ILLINOIS

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

PRODUCTION NOTE

University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign Library
Large-scale Digitization Project, 2007.

Occasional Papers

Nos. 198/199 June 1995

Critical Issues in Library Management
Organizing for Leadership and Decision-Making

Papers from the Thirty-Fifth Allerton Institute

Edited by

Bryce L. Allen and Terry L. Weech

The Library of the
NOV 03 1995
University of Illinois
of Urbana-Champaign

Graduate School of Library and Information Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

CRITICAL ISSUES IN LIBRARY MANAGEMENT

Organizing for Leadership and Decision-Making

Papers from the Thirty-Fifth Allerton Institute

Edited by
Bryce L. Allen and Terry L. Weech

© 1995 The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois

Manufactured in the United States of America
Printed on acid-free paper

OCCASIONAL PAPERS deal with any aspect of librarianship and consist of papers that are too long or too detailed for publication in a periodical or that are of specialized or temporary interest. Manuscripts for inclusion in this series are invited and should be sent to: OCCASIONAL PAPERS, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, The Publications Office, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 501 E. Daniel Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

Papers in this series are issued irregularly, and no more often than monthly. Individual copies may be ordered; back issues are available. Please check with the publisher. *All orders must be accompanied by payment.* Standing orders may also be established. Send orders to: OCCASIONAL PAPERS, The Publications Office, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 501 E. Daniel Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820. Telephone 217-333-1359. Make checks payable to University of Illinois. Visa and Mastercard accepted.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Leigh Estabrook, F. Wilfred Lancaster, Roger Sutton
Terry Weech, Robert Wedgeworth

Introduction 1
Bryce L. Allen and Terry L. Weech

Learning about Leadership:
What Works in Modern Organizations 3
Barbara B. Moran

The Leader as Decision-Maker: When Centralized
Decisions Become Imperative 19
Herbert S. White

Staff as Decision-Makers: The Merits of
Decentralized Decision-Making 29
Maurice P. Marchant

Making Human Resource Decisions 37
Richard E. Rubin

The Role of Leadership in Planning: A Frank and
Candid Anaysis of the Realities of Planning
in the Public Sector 57
Nancy Bolt

Remembrances of Things Past 73
Tom Eadie

INTRODUCTION

The title of this Occasional Paper, "Critical Issues in Library Management: Organizing for Leadership and Decision-Making," implies that somewhere in any library's organization there must be someone or some group to provide leadership, and someone or some group to make decisions. The library that lacks leadership lacks the vision necessary to transform itself. Without leadership, it is likely to subside into "business as usual" that becomes increasing irrelevant as the world changes around it. The library that lacks decision-making cannot deal with any of the important day-to-day decisions that define the character of the library.

So both are needed. Yet, somehow, leadership and decision-making seem to require different approaches. Many librarians have been convinced of the value of participative decision-making, but are they equally convinced of the value of participative leadership? Does that idea even make sense? On the other hand, a strong leader with a vision for the future of the library may be reluctant to have the implementation of that vision bogged down in the endless committee meetings that seem the hallmark of participative decision-making.

This, then, is the conundrum addressed by the papers* which were presented at the Thirty-Fifth Allerton Park Conference (October 24-26, 1993) sponsored by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: how can libraries successfully combine leadership and decision-making in their organizations?

This discussion has a number of components. Barbara Moran's keynote address provides a pathway through the voluminous literature on leadership and discusses current concepts relevant to those seeking to provide leadership in libraries. The papers by Herb White and Mike Marchant present different viewpoints on decision-making, and so set the stage for a wide-ranging discussion of how leadership and decision-making can co-exist within an organization.

This discussion then branches out into a number of specific areas of decision-making. Rick Rubin, and Nancy Bolt, discuss different focuses for leadership and decision-making in libraries. How can librarians provide leadership, and engage in appropriate decision-making, in personnel matters, and in long-range planning?

Finally, the paper by Tom Eadie addresses the environment in which leadership and decision-making occur. Labor management relations and collegiality both constrain the choices we can make in organizing for leadership and decision-making. Similarly, leadership and decision-making frequently occur in a collaborative environment, in which the preferences of one organization must be weighed against those of another.

There are no simple answers to the issues raised here. If there were, we could have published the answers in a how-to-do-it manual rather than bringing together the participants to debate the issues. It is our hope that the discussion will lead the reader to think deeply and creatively about how their libraries are organized, and that this process will lead to more effective types of library organization that will facilitate the leadership and decision-making so desperately needed by libraries.

Bryce L. Allen
Terry L. Weech
Editors

---

*In addition to the papers presented in this volume, the conference included a session by J. Brett Sutton, Assistant Professor, GSLIS, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and Joseph F. Porac, Associate Professor, College of Commerce and Business Administration, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign on "New Technology and Change in Organizations." Robert Wedgeworth, University Librarian, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, also presented a session on "Collaborative Decision-Making on National Library and Information Issues." The contributions of these individuals to the conference is gratefully acknowledged by the editors.

LEARNING ABOUT LEADERSHIP: WHAT WORKS IN MODERN ORGANIZATIONS

Barbara B. Moran

INTRODUCTION

> Of all the hazy and confounding areas in social psychology, leadership theory undoubtedly contends for top nomination. And, ironically, probably more has been written and less is known about leadership than about any other topic in the behavioral sciences. Always, it seems, the concept of leadership eludes us or turns up in another form to taunt us again with its slipperiness and complexity. (Bennis, 1959, pp. 259-260)

It is commonly believed that we are suffering from a "leadership crisis" in our society. We are dissatisfied with our leaders and confused about the type of leadership we want. In sectors as diverse as the federal government, higher education, and librarianship, the questions are the same. Where are the leaders we need, and why do so many promising individuals fail to live up to our expectations once they assume leadership positions?

James MacGregor Burns (1984), one of this country's most astute scholars of leadership, begins his book, *The Power to Lead,* with a description of the inauguration of a new president:

> After years of witnessing government in the hands often of well-intentioned mediocrities or outright scoundrels, here was a man of fine ethical standards, with a kind of sunny morality. After years of drift and deadlock and delay in government, here was a man of proved competence, tough, demanding, clearheaded . . . who had come from "nowhere" to win the Democratic presidential nomination and then knock off an incumbent President. (p. 25)

Burns (1984), of course, was writing about President Jimmy Carter, a leader who initially was viewed with immense expectations but who, four years later, left office "amid almost universal judgment that his Administration had been largely a failure" (p. 28). It is discouraging to see the same pattern seemingly repeating itself with President Clinton, whose entrance into office was accompanied by such high hopes on the part of many citizens, but whose tenure thus far has not lived up to the, perhaps unrealistic, expectations associated with it. Frank Rich (1993) recently described our country's "disillusioned mood as it lowers its expectations for a golden boy who did become President. America, so maniacally high with hope in the weeks surrounding the Inauguration, has since suffered its own psychic crash landing" (p. 42).

Those "crash landings" occur too frequently today. It is puzzling, because as a nation we profess to be seeking leadership, but almost as soon as someone assumes a leadership position, once the leader is anointed, we begin to look for evidence that he or she is failing. At times, it seems as though we delight in tearing down our leaders, in exposing the clay feet. We look for faults and question the individual's judgments and actions. Small wonder then that we are quickly disillusioned.

There are few national leaders who inspire us anymore. In fact, there are probably more that offend us than excite us. And, even more distressing, there are a growing number of Americans who look up to no one, who doubt that leadership can exist. They are the extreme cynics—the ones who have bumper stickers reading, "Don't Vote—It Will Only Encourage Them" (Bennis, 1989, p. xi). Never before does it seem that leaders have been held in lower regard. We often blame the media for destroying our faith in leadership, but regardless of the cause, people in leadership positions today are viewed with great skepticism. As Bennis (1989) writes:

> It is both an irony and a paradox that precisely at the time when trust in and credibility of leaders are lowest, when people are both angry and cynical, the nation most needs leaders, people who can transcend the vacuum. (p. 144)

Although many of the laments about the lack of leadership are focused on national leaders, especially those elected to high office, the problems do not end there. We see the same type of gap between our expectations and reality in many other arenas, including libraries. The challenges facing libraries over the next decades are immense, but the leaders for the transition, those individuals who will guide us through the uncharted waters of tomorrow, have not yet emerged. There are many competent managers, but few that seem to possess a clear vision of the future and the knowledge of how to get from here to there. And, in librarianship as in other areas, the same troubling pattern exists. Too often, after individuals have been chosen for leadership positions, they quickly lose their luster.

It is more difficult for individuals to assume leadership roles now for a number of reasons. In the past, people were far less likely to question the authority of a leader. Today's leader must try to inspire confidence and trust in followers who are likely to be at least partially distrustful of authority of all types. Michael Maccoby (1979), for one, is concerned that the traditional forms of leadership do not work any longer. He writes:

> I believe that there is a crisis of authority, a questioning of its legitimacy, because neither the functions of leadership nor the image of the leader fit the needs of large organizations, especially business and government in an age of rights, limits, new values, and a changing concept of productivity, which have not yet crystallized into a new ideal character. (p. 17).

In another work, Maccoby (1981) describes the problem yet again:

> The old models of leadership no longer work. In an age of individual rights, paternal protectors appear patronizing. In an age of limits, seductive promises fall flat. In an age of self-expression, even rational authority may seem oppressive. Searching for direction, but critical of anyone who controls us, we look for new leaders, as much in fear that we will find them as that we will not. (p. 23)

That last phrase seems particularly pertinent: "We look for new leaders, as much in fear that we will find them as that we will not." We constantly lament the lack of leadership in our society. From all sides come calls for better, more effective leadership. Improved leadership is touted as the cure for much of what ails our society's institutions and organizations. But, at the same time, we deeply mistrust leaders. As Herb White (1987) has written, "We believe in leaders and in leadership, but on a personal basis, few of us want to be led" (p. 68).

Since ours is basically an antiauthoritarian age, it is not surprising that it is easier to diagnose the need for more effective leadership than to effect the cure. It is no wonder that so many contemporary leaders fail, when the often turbulent, complex, and crisis-ridden environment in which leadership must now be provided is combined with the modern dislike of accepting authority of any type. Whatever type of leader we have chosen, whether authoritarian or laissez-faire, whether outsider or insider, whether older or younger, something is always less than perfect, something fails to live up to our expectations. We bring that leader down and begin to look for another; the cycle goes on and on.

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

It is hard to be anything but downcast as one reviews the literature on the topic of contemporary leadership. There are as many prescriptions for improving leadership as there are complaints about the current state of leadership in this society and its institutions. Unfortunately, many of the prescriptions for change are contradictory and shortsighted.

First, let us look at leadership as it is defined by the experts. Researchers have long been interested in the subject of leadership, and one of the responses to this concern about leadership, or the lack thereof, has been an outpouring of literature on the topic. Literally thousands of books, articles, and presentations have been devoted to the subject, and there has been an abundance of both research and analysis. This literature is full of copious and often conflicting advice for those who would succeed as leaders, and much that has been written is neither helpful nor illuminating. It has been said that "leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Burns, 1978, p. 2). Leadership is a difficult subject to understand because it defies easy analysis. Indeed, it is even a difficult term to define. Almost every book or article defines leadership, but often these definitions do not agree with one another.

Rost (1991), in a recent review of the literature of leadership, found 331 different definitions of leadership in works written since the turn of the century (pp. 44, 70). To give the flavor of some of the variability in definition, just a few will be helpful.

Philip Selznick (1957), a sociologist, viewed a leader as someone who infused an organization with values; someone who molded the social character of the institution. In his view, "leadership goes beyond efficiency (1) when it sets the basic mission of the organization and (2) when it creates a social organism capable of fulfilling that mission" (pp. 135-136). Robert Tannenbaum, Irving Weschler, and Fred Massarik (1961) defined leadership as consisting of interpersonal influence exercised in a situation and directed by means of the communication process towards attainment of a specified goal or goals. In their opinion, leadership always involves the attempts by a leader to affect or influence the behavior of a follower or followers (p. 24). Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (1982) state that leadership is "the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation" (p. 83). They hold that the leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower, and other situational variables. Harold Koontz, Cyril O'Donnell, and Heinz Weihrich (1986) define leadership as "influence, the art or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly and enthusiastically toward the achievement of group goals" (p. 397). According to them, to lead is to guide, conduct, direct, and precede. Leaders do not stand behind a group to push or prod, but they place themselves before the group as they facilitate progress and inspire the group to accomplish the organizational aims. James MacGregor Burns (1978) has defined leadership as being exercised when "persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers" (p. 18).

Regardless of how leadership is defined, there are certain elements that are usually present in the definition. The words "influence," "vision," "mission," and "goals" are usually found in the definitions. It is commonly accepted that an effective leader has the ability to influence others in a desired direction and, thus, is able to determine the extent to which both individual employees and the organization as a whole reach their goals. Leadership transforms organizational potential into reality.

Because leaders often function in an organizational or institutional setting, the terms *manager* and *leader* are closely related, but they are not the same. Bennis and Nanus (1985) have delineated the difference between leaders and managers, as follows:

> "To manage" means "to bring about, to accomplish, to have charge of or responsibility for, to conduct." "Leading" is "influencing, guiding in direction, course, action, opinion." The distinction is crucial. *Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing.* The difference may be summarized as activities of vision and judgment—*effectiveness* versus activities of mastering routines—*efficiency*. (p. 21)

Although some authors still fail to differentiate between the terms "manager" and "leader," more commonly a distinction is made. Leaders are needed to "light the way to the future and to inspire people to achieve excellence" (Manske, 1990, p. 7). Managers are needed to ensure that the organization operates well on a day-to-day basis. Individuals can be good managers without being leaders. Our organizations need good managers. We want individuals to see "that the trains run on time." Effective managers are highly valued by those who work for them because good managers facilitate employees getting their jobs done. Of course, some managers may also be leaders, but we should be careful not to denigrate what managers do by assuming that they are failures if they are not also leaders.[1] Leadership may not be as important to an organization which is enjoying a favorable, nonturbulent environment. But, when an organization needs innovation more than standardization, it needs a leader, rather than a manager, as CEO. An organization may be managed well but led poorly (Bennis, 1989, p. 17).

If managers and leaders are not synonymous, are there qualities that every leader possesses? It must always be remembered that there is no one model of a successful leader, and leaders differ in different cultures and historical periods. But despite this variability, according to most experts, each leader must fulfill two major roles. First, a leader must exercise power wisely and efficiently, and, second, each leader must through actions, appearance, and articulated values, present a model that others will want to emulate (Maccoby, 1981, p. 14). Let us look at these two roles a little more closely.

The first role, that of exercising power wisely and efficiently, obviously has close connections to what a good manager does. A leader must be temperate and fair, must set objectives, and see that they are carried out, and must make good decisions. So, the characteristics that we usually associate with a good manager are also found in a good leader.

The second role, that of presenting a model that others will want to emulate, is the aspect of leadership that is often called "vision," (or "the vision thing," as George Bush would say). A leader must provide a vision, a difficult undertaking in itself, and a lack of vision is one of the major problems of leaders today. As Henry Steele Commager (1979) wrote a few years ago:

> One of the most obvious explanations of the failure of leadership in our time is that so few of our leaders—and our potential leaders—seem to have any road map. It is hard to lead when you yourself are in a labyrinth. (p. 1)

Although a leader must present a vision so that an organization will not drift aimlessly, presenting a vision is not enough. A leader must have his or her vision accepted by the followers; the followers must buy into the vision and adopt that vision as their own. They must be energized so that the vision can be accomplished (Manske, 1990, p. 5). With an effective leader at the helm, the goals of the leader and the followers are meshed and congruent.

Walt Whitman once said, "To have great poets, one must have great audiences." In a similar manner, to have great leaders, you must have great followers. It is evident that someone cannot be considered a leader unless he or she has followers. When leaders fail, it is often because they have not been able to create a vision that is shared. A leader sometimes positions himself or herself in front of the pack and neglects to look back, thus failing to discover that there is no one following at all. We have probably all seen the cartoons depicting sled dogs running across frozen terrain. Often, the joke is that the lead dog is running as fast as possible without ever noticing that the other dogs and the sled are no longer behind. It doesn't just happen to dogs. Often, people are hired in an organization or elected to an office, and they bring with them a predetermined vision that they want to see fulfilled. They begin to move too quickly, before their vision is accepted by the individuals who are going to have to carry it out. These individuals inevitably fail because they did not sell the vision to those responsible for implementing it.

Just ask anyone who has worked in an organization where there has not been congruence between the leader's vision and what the employees think should be done. At best, the leader's objectives are met with half-hearted acceptance, and people do what needs to be done in a lackluster manner; at worst, there is outright sabotage which causes a complete derailment of the leader's plan. Either way, the objectives are not achieved. If the vision is not shared, if the congruence is not there, it is highly unlikely that the vision will be accomplished. The leader and his or her vision will go one way; the followers and the organization will go another.

Getting individuals to buy into a vision is perhaps the hardest task confronted by a leader. As Lao-Tse, the famous Chinese philosopher, said long ago, a leader is best when people barely know he exists. When his work is done, his aim fulfilled, they will say, we did this ourselves. The leader's vision has been so thoroughly ingrained in the followers that they think it was their idea originally.

How do we get people to buy into a vision? Today, that is a difficult task. We live in a diverse society where the fractures between various sectors seem larger than before. The old idea of the common good, the commonweal, seems to have disintegrated into disunity with individuals wanting to get the most possible for themselves and for their group. Two long conflicting values in American society, public good and individualism, have joined battle, and it seems that individualism is winning. Few of us have a sense of community, of shared values. As a society, we seem to have lost our vision of where we want to go. This national indecision and unwillingness to commit to common goals is mirrored in our society's institutions, which are often rife with divisiveness and lack of unified purpose.

SUCCESSFUL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

The best-seller list is full of books that attempt to tell people how to be leaders and to prescribe certain leadership styles as the path of success. Recent best-sellers in the management literature have postulated that a new style of leadership may be emerging, one that can provide guidance in new types of organizations. John Naisbitt and Patricia Aburdene (1985) in *Re-inventing the Corporation* and Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman (1985) in *In Search of Excellence* sing the praises of people-centered executives who provide leadership in revolutionized workplaces—workplaces that are humane and feature management-worker unity. Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985) state that the first ingredient of reinventing the corporation is a powerful vision, and "the source of a vision is a leader, a person who possesses a unique combination of skills: the mental power to create a vision and the practical ability to bring it about" (p. 20). Peters and Waterman (1985) examine the corporations that they consider the most successful and argue that the best type of leader is a "people-oriented" leader who can be "tender" and "tough" at the same time (p. 43). Peters and Austin (1985) in *A Passion for Excellence* argue that a manager should no longer be a "cop, referee, devil's advocate, dispassionate analyst, professional, decision-maker, naysayer, pronouncer, [but a leader who acts] as cheerleader, enthusiast, nurturer of champions, hero finder, wanderer, dramatist, coach, facilitator, builder" (p. 265). James Belasco (1990) in *Teaching the Elephant to Dance* argues that leaders in any level of an organization must develop a new strategic approach by empowering employees.

Critics of these works have questioned whether a revolution in leadership style is—or should be—underway. In their view, effective leadership is too complex an issue to be treated in a simplistic "one-approach manner." Leadership cannot be implemented by "buzzwords" and "managerial fads." They feel it is senseless to adhere strictly to either a "hard-line" or "soft-line" approach to leadership (see, for example, Mills, 1985).

It is senseless to try to prescribe a "one best way" to successful leadership. Research has never demonstrated that one style of leadership is superior to the others. Analysis of leadership style is a complex topic, and much of the research that has been done to date has been short-term and scattered. The situational approach to leadership says that a leader's style must match the needs of the followers and the organization. The same style will not be right in all organizations at all times. But, research in leadership also shows that each age usually has a predominant style of successful leader. Michael Maccoby (1981) has done the most work in this area, and he writes that leaders "succeed only when they embody and express, for better or worse, values rooted in the social character of group, class, or nation" (p. 23), and ideal leadership expresses "vision and values that [bring] out the best in the social character" (p. 52).

Maccoby identifies three distinct types of leaders who were successful at various times in America's history because their leadership style matched the social character of their time.[2] These types of leaders were:

1. The *Independent Craftsman*. With an interest in the process of making something, the craftsman embodies the traditional work ethic with its concern for quality and thrift. This type of leadership was predominant from the late eighteenth century to the Civil War.

2. The *Empire Builder.* This is a leader with entrepreneurial skills and the toughness to build industries and survive in a competitive jungle. These leaders treat their followers in a paternalistic fashion. This type of leadership predominated from the post-Civil War period to the 1950s.
3. The *Gamesman.* The gamesman is interested in the challenge and the competition of the game. His goal is to be a winner. The gamesman controls subordinates by persuasion, enthusiasm, and seduction rather than by heavy and humiliating commands. This style of leadership has been most common from 1960 to the present.

In Maccoby's view, none of these leadership types is adequate for today's needs. He stresses the need for the development of a new type of leadership, one that will be able "to understand both motives and resistance to change, and to establish operating principles that build trust, facilitate cooperation, and explain the significance of the individual's role in the common purpose" (Maccoby, 1981, p. 20).

Other experts have pointed out the need for a change in the style of leadership as our nation shifts from an industrial to a postindustrial age. The changes that are occurring in the workplace are, according to Riane Eisler (1991), reflections of a larger societal transformation. Eisler describes two types of social organization models: the dominator and the partnership models. Dominator societies are marked by rigid male dominance, a generally hierarchic and authoritarian social structure, and a high degree of institutionalized violence. The partnership model is marked by more equal partnership between women and men, less institutionalized violence, and a more democratic or egalitarian social structure. According to Eisler, the modern workplace was patterned to conform to the requirements of the dominator model—hence, its hierarchic and authoritarian characteristics and its top-down chain of command. The author asserts that the workplace is evolving into a more humane, people-centered place which will demand a different type of leadership model.

Rost (1981, pp. 180-181), too, contrasts the values of the industrial paradigm, "(1) the structural-functionalist view of organizations, (2) a view of management as the preeminent profession, (3) a personalistic focus on the leader, (4) a dominant objective of goal achievement, (5) a self-interested and individualistic outlook, (6) a male model of life, (7) a utilitarian and materialistic ethical perspective, and (8) a rational, technocratic, linear, quantitative, and scientific language and methodology," with a new postindustrial paradigm he sees emerging. The values of this new age are collaboration, common good, global concern, diversity and pluralism in structures and participation, client orientation, freedom in expression in all organizations, qualitative language and methodologies, substantive justice, and consensus-oriented policy-making process. Rost asserts that although it is clear that our old notion of the leader is not functioning well, the new model of the postindustrial leader has yet to be formed.

If we are on the cusp of a new age, it is not surprising that there is so much uncertainty about leadership. The old ways of leadership do not work any longer; the new ones are still emerging. There are still more questions than answers about what the successful leader of tomorrow will be. But, by looking at projections of the type of organizations that seem to be emerging and the type of leadership that such organizations would require, it is possible to conjecture about the leadership practices that should be most congruent with these new structures. I do not pretend to have the answers, but it seems to me that in this new age a successful leader will, first, have to keep the needs of the followers in mind; second, will have to be willing to share leadership responsibility and encourage followers to develop their own leadership potential; and, third, will have to be able to match his or her leadership style to the needs of the individual organization and its constituents. Let's look at these in turn.

BEING SENSITIVE TO SUBORDINATES' NEEDS

We live in an antiauthoritarian age when holders of power are suspect and actions that stem from authority are resisted. What kind of leadership style is most apt to be successful in this type of environment? I think it is obvious that an authoritarian style does not work well. Most people resist being told what to do.

As mentioned earlier, most of the best-sellers on the topic of leadership are unanimous in declaring the demise of the autocratic leadership style. They use words such as "enabler," "cheerleader," "coach," and "facilitator" to describe the best leaders for the organizations of today. This emphasis on the follower is likely to be a key concept of success in the future.

Burns (1978) categorized two types of leadership styles: the transactional and the transformational. Transactional leaders see job performance as a series of transactions with subordinates. The transactions consist of exchanging rewards for services rendered or punishments for inadequate performance. On the other hand, transformational leaders are skilled at getting subordinates to transform their own self-interest into the interest of the larger group. Transformational leaders bring out the best in their subordinates. Another researcher described transformational leaders as working:

> to make their interactions with subordinates positive for everyone involved. More specifically, [they] encourage participation, share power and information, enhance other people's self-worth, and get others excited about their work. All these things reflect their belief that allowing employees to contribute and to feel powerful and important is a win-win situation—good for the employees and the organization. (Rosener, 1990, p. 120)

This win-win situation is also advocated by Bennis (1989), who states that an organization which has an effective leader, one's whose vision is accepted by the followers, will empower the employees and make them:

1. Feel significant. They will feel that each of them makes a significant contribution to the success of the organization.
2. Engage in learning and feel competent. Good leaders make it clear that there is no failure, only mistakes which give us feedback on what to do next.
3. Feel part of a team. According to Bennis where there is good leadership there is a feeling of family and unity.
4. Feel work is exciting, challenging, fascinating, and fun. A vital ingredient in organizational leadership is pulling rather than pushing people to a goal.

According to Bennis, a "pull" style of influence attracts and energizes people to adopt an exciting vision of the future. This style motivates through identification rather than through rewards and punishments. Burns's and Bennis's emphasis on people-centered leadership prefigures the type of leadership which will be most effective in the future. Successful leaders will need to work to empower followers. Robert Greenleaf (1977), who has written insightfully on leadership, wishes us to go even further. He invites us to think about two terms generally considered antonyms—leader and servant. It is Greenleaf's thesis that the best leaders are servants. He writes:

> A fresh critical look is being taken at the issues of power and authority, and people are beginning to learn, however haltingly, to relate to one another in less coercive and more creatively supporting ways. A new moral principle is emerging which holds that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader. (pp. 9-10)

At first glance, this seems nonsense. Leaders lead, and servants serve, and a servant leader seems an obvious oxymoron. Greenleaf (1977) makes a persuasive case, however, and his rationale is closely akin to other modern thinkers about leadership such as Bennis. For a leader to be a servant first means that the leader makes "sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, *while being served,* become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?" (pp. 13-14). A servant leader is a giving, enriching individual. As examples, Greenleaf uses two characters from Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest.* He contrasts Big Nurse—"strong, able, dedicated, dominating, authority-ridden, manipulative, exploitative—the net effect of whose influence diminished other people, literally destroyed them," with the patient, MacMurphy, who used his influence "to build up people and make both patients and the doctor in charge of the ward grow larger as persons, stronger, healthier" (p. 43). In effect, what Greenleaf is saying is that the leader must empower the followers. I think this is the first lesson that we need to know to make leaders successful—they must be people centered.

LEADERSHIP MUST BE SHARED AND DEVELOPED

The second lesson that successful leaders must learn is that no one can lead alone. By definition, leaders don't operate in isolation. Nor do they command, in the literal sense of the word, issuing a one-way stream of unilateral directives. Instead, leadership almost always involves cooperation and collaboration, activities that can occur only in a conducive context (Pagonis, 1992). It is impossible for any one individual to succeed as a leader if he or she is working without help. It is no longer possible for any one person to run an organization successfully. For contemporary organizations to function effectively, "interdependent teams at different levels need leaders" (Maccoby, 1979, p. 21). Of course, one of the reasons that successful leaders will want to empower their subordinates is so that there will be others to contribute to the leading. If we assume that leadership has to be found throughout the organization, leadership skills must be nurtured and developed in many individuals. One of the challenges organizations will face in the future will be to nurture the leadership proclivities of individuals working in all levels of the organization. We need to learn more about how the environment interacts with personality and character in the formation and the performance of leaders.

So, the successful leaders will work to develop other leaders. Organization theorists have long been interested in how leadership can be encouraged and developed. Are great leaders born or made? Early studies on the subject of leadership were concerned with identifying the traits or personal characteristics that were associated with leadership. The studies were based on the premise that leadership was primarily exercised by "great men" and that leaders were born and not made. Since all individuals did not have these traits, only those who possessed them could be potential leaders. The assumption was that once these traits were identified, leadership selection could be reduced to finding people with the appropriate physical, intellectual, and personality traits. Leadership training would then consist of developing those traits in potential leaders.

A large number of trait studies were conducted, and traits were identified that were said to be associated with leadership such as energy, aggressiveness, persistence, initiative, appearance, and height (Stogdill, 1974). However, summaries of this research demonstrate the shortcomings of this approach: each study tended to identify a different set of traits associated with leadership. In one summary of over a hundred studies, only 5% of the traits were found in four or more studies (Carlisle, 1973, p. 124). As Eugene Jennings (1961) concluded, "Fifty years of study have failed to produce one personality trait or set of qualities that can be used to discriminate between leaders and non-leaders" (p. 2). Although some traits have been found to be weakly associated with leadership, these studies show that there is no such thing as a "leader type." There is instead much variation in the skills, abilities, and personalities of successful leaders.[3]

Today, it is commonly accepted that leadership is a quality that can be developed. Leadership is an acquired competency which is the result of many circumstances, including chance. As the old saying goes, being in the right place at the right time often results in a person being located in a position where he or she can exert leadership. Some people seem to have innate capabilities that blossom in specific circumstances. For example, Bennis (1989) states that the Great Depression was the crucible that transformed Franklin D. Roosevelt from politician to leader (p. 37). Eisenhower is another good example of a leader who was made not born. While many of his West Point classmates were fighting and earning medals in Europe during World War I, Eisenhower was stuck in a Pentagon desk job. Shortly after World War I, Eisenhower was transferred to Panama where he worked under the guidance of a senior army officer who tutored him in every aspect of military leadership. Eisenhower (1967) described his relationship with this general as a "sort of graduate school in military affairs and the humanities, [taught by] a man who was experienced in his knowledge of men and their conduct. I can never adequately express my gratitude to this one gentleman. . . . In a lifetime of association with great and good men, he is the one more or less invisible figure to whom I owe an incalculable debt" (p. 187).

Blake and Mouton (1985) who have written a great deal about leadership training have stated:

> Some think that learning how to lead effectively is next to impossible; some believe leadership is a natural ability and either you have it or you don't; and still others think that you can learn it but you can't teach an old dog new tricks. Accepting any of these propositions precludes the possibility of learning to become more effective. Though they are value-based beliefs, they rest on false assumptions about human learning. It is as practical to learn to lead effectively as it is to learn arithmetic or to referee a game or to perfect any other applied skill. (pp. 17-18)

There will always be some people more successful at becoming leaders than others. And obviously, everyone cannot be a leader at all times—we can't have just chiefs and no Indians. But, people can exercise leadership in different ways and at different times. As society and institutions become more complex, it will be even more important to expose more individuals to the opportunity to learn leadership skills. Leaders are not born, although leadership may come more naturally to some than to others. As a society, we cannot afford to waste the leadership skills which can be developed in the majority of people.

Even with the best of training, some leaders will continue to fail. Sometimes the failures will be because of faults inherent in the individuals; sometimes the failure will be the result of situations beyond their control. Burns (1984) wrote, "We have no calipers to measure where personal failures leave off and situational forces take command—and even if we did, it would be hard to measure the interplay between the two" (p. 39). With appropriate training in leadership, the failures will be fewer and the leadership talent available will be more widespread.

RECOGNIZE THAT THERE IS NOT JUST ONE RIGHT WAY

The third lesson that a successful leader needs to keep in mind is that there never has been just one right way to lead. If there is anything we have learned from research in leadership, it is that there is no single ideal type of leader; but, instead, a number of leadership styles may be appropriate depending on the situation. Maccoby described the predominant type of leader for each age, but not the only types. Most recent theorists have turned away from the idea that there is one "best" leadership style. They feel that earlier theorists have had little success in identifying consistent relationships between patterns of leadership behavior and group performance. The "contingency" or "situational" theorists argue for the relationship of the various situational variables involved in leadership. Leadership effectiveness depends on the variables found in each situation. So, even though it seems that a people-centered, power-sharing leader would be most appropriate for the organizations of today and tomorrow, that does not mean that it is the only type of leadership that will be appropriate. Employee-centered leadership may be best under some circumstances and production-centered leadership may be best under others. According to advocates of contingency theories, the task of a leader is to adapt to using the style that would be most appropriate in any given situation. Leadership skills need to be varied to meet various tasks and environments. There is no one right style, and no one right set of "traits."

Many people would like to be told how to lead; the situational theories say there is no one right way. Instead, effective leaders will adapt their style of leadership behavior to the needs of the followers and the situation. Since these factors are not constant, discerning the appropriate style is a challenge to anyone who wants to be an effective leader. If organizations continue to become flatter and less hierarchical, the people-centered, power-sharing leadership styles will be most appropriate in those organizations. Other organizations and institutions will demand a different type of leadership style.

The recognition of a diversity of leadership styles will allow potential leaders to lead in ways that will draw upon their individual strengths. Once leaders have adjusted to the new paradigm of leadership demanded by the restructured workplace, we can hope that the current crisis in leadership will fade away. Abigail Adams once wrote that "Great necessities call forth great leaders" (quoted in Bennis, 1989, p. 159). We are living in an age that demands better leadership; too often recently we have been disappointed in our leaders. Let us hope that a new style of leadership is being developed that will prove sufficient to the tasks that lie ahead.

NOTES

[1] For an illuminating discussion of the differences between management and leadership, see Rost (1991), pp. 140-152.

[2] In later books, Maccoby reclassified his social character types. In his *Why Work: Leading the New Generation* (1988), he labels them as experts, helpers, defenders, innovators, and self-developers.

[3] For an overview of some of the variations of leaders in the field of librarianship, see Sheldon (1991).

REFERENCES

Belasco, J. A. (1990). *Teaching the elephant to dance: Empowering change in your organization.* New York: Crown.

Bennis, W. (1959). Leadership theory and administrative behavior: The problem of authority. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 4*(3), 259-301.

Bennis, W. (1989). *Why leaders can't lead.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1985). *The managerial grid III.* Houston, TX: Gulf.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper and Row.

Burns, J. M. (1984). *The power to lead: The crisis of the American presidency.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Carlisle, H. M. (1973). *Situational management: A contingency approach to leadership.* New York: AMACOM.

Commager, H. S. (1979, November 11). Our leadership crisis: America's real malaise. *Los Angeles Times,* Part V, p. 1.

Eisenhower, D. D. (1967). *At ease: Stories I tell to friends.* New York: Doubleday.

Eisler, R. (1991). Women, men, and management: Redesigning our future. *Futures, 23*(January-February), 3-18.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* New York: Paulist Press.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Jennings, E. E. (1961). The anatomy of leadership. *Management of Personnel Quarterly, 1*(Autumn), 2.

Koontz, H.; O'Donnell, C.; & Weihrich, H. (1986). *Essentials of management* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Maccoby, M. (1979). Leadership needs of the 1980's. *Perspectives on Leadership, Current Issues in Higher Education, 1,* 17.

Maccoby, M. (1981). *The leader.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Maccoby, M. (1988). *Why work: Leading the new generation.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Manske, F. A., Jr. (1990). *Secrets of effective leadership* (2nd ed.). Columbia, TN: Leadership Education and Development.

Mills, D. Q. (1985). *The new competitors.* New York: Wiley.

Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1985). *Re-inventing the corporation.* New York: Warner Books.

Pagonis, W. G. (1992). The work of the leader. *Harvard Business Review, 70*(6), 118-126.

Peters. T., & Austin, N. (1985). *A passion for excellence: The leadership difference.* New York: Random House.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1985). *In search of excellence.* New York: Harper & Row.

Rich, F. (1993, September 5). Down time. *New York Times Magazine,* p. 42.

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(6), 119-125.

Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century.* New York: Praeger.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation.* New York: Harper & Row.

Sheldon, B. E. (1991). *Leaders in libraries: Styles and strategies for success.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership.* New York: Free Press.

Tannenbaum, R.; Weschler, I. R.; & Massarik, F. (1961). *Leadership and organization: A behavioral science approach.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

White, H. S. (1987). Oh, where have all the leaders gone? *Library Journal, 112*(16), 68-69.

THE LEADER AS DECISION-MAKER: WHEN CENTRALIZED DECISIONS BECOME IMPERATIVE

Herbert S. White

My title requires at least some definition. I am not an advocate for authoritative decision-making just for the fun of it, or simply to fuel the manager's ego. Of the four ranges of management styles I identify—authoritative, consultative, participatory, and abdicative—I stress that the most appropriate for any situation is the one that manages least, given the constraints under which the manager is operating, and of course managers always operate under constraints. These include time, money, space, and the expectations of others outside his or her management sphere. In lecturing on this point to my students, I stress that frequently managers make decisions they need not make or should not make, and perhaps as frequently they refuse to make decisions that they alone can make.

Inevitably, I am pressed for examples. I suggest that library directors do not need to decide—indeed it is a decision they can totally abdicate—where to hold the library picnic, or what color to paint the staff lounge, and I am met with howls of protest. Those aren't really important decisions for the staff, I am assured. I can only state that, as they gain management experience, they will learn that these are very important decisions, in terms of staff morale. I think we all know that it is not the big things that destroy the confidence and will of an organization, it is the cumulation of little things. We can understand and accept the reality that there isn't much money for salary increases, even as we wish there were more. By contrast, we get furious at the realization that somebody else is getting the desk near the window, that somebody else is getting to attend that LC committee meeting in Washington, or conversely that I am stuck once again by having to go to Washington. Either negative reaction can occur, and the sensible manager understands that, when selecting someone to go to Washington, or to chair a committee, or even to be a member of a committee, if possible select someone who thinks this would be an honor, or at least fun. To do this, you have to know your staff as individuals and understand what motivates them. What motivates them is not necessarily what you think ought to motivate them. It is indeed the cumulation of little decisions, and particularly when these are perceived as arbitrary and unreasonable, that tend to destroy the morale of an organization. The manager does not need to pick either the picnic site or the color of the staff lounge. Managerial competence is no stronger in this area than anyone else's. It is of course possible that the decision, once reached democratically, will still cause some unhappiness, but that unhappiness is then directed at a process (I am surrounded by people without taste) and not at the organization itself. If students think that "minor" decisions are not important for staff morale, they will just have to take my word for it until they can discover it for themselves.

My example of an autocratic decision comes with the.question of what I might do if the fire alarm bell rang. Would we discuss, and perhaps vote, on whether or not to leave? After all, we know that most library fire alarms are false alarms. No—there would be no discussion. I would tell them to pick up their coats and notebooks and leave the building—now!

I am sure that other speakers will tell you it is desirable to permit the staff to participate in the decision-making process, and I agree. Delegation, that much revered and little practiced concept, is a valuable management tool that we don't employ nearly enough. However, delegation is not abdication, the tactic I suggested in selecting a picnic location. It is not even participation, except in a very narrow and limited sense. The Japanese have far more delegation than we do, but that delegation is specifically focused on the individual's or the group's own job. Japanese workers do not make automotive company policy with regard to whether to open a new U.S. production plant, what prices to charge for cars, or whom to promote to director of the factory. Japanese workers are given a great deal of responsibility (which they translate into freedom), in determining how *they* will do *their* work more effectively to achieve the desired results—greater output, lower cost, fewer errors. They accept this willingly because they understand the contract between the employer and themselves—loyalty returned for loyalty offered. That may change as the Japanese work force is faced with layoffs, but that is an issue for the future. For the present, it should be noted that these Japanese tactics of individual and team empowerment work even, albeit with modifications, for American employees of Japanese corporations. And this is because of one very simple characteristic of delegation—it concentrates on results and not on methods. Being judged by results is something we generally consider fair, as long as we understand what those expected results are—in advance. The way to deal with this is through specific job descriptions that relate to unit and larger group plans and strategies, and of course these are based on goals and objectives. Individuals must know *why* it has to be of certain quantity, cost, and quality. Understanding this is for them more important than the question of how the decision was made—participatorily or consultatively if possible, authoritatively if necessary. Human beings, unlike robots, need to know WHY. It is a question we begin asking almost as soon as we learn to talk, and it demands an answer.

Once we understand the why, the how is a territory that individual workers, and teams of workers, cherish as their own domain. Where authoritative managers fail most abysmally is not so much in edicting what should result, but in how it should be accomplished. That "how" is usually totally unnecessary, and as the Japanese have found, it can be totally counterproductive. Workers usually know their own jobs better than the boss knows them. If encouraged and rewarded to participate in this process, they will improve quality and quantity, and in doing this also enhance their own morale. It is the classic example of the win-win phenomenon. The problem, I would argue, is not just that managers make too many decisions, it is that they make the wrong decisions. Some of the things they are supposed to decide they often refuse to decide. What is at fault here is the existence of needless rules and needless decisions—what we so fondly call red tape bureaucracy. Whether these needless and intrusive rules were introduced by managers or by a committee matters very little, because the committee process also can lead to intrusive and unnecessary regulations. My concern, in this paper and in my management teaching, is far less with the issue of who makes certain decisions (although I have already expressed my preference for decentralization whenever appropriate) but rather with whether needless decisions are being made, and on whether needed decisions are not being made. Both problems can occur, and they can occur simultaneously in the same organization.

Managers have many roles, but probably the most significant of these can be identified as the need for control and the need for decisions. For the control process, we now have a great deal of help—from computer programs that instantly spot deviations from financial plans and from "helpful" staff organizations, within the library and, most frequently, outside it. I am thinking in particular of the accounting department, which reminds us that we have spent 57% of the funds in only 48% of the time. Control, while obviously an essential part of management, is a process that can, to a large extent, be abdicated to others and even to machines. It is by far the easiest part of management.

However, we get very little help with decisions, and here I would define the managerial role as one of either making decisions or of seeing to it that decisions are made. There are certainly authoritative managers who make decisions that should be left to subordinates, to committees, and to individual workers, or for that matter, there are managers who make decisions that need not be made at all, by anyone. Loren Belker (1978) refers to these as octopus managers, and it is my own sad observation that these individuals may not be trainable, and as in dealing with an octopus, we may have simply to squish them.

Of greater concern to me are managers who refuse to make decisions, and who refuse to see to it that others make decisions. My observation, in libraries but not necessarily exclusively in libraries, is that decision-avoidance managers are far more likely to be found than authoritative and octopus managers. Most specifically, when we reach the level above the library, we find that the nonlibrarians above us who are supposed to make decisions as part of their jobs—university presidents and chancellors, mayors, presidents of library boards, corporate directors of research or of administrative service, principals and superintendents of schools—won't decide at all. We also find managers within libraries who are reluctant to decide what they are supposed to decide or at least to make sure others decide. As we know from management precepts, the absence of a decision is a decision. When I tell you I can't or won't decide whether we will let you attend the next ALA conference, which is now only four weeks away, I send one of several messages, all of which are unhappily received, unless I can also tell you why I can't yet decide and when I will be able to decide. Those messages may include: (1) you are trivial and don't matter to me, or (2) I have no guts, or (3) a combination of both (1) and (2). I think everyone who has been caught in this trap would agree that, at some point, even a negative decision is preferable to a continuation of no decision. Nature abhors a vacuum, and organizations abhor a lack of decisions, a lack of direction, a lack of focus. Managers are responsible for seeing to it that decisions are made—by themselves if necessary—by others if possible. That is, if a decision needs to be made. If no decision needs to be made, then that conclusion that no decision is required, and you can do whatever you want, is in itself also a decision. My concern here is less with fixing percentages on who makes what decisions, but rather with insuring that the process takes place at all. In general, I don't care for authoritative managers, particularly where authoritarianism is not called for. However, not only I but just about everybody else would prefer a predictable authoritarian to someone who is paralyzed by the need to do anything.

Why do individuals avoid making decisions? The answer may be nothing more than a lack of interest, or a lack of awareness that decisions matter, at least for the individual charged with making the decision. That could well apply to nonlibrarians who have responsibility for libraries as part of their domain. We understand that such a situation cannot be acceptable for the library. As Peter Drucker (1986) notes, any subordinate has the right to expect that his or her boss is fascinated with what is done by subordinates, because it is the manager's responsibility to care.

That reason is less likely to apply to library managers. Their reason for failing to react may be a decision paralysis that can relate either to lack of confidence, a fear of offending, or a whole range of other reasons. Unfortunately, decision-avoidance managers have become very good in the process of avoiding decisions. Some of the tactics are a claim of being too busy, which can then in turn lead to a failure to read supplied documentation, or simply a failure to schedule meetings or return telephone calls. It should be noted that a claim of being "too busy" is a selective claim, because it simply means that they are too busy to deal with you. In other words, it is really a lie, although a polite lie. The process of decision avoidance through endless delay by asking for more information even when it is not needed is also well known to those who have suffered from its effects. However, some of the tactics provided by the desire to involve a greater participation, and I would hasten to state that this is an appropriate tactic where applicable, can also serve the decision-avoidance manager. The appointment of committees where no committee is really required is such a tactic, and we should note that those named to pointless committees almost always know what has been done to them. The misuse of the committee process as a dodge against decision-making is so well understood even by the general public that cartoonists are safe in using it. I recall one cartoon of tourists examining a historical marker which proclaims: "On this spot the leaders of all of the world powers convened to face the crises facing the world, and decided to appoint a committee."

It may be useful to reexamine, very briefly, some of the characteristics that define managers and leaders, and particularly the differences between the two. I attempted to do this in one of my own articles (White, 1990) which drew heavily on the work of Tom Cosgrove (1988). Management can be taught, although it requires, in its successful application, a number of characteristics. The most important of these, I would argue, is courage. Because if it is important that managers empower their subordinates, it is at least equally important that they protect them—against unfairness, against unreasonableness, against abuse. There are some very courageous library managers, but there are also some that are not. I find it discouraging that, in an in-basket exercise I give to some of my students, some respond in the assigned role of director of an academic library to a demand for an apology by a faculty member for the presumed rudeness of a staff member by simply apologizing. Is anything known at this point, even, for example, who it was who was rude? Managers are by necessity pragmatists, but they must also understand their obligation to others, and particularly to the members of their staff. Management is not perceived as fair and predictable. Since we rarely appoint managers because of their perceived stellar qualities as future managers but more likely because of their success as workers, it should not be surprising that some managers lack courage, and that some will dive headlong into a search for compromise and consensus. It should be noted that such senior management writers as Peter Drucker (1986) and Mary Parker Follett (1942) caution against the easy search for agreement and consensus. Drucker notes that when consent appears to be too easily reached, it may simply be because some people don't care, or because others are intimidated. The decision could well turn out to be wrong. And Drucker argues that we should back away from consensus too quickly reached and talk some more. Follett stresses that we should encourage rather than squelch dissent, and Thomas Watson of IBM meant the same thing when he urged his mangers to protect the "wild ducks," those whose opinions differed markedly from the majority. They might simply be stupid pests. On the other hand, they might be right.

If it is the job of the manager not just to find, through a variety of techniques, an answer to the problem but also the best answer, the appropriate and inappropriate use of the committee process comes into focus. Managers can be arbitrary and tyrannical, but so can committees in squelching dissent. I have long been worried about the phrase "gets along well with others" as a virtue in the performance evaluation process, because it never seems to add "in the reaching of good decisions."

It is here that the characteristics of managers and leaders can differ. If managers seek a consensus, even if the decision is not necessarily their own (and that may not be bad if the group's is better), leaders are rarely so lacking in confidence. Leaders do not seek consensus, they try to persuade others to accept their view of the world. Positive leaders accomplish great things, but we can't really judge until after the fact, and certainly not all leaders are beneficial. If they were, we would not have had Nazi Germany, Jonestown, or Waco. Leadership as a character trait, I would insist, cannot be willed into existence, and even basketball coaches have learned that the only senior is not necessarily the best team captain.

Sometimes it is a freshman. It is certainly even a bad idea to force unwilling managers to manage, with such exhortations as "sure you can do it, anybody can." It is probably even more mischievous to suggest that anybody can be somehow taught to be a leader. We can perhaps empower leaders, or show them how to be more effective, but the suggestion that anybody can lead (or for that matter manage) simply perpetuates the problems documented for us so handily by Laurence Peter (1969), who noted that, despite all of our good will, personnel selection still seemed to aim at finding for everyone a job they can't do. We do this in large part because we use promotion to management as a reward for work well done in another dimension. Parallel career lattices are still not common in libraries. How many superb reference librarians are able to earn more than the individual who is "merely" the Head of the Reference Department? And yet, what's wrong with that, if the reference librarian makes a greater contribution?

Instinctively, we look for individuals who will both lead and manage us, but in a recent column, Tom Peters (1993) points out this is not all that simple. Leaders deal with large concepts, managers deal with detail. While it is desirable to appoint our leaders as managers, it is also important for these individuals to understand the discipline that this now imposes on them. If leaders seek followers, management authority automatically hands them some, and power can become an aphrodisiac. Peters recalls the observation by Admiral Hyman Rickover, the father of the nuclear submarine and a leader by any standards, that when he moved from conceptualizing this project to having to manage it, he was immediately faced with thousands of annoying little decisions that took up most of his time. Countries that operate under a parliamentary system usually have two designated officials—a prime minister who runs the country and a ceremonial president or monarch who cuts ribbons, graciously receives the championship hog, and welcomes the winning football team. We expect one individual to carry out both the leadership and the ceremonial functions, and it is difficult. Our founding fathers abhorred royalty, but royalty has its management uses in doing what real managers are too busy to do.

On a much less dramatic scale, I can attest to the limitation of freedom I encountered when I served as dean of a library school, or when earlier I had served as president of two national societies. Contrary to what we are shown on television situation comedy programs, management roles are not an enhancer of power, they form barriers and limitations. As dean I understood that when I walked down the hall to the cafeteria, I had to be pleasant to any student, even if I had a toothache. The student, not knowing about my toothache, would assume she was about to be expelled from school if I frowned at her. Similarly, as a dean I also had to be at least polite to everyone in the administrative hierarchy, because if I made them angry they might punish my school as a way of getting even with me. They shouldn't do that, but they might, and I simply could not take that chance. Now that I have no administrative responsibilities but serve as a tenured faculty member, I can afford to pick fights with anyone I choose and write anything I like. This is a newly found freedom, and I understand the trade-offs between freedom and authority. I am not sure that all charismatic leaders, who may seek managerial status because it conveys prestige and money, necessarily understand what they are giving up, or at least should be giving up. Leaders who seek appointed power as a manipulative tool should of course worry all of us.

What does all of this mean for the management of libraries? I would agree that there are managers who should be more open, more sharing, and at least more consultative if not participatory. In many cases, such a blustering style covers an incompetence and an insecurity, although there are managers who make all the decisions because they think they are smarter than their subordinates. Even when they are right, the price for this management style is too high, because the prophecy becomes self-fulfilling. Managers who treat their subordinates as incompetents will eventually have a staff of incompetents, who are perfectly willing to let the boss make all of the decisions. Individuals with even a modicum of self-respect will have left as soon as they could.

However, while I agree that managers should be as open and democratic as possible, I must again remind you that style is not nearly as important as substance. Are good decisions being made? Committees, I would stress, can be incompetent, and more importantly, can be viciously intolerant of dissent from group consensus. In an article in a recent issue of *Fortune*, Assistant Managing Editor Walter Kiechel (1991) argues that tough times for managers (and there is general consensus that times are tough) do not improve management, they simply strengthen the emphasis that the manager already has as the primary attribute. Good managers get better, but bad managers get worse. More specifically to the point, Kiechel warns against a rapid increase in what he calls "wimp" managers, individuals who see survival as their primary goal. That is, survival for them and not necessarily for the organization that employs them. The musical "How To Succeed in Business Without Really Trying" has a song that captured that mood completely. It is entitled "No Matter Whom They Fire, I Will Still Be Here." If we measure managers by their rate of success in achieving their objectives, it becomes clear that for success they will have to employ a range of management styles, from the autocratic to the abdicative. If there is a generalization in all of this, it is that good managers, regardless of the range of styles, must be approachable, fair, predictable, willing to communicate and particularly willing to answer questions and explain. Finally, they must be courageous. If we want to add to that the unique characteristics of a leader—vision, communication skills, and charisma—we must then remember that the leaders who would also be managers must learn self-discipline and must understand and consider the impact on others of what they do. Having good leaders who make good managers is not a simple process.

If management writers such as Drucker and Gifford Pinchot (1985) are correct, the changes that are coming to the management structure may make much of this discussion moot in the long run, although we must remember that management changes made in industry may take a decade to reach libraries, because it isn't just librarians who tend to be conservative but also those who control their direction and tend to like them just the way they are. When we add librarian conservatism to user conservatism to inherent conservatism in the university environment, it may take more than 10 years.

We already see a ruthless weeding, in the corporate sector, of layers of middle managers, and most particularly of those who carry such staff titles as facilitator or coordinator. These individuals, it has been noted, don't really do anything, and perhaps many managers don't, either. If we move, as has been suggested, to self-directed work teams, we will have far fewer managers, and because of that they will not be able to meddle nearly as much. Managers will be responsible for selecting the right people, setting overall goals and objectives, negotiating and defining resources and time scales, and then getting out of the way. I think there is positive news in all of this for us because, unlike a lot of people, librarians really do a lot. It is also at least potentially positive news for those who want to empower individuals to the maximum of their potential and their effort. Because, in this process, at least as I understand it, it is individuals and not just groups whom we will be empowering. Those individuals will undoubtedly form themselves into work teams, probably primarily temporary work teams like task forces, and they will monitor the contribution of their fellow team members far more closely than management ever did. If this turns out to be a true meritocracy, I for one have no problems with it. It will require excellent if fewer managers, and it will both reward and punish on that basis far more effectively than we have ever done. It will do the same thing for individuals in the work force, reward and punish based on achievement. There is risk in this process, as there has always been in a situation which can be subjective, that we not allow biases against individuals and groups who are different (and perhaps different because they are better) to take hold. We used to label those biases rather blatantly—preconceptions about women, about men, about minority members, about young people, about older people. We hide those biases more carefully now—in terms such as "fits the model of the group" and "acts collegially toward other staff members." We will have to guard against such labels, because they can be every bit as discriminatory. It doesn't really matter that you match the others because the others can be told to adjust.

In the future, will successful managers be expected to practice centralized decision-making, consultation, participation, abdication? The answer to all of those is yes. The primary concern is that they had better know why they are doing what they are doing. We should have demanded this all along. Perhaps now we will.

REFERENCES

Belker, L. B. (1978). *The first-time manager.* New York: American Management Association.

Cosgrove, T. (1988). Cleaning up our language about leadership. *Campus Activities Programming, 21*(3), 40-45.

Drucker, P. F. (1986, August 1). How to manage the boss. *Wall Street Journal,* section 1, p. 16.

Follett, M. P. (1942). *Dynamic administration.* New York: Harper.

Kiechel, W. (1991, August 12). Dealing with the problem boss. *Fortune,* pp. 97-98.

Peter, L. J. (1969). *The Peter principle.* New York: Morrow.

Peters, T. (1993, May 12). Even the most mundane work can become a source of pride. *Bloomington (Indiana) Herald-Times,* (B6).

Pinchot, G. (1985). *Intrapreneuring: Why you don't have to leave the corporation to become an entrepreneur.* New York: Harper & Row.

White, H. S. (1990). Managers and leaders: Are there more differences than similarities? *Library Journal, 115*(11), 51-53.

◆

STAFF AS DECISION-MAKERS: THE MERITS OF DECENTRALIZED DECISION-MAKING

Maurice P. Marchant

INTRODUCTION

During the 1950s and 1960s, research teams across the country searched for differences that explained why some organizations were highly successful while others were only marginally successful, if at all. Several of them came to similar explanations involving managerial treatment and use of their subordinates. Major researchers were Rensis Likert, Douglas McGregor, Robert R. Blake (with Jane S. Mouton), and Chris Argyris. Even though the results are 30 to 40 years old, they are both relevant and critical to the most recent discussions of managerial style. While they differed in the expression of their theories, each claimed that using the talents and knowledge of subordinates and treating them with respect improved their productivity. One aspect of that superior pattern of behavior was to decentralize decision-making.

THEORIES OF MANAGEMENT STYLE

I became interested in decentralized decision-making as a doctoral student at the University of Michigan in the late 1960s. Rensis Likert was there as the director of the Institute for Social Research. A major activity of the ISR was studying organizational behavior within corporations, using modern social science research procedures. Using the findings from several hundred of these studies, Likert identified characteristics that were common to many successful organizations, and he wrote up his conclusions in an award-winning book, *New Patterns of Management* (Likert, 1961). In substance, it spelled out the theory of participative management. A later book, *The Human Organization* (Likert, 1968), provided a research instrument that allowed quantifying managerial style. He claimed that the further towards a participative system an organization behaved, the more successful it would be.

Working at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Douglas McGregor was emphasizing differences in two contrasting assumptions about human nature and behavior held by managers as being at the root of productivity. He called them theories X and Y, and he reported them out in his very popular book, *The Human Side of Enterprise* (McGregor, 1960). Theory X, commonly practiced among traditional authoritarian organizations, assumed that people are naturally lazy, remain children grown larger, require close supervision, do not want to think for themselves, work out of fear of being demoted or fired, and are motivated only by economic rewards. Theory Y views people as naturally active, self-directing, enjoying learning and growing, and motivated by many different aspects of the work environment besides the paycheck when work conditions are encouraging. When managers act on theory Y assumptions, work performance of their subordinates improves, according to McGregor.

Working at the University of Texas at Austin, Blake and Mouton talked of managerial styles structured from the intersections of two variables: concern for production and concern for workers. The two variables serve as the axes of a two-dimensional grid with values from 1 to 9. Concern increases as the number increases. Thus, a 9,1 organization would be highly concerned with production but little concerned for the welfare of workers, a classical authoritarian approach. They found that 9,9 organizations, highly concerned for both production and the welfare of workers, were the most productive. The initial book describing their findings was *The Managerial Grid* (Blake & Mouton, 1964), and they have written several books since then based on the basic concept.

Another researcher who deserves attention was Chris Argyris, from Yale University, whose book *Integrating the Individual and the Organization* (Argyris, 1964) proposed increasing a company's productivity by integrating individual and organization goals. Argyris believed that, when workers are able to achieve their aspired ends while meeting their company's goals, their productivity increases.

MOTIVATIONAL THEORY

Not an advocate of group decision-making but important for his work on motivation was Frederick Herzberg, a psychologist at Western Reserve University in the 1960s. His research, published in book form in 1966 and in an important journal article in 1968, presented evidence that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction result from different factors.

He found that dissatisfaction results from factors extrinsic to the job such as company policies and administration, supervision, working conditions, and salaries and wages. When workers find them not to their liking, they are dissatisfied. Herzberg labeled them hygiene factors because they make an organization sick when they are painful to workers but cannot assure its health when they are painless. Workers finding the hygiene factors satisfactory are not dissatisfied, but good conditions do not satisfy nor motivate.

By contrast, factors affecting job satisfaction are intrinsic to the job, including achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, personal and professional growth, and advancement. When workers consider these factors as positive, they are both satisfied and motivated to perform well. As a consequence, Herzberg identified them as motivators. If they are negative, workers are not dissatisfied, but they lack motivation.

Two aspects of Herzberg's work deserve special attention. First, he identified several different factors as work motivators, just as McGregor had claimed in his theory Y, not including monetary reward. Second, Herzberg's consignment of management style to the hygiene category conflicts with Likert's findings, and this difference will be discussed later.

The continuing popularity of the Herzberg theory was demonstrated in 1987, when the *Harvard Business Review* reprinted its Herzberg article. The journal reported that more than 1.2 million reprints had been sold over its 20 years, and it was their most popular article ever.

LIBRARY APPLICATIONS

As my dissertation topic, I chose to test the application of the Likert theory to academic libraries. Most of the work from which his theory came was in profit-making organizations. The question naturally arose whether the theory applies also to nonprofit organizations such as libraries. The independent variables in my dissertation (Marchant, 1970) were the decision-making aspect of Likert's research instrument and a generalization of management style varying from authoritarian to participative. Controlling for many variables that could have confounded the relationship between management style and quality of the library, I found a strong positive indirect relationship between the independent variables and faculty appraisal of the library. Wherever management style was relatively high in staff participation in decision-making, staff job satisfaction was high; and high staff job satisfaction was a strong predictor of faculty appraisal of the library. While these findings were only part of the model that developed from the data, they conformed to the theory being tested.

Thereafter, the dissertation was expanded and published as a monograph (Marchant, 1976). Shortened versions were also published in *Library Trends* (Marchant, 1971) and *Library Journal* (Marchant, 1982).

Part of the dissertation research studied job satisfaction, which provided an opportunity to compare my results to Herzberg's. I did not replicate his methodology, however. Rather, I asked librarians how satisfied they were with their jobs generally and regarding nine specific aspects of their work. Then I intercorrelated them. Of the specific satisfaction measures, the three most highly interrelated were opportunities for promotion, opportunities for professional growth, and relations with supervisors. The first two are Herzberg motivators and the third is a hygiene factor. That they are so highly related suggests that they have a lot in common, suggesting that relations with managers might contain some motivational power. All three also have high correlations with overall job satisfaction, identifying them as strong predictors of an important mediator between management style and faculty appraisal of the library. Insight helping to explain this seeming oddity and the disagreement between Herzberg and Likert regarding the effect of management came from a replication of Herzberg's research among librarians by Plate and Stone (1974). Their results were very similar to Herzberg's, including the observation that incidents identified with management were mostly negative, contributing to dissatisfaction. But many of the satisfying incidents classed under such motivators as recognition, promotion, and professional growth came from management. When management fails to support an activity, management gets blamed; but when it facilitates a successful experience, management gets no credit. After all, the purpose of management is to facilitate workers' performance. Librarians grow professionally because supervisors encourage growth experiences, and they help design library services because their supervisors consider them competent to help in the planning process.

As I interpreted my own data and tried to understand what was going on among the library staffs studied, I came to the conclusion that decentralized decision-making was not the basic causal factor affecting job satisfaction and motivation: rather, decision-making is a behavioral expression of a deeper issues: trust and confidence. Managers express trust and confidence in a number of ways, including listening to them, involving them in the decision process, and refraining from intimidation. Likert (1968, p. 45) called it the principle of supportive relationships.

Librarians seem to make their best contributions, and gain greatest satisfaction, from involvement in two areas: designing service processes affecting their own jobs and involvement in personnel policies and procedures. Recent experience replacing public library standards with planning and role-setting processes (McClure et al., 1987; Van House et al., 1987) has demonstrated the superiority of involving staff members rather than just the library director. The director alone is more efficient, but the results are inferior. Staff insights are invaluable because staff members are closer to patrons. As libraries rely more and more on planning to determine the services they supply, they must also rely increasingly on their staff members as planners.

APPLICATION IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY

During the 1960s, many business executives attended workshops and seminars to learn about Likert's concepts, but few translated them into operational behavior. Many gave it a lick and a promise, but only a few were willing to invest enough to succeed. American industry dominated international business after World War II using authoritarian procedures, so they saw little reason to change. More recently, competition from other countries, especially Japan and Germany, have encouraged change.

POPULAR EXPRESSIONS IN BEST-SELLERS

Following the research of the 1950s and 1960s, many books have encouraged the transition. Among them have been Ouchi's *Theory Z* (1981), Naisbitt's *Megatrends* (1982), Tom Peters' two best-selling books, *In Search of Excellence* (1982) and *A Passion for Excellence* (1985), and Covey's *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* (1989). They each emphasize some participative elements. People often read to reinforce their own opinions, and for vast numbers of people participative management sounds right. Remember, we are talking about applying democracy to the workplace just as it has been applied to government. Librarians, as well as other workers, relate to this message. Covey was the keynote speaker for the Public Library Association at the 1992 American Library Association conference in San Francisco. He spoke to a standing-room-only crowd in a large hotel ballroom. Their applause demonstrated strong librarian approval for his message.

NEW SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS

Scholars are often accused, sometimes justifiably, of creating new fads for their own aggrandizement, then moving to another fad. Was participative management just a fad? Certainly, it has not revolutionized managerial behavior, although its use is increasing. In 1988-89, my research assistant carried out an extensive review of the scholarly literature published since completion of my dissertation. It was enormous, and from it we wrote a paper for an issue of *Library Trends* (Marchant & England, 1989). In substance, we found that the debate has moved from whether staff should be included in the decision process to how and when it should occur. An American Management Association (1985) publication identified 12 different forms of staff involvement, including job enrichment, job rotation and cross-training to improve flexibility and breadth of knowledge, flextime, job sharing, quality circles and problem-solving teams, formal training in participative management, and self-managed work groups. Automation seems to increase the benefits for participative management, particularly in facilitating innovation (Zuboff, 1985).

CONCLUSION

The main messages reported by scholars, consultants, and practitioners are these. Group decision-making can enhance the quality of performance of an organization, but it must reflect a belief in the value and worth of individual workers. Without administrative trust and confidence in subordinates, group involvement will have little effect. Managers who do not trust their workers cannot successfully fake it. While motivation must come from within, it can readily be turned off by a supervisor or company that demonstrates a lack of concern for its work force. Even so, participative management is inadequate by itself. High performance also requires commitment to high performance goals that reward the organization and its workers. If the organization tries to reward itself at the expense of its work force, the workers will get even eventually.

Some companies are setting themselves up today for later trouble by firing workers only to rehire them as temporary or contract workers devoid of health and retirement coverage. They hazard the loss of worker loyalty, motivation, and productivity.

The transition away from authoritarian management is happening but not everywhere. Carrier Corporation of Arkadelphia, Arkansas, represents many small companies that are applying elements of participative management successfully. Carrier makes compressors for air conditioning. Its workers don't punch a time clock, they are authorized to shut down production if problems arise, and they can order needed supplies. Every worker can handle several jobs, so if one gets sick, others can fill in. When the plant first opened, the workers were taught to install the machines, leading to a sense of ownership and saving the company $1 million. Realizing later that their machines were arranged poorly, they realigned them, taking just four days for a job that would have dragged out for weeks under normal conditions. Workers participate in hiring new workers, sometimes even new supervisors. Ability to get along is an important consideration. The plant's managerial style results in compressors that are cheaper and of higher quality than their competitors', and the company's goal is to sell Arkansas compressors to Japan. Companies like Carrier are making jobs that replace those lost by authoritarian corporate giants that are now downsizing. They are the wave of the future and will determine America's future in manufacturing (Norton, 1993).

Many libraries have found success using participative methods. The Tulsa City-County Library has been using that style successfully for more than 20 years. Another is the Weber County Library in Utah. When its board found the budget overspent and lacking adequate funds to pay salaries and wages through the rest of the year, it fired the director and promoted one of the staff, assigning her to decide what should be done. She called a staff meeting, laid out the problem, and asked for advice. Two possibilities were to cut staff or close down until funds were available. Instead, they chose to stay on the job at reduced salaries temporarily. Since then, they make decisions as a group and run such an efficient and effective organization that the county commission considers the library their model department.

Perhaps you would like to experiment with a safe participative approach. If so, next time you decide on a change, send out a memo describing your intention and asking for staff advice. Take the time to talk one-on-one to some of the staff whose jobs will be affected and tell them you will appreciate their contribution. Give them time to respond before making the change and take their advice seriously. That is a simple beginning. When the staff learns that you value their contribution, they will think better of you, and their trust will grow. From there, you can involve them in designing procedures, planning, and policy-making which they will support. You will be gratified at the results and the improvement in staff morale.

Let me conclude with a quotation from a letter to the editor in the Wall Street Journal. It was written in response to a page-one article telling about a popular executive strategy newsletter on getting ahead by being a ruthless middle manager. The respondent, a management specialist named Randy G. Pennington (1993), said, "Fear and intimidation are not effective tools for long-term management success. . . . The most effective leaders create environments in which employees can do their best. . . . [T]hrowing sudden tantrums and instigating dirty tricks eventually will lead to self-destruction. . . . [O]ne should always remember that time wounds all heels" (p. A15).

REFERENCES

American Management Association. (1985). *The changing American workplace: Work alternatives in the '80s.* New York: AMA Membership Publications Division.

Argyris, C. (1964). *Integrating the individual and the organization.* New York: Wiley.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid.* Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Covey, S. R. (1989). *The seven habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man.* Cleveland, OH: World Publishing.

Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review, 46*(1), 53-62.

Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review, 65*(5), 109-120.

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Likert, R. (1968). *The human organization: Its management and value.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Marchant, M. P. (1970). *The effects of the decision making process and related organizational factors on alternative measures of performance in university libraries.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Marchant, M. P. (1971). Participative management as related to personnel development. *Library Trends, 20*(1), 48-59.

Marchant, M. P. (1976). *Participative management in academic libraries* (Contributions in Librarianship and Information Science #10). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Marchant, M. P. (1982). Participative management, job satisfaction, & service. *Library Journal, 107*(8), 782-784.

Marchant, M. P., & England, M. M. (1989). Changing management techniques as libraries automate. *Library Trends, 37*(4), 469-483.

McClure, C. R.; Owen, A.; Zweizig, D. L.; Lynch, M. J.; & Van House, N. A. (1987). *Planning & role setting for public libraries.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Naisbitt, J. (1982). *Megatrends: Ten new directions transforming our lives.* New York: Warner Books.

Norton, E. (1993, January 13). Future factories: Small, flexible plants may play crucial role in U.S. manufacturing. *Wall Street Journal,* pp. A1, A8.

Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge.* New York: Avon.

Pennington, R. G. (1993, April 21). Fear and loathing as corporate strategy. *Wall Street Journal,* p. A15.

Peters, T. J., & Austin, N. (1985). *A passion for excellence: The leadership difference.* New York: Random House.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies.* New York: Warner Books.

Plate, K. H., & Stone, E. W. (1974). Factors affecting librarians' job satisfaction: A report of two studies. *Library Quarterly, 44*(2), 97-110.

Van House, N. A.; Lynch, M. J.; McClure, C. R.; Zweizig, D. L.; & Rodger, E. J. (1987). *Output measures for public libraries: A manual of standardized procedures* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Zuboff, S. (1985). Automate/informate: The two faces of intelligent technology. *Organizational Dynamics, 14*(2), 4-18.

MAKING HUMAN RESOURCE DECISIONS

Richard E. Rubin

> Decision making is one of the most important recurring responsibilities facing managers in organizations. Choices are called for on a regular basis with important consequences. To make a decision, the manager must choose among ways to deal with problems confronting an organization. The choice among these alternatives often makes irrevocable commitments. Once a decision is made, resources have been committed that are seldom recoverable should something go awry (Nutt, 1989, p. xiii).

INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that human resources decisions are among the most difficult to make. Not only do they have the potential to affect significantly the productivity and morale of staff, they are fraught with legal pitfalls. Decisions concerning human resources can determine the quality of library service, the character of the work environment, and the culture of the organization itself.

Many human resource decisions are "tough" decisions because they are characterized by uncertainty, ambiguity, and potential conflict (Nutt 1989). For example, in most hiring situations, even when considerable care is taken in the selection process, it is difficult to predict whether the individual selected will actually be a productive employee. Reasons for this might include that the hiring criteria were ambiguous or that different individuals involved in the process interpreted and applied the hiring criteria in different ways. The interests of the selectors might sometimes be contradictory and subsequently lead to conflicts. For this reason, a systematic understanding of the decision-making process in human resources is critical.

Defining the Organizational "Decision"

Before discussing the nature of human resource decision-making, it is important to define the term "decision" in the organizational context. "Decisions" are understood in many ways within organizations. What, for example, distinguishes a decision from recommendations, advice, or a conclusion? One might say, for example, that recommendations and advice are "inputs." These inputs and others lead to a conclusion drawn by one or more individuals, and a decision arises from that conclusion. The object of this paper is not to analyze these distinctions in detail, but it is important to highlight them to get a clearer understanding of the decision process.

For the purpose of this paper, *a decision is a human judgment regarding an action to be taken, including the judgment not to act.* When proposing such a definition, one must hasten to admit that there are many philosophical complexities to notions such as "judgment" and "action." Despite these difficulties, there are specific aspects of this definition that make it useful for our purposes, especially the link between a judgment and an action. It focuses on judgments that involve actions, because it is the decision to act or not to act that has actual consequences within organizations. Examples of these decisions would include decisions to hire or terminate an employee. For example, when one makes a judgment such as "John is a poor worker," it would not be considered a decision using the proposed definition, unless the judgment included an intention to act or to refrain from acting, such as "John is a poor worker, and I am going to terminate him." A decision, then, implies an action or a conscious judgment to refrain from action.

There are further refinements that should be made to the notion of a decision. In order for something to be considered a "decision," it implies that the individual making the decision has sufficient power to act in accordance with the judgment. If this was not true, then the significance of making a decision would be trivial. For example, suppose a library clerk makes a judgment that the library budget should be reallocated. Assuming that the clerk has no authority to make such a change, to call this a "decision" seriously impoverishes what is meant by the term. A decision is only a decision if the "decider" has the power to act.

That this power is a prerequisite to decision-making serves to distinguish decisions from other closely related but distinct concepts such as "opinions." Having an opinion does not necessarily imply a subsequent action. The library clerk mentioned certainly has an opinion, but the absence of the power to act renders that opinion far short of a decision. Similarly, a "recommendation" involves a judgment regarding some action that is decided and carried out by another. It is the "other" who has the power, who makes the decision. Recommendations and opinions lack the authority to act. Opinions and recommendations can be advanced with or without effect. Understood from a different perspective, a manager may listen to the opinions or recommendations of co-workers or subordinates, but act in a manner completely different from these opinions or opinions. Given this refinement of the meaning of a decision, the definition might be altered slightly in the following way: *A decision implies a judgment to take an action (or to refrain from action) which can, under normal circumstances, be implemented by the decision-maker or by others acting on behalf of the decision-maker.*

Emphasizing the importance of action and authority in relation to a decision also clarifies several important issues that are often obscured or blurred in discussions of decision-making in organizations. First, because it is implied that actions and therefore consequences may arise from a decision, the question of who makes decisions becomes especially important. Therefore, it is critical, in any organization, to clearly identify decision-makers. Second, clarifying the characteristics of a decision helps to explain how frustrations arise when decision-making is poorly understood within an organization. For example, the extent to which superiors or board members alter, reverse, or abrogate the decisions of supervisors is the extent to which the decision functions of these supervisors is diminished. The frustration of being "overruled" is, at least in part, the frustration of thinking one had the power to make a decision only to discover that it was not a decision at all but was treated as something else, e.g., an opinion or recommendation. When thwarted, employees who thought they had decision-making authority can become disenchanted and demotivated.

This type of diminution of authority, should not, however, be confused with the actions of superiors that are necessitated by law or bureaucratic structure in implementing a decision. For example, if a manager makes a decision to terminate an employee, legal and bureaucratic regulations may require that others, such as board members, place their imprimatur on the decision by voting approval or giving assent. This does not reduce the decision-making power of the manager; it merely delays the implementation of the decision for procedural reasons. In reality, their actions are often performed after the fact, ratifying decisions already made.

Limitations to Decision-Making

Given the distinctions made concerning decisions, it is also important to look at what organizational factors limit the authority of individuals to make genuine decisions, including human resource decisions:

1. *Decisions are limited by organizational position.* The concept of decision-making is restricted by the broader notions of authority and responsibility. That is, the authority to make a decision is directly associated with the responsibilities assigned. Often a manager has the right to make hiring decisions within her own department,

because the effectiveness of the department is her responsibility; but the manager seldom has the power to make hiring decisions for other departments because the activities of other departments are not part of her responsibilities.

2. *Decisions are limited by regulations.* Each employee, no matter how high in the bureaucratic hierarchy, is governed by laws, rules, and policies that diminish the extent of the employee's power. Even a library director lives very dangerously, if she violates accepted policies and procedures or contravenes civil rights laws or an employee's right to due process or privacy.
3. *Decisions are limited by the responsibilities of others whose function may be interdependent or even competing, especially when limited organizational resources are involved.* For example, a department head may decide to order replacement materials for her collection (a decision well within the purview of a department head), while the head of another department may decide to purchase additional databases. If there are limited resources, the decision of one may be limited by the decision of the other.
4. *Decisions are limited by political and social relationships.* Although a decision may fall within the formal purview of a particular position, the individual may lack the confidence of superiors, thus effectively nullifying decision-making authority. Similarly, the decision-making authority of even the most competent manager may be limited by a director who believes that all decisions should be made by him or her.

EXAMINING HUMAN RESOURCE DECISIONS

Now that the concept of a decision has been clarified and the limitations to decisions identified, it is useful to examine several types of decisions commonly made in library organizations. For the purpose of this paper, three types of decisions will be discussed:

1. decisions related to the appointment of new employees (hiring decisions),
2. decisions related to individual performance evaluations, and
3. decisions related to involuntary separation of employees by the organization (termination or firing decisions).

These decisions have been selected because they represent critical human resource decisions and place in relief important issues in the decision process. It should be kept in mind that for most major decisions, there is a series of intermediate decisions that are necessary before a final decision is made. For example, in a hiring process, intermediate decisions might be made on the following:

1. decision on the need for the position,
2. decision on how to recruit for the position and conduct a job search,
3. decision on which candidates to interview and test,
4. decision on which candidate is best suited for the organization, or
5. decision on the terms and conditions of employment.

The goal of decision-making in organizations is to improve the function of the organization. The process of making quality decisions in human resources is not unlike other important decision processes. A good decision process must have effective ways to identify and gather relevant and complete information, but it must also be so structured that the human interactions or psycho-social factors involved in decision-making are channeled toward quality decisions. An organization may have excellent information, but the individuals making the decision may be unable to process this information effectively; they may be inclined to conflict or to introduce irrelevant information or judgments that unduly affect the outcome of the decision. Both aspects are necessary for quality decisions to be reached: good information gathering and a process that promotes healthy and fruitful interactions among decision-makers.

The first stage in a sound decision process is collecting information and involves identifying sources of information and gathering information from those sources.

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION SOURCES

For important HRM decisions, decision quality will be substantially affected by the quality of the information sources. Among the sources to be consulted in the hiring, evaluation, or termination process are the following:

Hiring

The most common sources of information in the hiring process involve

1. information provided by candidates (resumes, cover letters, and interview and test responses);
2. information provided by other individuals (work and personal references, including internal references);

3. information provided by institutions (verification of academic degrees, attendance, employment and performance records from previous employers);
4. procedural and policy manuals that delineate the hiring policies and processes; and
5. information from the individual or office in charge of human resources concerning available candidates and hiring goals.

There are a variety of problems associated with these sources. For example, candidates can distort information on their resumes or application forms. The evidence that such distortions occur is considerable. Candidates also can distort information in interview responses. Indeed, there are entire books and workshops devoted to how candidates should respond to interview questions. In addition, irrelevant factors can affect both interviewers and interviewees as information is being exchanged. Factors such as attractiveness, perfume scents, and body language can affect how information is evaluated (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Forbes & Jackson, 1980; Hatfield & Gatewood, 1978; Baron, 1983). Because of the vulnerability of the information provided in this process, quality decisions require that the employer verify to as great extent as is possible all information provided by a candidate. It also suggests that the interview be very skillfully conducted and interviewers skillfully trained so that pertinent and accurate information be obtained and evaluated.

Distortions also can occur with other types of information sources. Work and personal references can exaggerate a candidate's strengths or deficiencies. References can also limit information concerning an employee's work record out of fear of a defamation of character suit. In regard to policies and procedures, these may not be established in writing or may be written poorly. Those in charge of human resources may not be sufficiently knowledgeable or able to explain policies and procedures well.

Performance Evaluation

In the performance evaluation process, sources of information may come from a variety of arenas. These include

1. examples of work (reports written by the employee, accuracy and completeness of records maintained by the employee, materials prepared by the employee);
2. statements of co-workers in oral or written form regarding excellent or problematic performance;
3. observations of the supervisor (written observations or recollections of poor or excellent performance);

4. written records (data maintained on activities such as numbers of questions answered, numbers of programs given, work attendance records, disciplinary warnings);
5. patron statements (signed letters of praise or complaint);
6. statements of policy and procedures regarding performance evaluation;
7. information from the individual or office in charge of human resources on dealing with complicated or difficult evaluation issues.

These sources are not unusual, although some may argue that not all should be used. For example, some might object to co-workers being consulted in a performance evaluation process, and there are arguments for and against such involvement.

As with hiring, although these sources of information are relevant, the potential for distortion is present. Examples of work can be provided selectively, or improper weights can be assigned to particular examples. Co-workers or patron statements may not be objective and may reflect personal admiration or animus. The memory of a supervisor may be highly selective or faulty. Supervisors may not be objective and unduly weigh certain observations more heavily than others. This may be especially insidious for female workers because there is evidence in the general management literature that successful performance by women is undervalued by supervisors (Deaux & Emswiller, 1974; Heilman & Guzzo, 1978; Lott, 1985; Nieva & Gutek, 1981).

Termination

Sources of information for termination are similar to those related to performance evaluation and with the same vulnerabilities. Additional sources of information might include

1. advice from upper-level managers, administrators, and, in some cases, board members, who must support the termination decision;
2. advice from legal counsel who may render judgments on the validity of the information that has been gathered and the process pursued prior to making the termination decision;
3. review of the employment records of other employees past and present to determine if similar decisions were rendered in similar circumstances;
4. information provided directly by the employee in a hearing.

These additional sources of information are vital in any termination proceeding. The judgments of upper-level administrators and board members not only are useful in testing the validity of termination judgment, they also supply information on the support that such a judgment would receive if challenged, as is common, by the employee affected. Similarly, discussion with legal counsel is a prerequisite because of the liabilities associated with termination decisions. Studies of previous employment decisions help assure that the employer has been consistent in applying its discipline. Reviewing past practices helps assure that charges of discrimination and "disparate treatment" will not be successfully adjudicated by the employee if a legal challenge is made. The employee is also an important source of information before a termination is completed. When a termination judgment is about to be made, the employer may consider a hearing in which the employee can provide an explanation regarding the conduct or performance that is problematic. This hearing may provide new and important information, and it is much better for the employer to have this information prior to a termination than after it.

There are, however, potential problems with these sources as well. The judgments of administrators and board members are not always based on a sound knowledge of the law or good human resource practices. Advice from attorneys may not always be definitive, and the need to balance possible legal action with the effects of inaction is still required of decision-makers on this issue. When reviewing past practices, it is important to examine both the similarities and dissimilarities of termination circumstances and to ensure that accurate records were made and a complete search of the files conducted. Finally, information obtained from an employment hearing is based on the employee's perception of the situation. The source must be considered self-serving and biased, therefore, the information gathered needs to be carefully verified and placed in its proper context.

Gathering Information

The process of obtaining information is closely related but distinct from identifying the sources of information. How information is obtained can affect the quality of that information and how it is evaluated.

Hiring

Much of the information obtained in the hiring process is gathered from the applicant, usually in writing or through telephone conversations. Because self-interest plays a substantial role for the applicant, the applicant is bound to emphasize positive information and suppress or understate negative material. This is one reason why the employer should use an application form and not rely solely on resumes. Application forms permit the employer to seek information on the job-related areas deemed important by the employer and, to some extent, allow the employer to control the order and manner in which that information is given (Rubin, 1991).

Information is also gathered from other sources in the hiring process, such as references. The two traditional manners of reference gathering is by writing or by phone. Which method is chosen can affect how the information is evaluated. Generally, written work references are considered to be less influential than are references obtained by telephone. Ostensibly, this is based on the belief that the referee is more spontaneous on the telephone and feels more comfortable with saying critical things because there is no written evidence, and phone conversations seem less formal.

Information may also be gathered through job testing. An applicant may be subjected to psychological or skill tests, the results of which are evaluated by decision-makers. Information gathered in this manner is, in one sense, provided by the applicant, but in another sense is being provided by the creators of the test instruments. The meaning of the scores on such instruments may not be known by the test taker. Gathering information in this manner may be very useful. In fact, job tests, especially work sampling tests, when properly selected and administered, have been shown to be as good if not better predictors than job interviews (Gatewood & Feild, 1990; McClelland, 1973).

Performance Evaluation

A variety of strategies may be used to gather information for a performance review. A very common technique is direct observation. Direct observation has the advantage that the decision-maker is actually observing the performance to be evaluated. The problem with direct observation is that the observations tend to be selective and unsystematic. In addition, how one interprets an observation could be affected by one's prejudgments concerning the individual. An evaluator may be more forgiving or generous in interpreting an incident if the individual being evaluated is perceived as a good performer or a friend. There is also evidence that a female worker's performance may be evaluated differently from that of a male worker's (Nieva & Gutek, 1981). Additional problems arise because evaluators are usually very busy people, and they may observe employees only a relatively small proportion of their actual work time. Hence, the sample of observations may be unrepresentative of the actual performance. Finally, negative information is usually weighed more heavily than positive information (Arvey & Campion, 1982), as are the most recent observations. In these cases, some observations may be given more weight unduly.

Other techniques for gathering information involve getting information orally or in writing from co-workers or others. Such forms of information gathering can foster a sense of "peer review" among colleagues, but they also may produce negative effects. First, information gathered in this manner can be selective. It is possible that, inadvertently or intentionally, not all perspectives were solicited, or the information provided may be the result of personal biases. Information gathered orally may be easier to obtain because it generally requires less effort, but it also may be less reliable. Information acquired in writing may be less forthcoming but suggests greater commitment. Fewer individuals, however, may be willing to provide written information.

Additional information may be gathered by consulting work records and files. Gathering such information can be extremely valuable in that it often provides quantitative documentation regarding an individual's performance. The process is vulnerable to selective examination of the file, inaccuracies in files, consulting files that are not relevant to the performance judgment, and ethical issues regarding ensuring the employee knows of the existence and content of such records, and indicating who has access to such files and for what reasons. Consulting records, even when accurate, can be problematic. For example, the use of previous performance evaluations in assessing the current performance of an employee may seriously distort a review's outcome. Performance reviews are supposed to be assessments of current performance, but evaluators may be hesitant to alter an evaluation judgment that is lower than previous evaluations.

Termination

Although the type of information sources for termination decisions are similar to performance evaluation sources, additional considerations should be made regarding gathering the necessary information. Generally, information gathering for termination comes much later in the decision-making process than performance evaluation and is based in large part on the information obtained from earlier efforts to gather performance information for performance review. For this reason, consultation with prior records is a normal part of the information-gathering process.

In addition, obtaining current direct observations and reports of others are basic to a termination decision. But in the latter stages, gathering this type of information must be done scrupulously, thoroughly, and in private. Consultation with files and records must be done in a confidential manner. All information gathered, past and present, must be checked for accuracy, timeliness, and job-relatedness. Only individuals who are authorized to gather the relevant information should be permitted access to it. In addition, all negative information must be reviewed to assure that the employee was made aware of the problem in a timely fashion and had an opportunity to respond to this information. To this extent, the information-gathering process for a termination decision is also a quality review process.

HUMAN FACTORS IN HUMAN RESOURCE DECISIONS

There are many psychological and sociological factors that must be considered when approaching the interactions of decision-makers. Because these factors are common to the three different types of decisions under study, this discussion will focus primarily on the psycho-social dynamics of the hiring process.

In some instances in human resource decision-making, only one individual is involved. Even when only one individual is involved, that person's personality, intellectual capacities, background, experiences, and prejudices play a role. The key factors for an individual making the decision is basically the same as when groups make decisions.

When more than one individual is involved, and this is frequently the case, then the decision process becomes even more complex because the interactions occur not only between the individual and the information but between the individuals themselves. For this reason, it is important to explore the dynamics of group decision-making when considering many human resource decisions. The problem is broadened even further because there may be several individuals involved who will be evaluating information but who may not have decision-making authority, only authority to recommend or state an opinion. These individuals also interact with decision-makers and can have considerable influence over the final decision.

The involvement of groups in library human resource decision-making varies. Group decision-making is a common practice in hiring. Search committees and group interviewing processes are ubiquitous practices. Group decision-making in performance evaluation is not common in public libraries but is fairly common in academic ones. This occurs in academic libraries through the use of peer review systems, which contribute to a final judgment of a manager or director. Termination decisions commonly involve groups of upper-level administrators, managers, and board members before final determinations are made. Boards and directors often meet as a group if a termination is challenged.

Decision quality is based on how and what information is acquired, how well it is learned and retained, and how well it is recalled and evaluated. Some researchers have suggested that the amount of information an individual can acquire, retain, and recall is really quite small, and this is a primary reason why group decision-making is advantageous. Groups, almost invariably, are able to recall a great amount of material than an individual (Guzzo, 1982).

Group decision-making appears to have several distinct advantages. First, a variety of perspectives can be elicited, hence there is less opportunity for restriction of essential information (Nutt, 1989); second, more information is remembered when it is *acquired* in front of a group than when individuals receive information in the absence of others. This suggests that group interviewing increases the ability of interviewers to remember the information provided by the interviewee. In fact, the total amount of information *recalled* at a subsequent time is greater when a group accomplishes the recall, rather than a single individual. In addition, there is some evidence that each individual member, if he or she becomes actively involved in the decision process of the group, improves in the amount of information that can be recalled. This suggests that group settings should encourage active involvement of all participants (Guzzo, 1982).

This does not mean that the group decision-making process is perfect. Although a great deal of information may be acquired by a group, not all information is recalled when decisions are being reached. This may be due to faulty memories on the part of the decision-makers, or it may be due to one or more members of the group dominating the decision process and forcing the group to focus on only a certain segment of the information collected. This results in selective recall, which could lead to poor decisions.

Similarly, individual members of groups are sometimes swayed to accept the norms or values established by other members of the group. When this happens, the individual's ability to make independent judgments is affected. This is more than a need to "go along"; such individuals may genuinely interpret information differently while working within the group than they would otherwise interpret it if they were alone. This accounts for what is called "post-decisional dissonance," which occurs when a decision-maker has misgivings about a decision after he or she is outside the influence of the group (Guzzo, 1982). Consider a group hiring decision in this context. Sometimes, within the group, we accept what other members think is an essential skill or attitude for the job, and we are swayed by this thinking. Later, when we are alone, we begin to reconsider, and we develop a feeling that the right choice might not have been made after all—this is post-decisional dissonance.

Similarly, problems can arise in groups when there are differences in opinion as to what is being recalled. Generally speaking, if two or more people recall an item, or if the majority recall a particular item, it is usually accepted as "the truth." But this may not necessarily reflect what actually happened. Such dynamics can therefore lead to accepting information that is, in fact, not a reflection of reality. A type of "group think" develops. Decisions based on such a situation could be of poor quality and could be especially problematic in termination decisions.

Given the complex dynamic of group decision processes, there are a variety of factors that should be considered in attempting to produce high-quality human resource decisions. They include abilities of the decision-makers, interests of the decision-makers, group size, reward structure, and rules for conduct (Guzzo, 1982).

Abilities of the Decision-Makers

The quality of a decision may well depend on such factors as the intelligence, creativity, analytical abilities, job knowledge, memory, and articulateness of the decision-makers. Of course, there are usually structural and political reasons why some members of a decision-making body are selected. But within these constraints, when decision-makers can be selected from among a pool, it is important that the selection include people with intellectual talents, good social skills, relevant experience, and knowledge of the job, and, equally important, individuals who learn from their past experiences including their mistakes (Nutt, 1989).

Interests of the Decision-Makers

Within a group, the various individuals may have their own interests or the interests of their work unit in mind when making a decision. Clashes of these interests can lead to considerable tensions. This often results in attempts to balance the various interests through what is sometimes referred to as "trade-offs." Trade-offs are found to play a basic role in much group decision-making and suggests that different individuals will place greater emphasis or "weight" on one factor over another, and there is seldom complete agreement on the weights of important factors. This is often a source of much misunderstanding and disagreement among participants. Often, the source of the disagreement, different weighting of factors, is never articulated or exposed, and, consequently, there is often a residue of dissatisfaction in the decision process because the basis of the final decision is not really clear (Guzzo, 1982).

In addition, biases, which cause undue weighting of factors, are not always overcome in group processes. This can seriously impair the ability of participants to recall all pertinent information when the group is trying to come to a decision. For example, one member in the group wants to emphasize a particular job skill because the member wants a particular individual with that skill to get the job. If the individual can narrow the discussion to focus on that skill to the exclusion of recall and discussion of information on other skills, then the selection decision could be seriously distorted.

The issue of the balancing of interests also leads to a consideration of who should be part of the decision. Obviously individuals who have a direct stake in the outcome are likely individuals either to have decision-making authority or input into the decision-making process. Failure to consult with such sources could lead to inferior decisions and politically alienate important employees.

Group Size

When hiring support/clerical staff, decision units tend to be small, even one individual. For positions of greater responsibility, the number of decision-makers may increase substantially. Group size may tend to affect group composition. With larger decision-making bodies, representation can occur from more work units, but the complexity of the interpersonal dynamics increases. Generally, in the hiring process, groups consist of three to six individuals. There is little evidence, however, as to what an optimum size for such a group would be.

A separate issue involves both confidentiality and liability. As a group gets larger, the possibility of information being disseminated to inappropriate individuals increases. Such dissemination may not be intentional; it may be the result of a statement made in an informal setting, or it may result from a memo or document that is inadvertently left in a place where others could view it. This leads to a second point. As the chances for error increase, the possibility that the organization may make an expensive mistake, intentional or otherwise, also increases. On the other hand, group decision-making can conceivably reduce liability because decision-making is dispersed. When only one individual makes a decision, he or she is more susceptible to the charge of bias. When groups make decisions, especially groups that are representative in terms of age, sex, and race, the organization has a stronger case for objectivity, especially when civil rights issues are raised.

Reward Structure

Although seldom part of library decision-processes, organizations can decide to reward decision-makers for making good decisions. In terms of a hiring process, it would be an intriguing proposition to reward job selection committees with bonuses if candidates selected by them subsequently performed well over a defined period of time.

Rules for Conduct

Research on group decision-making suggests that specific procedures for accomplishing a task increase decision quality. This has direct implications for the making of hiring decisions. Certainly, there are a variety of activities that can be carefully structured in the hiring process: recruitment, application-taking and evaluation procedures, reference gathering, interviewing, and group decision-making, including a criterion for selection. When these activities are well structured and clear, the quality of the decision is likely to improve.

Decision Practices

In terms of the actual functioning of decision groups, some practices may increase the chance for decision quality.

Make Sure that the Correct Problem Is Being Addressed

Because of the complexity and uniqueness of the human resource decisions under discussion, it is sometimes difficult to determine where the real problems exist. For hiring, determining exactly what the nature of the job is and what exactly is needed in terms of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the worker to fill it can be extremely difficult. In performance evaluation and termination, it is sometimes difficult to determine if poor performance is the result of a particular worker's abilities or motivation, or if it is caused by external factors such as working conditions, poor supervision, or problematic co-workers. Decisions based on a misanalysis of the problem might seem to offer simple solutions but may actually produce more difficulties (Nutt, 1989).

Separate Idea Generation from Idea Evaluation

When groups make decisions, there is a temptation to form judgments about the possibilities or alternative courses of action before the total group of possibilities or alternative actions have been fully expressed. This could be the result of some individuals with vested interests attempting to push through particular solutions, or it may be a result of a false sense of urgency or a response to the press of time (Nutt, 1989; Guzzo, 1982). No matter what the reason, it tends to restrict decision-making quality. Within the hiring process, this often arises during the interview stage. As each candidate is interviewed, there is a tendency to form overall judgments about the interviewed candidate immediately. This may affect assessments of subsequent candidates unduly. Indeed, there is a phenomenon known as "contrast effect," which suggests that when a poor candidate is interviewed, the next candidate interviewed will be rated higher than he or should would otherwise be rated if no candidate had preceded and vice versa; when a strong candidate is interviewed, the next candidate will be rated somewhat lower than he or she would have been rated if no candidate had been interviewed previously. It is useful then when making group hiring decisions to minimize evaluation statements prior to having the full information on all the interviewed candidates. Following all the interviews, each member of the group should be encouraged to recall all pertinent facts and characteristics of each candidate that would help predict job success or failure.

Separating idea generation from evaluation may also reduce the tendency of decision-makers to rely on organizational traditions and past practices, which is a very powerful force in most organizational situations. By allowing all ideas to be expressed first, novel and imaginative observations may emerge rather than reliance on only common and well-accepted ones (Nutt, 1989).

Train in Group Dynamics and Conflict Resolution

Conflict is an inevitable part of most decision processes and may often arise when considering candidates for a job. The conflicts that do arise, even when resolved, are often handled poorly leaving individuals angry, upset, and feeling that they have been poorly understood. By teaching decision-makers how to deal with and mediate conflicts and how to present points of view in constructive, nonthreatening ways, superior decisions can be reached (Guzzo, 1982). Oftentimes, group members hesitate to deal with conflict leading to avoidance of important issues or attempts to suppress those who create conflict. It should be kept in mind that moderate levels of conflict can be productive in that conflict can stimulate further exploration and information gathering, reevaluation of conclusions, and reviews of the processes by which decisions were made (Nutt, 1989).

Understand the Criteria for Judgments

A classic problem in attempting to make judgments in human resources is trying to make clear what criteria should be applied in making the judgment. Often, decisions rely more on tradition and intuition rather than on a criterion specifically related to the situation. In the hiring process, this is a notable problem. Although hiring committees usually have written job descriptions to work from, the fact is that these descriptions are seldom adequate criteria in and of themselves to provide a sound framework for decisions. Even when criteria are elaborate, different individuals may place a greater weight to various job requirements and activities. When this occurs, different criteria are, in fact, being applied by the evaluators. Because there is seldom uniformity in applying the criteria, the participants bargain "giving" on some points and "holding fast" on others. Regrettably, the subsequent effects of such trade-offs are seldom well evaluated at the time decisions are reached (Guzzo, 1982).

Monitor Ethical Standards

Hiring, evaluation, and termination decision-making, as with almost all human resource practices, have ethical implications. Individual lives can be profoundly affected by these decisions, and it is incumbent on decision-makers to ensure that all individuals who are subjected to decision processes be treated with respect and that all appropriate communications and practices be honest and open. The maintenance of secret files and communications regarding an employee and deceptive practices in the gathering of information should be avoided.

Confidentiality is an important ethical consideration in these processes. Confidential materials concerning an employee should be disseminated only on a "need to know" basis. For example, an employee's performance evaluation or disciplinary record should be available only to those who are involved in performance or disciplinary decisions. Work references should be available only to those who are making hiring decisions.

Allowing irrelevant factors to play a role in the decision-making process is also an ethical breach. Obviously, factors such as race, age, sex, and religion are especially pernicious when used as criteria to exclude or mistreat individuals.

One researcher (Catron, 1983, cited in Nutt, 1989) has proposed the "billboard" tactic to test ethical conduct. Basically, this technique asks decision-makers to consider if the procedures and deliberations that led up to their decision were published on the front page of the newspaper, would they feel uncomfortable?

CONCLUDING NOTE

When all is said and done, even with the best decision processes, the result may not be what we expected. An individual hired even by the most systematic and thorough means may turn out to be a poor performer. Our attempts to measure the performance of others may lead to conflict and loss of productivity; our decision to terminate may lead to divisiveness, lowering of morale, loss of productivity, even public censure. But there is no doubt that such poor outcomes are much more likely to arise when decision-making is informal and unsystematic. In an age of considerable liability for human resource decisions, our greatest danger is when we act without complete information, when we act too quickly, when we fail to consult all appropriate sources, and when our deliberations are based not on facts but on the intuitions or prejudices of ourselves or others. It is also essential to realize that decision-making is a distinctly human process. Human interaction, interpretation, and evaluation play an essential role, and because humans possess both strengths and weaknesses, good decision-making strategies need to be developed so that these strengths are promoted and the weaknesses suppressed.

REFERENCES

Arvey, R. D., & Campion, J. E. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. *Personnel Psychology, 35*(2), 281-322.

Baron, R. A. (1983). "Sweet smell of success"? The impact of pleasant artificial scents on evaluations of job applicants. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 709-713.

Catron, B. L. (1983). Ethical postures and ethical posturing. *American Review of Public Administration 17*(2/3), 155-159.

Deaux, K., & Emswiller, T. (1974). Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What is skill for the male is luck for the female. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29*(1), 80-85.

Forbes, R. J., & Jackson, P. R. (1980). Non-verbal behaviour and the outcome of selection interviews. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53*(1), 65-72.

Gatewood, R. D., & Feild, H. S. (1990). *Human resource selection* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Dryden.

Guzzo, R. A. (Ed.). (1982). *Improving group decision making in organizations: Approaches from theory and research.* New York: Academic Press.

Hatfield, J. D., & Gatewood, R. D. (1978). Nonverbal cues in the selection interview. *Personnel Administrator, 23*(1), 30, 35-37.

Heilman, M. E., & Guzzo, R. A. (1978). The perceived cause of work success as a mediator of sex discrimination in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 21*(3), 346-357.

Lott, B. (1985). The devaluation of women's competence. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*(4), 43-60.

McClelland, D. C. (1973). Testing for competence rather than for "intelligence." *American Psychologist, 28*(1), 1-14.
Nieva, V. F., & Gutek, B A. (1981). *Women and work: A psychological perspective.* New York: Praeger.
Nutt, P. C. (1989). *Making tough decisions: Tactics for improving managerial decision making.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Rubin, R. E. (1991). *Human resource management in libraries: Theory and practice.* New York: Neal-Schuman.

THE ROLE OF LEADERSHIP IN PLANNING: A FRANK AND CANDID ANALYSIS OF THE REALITIES OF PLANNING IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Nancy Bolt

INTRODUCTION

In a syndicated article by Tom Peters (1992), published in Denver's *Rocky Mountain News*, Tom Peters quotes Oliver Cromwell as saying, "No one rises so high as he who knows not whither he is going." Peters goes on to say that he believes that personal success, and, by extension, business success by business leaders, is "about 99% passion, and 1% plan. Moreover, the passion must be for the present."

Peters is half right. But he's also half wrong. The passion must be present, but this article will argue that the passion must be combined with a long-term vision.

This article will not present yet another comprehensive approach to library planning. There are enough of those out there already. Rather, this article will present elements that leaders must consider that are critical to any successful planning process and contribute to success. This is not a primer on how to plan, but more what to include in any successful planning process and why it is important.

CHANGE

But first a word about change. Jerry McCarthy, a computer consultant in Denver, Colorado, says, "The only person who welcomes change is a wet baby." An underlying element of leadership, particularly in the area of planning, is to help people consider, even welcome, how an organization might change. People are frightened by planning efforts. They see them as a potential threat to their own piece of the organization. "What if my job isn't a priority after the planning process is complete? Will my little turf in the library continue to receive support?" It feels safer to resist the change, resist the planning effort, and continue what John

Gardner (1987, p. 15) calls "systemic stagnation." This means that both staff and leaders are satisfied with things as they are. Gardner goes on to say that organizations that need change show clear evidence that it is needed. But it is easier to ignore the warning signs. What is needed are leaders who can "bestir" themselves, and they will be credited with "an uncanny gift of prophesy."

It is role of the leader to confront change, propose change, empower people to suggest change, soften the fear of change, and manage those whose fear paralyzes them. The elements described below can assist these efforts.

TYPES OF PLANNING PROCESSES

There are five types of planning process that I want to briefly mention, showing the advantages and disadvantages of each:

1. traditional long-range planning,
2. strategic long-range planning,
3. annual planning,
4. outcome/standards planning, and
5. total quality management planning.

Comprehensive Long-Range Planning

Comprehensive long-range planning is the oldest planning model, and the one most often used. The original *A Planning Process for Public Libraries* (Palmour, Bellassai, and De Wath, 1980) and the revised *Planning and Role Setting for Public Libraries* (McClure, Owen, Zweizig, Lynch, and Van House, 1987) attempt to assist public libraries in a comprehensive planning process. Two advantages of this approach are that there are lots of guides to help a library through the process, and it can include the interests and activities of all library staff. It is the least threatening of all the planning processes to library staff.

The biggest problem with traditional, comprehensive long-range planning is the "comprehensive" part of it. The second biggest problem is that the plans reflect so much compromise and fuzzy thinking that they become weighty doorstops rather than guides to actual activity.

Comprehensive long-range planning is particularly liked by staff who feel they will be left out of a strategic planning process. Comprehensive long-range planning most often takes what a library is currently doing, projects it doing the same thing only a little more, includes all current activities of the library reconfigured slightly differently, and library life goes on the same as before. In *Close to Power*, William Lucy (1988) says, "those who call themselves planners establish psychological limits for themselves by focussing on the preparation of plans as their goal rather than trying to achieve results in which the plans are an important stage" (p. 27).

Comprehensive long-range planning typically starts with the articulation of a mission, data collection about the community and the library, and definition of goals with objectives under them. The full implementation of the plan with a detailed action plan and the annual and long-term evaluation are often slighted.

Comprehensive planning too often gets bogged down in definitions. What's a mission, vision, purpose, goal, objective, activity, strategy? Planning committees have been known to argue endlessly over which is measurable—the goal or the objective.

Strategic Long-Range Planning

Lucy (1988) describes the difference between strategic planning and more traditional planning as "its emphasis on (1) action, (2) consideration of a broad and diverse set of stakeholders, (3) attention to external opportunities and threats and internal strengths and weaknesses, and (4) attention to actual or potential competitors" (p. 49).

Strategic planning cures some of the ills of comprehensive planning in that the focus is on what the library strategically needs to do to improve its position or targets special, high priority needs. As the major defect of comprehensive long-range planning is that too much is included, the major defect of strategic planning is that in concentrating on a few key areas, other parts of library operation are excluded. This can give the impression that these areas are less important, creating anxiety among the staff.

An alternative approach is to establish priorities and require all staff to plug their activities into these priorities. For example, in the Colorado Department of Education, approximately two-thirds of the activity is related to pre k-12 grade education and one-third is related to libraries and adult literacy. Yet the department's priorities have been in the pre k-12 arena. The mailroom clerks at the Colorado Talking Book Library, who serve primarily home-bound senior citizens, find it difficult to fit their activities into priorities that focus on student achievement and parent involvement in education.

Annual Planning

Annual planning is usually budget and deadline driven. The city manager or university administrator asks for a budget by a specific date. You and your board or staff advisors scramble to determine how much to ask for. You think strategically about what it really costs to do something; how to invoke a crisis atmosphere with the funders about how terrible the situation will be if you are not given an increase; how to keep from specifically saying what will happen because you don't want to scare the staff to death; and how much more to ask for than you really need in order to still get a little increase once they cut you back.

Annual planning should be done in the context of a long-range or strategic plan.

Outcome/Standards Based Planning

Outcome or standards based planning is the latest approach to planning, currently used primarily in education. In this approach, desired outcomes are first identified or standards are set. Planning is tied to the best way to reach the outcome or standard. This approach has the advantage of being focused on a desired future. If the library is in the position of setting for itself the desired outcome or standard to be reached, this type of planning can be very successful. If the outcomes are customer/student based and the standards broad enough, most library staff can feel their activities can fit into the articulated outcomes.

The disadvantage of outcomes/standards planning is the difficulty of articulating the outcomes or standards. Even more problematic is when the parent institution sets the outcomes or standards, and they may or may not relate to the library activity. In this arena, all the elements indicated below are particularly critical.

Total Quality Management Planning

Another planning method currently popular is planning in the context of Total Quality Management (TQM). TQM uses customer input, benchmarks, and cross-level staff teams to establish organizational priorities and activities. While TQM does involve staff in a meaningful way, I believe that it also presents problems for the exercise of leadership. Often, leadership in planning involves predicting what the public will want in the future. Asking the public as part of the TQM process can result in an uninformed public asking for what they already have. Would libraries ever have become automated if the TQM process had asked the public what they wanted in card catalogs?

All of these models can break down in the face of real and concrete decisions that must be made in order for the library to thrive, maybe even survive, in today's fiscal and competitive environment.

I've come to believe that it doesn't really matter which of the models above you choose or are forced to use. What is critical is that the planning leader, personally, keep the six elements below in mind in whatever planning process is used.

ELEMENTS OF A SUCCESSFUL PLAN

The principles below were selected from many sources. Lucy (1988) in *Close to Power*, Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) in *Changing the Essence*, Belasco (1990) in *Teaching the Elephant to Dance*, Covey (1990) in *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, and Kouzes and Posner (1988) in *The Leadership Challenge*, all use the same basic elements, although sometimes they are combined in different ways or given different names.

But the principles really come from my own experience in planning, ten years in facilitating libraries that are engaging in long-range planning, and in leading two state library organizations. The principles are

1. Determine a vision
2. Communicate the vision to others
3. Flexible persistence
4. Collaboration/infiltration
5. Staff involvement
6. Assessment and evaluation

Determine a Vision

Kouzes and Posner (1988) write, "Every organization, every social movement begins with a dream. The dream or vision is the force that invents the future. Leaders spend considerable effort gazing across the horizon of time, imagining what it will be like when they have arrived at their final destinations" (p. 9).

This is the first and most crucial step. A leader MUST determine the direction he or she wants to take the organization. The clearer the end result is presented, the more likely that the vision can be attained. But it is critical that only the end be envisioned as this process starts. Envisioning the means to the end can lead to early failure. One failure of a path to a vision does not mean the vision fails, only that another path must be developed.

The difficult part of this step is actually articulating the vision. It must come from the gut first and not from the head. Of all the possible visions of the future, what is it that you want the library to be? The vision can be for the library as a whole or for individual parts of it. Each unit in the library can have its own separate vision of the future that are then brought together through a planning process.

Stephen Covey (1990) in *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* calls it "beginning with the end in mind." This is based on the principle that "all things are created twice. There's a mental or first creation and a second or physical creation to all things" (p. 99).

In a recent tour of a winery in Napa Valley, the winemaker described his process for making a good wine. First he envisioned what the wine would taste like and then he tried to put together grapes to get that taste. He did not combine grapes and choose the best combination to sell. First he envisioned the wine in his mouth, in his nose, with all of his senses. With that vision, he had many possibilities to bring it about.

In karate, even young children, novices in the sport, can break boards. The technique is simple. They look below the board at where they want their hand to be. The board then becomes something their hand simply passes through in order to get to where they want their hand to be. More proficient karate students can break an unbelievable number of boards using this same technique. With a clear vision in mind, obstacles become insignificant barriers to reaching the desired future.

One major issue in creating a vision is who creates it. The vision can come from anywhere, but the leader must, first and foremost, understand, support, internalize, commit to, embrace the vision as his or her own. Sometimes, in the best of circumstances, the leader has a visionary team that can participate in the visioning process. But even without this supportive team, the leader can create and communicate a vision.

Communicate the Vision

Public library guru Charlie Robinson from the Baltimore County Public Library, has what I believe to be the best definition of leadership: The essence of leadership is the communication of commitment.

Creating the vision is the commitment element of Charlie's definition. But the second key element is the communication of that commitment. This is selling your vision to others.

Beginning with a clear vision doesn't necessarily mean that it is set in concrete. Even clear visions can be improved as they are communicated and discussed. A good leader will flesh out the vision as a result of this communication and discussion.

A major component of leadership is followers. No one can lead without someone else going in the same direction. Communicating the vision is what produces not only followers, but passionate followers committed to the same vision and direction.

Research (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 16) on what people want from their leaders reveals three primary characteristics: forward looking, inspiring, and honest. People want to believe that their leaders know where they are going (and taking the organization), and that they are honest/credible in communicating about that direction. People must have confidence that they, personally, can affect the future. That confidence in themselves comes from confidence in their leader to which they look for guidance and inspiration. Confidence in themselves and the leader, as Gardner (1987) puts it, "greatly increases the likelihood of sustained, highly motivated effort" (p. 13). The research done by Kouzes and Posner (1988) reveals that, "Credibility of action is the single most significant determinant of whether a leader will be followed over time" (p. xvii).

Communicating a vision combined with belief in the credibility of the leader has a powerful positive effect on the entire organization. Kouzes and Posner (1988) find in their research that "when leaders clearly articulated their vision for the organization, people reported significantly higher levels of job satisfaction, commitment, loyalty, esprit de corps, clarity of direction, pride, and productivity. It is quite evident that clearly articulated visions make a difference" (pp. 92-93).

Visions must be communicated over and over. They must permeate the very fabric of an organization. Staff may doubt the commitment of a leader to create a future for the library and lead the library toward that future. Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) add, "People also forget, and sometimes they do not hear what they have been told. Messages that are very familiar to top management must be repeated and repeated, more than top management would believe to be necessary" (p. 85).

The best way to communicate a vision is . . . just start talking about it, over and over, adjusting it as input comes, making it clearer each time, always communicating your commitment.

Flexible Persistence

Leaders seeking to implement a vision must be persistent in moving toward the vision but flexible in the methods chosen. The persistence requires, purely and simply, energy. If leaders don't have the energy and excitement about the vision, staff will not have the energy either.

Having the vision, the end result, clearly in mind allows a library leader to seek numerous paths to attain the vision. This is the primary reason why visions should not start with a single path to attainment. If there is a clear vision, the failure of one path creates a mere pause until another path is found.

When we created the Access Colorado Library and Information Network (ACLIN), we began with one clear vision: free library and citizen access to the maximum number of library resources in Colorado, regardless of where a person lives in the state. The vision was remarkably easy to articulate, but the path toward it changed constantly over the three years it took to get the money to bring it to fruition. Three different approaches to getting the phone lines installed and access provided failed until the final successful method was developed. But the vision stayed clear the entire time.

Keeping the vision in mind while exploring different paths to the ultimate fruition produces a way of thinking that is both inspiring to staff and productive in the outcome. Sandy Cooper, State Librarian in North Carolina, calls this "informed opportunism." It is possible to take advantage of opportunities that come along if the ultimate result is clearly defined.

Lucy (1988) calls it "strategic thinking," and describes it this way: "Strategic thinking helps to identify resources, calculate how to combine these resources in timely and effective combinations, and how to use them at opportune moments to achieve results" (p. 4).

Most helpful, the existence of a vision gives a leader a context for planning activities, choosing courses of action, and making informed decisions. Will a choice to be made bring one closer to the vision or not?

Collaboration (Infiltration)

Collaboration is meaningful cooperation with other organizations to accomplish one's goals. Infiltration is collaboration with stakeholders who have an effect on your organization's future.

Partners are valuable contributors to the achievement of a vision. Part of "informed opportunism" is identifying those who can help bring about the desired results.

Steven Covey (1990) in *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, advocates what he calls "the third alternative" (p. 207). It's a step beyond seeking a win/win solution. The third alternative is finding a way to approach a problem that is better and more satisfying than either of the parties involved could develop alone. You not only "win," but get more than you originally even conceived possible. That's the best kind of collaboration that leads to the "third alternative."

And then there's infiltration. Almost all libraries are part of some larger governmental structure upon which they depend for survival. Cultivating that relationship in a positive way is essential and requires constant vigilance. Implementing the library's vision in the context of a parent organization that may or may not share the same vision is a challenge. Infiltrating the organization allows you to sell your vision inside the organization and/or relate your vision to the vision of the parent organization.

Joey Rodger, Executive Director of the Urban Libraries Council, quotes a city council member as saying that there are four things that assist success in a bureaucratic structure: (1) keep problems in-house, (2) win a prize every once in a while, (3) be a partner, don't ask for what's unrealistic, and (4) be a part of the solution to the problem. He concluded by saying it's harder to un-fund a partner than someone with their hand out.

Stakeholders can begin as supporters of a vision or detractors. Leaders ignore negative stakeholders at their own future peril.

When we attempted to initiate a statewide borrowers card in Colorado, without compensation to net lenders, we knew we had to obtain two kinds of cooperation. First, the majority of the libraries had to support the concept, and, second, those key stakeholder libraries that opposed the idea had to be converted. We put the negative stakeholders on the planning committee and asked them to help design a program that would address all of their concerns. They did, and the program was implemented on July 1, 1992.

Lucy (1988, p. 47) suggests concepts and processes to consider in making collaborative efforts successful. It is important to build coalitions before key decisions are made so that there is adequate time to seek the best solution incorporating everyone's needs. Seek agreement on low-controversy policy alternatives so that there is a history of cooperation, even friendship, when the more controversial issues are discussed. Look at the key concerns and inclinations of key decision-makers. Who influences the influential? Do policymakers respond to citizens, faculty/students, other stakeholders? From how many of them can you get support?

Credibility is also a key element in collaboration (Lucy, 1988, p. 170). To be effective, you must be credible. Others must believe that your participation in decisions is appropriate. "Legitimacy gets you in the door and a seat at the table. . . . Credibility comes from how you handle yourself at the table." To be a partner at the table means you have to accept the pain and responsibility for making hard choices. Balancing the needs and vision of the library with the needs and vision of the parent or collaborative organizations provides ample challenge to create Covey's third alternative.

Involving Staff

No leader achieves results alone. Transforming a vision into reality requires the efforts of a whole team. Part of leadership is inspiring that team effort and empowering staff to participate in the effort in a meaningful and appropriate way.

Interaction Associates (1993), a California training firm focusing on group dynamics, suggests five levels of involvement in organizational decision- making (pp. 3-26). The five levels of involvement are directly related to the level of ownership of the decision.

Level 1: Decide and announce—the supervisor makes up his or her mind and announces a decision. No involvement of staff and no level of ownership.

Level 2: Gather input from individuals and decide—this can produce some level of ownership, at least if some of the individuals recognize their own ideas in the final decision made.

Level 3: Gather input from a group and decide—the advantage of this level, both for the staff and for the supervisor, is that ideas have the benefit of discussion in a group situation where people can build on other ideas. It produces a higher level of ownership if the group's input is reflected in the decision finally made.

Level 4: Consensus—the supervisor is a participant in the group decision-making and the group's decision, agreed to by all, is the final decision made. This produces a high level of ownership by all who are involved. It works best if a back-up method of decision-making is designated from the very beginning—if consensus cannot be reached, the supervisor decides based on the discussion. It also has the extreme advantage that employees know that in order to have their position prevail, they must be willing to listen, accept, and possibly compromise with others. Used to the best advantage, the solution is Covey's "third alternative."

Level 5: Delegate with constraints—the supervisor delegates a decision to a group of staff with clear constraints (I prefer to call them parameters) in which the staff is to work. It relieves the supervisor from the decision-making process (once the parameters are given) and produces the highest level of staff ownership in a decision.

A leader working to communicate and implement a vision would most likely use the higher involvement/ownership levels. These levels work to implement a vision in other ways as well:

1. They tend to produce the most innovative approaches because more creative minds are involved.
2. People feel empowered to act and give their full commitment to the vision.
3. When one path fails, there is a cadre of people who understand the vision and can find new approaches.
4. Not only staff but other stakeholders can participate in the discussion, planning, and decision-making process.
5. It allows those who do something best to exercise their skills.
6. It produces very satisfied staff and excellent decisions.

Leaders keep the big picture in mind and stay out of the little stuff. Leader involvement in details of any project can stifle staff creativity involvement. When a leader tells staff what to do, the responsibility for any action falls on the leader's shoulders.

The leader's decision about involving staff is a controversial one. Some advocate less sharing of decision-making and more individual decisiveness. For example, Herb White (1987) says:

> But leadership skills are not the same as management skills, and primarily they are instinctive although they can be refined. The confusion becomes most apparent when it is suggested that leaders seek consensus and learn to compromise. The search for consensus is the very opposite of what they do, and if they agree to compromise it is part of a pragmatic process for yielding a little bit now in order to win a lot later. (pp. 68-69)

In the same vein, John Berry (1993) quotes K. Wayne Smith, OCLC CEO, saying, "due process sometimes outlasts the window of opportunity" (p. 28).

This is why I like the Interaction Associates approach. Their entire decision-making process makes it clear that the ultimate decision is ALWAYS in the hands of the organization leader. It is his or her decision about what level of decision-making to delegate. They do make the point, however, that more minds and voices sometimes make better decisions.

A leader is foolhardy who subdues his or her instincts about a *right* decision in honor of a process. By the same token, a leader who only listens to his/her own voice, all the time, runs the real risk of making bad or at least nonproductive decisions. Gardner (1987) urges leaders to "keep a measure of diversity and dissent in the system. Dissent isn't comfortable, but generally it is simply the proposing of alternatives—and a system that isn't continuously examining alternatives is not likely to evolve creatively" (p. 15).

What is needed is the balance, best suggested by Covey's third alternative. Any staff-community-stakeholder involvement should result in not only better, but "quantum leap" better, decisions. Kouzes and Posner's (1988, p. 38) research shows that 50% of the time, the best ideas that made a project successful did not come for the leader him or herself but rather from the leader's supervisor or the leader's staff. It was the ability of the leader to recognize a good idea and work with staff to run with it that contributed to the success.

This relates closely to the key element of flexible persistence, the continual search to identify alternative methods to reach an identified mission.

Assessment and Evaluation

Finally, the sixth key element is that of assessment and evaluation. I'm using these terms with the following definitions. Assessment is the process of measuring a library's success in achieving its vision, goals, objectives, however they are named. Evaluation is a body of critical decisions, made as a result of the assessment, that lead toward new efforts and directions.

The literature variously describes three kinds of assessment:

1. Input assessment measures what goes into making something happen in the library (number of programs planned or books purchased).
2. Output assessment measures what the library produces with those inputs (number of people who attend programs or borrow books).
3. Outcome assessment measures the impact of the library's activities on those it is serving (what impact did program attendance or a book checked out have on people's lives).

Obviously, it is easier to collect data about inputs and outputs than outcomes. In fact, one line of thought says that it is impossible to collect outcome or impact data because the library is seldom the only contributor to that impact. In addition, the only possible way to measure impact is to ask the library user directly—clearly the most difficult and expensive way to collect data.

One excellent example comes from the *Journal of the American Medical Association* where a letter to the editor reported a study done in the Rochester, New York, area (Joynt, Marshall, & McClure, 1991). Threatened with severe budget cuts because the New York Department of Health saw no "useful linkage" between the need for a hospital to maintain a medical library and its effect on patient care, the medical library community, in response to that assertion, asked doctors to request some information from their hospital library related to a current clinical case and to evaluate its impact on the care of their patients. The doctors reported changes in the following specific aspects of care as a result of the materials they received: diagnosis (29%); choice of tests (51%); choice of drugs (45%); reduced length of hospital stay (19%); change in advice given to the patient (72%); avoided hospital admission (12%); avoided hospital acquired infection (8%); avoided surgery (21%); avoided additional tests or procedures (49%); and *avoided mortality (19%)* [emphasis added].

Now that's impact. Avoided mortality! Libraries need to think more creatively about how to measure the value of what they do for their users.

Lucy (1988, p. 22) devotes considerable space to suggestions for collecting pertinent information that will influence decision-makers. He says to focus on the information that would help lead to decisions which must be made or which might be made. Gather information that is central to the accepted or competing theories. Gather information that will help decide among alternatives. Information is gathered too often which is not pertinent to decisions which are possible or probable. Information should not be gathered simply because having some information makes analysis feel better. The central question is how might it contribute to arriving at a decision?

At the Colorado State Library, Keith Lance (1993) has developed an evaluative process which he calls CITE (Criteria for Information Transfer Evaluation). It is designed specifically to look at the relationship between inputs, outputs, and outcomes. As we try to prove to the legislature the value of what we do, we need to assess our activity in a different way and move as far as possible toward assessing the impact of what we do. We hope to prove that more inputs has a direct impact on outcomes.

CONCLUSION

In this article, I have looked at the advantages and disadvantages of five planning processes. Libraries choose or are required to use variations of these five processes. The position I am emphasizing is that, regardless of the planning process used, there are six key elements essential to the success of any plan.

I want to close with a thought from Beckhard. He devotes a full chapter to "Resolving the Leader's Personal Dilemmas." Beckhard (1988, pp. 53-54) makes the point that much of the process of visioning, communicating, and motivating staff emanates from the personal values of the leader and that leaders must balance their own values with the needs of the organization. He raises a number of questions/issues:

1. How much will the leader's behavior be driven by personal values, beliefs and priorities, and the need to stimulate and develop the best leadership behavior in staff?
2. What managerial roles does the leader wish to play: manager- director, court of appeal, stimulator-facilitator, consultant?
3. How does the leader wish to be perceived: visionary, entrepreneur, leader/manager, solid business executive?
4. Whose perceptions matter: key administrators, colleagues and subordinates, competitors, the media?
5. What aspects should the leader personally manage?
6. How does the leader integrate business and personal aspects of life?

I will let Beckhard (1988) have the final word. He emphasizes:

> the absolute essentiality of a fundamental change effort being vision-driven. The vision of the end state is a statement of leadership's priorities and commitments. It is the expression of the context, within which goals must be set, activities determined, and commitment secured. (p. 35)

The six key elements of creating, communicating, and persistently pursuing a vision, and then forming coalitions, motivating staff, and assessing the process and outcomes are critical not only to business-library relationships but to community and personal relationships as well.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to recognize James Scamman for the contribution of his thoughts to this article before his untimely death in May 1993.

REFERENCES

Beckhard, R., & Pritchard, W. (1992). *Changing the essence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Belasco, J. A. (1990). *Teaching the elephant to dance: Empowering change in your organization*. New York: Crown.

Berry, J. (1993). K. Wayne's world: OCLC confronts the future. *Library Journal, 118*(9), 28-31.

Covey, S. (1990). *The seven habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Gardner, J. W. (1987, June/July). What leaders do. *The National Voter*, pp. 12-15.

Interaction Associates. (1993). *Mastering meetings, Tools for collaborative action.* San Francisco, CA: Interaction Associates.

Joynt, R. J.; Marshall, J. G.; & McClure, L. W. (1991). Financial threats to hospital libraries [Letter to the editor]. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 266*(9), 1219-1220.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1988). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lance, K. (1993). *Criteria for information transfer evaluation.* Unpublished manuscript.

Lucy, W. (1988). *Close to power: Setting priorities with elected officials.* Washington, DC: American Planning Association.

McClure, C. R.; Owen, A.; Zweizig, D. L.; Lynch, M. J.; & Van House, N. A. (1987). *Plannning and role setting for public libraries: A manual of options and procedures.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Palmour, V. E.; Bellassai, M. C.; & De Wath, N. V. (1980). *A planning process for public libraries.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Peters, T. (1992, October 6). The best-laid plan is no planning at all. *The Rocky Mountain News.*

White, H. S. (1987). Oh, where have all the leaders gone? *Library Journal, 112*(16), 68-69.

REMEMBRANCES OF THINGS PAST

Tom Eadie

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL NOTE: *In writing this paper I set out to say something about some interrelationships and tensions I have detected between faculty (or academic) status for librarians, academic trade-unionism, participative management, the professional status of librarianship, and a number of other loosely related topics. Perhaps I should start with the story of tea time in a small academic library in Canada in the late 1950s.*

When I said tea time, I meant tea time. Society at large countenanced coffee breaks, often two a day, but in this library there was one daily tea break. During this break library staff were expected to maintain an attentive silence while the Chief Librarian and his Associate had edifying conversations on appropriate topics. What an image of unchallenged administrative eminence and non-participative approaches to library functions! This story is set in a period a year or two before I began working in that library as a student assistant. The old order had changed, and a new Chief Librarian reigned by the time I took coffee in a new staff lounge. But while ceremonies and styles had altered, it was clear that the Divine Right of Chiefs still obtained. I remember the time a fellow student assistant (working on his Ph.D.) dared to bring a guest—a junior faculty member—into the Library staff room and was savaged in front of his guest and the other astonished coffee drinkers. There were no evidences of collegial governance to be detected in that library at that time. Nor did the librarians appear to be seeking faculty status in order to gain a professional voice in the direction of the Library. Those were times of undisputed droit de Chef.

A few years later, I was a librarian myself, beginning my first professional job in a large academic library. Within its units there was a fair degree of consultative planning, though practices were not uniform: much depended on the style of the individual department head. The senior administrators were easy to approach and open to discussion, though there were no mechanisms in place to facilitate broad discussion of library issues on a regular basis. The Library Administration supported the involvement of librarians in the faculty association as a means of achieving a form of academic status and reinforcing the professional standing of librarians. This supportive attitude encouraged me to become Library representative on the faculty ad-hoc committee for collective bargaining. One key issue was *that salaries for beginning librarians were anomalously low, which seemed linked to the fact that there were no salary scales, and the rank structure was rather limited: one was either a librarian or an administrative specialist.*

This early association work led to my appointment to a committee jointly established by the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries (CACUL) and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) to draft a document defining the academic status of librarians. The document, among other things, recommended the establishment of library councils, on a model with faculty councils. Later, and growing out of this work with the Canadian Association of University Teachers,[1] I became a member of the CAUT Collective Bargaining Committee, serving for nine years, during a remarkable period when most Canadian faculty associations unionized, with librarians included as members of the bargaining unit in virtually every case.

The second library in which I worked as a professional shared a characteristic with the first: there were no provisions for moving through the ranks other than by taking on administrative responsibility. I played a hand in the development of terms and conditions of employment for librarians which would remedy this deficiency, expand the rank structure, and otherwise put in place most of the benefits and obligations enjoyed by librarians who had faculty or academic status. This response to the concerns of librarians by the library administration was in part intended to show one could achieve appropriate status without faculty assistance, or recourse to collective bargaining.

With this background, it was interesting to take on the position of University Librarian at a small Canadian university with a unionized faculty and a library council in place, and a degree of Administration-Union polarization. The certification of the faculty union had been bitterly contested. My predecessor had been involved in some of the attempts to defeat unionization. There were library-specific clauses in the agreement which seemed to be directed at very particular local situations. And when I arrived, the President asked me if I would be a member of the university's negotiating team in the upcoming contract talks. I agreed. A few years later, I served on the next team, under a different President, and had my first direct experience of a faculty and librarian strike.

You will appreciate from this sketch that there is an experiential basis for complexity in my attitudes. At the very least, I have worked both sides of the bargaining table. From years of experience as a student assistant in libraries I am slightly familiar with the golden era of administrative potency. The libraries I first worked in as a professional were libraries in transition. I did some work, both locally and through national associations, toward the definition and achievement of *academic status for Canadian librarians. I then had an opportunity to direct a library where the librarians had academic status, and where a vehicle for collegial governance was provided by a library council enshrined in the collective agreement. I would like to share with you some of my observations, and some tentative conclusions, from this experience. The experience is obviously limited and does not provide the broad base required for secure pronouncements. On the other hand, it may at least identify areas for further exploration.*

WHY FACULTY STATUS?

The overall reason librarians sought faculty, or academic, status was to be treated appropriately. More specifically: librarians sought improved salaries, access to tenure, sabbatical entitlement, and status in itself. This list is no doubt far from complete but the two paramount items to be added are provisions for non-administrative advancement in the introduction of collegial or participative approaches to governance. These items are not unrelated. If the recognized hierarchy is managerial or administrative, then movement up that hierarchy is the only means of increasing one's involvement in the direction of the library. An alternative hierarchy based on increasing competence and knowledge, progressive accomplishment, wider professional recognition, and like considerations, recognizes that other factors than administrative responsibility are worthy of reward and respect. Without such recognition, collegial or participative forms of governance will be merely formal.

There are a number of reasons why nonadministrative advancement and collegial forms of governance were so important to librarians in the 1970s. Collegial governance seemed central to what it was to be a professional. (Gisela Webb [1988] notes this linkage between professionalism and participation: "Participatory management provides us the opportunities to apply our professional knowledge to the governance of our organizations.") (p. 50). In paradigm professions such as Medicine and Law, the essential professional relationship is that of practitioner-client, a relationship governed by professional codes of ethics, and regulated by self-governing professional bodies and peer committees, and not primarily by employers and administrators. As regards nonadministrative advancement: university libraries were expanding rapidly in the late 1960s and early 1970s in Canada. In the smaller libraries of earlier years, there might have been managerial positions for most librarians (with library support staff working for them) and a degree of satisfaction with the resulting rank, and some involvement in library management. The larger departments of later years meant there were more rank-and-file librarians with little voice outside their department. Opportunities for advancement were blocked by those who had entered the profession only a few years before. As well: new librarians entering university libraries in the late 1960s and early 1970s tended to have rather better academic qualifications than their predecessors. Librarians who had done graduate work in a disciplinary area before turning to librarianship were inclined to look to academic models as appropriate for librarians, specifically the models of academic promotion, and collegial governance. The most compelling reasons, though, were that times had changed. Unlike their predecessors, the new librarians of the 1970s were of the generation of student activists, some of whom had challenged more senior administrations than those to be found in academic libraries. As Louis Kaplan (1988) noted, "They were not afraid to make known their demand for a share in decision-making" (p. 21).

As a practical matter, rank structures and provisions for advancement have salary implications. There is also a need to recognize the enhanced competence that enables an experienced librarian to do "the same job" better than a junior colleague. This concept of qualitative difference is common in the academic realm, where junior faculty and full professors might have the same essential job description (teaches, does research) but are presumed to perform their job at different levels. If the only means of advancement available is through taking on administrative responsibilities, then capable librarians with ambition will seek administrative positions, even if their best talents lie elsewhere. It is in the interest of all concerned to provide alternative means of advancement.

Why was it felt that achieving faculty or academic status was the best way for librarians to gain nonadministrative advancement and collegial forms of governance? Another approach might have been persuading library administrators of the appropriateness of the desired changes. Alternatively, librarians might have sought change through collective bargaining on their own, rather than with faculty. I suspect it was because the academic status was attractive in and of itself: association with faculty was seen as desirable because of their preeminent position in the academic community. As well, faculty or academic status might be achieved by adoption. An enhanced "librarian" status would have had to be developed from scratch. Ironically, in respect of the issue of collegiality, faculty were far from satisfied with the effectiveness of their own role in university governance, so that the model to which librarians looked with envy may not have been that enviable.

WHY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING?

The groundswell of interest in academic status among librarians coincided with an interest on the part of faculty in collective bargaining.

This may not have been wholly coincidental. Salaries for both librarians and faculty were adversely affected by the rapid inflation of the 1970s. For librarians, this provided a motivation for achieving academic status: achieving better salaries through association with the better paid. For faculty, it suggested substituting negotiations under the umbrella of the Labour Relations Act for what has been called "binding supplication." Librarians tended to feel that they could achieve a greater voice in library governance if they were allied with faculty, both because they might achieve some of faculty's collegial rights and because they would have powerful allies in any disputes. Faculty (or, at least, those who favored unionization) tended to be dissatisfied with their influence in university governance, and to seek to strengthen their influence through collective bargaining. Those librarians who wished to join faculty in seeking certification was that many of their colleagues who saw involvement with faculty as enhancing the status of librarians. Faculty unionists, facing certification battles which were often delicately balanced, saw librarians as bloc voters: likely to join a certification battle *en masse* since the benefits of association with faculty were obvious to them. I would not want to misrepresent what is clearly a complex issue, but while there were certainly librarians who favored achieving their goals through collective bargaining, rather more favored the vehicle of academic status. I believe it was the determination of faculty to unionize that in effect offered both routes simultaneously.

There are certain ironies here which will not be lost on the reader. One might wonder whether faculty-negotiated criteria for advancement and the procedures by which they would be applied, would be appropriate to librarians, or whether they would be faculty criteria misapplied, with the effect either of disadvantaging librarians, or librarianship. Equally, one might wonder whether the greater effectiveness which might be conferred on collegial or participative processes through negotiated agreements might not be offset by the adversarial character of collective bargaining and the employer-employee dichotomy which lies at its heart.

IS PARTICIPATIVE MANAGEMENT APPROPRIATE FOR LIBRARIES?

To this point, I have treated participation in library governance, collegiality, and other related matters as though they were self-evidently good. Is this the case? Of course, from the perspective of the librarian *qua* professional, the answer might seem obvious, and affirmative. But we might ask whether such professions as Medicine, Law, or the Professoriate provide the best models for librarians. We must also seek to clarify the way in which these professions are in fact participative or collegial. At their heart lies the practitioner-client relationship. For librarianship, the practitioner-client relationship may be central in reference service. But is this the case for other forms of librarian's work? While the library profession is client-centered, many of its members do not engage in giving direct service to clients.

When doctors work in hospitals, many elements of their work will be regulated in a bureaucratic fashion, but there is a professional core which is not directly subject to administrative control. The purely professional aspect to a librarian's work could be subject to professional rather than administrative regulation, and thus provide scope for participative and collegial mechanisms. But it seems to me that the logic of this argument suggests that these mechanisms should be located in the professional associations. In Canada, at least, we haven't got professional associations for librarians, and the library associations have not exactly excelled in establishing professional codes of conduct or in establishing disciplinary committees to enforce the codes.

Another argument for participative management is that it works, that it confers notable benefit if properly implemented. Employees, it is said, will be more committed to their work because they've had a hand in determining how it will be done (even if their contributions were not accepted?). Decisions will be strongly supported (presumably even by those who were members of the loyal opposition) because they were arrived at collectively. Decisions will be better because all concerned had an opportunity to contribute, and thus nothing was overlooked. (Must everyone be involved in order to ensure that the right people are involved? If not everyone, how do you ensure you have the right ones? If everyone, how many decisions can be taken?) Participative approaches will ensure that everyone understands the rationale for policies and learns of decisions in a timely fashion (though again, one might question the efficiency of involving everyone as a means of ensuring effective communication). Perhaps as a consequence of the foregoing, "participative libraries [have] the most satisfied professional staffs" Marchant & England, 1989, p. 471).

It has been claimed that sooner or later participative initiatives run aground on the lack of competence among senior managers. This may well be so. On the other hand, in a spirit appropriate when disseminated decision-making, diffuse accountability, and uncertain authority are involved, I suggest that making participative management work is going to require an increase in competence, a personal acceptance of responsibility, a clear understanding of where accountability and authority lie in every situation, in short a professionalism . . . on the part of everyone involved.

Everyone, by the way, must surely include a group often forgotten by librarians when they address the issue of participation: the "nonprofessional" library staff. It sometimes happens that those who are strongly against hierarchical decision-making when it comes to librarians are very hierarchical when it comes to the "other ranks". Such an attitude is difficult to defend in university libraries, where these "nonprofessionals" are often not just experienced, capable, productive, and intelligent ... but well-qualified academically. To make participative processes work, there has to be a good deal of openness, and acceptance of suggestions without prejudice, all of which requires confidence rather than an uneasy and defensive professionalism.

LINCOLN'S HORSE

How *was* the participative model of library governance meant to work at the time it was put before C.A.C.U.L. and C.A.U.T in the *Guidelines on the Academic Status of Librarians* in 1975? The short answer is "on the faculty model." The chosen vehicle for participation was to be the Library Council. (This is still the case. Other forms of participative management—team-based models, for example, have not, to my knowledge, made it to the bargaining table.)

To revert to historical mode again: there were three librarians and three faculty members on the joint committee which drafted the Guidelines. The librarians, including myself, were all department heads, and all from middle-sized universities, which may have conditioned our assumptions about the nature of faculty councils and their role. We thought a Library Council could serve as a forum in which policy issues could be discussed before decisions were taken, and where there could be professional discussion of broad issues, and major changes or initiatives.

When the Guidelines went out in draft form for comment, some respondents felt that the Council might be unwieldy in large libraries, and unnecessary in small ones. The first objection was based, we thought, in a misconception of the role of the Council: it should not substitute for responsible librarians acting in the light of existing policies and making daily decisions. Instead it was to be consulted about major choices and changes.

The small university I joined as University Librarian had two Deans. There was one Faculty Council, chaired by the President. All librarians were members of this *body. It did not concern itself with course descriptions and the like: these proceeded directly from departments to a committee of Senate, and thence to the Senate floor. But a wide range of information was put before the Council, particularly because the President was available for direct questioning, and it was free-ranging in its inquiries and discussions, and free with its recommendations to the President and to Senate. It was, de facto, a far more powerful body than the six individual faculty councils mentioned above because it provided one voice for faculty, rather than six voices, and because it had direct access to the President, who had to confront questions and respond to recommendations directly.*

Since all librarians were members of the Faculty Council, it may come as a surprise to hear that there was also a Library Council. It was written into the collective agreement (the Faculty Council was not). The University Librarian chaired the Council. The Council could recommend on virtually anything and to virtually anyone.

The Council's meetings could be like academic department meetings: informal and collegial. The meetings could also resemble meetings of a library management group: most of the librarians had some managerial or supervisory responsibilities, and on Council's view all matters concerning the operation of the Library should be brought forward for their approval. And despite the wording of the collective agreement (Council recommended, it could not decide) Council certainly expected to have its majority recommendations effected. Finally, the Council could operate like the Faculty Council, i.e., as a group of academics protected by academic freedom, and employees under a collective agreement, with every right to question and criticize administrative actions with no sense of personal implication in these actions.

You will gather that in my view the Library Council did not at all times operate in an appropriate fashion. Essentially, I feel that to the extent this was the case it was because the members of Council had conflicting roles which they did not at all times manage to fully integrate. One role is that of employee under a collective agreement. A variation on this role is that of union activist. (Some of the more striking examples of difficult stances adopted by certain members of Council might properly be viewed as strategic maneuvers, rather than realistic positions.) Another role is that of the collegial professional. Finally, there is the role of the 'small-m' manager of a library operation.

In a large library there would be a good deal of work going on outside Council, some of which would come before Council for information, advice or approval. That work would be subject to administrative initiation, or approval, and control. But if Council also acts as the library's management group, if Council initiates policy, and committees of Council do the work, accountability is diffused, except in so far as it is in the end placed before the accountable administrator for action.

What exactly is the problem with the situation I'm sketching? Essentially, that it is possible through collective bargaining to achieve effective power without acquiring concomitant responsibility and accountability. Library Council cannot at the same time be the management group of the Library, and an extension of the collective bargaining unit with essential responsibility to its members and their well-being (not to the University, or its students). One would need a very big head to accommodate both of these hats.

My purpose in going over this ground is to identify from direct experience potential problems with participatory approaches to library management in a collective-bargaining context. If Council, on this model, did not work well, how could this be remedied? Although it may seem artificial in a small library, I would recommend a committee structure, and some elements of an administrative structure, resolutely maintained outside of Council: if one is to wear two hats, one should do so on separate occasions. If Council must be the sole deliberative body, then it must be as professional as possible, and leave institutional politics for another occasion. I would also recommend that Council remind itself that it is not a decision-making body, but rather a navigational resource.

Despite the participative mechanisms written into the collective agreement at my small university, it is my personal view that the collective bargaining regime sometimes reinforced hierarchical structures, rather than the reverse, and at times impeded collegial approaches to deciding issues. There were a good many reasons for this. Budgets were extremely tight, for instance. Indeed, there was a major deficit. The Administration, answerable to the Board for budgetary matters, would press hard in one direction. The bargaining unit would attempt to defend whatever ground it had taken. In such a polarized situation, solidarity (administrative or union) tends to take precedence over collegiality.

Abraham Lincoln was known to tell the story of a man who was having difficulty with his horse: it made various attempts to dislodge the rider, without success, but finally managed to get a rear hoof caught in the stirrup. At this point, the man dismounted, with the comment "If you're getting on, I'm getting off." I suppose one might view this as a rejection of (at least one form of) participative management. It would be a good point at which to end these remarks, if I had rejection in mind. I have some sympathy with the rider's point of view: it may be awkward sharing the saddle. But I don't think that participative management should be dismissed so easily and written off as unworkable.

PARTICIPATIVE MANAGEMENT IS INEVITABLE

Far from wishing to dismiss participative management, I think it is here to stay, essentially for two reasons: budgetary pressures require us to be as efficient and effective as possible, to use to the fullest every resource we have, and the information universe is changing so rapidly that we must evolve libraries, structurally, technologically, and otherwise, as quickly as we can. I expect that flatlined organizations with disseminated decision-making will provide the flexibility and adaptations we will need as we face the future. My favorite word for the preferred route by which we might get to such structures is "organic," and I was therefore delighted to find Katherine Hawkins (1990) using this term to describe the "end product":

> Organic organizations are characterized by individual workers' contributions of knowledge and expertise to the *common* task . . . a network structure of control, authority, and communication; codes of conduct that derive not from rules but from commitment to high professional standards; use of lateral (between departments, divisions, etc.) as well as vertical communication . . . organic organizations . . . respond quickly to changes in their environment. (p. 11)

Charles Martell (1987), drawing on work by Lawrence and Lorsch, observes that "in dynamic or turbulent environments . . . less hierarchical systems that encourage participation are characteristically more adaptive and successful," a claim Hawkins makes as well (p. 111). "Dynamic and turbulent" seems a fair characterization of the situation of academic libraries today. It is because I anticipate that library governance will become more participative that I have reviewed problems I have encountered and attempted some rudimentary analysis. If participative management is the order of the day, then we have to make it work.

One of the major benefits of networking library information resources is that it puts in the hands of the frontline staff a wealth of information they can use to provide better service to library patrons. Firstline managers will have access to a range of information previously brought together only in the Director's office. Creating the management information systems which will organize and present this information coherently is a challenging task, but one which is being achieved. Information technology is providing a powerful set of tools which could remove such barriers to effective cooperation as rigid, hierarchically-organized decision-making, and poor communication. "In a library which has an integrated, automated library system, workflows and interaction among staff and with users will likewise become integrated" (Rader, 1989, p. 164). On the other hand, technology will not *ensure* that good communication takes place, nor that accountability will not become uncertain in the absence of external, hierarchical control. It is for us to use the integrative technology to good effect and to be clear about accountabilities and responsibilities.

It makes no sense to locate the authority to make a decision any further up the organizational hierarchy than is necessary. But what is necessary? One of the necessities—access to appropriate information—is being altered by information technology. Another necessity—reasonable assurance that the decision will be made in accordance with institutional policies—rests on two factors: that policies have been communicated and are understood and that staff are "professional" in their approach to their duties.

There are two assumptions, still made by some, which must be questioned: that staff, if not controlled, will act irresponsibly and that significant decisions about the library can only be made by senior management (Eadie & Groen, 1993, p. 141). The culture in which these assumptions may have been valid must be changed. With *de facto* power in the hands of staff, courtesy of technology, we must ensure that the power is formally recognized, and that responsibility is placed where the power lies, that authority is bestowed, support provided, and accountability is required.

It may be time to revisit our models of professionalism. Hanks and Schmidt (1975) proposed an "open systems" approach to professionalism, characterized by "laterality"—long-term interest in the client—which would fit well with current concerns for lifelong learning; advocated the utilization of staff with undergraduate library training—which would accommodate a determination to fully utilize the continuum of staff skills; and claimed that their model is "client-committed" and "democratic" (Hanks & Schmidt, p. 186). There is more than one continuum of skills we will be obliged to recognize. In addition to those developed "in-house" by dedicated, capable staff, there are technical skills imported from outside the library. An example is provided by the computer specialists who work in progressively closer concert with librarians, to the point that their departments may integrate with the library into a larger information organization. When notable library schools such as those of

Columbia, Emory, and Denver close their doors even as we enter the Information Age, it might seem that the profession has a surprisingly uncertain relevance. High time to rethink what it is to be a librarian. I hope we proceed with a breadth of vision, and in a spirit of inclusion rather than exclusion, or we may find ourselves marginalized by commercial information vendors more concerned with markets than with professional turf.

We are seeing changes in organizational structures which reflect and enable a distributive approach to library management. I am not sure how we will achieve appropriate changes in academic collective bargaining, as it applies to libraries. For one thing, it is grounded in a distinction between academic staff and other ranks which increasingly will not find a counterpart in the working library world. For another, it requires a distinction between employer and employee, management and worker, which cannot remain valid without modification. At the time that the Yeshiva decision was taken, and like cases were being heard before Labour Boards in Canada, the argument that collegial governance meant that faculty were managers within the meaning of labour law was appropriately countered by the claim that collegial governance was a myth. Now that it is time to make that myth a reality (past time, many would say), the issue may have to be joined again. For a time, we will be able to press the limits of the letter of labour law, and move institutional governance further and further in the direction of full collegiality. The question to be determined is just how far these limits can be pressed and if they will break.

NOTE

[1] While the parallels are not exact, the CAUT is the Canadian equivalent of the AAUP and the NEA.

REFERENCES

Eadie, T., & Groen, F. K. (1993). Information technology, libraries, and lifelong learning. In J. Gornostaev & R. Thomas (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Technology and People,* Part II (pp. 136-145). Moscow: International Centre for Scientific and Technical Information.

Hanks, G., & Schmidt, C. J. (1975). An alternative model of a profession for librarians. *College and Research Libraries, 36*(3), 175-187.

Hawkins, K. W. (1990). "Implementing team management in the modern library." *Library Administration & Management, 4*(1), 11-15.

Kaplan, L. (1985). On the road to participative management: The American academic library, 1934-1970. *Libri, 38*(4), 314-320.

Marchant, M. P., & England, M. M. (1989). Changing management techniques as libraries automate. *Library Trends, 37*(4), 469-483.

Martell, C. (1987). The nature of authority and employee participation in the management of academic libraries. *College and Research Libraries, 48*(2), 110-122.

Rader, H. B. (1989). Teamwork and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Library Administration, 10*(2-3), 159-168.

Webb, G. (1988). Preparing staff for participative management. *Wilson Library Bulletin, 62*(9), 50-52.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
02012901 C001
OCCASIONAL PAPERS [URBANA
198-199 JE 1995
3 0112 018555984