

**Johnson & Wales University**  
**ScholarsArchive@JWU**

---

Library Staff Publications

University Libraries

---

12-15-2005

# Emotional Intelligence in Academic Library Leadership

Rosita E. Hopper

*Johnson & Wales University*, [rosie.hopper@jwu.edu](mailto:rosie.hopper@jwu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarsarchive.jwu.edu/staff\\_pub](https://scholarsarchive.jwu.edu/staff_pub)

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

## Repository Citation

Hopper, Rosita E., "Emotional Intelligence in Academic Library Leadership" (2005). *Library Staff Publications*. 1.  
[https://scholarsarchive.jwu.edu/staff\\_pub/1](https://scholarsarchive.jwu.edu/staff_pub/1)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at ScholarsArchive@JWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Staff Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarsArchive@JWU. For more information, please contact [jcastel@jwu.edu](mailto:jcastel@jwu.edu).

## Emotional Intelligence in Academic Library Leadership

Rosie Hopper

### Executive summary

Recent research by Peter Hemon and Nancy Rossiter (in press) analyzed the extent to which desired traits listed in current job advertisements for library directors correspond with the five components of emotional intelligence (EI) identified by psychologist Daniel Goleman (i.e. self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill.) The research of Hemon and Rossiter also examined the level of importance that current library directors themselves ascribed to those traits found in the ads. This study quantifies the extent to which the ninety-six traits listed by Hemon and Rossiter are likewise described as desirable by the authors represented in five published collections of essays on library leadership. It identifies additional desired traits referred to in the essays and which did not appear in the Hemon/Rossiter lists, quantifies the extent to which these appear in the essays, and then examines whether or not the additional traits fit the emotional intelligence schema. This study also compares the top five rated traits in each set of rankings, identifies the highest and lowest ranked traits across both sets based on an average number of all points given per trait, ranks each component of emotional intelligence based on the average number of points given to traits associated with each component, and concludes that in spite of only moderate correspondence between the rankings from the current study and the Hemon-Rossiter study, the overall high correspondence of many of the desired traits identified in the essays with the components of EI makes the Goleman theory of emotional intelligence a relevant tool for characterizing effective library leaders. The study concludes first by suggesting a

valuable report on the findings that could be made to decision makers in an academic library setting, and then by considering topics on emotional intelligence and on library leadership worthy of future research.

## Background

The characterization of effective leadership will never lose its relevance to organization theory because all organizational progress requires decision-making and all decision-making relies upon leadership in some form, whether from a single operative or many operatives collectively. The quality of the decision will be seen to correspond directly to the effectiveness of the leadership. Psychologist Daniel Goleman popularized the concept of emotional intelligence, positing that traditional personal qualities such as intelligence, determination and vision were important yet insufficient for effective leadership of business organizations. Goleman identified and characterized the five main components of EI and was then able to associate the levels of these traits in business leaders with measurable business results. Self-awareness he defined as the “ability to recognize and understand your moods, emotions, and drives, as well as their effect on others.” (2004) Sometimes mistaken by business executives as a short-coming rather than a strength because of its suggestion of emotional openness and compassion as opposed to emotional boundaries and toughness, Goleman describes a self-aware person as one practiced in making the necessary honest assessments of an organization as well as of him- or herself. (2004)

Self-regulation is closely tied to personal integrity and is defined by Goleman as “the ability to control or redirect disruptive impulses and moods.” (2004) Disruptive impulses can be range from poorly worded e-mails rashly fired off in a moment of emotion to succumbing to the mishandling of funds for personal gain. All have the power to derail leadership effectiveness to a greater or lesser extent.

Goleman’s definition of motivation applies to a person’s own inner fire or drive as opposed to the inspirational effect a person has upon others. Motivation according to Goleman is “a passion to work for reasons that go beyond money or status” and “the propensity to pursue goals with energy and persistence.” (2004) This type of non-materialistic motivation is what Goleman considers the source of the tenacity, innovativeness and even optimism of a true leader. Furthermore, an appetite for wealth or prestige alone does not necessarily translate into the level of organizational loyalty typical of great leaders.

The most daring association Goleman makes with effective business leadership is the quality of empathy. More short-sighted students of business theory might assume that an aptitude for considering the feelings of others would keep a business executive from making uncomfortable yet necessary decisions. Goleman says that on the contrary “the ability to understand the emotional makeup of other people” helps leaders to among other things “heighten collaboration,” more accurately “read” the intentions of clients, and “retain talent,” leading to “increased job satisfaction and decreased turnover.” (2004)

Social skill on the other hand is an aptitude that is more typically associated with effective leadership. According to Goleman “proficiency in managing relationships and building networks,” is--unlike the other four EI components--considered “a key leadership capability” in most companies. It is understood that leadership involves the effective management of relationships for promoting agendas, building coalitions, and gathering external resources. (2004)

### Problem Statement

While research has been conducted into the preferred competencies and traits for academic library leaders (Euster, 1988; Herson, Powell & Young, 2001; Herson, Powell & Young, 2002) and for public library leaders (Herson, 2003) no study has analyzed the extent to which the preferred traits identified in writings by practitioners and scholars in the field of professional librarianship correspond to the five components of emotional intelligence. How successfully does the EI construct cover ideal traits for library leaders? Are there traits that do not fit within the EI construct and if so how significant are they compared to the traits that do fit? Which traits are found to be least significant and finally, is it possible to use the EI construct to predict effectiveness of prospective library leaders or to design education and training curricula for library and information science professionals? The value of answering these questions lies in the fact that it is, as Sharon Gray Weiner writes, “the leadership of the library that determines whether a philosophy and vision are articulated and to what extent they are implemented,” yet Weiner goes on to conclude, “although some research has been done on identifying library leadership potential, career development, characteristics and management styles of academic library

directors, and their roles and responsibilities, it is clear that many aspects have not been addressed and that a comprehensive body of cohesive, evidence-based research is needed.” (2003) In their own study on EI and effective leadership Benjamin Palmer, Melissa Walls, Zena Burgess and Con Stough concluded that “an effective leadership sample from a diverse range of industries across both private and public sectors may indicate whether EI is more or less important to effective leadership within certain industries or at different leadership levels.” (2001) By now examining a total of 68 articles on EI by 63 separate authors selected by the editors of the books for their expertise in the subject area of library administration, this study will contribute to an improved understanding of the importance of EI to academic library leadership.

#### Literature Review

Limited research exists on EI in library leadership, academic or otherwise. The soon to be published article by Peter Hernon and Nancy Rossiter (in press) is the first to present empirical evidence of a direct association between the EI framework and ideal traits for library directors. Hernon and Rossiter compiled lists of traits both from those mentioned in 226 job advertisements appearing in *College & Research Libraries News* from 2000 through 2004 for library directors at either Association of Research Libraries (ARL) or the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), as well as from a survey of--and then follow-up interviews with--librarians currently employed as directors. The job advertisements yielded the fewest corresponding traits--twenty-eight out of the total of ninety-six--and there was little agreement between the most highly prized traits in the ads and those traits most highly prized by practitioners in the field. The ads cited

“commitment” (associated with EI component no. 3, motivation) most frequently, while the practitioners cited “visionary” as the most important trait. The Hernon & Rossiter article concludes that “[library] leadership might be defined in terms of emotional intelligence,” and therefore merits closer scrutiny.

Although a few other discussions of EI and library leadership appear in library and information science literature (Eidson, 2000; Nazarova, 2002; Rovenger, 2000) these are non-research pieces. One must go outside the LIS field to find other empirical studies.

In their research Dulewicz and Higgs (1999) asked if emotional intelligence could be measured or developed. They devised a questionnaire intended to compare emotional intelligence competencies with the EI five concepts construct. The questionnaire was piloted on 201 managers attending a variety of management programs at Henley Management College in England and results showed that all the elements of the EI questionnaire were “significantly correlated with the EQ competences with the exception of sensitivity, conscientiousness and integrity.” Dulewicz and Higgs conclude that with the ability to effectively measure EI and given that EI is a predictor of “advancement within an organisation,” there “could be a relationship between EI and effective leadership.” (1999)

The results of another study by David Rosete and Joseph Ciarrochi suggested that “executives higher on EI are more likely to achieve business outcomes and be considered effective as leaders by their subordinates and direct manager.” (2005) The sample from

which the results were taken was fairly small (41 participants) and the instrument was the Mayer-Salovey, Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCET) which consists of eight different tasks--two tasks devoted to the four branches of emotional intelligence (i.e. perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions) identified by J. D. Mayer and P. Salovey (1997) Nevertheless, the results bear upon this study in that they revealed that "EI, and specifically the capacity to perceive emotions, was able to predict effective leadership." (2005)

### Objectives

The objectives of the study are to compare the preferred traits for library leaders cited by authors of articles on library leadership with the traits cited in the Herson-Rossiter lists of preferred traits. The comparison includes counting the number of times each of the ninety-six traits was referred to in the articles and listing any additional traits not included in the Herson-Rossiter lists, as well as ranking the most frequently and least frequently cited traits.

### Research Questions

Is there a correspondence between the traits most frequently cited in the Herson & Rossiter study and the traits most frequently cited by the authors of the articles? Are there traits cited in the articles that do not fit (easily or at all) into the Goleman EI construct? How valuable is the Goleman EI construct for identifying those traits most likely to contribute to effective leadership of academic libraries?



## Procedures

A convenience sample of five books was selected for data collection: *Leadership in the Library/Information Profession* (Gertzog, 1989); *Leadership and Academic Librarians* (Mech & McCabe, 1998); *Library Communication: the Language of Leadership* (Riggs, 1991); *Leadership in the Library and Information Science Profession: Theory and Practice* (Winston, 2001); *Leadership for Research Libraries: A Festschrift for Robert M. Hayes* (Woodsworth & Wahle, 1988).

All traits in the Herson-Rossiter lists were tabulated in Excel worksheets. The contents of the essays (including the editors' introductory essays) were then analyzed and a mark made in the appropriate table and trait row each time one was referred to as desirable in a library leader. If a trait was mentioned multiple times within a single paragraph it counted for only a single reference however if the same trait was referred to again in a separate paragraph and reflecting a new train of thought but within the same essay it was counted as a separate reference. Traits that did not match any of the traits in the Herson-Rossiter lists were also tracked and matched to the five EI components.

## Findings - Self-Awareness

Each of the twenty-three traits associated by Herson and Rossiter with the EI component self-awareness was cited at least once in the analyzed essays as a preferred trait for library leaders. Rankings based on total points given in either of the studies resulted in little correspondence, with agreement only on the second most highly ranked trait (self-

confidence. (Table 1) Taking an average of the total points for each trait showed greater agreement between the data. (Table 2)

Table 1

*Self Awareness - Highest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Assertiveness	22	4
Self-confidence	20	20
Drive for task completion	19	5
Absence of ego	16	8
Respect for scholarship, learning, teaching	15	1

Table 2

*Self Awareness - Highest Rated Trait Based on Combined Average*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Rank/Average</i>
Cognitive ability to deal with complex scenarios	1
Self-confidence	2
Realistic understanding of oneself; emotions, strengths, weaknesses...	3
Know where he or she is taking the organization	4
Respect for individuality and diversity	5 (tie)
Sense of humor	5 (tie)

*Note. Ranks in the above table are based on the average of the total number of points given for all traits associated with a particular EI component in the Herson-Rossiter tables. (2006)*

Fifteen out of the 23 traits in the Herson-Rossiter list for self-awareness received less than ten citations in the essays and one of those traits was ranked second most valued trait in the Herson & Rossiter study. (Table 3)

Table 3

*Self Awareness - Lowest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Narcissism (an acceptable level)	1	1
Recognize how one’s feelings affect others, one’s work	2	13
Intuition	5	9
Willingness to tolerate frustration and delay	5	5
Resilient	5	13

There were also a total of 27 points given to unique traits each of which was mentioned at least once. (See appendix for complete list.) Those traits that received more than one mention were: professional credentials such as a Ph.D., communicating the teaching role of librarians, sharing power, truth-seeking, and risk-taking. How do these traits fit the paradigm of self-awareness? “People with strong self-awareness are neither overly critical nor unrealistically hopeful,” says Goleman, “rather they are honest--with

themselves and others.” (2004) Looking at the achievement of the Ph.D. or other doctoral level credential, it can only be assumed that the professional and personal sacrifices made in successful candidacy such qualifications reflects a high level of understanding about what one can and cannot afford or achieve. “Self-awareness extends to a person’s understanding of his or her values and goals,” continues Goleman. (2004)

Communicating the teaching role of librarians could likewise be seen to result from an inner understanding of one of the most important aspects of one’s profession. “People who assess themselves honestly--that is, self-aware people--are well suited to do the same for the organizations they run,” Goleman asserts. (2004) Extending the analogy further, such people are well-suited to honestly assessing and characterizing their professions.

Sharing power and truth-seeking are likewise relate closely to the type of person who is “recognized by their self-confidence ... [and] a firm grasp of their [own] capabilities [and those of others]” (2004); they apply the skill of candid self-analysis internally and externally and are unflinchingly realistic. “When managers feel vulnerable,” say management theorists Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal, “they revert to self-protection ... and escalate games of camouflage and deception [and] ... no one wants to be the one to speak the truth.” (2003, p. 167)

The combined total of points from both studies given to traits associated with self-awareness was 550 however a combined average of 22.916 given to any one trait makes

self-awareness overall the component least valued among the five EI components.

(Appendix)

#### Findings - Self-Regulation

There was no correspondence between the essay rankings and the Herson-Rossiter rankings of traits associated with self-regulation (Table 4) however as with the previous list of traits each out of the total twenty-five in the Herson-Rossiter table received at least one mention in the essays. The top-rated characteristic “comfortable with change” received 30 points. The point spread in the essays ranged from a high of 30 points to a low of one point.

Table 4

#### *Self Regulation - Highest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Comfortable with change	30	13
Realistic organizational awareness	13	13
Trustworthy	22	10
Think “outside the box”	21	10
Integrity	18	26

Averaging the combined totals for each of the traits reveals greater correspondence between the two studies, with complete agreement between on the most highly valued

trait (comfortable with change) and the second most highly valued trait (realistic organizational awareness.)

Table 5

*Self Regulation - Highest Rated Traits Based on Combined Average*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Rank/Average</i>
Comfortable with change	1
Realistic organizational awareness	2
Comfortable with ambiguity	3
Stable temperament with ability to maintain emotional balance...	4
Skill at diagnostic, strategic, and tactical reasoning	5

Only four traits in the Hernon-Rossiter list were cited less than ten times in the essays and none of them ranked particularly high in either study. The traits of endurance and even-handedness received the identical number of points, with endurance coming in the lowest. This is not to say that endurance doesn't count but only that it is not as important compared with so many others.

Table 6

*Self Regulation - Lowest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Endurance	1	1
Ability to figure out what's going on without being told	2	15
Diplomatic	2	14
Ability to compromise	3	16
Even-handed	4	4

A total of 26 points were also given to 23 traits not found in the Herson-Rossiter table of traits associated with self-regulation however only two traits received more than a single point: decisive, and generous. It is not difficult to see how these traits correspond to Goleman's definition of self-regulation. Decisiveness requires the ability to balance the impulse to action with fear of the consequences of the action. That balance requires "emotional self-regulation" and the ability to "roll with the changes... suspend judgment, seek out information ... listen" and then move forward with new initiatives. (Golman 2004) Generosity is likewise an act of self-regulation and this trait closely matches the traits of "accessible to others" and "tolerate some mistakes" that Herson and Rossiter associate with the EI component motivation. "Accessible to others" might be seen in a library director who by and large responds enthusiastically to unexpected interruptions in her daily activities or unexpected demands for her attention; a director who makes the time to wander through the library and greet patrons and staff; a director who also does

not rush to point out the flaws in others, but makes a conscious effort to question on those mistakes that are of significance. It would be hard to argue that these characteristics come completely naturally to anyone and don't require a measure of self-regulation.

The total number of points for self-regulation came to 613 while 47.15 was the average number of points given to any trait in this table, making self-regulation the most highly valued of the EI components.

#### Findings - Motivation

Correspondence between the two studies was dramatically achieved for the trait of "visionary." This trait received more mentions than any other of the total of 96 traits and almost twice as many mentions as any other trait in the list of traits associated with motivation. "The challenge," wrote Donald E. Riggs, "is to become skilled in the 'art of seeing' and in the 'art of reading' the future of libraries. Dreams, ideas, and even metaphors may be helpful in developing the mental model of the 21st century library." (1998)

How is vision associated with the EI component of motivation? It is the "passion for the work itself" as opposed to the drive for "external rewards" as well as "commitment to the organization" and "optimism" that contribute to a strong visionary bent in leaders who will then communicate that vision to "build a team of managers around them with the same traits." (Goleman, 2004)



There was also a correspondence between the two studies and the second most highly valued trait: motivate people to develop and adhere to a shared vision. Although the two studies diverged on the third most valued trait and another “vision” thing, (articulate direction for the library), the point spread was a mere three, and the trait was ranked fourth most highly valued trait in the Hernon & Rossiter study.

Table 7

*Motivation - Highest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Visionary--able to build a shared vision ... rally others	60	36
Motivate people to develop and adhere to shared vision	36	31
Articulate direction for the library	33	29
Encourage reasonable risk-taking	29	26
Nurture staff	25	9

Averaging the total points for each trait demonstrated again a much higher correspondence overall between the rankings in the two studies (Table 8) with the traits of “encourage reasonable risk-taking” and “optimism even in the face of failure” natural complements to ‘the vision thing.’

Table 8

*Motivation - Highest Rated Traits Based on Combined Average*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Rank/Average</i>
Visionary--able to build a shared vision ... rally others	1
Motivate people to develop and adhere to shared vision	2
Articulate direction for the library	3
Encourage reasonable risk-taking	4
Optimism (even in the face of failure)	5

Four of the 19 traits in the list associated with motivation scored less than ten points and for the first time there were traits that received no mention in the essays whatsoever as highly valued characteristics for library leadership. (Table 9)

Table 9

*Motivation - Lowest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Figure out what's going on without being told	0	5
Understand small group dynamics	0	3
Driven to achieve beyond expectations	3	14
Mobilize individual commitment	9	10

Sixteen additional traits came out in the essays, of which four received more than one mention: action-oriented, inspired, ambitious, and leads by example. In this case ambitious appeared to refer to a more material form of drive than the ambition Goleman described as a “passion for the work itself.” (2004). In his comments on the nurturing of future leaders, Robert Wedgeworth says, “We will still be looking, however, for students who are ambitious to do well in the profession... who are confident and cocky.” (1989) This characteristic sounds more like the drive for professional prestige which it may have been the fashion in another era to associate with business leaders.

The traits Hernon and Rossiter associated with the EI component motivation received a combined total of 701 points and an average of 35.05 for any one trait within the table, giving motivation a cumulative rank of third most critical element of emotional intelligence.

#### Findings - Empathy

It is notable that in the Hernon/Rossiter study the EI component of empathy was associated with the fewest traits, a total of only ten and still showing minimal correspondence between the two studies in terms of rankings based on total number of points given to each trait (Table 10); however the average number of points for the traits was quite high (42 points) making empathy the second most valued of the EI components. It is also worth noting that there was only a 17 point difference between the highest and lowest rated traits in data taken from the essays.

Table 10

*Empathy - Highest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Good listener	23	33
Keep organization focused on high-quality service	16	37
Comfortable with team culture	14	24
Thoughtfully consider the feelings of others	14	14
Treat people with dignity/respect	14	54

Rankings based on the average number of points for each trait showed a closer correspondence. (Table 11)

Table 11

*Empathy - Highest Rated Traits Based on Combined Average*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Rank/Average</i>
Treat people with dignity/respect	1
Good interpersonal skills	2 (tie)
Good listener	2 (tie)
Keep organization focused on high-quality service	3
Good judgment	4

Only three traits received fewer than ten points. (Table 12)

Table 12

*Empathy - Lowest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Cross-cultural sensitivity and record of achievement	6	12
Good judgment	6	36
Attract, build and retain talent	9	46

Fourteen additional traits were referred to in the essays did not specifically appear in the Herson-Rossiter list however only one received more than a single point: trusting [in others.] Although trustworthiness is a trait that Herson and Rossiter associate with the EI component of self-regulation, the ability to trust in others is not the same characteristic but could be seen as one of the most crucial.

“Consider the challenge of leading a team. As anyone who has ever been part of one can attest, teams are cauldrons of bubbling emotions. They are often charged with reaching a consensus... A team’s leader must be able to sense and understand the viewpoints of everyone around the table.” (Goleman, 2004)

The final sentence could have justifiably made the claim that a team’s leader must be able to sense, understand and trust the viewpoints of everyone at the table. Goleman also makes the point that empathy plays an important role in retention of talent through coaching and mentorship (2004). A key way in which a leader can encourage and cultivate staff is to demonstrate trust in their abilities, even to the point of tactfully ignoring or collegially working through some shortcomings or mistakes.

The cumulative total of all points given to traits associated with empathy was 462 and the average number of points given to any single trait was 42, making empathy the second most valued of the EI components.

#### Findings - Social Skill

The Hernon Rossiter study identified 19 traits associated with the EI component social skill. The essays yielded a difference of 21 points between the highest ranked trait and the lowest. Between the two studies there was a modest correspondence among the top rated traits in that same traits appear in both lists albeit with slight variations in rank.

(Table 13)

Table 13

#### *Social Skill - Highest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Build rapport with a wide circle of people	21	24
Collaborative	24	23
Advocate for librarians' role in higher education	18	11
Bring issues of broad importance to the acad. community	10	19
Ability to gather outside resources	15	20

There were a total of nine traits that received fewer than ten points according to the data taken from the essays and five receiving five or fewer points. Of these traits, none

received more than 12 points in the Herson-Rossiter study, suggesting agreement on those traits least valued. (Table 14)

Table 14

*Social Skill - Lowest Rated Traits in Essays*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>H-R Points</i>
Expertise in building and leading teams	1	10
Consensus-building in carrying out strategic direction	3	12
Friendly (with a purpose)	4	4
Help people in meetings, consortia be results-oriented	4	7
Good people/networking skills	5	12

Nine additional traits came from the essays. Promotion/salesmanship was the one trait that received more than a single point. This trait no doubt draws upon self-awareness and the related ability to make a realistic evaluation of one’s organization, however the aptitude for promotion and sales requires a person with social skill, which according to Goleman is someone who “doesn’t think it desirable to arbitrarily limit the scope of their relationships,” and someone who can “build bonds widely...” Goleman also indicates that people with social skill are “expert persuaders.” (2004)

The points given to the Herson-Rossiter list of traits associated with social skill totaled 540 for both studies, with an average of twenty-seven points per trait, making social skill the fourth most valued among the EI components.

## Findings - Traits Not Associated with Emotional Intelligence

The essays also revealed 11 additional traits or competencies considered desirable in academic library leaders, including a background in higher education, business savvy, charisma, committed to doing no harm, fiscal savvy, maintain order, subject specialist, technological orientation, and a strong undergraduate education. None of these traits or competencies stands out as particularly surprising or even uniquely suitable for leading libraries. There was however one trait that will be referred to here as info-social sensitivity and was characterized by such phrases as the ability to “define the information society” and have a “knowledge of information seeking behavior.” It was also associated with the ideal of being able to not just comfortably adapt to change but actually anticipate change. Writes Beverly P. Lynch,

“Clearly what is before us is the realization that we must know and learn as much as we can about the present and future technologies so as to participate in a meaningful way in the necessary decision-making regarding our libraries and the services they provide.” (1988, p. 77)

Donald E. Riggs puts it another way when he says,

“Managing change is not good enough. We must anticipate, plan and lead change. With the impact of the evolving library technology, some librarians who have been successful in the past may not be successful in the future if they continue doing things they have been doing in the past. Their learning process will have to change significantly; for example, they will have to talk with different people, listen to different people, and in a sense they will have to unlearn those activities that brought them success in the past.” (2001, p. 10)

## Reliability, Validity, and Limitations

The selection of the five books used for the current study was based on the fact that each volume was devoted entirely to essays on the characteristics and competences of library leaders; that each was a collection of essays by a variety of writers rather than the



writings of a single author; and that each volume was included in the library collection of the Simmons Graduate School of Library and Information Science, presumed to be a collection discriminatingly formed in support of high pedagogical standards for the education of librarians. It is not possible for five books to adequately represent all ideas on library leadership however based on the third criterion for their selection they might be seen as a reliable sample of what has been published on the subject between 1988 and 2001.

The methodology relied heavily upon the judgment of Peter Hernon, Nancy Rossiter and the author of this paper, each of whom brought varying types and degrees of knowledge and bias to their contributions. This reliance would put more strain upon the reliability than the validity of the findings. To claim that the Goleman construct of emotional intelligence applies quite comprehensively to characterizing effective library leaders would seem to have high content validity considering the broad range of traits that the data from both studies corroborated as valuable. Would another researcher reading the same five books come up with precisely the same numbers? Chances are good that they would not. Nevertheless, chances are also good that the numbers would not differ significantly enough to ultimately cast doubt on the value of the emotional intelligence construct as a useful one for characterizing what is needed in a library leader.

## Discussion

The results of this study demonstrate that the traits Hernon and Rossiter associated with the Goleman framework of emotional intelligence are relevant to a discussion of the best

qualifications for library directors. It is significant that only two out of the total 96 traits received no mention in the analyzed essays. It is also significant that the additional characteristics identified from the essays fit easily into the Goleman framework although there is some subjectivity in determination of which EI component a trait associates with most closely. Only the trait of info-social sensitivity seemed to reflect an intelligence combining both insight into knowledge management and an aptitude for sociological analysis. The study does also leave some unanswered questions. Many of the essays used as the basis for the data presented ideal library leadership traits that were matters of opinion based on perceptions unsubstantiated by empirical research. One persistent question is whether or not it is possible to conclusively identify evidence of leadership. Are there outcomes that can be categorically seen to rely on leadership effectiveness? What are these outcomes and how could the influence of leadership be measured? If the influence of leadership can in fact be reliably measured then it would be incumbent upon all those interested in the future of the profession of library and information scientists to find a framework with which to accurately and succinctly convey the ideal characteristics of library leaders.

### Reporting

The results of this study would be of interest to decision makers in an academic library setting and would ideally be presented in association with a discussion of performance reviews (particularly but not exclusively for managers), or in association with a discussion of the hiring process. It would be of considerable use for administrators to be able to identify (or have identified for them through some collaborative process) the goals and

objectives of an organization or the goals and objectives for a particular staff position and associate these with the EI components best suited to achieving those goals.

## Conclusion

The desire and need to characterize the traits of leaders will no doubt persist as long as the world continues to be a place of continuous transformation, and libraries along with it. “Revolutionary shifts in the operational structures of our world seem to call for new definitions of who we are and what we are here for.” (Zander & Zander, 2000) In defining the ideal traits for leaders we are expressing ideas about who we want to be, how we want to be cultivated, where we want to go. The good news is that the analysis of leadership in general and library leadership in particular is all about intelligence which the Random House dictionary defines as the “capacity for reasoning, understanding, and for similar forms of mental activity.” (Urdang & Flexner, 1972) A determination of which types of intelligence are most important would seem to some extent to be situational. The challenges of any particular organization at any given time may call for aptitudes associated with either high IQ or high EQ. If the results of the current study demonstrate anything it is that many and most of the traits associated with emotional intelligence are indeed very valuable in leadership for libraries. Are high levels of these traits more valuable than high levels of the traits typically associated with high IQ? It was suggested in some of the essays that a certain level of intellectual preeminence contributed strongly to an ideal profile for a library leader. Perhaps the question to ask is whether or not a high quotient of one type of intelligence is exclusive of a high quotient

of the other, and if so, which is the more important. Informed speculation is that a balanced combination of high EQ and high IQ makes for an ideal leader.

## References

- Bolman, L. G., Deal, Terrence E. (2003). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dulewicz, V., Higgs, M. (1999). Can emotional intelligence be measured and developed? *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 20, 242-252.
- Euster, J. R. (1988). *The Academic Library Director: Management Activities and Effectiveness*. New York: Greenwood.
- Gertzog, A. (1989). *Leadership in the Library/Information Profession*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 82, 82-91.
- Grewal, D., Salovey, P. (2005). Feeling smart: the science of emotional intelligence. *American Scientist*, 93, 330-339.
- Hernon, P. (2003). *The Next Library Leadership: Attributes of Academic and Public Library Directors*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Hernon, P., Powell, R. R., & Young, A. P. (2001). Association of Research Libraries: the next generation, part one. *College & Research Libraries*, 62, 116-145.
- Hernon, P., Powell, R. R. & Young, A. P. (2002). Association of Research Libraries: the next generation, part two. *College & Research Libraries*, 63, 73-90.
- Hernon, P., Rossiter, N. (in press). Emotional intelligence: which traits are most prized? *College & Research Libraries*.
- Lynch, B. P. (1988). Changes in library organization. In Woodsworth, A., and Von Wahlde, B. *Leadership for Research Libraries: A Festschrift for Robert M. Hayes*. (pp. 67-77). Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P. (1997). *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational Implications*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mech, T. F., McCabe, G. B. (1998) *Leadership and Academic Librarians*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and Effective leadership, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22, 5-10.
- Riggs, D. E. (1998). *Library Communication: The Language of Leadership*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Riggs, D. E. (1998). Visionary leadership. In T. F. Mech & G. B. McCabe (Eds.), *Leadership and Academic Librarians* (pp. 55-65). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Riggs, D. E. (2001). The crisis and opportunities in library leadership. In Winston, M. D. (Ed.). *Leadership in the Library and Information Science Professions: Theory and Practice*. (pp. 5-17). New York: Haworth.
- Rosete, D., Ciarrochi, J. (2005). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace Performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26, 388-399.
- Urdang, L., Flexner, S. B. (1972). *The Random House College Dictionary*. (Unabridged ed.). New York: Random House.
- Weiner, S. G. (2003). Leadership of academic libraries: a literature review, *Education Libraries*, 26, 5-18.
- Winston, M. D. (2001). *Leadership in the Library and Information Science Professions: Theory and Practice*. New York: Haworth.

Wedgeworth, R. (1989). Nurturing leadership: a personal view. In Gertzog, A. (Ed.), *Leadership in the Library/Information Profession*, (pp. 35-42). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Woodsworth, A., Von Wahlde, B. (1988). *Leadership for Research Libraries: A Festschrift for Robert M. Hayes*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Zander, R. S., Zander, B. (2000). *The Art of Possibility*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.