directors must take the lead, and, in order to do that, some of them will have to have a vision of the library of the future. If that vision is an automated version of the past, the future may be short lived. Sweeney is probably correct in that a revolution is needed, not evolution.
The directors must also find new ways to deal with the ambiguities of organizations that are amalgamations of organizational structures. Is there a way to integrate hierarchies, collegial governance, TQM, and whatever other structures that exist into a coherent or integrated structure that will not only work but will also promote the goals of libraries to all relevant constituencies? Is it the post-hierarchical library and director described by Richard Sweeney or is it something else?

The potential for finding an answer is there, but it will be essential for directors not only to find an answer but to convince a conservative leadership beyond the library of the merit of the change. That may be the greatest challenge for library directors for many years to come.
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Directors of Large Libraries:
Roles, Functions, and Activities

KEITH M. COTTAM

ABSTRACT
This article examines the current experience and trends in the roles, functions, and activities of today's directors of large libraries or library systems. Directors assume an extensive range of complex responsibilities in their unique positions, foremost of which is accountability for internal organization, operations, and management. A shift in roles, functions, and activities is occurring, however, from predominantly internal affairs to an increasing emphasis on external concerns. These include technological, economic, and political issues.

INTRODUCTION
Directing a large American library today is not what this author expected it would be thirty years ago. New information technologies and scholarly communication systems, the Internet, access issues, and intellectual property rights have made the library landscape more complex. Rising prices for scholarly journals, coupled with the sheer volume of published information, have caused major economic problems. Budget cutbacks and rising costs for human resources and facilities exacerbate the problems. Leadership expectations, external politics, demands for accountability and the compelling need for strong public relations, all belie the three decades-old foresight.

Keith M. Cottam, University of Wyoming Libraries, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82070
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BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

In 1963, the author had just entered library school at Pratt Institute with an internship in the Brooklyn Public Library. Libraries then were still largely worlds of books and other printed material. Technology was just beginning to make an appearance. There were photocopy machines—the kind that used rolls of slick paper and cost 25 cents per copy—and photo-based circulation systems but not much else. Bush's (1945) visionary "memex" was still an intriguing, creative idea for dealing with the information explosion. Automated techniques were receiving increasing attention, but practical applications were yet to come; the machine-readable records pilot project (MARC) at the Library of Congress would not begin until 1966 (Avram, 1975). Holley (1972) had not written about the changes he detected in the "organization and administration of urban university libraries" (p. 175); McAnally and Downs (1973) had not produced their classic essay on the pressures affecting the roles of directors of university libraries. Libraries were then only on the threshold of a series of transitional periods which continue today, each with a shorter life-span than the last. But nearly fifteen years would pass before many writers would begin to seriously examine the changing and unique roles of directors in large libraries caused by changes in organization, management, technology, costs, and external politics.

Lee (1977) was one of the first to examine the pressures on academic library directors and the effect the pressures had on their administrative roles. A few years later, Metz (1979) looked at descriptive data to understand the actual roles of library directors, particularly external relationships. He concluded that internal library matters demanded more time and energy than external affairs.

Baughman (1980) inquired into the roles of metropolitan library directors, noting that more and more of their time was being required outside the demands of day-to-day operations and management. Moskowitz (1986) and Mech (1989, 1990) used Mintzberg's managerial role model in three different studies of the external and internal managerial roles of library directors. In keeping with Metz's conclusion, but somewhat contrary to Baughman's observations, Moskowitz and Mech concluded that library directors in both public and academic libraries were emphasizing their internal managerial roles over external environmental matters.

The work of Euster (1987), most notably her investigation of the role of academic library leaders, provides an important new role model. The model defines the roles of academic library directors in terms of influencing both the library's internal organization and its external environment.
The author's personal experience has followed a career path from a full-time entry-level professional position in 1965, through a department headship, to the directorship of a large undergraduate library, and then to senior line and staff positions. Library directorships at a private Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member and the University of Wyoming (UW), a land-grant institution, have placed the author in the mainstream of library transition and change. For example, the University of Wyoming has moved from the affluence of the late 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s into an era of resource constraints and greater public scrutiny and accountability. The University of Wyoming Libraries have become highly visible and attract significant public attention in both the state and the region. Increasingly difficult questions are being asked about library cost effectiveness, organizational efficiency, collections and access, the quality of services provided, the adequacy of facilities, the availability of new information technologies, the role of cooperation and resource sharing, and library leadership.

The UW experience, however, particularly in view of the institution's relatively recent commitment to build and develop a large academic research library, may not be easily generalized to other large libraries. This article, therefore, is based on additional experience from across the country. It reflects a selective contemporary look at the roles of directors in other large libraries and library systems. The nature of the inquiry for the study required an exploratory qualitative approach which describes the personal experience of library directors; it is self-selecting and situational, but the responses reflect roles which are probably common to most directors. The work is based on inquiries to ninety-one directors who have headed large libraries or library systems for at least five years. The directors surveyed were selected from the author's personal acquaintances within the ARL, the American Library Association (ALA), the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL), and the Greater Midwest Research Libraries Consortium (GMRLC); and participation in the ARL Office of Management Services Consultant Training Program and the University of California, Los Angeles/Council on Library Resources (UCLA/CLR) Senior Fellows program. Thirty directors responded, including public (eight), government (one), and academic (twenty-one). Another six responded that their demanding roles and responsibilities precluded the time required to develop an adequate response to the inquiry.

The survey was focused on present positions and how they contrast with roles and responsibilities from five to ten years ago. Six questions were posed:

1. What are the functions and activities which command the majority of your time?
2. What factors determine the priorities on your time?
3. What managerial roles and activities internal to your library do you emphasize as a matter of priority and time commitment?
4. What external environmental factors (e.g., economic factors, institutional politics, technological changes, and so on) do you emphasize as a matter of priority and time commitment?
5. What functions and activities do you delegate to others?
6. How do your answers to these five questions compare with what you were doing five to ten years ago—i.e., what are you doing today that is different from what you were doing five to ten years ago?

Assumptions

The survey explored the general supposition that the roles of directors of large libraries or library systems are changing/have changed. The survey also looked at several supporting assumptions in view of the experience of the author and the respondents. These assumptions were:

- Roles have changed over the past five to ten years; shifts in priorities on functions and activities are occurring.
- Traditional managerial roles are still prevalent (situational internal library managerial functions and activities), but both internal library circumstances and external environmental factors are causing directors to spend more time now than in the past on matters external to day-to-day library organizational and operational responsibilities. The focus on external matters may include strategic planning correlated with broad environmental trends and events, interinstitutional cooperation and resource sharing, communication within consortiums and alliances, fund-raising and development, and professional association leadership.
- Directors spend more time today than they did five to ten years ago responding to societal shifts (e.g., lifelong learning trends, diversity issues, economic pressures, technological changes, increasing scrutiny of public institutions) and less time on local library-specific issues. Directors also spend more time attempting to envision, design, and deliver (speaking, writing, negotiating, and so on) strategic responses to the external environment.
- Directors spend more time today than they did five to ten years ago teaching and influencing staff and constituency regarding values, purpose, and direction of the library enterprise—communicating, delegating, building trust and confidence—and less time with hands-on program management matters.

What emerged from an analysis of the survey, completed fall 1993, was a collective point-of-view which generally validates the
author's personal experience and assumptions. The underlying general assumption was upheld: A shift in roles, functions, and activities is occurring from primarily internal managerial and organizational matters to increasing emphasis on external environmental concerns. While the subjectivity of this conclusion may be questioned, the real-life, context-sensitive experience of most of the directors who responded gives credibility to the assumptions.

FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES COMMANDING THE MAJORITY OF A DIRECTOR'S TIME

The roles of directors of large libraries at any given time are characteristically driven by time-sensitive circumstances, such as personnel issues, organizational and operational demands, budget planning timetables, fund-raising initiatives, and new building construction. Being attentive to the needs of a well-oiled and functional organization is an essential role. The sentiment expressed by Kent Hendrickson at the University of Nebraska is shared by everyone else in the survey: "I will put coordination of library functions and organization at the top of my list," although he notes that senior officers run most of the day-to-day activities.

While directors may not be in daily contact with staff members, staying in touch was cited as a central role—almost as a cardinal rule. They described the responsibility variously as communicating, team building, and staff relations. Charles Robinson (Baltimore County Public Library) gave a unique response regarding the time-consuming role of communicating with staff, describing it as "internal consulting." The consultation role is essential in order for him to exercise his judgment as director:

Staff members who have ideas, projects, or crises which they determine (by experience) should come to my attention, discuss them with me. I say yes, no, let's do this instead, think about it, etc. It takes a lot of time, but that's what I'm primarily paid for: judgment.

The range of matters on which directors focus their attention, and most certainly on which they must use judgment, is extensive and complex. Sound judgment is critical since they hold ultimate responsibility for their libraries. The matters on which judgment is required include strategic planning and decision making—where to go with the organization; policy—guidelines for action; management—how to achieve strategic goals and objectives; directing—getting effective and efficient performance from the staff; budgeting—accounting and control; governance—dealing with the stakeholder, power relationships in and out of the library; facilities—
obtaining and maintaining adequate resources; personnel—developing, encouraging, and treating them fairly; and communicating and reporting—representing the library through formal reports, newsletters, and speeches.

In dealing with these and other matters, directors appear to have shaped their management roles, and their abilities to respond to the complex mix of responsibilities, on the basis of "what works for me." The several schools of management thought (scientific, human relations, and decision theory), however, are reflected in the experience of the respondents. And several directors mentioned the influence of Total Quality Management (TQM) and "management by walking around" (MBWA) on their organization and management practices.

Another common role sentiment regarding internal operation matters came from Barbara Smith (Smithsonian Institution Library). Her comment is notable for its emphasis on the importance of effective delegation and the efficient use of communications technology:

The bulk of my time is spent responding to the pile of paper that comes across my desk daily. This involves reading, assigning to other staff to deal with, or responding myself. The "pile" now includes e-mail activity which keeps me informed and in contact with my immediate staff in ways that are more efficient than in the past. E-mail is now indispensable to an effective library operation.

E-mail is a new medium, however, and many directors are learning how to deal with it more effectively. Unlike written correspondence, with which directors have much experience and skill in managing, e-mail is not yet comfortable for everyone. The lament from Joanne Euster (University of California, Irvine) is typical of many directors: "So far I haven't found a good way of dealing with e-mail, where everything seems to be of equal urgency."

The role of participating in meetings of all kinds is reported as both essential and an annoyance. Behind the need to fulfill meeting obligations is a significant drain on time and energy. Nevertheless, directors reported significant opportunities to represent the library to constituents; articulate and communicate the library's programs; work cooperatively with library staff, citizens, students, and faculty; build confidence, trust, and cooperation for the director's vision and leadership; solve problems and develop consensus; influence planning and budgeting; coordinate staff delegated to specific tasks; and provide mentoring, counseling, and evaluation.

Even as directors attend to internal matters because of local circumstances, the impact of larger environmental factors (such as economics, politics, technology, and demographics) on local library matters is causing directors to divert more and more attention to
external concerns. Time-sensitive internal library situations continue to command a high level of attention from most directors, but, with few exceptions, they reported that more time and energy is being invested away from running the day-to-day internal affairs of the library.

The most striking diversion of time and energy reported stems from increasing economic pressures. Directors are spending more time coping with declining budgets by reassessing priorities and working to complement traditional funding with other sources of financial support. They are constantly looking for ways to attract external funding, and they indicate that successful fund-raising programs require their attention, leadership, and direct participation. Edward Johnson (Oklahoma State University) concluded: "Perhaps as much as 20% of my time is devoted to fund raising and, as a result, I have to delegate more of the routine, daily administrative activities."

Rick Ashton (Denver Public Library) listed "fund-raising strategy, volunteer cultivation, and major related tasks" second only to his current management of a major $75 million building project. Joan Chambers (Colorado State University) said: "I am much more involved in fund raising and cooperative/consortial relationships." Robert Croneberger (Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh) ranked "fund raising, fund-fighting, for money" after "coordination of staff delegated to tackle problems" and "long-range planning." Euster defined "external affairs, mostly fund raising or activities that might lead that way," as one of three categories which commands the majority of her time. Hendrickson reported, "I spend more and more of my time on development, including our Friends group...." David Hennington (Houston Public Library) reported a list of activities which command the majority of his time: "planning, community relations, governmental relations, finance, fund raising, communication with managers under my direct supervision, and grievance disposition." Gary Pitkin (Northern Colorado University) cited "fund-raising activities, including grant writing and establishing formal contacts with foundations, corporations and individuals," after his top priority of dealing with academic governance issues. Frank Rodgers (University of Miami) reported that "more and more (of my time) relates to fund-raising activities." Pat Woodrum (Tulsa City County Library) cited fund-raising following "planning" and "representing the Library locally, statewide and nationally."

A second major external role is defined variously as community relations, public relations, or "external presence," as Brice Hobrock (Kansas State University) calls it. While staff frequently do not understand the importance of these external activities, and may even
criticize the absence of the director or the way some responsibilities are delegated, directors reported the increasing importance of these external relations, functions, and activities. According to Hobrock:

All academic library directors must "represent" the interests of his/her library at multiple levels. We generally report to the Vice President or Provost, sit on the Council of Deans, and participate in a wide variety of campus and community activities that maintain the "presence" of our libraries—so we don't get left out when things are discussed or when the pie is divided. If we are not "out there," our libraries get dismissed as not being "players." The Rotary Club, the Wildcat Club, the President's Club, the Chamber of Commerce, the Country Club, are all things that we must do in various combinations in order to "represent" the best interests of our libraries. The external presence is increasingly necessary outside one's own university because of the growing need to borrow and share materials. Within one's own university system in a state, or in any regional grouping or national organization, it is necessary for directors to be a presence and, hopefully, to exert some leadership.

Directors of public libraries report similar sentiments. Annie Linnemeyer (Springfield-Greene County Library in Missouri), who also serves on a number of community boards and advisory groups, reports:

What commands most of my time is communication and, at this point, outside my institution. That means meeting with community groups to try to establish linkages with their activities—to get them to understand the role of the library in facilitating their own activities. I am trying to establish our institution as a central and essential function of this community.

Additional external functions and activities include extensive campus and community governance relationships and involvement with other outside professional responsibilities. William Potter (University of Georgia) responded:

The second greatest portion of my time (other than hands-on management) is spent working with librarians at other institutions, primarily in the Atlanta area but also throughout the state and region and through national organizations. The need for greater cooperation dictates that I spend time working with the directors of other libraries.

Sterling Albrecht (Brigham Young University) said:

A university librarian must fully understand all library procedures and how the library operates. Then the librarian must be the liaison to the university administration to interpret the library and all its complexities.
Building on a list from William Studer (Ohio State University), a typical inventory of functions and activities which command the majority of a director's time, both internally and externally, may look something like this:

- meetings of all kinds
- strategic planning, including goals, objectives, policies and priorities
- budget planning and management
- report writing
- program coordination and operations management, including collection development, public service, technology development
- personnel management, including staff development and motivation
- crisis management
- paperwork
- building projects and facilities management
- problem solving and exercising judgement
- communicating (reports, e-mail, telephone, correspondence, speeches, etc.)
- public relations or "external presence"
- liaison to the university, community or governmental authority
- fund raising and development
- consortium or alliance activities
- leadership for both local circumstances and professional associations
- professional service

Factors Which Determine Priorities on a Director's Time

Personal judgment is the factor which appears most prominently as the influence which affects a director's role. As Robinson said, judgment is why directors are paid. What is the most effective way to use available time? How will one get the most value for the time invested in any given activity? What needs to be done first? What functions and activities must rise to the top as priority in view of planning goals and objectives, crises and critical incidents, or deadlines and expectations? What time-sensitive local circumstances and situations must be addressed? What is the best balance between internal operations and management needs and external matters which require attention? What is the best way to allocate resources?

On the other hand, the roles of directors are not just characterized by uncertainty requiring decisions at every step. Richard Talbot (University of Massachusetts) represents the complementary side to the requirements for weighing, sorting, and judging:
There is a rhythm to much of what I do, what most of us do, I think. Partly, it's dictated by the budgetary cycle, partly by other kinds of cycles which are built in by the parent organization or which I adopt for myself. These include personnel reviews and periodic but deliberate organizational performance reviews. Of course, these cycles are punctuated by external demands or the need to respond to crises not of our own making. So while most of my time is focused on planning, it is different kinds of planning at different times. Sometimes it is largely budgetary. At other times it is personnel, technology, public relations, fund raising, etc.

The rhythms that Talbot feels are clearly felt by other directors. They include planning and budget timetables, promotion and tenure calendars, annual reports, construction schedules, and other scheduled commitments. The respondents, however, identified a variety of punctuated interruptions to the rhythms. Potter said: "I can plan about 75% of my time based on clearly stated goals and priorities for the library, and the other 25% of the time I am responding to unanticipated demands." Hobrock observed that "outside commitments and interruptions seem to take priority over day-to-day operations." Other interruptions cited by directors include emergencies, such as broken water pipes or library computer systems that crash, unexpected assignments from the parent institution or government agency, and issues which could have long-term consequences if not handled properly. David Walch (California Polytechnic State University) reflects the disposition of all directors when he observed that "serious matters are dealt with 'sooner than later' in order to resolve issues before they become more complex or problematic." These include requests from a provost or mayor which always take priority.

Issues with long-term consequences require a more deliberate long-term view, often having greater influence as factors which determine the priorities on a director's time. For example, the current economic and fiscal climate for most large libraries is causing a reassessment of how funding is appropriated to libraries. Budget cuts must be managed, and program downsizing is not uncommon. Information technologies are developing and becoming available faster than most libraries can implement them, and public pressure for the new technologies intensifies with each new product advertisement or popular press news story about present opportunities or visions of the future. The crisis with scholarly communication—electronic information access, serials costs and other information marketplace forces, intellectual property rights, access versus ownership, and the increased amount of published material available—is really many crises in a field in which a library is only
one player. Because of this, public and institutional information policy is becoming a significant issue which directors must face, and several directors reported their involvement in "information policy development."

Finally, directors reported a commitment to involvement in professional associations, consortiums, and alliances. Several directors noted the importance of "setting an example" or "setting the pace" for their staff members as well as the profession. Commitments made to providing professional leadership are important factors which determine the priorities on a director's time.

**Managerial Roles and Activities Emphasized as a Matter of Priority and Time Commitment**

The responses to this question were remarkably consistent and are easily grouped into the following categories:

- communicating
- delegating
- managing personnel
- planning, budgeting and budget management
- setting policy and priorities
- evaluating and assessing programs
- managing impacts from external factors on internal operations
- monitoring technology developments
- managing change
- managing construction projects
- working directly with programs, notably collection development and public services

The necessity for effective communication is a self-imposed high priority responsibility for directors. Communicating through face-to-face conversation, correspondence, and e-mail is described universally as an essential managerial role. "Management by walking around" is also cited by several directors as an effective management style and a good way of staying in touch with the staff on a personal basis. Staff development, training, and mentoring are all emphasized as a matter of priority. Tom Mayer (Sno-Isle Regional Library System in Marysville, Washington) represents the concern directors have regarding effective communications:

> Communicating effectively is one of my paramount activities, and one that I must constantly work to improve. I am learning to appreciate that many of our problems can be avoided or, at least, lessened, if I communicate more fully and clearly with board members, staff, patrons, city and county officials, and the media.
My goal is to spend some time every day consciously informing at least one person or group about the library.

Direct contact with staff, constituencies, and governing authorities contributes to the process of building consensus around programs and priorities and helps to assure staff support for directors. The consensus-building process is often reported to be demanding. Directors work at clearly and persistently articulating the library's vision, priorities, goals, and objectives. Like the influence of repetitive advertising, library staff members and clientele must hear the message about programs and priorities often to understand them and feel a part of the library enterprise. They must be given opportunities to ask questions—and directors know the importance of taking time to listen and respond with reasonable answers.

In any large organization with a plurality of values, opinions, knowledge, skills, abilities, personnel classifications and compensation rates, and job assignments, there will be conflicts. The need to spend time on conflict resolution was cited several times by respondents. While the conflict resolution skill may come naturally to some directors, others reported that they were trained in the task. Several directors observed that, because of various personnel policies, rules, regulations, and state and federal laws, they are required to set aside time for study to stay abreast of personnel management issues as well as professional trends and developments. Several directors explained the importance of building harmonious connections among employees in the various areas of library operations before conflicts occur. The strategy, of course, is to lessen the possibility of problems later on. They described meetings, memorandums, newsletters, open staff meetings, e-mail, committee work, task forces, open door policies, TQM, and MBWA all as effective methods to encourage positive staff interaction, organizational participation, and well-informed awareness and understanding.

Change is inevitable in large libraries, and it, too, can cause conflict. Most staff members are resistant to change brought about by such things as budget constraints, new program initiatives, reorganization, and new technologies. Directors reported that they are constantly aware of change occurring in their dynamic library environments (both internally and externally), and that spending time on managing the complexities of change is essential. They strive to understand the changes that are occurring or about to occur. They work to accommodate the organization for impending changes. They involve library staff and outside experts as necessary to plan for and implement change. They exercise judgment and make decisions based on the planning. They work to overcome staff uncertainties, anxieties,
and reluctance. And they strive to assure that proper evaluation and assessment of projects and programs will occur. This author has reported on a major experience with managing change at the University of Wyoming (Cottam & Stewart, 1991).

While conflict resolution and change management must be emphasized as necessary, directors also cited the importance of giving praise for staff performance and achievement. They explained that this function requires special time and attention through personal notes, formal recognitions, and personal contacts.

**EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS EMPHASIZED AS A MATTER OF PRIORITY AND TIME COMMITMENT**

Responding to technological change is almost a preoccupation for most directors. Nancy Eaton's experience at Iowa State University is representative of the roles and activities directors assume in the area:

I have stayed actively involved in national issues such as attending Coalition for Networked Information meetings and chairing the ARL Access Committee that is focusing on redesign of ILL and document delivery systems. The director of the Computation Center and I are partnering campus development in information technology, with the full support of the Provost and the deans. I have been principal investigator on several major national projects, such as the National Agricultural Text Digitizing Project and a current three-year, $2.5 million federally funded biotechnology information management project.

Dale Cluff (Texas Tech University) said that "trying to keep up with technological changes" is second only to budgeting and fundraising issues. Marion Reid (California State University, San Marcos) noted that of all the external environmental factors, "I spend most of my time on technological change." And Potter expressed the general sentiment for all directors: "Formulating the library's response to technological change is something I consider to be extremely important. The future of the library is truly at stake in this area."

Technology is viewed as both an asset which can greatly enhance library resources and services, and a liability which can place considerable stress on already strained staff and budgets. Two responses, one from Roger Hanson (University of Utah) and the other from Raymond Gnat (Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library), describe the dilemma for most directors:

Technological change influences everything we do—at least it seems so. It also seems that funding for innovative information technologies is more easily available, but funds for maintaining traditional library activities are restrained. (Hanson)
Some of the biggest management challenges we face are with the implementation of automated library services at the same time we are faced with historically high usage of traditional library services. (Gnat)

As Cluff implied, this funding dilemma causes economic factors to rise high on the agendas for all directors. Thomas Shaughnessy (University of Minnesota) said that “attempting to stop the erosion of quality (services and collections) due to economic factors” is his major external commitment. Other directors reported they can no longer assume consistent economic trends or funding patterns. Fiscal and programmatic projections and forecasts are constantly upset by budget cuts. Costs for serials continue to rise and cause disruptive journal subscription cancellations, and increasing quantities of published material available in print and electronic formats magnify the fiscal problems. The demands for new information technologies force choices about allocating limited funds.

New information technologies, particularly, are causing radical shifts in budget allocations. Libraries must purchase equipment and software, install and implement automated systems, and train staff and clientele in the use of the new technologies in addition to supporting traditional library programs.

Efforts to cope with funding dilemmas are causing directors to consider new organizational models for delivering library and information services and different methods to fund them. External fund-raising through grants, corporations, and private donors is described by many directors as the most attractive option for additional funding, and fund-raising is a major new emphasis and priority on their time.

A third factor viewed as essential is the need to attend to institutional, community, state, and national politics, including legislation. The emphasis on this factor is frequently coupled with challenges related to technology and economics. Talbot observed:

I find that in a public institution it's difficult to untangle the economic from the political and the technological. As the chief librarian it falls to me to do most of the lobbying with external groups, library groups, faculty committees, the upper administration, the legislature, etc. All of these are political activities, but they are about obtaining the funding needed to maintain and preserve present activities and to secure the funding for technological change.

In addition to technological issues, economic problems, and political matters, some directors cited the following external concerns:
• networking, cooperation, resource sharing, consortium, and alliance relationships
• state and national library politics, including leadership
• interinstitutional relationships
• public relations, promotion, and developing a positive high-profile public visibility

DELEGATION

Most directors reported placing emphasis on regular meetings and consultation with senior line and staff officers, and all directors emphasized applying the principle of delegation.

Judgment is again the key factor. Delegation appears to be a highly personal and preferential matter. "It depends," said Smith. Directors cite the delegation of technical and tactical matters; personnel management, except recruiting, communicating, mentoring and developing; vendor relationships; office management; and accounting. Euster represents the general views of most directors:

> I delegate everything I can. I see delegation with direction as just about the only way of multiplying my time. I used to just work faster, then I worked faster and longer, then faster, longer, and technologically smarter, but however this plays out, you eventually reach the top of the curve where there just isn't any more personal productivity to be wrung out of the system. I tell certain of my staff (particularly my assistant—no longer just a secretary, my development officer, and my personnel officer) to act as extensions of me—get inside my head and think and act for me.

Another common sentiment was expressed by Mayer: "I delegate as much as possible to others in order to free up my time for external affairs."

Most directors reported the typical organizational practice of using a management team of line and staff officers. Some directors reported giving a relatively free hand to senior line officers, while working more closely with staff officers on such matters as personnel, technology, budgets, and collection development. Robert Migneault (University of New Mexico) described his use of a library management team: "I delegate—100 percent—to each and every member of the Library Management Team (LMT) the opportunity to be self-directed managers who manage for excellence, particularly in their respective areas of responsibility and influence."

HOW ROLES, FUNCTIONS, AND ACTIVITIES HAVE CHANGED

Roles, functions, and activities have changed over the past five to ten years; however, there does not appear to be a consistent pattern
of change among the directors who responded. Traditional managerial roles are still prevalent. Talbot thinks his managerial style and the fundamental management functions and activities required to run a large library have not changed. He stated a sentiment shared by several other directors: "I don't think the fundamental functions have changed. What has changed is the environment and the objects of our attention, particularly the technological objects, but also a plethora of personnel, social, and economic issues."

Much of what directors do today is similar to what was done in the past. There is a cyclical pattern to life as a director. Talbot described a "rhythm" to what he does. The design of daily life includes such things as communicating through meetings, phone calls, correspondence, and now e-mail; writing reports and representing the library to the institution or local government; and fighting inflation and managing personnel, budgets, and buildings. In responding to these patterns, the directors reported that they gradually develop greater confidence in their leadership capacity, more reassurance about delegation, and increasing comfort with technology.

While most directors cited fund-raising as their major new emphasis, some reported a different experience. Potter observed that fund-raising has not yet become a major commitment, but when it does, "it might change my work patterns considerably." Marilyn Sharrow (University of California, Davis) reported:

The complexity of the job is greater as technology is rapidly changing and I must work more closely with other units on campus to interface various systems. Also, I am doing about five percent more development/fund raising (10 percent overall). Otherwise, I think the job of an ARL director is just as interesting, rewarding and fun now as it was when I started fourteen years ago.

Cluff explained that changes in his roles, functions, and activities have occurred in four major areas: fund-raising, journal cost increases and cancellations, consortium building, and legislative activities. George Shipman (University of Oregon) reported that his "advocacy" role has broadened far beyond just keeping the campus informed. Within this role, his fund-raising activities have also intensified:

Close coordination of the Library's increasingly complex programs is essential, but the world is being connected by information, and directors must become better advocates. The importance of my influence on information technology, public information policy, legislation, information economics, and institutional fund raising cannot be underestimated. Fund raising, for example, requires a key emphasis on promoting and advancing the Library's goals to help assure that funding is secured for our programs.
Donald Riggs's experience with shifting roles and responsibilities at the University of Michigan is characteristic of many of the respondents:

Today, as compared with 10 years ago, I am spending more time in cooperative projects..., investing more time in private fund raising, working closer with computer personnel, focusing more on getting grants, fostering the principles of total quality management..., committing more resources to cultural diversity..., spending more time on the management of change, and taking a greater leadership role in the globalization of knowledge (recently I appointed a Project Director for International Initiatives).

Most directors also observed how much more outside work they are now doing which confirms the assumption that directors are spending more time now than in the past on matters external to day-to-day library organizational and operational matters. The focus on strategic planning correlated with environmental issues and trends is more intense. Fund-raising and development have emerged as essential priority activities. Interinstitutional cooperation and resource sharing, communication within consortiums and alliances, and professional leadership all now require more time and commitment.

Directors also reported that they are feeling greater effects from societal shifts. The focus on cultural diversity has raised important questions about cultivating external relationships, building bridges of understanding, and recruiting and developing a staff that reflects the diversity of society. Lifelong learning trends have strongly suggested the need to extend library resources through cooperation with distance education providers. Public demand for higher levels of quality performance and greater accountability require closer collaboration with parent institutions and governmental agencies outside the library to assure effective responses. The needs for leadership beyond the library—on the campus, in the community, in the state, and nationally—may be difficult to meet, but they must be addressed by today's directors.

Finally, a few directors confirmed that they are teaching and influencing the values of library staff and constituencies regarding the purpose of the library. Migneault's view is representative of the directors who raised the issue:

I am spending more time trying to mentor and influence others to value our approach to management, and to accept and foster pedagogical responsibilities as integral parts of the academic research library mission; that is, to value lifelong learning skills, including learning how to learn while utilizing the library and emerging information technologies.
The trust and confidence directors are able to build in their leadership will be dependent on their abilities to respond to external environmental factors, influence societal values about libraries, and adopt emerging information technologies, as well as to manage internal library resources.

**Notes**
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The Road to Success

HERMAN L. TOTTEN AND RONALD L. KEYS

ABSTRACT
Do management courses in schools of library and information studies provide the necessary knowledge for born leaders to become great managers? What makes a good leader has recently been a hot topic in the literature. The conclusions reached have been that change is inevitable and how a leader responds to this change is the mark of how effective he or she will become. The focus of writings in this area is that knowledge about creativity, risk-taking, innovation, and intuition—key elements in the makeup of a successful manager—is being successfully transferred to potential managers through the management courses being offered today in schools of library and information studies. The authors refute the conclusion that this transfer is happening successfully and infer that some curriculum changes are necessary to achieve this goal. It is suggested that an analytical model of leadership should be implemented in the curriculum to emphasize creativity, risk-taking, innovation, and intuition. The model would also include a discussion of these elements, their interdependence, the background of these elements, and their uses in the workplace.

INTRODUCTION
The “Road to Success” in becoming a director in the field of library and information science is not unlike that of many other fields and professions. It is the element of self-knowledge that will
lead one to understand the nature of the road upon which one chooses to travel. Thus, one must know, or at least have seriously thought about, where one wants to go and the obstacles likely to be encountered along the way before one starts the journey. All too often this is not the case.

Part of knowing where one wants to go comes from the knowledge attained in the educational process. For those seeking success, a beginning point will be based in management courses. Library management courses traditionally include the concept of management by objectives, that is, managing by setting and accomplishing goals and objectives. The goals and objectives of the library, the larger organizational structure of which it is a part, and the individual must be consistent to achieve any level of success. As an individual in a library who aspires to become director, it is essential to understand the nature of both the library and the parent organization.

Three key questions should be asked in seeking this understanding:

1. Is the organization rigid or flexible?
2. Will my leadership or management skills be more conducive to upward mobility?
3. Are there opportunities available internally and externally to the organization that will assist me in developing the necessary skills to be a successful director?

The issue of the perceived and actual differences between leadership and managerial skills is important because this can influence how an individual is perceived. In looking at the differences in leadership and management skills, several questions readily come to mind with respect to these differences:

1. Are there, indeed, any differences between leadership and managerial skills? If so, what are they?
2. Are leaders born and are managers trained/educated?
3. Can management courses transform natural leaders into efficient managers who can both lead and manage?

The thrust of this article deals with the operative question, Do library management courses provide the necessary knowledge for natural leaders to become efficient managers? The perceived and actual differences between leadership and managerial skills have been unclear at times. Indeed, in some instances careers have been destroyed when managerial skills were perceived as leadership and vice versa. These differences will be discussed briefly and then related to how the pertinent information can be incorporated into library management courses.
Paraphrasing George Santayana (1905) in his book *Reason in Society*, many people do live in this world without any practical interest in life, and one wonders if it is because their goals are too far in the distance to be perceived, or if they allow the proximity of the others to pass unnoticed. Recent systematic studies of library leadership and the characteristics of library leaders have been fully discussed within the profession in several articles (Gertzog, 1992; Kilgour, 1992; Sheldon, 1992; and Spitzberg, 1992). Unfortunately, it appears that there is little awareness of the practical and profound implications of this information to the profession. Thus, one wonders if many in the profession do indeed, as Santayana suggests, wander the professional landscape unaware of the needs of the organization without well-defined personal goals or without a practical means of achieving the goals they do have.

While our professional library education programs have attempted to provide the skills we need to manage libraries, leadership has been viewed primarily as an innate personality characteristic (Sheldon, 1992, p. 391) which is not incorporated into the curriculum. One view perceives librarians as being gateways to sources of information for those in other disciplines who are studying the concept of leadership. In fact, librarians are “uniquely qualified to help the student or scholar efficiently seek the guidance of earlier thinkers as he or she addresses questions about leadership” (Spitzberg, 1992, p. 382). Perhaps the concept has been mostly omitted from the curriculum in part due to such attitudes as, “leadership, much as we admire it in the abstract, is something we suspect in the specific” (Sheldon, 1992, p. 391). An examination of the differences in leaders and managers should precede the development of a model of a library management course which is more relevant to the needs of current library managers and directors.

Leaders and managers have been mistaken at times to be one and the same, but often a good leader is not necessarily a good manager. If leaders are born and managers are created, perhaps it is as Shakespeare has said, “some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon ’em.”

While some people become directors due to a combination of education and natural ability, others do so simply by determining what is required to get there and then doing it. This is called the “just do it” approach, and these individuals are doers. Others just happen to be at the “right place at the right time.” However, the “road to success” should involve more than having a just do it attitude or being lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time. What is required is an understanding of the need to have a vision based on a critical mass of original thinking and supported by
experience. This critical mass must be present if the individual is to have any chance of achieving and sustaining an impact in any field of endeavor. Potential leaders must possess a unique and perhaps radical vision of a future if they are to offer guidance to others in the field of librarianship or any other discipline. On the other hand, it is the nature of management courses to stress only those topics that tend to maximize efficiency in an organization. Nevertheless, intrinsic in the concept of maximum efficiency is the seed of change and the means of attaining it even though there is the inevitable resistance to change which might enhance efficiency.

Some library leaders are aware of this need to change. Sheldon (1992) states:

The library leaders interviewed are very much in tune with current management trends; they have been among the first to shift away from a somewhat mechanical model of planning and efficiency focused primarily on assessing needs, selling goals, etc. The new approaches do not throw out the systematic approach, but they place much more emphasis on creativity, risk taking, innovation, and even intuition. (p. 400)

The need for change was also on President Clinton's mind when he stated in his inaugural address that: "Profound and powerful forces are shaking and remaking our world, and the urgent question of our time is whether we can make change our friend and not our enemy." In our rapidly changing environment, "change is something many companies have little choice but to embrace" (Kramer, 1993, p. 4). Therefore, it is logical to conclude that library management courses must also adapt to this ever-mutable environment.

The understanding of the need for change is so clear that Kramer (1992) has developed a nine-step blueprint for initiating change in an organization:

1. analyze the organization's need for change;
2. work to build a vision and common direction;
3. create a sense of urgency—not panic;
4. put a strong leader in charge of the effort;
5. generate a broad base of support for the program;
6. lay down a plan for implementing the change;
7. develop systems, like workshops, to help employees;
8. be communicative and honest; and
9. reinforce the change and institutionalize it (p. 4).

Evidence abounds that social changes have not kept pace with technological changes. In an organization that does not keep pace with such changes, the consequences can be devastating. The need
for change was made abundantly clear in the massive restructuring announcement of International Business Machine Corporation (IBM) on December 15, 1992. IBM’s inability to adapt to rapid changes in the computer industry from mainframes and mid-range systems to personal computers cost the company nearly $5 billion in 1992 (Bunker, 1993, p. 1). IBM Chairman and Chief Executive John Akers acknowledged, in a prepared statement: “Our financial results are not acceptable to our shareholders. We are taking aggressive actions to improve our competitiveness and profitability by addressing changes that are sweeping our industry” (Bunker, 1993, p. 2).

Change and vision most often accompany one another. Visionary people look, indeed, they search, for change. Yet it seems that oftentimes it is not so much the kind of person an individual is as it is the situation in which he or she is placed that determines one's actions. So, while all great people are visionary, not all visionary people are great. Those who fall into the former category have an understanding and determination to deal with the nature of the social system in which, as Gertzog (1992) suggests, “leadership is an integral part...and is, therefore, always present” (p. 402). Although those of the latter category may possess vision, if the organization in which they are a part is rigid in nature, then those who search for change will inevitably produce an irritation that will more likely be perceived as a hindrance rather than as something promoting maximum efficiency.

PepsiCo Chairman and Chief Executive D. Wayne Calloway states that: “The test of management is the nerve to change...” (Kramer, 1992, p. 4). Having a vision with “nerve” is an added element in the formula for success. Thus, self-knowledge, vision, and “nerve” are the necessary navigational tools one needs to chart one’s “road to success.”

Hap Klopp (1992), author of The Adventure of Leadership, identified six common traits found in great leaders:

1. an ability to act on intuition;
2. an ability to make tough decisions;
3. a global perspective;
4. an appreciation for diversity;
5. a sense of urgency; and
6. an ability to deal with those you do not control (Klopp, 1992, p. 61)

The six traits that Klopp describes are a mixture of tangible and intangible characteristics. Intuition is an intangible innate characteristic while the ability to make tough decisions can be learned. Having a global perspective requires knowledge that is learned, while
an appreciation for diversity requires sensitivity to that which is different. A sense of urgency may involve an awareness of multifaceted dynamics found in almost all organizations and their interconnectivity with the global environment.

The ability to deal with those one cannot or does not control is rare indeed, yet it is something almost everyone has to do almost everyday. By developing communication skills to a high level, by always seeking to understand the other point of view, and by respecting colleagues, managers are less likely to create misunderstandings that make goals even more difficult to achieve.

All too often, differences of a personal nature have prevented a potential leader from becoming a great manager. The essence of leadership in relation to success as a director involves the ability not only to motivate people but also, and more importantly, to get people to believe in an idea and to manifest this idea into action, whereas management involves the most efficient utilization of time. The main component of an idea involves prioritizing the various choices resulting from the process of thinking.

Time management involves the ability to set goals and organize priorities. It is the nature of management courses to help one develop the skills necessary to achieve maximum efficient use of all available resources so as to maximize efficient use of time. Thus the ability to manage time becomes the litmus test for any successful manager. Leaders view time as a variable that can be manipulated and not as a sine qua non.

Leadership, impossible without a well-defined vision of where the organization needs to go, heightens motivation (an emotional factor) while management’s basic concern is efficiency (a learned factor). Perhaps what is involved in bringing these two factors into sync, and thus generating this transformation from natural leaders into efficient managers, is having the “right” attitude which consists of possessing what is commonly referred to as “people skills.” These skills are considered the most important abilities needed in the future (Stuart, 1992, p. 86).

One type of “people skill” involves the ability and willingness to communicate with everyone in the organization, from the newly hired hourly worker to the president of the organization. Simply knowing how to talk with others or relating well involves effective communication, and this is essential if leadership skills are to be effective. The art of involving others and making them feel a part of the decision-making process stimulates motivation, and it is this participatory process that enhances leadership qualities. Management courses for the twenty-first century must stress the concept of “people skills” as being an integral variable in the formula for success if
we are to deal with the rapidly changing business and educational milieus. The nature of leadership does involve certain intangibles and thus is to some degree abstract. However, while it cannot be sufficiently measured, it can be manifested, and library management courses must begin to analyze the specificity of its manifestations.

Institutions involved in the offering of library management courses must seriously analyze the implications of Sheldon's findings and, if necessary, be willing to apply these changes in the curricula. Thus, if library management courses are to continue to be a viable means of properly preparing future library leaders and managers for the twenty-first century, then it is paramount that evaluation and reevaluation of core library management courses be analyzed in light of the rapidly changing dynamics of the organizational environment. The operative question, Do management courses presently provide the necessary knowledge for natural leaders to become great managers? answered holistically is no. With this in mind, an analytical model of a leadership component in a library management course is proposed. It is based mainly on Sheldon's findings which include creativity, risk-taking, innovation, and intuition as the primary factors in the manifestation of leadership abilities.

AN ANALYTICAL MODEL INCORPORATING CREATIVITY, RISK-TAKING, INNOVATION, AND INTUITION IN LIBRARY MANAGEMENT COURSES

Rationale

In the evolution of theory, concepts that were found to be useful at various stages are later discarded or modified as analysis grows in rigor. As our understanding grows, systems of classification become more related to the functioning of interacting elements. In time, changes occur such that generalizations about the functioning of these elements are reached that become useful in predicting future events. These generalizations take on momentum such that an analytical model of the behavior of the elements is created. In turn, the analytical model becomes a mental construct which consists of a set of interrelating elements with their interrelations clearly defined (Hagen, 1962, p. 505).

Definitions

The elements are defined not so much as single independent units but as gestalten or interrelation of the elements—that is, the elements occur not through the summation of separate sensations but in interrelation with each other. Since the elements may vary in magnitude or field strengths among individuals, they have the nature of being variables.
Creativity: (1) having the power to bring into an act or cause to exist; (2) a causation; (3) the ability to transcend traditional ideas, rules, patterns, relationships, or the like, and to create meaningful new ideas, forms, methods, interpretations, etc.

Risk-Taking: To venture upon that which involves possible loss, danger, or disadvantages.

Innovation: The introduction of something new.

Intuition: Knowledge obtained, or the power of knowing, without recourse to inference or reasoning.

Library Management Courses

This section contains a description of the concepts that could be included in a library management course based on a modified open system approach. Each of the four concepts identified by Sheldon is discussed. Any model or system that attempts to interact with its environment is defined as an open system. All living organisms "partake of the character of open systems" (Allport, 1960, p. 303). Leadership involves personality traits, and the interaction of these traits with the environment constitutes for this analytical model an open system. Open systems have four criteria:

1. There is an input and output of both matter and energy.
2. There is the achievement and maintenance of steady or "homeostatic" states, such that the intrusion of outer energy will not seriously disrupt internal order and form.
3. There is generally an increase of order over time, "owing to an increase in complexity and differentiation of parts."
4. There is "extensive transactional commerce with the environment" (Allport, 1960, p. 303).

The interrelation of the four elements: creativity, risk-taking, innovation, and intuition are the evident dynamics of a changing social environment. In essence, they constitute the flux of change. They are interdependent, not independent, of each other. Having one element involves having, to some degree, the others. While the magnitude varies from individual to individual, to the degree that they exist, they interact with each other. This interaction involves personality theories in which many psychoanalytic, psychological, as well as sociological theories come into play.

Creativity brings into existence; it is a causation. Human beings are thinking creatures who interact with the environment, inputting matter and outputting energy. Consequently, there is a cause. Indeed, continuous existence is based on the first criterion of intaking and outputting. That is, the constant interchange of matter and energy sustains our existence. Psychologists have studied the principles of
matter and energy in such theories as stimulus-response. It says, in
effect, that a stimulus is entered and a response is emitted. The school
of thought on methodological positivism suggests that the concept
of personality need not exist. Humans can focus attention merely
on the measurable manipulations of input and output. The
ramifications of the methodological positivist approach are found
far too often in management courses that are carried over into the
business environment. Creativity must have a desire, and this desire
must be pleasurable for creativity to manifest itself. Central to this
desire is the concept of success which is by definition attaining one's
desired end.

The methodology used in obtaining one's desired end is an
application that involves the Socratic method of persuasion. The
persuasion technique is usually studied in the social sciences and
involves a change in one's opinion by inducing one with a persuasive
message from an external source, which can either be a one-way
communication channel or a face-to-face reciprocal communication
network (McGuire, 1960, p. 345). Specifically, the persuasion
technique involves asking one's opinion on logically related issues.
The goal is to sensitize one to any inconsistencies that may exist
in one's thinking, thus producing a change toward greater internal
consistency. This becomes a natural progression toward the second
criteria—that is, a steady or homeostatic state.

The second criterion of an open system addresses achievement
and maintenance of steady or homeostatic states, such that intrusion
of external stimuli will not disrupt the internal order of things.
Santayana (1905) poetically addresses this criterion when he states
in *Reason in Society*:

> If man were a static or intelligible being, such as angels are
> thought to be, his life would have a single guiding interest, under
> which all other interests would be subsumed. His acts would
> explain themselves without looking beyond his given essence,
> and his soul would be like a musical composition, which once
> written out cannot grow different and once rendered can ask
> for nothing but, at most, to be rendered over again. In truth,
> however, man is an animal, a portion of the natural flux; and
> the consequence is that his nature has a moving center, his
> functions an external reference, and his ideal a true ideality. (p. 3)

The process of change involves dialectics. According to Hegel,
dialectic proceeds by a necessary development in stages known as
the thesis, antithesis (or contradiction), and synthesis, which represent
the process of developing thought as it moves toward completion
as well as the stages and development of history. Thus, the modifi-
cation of the open system encompasses Hegelian dialectics as
intellectual tools to be used in encompassing the four elements in library management courses for the future.

Change is a universal cultural phenomenon, and the process of change over a period of time involves the four elements that constitute the dynamics of change. This process becomes dialectic, and the residual effect of the process increases the natural order in that it increases our understanding of our environment. As our understanding grows, it is consistent with the evolution of theory that certain concepts be modified.

Cultural change oftentimes conflicts with cultural conservatism. Conservatism and change in culture are the result of the interplay of environmental, historical, and psychological factors (Herskovits, 1947, p. 48). Risk-taking should be a part of an ever-changing environment. Risk-taking brings about a certain degree of uncertainty. Thus, uncertainty becomes a principle in risk-taking. In physics, there is Heisenberg's uncertainty principle which deals with probability factors. Borrowing this concept from physics, management courses can view the concept of risk-taking not as something to abhor but as a necessity that is best utilized with an understanding of the probability factors involved. These factors can be ascertained in library management courses using the Socratic method of persuasion as well as utilizing the concept mathematically. That is, the doctrine of chance defined as the likelihood of the occurrence of any particular form of an event, estimated as the ratio of the number of ways in which an event might occur in any and all possible forms, should be incorporated into any estimation of the amount of risk involved in any particular endeavor. In an ever-changing environment, it is essential that the concept of probability factors be utilized in the incorporation of risk-taking as an element in library management courses.

Creativity promotes innovation. Cultural change involves innovation in which the concept of need is paramount. The environment utilizes specific things for specific ends and sometimes they are recognized by one with an imagination who understands their values. However, the drive that carries one to new knowledge is a necessity (Dixon, 1928). Thus:

although the casual discovery of new food or material may lead to its use, if the foods already utilized are insufficient and there is a need for new sources of supply, a powerful spur is added to curiosity, and purposeful search is likely to ensue. Necessity is indeed often the mother of invention, and is likewise the parent of discovery as well. With the strengthening of this factor of need we pass more and more definitely into the sphere of invention, in which the need is met, not by the appropriation
to use of a hitherto unused thing, but by the creation of something new and fundamentally better (pp. 36-37).

An innovator may be one who invents a new machine or a new mechanical process, develops suggestions for a new economic system, devises a new political scheme, recommends a new model, or works out a new conception of the universe. Innovators are the incubators of ideas, and ideas are no less powerful than machines in shaping our lives. Cultural conservatism must understand the nature of cultural change. Indeed, change is essential for any culture's continual survival, and innovation becomes a necessity. Just as it becomes a necessity for culture as a whole, it becomes a necessity in library management courses that attempt to deal with an ever-changing environment.

Habit or inertia may make it easier for one to continue to believe in a given method or approach. Thus, it is possible to avoid doubting any fault by closing our mind to all contradictory evidence. But open systems require open minds. "A method that is repeatedly tried in order to guarantee stable beliefs is the appeal to 'self-evident' propositions—propositions so 'obviously true' that the understanding of their meaning will carry with it an indubitable conviction of their truth" (Cohen & Nagel, 1934, p. 401).

Throughout history, great thinkers, such as Copernicus, believed it to be self-evident that the orbits of the planets must be circular. No mathematician or physicist before Gauss seriously doubted that two straight lines somehow enclose an area. "Propositions which have been or still are believed by some to be self-evident are: that the whole is greater than any of one of its parts; that nothing can happen without a cause. The fact that we feel absolutely certain, or that a given proposition has not before been questioned, is no guarantee against its being proved false. Our intuitions must, then, be tested" (Cohen & Nagel, 1934, p. 402).

CONCLUSION

The journey on the "road to success" began by stating that there must first be an essential element of self-knowledge which is necessary in understanding the nature of the road. Questions that relate to the understanding of the organization involve knowing whether the organization is rigid or flexible, and whether leadership or management skills are more conducive to upward mobility. Opportunities that assist one in developing one's necessary skills must be fully explored without specific concern to the external or internal relationship to the organization. Perceived and actual differences between leadership and management skills exist.
Therefore, it is best to have a clear and well-defined understanding of those differences.

The concept of vision can only exist when original thinking exists; there can be no vision if there is no original thinking. Library management courses for the twenty-first century must include a component which exposes students to original thinking which encourages change as well as guiding them to be original thinkers themselves. Change then must be viewed as our friend and not our enemy. Library management courses must grasp the concept of the inevitability of mutability.

IBM can serve as a lesson to be learned in what happens if an organization does not adapt quickly to a changing environment. The library management courses of the future must be viewed holistically as they relate to the concepts of motivation, people skills, and attitudes. These concepts will facilitate communication in the organization. The four elements of creativity, risk-taking, innovation, and intuition constitute the essence of leadership. Our professional existence gives us no choice but to embrace these concepts in our library management courses. Sheldon’s findings confirm a fundamental principle in existential philosophy involving choice. To prepare both leaders and managers to ensure the future success of libraries and information related organizations, library education programs must reorient the library management courses to encompass a holistic approach which includes both leadership and management.
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Terms for Academic Library Directors

Dana C. Rooks

Abstract

In 1973, Arthur McAnally and Robert Downs authored a seminal article on the changing role of the university library director. This article takes a look at McAnally and Downs's findings twenty years later to determine whether the changes outlined in 1973 are still valid today. Additional sources of strife for university library directors are outlined and requirements for today's library directors are discussed.

Historical Perspective

My first professional position, upon completing my library science degree, was with the University of Oklahoma. A few months after my arrival, the Director of Libraries, Arthur McAnally, appeared in my office, handed me a typewritten manuscript, and asked me to read it and give him my thoughts on it in a few days. The manuscript was a draft for an article which later appeared in College & Research Libraries under the title, “The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries” (McAnally & Downs, 1973).

I was, of course, highly honored but also amazed that I had been asked to comment on his manuscript, given the fact that the libraries had many well-respected and widely published faculty at the time. Only years later did I realize what unique qualification I alone, within the University of Oklahoma Library faculty at the time, possessed. I was a newly minted graduate.

For those readers too young to remember McAnally and Downs's article or its impact on commonly held precepts of university
librarianship, the article was considered almost heretical when it appeared in 1973. My primary qualification for being selected to comment on the draft was my total lack of knowledge, biases, and preconceived ideas about the role of university library directors. My opinion provided, in effect, a blank slate upon which McAnally could test his premise.

McAnally and Downs's (1973) radical finding was that the directorship of a major university library could no longer be considered a lifetime post but was approaching an average span of five to six years (p. 103). Their investigation discovered that, among the seventy-eight university libraries holding membership in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in 1972, half had changed directorships within the past three years and four of them had changed twice (McAnally & Downs, 1973, p. 103). Publication of the McAnally and Downs article represented a major wake-up call to many university libraries and their directors. McAnally and Downs documented a trend that has not changed in the ensuing twenty years.

In a study published after the McAnally and Downs article, Jerry Parsons (1976) compared the sociodemographic characteristics of forty-two United States academic ARL directors in 1958 with the seventy-eight comparable ARL directors in 1973. His data showed that the 1958 directors had an average tenure of more than eight years, a median tenure of nine years, and a range from less than one year (two directors) to a high of twenty-six years (two directors). In comparison, the directors in 1973 had an average tenure of less than eight years, a median of five years, and a range from less than one year (eighteen directors) to a high of twenty-seven years (one director). Parsons (1976) noted that only nine directors appeared in both groups (pp. 613, 617). Parsons's (1976) conclusion: "Like college presidents, research library directors face so many diverse pressures that most incumbents may well opt for a short-term position" (p. 617).

A separate analysis covering forty years of terms for ARL directors was conducted by William Cohn (1976) and published by *College & Research Libraries* also in 1976. Cohn found that, of the seventy-four United States academic libraries that were members of the ARL in 1973, thirty-four named new directors from January 1970 to December 1973 (p. 137). Cohn found that the average tenure for all directors during the period 1934-1969 was 12.65 years compared to an average of only two years for the period 1970-1973 (p. 143).

Cohn's analysis revealed yet another interesting piece of data regarding the immediate predecessors of the 1973 incumbent directors. Between 1934 and 1969, the average tenure for the preceding director was 14.1 years, and in the 1970-73 period it was fifteen years (Cohn, 1976, p. 143). Cohn also noted that from 1934 to 1969, more of the
incumbents' predecessors left as a result of death or retirement than for teaching or to direct a different ARL or a non-ARL library (p. 143).

Ten years after the McAnally and Downs study, Wong and Zubatsky (1985) found in a 1983 study, "the average tenure period for chief administrators of both ARL and non-ARL libraries has been slowly rising since the mid-1970s" (p. 76). One explanation offered by Wong and Zubatsky for this increase was a cycle of fewer opportunities created by retirements or resignations during the 1973-1983 period studied, combined with the increasing number of two-professional households which might hinder or delay a decision to change jobs (p. 76). While Wong and Zubatsky (1985) found that nearly 76 percent of the responding ARL directors had held their positions for ten or fewer years, fifteen of the sixteen women directors fell into the ten-years-or-under group (p. 72).

In 1989, Anne Woodsworth authored an article entitled "Getting Off the Library Merry-Go-Round: McAnally and Downs Revisited." Woodsworth (1989) contends that over half of the ARL libraries changed directors in the preceding three to four years. "What McAnally and Downs described as extraordinary turnover seems to have settled into the norm" (p. 35).

Do these five historical studies prove a trend or do they offer conflicting data from a snapshot in time? Are the varying data at each time period illustrative of changes in higher education as a whole or proof of the growing complexity of research library administration? Are tenure rates of academic library directors attributable to societal or generational changes? Are these changes a result of economic trends or changes in the lifestyle demands of today's library administrators? Do changing demographics of ethnicity and gender play a role in the terms of directors of research libraries?

Re-Evaluation of McAnally and Downs's Background Factors

McAnally and Downs (1973) cited twelve background factors within society and higher education which they viewed as contributing to the decreased tenure of library directors. These included:

1. growth of enrollment;
2. changes in the presidency;
3. proliferation in university management;
4. changes in the world of learning and research;
5. the information explosion;
6. hard times and inflation;
7. planning and budgeting;
8. technology;
9. changing theories of management;
10. unionization;
11. increasing control by state boards; and
12. no national system for information (pp. 104-09).

While the specifics of each factor may have changed in the ensuing twenty years, the general premise regarding the impact of each factor on the terms of library directors remains valid today.

**Growth of Enrollment**

Directors of libraries in the decade of the 1960s struggled with the problems resulting from unprecedented growth in student populations, increased numbers of faculty, and, as McAnally and Downs (1973) described, "a far more complicated institution" (p. 104).

Today the increased complexity still exists. Only the underlying causes have changed. Universities today are confronting serious issues of retrenchment and downsizing in the face of declining enrollments and reduced or stable funding.

**Changes in the Presidency**

McAnally and Downs (1973) outlined some of the growing pressures upon the university president as rising expectations, growing militancy of students and faculty, a newly critical attitude toward higher education on the part of the general public, political pressure from hostile legislators, increased power by state boards, and declining or stable financial support (p. 105).

Today these pressures remain largely unchanged. As presidents and senior university administrators come out of the faculty ranks, it is all too common for these individuals to opt to return to the faculty, after relatively brief tenures, as the pressures become excessive. Thus today's library director is all too often faced with the challenge of meeting yet a new set of expectations from yet a new president or provost. As Woodsworth (1989) so graphically states:

> There is a limit to the number of times a fresh and cheerful approach can be conjured up to educate someone who knows nothing about the complexity of managing a multi-million dollar service organization; has no conception of the external influences that affect research library operations; and has not a whit of appreciation of the rapidity of change needed in research libraries in order for them to remain responsive service organizations in the face of dramatic societal, scholarly, and technological changes. (p. 36)

The ability of the library director to establish a successful organization that responds effectively to the changing needs of faculty
and students and then to successfully convey this vision to each succeeding university administration will certainly be a determining factor in the tenure of today's academic library director.

Proliferation in University Management

The growth in management level positions in universities corresponded to the growth in the size and complexity of higher education institutions. McAnally and Downs (1973) noted the imposition of an additional layer of administrative officer between the library director and the president, thus reducing the power of the library to present its case directly to the president (p. 105).

With few exceptions, this has not changed today. In reality, the position of the library may have further diminished as the number of vice-presidents proliferate and as many library directors today find their reporting line redrawn from the president to the provost and, in some cases, to a vice-provost or assistant provost. In other instances, library directors are finding themselves even further removed from the academic decision-making forums as they find themselves reporting to computing and information technology administrators who are themselves outside the academic decision-making group. The integration of libraries and information technology divisions within higher education creates still greater pressures and demands for library directors, whether the library director administers the combined operation or is merely a component director within the newly created division.

Changes in the World of Learning and Research

As in 1973, the changes in the world of learning and research are rapid and dramatic. The fragmentation of traditional disciplines, the rise of interdisciplinary studies, and the demands for relevance documented by McAnally and Downs (1989, pp. 105-06) have only accelerated twenty years later.

Responding to the unprecedented changes in the world of scholarly communication brought about by technology today has become the number one challenge for library directors and a key factor in measuring the success of an academic library and ultimately its director.

The Information Explosion

In their 1973 article, McAnally and Downs cited a 1945 Vannevar Bush quote: "Professionally our methods of transmitting and reviewing the results of research are generations old and by now totally inadequate," and then stated, "No significant changes have occurred since Bush's statement" (p. 106).
If McAnally and Downs saw this inadequacy as a problem, one wonders how to characterize today's developments within libraries. The Internet, electronic journals, subject-oriented listservs, CD-ROM networks, and the future potential of the National Research and Education Network (NREN) are all major issues confronting academic library directors today. What will be the role of the library in these developments? How will the balance between traditional print collections and electronic resources be maintained? What are the implications for preservation needs, intellectual property rights, and scholarly and commercial publishing? How will libraries resolve ownership versus access issues? Today's library director must successfully resolve these highly complex issues, many with national level involvement, within their own institutions to the satisfaction of competing and diverse internal constituencies.

**Hard Times and Inflation**

In 1973, McAnally and Downs stated with undisguised horror: "Budgets have actually been cut, or the rate of increase slowed drastically" (p. 107). Today library directors justifiably view this period as "the good ol' days." Double-digit inflation, spiraling serial prices, and annual budget reductions or give-backs are seemingly a fact of life within most academic libraries. The universal view of the library as the heart of the university deserving of increased institutional funding on an annual basis has succumbed to the intense competition for increased support from a decreasing funding base across the university.

The library can no longer be viewed as a black hole into which more and more institutional funds are sunk. Library directors today are expected to be effective managers who administer cost-effective, highly efficient, and productive operations which yield high returns on investment. While this concept would have been heresy in earlier times, it is a reality today that will be yet another measure of the success and therefore, tenure of a library director.

Similarly in these hard times, library directors are increasingly being judged on their skills as fund-raisers. As institutional funding becomes increasingly inadequate to meet increasing demands, the library director will be expected to identify alternative sources of funding to pay the high costs for traditional library programs such as special collections and preservation as well as new initiatives in the areas of developing technologies.

**Planning and Budgeting**

Reassessment, restructuring, and reallocation have become the three R's of higher education today. The pressure for the library to do quality planning and highly analytical budgeting has increased
significantly. The library is, of course, a point of high visibility within the university. It frequently is the single largest budgetary unit on the campus. Typically, its materials and operating budgets are viewed with unabashed envy by deans and department chairs with little discretionary funding outside designated faculty and staff salary lines. An effective plan, widely disseminated within the university community, with a closely-related budget structure and visible results or products is becoming a mandate among library directors who wish to hold their own in the budget competition.

Technology

In 1973, McAnally and Downs stated in regard to technology: "Perhaps everyone, including librarians, had over-optimistic expectations" (p. 107). Today, while the expectations of librarians, and of our patrons, are still optimistic, reality is rapidly approaching and, in many instances, overtaking our expectations. The impact of technology on libraries today cannot be overstated.

The library director of 1994 faces a myriad of options in applying technology to the basic operations and services of the research library. The complexity of the solutions encompass issues of cost, expertise, currency, standards, and sheer capacity of the library to deal with the dynamism of technology today. The major stress point related to technology for a director today is the exponential growth in the pace of change—a pace that shows no inclination toward slowing.

It may be that the complexity and rapidity of change that results from the new library technologies will be the most prominent factors in hastening the departure of the current generation of library directors who will be replaced by the so-called Nintendo generation.

Changing Theories of Management

The collaborative theories of management heralded a new beginning in 1973. Twenty years later the participatory approach to management is espoused widely and adhered to infrequently. Despite new theories of total quality management and continuous improvement, which also advocate full participation and shared responsibility, it is still the manager at the top of the library organization who determines the tenor of the organization and ultimately assumes responsibility for its success or failure.

The value of participatory management in libraries, however, was significant in 1973, and it remains so today. As in 1973, a cornerstone of managerial success is the ability to fully utilize the diversity and talents of library staff at all levels to achieve identified goals, to compete for funding, and to build alliances within the community.
Unionization

While unionization has not progressed at the "revolutionary pace" predicted by McAnally and Downs (1973, p. 108), many of the principles which fostered the union movement in 1973 are still present in universities today. While the importance of many of these factors declined in the 1980s, the changing social values and declining economy of the 1990s are bringing unionization efforts back to the forefront today. Job insecurity, wage and benefit issues, along with a growing demand for shared governance and disillusionment with the status quo and current administrations are again raising the specter of increased unionization of higher education. As McAnally and Downs (1973) state: "Unionization is one form of participation in management" (p. 108).

Increasing Control by State Boards

"State boards of regents for higher education are becoming increasingly powerful and exerting more and more control over state-supported institutions" (McAnally & Downs, 1973, p. 108). This statement is truer today than twenty years ago. Increased demands by the public for accountability for its tax dollars are leading state legislators to empower such boards to enforce statewide master plans for the growth of higher education and more budgetary controls through performance measures or other techniques. The historical independence of higher education has given way to state board authority over academic programs, degrees, and other educational activities, as well as administrative functions such as accounting procedures, benefits administration, and even formula-based library funding.

No National System for Information

The failure to achieve an effective national system for the sharing of information was the final problem for libraries identified by McAnally and Downs (1973, p. 109). Only in recent years has this critical issue begun to be addressed through a major national effort. While McAnally and Downs (1973) acknowledged such efforts as interlibrary loan, cooperative acquisitions plans, union lists and catalogs, and the Center for Research Libraries, they also recognized that these efforts were too little and too ineffective (p. 109).

Current efforts, such as the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI), are only today beginning to address this final factor. Interestingly, McAnally and Downs (1973) identified the required components necessary to correct this deficiency when they stated:

many agencies ought to be helping to solve the problem: the various professional associations in different subjects, publishers of books and journals, computer and information specialists, foundations, and last, but not least, the federal government.
Information is a resource of national importance; certainly the center of an effective system will be enormous in size and complexity. (p. 109)

**ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF STRIFE**

While McAnally and Downs identified twelve background factors contributing to the turnover in directorships, there are other fundamental sources of strife confronting academic library directors today. Some are societal and thus not unique to higher education or libraries. These include:

- Economic pressures
- Lifestyle changes
- Ethnic and gender influences
- The pervasiveness of technology

*Economic Pressures*

Economic pressures of two-income households, corporate downsizing, escalating health-care costs, and other socioeconomic trends of the 1990s cannot be ignored by libraries or dismissed as not relevant for the organization and operation of the research library. Such trends affect the staff of the library as well as its primary client base. Increased economic pressures also impact potential funding sources both public and private.

*Lifestyle Changes*

Quality of life has become a common concern throughout society. The perception of a career and its role within one’s life has changed dramatically in recent decades. The concept of loyalty to an employer in return for lifetime employment has effectively disappeared. Many individuals change not just jobs but entire careers several times during a lifetime.

This societal trend also impacts academic libraries from the individuals they hire—who may have extremely diverse work experiences—to the patrons they serve—who may be retraining for yet another career change and who have highly formulated and unique service needs and demands.

The influence of today’s lifestyle changes incorporates the needs of the working single parent as employee and as user. It encompasses the older returning or second-career employee or user. It also includes the individual in the commuter or marriage relationship as well as the employee who works to support his or her true passion—whether it be acting, writing, or competitive bodybuilding. Each of these individuals can make a major and valuable contribution to an
organization, but each demands skilled and flexible management of resources to yield maximum benefit to both the individual and the organization.

**Ethnic and Gender Influences**

Twenty years ago the world of research library directors reflected the world of most major management positions, both public and private—directors were male and Caucasian. The rise of women and ethnic minorities into positions of influence within research libraries and higher education has also created additional sources of strife for today's library director. These pressures range from the need to identify, mentor, and promote women and ethnic minorities to the different and changing needs and values of these individuals. The inclusion of women and ethnic minorities into positions of influence has changed, and will continue to change, the way in which organizations are managed.

**The Pervasiveness of Technology**

Today's entering college freshmen are of the age of technology. They are the so-called Nintendo generation. They never knew life without a video game much less a television. They prefer the ATM to a teller behind a bank counter. They researched their first term paper on a CD-ROM encyclopedia or through a special interest bulletin board using their Compuserve account. They do not just demand access to technology, they expect it as a fact of life. They will always want more technology than the library is currently providing, and they will always know more about what is technologically feasible than the librarian does. Meeting these demands will become one of the largest sources of strife for the academic library director.

**BROADENING REQUIREMENTS FOR DIRECTORS**

As the demands of library directors increase, so must the range of skills and abilities required of the successful director. Some of the most significant of these include:

- Management skills
- Technical skills
- Communication skills
- Human Relations skills
- Fund-Raising skills
- Legal skills

**Management Skills**

The quaint concept of the research library director as gentleman scholar is defunct. Research libraries are highly complex organizations
more comparable to many medium size businesses. With multimillion dollar budgets, employees numbering in the hundreds, and assets in the hundreds of millions, libraries must demand and receive management by highly skilled administrators. As CEO of the library organization, the library director is expected to be master of all skills from planning to budgeting, from organization to staffing, and from controlling to reporting. The success of library directors today depends much more upon their management skills than their breadth of library knowledge.

Technical Skills
Library directors are often the most technologically obsolete staff within the library. Yet they are called upon to convey the library’s technology needs to university administrators, constituents, and donors. They must concern themselves with issues of connectivity, electronic publishing, networks, and information access policies. They must participate as informed leaders on the national level in the design and implementation of the so-called information superhighway. Research library directors today must be versed in a full range of technical issues from national policy issues to hardware and software development.

Communication Skills
The ability and the opportunity of the library director to effectively communicate the goals and the needs of the library to library staff, teaching faculty, the students, university administrators, and external constituencies will play a major role in the continuing success of the director. Today’s research library directors must be capable communicators who are welcomed by the diverse and often competing constituencies to address and respond to their individual needs. The director must be skilled at presenting the case for the library’s interest and needs persuasively in each environment. Library directors must be leaders who can communicate a vision for the future of information access which is responsive both to current and future needs and realities.

Human Relations Skills
McAnally and Downs (1973) identified five different groups that exert pressure on the director: the president’s office, the library staff, the faculty, students, and, in publicly supported universities, state boards of control (p. 110). The human relations skills of the director in interacting with each of these groups will oftentimes determine the perceptions and thus the success of the library director. The deterioration of these relationships, especially with two or more groups simultaneously, is arguably the most frequent cause of turnover at the director level.
Fund-Raising Skills

As institutional funding becomes increasingly inadequate to meet escalating costs of traditional services, much less new initiatives in the area of electronic information services, it is becoming incumbent upon the library director to increase funding from alternative sources. It is rare to see an announcement for a library director vacancy that does not include successful experience in fund-raising as a major criterion.

While library directors have traditionally sought external funding for specialized collections of rare book and manuscript materials, library directors today are expected to engage in fund-raising for any collections or services beyond the most basic.

Unlike departmental deans, the library director does not have a ready-made constituency of alumni to turn to for donations. There is no relevant industry with self-interests in supporting the library. The library director must identify foundations and donors, who frequently have no knowledge or understanding of library operations and services, and convince them of the value of supporting the needs of the library.

The success of the library director in fund-raising will often spell the difference between a caretaker status-quo operation and a progressive forward-looking library offering quality services to its patrons.

Legal Skills

Today’s complex library environment frequently calls for a library director to also have the skills of a trained lawyer. From the maze of employment issues to intellectual property rights, from negotiating contracts to translating license agreements, the library director is responsible for making decisions on a daily basis that have legal implications for the university, the library, and often the director. The stresses of a protracted lawsuit, whether over employment or copyright issues, cannot be overstated and the potential for such may be the primary emphasis on too many administrative decision-making processes today.

Reality Versus Perceptions

So what is the reality versus perception of the job of academic library directors today and the success of these individuals in retaining their positions? Are today’s library directors still traditional book lovers or have they all become business managers? They are both. To be successful, academic library directors must have a love and an understanding of the printed word. However, they must also have acquired the skills of an effective and capable business manager.
Academic research libraries are still in the business of acquiring, preserving, and disseminating the world's knowledge. However, while this premise has not changed, the implementation of this mission has changed dramatically and will continue to change at a rapid pace. McAnally and Downs wrote in 1973, "the director's office now operates in a condition of constant change, intense pressures, and great complexity. These factors are of crucial importance to the director personally, demanding the highest administrative abilities as well as durability, flexibility, and determination (p. 114)."

A second issue in the turnover of academic library directors is the value of long-term stability versus change. McAnally and Downs found the average terms of the library director and the university president to be five to six years (McAnally & Downs, 1973, pp. 103, 105). Stability within the directorship allows for leadership on a national level to solve national problems. It permits the development of solid relationships within the university community and it achieves continuity within the library itself. The mandate for change from the outside, through the appointment of a new director, occurs when the current director does not or will not recognize that change is continuous and is not receptive to such an evolutionary process. "Either he adapts to new ways, or another person will be brought in who has the qualities needed in the new era" (McAnally & Downs, 1973, p. 114). There is value in stability but only if necessary change is encouraged and allowed to occur. Stagnation, in the name of stability, is a negative for the director, the library, and the university.

**The Results**

As the job of academic library directors becomes increasingly difficult and demanding and the terms of such appointments become increasingly shorter, what is the impact on current and future directors and on the library and the institution?

**Current and Future Directors**

One has to question whether the best and the brightest of the profession will continue to seek the position of director given the difficulties and pressures of the position. While this may deter some individuals, the directorship will, in fact, continue to be viewed as a desirable, however challenging, position by most.

What must be addressed is "What steps can be taken by individuals and institutions to ensure that the best and brightest middle managers do not get tired, do not burn out, do not see themselves in dead-end jobs, and do not seek escape from their institution and/or profession" (Woodsworth, 1989, p. 38)?
The result of excessive turnover in the directorship for the library and the institution is the absence of a cohesive vision and the lack of effective leadership for a major component of the university. Feelings of uncertainty among library staff, the loss of established relationships with faculty, the perception of a troubled library organization by former and potential donors, and a seemingly unending search process in the view of university administrators can all result from frequent turnover in the position of library director.

New directors can establish new visions, effect new directions, and create new allegiances within the university community. However, excessive turnover unquestionably impacts the library's role within the institution, the status of the director within and outside the library, the library's planning process, and most certainly its fundraising and development efforts, all of which take time and attention.

Options and Alternatives

One option to the uncertainty of the library director's length of tenure is term appointments. Appointments for a fixed term, perhaps five or even ten years with the option of extension or renewal, offer an orderly process for planning and structuring a change in administration.

Institutional appointment options should also be explored so that library directors, voluntarily or involuntarily, may step down from the demands of the directorship without threatening their economic livelihood or damaging their careers. Academic deans, provosts, and presidents return to their teaching departments with plaudits for their years of service as dean and with no stigma to their careers for their decision. Academic library directors need a similar option. Career options to enter the academic administrative path should be openly discussed and pursued by the library director with senior university administrators. As Woodsworth (1989) states: "There is scant evidence to suggest that even the brightest and the best can survive twenty or thirty years as a dynamic library director given the current tempo and demands of the job" (p. 38).

Conclusion

The position of director of a major research library is indeed becoming more demanding. McAnally and Downs (1973) identified three major qualities required of a director of libraries:

1. Flexibility, adaptability, and a willingness to accept change as a way of life.
2. A stable and equable temperament and the ability to maintain an emotional balance under constant tensions.
3. Endurance (p. 122).

Certainly these qualities have only increased in value in the twenty years since McAnally and Downs first espoused them.

While the pressures have increased, the job of academic library director is still manageable, and it is still desirable. It may never return to the status of lifetime appointment and that may indeed be a positive for all concerned. It must, however, stabilize at some reasonable term of appointment for the good of the individual, the library, and the institution.
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Leadership in the Post-Hierarchical Library

RICHARD T. SWEENEY

ABSTRACT

THE POST-HIERARCHICAL LIBRARY IS A flattened organization, unlimited by the traditional hierarchy, antibureaucratic, with empowered cross-functional teams, fewer people, constant learning, and redefined and re-engineered work processes focused on customer service. The purpose of the post-hierarchical library is to increase user satisfaction with reduced resources and more staff empowerment. It is being propelled by rising user service demands, increasing costs, new technologies, and internal and commercial competition. The post-hierarchical library leader is a planner, coordinator, motivator, negotiator, innovator, communicator, listener, recruiter, risk taker, problem solver, and evaluator. The leader's responsibilities include adopting and exemplifying a user satisfaction mind set, defining and articulating the mission and strategic plan, creating a supporting technology and knowledge-sharing infrastructure, and fostering relationships and teams. The significant impediments to the development of the post-hierarchical library are the inertia of the parent institution, the leader, the staff, and the motivation for change.

INTRODUCTION

Times of rapid change call for real leaders who possess, communicate, and implement a vision for radically transformed and improved organizations. This article is about such radically redesigned library organizations and the characteristics of the library leaders who will create them.
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This article will answer five questions: (1) What is the post-hierarchical library and how will it develop? (2) Why should the traditional library be reengineered? (3) What are the characteristics and roles of the post-hierarchical library leader? (4) What are the critical library leadership strategies? (5) What are the impediments to recruiting a library leader and implementing the post-hierarchical library?

The first part of this article explores the vision and nature of reengineering the traditional library and the reasons why this radical redesign is underway. The post-hierarchical library is a radically redesigned and reengineered concept of a library with an entirely new organizational structure and redesigned work processes. The term post-hierarchical library has been created by this author since there is no other suitable term. Terms such as the electronic library, the virtual library, and the smart library do not convey the same meaning. Primarily, the post-hierarchical library will change the nature of library service, library work, and library leadership, and second, the post-hierarchical library, like the electronic library, the virtual library, and the smart library, will involve the use of new information technologies, the emerging national information infrastructure (NII), and the electronic highway (National Research Education Network).

The latter part of this article explores the leader and the leadership skills necessary to transform this new vision into reality. What are the post-hierarchical library leader's desirable traits, skills, roles, ideas, inventions, motivations, and limitations? Such leaders must make quantum leaps in the quality, type, and amount of library services. These library leaders understand and communicate the vision of the library of the future and implement it within radically reengineered organizations.

Is it possible to reengineer vast improvements in the effectiveness and productivity of libraries? How is this possible? Is it possible to implement a reengineered library with a more humane organizational structure? Who will be able to do this? Why is it difficult but not impossible for library leaders to successfully create the post-hierarchical library? How can boards of trustees, university administrators, school principals, and others identify and recruit a new breed of library leaders to accomplish such new organizations? The library community has not yet answered these questions. This article is a first step to posing the questions and, in some cases, suggesting possible solutions.

The Post-Hierarchical Library

Reengineering is the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements.
in critical, contemporary measures of performance, such as cost, quality, service, and speed. (Hammer & Champy, 1993, p. 32)

The post-hierarchical library may be thought of as the "antibureaucratic library." It is an organization which is much more focused on patron or user service and much less bound by inflexible rules and the paperwork tradition. Unlike bureaucracy, the post-hierarchical library may often change its organizational structure fundamentally and rapidly in order to offer new and better services to meet rapidly changing user needs. The staff of this type of library is characterized by its flexibility, willingness and ability to learn and adapt. The post-hierarchical library is characterized by a unique mission, self-organizing systems, and major changes in work processes but not by fixed bureaucratic systems. This library, most of all, is more focused on the satisfaction of user information needs.

The post-hierarchical library is not just a change in the traditional library but rather a radically changed concept of a library—i.e., a reengineered library. Many, if not most, librarians, administrators, parent institution administrators, and even users are frightened by the very notion of reengineering—i.e., radical redesign. Reengineering is threatening to some, does pose additional risks, and calls for huge initial expenditures of energy, time, and resources.

This library is likely to be a flattened organization with empowered cross-functional teams, fewer people, constant learning, reduced operating resources, new knowledge and information infrastructures, and reinvented and reengineered work processes focused on customized service. This post-hierarchical library is designed to satisfy user knowledge and information needs rather than provide a collection of documents in a building. It effectively uses many new information technologies, but its most unique characteristics are the new patterns and structures in which people work.

The post-hierarchical library may or may not have physical collections of books and other materials, or even a building designed for client use. It may or may not, but probably will, include establishing empowered teams, implementing total quality management, and/or downsizing efficiently. Each of those activities, while very worthwhile, are not radical nor fundamental enough in themselves to be called reengineered or reinvented. Simply, the mission of the library must be reconsidered and rethought while focused upon the changing information needs of users. Each library organizational structure must be uniquely redesigned to meet its new mission.

The concept that a hierarchy is the only way to structure an organization is so ingrained in our culture that many of us cannot imagine any other structure. In this article, post-hierarchical does
not mean nonhierarchical. Rather, it means "beyond the hierarchical mind set." In other words, hierarchy is not always the best organizational structure for any process or organization.

Each post-hierarchical library must have a structure or structures that best meets its unique mission and evolving services. It is a library which does not have a single permanent type of organizational structure. The organizational structure must be adaptive—i.e., the structure must adapt quickly to changing goals, needs, and conditions. For example, a single library may keep one traditional department focused on a certain service process, a confederation of teams on a second process, and have a vendor-library alliance working on a third process. Each substructure may be different based upon the skills required, the scale of the investments, the clear advantages they produce in the results, and a host of other critical factors. The organizational structure itself must be flexible.

Hierarchy remains one organizational structure possibility. Most organizations trying to restructure will start from a hierarchy. Many of those organizations will retain some features of the hierarchy in the early stages of transformation. Features such as budgets, salaries, titles, job descriptions, department structure, faculty tenure status and evaluations, are not likely to change simultaneously or easily. Yet every feature of the organization must be examined carefully, vigorously, and microscopically to determine its effect upon each and every process. User satisfaction is sacred—not the organizational structure.

A successful reengineering transformation plan will identify, at the outset, every possible inhibitor and motivator within the organizational structure. A motivator is an event or action which causes the process performance to greatly improve while an inhibitor is an event or action which causes the process performance to remain the same or to deteriorate. The plan must remove each inhibitor and establish new motivators. Some motivators within the traditional structure, such as job title and salary range, might become inhibitors within the post-hierarchical library. For example, members of a small team might be rewarded for the success of the team or the success of a service process rather than for the personal success of an individual.

The timing and speed of the organizational changes will have a crucial determining effect upon the effectiveness of the new organization. Reengineered organizations require extraordinary amounts of analysis and planning. The timing of the implementation is likely to be as important as the changes themselves. The timing must account for changes which must happen simultaneously or in sequence. In any case, protracted major reengineering shifts are less
likely to be successful than quick well-planned and executed transformations.

There are many possible alternative organizational structures, including unique local variations, such as empowered teams, confederation of teams, free "intraprise," strategic partnerships and alliances, member cooperatives, vendor partnerships, vendor outsourcing, privatization, and more. Each alternative organizational structure has its own strengths and weaknesses. Empowered teams are groups of employees and/or customers and vendors with both budgetary and personnel authority to accomplish a well-defined set of tasks. Some organizations are designed as large partnerships resembling a large law firm. Other organizations have wholly owned, but independently organized, subsidiaries set up to accomplish specific objectives. This article will not review each type of organizational structure since the literature is replete with good examples. It is, however, important to realize that there are many alternatives and variations.

_The End of Bureaucracy and the Rise of the Intelligent Organization_ (Pinchot & Pinchot, 1993) is just one example of a recent book attempting to provide a blueprint for replacing bureaucracy with more humane and effective organizational structures. There are many books, articles, and speeches on the revolution of organizational structures within industry and government. _Reinventing Government_ (Osborne & Gabler, 1992), _Reengineering the Corporation_ (Hammer & Champy, 1993), and _Liberation Management_ (Peters, 1992) are just a few examples stressing the need for a major change in organizational structures. Each of these books cites successful instances already occurring within corporate and government organizational structures but not a single library. Unfortunately, there is no real library transformation success story.

A few library administrators have begun to experiment with new technologies, techniques, and organizational structures to move toward the post-hierarchical library. Clemson University Libraries, for example, have reorganized into teams. Some libraries have even questioned how they might be able to completely reinvent their library organizations. Most have not yet dared to try. "Reengineering isn't about fixing anything. It is about starting all over from scratch" (Hammer & Champy, 1993, p. 94).

Post-hierarchical library leaders must start planning as though they were starting with the mission of the library. Nothing is taken for granted or considered sacred except satisfying users' needs which determines the mission which in turn drives the work processes. The work processes then drive the changes in the organizational structure.
The traditional library organizational structure, on the contrary, often determines both the mission and the work processes.

Reengineering a library requires major changes in library work processes. Most libraries are hierarchy and department oriented, not process oriented. Libraries are structured with many departments such as cataloging, circulation, and reference. The notion of work processes is not typically taught in library and information science schools, nor is it prevalent in practice. Hammer and Champy (1993) define a process as: “a collection of activities that takes one or more kinds of input and creates an output that is of value to a customer” (p. 35).

Customers can be library users or internal customers such as librarians, administrators, trustees, taxpayers, government officials, funding agencies, or other staff. A single work process may be focused on either internal customers, external customers, or both. The customer’s perception is the only one which should count when considering the service delivered by a process. The intended customers must judge the process to be of value or it is wasted no matter how well considered, intended, or well established. Each process must have a well-defined set of customers whose judgment on the service is final.

Each process must also have a well-defined set of goals and objectives which must be consistent with the mission. Obviously the staff in a library which does not have a written mission will not be able to tell whether the goals and objectives of a specific process are consistent with the mission. The mission must, at least, tell all employees why they are providing a service and whom they should be serving. The objectives of the process must ultimately be measured by customer satisfaction.

Each process has inputs which can include funding, staff, facilities, and equipment. The inputs are what are needed to accomplish the process. The reengineered work process is successful only when it vastly improves user satisfaction with reduced inputs. It may actually redefine the service and the user’s expectations for that service.

Processes are collections of activities or tasks requiring different knowledge and skills. Processes often involve multiple traditional departments, many staff, various vendors, and many types of customers. Frequently, there are few, if any, employees who understand an entire process from input to customer. Many times the process is only known and “owned” by a manager. The most effective processes are those where every employee involved understands all of the activities and tasks and accepts the responsibility of ownership.

Processes are complicated because they involve many types of customers, activities, technologies, variables, and inputs. Effective
processes, even though complicated, are logical and therefore can be represented graphically as flow charts. Not every flow chart is a work process, however. Critical activities of a process can often be either intentionally or unintentionally hidden. This makes the process analysis much more complex. The leader must probe deeply into each process in order to determine what actually occurs.

Processes are also complicated because they involve people whose needs and motivations vary considerably. Employees are people who perform the activities of the process. Vendors, funding agents, and other suppliers of external inputs to the processes, also involve people. The most important part of process redesign and leadership are the relationships with all the people involved. These relationships can be either supported or diminished by the organizational structure.

Individual tasks or activities in a work process are not sacred; only the complete process and its impact upon the customer matters. The success of a single activity is best judged by its direct effect upon the customer. In other words, an improvement to a single activity is useless if it does not greatly improve the end result of the process to the customer. Processes are completely driven by their value to customers which means delivering higher quality library service with fewer resources than the customer or funding agent expected. Results matter more than the specific tasks or activities of the process.

Do small advances and incremental process improvements add up to greatly improved processes? Not necessarily. Some so-called advances and fine tuning can improve a part of a process without influencing customer satisfaction. Other small advances may result in only modest improvements in customer satisfaction. Some steps simply have a greater impact upon customer satisfaction than others. In some cases, a certain combination of tasks must be improved to greatly improve customer satisfaction. It is not always obvious or intuitive how to make great improvements in customer satisfaction. For example, the activity of choosing an automated circulation system is not reengineering. No matter how well accomplished, it becomes reengineering only if it results in radical customer service improvement. Often the specific benefits of choosing an automated circulation system do not typically bring radical improvements in service, they simply change the method of record keeping.

Traditional library departments often measure performance of a process on a task-by-task basis or on an input basis rather than on customer satisfaction. Job descriptions, for example, are often written to include sample duties or tasks instead of identifying the basic process performed and the statement of who will be served.

Suppose that a library concentrates upon building a CD-ROM tower on a network so that users can remotely search a special index
of journal articles. Can the process be greatly improved if the library is not able to deliver the articles indexed and located by users in a timely fashion? Of course not. Users still may have to go to the library and physically try to obtain the journal articles. In very few cases can the user both search and obtain the articles remotely. The user will be frustrated with remote access to the citations (CD-ROM) without the same access to the articles. In this example, the process is the collection of tasks which permits a user to search remotely and retrieve the necessary information—i.e., the articles. The CD-ROM network may seem like a great achievement to librarians, but it does not vastly improve the user process—i.e., obtaining articles on a subject. The CD-ROM system does greatly reduce the amount of searching time when compared to hard-copy indexes. It certainly results in user benefits but not in complete user satisfaction. In short, it is not reengineering.

The customers of the post-hierarchical library must receive enhanced benefits in all service areas. Reengineered work processes, primarily directed at internal customers, are also not enough to create a post-hierarchical library. Carefully reengineered work processes are certainly needed in order to achieve this type of library, but they are not sufficient.

Librarians are very familiar with the traditional library department structure which has served the library community well for over a hundred years. Indeed, most library administration books have been written with chapters dedicated to each department. The structure was a practical response to accomplishing tasks which had to be performed, but the structure was not concerned with ensuring continued customer satisfaction.

Everyone in a process needs to understand the ultimate benefits to the customer. For example, the acquisitions department performed the service of ordering and purchasing books which were then sent to the cataloging department. The cataloging department was the principal customer. The cataloging department was concerned with the quality of the catalog but not necessarily with how quickly a user could search and obtain a particular book that satisfied his or her need. Typically, no one department "owned" an entire process and measured what their customers really wanted.

The last generation of librarians developed expertise in a specialty and often did not know very much about activities outside their specialty. An acquisition librarian may not have been very knowledgeable about cataloging and data processing, for example. Those specialties developed in response to the large amount of knowledge and skill required in limited areas of library operations.
Each specialty, over time, built its own culture and tradition. It was not necessary nor convenient for the various specialties to frequently interact. After all, a specialist was rewarded for his or her work by the department manager not by other internal or external customers. It was the job of the manager to take care of interdepartmental communications and issues. The hierarchy created the flow of information and decision making.

Specialists became more responsive to their colleagues than to the final customers of their processes. It was more important to be recognized for your expert cataloging by professional colleagues, for example, than to be recognized by the customers for the great catalog.

Cross-functional teams offer an opportunity for all staff, even specialists, to be assigned to interdepartmental processes. Cross-functional teams own an entire customer-oriented process. These teams are beginning to be used not to replace “home” departments but rather to speed effective decision making and responsiveness. Cross-functional teams are composed of different kinds of specialists with a common charge—i.e., the specific process goals. These teams vary considerably from advisory in nature to fully empowered. Every member of an effective team must share the common concern for, and knowledge of, the customer.

Advisory committees (teams) have been around for a long time. They provide important consultation and advice, general communication, and evaluation, but they have no authority or responsibility to change anything as complicated as an entire work process. In short, they cannot make decisions. There are still good reasons to use advisory committees, but they simply cannot achieve radical improvement. Real authority and resources are needed to reengineer an organization.

The sports model of empowered teams is one which can benefit many libraries. The sports model includes a team of players, a coach, assistant coaches, support personnel, referees, and fans. The manager/coach does not play on the field and cannot therefore make decisions that have to be made quickly in response to a given situation. However, the coach is the ultimate authority. A player on a sports team is often benched in a game by the coach for poor performance.

Cross-functional teams can be empowered. Empowerment means that the team has been given authority to make decisions. The decisions might affect the hiring of personnel, reorganization of processes, a budget and spending authority, and so forth. Cross-functional teams have developed with many variations of authority. The manner in which authority has been granted (empowerment) can have a profound impact upon customer satisfaction.
The key questions regarding empowerment are how to hold cross-functional teams accountable and how to reward excellent performance. Does the entire team get equally rewarded when the team performs well? Each player must respond to the situation as though the entire team depended upon him or her. In other words, each player assumes responsibility for the entire team. Accountability must be designed to achieve team performance as well as personal performance.

However, every decision is personal. Well-coached players follow their playbook until they are no longer able and then they exercise good judgment. Good judgment is required when the playbook no longer applies. Some coaches allow more latitude for independent decision making within their playbook. For example, option plays appear in many football playbooks, but no one, including the coach, knows the option that will be selected until the situation arrives. The effective empowered team member makes individual decisions for the good of the entire team.

The most effective form of empowerment occurs with teams that are well coached. Teams can reach decisions by consensus and consultation where there is no formal opposition. Yet this can be time consuming and less responsive. Alternatively, the empowerment might be delegated by team leaders to all individuals within specified guidelines. Empowerment also might take the form of majority rule by democratic vote. In any case, each member of the team must understand how and when to make decisions.

Cross-functional teams may be ad hoc "departments" formed for a temporary period to accomplish a specific project and disband afterward. They can also be permanent parts of the organizational structure.

The entire issue of empowerment gets to the heart of cross-functional teams. For example, if a process involves multiple departments, does the team have the authority to make a decision when one department does not fully support it? The best decision-making process is designed for customer responsiveness and well coached good judgment.

The traditional model of a modern hierarchy is a series of departments with managers who are in total control of a group of specialists, professionals, technicians, and clerks. The bottom level worker of the hierarchy did not possess any special knowledge or skills. At best, this worker possessed a high school diploma. Yet the bottom level worker of the hierarchy was the person most likely to interact initially with customers. In the hierarchy, there were more people at the bottom level than at any other level, thereby resulting
in a pyramid structure. The performance of the individual was more important than the performance of the team.

Today everyone needs both formal education and life-long learning in every position in the post-hierarchical library. The person who has the least amount of education, flexibility, and skills becomes the lowest common denominator or choke point for the entire team. The post-hierarchical team will be as good as the weakest members. The strength of this team derives from the fact that everyone produces and "owns" the process. The team members who have the least amount of skills and performance will reduce the flexibility and performance of the entire team. Post-hierarchical library teams are likely to have fewer more highly skilled and talented employees all working together.

Because of the need for more knowledge, skills, and education, it might seem apparent that libraries need more specialists in narrower and narrower subject areas. There is, however, a contrasting need for libraries to be highly responsive and flexible. This means that all employees must simultaneously possess excellent specialized knowledge, skills, and education and "own" an entire process, delivering services and adapting quickly to meet customers' needs.

Every specialist in the post-hierarchical library must be a flexible generalist. Specialization must be augmented with even better team-playing skills. The specialist is not only a person with special skills but a person who can and must contribute with other more common skills outside of the specialty. The specialist must be able to see the entire process, the organization, and have some basic practical understanding of all the different tasks to compliment his/her special skills. Each new librarian is both a specialist and a generalist possessing much more knowledge and expertise than was required in the traditional library. The addition of smarter technology has actually raised the need for a higher core level of common knowledge.

There are core processes to every team. The core library processes concern services delivered directly to users. They are the reason for the existence of the team. The essential knowledge and skills required for those core processes should be able to be performed by all staff on the team when required. This means that a specialist should be able to take over work within the core processes at any time.

In the old model, a specialist was most efficiently employed when only performing that specialty. Unfortunately, this made organizations less flexible. A specialist who could only perform the skills of a single specialty could not help when the skills of the core processes or some other specialty were more urgently required.

Indeed, the traditional specialist often did not possess the empathy and flexibility necessary to participate as a full member
of the team. Many specialists felt superior to employees involved in the common core processes. This caused many specialists to become prima donnas and the performance of the entire library suffered.

A team works most effectively when there is great respect and interest in one another's work. Empathy is a quality that must be present among members of an effective team. Empathy is best achieved when everyone shares some common work and experiences.

In the new model of the post-hierarchical library, every staff member on a team must possess operating knowledge and skills of core processes and also specialized knowledge in one or two domains of importance to the team. Cross training must be pursued with great vigor on a modern team since flexibility is paramount. Specialized knowledge and skills must be recognized by peers based on performance and not formal education.

Formal education, training programs and, most importantly, self-paced learning programs are essential to the performance of team members in the modern organization. Many of the specialized skills required in today's libraries did not exist in libraries ten or even five years ago. Many computer programs, new organizational structures, and methods of operating, did not exist when most of today's librarians were in graduate school. Many specialized skills must be learned on the job by current staff. Formal education programs are helpful, but many practical skills change so quickly that traditional formal education programs are inadequate.

Learning is what is important, not how the person learned. Teacher-led education programs are not enough. Self-paced and self-motivated learning are essential skills in the modern library organization. Rapid response to changing circumstances is greatly improved with staff who have the ability to quickly and flexibly learn new and appropriate skills. Learning must result from learner-initiated reading, watching videos, listening to tapes, interacting with multimedia, and asking questions or experimenting.

A specialist is not defined as someone who cannot (or will not) do other work but rather someone who is most knowledgeable and skilled in a specialty. The old, "It's not my job or responsibility" attitude has no place in a modern flexible team or organization. A specialist who does not willingly and flexibly adapt to the core processes of an organization is a liability. The specialist is less efficient to the performance of the team when only working in a specialty. A modern specialist must be focused upon the needs of the team at any given moment and therefore must thrive on greater diversity as well as the specialty.

The post-hierarchical library is a networked library with distributed staff, resources, and documents. No individual library has,
or is capable of housing, all of the materials published every year. The networked library depends upon such services as interlibrary loan, electronic document delivery, remote searching, and delivery systems. Electronic networking with OCLC, the Internet, and similar utilities is everywhere. However, most library leaders have not yet responded with more appropriate library organizational structures meeting the needs of the users of these networked services.

Networked teams and organizations require more communication, more distributed decision making, and better methods for accountability. Although almost every library is networked today, most staff still operate in traditional organizational structures. Many important decisions requiring timely responses are still funneled back up the chain of command to the appropriate level of authority. Depending upon the number of layers, the decision gets slowed down moving from one person to another. In addition, the information gets altered consciously and unconsciously during the transfer phase. This is just like the children's game "telephone" where the first person whispers a message to another person in a circle, which is then relayed to the next person and so on until it has returned to the first person resulting in the message being totally corrupted. In real life, time delays and forgetfulness can worsen the situation.

In sports, the coach is present and can visually see and hear the performance of the team and each player. The coach gets constant feedback during the game from the scoreboard, the assistant coaches, the players, the referees, spotters in the press box, and his or her own observation. The only time that the coach can confer with the full team during the action of the game is when there is a timeout or halftime, and then the time is limited. The constant feedback that the coach obtains is essential to making timely decisions that respond to the people and immediate situation. The library leader cannot see every service transaction taking place and often has to respond after the fact and only when either the customer complains or the librarian communicates the problem. The library leader may get feedback, but too often the feedback is late, or worse, inaccurate. The networked leader must create new opportunities for getting reliable feedback.

Stand alone not only means a single physical location, but it also means individuals operating without regard to the team. For example, a librarian can make a decision that is an exception to existing policy to accommodate speedy service. However, if the librarian fails to communicate that decision to every member of the team, both present and remote, problems result. Not only will other librarians be faced with the same issue, but they may judge differently.
In any case, such a policy may never be discussed, decided, recorded, and communicated effectively.

The new organizational approaches to distributed and networked teams have taken a variety of forms but still require rethinking management methods. How does the team leader motivate team members? How does each team member know what every other team member is doing? Distributed workers can actually become stand-alone workers if they are not actively and intuitively involved in a team structure. Remote team members must feel a part of the team whether they are present or remote.

Telecommuting employees are the most extreme example today of networked team members. While telecommuting as an organizational structure is still new, there is a growing body of experience with what works and what does not. Employees who do not have any physical contact with each other, or adequate replacement of such contact, have needs which must be met by a successful organization. Time for physical contact has to be provided. The remote worker must not be at a political disadvantage when compared to other workers on site. Communication systems have to be elaborate and decision making has to be delegated more so than with other types of organizations. The umbilical cord of electronic telecommunications often is less stable than communications on site. Telecommuting employees must be more empowered to make decisions when cut off from the team leader.

Networked and distributed workers are not necessarily teams. Many networked organizations are simply remote staff who do highly repetitive tasks that do not require a high degree of interactivity. Real networked teams require constant communication, questions, observations, experimentation, collaboration, brainstorming, consensus building, and so forth. Collaborating professional staff need both new technologies and redesigned and flexible organizational structures to be most effective.

Distributed teams will work effectively if decisions are routinely communicated and recorded. All team members must be able to retrieve decisions, policies, and information instantly. Everyone must feel they are kept up to date.

The post-hierarchical library is not only composed of networked and distributed teams, but it is different in its fundamental definition. The definition of the library, in almost every common dictionary, represents how the general population thinks about libraries and librarians. The library is a place with a collection of books and other documents. The librarian is the person who works or manages a library. The post-hierarchical library changes this thinking.
Nowhere does the traditional definition say that the library is an organization which satisfies the knowledge, information, and document needs of its clients. The traditional library is a place and a collection; the new post-hierarchical library is a service. The organizational structure which best supports a service culture is not the best structure to support a collection or warehouse function. In the library jargon of today, current terminology calls these approaches just-in-time (post-hierarchical) instead of just-in-case (traditional).

A service library focuses resources on obtaining the books or information that the user wants regardless of the source. The collection library focuses upon building well-rounded collections regardless of the expressed user need. Service means that the user leaves the library satisfied regardless of how many books or other materials are in the collection. Service-oriented library staff are focused on obtaining the material needed for the end-user. This may or may not result in any collection enhancement.

The end result of the traditional collection-based library is a good well-rounded collection. The assumption is that such a collection will, by definition, meet user needs. However, it is well known that a collection alone does not produce good service. If the user does not know how to search and retrieve the material or if the material needed is in use, stolen, missing, in cataloging, or otherwise not on the shelf, the user remains immediately unsatisfied.

The post-hierarchical library provides an unequivocal focus upon the end result, which is satisfying users' knowledge, information, and document needs. The effective structure enables the staff to be flexible enough to obtain what the users want, when they want it, and with the least possible expenditure of resources. This structure has all staff working in customer or user processes. Some staff should be serving internal customers but only if that process greatly improves the internal customers' ability to serve their external customers.

The post-hierarchical library measures user satisfaction. Did the user obtain what she or he wanted? Traditional libraries measure additions to collections, the number of books borrowed, and other easy methods to measure items which are not necessarily directly related to user satisfaction. If the only things measured are those which do not reveal user satisfaction, then the library will be focused on those items rather than upon user satisfaction. Measuring customer satisfaction is the key.

Nonpublic service library support departments, such as acquisitions, cataloging, and administration, often easily become focused on internal rules and procedures and forget the customer. In many traditional library bureaucracies the support departments are not evaluated by either users or public service librarians.
The reward system for employees should be based ultimately upon increasing user satisfaction. Everyone in the library must be constantly thinking about increasing user satisfaction.

Understanding the nature of the post-hierarchical library still does not explain why such a new library is needed. After all, a huge amount of energy, money, and time will be consumed in the implementation of this concept. Most professionals need to be convinced that it is worth the price.

WHY REENGINEER THE LIBRARY?

Many academic, government, community, and corporate leaders are beginning to show real interest in reinventing and reengineering businesses, industry, and government institutions. They believe that it is now possible to achieve huge increases in service and performance for the same or less money, but they are caught in the dilemma of expanding desires for new services, continued demands for existing services, and fewer resources to provide both. There simply is no way to significantly satisfy both the users and the parent organization using the traditional mission, structure, staff, and processes.

Some institutions are looking for ways to disassemble the traditional library and its inflexible structure and reinvent new processes that will improve the value of the library to their whole enterprise. They are looking for leaders with revolutionary vision and key leadership skills to give them direction and reengineer their enterprise.

Why reinvent the traditional library? Why make radical change? Why not progress with incremental improvements to the traditional library? Will there still be as great a demand for the traditional library in the future as there was in the past?

There are a variety of reasons why the traditional library needs radical changes. User service demands are increasing far more rapidly than the resources to meet these needs in traditional ways. The cost of building large collections of books and journals has escalated far faster than income. New information technology provides opportunities for vastly improved services with far greater access. External agencies, parent organizations, and government have placed greater burdens upon libraries and the services which libraries must provide. The corporate sector has begun to compete heavily in the new information infrastructure carving out the most lucrative areas.

Users have greatly expanded their demands upon libraries. About fifteen years ago, libraries did not have VHS videocassettes, CD-ROMs, audio CDs, personal computer networks, or Internet access. Many of the younger generation are now looking for video games
from libraries. Users want to obtain access to Internet services and multimedia services from libraries.

Today users demand that libraries have it all. The demand for books, journal articles, and other traditional formats has remained high and, in many cases, has accelerated. Users want to search in automated catalogs and obtain the books faster, and they want access to more commercial online information systems. In addition, they want more help from the staff. Yet library budgets have remained static after adjusting for inflation.

More importantly than the increase in the volume of use is the desire on the part of users, particularly younger users, for highly interactive and easy to use information resources. Many college students now play a version of dungeons and dragons in a game called MUD over the Internet. They play highly entertaining and interactive video games. Even parents are using e-mail and other interactive activities on the Internet, CompuServe, and other networks. These users find passive media without full motion image to be less interesting and less desirable by comparison.

Traditional librarians and libraries are character/word based. They create and provide written language with the tools available. They are reader friendly but not necessarily user-friendly. Few librarians even understand visual and aural literacy. In order for libraries to make substantial progress in developing a modern library, the organization must develop expertise in areas that were once considered foreign and unrelated.

The only solution to meeting explosive growth in user demands lies in reengineering the entire library, focusing on customer satisfaction and relying less on buildings and collections. Users want more visual information, more color, more full motion, more interactive information, more audible sound and speech, better filtration and synthesis of information, and better and easier to use packages. They want all of this and books too. Such demands turn into high user frustration in traditional libraries. Traditional libraries are spread too thin to serve anyone well.

In addition to the explosive growth in the demand for services, taxpayers and users do not want to pay any more for the new services than they have for traditional library services. Library budgets all over the country are experiencing erosion of support. In many cases, parent institutions are looking to cut costs, and the library is viewed as a cost center. Taxpayers are demanding decreased taxes and more control over how money is spent. Library budgets are no bigger than they were years ago, and many are smaller. Libraries, generally speaking, do not produce revenue so, therefore, are considered a target during budget reductions.
Journals have increased dramatically in price over the last ten years, far exceeding the rate of inflation. Since library budgets have not increased, the number of journal subscriptions has shrunk and/or the cost was shifted and other services dropped. In some cases, services just deteriorated when too few dollars chased too much demand.

More important than the increase in the journal prices is the lack of improvement in the service offered for the money expended. Journals are not measurably better than they were ten or twenty years ago, and they can only be used by one person at a time. They are also limited to the place where they are stored, and it still requires too much time to locate the desired articles. Journals are growing in page count while there is evidence that the average article is used less.

The problem is not limited just to journals. Books, multimedia materials, and videocassettes have increased in price almost as fast as journals. Yet their increased value to users has not gone up measurably.

One reason for the cost increases in journals is the cancellation of subscriptions at universities. The bulk of the cost of publishing is incurred during the writing, editing, review, and production stage, which creates the first copy. The cost to print one extra copy of a document is small. When a university cancels a single journal subscription, the cost of publishing that journal does not decline in proportion to the cost of the subscription. In order to stay in business with that journal, the publisher raises prices to cover the loss of the cancelled subscriptions.

The number of publications also has mushroomed. Fewer libraries are chasing greater numbers of titles. Greater diversity in the types of documents and in the types of information sought have increased the cost to author and publish documents. If the trend continues for, say, twenty years, libraries will not be able to afford to purchase any physical documents. This is not likely to occur because our supply and demand market-based society will be altered by those who develop and implement a new model. Not only is the library affected by the decline in the publications available locally but also in the decline in the publications available from other libraries where interlibrary loan could have made a difference. Therefore, the declining traditional publications available in libraries can be expected to accelerate until the new model for libraries is in place. It is also clear that the traditional library cannot survive without building collections.

The effect of publishing cost increases upon libraries is causing change, one of such importance that it is cracking the foundation of the traditional library. This change has already greatly weakened
the collection-based approach to traditional libraries. An entirely new replacement system, based upon a reasonable just-in-time approach, must be built quickly or current libraries will cease to be viable.

Libraries are faced with the dilemma of continuing with the traditional library as it declines or shift resources strategically, but rapidly, into a reinvented library. Both will compete for the budget and personnel of libraries. Parent organizations and taxpayers will not be able to fund both the new model and the traditional library, thereby creating a titanic struggle.

Clearly both models will exist simultaneously for a period, each competing for resources and users. During this crucial transition period, the post-hierarchical library will develop. Libraries will not survive merely with a strategy of incremental change during this rapid erosion of library collections. Only the reengineered library will emerge.

Increased user demands, increased costs, and reduced budgets are occurring simultaneously along with the explosion of new information technology that has the potential of solving some of the problems. However, the technology cannot be used to automate what now exists. The entire library needs to be reengineered: "merely throwing computers at an existing business problem does not cause it to be reengineered. In fact, the misuse of technology can block reengineering altogether by reinforcing old ways of thinking and old behavior problems" (Hammer & Champy, 1993, p. 83).

Libraries have used technology for many years but have not seen huge productivity increases. Most libraries, including almost all of the large libraries, have spent millions of dollars for integrated library systems. Yet it is almost impossible to see anything more than marginal productivity improvements for users of the systems. Neither taxpayers nor parent organizations have benefited measurably from technology.

The principal reason library technology has not yet greatly improved user productivity (cost/benefit ratio) is that the traditional library automated existing operations instead of using it to reengineer processes. Technology should provide new services which were not possible before.

The potential benefits of each technology come from asking how libraries can use technologies to accomplish what they are not already doing. In the past, library leaders asked how to use technology to accomplish existing tasks such as circulation and cataloging. The post-hierarchical library leader asks how technology can accomplish something totally new. For example, how can a library provide remote searching and retrieval of articles from home? This thinking provides a new approach to considering how technology can really improve
services. Concentrating on totally new services is just the sort of thinking which results in radical, rather than incremental, change.

Reengineering often starts with brainstorming about possibilities that seem almost impossible. Reengineering the entire scholarly communication system is one such discussion already underway. There are a number of proposals in the literature including those by Boyce (1993) and White (1993). The Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) is also pursuing such change.

Another post-hierarchical idea is to do away with circulating book libraries and provide a system that anyone can use from home or any remote location. Of course, the entire concept of reengineering means that the processes are radically transformed. The post-hierarchical library can deliver such results with bold leadership that can ask questions inductively or deductively.

Demands for new services extend beyond the internal customers. Parent institutions want more service for the money. Taxpayers want more service for the money. Publishers want a bigger share of the market and greater profits. Local citizens want access to neighboring libraries where they are not members. Legislators want libraries to work together delivering service to users outside of their service districts. City officials want the library to be helpful in keeping or in recruiting businesses to the community. Government officials want libraries to provide government information and other important community information. Schools want libraries to help students with their studies.

Perhaps the greatest single reason that libraries must embark upon reengineering is that the rest of the world is now in the information business. The stakes have increased dramatically. Industry is investing at unprecedented levels in information technologies that promise to bring information services into every home. The size and scale of these projects dwarf all combined current library expenditures.

Industry has embarked on a direct frontal attack upon the historical preserve of libraries—i.e., collecting a huge amount of knowledge and making it available to scholars and the general public. A recent article in Fortune (1993) highlights the direct competition with libraries. In the article, Oracle CEO Larry Ellison is quoted about his company's current multimillion dollar database project called the Alexandria Project:

It aims at nothing less than using computers to change the way human knowledge is amassed and stored. The name, Ellison explains, evokes the ancient Greek attempt to build a library
containing copies of all the world's published works. The Greeks assembled more than 500,000 volumes in Alexandria before early Christians burned the site in 391 A.D. (Kiechell, 1993, p. 40)

This direct commercial confrontation with libraries has consequences for the future of libraries. Industry wants to reap huge profits from providing and controlling the networks, information services, and multimedia products and databases, including the entire supporting infrastructure. What role will the library have? How can libraries with such paltry resources compete? Clearly the post-hierarchical library must be positioned to co-exist with the for-profit sector, providing critical services for the common good.

Just as libraries and book and video stores have co-existed for years, the library must become the agency that provides fair and equal access to information clearly needed for the common good, assistance and access for all citizens, particularly to those with few resources, preservation of materials of historical value, and input into the rules for the fair use of this new super information highway. The corporate sector, in a free and open market, certainly can and will dictate a great deal of the information services provided, but there will remain a critically important role for libraries.

Those wishing more information on the issues involved with library organizational transformation should obtain the bibliography provided at the meeting entitled "Organizational Transformation; New Structures for New Realities" (Association of College and Research Libraries, University Libraries Section, American Library Association Conference, July 1993, in New Orleans).

LIBRARY LEADER CHARACTERISTICS

The team leader in the post-hierarchical library possesses special leadership skills and knowledge. The team leader is an effective manager, a superb leader, and also a full team member. The effective team leader understands that he or she cannot perform with the same skill and knowledge as a proficient team member in a special skill. However, the leader must understand, at a fundamental level, the abilities, knowledge, skills, needs, and motivations of team members in order to effectively coordinate the activities of the team. This requires the team leader to spend even more time learning than any other team member.

The post-hierarchical library demands new leadership. A single reengineered work process will not create a post-hierarchical library. The post-hierarchical library must radically improve all processes through a transformed structure for vastly improved user satisfaction with the same or less resources. A single reengineered process calls
for a reengineering coordinator, while a reengineered library calls for a special leader.

The team leader is also the team member who develops and possesses a vision for the team, articulates the mission, innovates, keeps everyone focused on the mission, and leads. The team leader may not even be the most valuable member of the team. This is not to say that such leadership is unimportant or unnecessary. On the contrary, leadership is essential on every team. Quite often in team sports the team manager is paid less than the top performing players. The special skills required and the availability of qualified people possessing such skills have more to do with determining market value than the bureaucratic status.

The post-hierarchical leader possesses a unique set of personality traits. Those traits are suited to the radical changes that this leader must create in a rather conservative and traditional institution. This person's personality will be tested in the fire of immense change. The leaders who are successful will not all possess the same personality, but they are likely to share several important traits. The library leader must be flexible, energetic, empathetic, wise, creative, courageous, principled, gregarious, determined, and possessed of a sense of humor. Certainly there are many other important traits that one might expect to see in this leader but perhaps none so important as these.

The leader is flexible, and not bound by the way things have been done but rather by the force of radical improvement. The leader understands the past but is not constrained by it. The new leader accepts and learns from mistakes. This leader listens and carefully considers others' ideas and is willing and able to shift his or her personal ideas when needed. The leader plans carefully in advance but can quickly adapt on the spot to changes in the situation.

The immense changes to a post-hierarchical library demand a huge exertion of energy from the leader. Things in motion tend to stay in motion. Things at rest tend to stay at rest. To move a large organization in a new direction takes tremendous physical and emotional energy. Those who are of average energy will find the task daunting. This leader must be very energetic to be able to sustain the changes.

It may be difficult for some experienced staff to accept the notion that empathy in a professional position is necessary at all, much less an essential attribute of the best library leaders. Some people believe that an empathetic leader will not be able to make the most difficult changes in staff that may be required. However, the opposite is true. The empathetic leader will understand and feel the impact his or her decisions have upon other people. This leader will look
for ways to accomplish results and major changes with the least amount of discomfort to staff. This empathetic leader will also be able to better relate to customer needs. Empathetic leaders give more latitude and support in making tough decisions than leaders who do not care. Empathy is an important characteristic of the leader particularly when an organization is going through massive change.

It would be both humorous and wrong to suggest that a real leader does not have to be intelligent. Leaders need good analytic skills, deductive and inductive reasoning abilities, and more. However, a good leader is really more wise than intelligent. The leader must use good judgment, be logical, and call upon a vast amount of knowledge and experience.

The entire effort to create a newly reinvented and reengineered library demands imagination, innovation, and creativity. In what has been written about creativity, there is agreement that creative people possess the ability to see things, circumstances, and ideas in unique ways, uninhibited by what is or what was. They see around obstacles that many people do not perceive. Most importantly, they are always creative and encourage creativity in others.

The greater the changes in an organization, the greater must be the courage of the leader who makes them. Making changes in a large organization will make many people unhappy. A fool can make massive changes because she or he does not understand the enormity of the impact. A leader realizes the enormity of the impact of the changes and has the courage to persevere nonetheless. Leadership is not for timid souls; the leader is courageous.

During the most difficult periods in life, many people give up their principles. Some people never develop a set of ethical principles in the first place. A real leader sticks to his or her principles even when they conflict with other duties. The leader is like the sportsman who craves winning but who will follow the rules of the game with total commitment, win or lose. If a leader does not recognize and abide by a set of higher principles then she or he would likely bring confusion and disorder. The reengineering discussed in this article assumes a transition from one ordered state to another and not to chaos. Ethical principles keep everyone directed toward an ordered state.

The leader likes people and likes to be with all different kinds of people. This may seem unnecessary or irrelevant, but it is most important. The leader who likes human beings can see their strengths, which is essential to obtaining their best efforts. Gregarious leaders are able to socialize with everyone; they generally do not like to be isolated, nor do they want to work primarily with things. Leaders need social interaction.
Leaders are determined people. Once they are convinced of the correctness of their decisions, they will persist despite immense difficulties. They will, of course, change in light of convincing new evidence, but they will not change just because of the amount of conflict. Leaders get results.

Another characteristic is that the library leader is always able to laugh at himself or herself. This leader has confidence and can accept making mistakes because of a sense of proportion. This library leader is possessed of a sense of humor. After President Reagan was shot and about to undergo extensive surgery, he told his doctors, "I hope that you are Republicans." A good sense of humor can help defuse difficult situations.

THE ROLES OF THE LIBRARY LEADER

The roles of the leader are many and varied, but a few of these roles take on increased importance in the post-hierarchical library. Such leaders automatically gravitate to these roles. It is critically important for the library leader to be a strategist, communicator, coordinator, planner, motivator, nurturer, recruiter, teacher, negotiator, and mediator.

The library leader is a strategist with a vision, a plan, and the will to achieve it. A strategist will understand both the conceptual design of a post-hierarchical library and the general steps necessary to achieve it. The nature of strategy is that it provides a broad brush stroke leaving the immense tactical details to be settled afterward. Such details can greatly affect the final results, yet the importance of understanding, developing, and selling the strategy is a key role of the successful leader. No organization is likely to achieve radical improvements without a leader who has created and sold a viable strategy for success.

The post-hierarchical library leader must also play the role of a superb communicator who listens well and who speaks and writes well. This leader must articulate concepts that are new and foreign to staff, users, administrators, and others in an appealing and rational manner. Perhaps listening well overshadows every other essential communication skill. After all, listening to the customer is the focus of any successful antibureaucratic organization.

The library leader must also be a superb coordinator and planner. Designing, planning, and coordinating the post-hierarchical library is extremely complicated and therefore requires knowledge and use of the most modern project management skills—listening, continual rethinking, evaluation, and revision. The post-hierarchical library cannot progress without meticulous coordination of diverse teams.
The library leader must recruit an outstanding, innovative, talented, flexible, and resourceful team to be successful. This is particularly difficult in organizations which have a large entrenched staff, protected by tenure, who are not fond of radical change. However, the recruitment of even a small core group of carefully chosen staff can actually change the entire organization. This core group can be recruited both from inside as well as from outside the traditional library. People are the reason for the changes to the library, and people in the library organization will ultimately make it happen. The leader is an expert in knowing and recruiting this team.

The transition to the post-hierarchical library is fraught with problems, and so the leader must act as an expert problem solver. Such a role goes hand in hand with flexibility, creativity, and resourcefulness. The leader will have to solve immense problems as the strategy unfolds and new situations develop. This role will not be limited to the leader, but the leader must recognize and tap the problem-solving skills of all staff as well as external experts.

The people who will move the traditional library into the post-hierarchical library are pioneers who are willing to take carefully calculated risks with both their careers and the library to transform it into an organization that is a quantum leap beyond the previous organization. The leader is not foolhardy, nor an adventurer, but neither does the leader shrink from making critical decisions even when such decisions are innovative and have some risk. The leader is careful to take risks in clearly defined areas where potential catastrophic impact can be avoided or minimized.

The leader is also fair, objective, and thoughtful in evaluating important decisions, directions, and people. It is not easy assessing the probability of success in many areas, particularly when the areas are virgin territory for the participants. Part of this risk-taking role includes using intuition, knowledge, careful thought, and common sense. However, the role of risk taker is often the most difficult in a modern bureaucratic organization. Bureaucracies are designed to protect the status quo from risk takers. Risk takers are those who move us beyond our current comfort zones.

Are there core leadership skills or does leadership depend upon the situation? Do leaders simply develop to meet the needs of the people? Or, are such leaders always possessed of such leadership skills? It is important to know whether a post-hierarchical library leader will develop in a library facing major crises or if a leader can be found who already possesses the necessary skills mentioned, ready to be recruited into any situation.

The answer is both. The most successful leader will have developed his or her leadership skills over a long period of time.
This requires the forge of some crisis or other along the way from which the leader survived, wiser and more determined. However, the type of radical change necessary to turn, for example, a traditional ARL library into a post-hierarchical library will also be situational. After all, no one has yet accomplished such a massive change as described in this article at another library. This is not to diminish the amount of progress made at any of these libraries but rather describes the amount of change necessary to achieve a reengineered post-hierarchical library. One business executive, Don Martin (1991), describes the differences between a leader and a manager: "A manager administers; a leader innovates....A manager maintains; a leader develops....A manager plans; a leader sets a direction....This is not to say that managers cannot be strong. The real goal is to combine strong management with strong leadership" (p. 35).

In his book, Martin suggests that a leader has vision, has scope (the big picture), is innovative, is focused, is the decision maker, remains rational, handles pressure, is trustworthy, has a sense of humor, encourages involvement, and demonstrates the conviction of his or her principles. He sees the leader's roles as planning, establishing management philosophy, resolving conflicts, and establishing methods of accountability.

Craig Hickman (1990), in another book, says that:

managers tend to be more practical, reasonable, and decisive, while leaders tend to be more visionary, empathetic, and flexible.... (p. 2).

In our economy and society, the leadership-driven organization fulfills the vital role of breaking with current tradition and past approaches in order to innovate and bring about the breakthroughs that benefit everyone. (p. 33)

All leaders possess a vision that some colleagues would call a breakthrough and others would call a fool's mission. Leaders show everyone a new way, breaking with conventional processes. The vision of the leader is innovative based upon knowledge and accumulated experience and empathy for users. He or she shows us unique and creative directions that promise vast improvements.

The vision of the leader is the rallying cry not only for proponents but also for opponents. Leaders create adversaries among those who do not want radical change and among those who have their own personal agendas for change. Often the leader's vision conflicts with the status quo and those who are empowered with the status quo. Leaders are often not popular and are even ridiculed during the often stressful initial stages of the transformation process. Maintaining and spreading that vision requires great faith in the vision, great courage, and persistence.
Charles Manz and Henry Sims (1989) quote Joseph Paterno, the highly successful football coach from Pennsylvania State University, about the need for leaders willing to take risks: "I think that is part of the problem we have in this country sometimes....We're not innovative enough because...we are afraid to take a chance" (p. 73). Manz and Simms (1989) add that real leaders are teachers who surround themselves with other leaders: "Be a strong, even a charismatic, leader, and followers will know where to go as long as you light their way; teach them to lead themselves and their path will be lighted always" (p. xix). However, even our most innovative library leaders understand the inherent career problems for leaders if they choose to make high risk, innovative, systemic change, no matter how well considered and planned, "it is easy to simply state that library administrators should step forward and provide leadership, but it is far more difficult and risky to take that step" (Dougherty & Dougherty, 1993, p. 1).

A leader requires a great amount of professional courage and faith in his or her vision and trust in the people who pursue it. It is much safer to experiment with smaller and less risky improvements and not have to chance making huge, and often public, mistakes. The courage to take the big risks is, in this author's judgment, one of the key personal characteristics of a true leader.

A leader cannot lead without the trust and support of superiors and the parent organization. An organizational commitment to radical change is essential for successful leadership. This also assumes constant support and reinforcement of the value and importance of the vision and the mission.

Leaders often take prudent risks and trailblaze where others have not yet ventured because they are flexible. They are not foolhardy or reckless. They learn and adapt quickly. They are careful to scout problem areas, to listen to everyone concerned, to observe carefully themselves, and to empower entrusted colleagues. They try to reduce the downside possibilities of major decisions.

A few library leaders are embarking upon the reinvention and reengineering of the traditional library. They are a new breed. They listen, think, and act differently than traditional library administrators. These leaders are revolutionaries who are changing the way librarians work, the way in which library services are delivered, and the services themselves. These revolutionary leaders bring radical and dramatic change, not just the incremental change of traditional library leaders. Such leaders are the inventors and champions of this post-hierarchical library.
TEN NEW LIBRARY LEADERSHIP STRATEGIES

The ten leadership strategies that are most likely to achieve this post-hierarchical library are:

1. **Adopt a new mind set.** The mind set of the new post-hierarchical library is counter intuitive to someone fully imbued with the traditional library culture. It cannot be translated; it has to be understood as a whole new way of thinking and operating. Changing our minds is difficult. Changing our mind set is incredibly difficult. For example, it is very difficult to explain to a manufacturer who was educated on efficiency to think of quality. This is not instinctive—the effective leader must constantly examine his or her mind set.

2. **Reinvent, communicate, and sell the library mission.** Almost all traditional libraries have a version of the same mission. Loosely translated, that mission says that the library will acquire and provide a collection of library materials in given domains to meet the information needs of a given set of users. The missions of the ARL libraries have been remarkably similar. Because the post-hierarchical library is, by definition, reinvented and reengineered, the place to start is with the mission statement.

3. **Change your concept of a library professional.** Professional librarians are defined by their knowledge, skills, ethics, and performance, not by what tasks they do or do not do. If a person says that they will not do something required to operate a post-hierarchical library, they are probably not a team player.

   Professionals are also not defined by the M.L.S. degree but by performance. The M.L.S. degree does attract people who are already interested in a library career but in no way provides an indication of that person's suitability for a truly professional position in a post-hierarchical library. Professionals are performers, highly skilled with a wide body of knowledge serving other people. The M.L.S. degree is the beginning of the process.

   There are fewer and fewer positions in the post-hierarchical library for people who have limited knowledge and skills. People with limited knowledge and skills cannot contribute as much nor are they flexible enough to accomplish a higher percentage of the tasks required. Low level knowledge workers moving around paper or books will disappear in the future library.

   The distinguishing professional characteristics of the post-hierarchical professional are not seniority, title, base salary, or experience. The distinguishing characteristics are the degree of customer satisfaction provided, performance, energy, creativity, and team work. The most valuable team member of the
post-hierarchical library should be recognized with bonuses, money, and other forms of reward. The salaries are tied to performance and not to the years with the organization. Knowledge and skill performance in achieving user satisfaction is respected more than seniority, amount of activity, or status. The post-hierarchical library professional is quick to describe team goals and values and not just personal ones.

4. **Build a powerful technology infrastructure.** The technology infrastructure gives everyone the tools to meet the needs of the team. The technology and networking infrastructure must be made available to everyone. The post-hierarchical library demands extraordinary tools to accomplish significant improvements and demands that everyone participate. The development of the technology includes providing software and manuals regarding the use of that software so that data can be exchanged and used effectively. Using common hardware and software enables one team member to assist another. Technology sharing is usually more important than specific specialized features of stand-alone systems or software only known by a few. The technology infrastructure takes a lot of thought, investment, and maintenance, but it is vital to building and sharing knowledge and to delivering reengineered services.

5. **Build a knowledge sharing infrastructure.** The post-hierarchical library requires staff to know what is going on and perform well without constant interruption and repetition from other staff. The knowledge needed to learn and perform all of the tasks within a complicated process has to be written, updated dynamically, and shared using the technology infrastructure. When the knowledge needed to perform a job is only in someone's head, the library reverts back to the traditionally slow cumbersome model. It becomes unresponsive. Knowledge has to be frequently communicated and absorbed.

6. **Build and empower cross-functional teams.** The beginning of cross-functional teams is the destruction of traditional library departments. The fastest way to accomplish this task is through changes in employee rewards and through budget reallocation. Cross-functional teams have to be entrusted with real authority but also have to be held accountable with both rewards and punishments. These teams are essential in most post-hierarchical library processes because no single department structure can be designed to meet overlapping requirements.

7. **Reward initiative and performance.** Only a real modern post-hierarchical library rewards all staff based upon user satisfaction, resource consumption, innovation, and results. Raises in a truly
responsive organization are not permanent nor based upon anything other than customer satisfaction and inputs. Bureaucracies reward longevity; post-hierarchical libraries reward team performance whenever possible.

8. Make quality information satisfaction a number one goal. The only thing that matters is the service satisfaction of the clients. The performance of the team as a whole, not a part of the team, as viewed by the customers is what is important.

9. Flatten the hierarchy; more service people and fewer support people. The goals of most post-hierarchical library processes cannot be accomplished within a hierarchy with multitudes of layers. Layers bring control but inhibit responsiveness. Control should be exercised in evaluating team performance on specific goals. Responsiveness means eliminating middle managers who simply pass information on and do not add expertise. Staff should be focused on end-users resulting in eliminating back office positions which do not increase user satisfaction.

10. Reinforce traditional library values: service to individuals, intellectual freedom, access, and knowledge. Our traditional values, ethics, and philosophy must be maintained while moving to the post-hierarchical library. The post-hierarchical library should not change what our customers and our profession values—i.e., the freedom, right, and access to the knowledge and information needed to live as good and productive citizens.

IMPEDIMENTS AND RECRUITING THE LEADER

Perhaps the single greatest reason why library leaders are currently unable to reengineer significant improvements in library services is institutional inertia. Institutional inertia is the way things are or the way things have been done. Inertia saps energy from any person or group attempting to make changes. People get comfortable in their old roles and habits and are slow to change. It takes an extraordinary leader and a lot of time to overcome this inertia.

If the parent organization is not poised and pushing for radical library improvements and willing and able to try radically innovative solutions, then the library leader has an almost impossible job. Some improvements can be made, but significant improvements will ultimately not be successful. It is, however, possible for a parent organization to remain essentially the same and spin off a suborganization with incredible flexibility. This occurred when IBM spun off the PC group to create the first IBM PC. Perhaps the library can be spun off to create a new type of organization.

When people are rewarded for individual performance, they will usually try to personally perform better. If staff are rewarded for
team performance, they are more likely to try to help all team members perform better. When staff receive recognition, salary increases, bonuses, and benefits regardless of customer satisfaction with the team, the leader will not be able to radically improve the organization. Reward systems will not work alone, but no new organization will develop without also changing the reward system.

Many of the needed changes are counter intuitive to the uninitiated. Rewarding team play may seem like it would result in less individual performance, but it does not. The entire post-hierarchical library is replete with examples that will seem, at face value, to be wrong when measured by traditional means. Knee jerk reactions can be deadly and have to be constantly fought in rethinking and reengineering.

The leader has to overcome personal habits which are no longer adequate. For example, many chief executives will not type. The current state of most information technology requires typing, for executives to send their messages directly instead of going through a secretary. Long-standing personal habits can be difficult to break but are also real obstacles to change.

Leaders have to change the "controlling" mind set. They need to adopt a user satisfaction mind set and keep focused on that. The leader does have to sift through the details looking, evaluating, recommending, and directing but must spend much less time telling staff how to accomplish a process and much more time describing the goals and evaluating the results of the process.

The library leader will certainly not be just a hired gun, an itinerant director aimlessly wandering from library to library in search of higher paying jobs. Nor will the library leader, bringing radical change, likely come from within the organization needing such radical change. The most effective library leader is someone who has the personal traits, skills, and roles described in this article and also is willing to move into other similar libraries. Library leaders who bring massive change will not be well received by those wanting to maintain the status quo. They may be successful building a core group of change agents with inside people, but they are just as likely to have to recruit people who were not part of the previous administration.

Staff resistance to change is an important consideration. Many a good library leader has been undermined by some tenured/unionized/civil service staff who are unwilling to change and will find every opportunity to actively or passively resist. Any organization contemplating radical changes must protect the leader and the core group of change agents from a counter revolution within.
Last, and most importantly, if the organization is thinking about making some radical changes but is not committed to the consequences and persevering through the ordeal, then it should not start. It should certainly not recruit a library leader to reengineer library processes. There must be sufficient impetus to change. Reengineering is too traumatic to pursue as a nice idea without full commitment.

The push for the post-hierarchical library will occur as momentum builds to respond to the problems of the traditional library. Users must demand improvements and must be sufficiently upset with current library processes. University or parent institution administrators must be upset with the rapidly escalating costs and/or continual complaints. Staff must be upset with their increasing inability to render quality service. The move to the post-hierarchical library should only be pursued when the institution has momentum, critical mass, and sufficient support from a variety of sectors.

It is not easy to identify or recruit the new post-hierarchical leader. However, it should be evident that the new library leader is clearly different from the traditional library leader. Leaders must be identified with appropriate traits and experiences.

Should the new library leader possess a doctoral degree in library and information science? Should this library leader possess experience as a leader of an ARL library or experience and training with information technology? These credentials may all be important, but a candidate can possess all of these and not be the leader described in this article.

The new leader wants to lead and not just manage. He or she has to have sufficient vision to see not only what is being done but also what is possible. The new leader is very rational but is also a bureaucratic revolutionary. The post-hierarchical leader can be recognized by the types of traits mentioned in this article, but this leader will have to be convinced that there is a demand for radical reinvention of the library.

The worst scenario would be if a library organization, which really does not want radical change, recruits a post-hierarchical leader. This mistake will be detrimental to both the organization and the person hired. The traditional path to the directorship of the ARL library may even selectively screen out candidates who are likely to be post-hierarchical library leader risk takers.

The best method to recruit a post-hierarchical leader is to advertise for someone who will bring in radical improvements, reengineering, and reinvention. Those who are timid, comfortable, without a vision or a plan, or those who want to be involved in more modest change are less likely to apply. The pool of applicants
then has to be carefully screened because traditional recruitment methods will not work. After all, how do you screen résumés for energy, creativity, and courage? The recruitment itself will have to be creative.
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Public Library Directors: Hierarchical Roles and Proximity to Power

DAVID HENINGTON

ABSTRACT
Access to power and recognition of the drifts and currents of political life represent the greatest challenge to positioning for the library and its leader. Clear vision is vital to successfully navigate a multitude of constituencies and their conflicting desires. The director's hierarchical position may or may not be of value in his/her quest for that for which he is ultimately held responsible: the success or failure of the goals of the public library.

"Men of power have no time to read; yet the men who do not read are unfit for power."

A long-held assumption about the effectiveness of a library director has been that the individual is effective in relation to how high in the organization the job places him or her. This is an assumption that has never been verified. To test the hypothesis, several public library directors were asked to share their experiences and observations (see Appendix), either in writing or during an interview, concerning placement in the organizational structure and the real or perceived strength of the library. Because the sample size was small, the data's validity may not be broadly applicable.

It must be noted that public libraries operate within a wide variety of governmental structures. Organizational configurations include municipal, county, multijurisdictional, school district, state, and independent taxing districts (Scheppke, 1991, pp. 288-89). Even with
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so many kinds of organizations, there are still only a limited number of variations in the reporting hierarchy for public library directors. Although there are profound differences in working in any of these organizational structures, there is no empirical or research-based evidence that the organizational framework affects the performance of the library within it.

The most desirable position for a public library director is to report to the individual with the most power. In a municipal library, that translates as reporting to the mayor. The City of Houston, for example, operates under a strong-mayor form of government; it is so strong that one veteran city councilman recently likened it to “King Kong and the 14 chimps” (Ryan, 1993, p. 1A). In this writer’s experience, which includes twenty-seven years as library director and dealing with the administrations of five of these strong mayors, the mayor controls the library’s fortunes, for good or bad, but in ways that have almost nothing to do with the library director’s degree of access to the chief executive. Houston Public Library got its most generous funding from the one mayor of the five who was probably least familiar with library issues. Under another mayor, who served ten years in office (and with whom the library director enjoyed a collegial relationship), library conditions seriously worsened. An “open door” policy under a mayor does not guarantee opened purse strings anymore than holding certain political convictions in common with a mayor leads to a bigger budgetary commitment to the library.

A library director in Minnesota said:

I believe you can do more and be more visible if there is less of a hierarchy to move through. The fewer people who have
to give you permission to go ahead the easier it should be to
take the reins and gallop on. However, the more you can do
on your own, the more responsibility you have to do the “right
thing” or at least not the wrong thing. (Susan Goldberg Kent,
personal communication, July 21, 1993)

In the traditional municipal structure with a city manager, the
library director will usually report to an assistant city manager. At
this distance from the top of the hierarchy, position within the
organization can diminish the director’s own view of the power or
impact he or she has. This perception was understood by one public
library director:

The Phoenix Public Library stands as a good (or rather should
I say bad) example of the problem of a poor position in the
city organization combined with poor city support. But I have
never been able to determine for sure what is cause and what
is effect. Are we low in the city hierarchy because the city doesn’t
care much about libraries, or is the city supporting us poorly
because we are so low in the hierarchy? I do know that my position
in the hierarchy makes it very difficult for me to get better support.  
(Ralph M. Edwards, personal communication, September 20, 1993)

At the opposite extreme, there is the structure of an independent taxing district in which the director ordinarily has much more freedom. One library director who reports to an independent taxing district board said, “I like having the independence of not being part of city government and, on any given day, for at least 50 percent of the time, I am glad that I have an elected board” (Susan Goldberg Kent, personal communication, July 21, 1993).

From the perspective of a former city manager, position in the organizational structure has some importance, but it does not have a significant impact on effectiveness. The librarian needs to be close to the top of the hierarchy so that he or she can have some interaction and relationship with the top official, but actual placement in the structure is not overly important. The typical director needs authority, but it is also important to have leadership qualities, to be able to focus on the tasks at hand, and to communicate the library’s mission (Albert Haines, personal communication, June 16, 1993).

Another aspect of the reporting hierarchy deals with the turnover of elected officials and their agenda while in office. A California city librarian commented:

I have worked under four City Managers and five Mayors in my fourteen years as City Librarian. The eight member City Council has had at least three replacements in each Council District during this period. I personally have reported to six Deputy City Managers. A former City Manager said that to understand the motives of an elected official, you have to realize that they are either trying to get re-elected to their own office or are seeking a higher office, and this drives all their decisions. (William B. Sonnwald, personal communication, May 19, 1993)

Ongoing communication is necessary to be knowledgeable about the agenda of the person, whether elected or appointed, to whom the librarian reports. It is also important for the library to make itself a part in that agenda by portraying its programs in ways that help the top official achieve his or her chief priorities.

Another experienced municipal library director observed:

If a library has a direct reporting relationship to a powerful and prestigious figure who does not value the library, this produces a much weaker position than the library might be able to build with a less direct or less clear reporting relationship.  
(Rick J. Aston, personal communication, May 12, 1993)

In Houston’s recent run-off elections, a restless electorate and a wave of anti-incumbency sentiment put new faces into seven out
of eight available seats on the city council. When there is so much change in elected leadership or at any level of municipal governance, one of two things usually happens. Without continuity of leadership, it can be difficult for the director to retain ongoing support for the library's programs. In the other scenario, the library is left to operate pretty much as an independent entity. There are advantages and disadvantages to both situations. One library director, who describes herself as having "a great deal of power both real and implied," contended:

This power is contingent on the Board's trust and faith in me, in my leadership and direction of the Library, and in my partnership with them. Understanding the nature of the relationship of the Board and Director is essential but not easy. I see it as a partnership, not an employer-employee relationship. They govern, set policy—I lead, provide vision, and direction—together we move the library forward, create support in the community, communicate with other elected officials and grow and prosper. (Susan Goldberg Kent, personal communication, July 21, 1993)

Power equates with control over resources, but its use depends on reins tied to other powerful people. Power sometimes comes from position in the hierarchy (Albert Haines, personal communication, June 16, 1993).

However, there are those who take an exactly opposite view of the effect of the reporting relationship. A dissenting administrator remarked:

Reporting relationships and alliances do not seem to me to make a great deal of difference for libraries and library directors. We can look around the country and find politically strong libraries and politically weak libraries whose institutional positions are virtually identical. We rarely see effective alliances between libraries and other municipal or county entities, but rather a Hobbesian war of all against all in most city/county government situations. (Rick J. Aston, personal communication, May 12, 1993)

As Scheppke (1991) concluded, it has not been proven that there is a strong relationship between type of public library governance and "financial support and effectiveness" (p. 293). However, not being near the top of the hierarchy requires the director to seek other ways to make himself visible in the organization. There is a corollary view to the prior statement, summarized by Sonnwald:

As probably in all organizations, San Diego has a corporate culture that really is the key factor in determining political power. The manager likes Department Heads to keep a low profile and to make sure that the elected officials get all the credit. He does not like staff to "get ahead of the issues" or to suggest change that may be of conflict with the agenda of elected officials. Above
all else, he wants us all to be responsive to the community.
(William B. Sonnwald, personal communication, May 19, 1993)

If this view prevails, the director can be faced with either a quandary or an opportunity. It is a win-win situation if the library is in a position to give credit to the elected officials for programs that are central to the library, because the elected officials get credit and the library gets support for its programs. However, if there is no legitimate way to involve elected officials in the library's programs, the director may be in a position where the library will languish because it has no visibility.

Being visible can translate into a successful political and public relations record of achievements. In any size of library, the director and key staff must tell the "library story" so that the library is not a forgotten entity. This means not only attending meetings but also assuming community leadership roles to improve the visibility and credibility of the library (Lee B. Brawner, personal communication, May 27, 1993).

It is important to establish that the library is an essential service to the community. As one expert noted: "The more people use, know about, support and love the library, the more they can exert their power to influence decision makers" (Gates, 1991, pp. 114-15).

There are three power bases in any community: (1) elected officials, (2) business community, and (3) press (Marilyn Gell Mason, personal communication, June 29, 1993). The library can profit from close ties with these three groups in several ways. These groups can help in promoting library issues at the local level and in taking library legislation to the state level. They can also assist at the federal level when library legislation is at issue (Lee B. Brawner, personal communication, May 27, 1993).

There is another view, represented by Aston:

It is my general sense that elected leaders all over the United States are less powerful than they were 20 years ago. Government plebiscite, rather than government by elected representatives, is the theme of our time, with results that can help public libraries. Of all local government services, public libraries are inevitably the most popular. Active library users also tend to be active citizens. This connection, as we move further and further into government in the voting booth, will be to our benefit if we can mobilize and energize it. Excellent service, excellent management, clear and honest direction are great starting points for constituency building. Beyond them, we must inform the public and help them to know that their own personal decisions will affect the library's ability to serve them well. (personal communication, May 12, 1993)
Today more than ever, public libraries have a distinctive role in promoting community participation and support. According to Gates (1991):

Economic determinism and the new rolling coalitions in support of "self-government" are opening still new positioning strategies for the library to draw closer to local politics and power. The emerging movement is what former San Antonio Mayor, former National Civic League Chairman, and now Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros calls "citizen democracy" or the creative intermeshing and positive interaction of business, government, community groups and citizen involvement. (pp. 114-15)

Citizens are becoming more vocal and better organized on issues: this, in turn, has a strong influence on our elected officials. They must listen or relinquish their positions. As a service valued by voters, libraries can gain from increased civic involvement. The library can reinforce its position as a player in the community when more and more elected officials have to be concerned with how voters will respond to their library-related decisions (Susan Goldberg Kent, personal communication, July 21, 1993).

Donald J. Sager, former public library director, noted that public library directors have to have access to the city's power brokers—and that means involvement in those groups and organizations where power tends to gravitate (Carrigan, 1992, pp. 337-38). Another director said this in a slightly different way:

In the larger framework, the power of a public library to set and carry out its agenda depends most heavily on its ability to identify and mobilize a popular constituency. One of the many things that mayors, county commissioners, and other elected leaders can do is count votes. If it is clear that voters care about the library, elected leaders will care. The flip side of this is that the library and the library director cannot be seen to mobilize or motivate this constituency. It must seem to spring up of its own accord. (Rick J. Aston, personal communication, May 12, 1993)

Power or influence that can serve the library well can come from support groups such as Friends organizations, as Sonnwald (1993) pointed out:

Since I have been Director, the Friends of the Library has grown from an organization of less than twenty people to over 4,000 paid members and a group at all of our 32 branch libraries. They are an effective group for drawing attention to the needs of the library and the City Council listens to them, as well as a strong lobbying group. When the Mayor and City Manager needed community support to extend a spending authorization in the City, the Friends and their telephone tree got out the vote. The
Mayor gave the Friends credit for passage of the waiver in a very close election. My role is to send a representative to their meetings to act as a resource person. We do not try to control the Friends because I think they are stronger if they are viewed as independent of library administration influence.

Power also comes from a different orientation than organization structure. Sonnwald went on to say that his power evolved from directing a service that is valued and appreciated by the citizens of the community (William B. Sonnwald, personal communication, May 19, 1993). For example, when Houston's mayor ordered a reduction in library hours to stem a city budget shortfall in March 1988, it was not administrative appeals but library users picketing outside locked doors and public protests reported by the media that quickly got longer hours reinstated.

There is another slightly different view of power and politics offered by Brawner:

Recognizing the power of information and the access to it is, of course, no news for libraries. But, the political shift described by Gates and others makes library administrators more cognizant of the library's catalytic role as information brokers, especially with regard to accessing electronic publishing information loads. The shift at once places heightened emphasis on the role of information and politics for libraries in the community. Are libraries now poised to make their own paradigm shift as the infostructure of the infrastructure in their communities? (Lee B. Brawner, personal communication, May 27, 1993)

Dealing with multiple and sometimes conflicting constituencies requires tact, understanding, discretion, flexibility, and knowing when to apply pressure and when to let the group act independently. The effective director must also be able to articulate the relationship of external pressures to internal pressures (Lee B. Brawner, personal communication, May 27, 1993). When a director cannot coalesce various groups on specific issues, there may be many reasons, but in the end, the responsibility is that of the director, and it will often be viewed as a weakness (Albert Haines, personal communication, June 16, 1993).

The successful director has a clarity of purpose in effectively demonstrating the necessity for library service to the library's many constituencies. Politics are variable, so the effective director moves beyond the traditional role of librarian and administrator to one of a lobbyist working with and among the diverse constituencies of the library.

A more direct view of the director's role is provided by Susan Goldberg Kent:
One of the things I have learned about being a Director is that you can't please everyone and you have to understand that not everyone will like you. This goes with the job. If you have to make tough decisions, then those decisions are likely to offend or upset one group or another. That's life and that's why we get paid the big bucks.

Even though it is not possible to make everyone happy, the director must try to address the expressed needs and concerns as astutely as possible and be as politically aware as possible to be able to advance the library's cause in the community and to provide the best possible service (Susan Goldberg Kent, personal communication, July 21, 1993).

More than anything else, the effectiveness or success of the director is not dependent upon status or position in the organizational structure but rather on the leadership, charisma, and the ability to mobilize constituencies. Power is more diffuse today because officials are now elected by more heterogeneous groups, each with its own agenda, thereby creating a patchwork of constituencies with little in common. It must also be recognized that the electorate is more active today than it was twenty years ago. Power becomes a combination of being able to accurately judge the city's vision and then to produce in a way that incorporates the city's visions into the library's needs (Albert Haines, personal communication, June 16, 1993).

The effectiveness of the public library director originates from close proximity to three sources of real or perceived power: (1) having a role high up in the hierarchical structure of government; (2) acquiring political influence from close alliances with like-minded politicians and elected officials; and, (3) appealing directly to grassroots constituencies for support. Clearly, from the opinions shared by the library directors polled, achieving a position of power is more a matter of the positive public image of the library (or the director's own assessment of his degree of empowerment) than it is empirically based.
APPENDIX

Interviews were held with the following individuals:

Albert Haines, President, Houston Partnership, June 16, 1993.
Marilyn Gell Mason, Director, Cleveland Public Library, June 29, 1993.

Correspondence was received from the following individuals:

Rick J. Aston, City Librarian, Denver Public Library, May 12, 1993.
Lee B. Brawner, Executive Director, Metropolitan Library System, Oklahoma City, OK, May 27, 1993.
Ralph M. Edwards, City Librarian, City of Phoenix, September 20, 1993.
Susan Goldberg Kent, Director, Minneapolis Public Library, July 21, 1993.
William B. Sonnwald, City Librarian, City of San Diego, May 19, 1993.
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Mission-Oriented Management: Librarian-Trained Directors in Nonlibrary Settings

REBECCA T. LENZINI AND BONNIE JUERGENS

ABSTRACT
Are the characteristics, goals, and required skills of librarian-trained managers who choose careers in nonlibrary, but library-related, settings different from those of directors of libraries? This question will be explored by executives from two library-related organizations—one a not-for-profit library cooperative and one a private sector information vendor. Methodologies for exploring this topic include interviews with colleagues in nonlibrary settings, analysis of executive position descriptions from library-related organizations, a review of associated professional literature, and observations of the authors.

INTRODUCTION
Are the characteristics, goals, and required skills of librarian-trained managers who choose careers in nonlibrary, but library-related, settings different from those of directors of libraries? Readers can determine the answer to that question after comparing the characteristics described later with those ascribed to library directors by other contributors to this compilation.

The authors have chosen to explore this topic by interviewing eight colleagues (including each other) who currently hold senior or top management positions in organizations directly related to or serving the North American library community. The authors conducted the interviews in person or via phone using the survey instrument attached as Appendix A. Information and opinions

Rebecca T. Lenzini, CARL Systems, Inc., 301 E. Florida, Suite 300, Denver, CO 80218
Bonnie Juergens, AMIGOS Bibliographic Council, Inc., 12200 Park Central Drive, Suite 500, Dallas, TX 75251
LIBRARY TRENDS, Vol. 43, No. 1, Summer 1994, pp. 105-20
© 1994 The Board of Trustees, University of Illinois
provided by the interviewees were examined for similarities among the contributors, but these data were compared only in informal and anecdotal ways to characteristics generally ascribed to traditionally employed librarians and/or library directors. The authors also analyzed executive position descriptions from library-related organizations, and it is interesting to note that only three of the eight interviewees' organizations have established position descriptions on file for these top management positions. Position descriptions for three additional positions of interest in analyzing nontraditional librarian careers are incorporated into this discussion (see Appendix B). A review of the professional literature and observations of the authors complete the methodologies used to prepare this report.

This discussion will focus on the characteristics of a representative set of individuals who currently serve in managerial or leadership positions in nontraditional, but library-related, settings, and who also have in their educational background a master's degree in library science. The authors wish to acknowledge with thanks the interviewees identified in Table 1. All comments expressed by the interviewees are the opinions of those individuals and are in no way intended to reflect the opinions or policies of the organizations they represent professionally.

TABLE 1
LIBRARY DIRECTORS IN NONLIBRARY SETTINGS
COLLEAGUE INTERVIEW LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview List</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. John Garralda</td>
<td>Director of Operations, The UnCover Company, Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bonnie Juergens</td>
<td>Executive Director, AMIGOS Bibliographic Council, Inc., Dallas, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rebecca T. Lenzini</td>
<td>President, CARL Systems, Inc., Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Catherine F. Nevins</td>
<td>Vice President, Member Services, OCLC, Online Computer Library Center, Inc., Dublin, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ward Shaw</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, CARL Systems, Inc., Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Debra Wallace</td>
<td>Manager, Marketing and Business Development, ISM Library Information Services (formerly UTLAS International), Toronto, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Robert A. Walton</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Innovative Interfaces, Inc., Berkeley, California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The eight interviewees represent four senior managers and four top managers of seven library-related organizations. Five of the organizations are headquartered in the United States; two are chartered abroad, one in Canada, and one is a partnership between U.S. and U.K. companies. Four are for-profit companies, two are not-for-profit corporations, and one is a U.S. federal government agency. All eight interviewees hold M.L.S. (or equivalent) degrees.

**Defining the Nonlibrary Setting**

Increasing numbers of librarians find themselves working in what are referred to as “nonlibrary settings.” Some leave the profession entirely. Some embark upon entrepreneurial careers as self-employed information specialists who seek and serve information-hungry clients. Others create or seek employment in organizations that exist primarily to serve or support libraries.

In analyzing career choices of M.L.S. graduates from the University of Pittsburgh, Detlefsen and Olson (1991) determined that roughly one-third of the graduates studied were not working in libraries at the time of the survey. The “leavers,” or those who depart the profession, were defined as “those who were not working at all or who identified themselves as being in some other field entirely, as in real estate, law, teaching, the business sector, etc.” (p. 293). These individuals exhibited a number of characteristics in common with the interviewees for this report, as will be reflected in their comments.

Alice Sizer Warner is one of today’s most articulate spokespersons for the entrepreneurial information specialist. She captures the imaginations of many in the library profession with this call to arms: “Wherever there is confusion, wherever things are in a mess, there is an opportunity for a librarian. By seizing such opportunities, many librarians now earn their livings nontraditionally” (Warner, 1990, p. 946).

Both the “leaver” and the “entrepreneur” have received attention in the professional press in recent years, and they are described and discussed at great length in the items listed in this report's Selected Bibliography for further reading on the topic of alternative careers. For purposes of this discussion, however, a “nonlibrary setting” is defined as an organization that exists primarily to serve or support libraries. It is within this context that the interviewees have chosen to serve the library profession, and it is also within this context that the authors describe librarians working outside of traditional library settings as “managers with a library mission.”

Throughout the interview process, and in the authors’ subsequent analysis of the opinions expressed by the interviewees,
it became clear that responses did not vary greatly depending upon the for-profit or not-for-profit status of the interviewees' organization. The authors speculate that this is partly due to the revenue-generating demands of not-for-profit organizations; partly due to the similar mission-oriented educational backgrounds of the interviewees (all of whom have earned M.L.S. degrees or equivalent); and partly due to the types of rewards cited as important to the interviewees (only two referenced higher personal earnings as specifically related to the nonlibrary setting). Rather than earnings, interviewees mentioned job satisfaction, impact upon the field, "making a difference," or "creating something from scratch" as work rewards.

**Requirements for Leadership in the Nonlibrary Setting**

The characteristics most commonly mentioned in answer to the questions, What skills are needed for success in your current position? and Describe the personal attributes and characteristics which you believe have most contributed to your success, are listed in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of interviewees specifying this item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical/Problem-solving approach</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom-line orientation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management skills</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level with politics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire and ability to learn quickly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-paced environment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility, lack of bureaucracy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library experience</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L.S.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production orientation; Results driven, action-oriented approach</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service (client-centered) orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taker</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit of adventure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology knowledge, skills</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to work hard, to work smart</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Risk-taking"

Among the most common phrases used by the interviewees to describe the requirements for their current posts is "being a risk-
taker.” These managers typically were interested in assuming full responsibility and accountability for their actions. In the interviews, most dwelled at length on the risk-taking requirement. Some remembered the first high-risk career move, as reflected in this statement: “My most significant promotion was into sales—this was scary, risky, an activity about which I felt culturally at odds.” Another confided that: “Many librarians suffer from lack of confidence, and some become risk-takers to overcompensate for low self-esteem.” One reflected on fear as an inhibiting factor in making the move to the nontraditional setting, and said: “I wish I had confronted the fear and made the move earlier.” Most, when asked about giving advice to a librarian aiming for a similar nontraditional position, agreed that it is necessary to become a risk-taker in order to get what one wants out of life.

Conversely, when asked, Do you believe most librarians are well suited to the kind of job you are doing? many responded “No,” stating that the traditional librarian is “risk averse.” One respondent reflected that, “we don’t learn business concepts related to risk analysis in library school!” Another boldly stated that, “the greatest missing ingredient in libraries today is the spirit of entrepreneurship. Librarians have interpreted their service mission to mean they cannot take risks at a time when they should take more risks...”.

**Flexibility**

Several of the interviewees also noted “flexibility” and “multitasking” as keys to their success in the nonlibrary setting. Most had sought positions which would offer challenges across many areas and noted that their traditional library posts were not able to offer this variety of experience and opportunity.

The interest in “flexibility” is most likely the counterpart to the frequently expressed desire to avoid, as one interviewee put it, “Death by bureaucracy.” Another said, “I had tried to ‘break the mold’ for twelve years, but felt like I was constantly beating my head against that proverbial wall.” And a third: “I’m just not comfortable working in any bureaucracy, and libraries are definitely a type of bureaucracy.” In each case, the individual had sought to leave a bureaucratic environment and replace it with an environment which rewards those who are “quick on their feet” and who can handle multiple tasks simultaneously. These skills are not generally rewarded within highly bureaucratic settings and, indeed, may be penalized.

Many of those interviewed noted they could have chosen to continue to move within the traditional library director or department
head ranks to positions of higher authority or larger responsibility. Others noted that the problems and challenges of traditional library management remained interesting and attractive. In the speakers' cases, however, a conscious choice was made to pursue opportunities which provided more autonomy and demanded accountability.

Yet in every case in which respondents cited previous library experience, they stressed the importance to their careers of that direct library experience. Their reasons were varied: “For credibility,” “for foundation,” “for context: I still think of myself as a librarian.” Three cited the value of cross-experience for success in their current environment, describing a career pattern of “crossing boundaries” to work in both technical and public services and among multiple types of libraries. For all who cited a library-related sense of mission, having actually worked in libraries was very important to success in their current positions.

Though not common, it should be noted that a couple of interviewees had worked to receive the M.L.S. after attaining considerable success working within the library field at large. In these cases, the M.L.S. was seen both as a way to learn more about the field and a way to become validated to those within the field: a “union card,” as one individual expressed it.

Communication and People Skills

Communication cropped up frequently as a descriptor of skills and personal attributes required for success in management—of libraries as well as in nontraditional settings, as several hastened to point out. One respondent commented that a debating skill developed in high school “has served me well.” Another expressed the importance of having excellent communications skills: “The visionary and change-agent role depends upon communication skills.”

Many of the interviewees noted the importance of a basic set of “people skills” which can be applied to staff development, customer service, and sales alike. The importance of communications and people skills in building strategic organizational relationships was noted. A basic attitude of “liking people and letting it show,” as one interviewee expressed it, may in fact be the foundation of an all-important service orientation for individuals in these roles.

Several of the interviewees noted the need for strong presentation skills; requirements for these skills were clearly evident in the job descriptions and résumés reviewed. In most cases, presentations are made in support of corporate objectives (i.e., “communicating mission, priorities and activities” of a given organization) or are made on broader topics of relevance to the library field.
Analytic/Problem-Solving Skills

The need to approach challenges in an analytical and problem-solving manner was noted by most of those interviewed. While this requirement would seem to be a key for anyone in a managerial position within or outside of the library profession, it is perhaps the case that the nonlibrary setting affords more opportunities to solve problems creatively—that is, beyond the confines of the traditional and more bureaucratic construct. While four out of eight interviewees specifically named analytical problem-solving as a required capability, another mentioned the "ability to define core issues and prioritize" and a sixth described the requirement for "lots of data-gathering and analysis; the ability to read and think critically."

On a more personal note, stamina or endurance, resilience, and a sense of humor were also mentioned as necessary characteristics for success—or survival. And various sets of specialized knowledge bases relative to certain specialized positions or environments were also mentioned as success factors. Three respondents stressed the importance of a bottom-line orientation with one commenting that: "Library school didn't foster this!" And a lifestyle that sustains years of working long hours, as well as "working smart," was mentioned by several interviewees. One said bluntly: "Don't be afraid of hard work. Nine to five won't make it." Others said "intelligence counts" and "long hours and self-instruction were the order of the day" throughout their careers.

Two respondents mentioned the importance of recognizing that perfection cannot always be achieved, either for lack of time or due to human frailty. One went on to stress the importance of learning that "it's okay to make mistakes. What's important is to make decisions and go on. I remind myself that Babe Ruth is frequently applauded as the Home Run King but few remember he was also the Strike-Out King."

PREPARATION: EDUCATION, EXPERIENCE, SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE

The characteristics cited in Table 2, along with the elements of advice respondents offered to librarians (see Table 3) seeking careers in nonlibrary settings, paint a picture of the nontraditional work environment as fast-paced, demanding, of high visibility, and rewarding. How could the interviewees have prepared earlier and better? What are their recommendations for librarians thinking about moving into nontraditional careers?

Without exception, the interviewees noted that many of the skills developed either in preparation for, or during a career in, library science translate readily to the nonlibrary setting whether that setting
Table 3
Advice to Librarians Seeking Careers in the Nonlibrary Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion/Advice</th>
<th>Number of interviewees specifying this item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automation: Have education, interest, and/or devotion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, finance, and management courses: Take more and earlier</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change jobs frequently</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross type of library lines</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't let fear hold you back</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on &quot;big picture,&quot; less on details</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn a foreign language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and sales skills: Learn about and respect</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to work hard; put in long hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who openly referenced this</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who exhibited this</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More/better courses needed from library school:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing for Not-for-Profit Organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group process skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making tools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (concepts, applications)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding, development processes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is not-for-profit or for-profit in nature. Mentioned specifically were management skills, organizational skills, and reference skills. As noted by one individual: “The basic skills for managing any organization translate.”

Most of those interviewed also expressed a wish that their formal M.L.S. training had included more business and financial management coursework as well as more learning opportunities in the areas of automation and computing. One suggestion for those preparing for a career in nonlibrary management was to focus less on the "details" and the "how to do it" level, and more on the concepts behind the details. One interviewee suggested that those headed for the nonlibrary setting “can't prepare, but must build and 'make it happen'." This same individual offered the following advice: “Figure out something you want to do, and set out to achieve it step by step.” Another respondent said the best way to prepare for the leadership role was to “study transcendental meditation; take philosophy, public policy, international relations, and technology courses; change jobs every three years for twenty-four years; and work across all professional borders, in public, special, and academic libraries and in public and technical services.” Another respondent said “I should have learned a foreign language and developed more global sensitivity.”
In a 1985 article in which she discussed the requirements and needs of the M.L.I.S. education from the vendor’s perspective, Lenzini (1985) suggested that the profession “mold the educational process to incorporate the business management and marketing skills that these students [headed for the nontraditional career] will require.” She noted that these new skills may combine with traditional librarian skills to produce individuals better prepared not only for the nonlibrary sector, but also for the library setting (p. 494).

The frustrating and sometimes painful side of holding a position of authority and accountability in a fast-paced and very visible work environment was mentioned by several of the interviewees, somewhat in the form of advice to the would-be traveler of similar paths: “Endurance, hard work and long hours, and an ability to handle lots of stress are definitely required.” “Learn not to overcommit...and then get caught! Your good intentions don’t seem to count!” “You have to recognize you can’t control all the things you’re responsible for; learn to work through others.” “A personal goal for me is to balance work and family so as not to turn into a zombie. My task list always includes both personal and professional goals.” “I’m trying to remember to build in time for my family and time for myself.”

AN INTEREST IN AND DEVOTION TO AUTOMATION

A common characteristic of almost all of those interviewed was an interest in and a belief in the role of technology in libraries. This bias may in fact merely reflect on the individuals chosen by the authors to be interviewed, or it may be a significant characteristic particularly relevant to the library field’s growing linkage to technology.

More than half of those interviewed could point to professional experiences in which they either introduced automation to libraries or were involved closely in early automation activities in the field. This involvement ranged from creating automated systems, to installing the first OCLC terminals, to selling and supporting the earliest vendor-based library circulation systems. One respondent talked about having been “in the vanguard” in bringing automation to libraries.

Interestingly, Detlefson and Olson (1991) in their study found corresponding high levels of interest in the field of “information science” as opposed to traditional “library science” among those who had left the profession (p. 282).

Lenzini (1985) noted the increase in the number of professional librarians employed by the vendor community and related the increase specifically to the rise in the number of automated library system
vendors, which sought to employ those with backgrounds in either technical services or library automation (p. 494).

**Greater Job Mobility**

A second common characteristic among the pool was job mobility. Whether within a single institution or between multiple employers, those interviewed had routinely changed jobs or job responsibilities at least every three years. As one of those interviewed noted, “I didn’t go looking; the jobs came to me.” Indeed, several noted this phenomenon; most had not actively searched for a position since early in their professional careers, and all had attained positions of management and leadership in the nonlibrary setting.

The pattern certainly reflects the stated characteristic of “flexibility” as discussed earlier and the interest expressed by the pool in multiple challenges and opportunities. Again, Detlefson and Olson’s (1991) findings correlate the “leaver” characteristics to the “nonlibrary setting” characteristics: in their study, those in the “leaver” category had worked for more employers and had experienced more promotions than had their traditional counterparts (p. 285).

**Service Orientation**

Another common personal characteristic among those interviewed was concern for serving the patron or client in a “customer is always right” service environment. This attitude, which should be found not only in nonlibrary settings but throughout traditional libraries, was thought to be something which is in fact frequently missing from libraries. Traditional librarians have a reputation of too often believing they know “what is good for the patron” or client and therefore delivering not what is perceived by the client to be needed but what is thought by the librarian to be needed.

Another expression of the same concern appears in Lenzini’s (1985) article. She notes that a shift in emphasis is required of the traditionally educated librarian moving to the private sector, a shift which fosters critical evaluation of current services and a “marketing” attitude. This attitude is characterized as one in which the business (or library) “seeks to determine the products or services which are needed and then provide them” (p. 495).

**Rewards**

A common perception is that the director in a nonlibrary setting is there, in part at least, to earn more money than is possible in the traditional setting. The interview group, as noted earlier, contradicted that image (see Table 4). While two individuals acknowledged their greater earnings or earning potential in their current nonlibrary positions, those who commented about earning
Table 4
Rewards in the Nonlibrary Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward</th>
<th>Number of interviewees specifying this item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earning potential greater than in traditional librarianship (but a secondary motive; a “score-keeper”)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility, lack of bureaucracy; new opportunities and challenges</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have fun! Enjoy one’s work!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking, variety of roles, responsibilities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that one can “make a difference”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership opportunity or “Build something from scratch”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Pioneer in some element of profession”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Being the first!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Satisfying personal quest”</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility &amp; authority, ability to “get things done”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

power stated that money was at best a secondary motivator. Primary were the needs discussed earlier, particularly related to the working environment. These individuals valued their “freedom” above compensation.

The greatest “rewards” appeared to be the ability to work and contribute within a mission-oriented setting which fostered the flexibility, rapid pace, and control which have been described. Of paramount importance was the ability to exercise decision-making without the spectre of second-guessing which often haunts the traditional library director. The phrase “bottom line orientation” was often used in a positive sense to summarize this desired environment. Important messages in all eight interviews included “Have fun!” “Enjoy your work!” “My job must include a high fun quotient” and “After all these years, I still love my job!”

On the other hand, the lack of interest in earnings as a primary reward does not mean the respondents are not involved constantly and intimately with the organizational process of earning revenue. As Alice Sizer Warner (1990) states, those who are successful in nonlibrary environments must be “comfortable with money” (p. 946). Further, Warner maintains that: “You have to like selling. You have to sell all the time, think about it all the time” (p. 947). She urges those crossing into information entrepreneurship to “get tough in the for-profit sense” (p. 948), which is certainly advice that applies to the managers of library-related organizations in today’s financial climate.
These themes were echoed by the directors in nonlibrary settings. As one individual phrased it: "One challenge to librarians working in the business side of the information industry is to charge for information—the normal librarian mindset is to provide information or access at no charge." Again the phrase "bottom-line orientation" must be cited. Nearly every interviewee, at some point, used these words, perhaps meaning by them the environment which allows and supports rapid and nonbureaucratic decision-making, as noted earlier, and most likely illustrating, as Warner suggests, a "comfort" with the "tough-minded" nature of the nontraditional setting.

A sense of mission and the importance of working in the library field were expressed by many of the respondents. When asked about "your personal goals for the future," responses included statements like "create a more systematic approach to the business, a more mature business environment"; "accomplish organizational goals we're continually defining to strengthen our mission"; "help librarians shift to new roles in the information industry; help create a totally new world"; "make the organization I created a more healthy one"; "I'm working to endow a chair at a library school in the name of a respected mentor..."; "my role is to help others reposition libraries as a balance point in achieving information access equity for the nation."

CONCLUSION

In the earlier discussion, the authors have reported on, and analyzed, the information and opinions shared by eight interviewees, all of whom earned M.L.S. or equivalent degrees, most of whom have worked in libraries prior to moving into the nontraditional arena, and all of whom hold high-level positions in nonlibrary organizations that exist primarily to serve or support libraries. The library service mission of the organizations appears to be a unifying factor in characterizing the individuals; the for-profit or not-for-profit status does not appear to be a differentiating factor among them. Only three items were specified by all eight participants as being critically important to their success in the library-related but nonlibrary arena: that they be willing risk-takers; that they hold an M.L.S. or equivalent degree; that they find joy in their work. Additionally, they all described or exhibited a willingness to put in long hours—it is hoped "working smart" as well as "working hard." On these four items there was unanimity.

Additional personal characteristics important to success in the nontraditional leadership roles undertaken by these individuals include, in descending order, desire and ability to work in a fast-paced environment, a spirit of adventure, flexibility and discomfort with bureaucracy, and a public-service or customer-service
orientation. Skills commonly described as necessary include, also in descending order, business and management skills, library experience, communication skills, technology knowledge and skills, and analytical problem-solving skills. Uncharted but inferred throughout the interviews is a comfort level with money—the focus on revenue-generating activities. Those who do not bring that comfort level to the position must develop it in order to find overall satisfaction in their nontraditional roles.

Scattered throughout the interviews were comments relating the characteristics and skills required for these positions to both traditional library directorship requirements and to nonlibrary business management requirements. Many of the traits and skills discussed earlier are readily transferable in both directions, and, indeed, more and more library directors are recognizing the need for and obtaining business management skills. In a tight economy with government accountability the battle cry of the 1990s, the risk-taking characteristic and analytical skills espoused by the interviewees are becoming more valued in the traditional library management arena along with financial planning knowledge. As one interviewee put it: "Our profession is challenged even to stay in existence. We must adopt and adapt business skills without losing our sense of mission...".

But this also works both ways. Librarian skills are also valuable to the evolving business environment, particularly in the "information age" and a society drowning under the barrage of data—if not information—generated by the minute. Interpretation, synthesis, and management of information are skills that have become basic tools required of managers and leaders in all industries. One interviewee spoke of the importance of librarians "cycling out" of traditional library work into the business or at least the library-related business world on a regular basis; another spoke of the value to those in the nontraditional arena of "dipping back in"—much as one imagines faculty members of professional schools would/should do. "The more we move out into nontraditional settings, the better equipped the profession will be to address future opportunities."

And where do the individuals interviewed for this article go from here? What are their most likely next career moves? One is planning to move into the business world, not necessarily in the library support arena, and expects to go back for some "retooling" in the form of additional education. One mentioned returning to more traditional librarianship, seeking a directorship in a "cutting edge" institution. Others spoke only of staying in the line of fire, striving to create more or become better—not necessarily bigger. Several spoke of "having so much still to do" and "so much still to learn." These are strong and positive sentiments to bring to one's work.
APPENDIX A

Librarian Trained Directors in Nonlibrary Settings
Colleague Interview Questions

1. Name; Current position: Organization & Title
2. Length of time in position
3. Educational background
4. Prior positions
5. About current position:
   a. Nature of organization [For profit or N-F-P]
   b. Nature of position
   c. Skills needed for success
6. General discussion items:
   a. What led to/attracted you to your current position?
   b. What was attractive/unattractive about remaining in a library setting?
   c. Describe career history (significant events, decisions)
7. Describe the personal attributes and characteristics which you believe have contributed most to your success
8. What are the challenges of your current job? What’s rewarding? What’s not?
9. How could you have prepared better for what you are doing today?
10. Do you believe most librarians are well suited to the kind of job you are doing? What determines a good fit?
11. If a librarian reading this article wanted to aim for a position like yours, what advice would you give him/her?
12. What are your personal goals for the future? And how do you hope to achieve them?
13. Additional general comments...
APPENDIX B

Position Descriptions/Advertisements Reviewed

Of eight positions held by interviewees, only the three not-for-profit organizations currently have established position descriptions for high-level executive positions. The following position descriptions/advertisements were reviewed during the course of developing this article.

1. American Library Association
   Chicago, Illinois
   Executive Director (position advertisement, 1993)

2. AMIGOS Bibliographic Council, Inc.
   Dallas, Texas
   Executive Director (current position description)

3. NELINET, Inc.
   Newton, Massachusetts
   Executive Director (current position description)

4. OCLC, Online Computer Library Center, Inc.
   Dublin, Ohio
   Vice President, Member Services (current position description)

5. Southeastern Library Network, Inc. (SOLINET)
   Atlanta, Georgia
   Executive Director (position advertisement, 1993)

   Washington, D.C.
   Executive Director (current position description)
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A Generalist in the Age of Specialists: A Profile of the One-Person Library Director

ROBERTA L. PITTS

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on defining the role of the one-person library director in public, academic, and special libraries. Some literature exists on the management of one-person libraries, but little research exists on the directors themselves. A profile survey of sixty-seven such directors reveals the career paths which led these individuals to one-person librarianship. Additional results provide data on education and training, staffing, issues of concern, job satisfaction, and demographic characteristics.

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps no term more aptly describes the one-person library director than the British acronym for such an individual—an OMB, the one-man band (St. Clair & Williamson, 1986, p. 2). The picture this brings to mind is an accurate reflection of a one-person library director—i.e., one individual who does it all. A one-person library is usually defined as one where all the work is performed by the librarian. A more specific definition, and one that more accurately fits the profile of this study, is that of the Special Libraries Association (SLA). SLA defines the solo librarian as “the isolated librarian or information provider...who has no professional peers within the immediate organization” (St. Clair & Berner, 1991, p. 4). However, the accepted terminology in library literature is one-person library. For the purposes of this study, the term one-person library director is interpreted as the one professional librarian within the
organization. There is a broad range of responsibilities within this scope. The work of the one-person librarian may be limited to professional duties with support staff, students, or volunteers available to handle clerical duties, or the individual may literally do all the work. The official title of the one-person librarian varies greatly. They may be called director, head librarian, university librarian, coordinator, or simply the librarian, but they all direct the work of the organization and are responsible for its operation. The libraries these individuals manage include all types with the majority, as might be expected, holding positions in special libraries and in school libraries. However, academic libraries and public libraries have their share of one-person library directors. The Federal State Cooperative System for Public Library Data in 1988 reported that only about 10 percent of U.S. libraries serve populations of 50,000 or more. Nearly half (45.6 percent) serve populations of less than 5,000 (Berry, 1990, p. 6). Texas, for example, has one-person library directors operating approximately 280 public libraries and twenty-five academic libraries (Texas Public Library Statistics, 1991; Texas State Library, 1992). The library training and educational backgrounds of the individuals who manage one-person libraries range from M.L.S. degree professionals to information providers with no formal training. Of the 280 public libraries mentioned, fifty-five of those have directors with an ALA-accredited M.L.S. degree. The remaining 225 one-person library professionals are identified as librarians as opposed to "other paid staff." The profile study will shed more light on the educational background these individuals bring to their role as one-person library directors.

Literature Review

There does not appear to be a great deal of research in the area of one-person librarianship. For example, research conducted on First Search (WorldCat) yielded over 900 titles on the subject of small libraries, but only six of these dealt specifically with the one-person library. While much of the information concerning small libraries may overlap and can be useful in the area of research under review here, still about 85 percent of the titles deal with the "how-to" of small library operations. Virtually no research exists on the librarians who direct these operations.

Article1st (First Search) produced twenty-eight articles on small libraries. Again, the majority of these records are limited to management issues, advice to small libraries, descriptions of programs, and other similar topics.
The ERIC database yielded 912 records under the heading of small libraries. Those that deal with one-person librarianship in this body of materials are scarce.

In all searches using keyword or subject searching under one-person libraries, one-professional libraries, and similar components of the phrase yielded few results. It is necessary to look at the larger body of records under the heading small libraries. How well does the term small libraries serve one-person librarianship? One might ask what specifically defines a small library? There are obvious criteria that serve to define such an organization—size of staff, population served, budget, or size of the collection. In perception, however, what is large in one particular state might be considered small in another (Reed, 1991, p. vii). For purposes of research, the body of work dealing with small libraries is currently the most useful available on the topic but is limited in that the major topic is management of such institutions, and very little deals with the directors who manage these organizations.

Roots

The tradition of a library in the charge of one individual is certainly an old one and its roots can be traced to medieval times. When Sulla captured Athens in 86 B.C. and with it the library of Aristotle, he placed two librarians in charge of the collection. If such a significant collection had two librarians, it is probably safe to conclude that other collections had at least one librarian (St. Clair & Williamson, 1986, p. 3).

Monasteries of the seventh and eighth centuries had large numbers of monks involved in copying manuscripts, and references are frequently made to the one librarian in charge of these sizable collections.

The first public library in Great Britain was provided to the city of London by Richard Whittington, and its chained collection was the responsibility of one person, the Chaplain of Guildhall College. Similar collections were established at Worcester and Bristol, and regulations were drawn up proclaiming that “books should be chained and catalogued and that the librarian should be a bachelor of divinity, or at least a graduate” (St. Clair & Williamson, 1986, p. 4).

The forerunner of the public library, the subscription library, appeared in the eighteenth century. In Philadelphia, Benjamin Franklin and friends created the Library Company of Philadelphia which Franklin called “the mother of all North American subscription libraries” (Gray, 1936, p. 4). It was only after monies were collected, books were on the shelves, and the catalog was underway that the directors decided the time had come to appoint
a librarian. Louis Timothee, a French refugee and a protégé of Franklin was appointed. Timothee's primary duties were:

- to give due Attendance in the Library on Wednesdays from Two to Three o'clock and on Saturdays from the hours of Ten till Four. He was to allow any Civil Gentlemen to peruse the Books of the Library in the Library Room but...not lend to or suffer to be taken out of the Library by any Person who is not a Subscribing Member any of the said books. (Gray, 1936, p. 12)

As time went on, additional rules were added. Sleeping in the library room was considered a loud and offensive noise and the librarian was instructed that, “if any Person hath to be awakened Twice, he shall be requested to leave” (Gray, 1936, p. 12).

Several years later, when Timothee resigned, Franklin himself served as the one-person librarian for several months. In 1746, Robert Greenway was appointed librarian serving in this position for seventeen years. Relations between the librarian and the directors became somewhat strained when the directors passed a bylaw that the cost of all books lost from the library should be taken from the librarian’s salary. As might be expected, Greenway protested volubly, pointing out that it was the directors themselves who were most to blame for loss of books by failure to return them (Gray, 1936, p. 13).

By the late 1800s, the concept of library work as a service profession developed and the hiring of several librarians with specialized tasks began to be an accepted form of librarianship in cities. However, schools, small academic institutions, special libraries, and numerous rural communities continued (and continue) to be served by the one-person librarian.

Skipping ahead a century, it was in the early 1970s that Guy St. Clair was asked to lead a roundtable discussion on the “one-man” library at a Special Libraries Association conference in Boston. St. Clair disclaimed use of the term in a profession where the vast majority of members were women. He suggested that the discussion concern the “one-person” library and at that point brought into the professional vocabulary a term for a concept that had been historically in operation for many years. In 1984, St. Clair began publishing, with Andrew Berner, *The One-Person Library: A Newsletter for Librarians and Management (OPL).* In 1991, the board of directors of the Special Libraries Association approved division status for SLA’s Solo Librarians Caucus. By their action, one-person librarianship was recognized as an official branch of SLA. It was at this point that the organization defined the solo librarian as “the isolated librarian...who has no professional peers within the immediate organization” (St. Clair & Berner, p. 4, 1991). It was estimated that between one-third and one-half of SLA’s membership was made up
of solo librarians. St. Clair broadens the concept beyond the special libraries milieu when he asks:

Isn't one-person librarianship a subject, a branch of the library and information profession that crosses all boundaries? I think it is. It seems to me that when we are talking about the concerns and interests of one-person librarians, we are pretty much talking about ideas that are not limited to one type of library or even to libraries specializing in the same subject." (St. Clair, 1989, p. 4)

Perceptions

One-person librarianship has long suffered with misconceptions about its role, not only from the layperson but also within its own profession as well. More resources, more staff, and large collections often translate into bigger must be better. Berry (1990) wrote that the persistent suggestion that something is inherently wrong with small libraries is like a "self-inflicted wound" (p. 6). He adds that we know enough about big and small now to finally bury the notion in our profession that small is bad or big is better (p. 6). McCabe (1989) tells us that the smaller library is not a microcosm of a larger organization; it is an entity in its own right. The larger library should not be used as a role model because small libraries have their own unique needs and objectives (p. vi). An optimal benefit of smallness is the option to create an organization that encourages workers to act independently. Theorists contend that the most flexible organizations are those where decisions are made closest to the level of impact. Because the one-person librarian is close to this point of impact, small libraries tend to be more flexible and democratic in their approach (Williams, 1988, p. 57).

Often questions arise as to what level of professional duties a one-person librarian can perform along with the myriad of necessary clerical functions. Herbert White (1988) wrote:

Libraries in the common perception, are defined by clerical functions and there is enough reality to validate the generalization. I am sufficiently radicalized on this issue so that I even have trouble with the phrase, "one-person libraries" as contrasted to one-professional library. I am sure there are exceptions, but I harbor the suspicion that some of the "one-person libraries" are not really libraries at all; they are clerical centers for buying, lending, and recalling. That, of course, is what a stockroom clerk does. Perhaps we need to postulate that "one-person library" is an oxymoron. (p. 56)

Needless to say, one-person librarians took exception to this statement. St. Clair suggests that it is better for a dedicated professional to take on the duties of a one-person library because such an individual
can provide a level of professional excellence while dealing with clerical routines in the most efficient and effective manner. He points out that one-person libraries which fall into the nonprofessional, clerical category are the exceptions (St. Clair, 1988, p. 2). Additional data will be provided on professional status of one-person library directors in the profile study.

**PROFILE: AN OVERVIEW**

It has already been pointed out that little has been written about the one-person library directors themselves. They are basically an unknown group. Two major studies on job characteristics in librarianship which involve one-person librarians were both conducted in Great Britain. Of these two, the one conducted by Janet Shuter and Judith Collins for the British Library Reference Division in 1984 had a response rate of 47 percent or seventy-six employees in one-person libraries. The content of the study dealt with aspects of the job, working conditions, qualifications, and career history. The results were compiled in groups of “extremely satisfied,” “very dissatisfied,” and “average.” Of the job factors that most met expectations, all groups listed organizing one’s own time at the top of the list. The “extremely satisfied” group also gave interest in the work as a top priority. The dissatisfied group felt that not delegating skilled tasks was the main factor that did not meet their expectations. Overall, the most positive aspects of the job for the satisfied group related to the content of the work while those for the dissatisfied group related more to working conditions. For all of the one-person librarians who answered the survey, lack of training was considered the number one problem (St. Clair & Williamson, 1986, p. 10).

Authors St. Clair and Williamson (1986) conducted their own informal survey which yielded additional profile information including the following data:

1. More than 80 percent of one-person librarians have the title of librarian.
2. Approximately 25 percent of one-person librarians work in public libraries (in the United States), and another 25 percent work in special libraries.
3. About 70 percent of one-person libraries have between 1,000 and 15,000 volume collections. Rarely did any have less than 1,000 or more than 25,000 volumes.
4. Almost 60 percent reported that they supervise a clerk, student, or volunteer.
5. Approximately 70 percent of these libraries participate in formal or informal networks (p. 12).
The one overwhelming distinguishing characteristic of this type of director is that the individual works professionally alone and is required to direct his or her energies to a total picture of service. These individuals do not have the luxury of limiting themselves to only one area of library service. As such, these directors are very much generalists in an age of specialists. Brooks places total responsibility clearly on the shoulders of the one-person library director. He says, "the requirement to set up an atmosphere falls on the librarian. He can make it hum or plunge it into static silence. In a small public library, the librarian is the library" (quoted in Hart, 1988, p. 3).

In the one-person library setting, duties may include everything from administrative work to the most menial of tasks. In the course of a day, the director may draft a policy for use of the library by outside groups, help a patron locate information for a report, edit catalog records, select new titles as well as placing the order for them, and handle the circulation desk in the absence of a volunteer or clerk. As verified by the British study, this variety of duties or the content of the job is singled out as the most positive aspect of work in a one-person library by the individuals who work there. Other advantages of working in a one-person library include independence, flexibility, and personal knowledge of library users. Common dissatisfactions were isolation, lack of training, low pay, lack of support by the parent organization, and physical surroundings (St. Clair & Williamson, 1986, p. 10).

Certain traits of one-person library directors have been identified as factors for success. These include analytical intelligence, self-confidence, flexibility, a sense of humor, patience, and a high frustration threshold (Weinsoft, 1990, p. 30). St. Clair (1987) adds that the single-staff librarian must be a visionary, an idealist—one who can see the big picture (p. 267). Safford stresses the importance of administrative duties and points out that even in one-professional college libraries some significant part of the director's time should be devoted to administrative responsibilities. A common error is that such individuals cannot afford the time for "administrivia" (Safford, 1988, p. 20).

Profile Survey Method

The review of studies summarized earlier in this discussion suggests that one-person librarianship has no small impact on library service in this country. As a unique blend of type of library and type of management, one-person librarianship has survived the bigger-is-better wars and has emerged as a voice with strong advocates in SLA, in school libraries, and in the public library arena. Still,
little definitive new information on these directors exists, specially
that which is pertinent to U. S. libraries. In light of this, a survey
was formulated to increase available data and help build a profile
of these individuals. Who are these one-person library directors? What
is their role and in what environments do they work? What career
paths led them to solo librarianship, and what impact does isolation
have on their effectiveness? What traits and skills are significant to
a one-person library setting? Are the concerns of one-person library
directors markedly different from concerns of larger organizations?
Are these directors involved in professional organizations, and do
they make use of continuing education or networking possibilities?
What advantages or disadvantages exist in one-person library
environments?

In an effort to obtain necessary data for this profile study, a
number of considerations guided the choice of a research strategy.
First, since no list of one-person libraries exists, a respondent pool
had to be built from a variety of existing sources. Second, the decision
was made not to include school librarians in the survey. This decision
was based on the overwhelming number of school librarians
nationwide and the fact that school librarianship is one area where
librarians normally expect to be in a one-person library setting and
probably receive the most appropriate training for such a setting.
Also, through state education agencies and the efforts of the American
Association of School Librarians, some profile data already exists
on the school librarian. This then left three types of one-person
libraries on which to build the respondent pool—special libraries,
public libraries, and academic libraries. Two information bases were
used to build the list to which the survey would be mailed. Sixty
libraries were identified as having one professional staff member in
names were randomly supplied by Guy St. Clair from the mailing
list of The One-Person Library: A Newsletter for Librarians and
Management.

Data were gathered using a questionnaire consisting of twenty
questions. Five questions on the survey were open-ended and the
remaining items were multiple choice. Once the potential pool had
been established, letters were sent to each individual at their library
explaining the nature of the project and a request for their
participation. They were told that individuals and libraries would
not be identified. Of the ninety surveys mailed, seventy individuals
responded for a return rate of 77 percent. Two of these were eliminated
because they did not meet the study’s definition of a one-person
library—i.e., there was more than one professional librarian on the
staff. One survey was returned unanswered because the position was
currently vacant. Thus the profile was dealing with surveys from sixty-seven respondents—forty-five were from public and academic libraries, and twenty-two were from special libraries.

Results

Demographic Characteristics

Respondents by type of library included twenty-four public libraries, twenty-two academic libraries, and twenty-one special libraries. Those respondents answering the survey represented thirty-one states and the District of Columbia.

The majority of one-person library directors (79 percent) surveyed were women. Of the respondents (n = 67), fifty-three were female and fourteen were male. No males were listed as directors of one-person special libraries. The number of male one-person library directors was equally divided between public and academic libraries. All twenty-two of the one-person library directors for special libraries were female. In the public/academic libraries, thirty-one of the library directors were female.

The age factor of these one-person library directors was somewhat surprising. In St. Clair’s work in 1986, many of the one-person librarians were in entry-level positions (St. Clair & Williamson, 1986, p. 170). The majority of the respondents to the survey (twenty-five or 37 percent) were in the forty to forty-nine age category. Their answers to career path questions and number of years in present position did not indicate that they were in entry-level positions. The next largest pool of respondents was equally divided between thirty-five to thirty-nine years of age and fifty to fifty-nine years of age (twelve each). There were eight respondents in the thirty to thirty-four age grouping. The least number of all respondents (three) fell in the less than thirty age category.

Environment

Respondents were asked to choose the statement that best described their position. These choices included:

—one-person library director with no staff
—one-person library director with paid clerical staff
—one-person library director with students or volunteers
—library director with one professional librarian
—other. Please specify:

One-person librarians in special libraries were most likely to be directors with no staff with nine individuals selecting that option. Almost an equal number in special libraries (ten) had paid clerical staff. In public and academic libraries, thirty-seven respondents
(n = 45) were in the one-person library director with paid clerical staff category, clearly indicating that while most one-person library directors were the only professional librarian on staff, they do not work alone. However, their sense of isolation from other professional librarians comes through in their responses to the open-ended questions on advantages and disadvantages of the one-person library environment. The number of paid staff reporting to the director varies considerably. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of staff supervised. Again, special libraries were the most likely to have no staff available to them. Seven of these indicated they supervised one staff member and only one supervised six or more. In academic and public libraries, most one-person library directors (sixteen) supervised one to three individuals. However, almost an equal number (fifteen) supervised six or more.

What is surprising in the statistics gathered is the size of collections and the number of titles added annually. For public and academic one-person libraries (n = 45), thirty-seven had 20,000 volumes or more and thirty-one added 700 or more titles annually. Of special libraries respondents (n = 22), eighteen indicated collections under 10,000 volumes. St. Clair and Williamson's (1986) earlier figures indicated that 70 percent of one-person libraries have between 1,000 and 15,000 volumes (p. 12).

Education and Training

Of the sixty-seven respondents, fifty-three (79 percent) hold a master's degree in library science. The degrees came from thirty-three institutions with twenty-four of that number being ALA-accredited library education programs. Interestingly, Simmons College was represented most often with four M.L.S. degrees coming from that institution. Those fourteen individuals without M.L.S. degrees held either undergraduate degrees in library science or degrees in other fields. In the case of special libraries, these degrees often related to the libraries served, as in the case of a law librarian with a JD. Several respondents held second master's degrees, and one held a Ph.D. in higher education. Only two marked non-degree status, and both of these individuals indicated that they had extensive on-the-job training. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they had attended staff development or continuing education courses within the last two years. Of the public and academic personnel (n = 45), ten indicated they had not done so. In the special libraries group (n = 22), three had not attended such training. Respondents' involvement in professional organizations was also sought.
Overwhelmingly, the greatest number of individuals were involved with state or regional professional associations. Some of these overlapped with membership in the American Library Association and the Special Libraries Association.

**Issues of Concern**

Are the concerns of one-person library directors markedly different from concerns of larger organizations? At an informal gathering of five library directors, a brief list was drawn up of a number of broad areas of concern. These included automation, time management, budget issues, staffing, and reference service. These topics were listed on the survey, and respondents were asked to rank in order those issues which concerned them the most with number one being the area of most concern. Blanks were provided so that respondents could add their own areas of concern and rank these appropriately. Automation and budget issues were top priorities for one-person librarians followed by time management, reference service, and staffing. The issues the respondents raised were collection development, long-range planning, keeping up with technology, outreach programs, building expansion, pay equity, technical services, copyright, relationship with management, and isolation. With the exception of concern over isolation, results appear to confirm the hypothesis that the issues facing one-person library directors are not so very different from those facing their colleagues in larger institutions.

**Job Duties**

When one-person library directors were asked to rank in order of importance the duties they perform regularly, there was a clear division of thought between special libraries and public/academic libraries. Again respondents were given a list of duties which a one-person library director might be expected to perform. Blanks were left so individuals could add their own duties and rank them accordingly. The list of tasks included:

- Administrative duties
- Reference service
- Using electronic resources
- Circulation of materials
- Bibliographic instruction
- Ordering materials
- Materials selection
- Cataloging/technical services
- Budget preparation

For special libraries, fifteen directors ranked reference service as the number one duty they perform. On the other hand, public and academic directors placed administrative duties at the top of their list with twenty-nine ranking it number one. Eight public/academic individuals ranked reference service number one. Additional tasks the directors added to this list involved public relations, retrospective conversion, community involvement, and building maintenance.
Career Paths

Of the sixty-seven original respondents, fifty-nine chose to respond to the request to describe briefly the career path or set of circumstances that led to their position as a one-person library director. The one-person library directors were refreshingly vocal on this and all the open-ended questions. After reviewing the comments, it was possible to group the career paths of these individuals into a number of broad areas for discussion.

Geographic location. At least ten one-person library directors mentioned location, job availability in the area, a desire to be close to family, or husband’s/wife’s job which took them to the area as reasons which led them to seek a one-person library setting. Several mentioned that they felt it was safer and less expensive to live and work in a smaller city or rural area.

Special concentration. Several individuals specifically chose areas of specialization, such as community college or small academic colleges, and set their careers for such institutions. Others who chose concentrations in art history or law or medical librarianship became involved in special libraries because of these interests.

Career changes. Seven or more respondents wanted career changes which led them to one-person libraries. Accountants, lawyers, social workers, a number of high school librarians—all wanted something different and appeared to find it in their gradual move to a new environment.

Promotion. A number of one-person library directors who had been volunteers, part-time employees, or part-time librarians in the organization took over when the previous director retired or resigned.

Not all career path reasoning can be neatly categorized. Some directors attributed their positions to fate or strictly chance or just being in the right place at the right time.

A corollary question to the career path response asked the respondents if they had had a career or profession other than as a librarian. Thirty-nine answered this negatively, indicating that librarianship was the only profession in which they had been engaged. Of the twenty-eight who replied yes, twelve had been teachers. Others had been lawyers, journalists, archaeologists, accountants, social workers, consultants, in retail sales, or members of the military.

Advantages and Disadvantages

The survey sought to answer the question of what advantages and disadvantages exist in one-person library environments. Of the sixty-seven original respondents, sixty-one chose to reply to this
question. Autonomy and control of one's work was considered the number one perk with twenty-three directors naming it as an advantage. Variety of duties was also considered of high value. Eighteen directors listed it among the advantages. Other advantages in order of importance were knowledge of the collection and patrons, many challenges and no boredom, opportunity to set administrative polices in place, and less red tape. One director pointed out that he does not have to give up the pleasure of serving the public in order to be an administrator. An academic director liked the sense of connection to many aspects of the work rather than the narrow view of over-specialization. One librarian said simply, "I am the show."

The comments on the disadvantages of a one-person library director position were more scattered. Eleven directors noted the need for more staff and delegation of clerical duties as a major dissatisfier. Other negative aspects receiving an equal number of comments included heavy work load, no time to complete projects, isolation, no other professional expertise to call on, little chance for advancement, and lack of support and resources. One director described herself as being on an island with no one to talk things over with. Another had one statement under disadvantages—"lonesome job." An academic director says, "the day-to-day activities of keeping the place running overwhelms even the most workaholic of us in time." Still another adds, "the heat's on you when things fall apart—from bathrooms to budget."

There is some corollary to the British study mentioned earlier on job satisfiers and dissatisfiers. The British study noted organizing one's own time and variety as the top advantages. This still holds true in the current profile survey. Isolation and lack of support are still among the disadvantages, but little mention was made of low pay, lack of training, or physical surroundings as it was in the earlier study.

Characteristics for Success

What special traits and skills are necessary for a one-person library director to be successful? This open-ended question was posed to the one-person library directors, and sixty-two of the original sixty-seven respondents chose to provide answers.

Taking each of the respondents' suggestions, a list of twenty-three different traits and skills was compiled. Of all traits, flexibility was most often listed as a necessity for success in a one-person library operation. This was followed by resourcefulness, communication skills, management skills, and organizational skills. Also on the
desired traits list were a sense of humor, patience, teaching abilities, computer skills, good time management skills, and a high threshold for frustration.

One academic librarian commented on what he felt was a necessary skill—"be meaner than a mad dog when dealing with administrators." A special librarian added that willingness to accept poverty level pay could be a necessity.

Job Satisfaction

In spite of the heavy work loads and high frustration levels, one-person library directors are amazingly satisfied with their jobs. Directors were asked to rate their job satisfaction by marking one of the following:

- very satisfied
- mostly satisfied
- somewhat satisfied
- disappointed
- very disappointed

Of the sixty-seven respondents, twenty (30 percent) indicated that they were very satisfied with their work. Thirty-four were "mostly satisfied" and seven were "somewhat satisfied." Three individuals indicated they were disappointed and only one library director was very disappointed. One respondent chose to add her own rating code, "frequently frustrated." It is interesting to note that two of the "disappointed" directors had had recent cutbacks in staff. The "very disappointed" directors indicated concern with weak administrative support and poor budgets.

Conclusion

This study set out to define the role of the one-person library director and to define some of the unknown qualities about the individuals who occupy these positions. The profile survey has provided data that both supports and enlarges the literature available on this topic.

One-person library directors, or one-professional library directors, are clearly on the front lines of librarianship. On their shoulders rest all the duties of what makes a library run. It is a challenge they appear to embrace with high spirits and a positive attitude. A true sense of concern for their patrons and a desire to improve service is evident in the profile surveys.
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In Praise of Acting and Permanent Library Directors and Their Symbiosis: A Dialogue

JOANNE R. EUSTER AND ERIC SOLOMON

ABSTRACT
A LIBRARY DIRECTOR AND A university professor of English, who has also served as acting director of the library, engage in a dialogue about the role of the interim or acting director. While they bring quite different perspectives to the discussion, they agree on the fundamental role and responsibilities of the interim director.

INTRODUCTION

Hello, I must be going!
—Groucho Marx

While library directors come and go, and often acting or interim directors hold the position momentarily, it is unusual when the paths of an acting director and a director crisscross as has been the case of the authors. Eric Solomon was acting director of the J. Paul Leonard Library at San Francisco State University (SFSU) when Joanne Euster arrived as director; six years later, Euster moved on to Rutgers, returning the directorship (again acting) to Solomon. Euster, on the other hand, has been followed (and been succeeded) by acting directors at several institutions. Thus, we seem to share a double (might one say even schizoid?) perspective on the question of what can/should an acting administrator do for an incoming director—and vice versa. The following dialogue will be anecdotal by its very nature, but it is hoped that some general perceptions will emerge as to the responsibilities involved in temporary, as opposed to long-term,
stewardship; in how one turns over leadership of an institution; ultimately, in making the best of awkward leadership situations and transitions.

THE DIALOGUE

Euster: I came to SFSU with experience as a library director at two smaller institutions. Although I had some twelve years of experience as a professional librarian, six of those as a director, SFSU was a significantly larger and more complex institution. My M.B.A. training had provided me with a pretty good grounding in management theories and techniques, and I felt it had served me and my institutions well. At the same time, I was going from a small library to one with nearly three times the staff and budget, and I was concerned about getting oriented as quickly as possible.

Solomon: I am not a librarian, have no M.L.S., have never cataloged a book, never taught a student how to use LEXIS/NEXIS, and never unearthed a government publication. Yet as a veteran professor of English literature, I have spent much of my working life in libraries; as a reluctant administrator, I have held a great many posts from assistant to the president to provost—and am now in my third incarnation as interim university librarian. I first took the job while serving half-time as presidential assistant. There was no lead time; the long-time library director left for new pastures on one week’s notice. Many librarians asked me to make sure the president did not appoint an incumbent administrator, and, in the course of our dialogue, I assured him that there were many faculty who loved books and libraries and could administer one temporarily—that, indeed, I could do so, and that, remarkably, I wanted the job. In those simpler days, President Romberg replied: “Then you shall have it, son.” Thus, unprepared, untrained, and certainly bemused, I took over the acting directorship for a year while two searches took place.

Euster: What help did you get from your predecessor?

Solomon: None. Well, he did spend an hour with me, mostly snarling at the work records of the venal, disloyal, incompetent administrators, librarians, and staff assembled in the building. And we had a three-minute meeting in the parking lot when he handed over to me eight promotion recommendations, all but one of which he turned down. I never saw or heard from him again. You got much more help during your transition.

Euster: I certainly did. You spent a fair amount of time, both during the recruitment process and after I arrived, telling me what you perceived to be the issues and problem areas. I don’t remember your
dwelling on negatives so much as just explaining what was on the immediate agenda and where I would probably need to take action fairly soon. The library was just at the beginning of implementing its first automated system, and there were some residual morale problems with staff. It seemed to me that your main concern was to give me a conceptual framework rather than to lay out in detail all the resolved and unresolved matters you had inherited and would be passing on to me.

Solomon: Ah, how good of me. I defined the acting university librarian job in three stages, all preparing for your arrival. Following Franklin Roosevelt’s model about the first hundred days (I thought big), I tried to accomplish as much as possible before the actual search heated up to the interview stage. I worked on structures a bit, on personnel a great deal, talking to people, suggesting how the university could help their career plans (yes, I reversed most promotions recommendations), listened to my assistant directors, decided whose advice I should take, defused some inappropriate actions by administrators, started a Friends of the Library group, and generally tried to inculcate a somewhat more democratic humane administrative style (I also tried to move the map cases; that change only occurred after you left six years later). Once the search starts, people in the library seem to decompensate and get testy about small grievances—change does not come without its threats—and the acting director must perform as a steady calming influence who is also quasi-parental. When the interviews started, all attention went to the future and, as acting director, I mainly existed, signed medical visit permissions, and stared bemusedly at leaks in the roof. The third stage, after you were chosen, led me to a largely secretarial role; I think I called you and asked for your decision on a host of minor issues.

Euster: As I recall, the office staff liked to say that you spent your days with your feet on the desk, smoking those pungent cigars and reading. As director, there were no worries about my successor until I realized I really was going to be leaving. I wrote out some general descriptive notes that I left in the top desk drawer (the old “prepare three envelopes” joke!). I doubt that you ever saw them, and they really weren’t meant for you so much as for someone coming in totally new. In spite of the fact that you were very circumspect and careful not to be too much of a presence in the library, I was pretty sure you knew quite a bit about what was going on. We had evolved into a much more participative style of management, and the organizational memory for what we were trying to do didn’t reside just in my head; you’d have a lot of help from many quarters. I’m
curious about why you chose the particular actions you did during the acting period.

**Solomon:** Actually, I did make a few personnel changes. I finished the hiring process for a head of technical services. I don't think an acting director should hire permanent administrators, but this action was a great boon to me since he was, in a way, my appointee as far as personal loyalty and trust were concerned. And I made a few shifts in assignments that were meant to be permanent and to be a help to the library and to the as-yet-unchosen successor—such as moving an extremely able but un-M.L.S.ed staff person into a position previously held by a professional librarian as head of interlibrary loan. And I tried to mediate turf wars and some really festering staff-supervisor problems. But I didn't want to make any major changes in personnel or policy as an acting director.

**Euster:** Indeed. One of the things I have always hoped for (maybe fantasized about is a better word here) from an acting director is to have made some of the really unpopular decisions, thus protecting my honeymoon period a little. I suppose, however, that this is a pretty unrealistic pipe dream, because it hasn't happened much yet. I remember you telling me that you considered it important to be a calming influence, and I've been told that by other acting directors as well—that the principal role was to reassure staff and generally keep the library humming along. One thing I think is especially important on the part of the acting director is to be very clear on why you take action and have a definite outcome in mind that can be communicated to the permanent director. I've had situations where changes were made, task forces appointed, and so forth, but there wasn't a clear plan for the outcome, so I was left to try to figure out not only what was intended, but how to redirect forward motion to fit my framework. Those experiences led me to think that the best model is in fact to do relatively little organizationally and programmatically unless there is a clear and compelling reason to act. My style involves a lot of organizational fine tuning and often some pretty radical change, and that would be difficult if it comes on the heels of a lot of change. Of course, you signed off on the entire automation system for circulation, which was a big change at the time.

**Solomon:** Remember, I was only supposed to stay six months after the first search failed—the president and provost were insisting on a Ph.D. requirement—I had to make the final decisions, but we had a very good internal assistant director and committee to help sift through the choices.
Euster: There always seems to be a certain amount of jockeying for position, if not outright turf wars, at the end of a director’s tenure and during the acting period. One of the greatest services the acting director can do for the permanent director is to convey some sense of the organizational culture to the new person. I am thinking of things like sharing a pretty good grasp of where the organizational and administrative strengths and weaknesses are, how personalities are affecting organizational effectiveness; this isn’t just gossip: the new director isn’t going to be able to look everywhere simultaneously and needs to have a good sense of what people to trust and which departments can run on their own for awhile.

Solomon: I did, by the way, do a huge favor for my successor. I led a march on the provost of all the assistant directors to insist on dropping the Ph.D. necessity. Come to think of it, I had remained (and this was unique) as an assistant to the president that year, so he ultimately overruled the provost at my whining plea for help.

Euster: That decision held until the day I arrived, or I wouldn’t have been there; that all came later. As you know, the staff had made a great point during the recruitment and interview process of regaling me with all their real and imagined grievances and slights, so I felt a strong staff mandate to change some things, although in my judgment the library functioned effectively and provided top quality service. By the way, I have learned since that it isn’t uncommon for candidates to be treated to a full display of dirty laundry. You know, Eric, you really were in a unique position as acting director. I rather doubt there is another acting director in the country who was simultaneously assistant to the president and head of the library, or for that matter, one who has been acting provost.

Solomon: Your arrival. Now, this concept seems to me crucial. I recall giving you as much information about the library as I could, going through the personnel roster with approbation or criticism, and trying to describe the players and rules of the university where I had been active for many years. And then I disappeared. Literally. I swore not to set foot in the library for a year and I did not. I had my office mate check out books for me. Extreme? Yes, but necessary. Once in the building, the ex-chief can become a target for complaints, false compliments (“You never would have done this”), and requests for help. Solomon’s rule: the acting/interim directors must exile themselves and let new university librarians be free—even to make mistakes.

Euster: That’s not quite the way I remember it, although I think it’s close to what you actually did. On more than one occasion I
found myself wishing for your perspective and advice, and I did call you now and then, because you were wonderfully positioned to have leverage with the president and to represent the library on occasion. There was at least one instance where we collaborated on a large and important project to bring it to successful closure. I’m referring to bringing the California State Library’s historic and unique Sutro Library to the campus. That couldn’t have happened without either of us, I am convinced. There were far too many political considerations involved, and leverage from the highest level—the president and trustees—was crucial.

Solomon: Other than helping with the president, who carried the Trustees, I was mainly a yea-sayer in what I saw as a tradition-bound institution where administrative time-servers kept insisting, “We can’t do this.” I was the little engine that mumbled consistently, “It can be done.” And I was able to use my old connection to get Vartan Gregorian to come and speak at the opening.

Euster: Did you ever break your absolute rule about staying away from the library?

Solomon: Absolutely. “I contradict myself? Very well, I contradict myself”—Whitman. The second time I stopped being acting director I segued right into the position of acting provost, and, since the new director reported to me, we met every other week for two years. A big mistake, I think, and the rule is still a good one.

Euster: But you did call me in New Jersey....

Solomon: I was trying to understand your matrix system. And your hiring a building consultant. And automating the catalog.

Euster: Some of those, such as the matrix organization in public services or adding the public access catalog to the automated system, were really specific to the assistant directors’ domains by that time. Of course, there was published literature on both. Other projects were much easier for an academic to comprehend and pick up on—for example, the ongoing work with the Sutro Collection and the establishment of the Bay Area Labor Archives. Even before my arrival you had been the chief architect in establishment of the Friends of the Library. Earlier you made reference to the fact that you had no training for librarianship. I expect that many of my colleagues winced at least a little as they read the words “always loved books and libraries and could administer one temporarily.” As a matter of fact, I happen to think you did a darned good job, but I also think it is hubris to assume that longstanding use of a library and love of books and literature in itself qualifies one to manage a library. There is such a great difference between the way an academic department—even
from the vantage point of a dean—functions, and the operation of what is even at its most democratic a professionalized bureaucracy. The contrast is pointed up by the amazement and sometimes difficulties experienced by library directors with long experience in academe who take on deanships of library schools. In fact, one of the issues academic libraries continue to struggle with is institutionalizing a thorough understanding of how faculty do scholarship, teach, and make decisions in their departments and schools; in short, knowing the customer. For instance, the hiring of a library building consultant is a pretty routine, although not always necessary, thing to do when considering a new or renovated building, and we do the same whenever we need more specialized expertise or a more experienced outside view than the library has internally. It seems to me, on the other hand, that faculty often believe that they are the outside expertise, and I think those contrasting views point up some of the differences in the cultures.

Solomon: By now, having been in this role three times, for a total of nearly four years, I have a broader perspective than I did in 1979. I know more about how the faculty and administration believe they love the library—"The heart of the University"—while at the same time are reluctant to share budgetary resources. And I understand more about tensions between library faculty and staff, between all librarians and university faculty. Mostly, I gained a grasp of the paradoxes involved in a hierarchical tradition and a collegial concept.

Euster: I’ve headed libraries with staffs varying in size all the way from 10 to 350, and I see in them certain underlying organizational themes and principles that apply regardless of size; I think a great deal of the trick to being the acting director, whether you are a librarian or not, is to be able to perceive what is general to organizations and make use of that understanding, rather than being solely focused on the idiosyncracies of the particular library. If the acting director can do that, it should make little difference whether there is an M.L.S. in the background or not. Of course, over the last couple of decades, management in general and academic libraries in particular have become progressively more participatory, collegial, consultative, democratic—choose your term—the point being that I think the librarians, if not the support staff, are better able to bridge the gap between the library as a hierarchy and the collegiality of the academic department.

Euster: Let’s sum up. As a director, I think that during the acting period, the acting director has to tread a very fine line. Almost inevitably, there will be some jockeying for position and power to be managed and time-sensitive decisions to be made. I tend not to
make many drastic changes in the first six to twelve months; since most acting directors serve somewhere in that time frame, I'd expect them to make few permanent systemic changes. At the same time, the acting director job isn't just a caretaker. Try a rule of three: pick out three areas where your actions and decisions will help and lay the groundwork for the future (for example, in your case, establishing the Friends of the Library, hiring a head of technical services, beginning the implementation of the automated circulation system), and concentrate your efforts on that controlled number. Even if the library was relatively peaceful, the loss of its leader tends to call for a period of reassurance, which the acting director can provide.

**Solomon:** In sum, I think success as an acting director calls for someone who is a quick study, knows the larger institution very well indeed, has good judgment in deciding whom to trust, listens well, and is not afraid—on occasion—to take an action even though one's authority is merely temporary. My rule of three: be a soothing steadying influence, take advantage of broad institutional knowledge and friendships, know where the money is hidden. It helps to have a relatively short attention span, to be one who knows one is temperamentally unable to function as a long-term administrator who must put up with delay, repetition, frustration, and postponement, for an acting director or interim university librarian should not really take the long view, since that might lead to putting oneself forward for the permanent slot. "Nevermore," quoth the soon-again-to-be-former-interim university librarian, raven-like. My last rule: an acting director should never be a candidate for the permanent position, for then no action taken during the acting director's period of administration can be distinguished from an electioneering gambit.
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