

Academic Library Directors: What Do They Do?

Peter Hernon, Ronald R. Powell, and Arthur P. Young

Eleven library directors recorded their work-related activities for twelve days. The activities depicted show them as both managers and leaders, and reflect contact with various individuals within and beyond the institution as the directors deal with local, regional, and national issues. This paper also highlights how previously identified attributes compare with their everyday work.



For some time now, the authors of this article have been studying the leadership attributes of library directors in academic and public libraries.¹ Their main focus has been to identify and rank those attributes within the broad categories of management, personal traits, and areas of knowledge. The complexity of this research topic has required the use of multiple research methodologies. Content analysis of documents, the Delphi technique used to identify and progressively refine priorities, interviews, solicitation of written comments, and thematic modeling have all been used to determine patterns and meaning from the evidence. In this article, the authors employ the diary-interview technique to record work activities over an extended period of time. Data derived from the diary exercise have intrinsic value but also may be used to compare actual work routines with the more con-

ceptual responses given in the authors' earlier studies of leadership qualities and their relative importance. In other words, the data allow one to determine how some directors actually spend their time as opposed to assuming that what they identify as their most important attributes accurately reflect their activities.

This study examined four primary research questions:

1. In what activities do directors engage?
2. Which activities are most common?
3. Does the range of activities encompass both management and leadership?
4. How do their reported activities compare with the attributes and activities previously reported as most important?

Two additional, or secondary, research questions that were probed through the analysis and comparison of diary entries were: Does multitasking occur? and What

Peter Hernon is a Professor in the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at Simmons College; e-mail: peter.hernon@simmons.edu. Ronald R. Powell is a Professor in the Library and Information Science Program at Wayne State University; e-mail: ad5328@wayne.edu. Arthur P. Young is Dean of the University Libraries at Northern Illinois University; e-mail: ayoung@niu.edu.

are the most common attributes (knowledge, skills, abilities, and personality traits) reflected in those activities?

This study took an exploratory, primarily qualitative, approach to answering these questions. Much of the information gathered is descriptive in nature and would support neither precise comparisons across types of academic libraries nor generalizations to all academic library directors. However, the information should bring us closer to understanding the common ground between an idealized set of attributes and workplace imperatives.

Literature Review

Some research (reported since 2000) has focused on the directors of libraries within institutions that are affiliated with either the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) or the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Those studies explore the managerial and leadership attributes that current and future directors should possess, the challenges that directors currently face, the qualifications and expectations expressed in job advertisements, "the presence and effect of the doctorate among small college librarians," the graying of the profession and those serving as directors, the job satisfaction of directors, the amount of time they spend on leadership tasks, and the relationship between job satisfaction and leadership.²⁻⁶ This body of research is not confined to the United States but also comes from countries such as Denmark. The latter research even uses the leadership barometer, a measurement instrument that profiles managers and leaders in the public and private sectors in Scandinavia.⁷

Procedures

This section discusses the selection of directors included in this study, the method of data collection, the pretest

procedure, and the instructions given to participants.

Selection of Library Directors

Twelve directors, six from ACRL and six from ARL, were invited to participate in the study. One of them had been included in the authors' previous research into the pool of attributes necessary to guide the present and next generation of academic and public library directors. This person was invited to participate in the present study because he had encouraged the authors to undertake it. The criteria for selection of the directors were length of service, extent of recognition in the profession, gender, geographic distribution, and type of institution in which the person worked.

The Diary as Means of Data Collection

Because it was impossible to observe the directors for any prolonged length of time and to visit each campus, compilation of a diary became a suitable means of data collection. As Colin Robson explained, a diary "is a kind of self-administered questionnaire ... [that] places a great deal of responsibility on the respondent."⁸ Don H. Zimmerman and D. Lawrence Wieder viewed a diary as "an annotated chronological record" but recommended its use in conjunction with a follow-up interview. Together, these methods approximate "the classic pattern of observational research when the investigator is unable to make firsthand observations or wishes to supplement those already collected."⁹

On occasion, library and information science (LIS) researchers have used diaries, and they may have done so in conjunction with other methods of data collection.¹⁰ As the above-mentioned literature emphasizes, it was imperative that participants be carefully selected and given a detailed set of instructions, a pretested instrument, and an opportunity

to ask questions prior to (and during) data collection. Furthermore, the diary has to be constructed in such a way that it is neither difficult nor time-consuming to complete but at the same time is capable of generating ample information to examine the six research questions.

Studies of work activity, Henry Mintzberg noted, distinguish between the *content* and *characteristics* of managerial work. The former focuses on what managers do in their work and the latter examines where, how long, and with whom they work and what media they use (e.g., telephone).¹¹ Work activity studies have used diaries, but in combination with other methods, so that it is possible to examine both content and characteristics.

A critical question relates to how long directors should be asked to maintain the diary. In a discussion of time- and self-management, W. Thomas Porter Jr. noted: "You may wish to keep a more detailed time log ... for three to four weeks to see where your time is being spent. Such an analysis is essential to diagnose the non-productive, time-wasting activities and to get rid of them if you possibly can."¹² In contrast, Mintzberg pointed out that data collection has been anywhere from one day to one month.¹³ Robert L. Adcock, on the other hand, recommended "a span of not less than two weeks."¹⁴ Based on discussions with pretest subjects, the authors of this study concluded that maintaining the diary for less than one week is insufficient and that longer than two weeks places a severe burden on participants.

Pretest

For two consecutive days during June 2003, the directors of three libraries (two affiliated with ACRL and one with ARL) conducted a pretest of the diary. Based on their comments, the form was split into two forms: one to record routine activities and the other to document nonroutine

ones. A routine activity is a repeated activity or something the directors do several times a day. In some instances, such an activity might become a habit. Routine, personal activities (e.g., coffee breaks or meals) were not recorded unless those activities related to work. Because the sole purpose of completing two forms was to simplify the process of recording responses, the authors did not distinguish between the forms during data analysis and reporting.

Diary Instructions

The instructions asked the directors to compile an exhaustive record of those activities that relate to their official role. An activity even includes discussions about the library, university, and higher education and the reading of documentation and the professional literature. The directors were expected to include activities even if those activities seemed mundane. They also were informed that whatever they found notable would be pertinent to the study. They were instructed to select two consecutive weeks (between the weeks of September 22 and November 17)—Monday through the second Friday—for data collection. If they engaged in work-related activities during the one weekend or if they worked during evenings, they were asked to make diary entries. The time period might involve work-related trips. However, the directors were advised not to select a period with more than three days' absence from campus, unless such trips were a usual part of their routine. In brief, the twelve-day period selected was intended as *most typical* of the academic term for them.

The diary for nonroutine activities covered five Ws: when, what, why, who, and where. *When* refers to the time of the activity, *what* describes the activity itself, *why* explains the purpose of the activity, *who* identifies the participants (but only

by their position), and *where* designates the location of the activity. (See appendix.) For each nonroutine activity described, the director was asked to indicate how typical it was on the following scale:

Not Typical at All		Somewhat Typical		Very Typical
1	2	3	4	5

Because some activities lead to follow-up activities, the directors were asked to make the connection when it occurred. In addition, they were asked to set aside regular periods each day to prepare diary entries; this would help them ensure the accuracy and comprehensiveness of each diary entry.

Moreover, after they had completed and returned the diaries, the authors read them and arranged an interview to expand on activities that either the directors or the authors had selected. The interviews probed details that were omitted from the written diary – attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, consequences of actions, and so on – and were conducted in a timely manner to ensure that the directors could easily recall those activities.

Findings

This section presents the results of each diary and interview. There is a quick snapshot of the institution and its library based on *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* and volume counts supplied by the directors.¹⁵ Population data were obtained from a Google search and from an examination of data on the home page of the U.S. Bureau of the Census (<http://www.census.gov/>). Although the directors might have responsibility for more than the library, their activities were not divided according to different reporting responsibilities because the authors had pledged to ensure the confidentiality of each director and institution.

As a result, the background information provided for each library and institution was limited.

One director from an ARL institution withdrew from the project, leaving six directors from ACRL institutions and five from ARL institutions. There is no standard for determining a sufficient sample size for a qualitative study such as this one. Having eleven participants enabled the authors to address the research questions, make some general comparisons, and place this study within the context of their previous work on the attributes that directors need to display.

Association of College and Research Libraries

Library A

Located in an urban center, this private, not-for-profit university is classified as *Master’s Colleges and Universities I*, meaning that it offers assorted baccalaureate programs and graduate education largely through the master’s degree. The library has a collection of more than 118,000 volumes.

The director compiled the diary from October 27 to November 7 but had no weekend entries. His typical workday was from 6:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The day always began with a walk-through of the library to verify that there were no water leaks, chairs and tables were in their proper places, and public workstations were operational. Other activities that he rated as “very typical” (“5”) were communication via e-mail and, as Webmaster, he updated the library’s Web site and Web pages and loaded them onto the university server.¹⁶ He was very involved with technology, updating the library’s technology plan, ensuring that equipment worked properly, and ordering new equipment; these activities, however, generally received a rating of at least “somewhat typical” (“3”). As well, he was engaged in devel-

oping a set of library measures of institutional effectiveness and budget planning. As part of that planning, he monitored library expenditures for fiscal year (FY) 2004 and did preparatory work on the next FY budget document.

Other activities rated no higher than "3." Examples of these activities included discussions with faculty members (e.g., about the establishment of a poetry center in the library), work on the university's strategic planning committee and on publications, meeting with alumnae, and preparing a grant proposal and an application for a foundation gift. He spent a considerable amount of time communicating with staff, especially department heads, and with others outside the library. As he noted,

Because of the issues faced (e.g., budget), I talked with DHs [department heads] first; however, on other issues I would talk directly with staff. [It all] depends on the issue and the level in which I am dealing with the issue at the time. I usually always go hierarchically from top to bottom so that DHs do not think I am doing an end run around them. I also tend to meet with institutional people more than the two weeks ... [of keeping the diary] would indicate.

His diary entries reflected examples of multitasking. For instance, while working on a grant proposal, staff, alumni, or faculty might interrupt him, and he might not return to the proposal for more than one hour. Planning was a major activity in which he was engaged during the data collection period. The meetings in which he participated might be impromptu or scheduled with department heads or university faculty. Involvement in planning and university committees reflected

his leadership role, while managing the library operation consumed a considerable amount of his time.

Library B

Located in a city of more than 30,000 residents, this private, not-for-profit college is classified as Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts, meaning that the major emphasis is on baccalaureate programs. Institutions in this category award at least half their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts. The library has a collection of more than 200,000 volumes.

From October 6 to 17, the director worked between eight and a half and nine and a quarter hours each day; for the one weekend he put in more than nine hours developing the agenda for a regular Monday morning meeting with department heads and working on a speech for an upcoming conference. Among the "very typical" ("5") activities are this meeting and preparation for it, taking his turn at the reference desk twice a week (including 7 to 10 p.m. each Tuesday), signing invoices for the dispersion of monies, and holding regular meetings with the associate college librarian.

The other diary entries reflect a wide range of activities, including communicating via e-mail, U.S. mail, and telephone; meeting with faculty members who are their department's liaison to the library; preparing to replace two photocopy machines due to poor performance; reviewing the adequacy of the library's electronic reserve policy in protecting copyright; discussing that policy with a faculty committee; preparing to attend an upcoming conference and to undertake a consulting assignment; discussing staff career development; supporting a mentor program for newly appointed college library directors; dealing with the hospitalization and death of the spouse of a staff member; ensuring that the building is properly cleaned;

discussing signage for use of cell phones and food and drink in the library with an artist in the art department; preparing to have library guides placed on the Web site for use by freshmen; preparing for, and meeting with, the vice president for academic affairs; dealing with reciprocal agreements with two local public libraries to ensure that the local community has circulation privileges and informing those directors that the college library honors their circulation cards; discussing the relocation, use, and disposition of *Chemical Abstracts*; attending a monthly faculty meeting as a voting member; talking with a librarian who would replace him at an upcoming curriculum meeting; arranging for publication of a list of electronic journals; sharing with the associate director the results of a meeting with the vice president for academic affairs and, based on those results, reviewing strategies on how to proceed; photocopying reports for distribution to divisional deans (the assistant who usually does the photocopying was ill that day); participating in a task force that perceives the decline in state funding and the state's enactment of a fee as inequitable (the task force sought to repeal or reduce the amount of the fee); scheduling meetings; reviewing letters and an agreement that would authorize him to sign that agreement on behalf of the consortium; responding to faculty requests to purchase books and videos; supplying colleagues with information about attending a workshop; meeting with the associate director to discuss strategies to replace a librarian who is planning to leave; seeking signage to alert students about possible theft in the library; completing surveys ("get lots of surveys to respond to"); and so on.

These assorted activities brought the director into contact with library staff, faculty members, university administration, local public library directors, college

library directors across the state, vendors, and librarians in other states. He actively participates on a listserv and asks questions of its users.

During the final two days of data collection, he attended a conference. As he explained, "while this particular meeting is not typical, it is typical for me to be off campus at least one day a week." He also noted,

I found as I did this project [keeping a diary] that there is very little I do that is simply a habit. Each day, and, in fact, each hour, seems to be a nonroutine activity, which is part of the fun and challenge of the job.

I did find it hard to keep up with the diary because many times I find myself doing two or three things at once, and I seldom find that I have a five- or ten-minute span where I can concentrate on one thing. When I do need to concentrate on things for a long period of time, such as writing a talk or an article, I typically do that in the late afternoon or on weekends.

When asked about how representative this time period is, he responded that the twelve days involved neither any refereeing for peer-reviewed journals nor any scholarly writing (usually he spends "part of each weekend writing something"). He also stated that he does one to two consultations each year, attends the winter and summer ALA conference, speaks at one or two conferences, serves on the executive library committee of one university (and has been invited to serve on the library committee of another university), participates in a seminar on mentoring directors, and usually attends the state library conference and meetings of the Council of Independent Colleges, the

Oberlin Group, and the regional nonprofit library resource-sharing network.

Library C

Located in an urban center of approximately 370,000 people, this private, not-for-profit university is classified as Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive (such institutions offer a diverse range of baccalaureate programs and provide graduate education through the doctorate; they award a minimum of fifty doctoral degrees per year in at least fifteen disciplines). The library has a collection of more than one million volumes.

The director maintained the diary from October 20 through the end of the month. Her major routine activity is communication via e-mail. The exact number of work-related hours is difficult to pinpoint, but the typical day seemed to be anywhere from eight to ten hours, with some activities completed at home in the evenings. The type of activities in which she was engaged complicated the calculation of the number per day.

During the twelve days, she drove to and attended two conferences, engaged in numerous ceremonial functions (e.g., spoke at and staged special events), prepared and delivered presentations, and participated in programs aimed at informing and educating senior citizens. These activities afforded numerous opportunities to network—meet and cultivate supporters for the library and its collections—and to encourage gift giving to the library.

She also participated on a task force that marketed new programs to campus leaders, held discussions about the Million Book project, and met with department heads and different members of the staff to discuss issues related to library governance and matters of mutual interest. Furthermore, during the time period, she spent more than four hours dealing

with a personnel problem; she discussed the problem with key people, including those in the human resources department. As part of the search team for a new dean, she convened a meeting in her office. Other activities included gathering information for a grant proposal, reviewing a proposal that failed to receive funding, engaging in donor relations (e.g., courting alumnae and planning a library development board meeting), and serving as a judge in an annual competition of the Council of Editors of Learned Journals to select the best journal.

She interacted with library staff, faculty, alumni (including the son of a Nobel Laureate whose papers the library is recruiting), the university counsel, and others in university administration. Finally, it is interesting to note that some of the issues she discussed included on-demand printing for the Million Book project, research and librarianship in general, the university's experiences with digital reference, digital libraries, and starting an electronic journal in one of the university's schools.

Library D

Located in a city of nearly 100,000 people, this public university is classified as *Master's Colleges and Universities I*. The library has a collection of more than 300,000 volumes.

This director kept the diary from October 6 through 17. Except for one day in which he worked in his office before driving to a nearby city to attend a reception (that day involved nearly twelve hours), he generally worked between eight and nine hours. His "very typical" activities included reading, composing, and sending e-mail messages; having assorted telephone conversations; holding biweekly meetings with the associate director, heads of different departments, and the library "A-Team" (an advisory

policy group of the same managers along with some staff at large). One of these bi-weekly meetings was with the university archivist, who reports to him.

Other typical activities included convening a monthly meeting of library staff; "dropping in" to consult with the assistant director (something the director does regularly); participating in meetings to discuss options and opportunities for external funding; holding a weekly meeting with the library development officer; reviewing recent account statements; signing letters and forms; attending the provost's roundtable luncheons in which faculty members present current research projects; attending a monthly meeting of administrators about marketing the campus; attending a weekly meeting of the council of deans; and having a discussion with a member of the anthropology department about the library's plans for a joint project to record the religious music of various inner-city ethnic and cultural groups. This director, who takes a proactive approach to library services, noted that this last activity was undertaken, in part, to integrate the library into academic programs. He often meets informally with individual faculty, as he prefers informal, over formal, meetings.

Some of the less typical, but recurring, activities included revising a report of the task force on academic integrity that he chaired (a position he believes he was asked to assume because the provost thinks "he doesn't have any turf"). That report recommends to the faculty senate "options and priorities" for improving the faculty's "ability to address academic dishonesty quickly, fairly, and confidently") and for reviewing and evaluating applications as part of a jury panel to select a statewide award for excellence in librarianship. Some of the other activities in which he engaged were a meeting of selected library staff to explore issues

related to online credit card transactions and to develop "a strategy for enabling staff to effectively employ credit card payment technology" to aid patrons who are paying library fines and, it is hoped, to encourage donations to the library. He reported a regular monthly meeting with the provost during which that administrator agreed to provide space for a campus archive. As he mentioned, this meeting was a result of two years of persistent, tactful lobbying. He reads library literature that "came into my inbox during the week." Once during the twelve days, he spent two hours "reading and thinking: [I] read accumulated and recently received library/higher education journal articles, etc., that help me think about our library and its strategic directions."

In addition, he did the following:

- Interviewed someone in a firm with which the library had contracted "to design an organizational assessment process and strategy so that we [can] collect information that enables us to understand how we are doing and what difference do we make.

- Prepared an outline and a draft proposal for the new director of institutional advancement on the creation of an external, visiting committee to assist the library in generating external funds. The director commented that he wanted to ensure that the library was part of the university fundraising process and had a good working relationship with the development officer. He observed that this activity, as is the case for "everything I do," was political in nature.

- Called a library patron who submitted a comment card about library hours. ("Our library invites users to fill out comment cards ... [offering] complaints, suggestions, or compliments. If a 'commenter' includes [his or her] phone number, we call back to discuss the matter. Library hours are one area that

I typically handle.”) The director added that he welcomes the opportunity to talk with library customers.

- Attended a meeting of the state-wide library consortium.

- Met with the development officer, assistant and associate library directors, and two librarians to discuss the library’s acquisition of a children’s collection formerly held by a public library. The director noted that this was a new activity for the library and would require a grant for maintenance of the collection. Thus, he used this activity as an opportunity to define and develop a process for fundraising and to train staff in development.

He met with senior members of the library and visited with other librarians twice when he conducted a “walk-around” of the library. He also dealt with members of the university administration, faculty (e.g., through the faculty senate), other library directors and librarians, vendors, and members of the broader community. One of the meetings with a vendor involved a discussion with a video producer to explore the feasibility of producing a rap video for a local, not-for-profit foundation. The director is responsible for the university’s video production department (as well as its media services), which, under his leadership, has changed its focus to academic support. He operates this department on a cost-recovery basis and avoids competing with commercial organizations.

Interactions such as these have increased his awareness of key issues. For instance, as his campus representative on a university, systemwide committee that advises the president on privacy matters, he attended a forum on privacy to learn more about issues related to scholarly databases. The director noted that being the campus representative enables him to emphasize the library’s major role in information policy issues (e.g., intellectual

property rights). It also merits mention that he frequently drove to receptions and meetings in other parts of the state.

Library E

Located in a town of fewer than 20,000 residents, this private, not-for-profit college is classified as *Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts*. The college has more than 150 FTE faculty and a FTE student body of fewer than 1,700. The library has a collection of more than 900,000 volumes.

Diary entries from November 10 through 21 showed that, except for one day in which he worked slightly less than eight hours, this director worked anywhere from eight to thirteen hours. He engaged in e-mail communication the one Sunday evening for thirty minutes. His “very typical” activities included e-mail communication, participating in a monthly meeting of nearby college library directors, sharing the resulting information with relevant department heads, and having lunch with the chair of the library committee. E-mail correspondence might deal with the retirement party for a library staff member, seeking support of the governor of the state in giving raises to the faculty and staff at a state institution, helping a student decide whether to seek a fellowship sponsored by the friends of the library, and upgrading media equipment in a classroom.

Most of the other activities listed in the diary ranged from “not typical at all” (“1”) to “somewhat typical” (“3”). These activities showed that he might have breakfast or lunch with, for instance, faculty members, the head of information technology, or the head of public affairs to exchange information or to socialize. He also was planning for the acquisition of the “one millionth” volume and the related ceremony, corresponding with a design artist about creating a bookplate, meet-

ing library department heads, planning a research project and soliciting advice (e.g., from a statistician to select a probability sample), dealing with a problem or the budget (e.g., the transfer of funds to cover the purchase of new databases), planning an electronic poetry display in the lobby of the library, discussing the composition of a college search committee for his replacement when he retires (fall 2004), or engaging in donor relations. Among the problems he dealt with were:

- An administrator's request for copies of media that, under the terms of a contract the director signed, could not be duplicated. He discussed with a department chair how to deal "with this difficult situation."

- Copyright infringement under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) when he had to disconnect a student's Web site in response to a written complaint from a legal firm that this person illegally downloaded songs onto his computer (the director is the college's DMCA agent).

- Explaining to the administration legal restrictions on the "use of a film in one collection."

- Meeting with a student library assistant "about an incident in the media center last week."

- Calling the associate dean of students to explain that a "student worker did not feel comfortable coming to a meeting in the dean's office tomorrow in which she was to receive an apology."

- Dealing with an insurance claim "to provide hourly rates for library staff who helped salvage and replace books damaged and lost in a flooded campus building."

- Drafting an agreement for a library pursuing affiliate status with the library consortium.

- Briefing the dean of faculty about the DMCA and the USA PATRIOT Act.

- Discussing a benefit problem and its resolution with a part-time staff member.

- Reviewing someone's probationary performance appraisal.

As part of donor relations, the library had just received a "major gift" (an endowment of \$900,000 now and \$300,000 later) and gifts of books from faculty members. During the twelve days, he also informed the president and others about the \$1.2 million gift, wrote thank-you and acknowledgment notes and letters to donors, discussed the use of monies that would be generated by the gift, advised the college administration about a donor's intentions, reviewed "with my secretary ... the status and handling of a very large gift of classical music CDs," and requested a donation for "one of the additions to the collection associated with the library's millionth volume ceremony."

He met with a wide assortment of people associated with the institution (e.g., the president, other administrators, and their secretaries; faculty; staff; students; and members of the library staff), a group of friends of the library, a former Poet Laureate, directors in the same library consortium, and leaders in the profession. If a library department head attended a key college meeting, he met with that person to discuss what transpired. He also met with a college department chair to discuss issues related to staff training and dealt with two faculty widows about either the receipt of funding for the preservation of a spouse's papers or speaking at a local retirement community event.

Finally, to guide the search committee seeking his replacement, this director categorized how he spends his time thusly (percentages total 99.99):

- interacting with library department heads (15.81%);

- interacting with faculty members (13.28%);

- responding to e-mail messages (12.18%);
- engaging in friends of the library activities (7.68%);
- participating in professional activities (beyond his campus) (7.35%);
- engaging in consortia activities (a local group) (6.48%);
- conducting donor relations (5.93%);
- interacting with the dean of faculty (5.60%);
- interacting with other campus administrators (5.60%);
- conducting staff meetings (4.39%);
- interacting with library staff other than department heads (3.84%);
- reviewing and writing documents and letters (3.07%);
- interaction with students (2.85%);
- performing miscellaneous administrative activities (2.63%);
- interacting with members of the local community (2.20%); and
- preparing for staff meetings (1.10%).

Library F

Located in a city of more than 50,000 people, this private, not-for-profit university is classified as *Master's Colleges and Universities I*. The library has a collection of more than 170,000 volumes.

From October 13 to 24, the director, who has been in the position for nine years, worked between five and a half and twelve hours; there were no weekend activities.¹⁷ The workday began at either 5:30 or 6 a.m., when he engaged in e-mail communication for one hour from home: "I start each day to catch up from previous days and/or to get a start on ... [that] day." Once at work, he reviewed the daily schedule and continued with his e-mail; however, these messages are "primarily the one- to five-minute transactions." He also listened to telephone messages and made numerous phone calls. Because he

teaches a history course each semester, he needs time to prepare for class, grade papers, advise students (he is an academic advisor for three or four undeclared liberal arts students each year), and meet with current and former students. His e-mail activities relate to both library administration and teaching.

He participated in numerous planned and impromptu meetings with members of central administration (e.g., the vice-provost for academic affairs to whom he reports, facilities staff, and the library associate director) and library staff. The topic of a meeting might be "to brainstorm some ideas on developing new/deeper relationships with several college/university libraries in the state," mold and mildew in the library's book storage area, or the university's offering of online courses. He held a weekly meeting with the librarians and chatted with them independent of that meeting. Less-typical activities (rated no higher than "3" on the five-point scale) included preparing to serve as a member of a team conducting a review for the regional accrediting organization; attending a lecture ("I attend guest lectures on campus several times a semester") and a dinner for the speaker; arranging travel plans for an upcoming conference; conducting collection development activities; and working on a virtual conference meeting ("annually, committee chairs now hold virtual committee meetings instead of in-person meetings").

In the interview, he explained that he is principally the library director but also is an adjunct professor in history. As he mentioned, "I spend a lot of time in meetings. The number and complexity of these meetings is increasing." The university wants him to be involved in institutional activities and to be aware of what is occurring. Due to the workload associated with meetings, he relies on the associate director to manage the "main line flow of

[library] activity." He recalled that, when he first became director, he performed many of these activities himself. Now he lacks the time. His contact with other library staff takes place at the previously mentioned weekly meeting. The staff also can meet with him informally by dropping by the office or formally by scheduling an appointment. Or, they might catch up with him in any part of the library as he "walks part of the building every day." He reiterated that he is very active within the institution, the profession, and the regional accrediting organization.

Association of Research Libraries

Library G

The main campus of this public university, which is classified as *Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive*, is located in a city of approximately 40,000 people. The library has a collection of more than two million volumes.

The director, who has been at this institution for seventeen years, compiled the diary from November 3 through 14. During this time, he worked anywhere between four and a half and nine hours a day. The one Saturday, he attended a college football game with a potential donor and his wife. His activities focused on the macro level, except for (1) the final two days when he spent thirty minutes a day walking around the library and when he (2) met with the systems staff to analyze a new software package (one hour), (3) had a phone conversation with a vendor (one hour), (4) convened a monthly meeting with library department heads, and (5) held a one-hour staff meeting that focused on the budget, planning, and technology.

Besides these activities, he focused on budget discussions with the deans' advisory group and the provost, met with the vice president for technology and the head of the physical plant, reviewed the strategic and technology plans, par-

ticipated in event planning, and met with friends of the library group (at a business and a board meeting) and potential donors. Furthermore, he often spent one hour a day communicating by e-mail and U.S. mail. He also worked on reports for professional associations (ALA and the state library association) and coordinated a statewide networking meeting.

His diary entries, in summary, reflect an extensive external role within the university and in courting potential donors. He spent considerable time cultivating support for the library, engaging in planning, and working on the budget and on behalf of professional associations. He rated the weekend entertainment of donors and the preparation of the reports for the professional association as "somewhat typical" ("3").

Library H

This public university, which is classified as *Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive*, is located in a city of nearly 500,000 people. The library has a collection of more than four million volumes.

Covering the period from October 27 through November 7, diary entries showed that the director worked approximately twelve hours a day (Monday through Friday). For the one weekend, she worked eleven hours (attending a meeting of a center under her jurisdiction and a dinner with community members and donors). Her weekdays tended to reflect a morning routine that first involved meeting with her administrative assistant to review the schedule of the day, checking e-mail, returning telephone calls, and receiving an update from the associate director and key personnel with different areas of responsibility. The end of the day saw her checking her e-mail. She also tended to spend thirty to forty-five minutes each day reading professional literature (library literature and higher education).

Some of the recurring activities included participating in the performance effectiveness review for the final quarter (reviewing the goals set and progress in achieving them so that administrators can “stay on track”) and conducting a budget review, which involved monitoring budget allocations and expenditures, reviewing areas in which monies might be saved, discussing possible state budget reductions for information resources and the consequences of an underfunded budget, preparing for an upcoming budget meeting, inquiring whether a unit outside the library had received funding for a grant coordinator (the library currently pays for the position), discussing the allocation of salary increases for librarians, and participating on a university strategic planning and budget advisory committee.

There also was a focus on donor relations, which involved meeting with the campus development officer (the director noted that she had successfully negotiated with the provost for a library development officer), writing thank-you letters to donors, seeking agreement on the job description and clarification of the reporting line for a new development officer for the above-mentioned center, meeting with library staff to review fundraising accounts that are undesignated (“to determine how we might use these ... [to meet] library priorities”), and attending a reception for university donors and a state-of-the-university luncheon (“talked with donors about the library ... [and] interacted with some deans and university administrators”). In addition, she spent time on strategic planning, was involved in discussions about a new branch library, and met with the members of teams to discuss their progress in achieving strategic goals and objectives. These meetings also gave staff a chance to interact with her by asking questions.

Other activities (ones not rated higher than “3”) included:

- writing a letter of reference for a colleague who had applied for the directorship of an ARL library;
- discussing with a staff member whether to accept another position (“to discover if the person thought the job was what she wanted and whether she would prefer to stay if her situation could be improved”);
- preparing for and conducting an all-staff meeting;
- meeting with senior officials on a university committee dealing with computer security;
- holding a discussion about the formation of a new administrative team in the library;
- providing a possible list of keynote speakers for the next ACRL national conference;
- discussing a library administrator’s sabbatical leave next semester and how to cover that person’s duties;
- discussing with another library director the fact that a vendor was not abiding by a development contract (“the purpose of this call was to plan strategy for confronting the vendor about future plans”);
- exploring the possibility of a certification program in museum studies; and
- discussing how to resolve visa issues for four staff members.

In addition, she was engaged in cooperative activities with other universities (e.g., outsourcing some cataloging), including a regional alliance of university libraries and a group of seven ARL libraries; discussing a report on the assessment of diversity in the university with the library cabinet (administrators and representatives of the staff and faculty); and assuming a ceremonial role (planning a ribbon-cutting function, inviting the state librarian to speak at an upcoming event, and attending a reception in the library for a national holiday

that a number of international students and staff celebrate). The ribbon cutting was to be for a project in which business, demographic, and climatological data are overlaid on a map of the state. One of the meetings with representatives for other universities concerned the development of computer software to build a portal for faculty and students to search across databases. To highlight library collections and build community and faculty support, she introduced a special public program on writing and publishing in nineteenth-century France as well as the program's speaker: "we have an exhibit [that we] developed for an international symposium and wanted to host a public program around the exhibit topic."

She also spent one hour with the associate director and administrative assistant in reviewing her schedule for next month so that they were aware of her activities, any absences from campus, priorities, and any materials that needed to be developed for those activities. Finally, she met with, or talked to, a broad range of people, including a vice-provost and the provost, the academic deans, faculty, members of the community, the president of the Center for Research Libraries, other ARL directors, and others. In fact, one night she hosted a dinner for the deans and their spouses at her home. Other examples of leadership were (1) a series of telephone calls to members of the friends' board about supporting the library's request for money to plan a new branch library; (2) participating in a discussion of the goals and vision for the university's strategic plan and of the board of regents' oversight of technology purchases; (3) meeting with the campus information technology group to discuss the board of regents' oversight of information technology purchases (the library director works closely with the campus chief information officer); (4) ensuring that a

white paper on how academic libraries might transform in the future is revised and sent to campus academic administrators; and (5) having a luncheon meeting with the new assistant vice-provost so that she would "understand our issues as they come to the provost and provost advisory group."

Library I

Located in a city of more than 100,000 people, this private, not-for-profit university, which has a religious affiliation, is classified as *Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive*. The library has a collection of nearly three million volumes.

From September 29 through October 3, except for two days, she worked anywhere between ten and twelve hours a day; one of those two days she spent four and a half hours engaged primarily in e-mail and telephone conversations and the other day was shortened due to jury duty. Every day contained activities she labeled "very typical"; these included discussions with her administrative assistant about the day's activities. Typical meetings included those with the provost and deans, the university council on academic technologies (a council consisting of elected faculty from the university's colleges; the library director is an ex officio member), the library executive committee, a board of academic library directors for a statewide consortium working to enhance access to resources and services, the library faculty appointments and promotions committee, and all of the professional library faculty. Other typical activities included reading and sending e-mail messages, making telephone calls, scheduling and preparing for upcoming meetings, meeting with associate library directors, and concluding the day with a "wrap up"—completing unfinished e-mail messages and reflecting on that day and preparing for the

next one. In one case, the director was preparing the agenda and reports for the university library committee, which consists of elected faculty who are advisory to the director.

Other routine activities, but ones not considered "very typical," involved a discussion of issues with "drop-in" visitors (e.g., "associate directors and other 'direct' reports: budget manager, ITR [information technology resources] director, or advancement officer"), an interview conducted by a student reporter (about the effects of the USA PATRIOT Act on academic libraries), participation in a Webcast of ARL directors on the topic of ARL statistics, and attending a workshop conference on the USA PATRIOT Act. Moreover, she was likely to have breakfast or lunch with either visiting library directors or the associate director.

During the twelve-day period, she clearly interacted with her senior staff, library directors in the state (in one case regarding the state library association), visiting librarians, the provost and deans, a new university employee involved with a new capital campaign, the library advancement officer, and the director of planned giving. The university president's corporate lunch that she attended included two hundred university administrators and local area business people.

She responded to e-mail messages "on a wide range of topics ... with responses requiring more than 'okay' or 'let's do lunch.'" The messages might be an invitation to serve on an ad hoc task force or a discussion with the chair of the library history council. Furthermore,

Some messages are responded to immediately (e.g., where answers are one to two paragraphs). Some messages are forwarded (e.g., surveys or questions for which I need answers from someone else).

Some messages get printed and put in piles, essentially work focused on preparation for a meeting, report, or other communication to other parties.

Finally, an example of a meeting, one with the chair of the history department, lasted an hour and a half and centered on an explanation and discussion of "library collection goals, history, options, etc."

Library J

This public university, which is classified as *Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive*, is located in a city of fewer than 500,000 people. The library has a collection of more than two million volumes.

From September 29 through October 10, the director worked on both Saturday (attending a college football game to socialize with potential donors) and Sunday (finishing a draft of a consulting report). For the first day and a half of data collection, he attended an annual meeting of deans, department heads, and related academic leaders that the vice president for academic affairs convened to report on the status of the campus.

The length of the workday for the remaining eight days ranged from four and a half to slightly more than eight hours. During this time, no activity was categorized as "very typical." Instead, the categorization ranged from "1," or "not typical at all" (e.g., attended a museum open house—"good will support of campus") to "4," a number between "somewhat" and "very" typical" (e.g., e-mail and U.S. mail). E-mail messages covered topics such as the library's private funds, the library annual report, cooperative storage, and a report on budget projections. He twice devoted forty-five minutes to reading professional literature. Most of the other time was spent meeting people or participating in formal meetings. For

instance, a faculty member stopped by his office without an appointment to discuss the possibility of the campus housing a collection of classified technical reports. He also gave a tour of the library's information commons to a visiting alumnus who manages one in another state.

A formal meeting might be with the provost, vice-provost for graduate affairs, library dean's council, the library personnel officer, the library Web developer, staff for the board of regents, and the business manager. For instance, he met with the vice-provost to provide an update on the digitization of theses and dissertations. He also chaired a search committee meeting for the position of associate vice-provost for distance learning and professional education; advised staff members on dealing with problems (e.g., how to handle faculty refusal to return books); met with the assistant director of the physical plant and one of his supervisors regarding dirty rest rooms in the library; worked on a plan and strategy for extension of one floor of the library; and read a records certification proposal.

These meetings and events brought him into contact with a number of librarians and senior library managers, university administration, faculty, potential donors, applicants for the position of associate vice-provost, members of the board of regents, and the larger community. He also did favors for the friend of a campus administrator ("spent forty-five minutes looking for information sites on the Web for grants" relevant to that person's interests) and for a librarian in another country (searched for information on the value of faculty status).

Library K

Located in a city of more than one million people, this private, not-for-profit university is classified as *Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive*. The library has

a collection of more than three million volumes.

From October 27 through November 7, this director worked all twelve days. His weekdays ranged from more than nine hours to nearly seventeen hours. For the one weekend, he worked twelve hours on Saturday and six hours on Sunday. That Saturday, he provided the "welcome" for—and attended—a campus conference that the library sponsored; read and sent e-mail messages; prepared materials for an upcoming presentation; and attended a library reception and later a donors' dinner. On Sunday, he prepared paper correspondence, read and sent e-mail, worked on a scholarly article, and read professional literature.

"Very typical" activities included reading and sending e-mail messages, preparing and sending correspondence, reading and routing U.S. mail, and doing professional reading (often while traveling). Examples of activities he rated as "4" were meeting with the provost, the associate vice president for finance and administration about budget and capital project matters, the library management committee, or the director of library development, perhaps about a proposal to attract a potential donor. He had a meeting with the director of an electronic publishing program to discuss a new grant application and to review the marketing and sales of products.

The other activities listed ranged from "not typical at all" ("1") to "somewhat typical" ("3"). Most often, he had a working breakfast, lunch, or perhaps dinner with visiting librarians or library directors, a candidate for director of an affiliated library, staff union delegates (to discuss budget developments and job impact), or someone in university administration. He traveled elsewhere to deliver a presentation and interact with other librarians, or he served as a peer

reviewer for an LIS journal. Returning to donor relations, he had a telephone conversation with a prospective donor, met with the director of development to discuss "several donors' case statements" and a proposal to be presented to a donor, and dined with a donor and a donor prospect about a gift proposal.

During the twelve days, he dealt with such assorted issues as the role of university presses in scholarly communication, information technology, information policies affecting higher education (e.g., intellectual property rights), scholarly publishing, library and university press collaboration, current developments in research libraries, personnel matters (e.g., a telephone conversation with the university counsel and a meeting with the deputy university librarian), an electronic dissertation program, staff development, bibliographic instruction, electronic collections, strategies for plagiarism management, an organizational strategy on information technology, the planning of a special conference for ALA, and a faculty teaching development center. In addition, he participated in planning meetings on the development of an information technology network, the capital budget, initial preparation for a new library building, development of an electronic classroom, network connectivity in university apartments and a new e-mail system, space planning, a new human rights center and collection in the library, and library renovation. He also participated in a meeting of the university president's advisory committee on master planning, discussed the strategic plan with the staff of a center affiliated with the library, met with the university budget committee, and conducted a performance review of a senior member of the staff who reported directly to him.

This director is externally focused and active within the university and the

library profession, and with representatives of other professional associations. He attended various committee meetings (e.g., a meeting of the Association of American Universities, of the university space policy committee, and of the advisory board of a nearby school of library and information science) and spoke to the friends of the libraries. He also discussed a consultant's report on the organization of university computing with the provost and the associate vice president for finance and administration. Furthermore, he reviewed and commented on a draft report from the National Research Council; prepared reference letters for two individuals interviewing for library director positions; and had telephone conversations with the president of Research Libraries Group and the chair of the ACRL Scholarly Communication Committee. Furthermore, as a member of the university senate, he attended its meetings.

In the interview, he mentioned that there is no single prototype of a director. Directors, he explained, have different strengths and interests, and they operate in different institutional cultures, organizational cultures, and environments. Because these cultures change, he believes that flexibility is an essential attribute for directors to possess. As for the daily operation of the library, he stressed the importance of having an outstanding senior management team upon which to rely.

Discussion

In order to identify patterns and commonalities among the responses provided by the directors, their diaries were subjected to a content analysis with a card sort. Each distinct activity reported in a diary was recorded on a card. Cards representing the same or similar activities were then grouped. For example, cards recording

FIGURE 1
Frequency of Occurrence of the 44 Activities

<u>18 Occurrences</u> Fundraising	Meetings with other librarians within the state
<u>17 Occurrences</u> Meetings with university administrators, including provosts and deans	Meetings with professional leaders Reading professional literature University strategic planning Involvement with electronic materials and services
<u>15 Occurrences</u> Personnel matters, including staff development	<u>4 Occurrences</u> U.S. mail Bibliographic instruction
<u>13 Occurrences</u> Meetings with library administrators (associate and assistant directors, department heads, and administrative assistants) Ceremonial functions.	<u>3 Occurrences</u> “Walk-through” of the library Planning Library evaluation/organizational assessment Work with vendors Collection management
<u>12 Occurrences</u> Financial management/budgeting E-mail, including use of one listserv	<u>2 Occurrences</u> Work with media and computer equipment Consulting Making a presentation Attending committee meetings Intellectual property issues
<u>9 Occurrences</u> Meetings with university faculty	<u>1 Occurrence</u> University diversity Policy review University faculty development Engaged in travel Preparing an annual report Academic advising Course preparation Multitasking Privacy issues Scholarly communication, university presses Academic integrity Meeting about library statistics
<u>8 Occurrences</u> Meetings with library staff Involvement with information technology	
<u>7 Occurrences</u> Activities related to cooperation and consortia	
<u>6 Occurrences</u> Preparation of grant proposals Telephone conversations Professional association activities	
<u>5 Occurrences</u> Building planning, maintenance	

that directors had taken alumni to dinner in order to solicit donations, had engaged in development activities, and had attempted to obtain external funding

were grouped in one category labeled fundraising. No doubt, some activities ended up in categories not perfectly representing them, but some imprecision was

deemed necessary in order to reduce the many activities to a reasonable number of categories. The content analysis and card sort ultimately identified forty-four types of activities. Figure 1 depicts those activities and the frequency of their occurrence, that is, the number of times they were reported in the eleven directors' diaries. (If a director used exactly the same terminology to report multiple activities, they were recorded only once for that director.)

Given observations made by Hernon, Powell, and Young in their previous research and the amount of attention given to such matters in the professional literature, it was not surprising that fundraising was the most frequently reported activity, nor was it surprising that meetings with university administrators, personnel matters, and meetings with library administrators came in second, third, and fourth, respectively.¹⁸ The high ranking of e-mail reflects the current pervasiveness of that activity. It was reassuring to see that involvement with university faculty received quite a bit of attention. On the other hand, it was surprising that planning was ranked only in the middle. However, it is quite possible that planning permeated many of the other activities, such as library evaluation, and that the directors did not think to identify planning activities explicitly. Similarly, though multitasking was stated explicitly only once, it was clearly occurring on a regular basis.

One noticeable pattern was the number of activities that involved meeting or communicating with others, especially administrators and other individuals outside the library. One director commented that it was sometimes difficult to decide if an activity was a library or university one; the activities tended to merge together. As more than one director noted in the follow-up interviews, campus politics greatly influences the director's activities. The total number of

activities that involved meetings is indeed quite impressive. The forty-four types of activities listed above represent a great variety; and as some of the directors commented in their interviews, relatively few of their activities are routine.

Hernon, Powell, and Young reported the 105 attributes deemed most important by directors and assistant/associate/deputy directors (AULs) of ARL academic libraries.¹⁹ Those attributes were listed in order of most to least importance in seven categories: managing, leading, planning, dealing with others, individual traits (general), individual traits (leadership), and general areas of knowledge. The types of activities identified in the present study were compared to the list of 105 attributes to explore the relationship between what directors said was important and what they actually did on the job. It should be kept in mind, however, that attributes and activities are not necessarily interchangeable, so it was not always possible to identify an attribute that could be used for a valid comparison with an activity. This was especially true for some of the personal characteristics, such as "is honest" and "inspires trust." Also, a number of activities could have been reasonably assigned to more than one category. For example, the "walk-through" logically could be placed in the managing category and the leadership category. Some of the activities related to leading also could have been assigned to "dealing with others."

With these caveats in mind, an attempt was made to compare the lists of attributes and activities. To do so, the activities were assigned to the categories in which the attributes had been classified. What follows in figure 2 is a list of those categories, with the activities assigned to them, ranked from most often reported to least often reported. Following each activity are the category's most equivalent

FIGURE 2
Activities and Corresponding Attributes

Managing

- 1) Fundraising—fundraising (9)
- 2) Personnel matters—promotes professional growth in staff (7)
- 3) Meetings with library administrators—communicates effectively with staff (3), delegates authority (4)
- 4) Financial management/budgeting—manages fiscal resources/budgets (8)
- 5) Meetings with library staff—communicates effectively with staff (3), facilitates the group process (14)
- 6) Grant proposal preparation—develops various sources of funds (11)
- 7) “Walk-through”—facilitates a productive work environment (5)
- 8) University diversity—is committed to staff diversity (12)
- 9) Policy review—nurtures the development of new programs and services (10)

Leading

- 1) Ceremonial functions—develops a campus visibility for the library (4)
- 2) Meetings with university faculty—is able to function in a political environment (3), develops a campus visibility for the library (4), is an advocate for librarians’ role in higher education (5)
- 3) Cooperation and consortia—leads and participates in consortia and cooperative endeavors (8)
- 4) Meetings with other librarians within the state—demonstrates effective networking skills (12), develops and fosters partnerships with groups and organizations on/off campus (15)
- 5) Meetings with professional leaders—demonstrates effective networking skills (12), develops and fosters partnerships with groups and organizations on/off campus (15)
- 6) Travel—demonstrates effective networking skills (12), develops and fosters partnerships with groups and organizations on/off campus (15)
- 7) University faculty development—is an advocate for librarians’ role in higher education (5)
- 8) Annual report—develops a campus visibility for the library (4)

Planning

- 1) Planning—sets priorities (1)
- 2) Library evaluation/organizational assessment—creates and implements systems that assess the library’s value to its users (4), creates an environment that fosters accountability (5)
- 3) Work with media and computer equipment—plans for life cycles of information technologies and services (2)

Dealing with Others

- 1) E-mail—is accessible (4), is articulate (7)
- 2) Telephone conversations—is accessible (4), is articulate (7)
- 3) U.S. mail—is accessible (4), is articulate (7)

Individual Traits (General)

- 1) Professional association activities—is committed to job and profession (5)
- 2) Reading professional literature—is committed to job and profession (5), has broad knowledge of issues (15)
- 3) Consulting—has a variety of work experiences (12)

FIGURE 2 (CONTINUED)
Activities and Corresponding Attributes

- 4) Presentation—is committed to job and profession (5)
- 5) Writing article—is committed to job and profession (5)
- 6) Academic advising—works on multiple tasks simultaneously (3)
- 7) Course preparation—works on multiple tasks simultaneously (3), has a variety of work experiences (12)
- 8) Multitasking—works on multiple tasks simultaneously (3)

Individual Traits (Leadership)

- 1) Meetings with university administrators—articulates direction for the library (3)
- 2) University strategic planning—articulates direction for the library (3), is change focused (1)
- 3) Committee meetings—is an enabler and facilitator (12), has team-building skills (15)

General Areas of Knowledge

- 1) Information technology—information technology (8)
- 2) Electronic materials and services—digital libraries (5)
- 3) Building planning and maintenance—facilities planning (4)
- 4) Bibliographic instruction—information literacy (22)
- 5) Work with vendors—information delivery systems (19), publishing industry (20)
- 6) Collection management—collection management and development (9)
- 7) Intellectual property issues—intellectual property rights (12)
- 8) Privacy—management issues (13)
- 9) Scholarly communication, university presses—scholarly communication (1)
- 10) Academic integrity—trends in higher education (7)

attribute and the attribute's ranking in parentheses. In some cases, more than one attribute was related to a single activity and some attributes are compared to more than one activity.

An examination of the comparisons between attributes and activities produced some expected results and some surprises. Activities whose rankings were close to, or the same as, those for the equivalent attributes included: meetings with library administrators, meetings with library staff, ceremonial functions, meetings with university faculty, planning, library evaluation, meetings with university administrators, university strategic planning, building planning, and collection management. Surprises, within categories, included: the number

one ranking for fundraising as an activity and its number nine spot as an important attribute; personnel, which was second as an activity but seventh as an attribute; grant proposal preparation, which was sixth as an activity but eleventh as an attribute; information technology, which was first as an activity but eighth as an attribute; bibliographic instruction, which was fourth as an activity but twenty-second as an attribute; and scholarly communication, which was ninth as an activity but first as an attribute.

This is an appropriate time to reemphasize that these comparisons must be interpreted carefully. As noted above, the identification of equivalent activities and attributes is not an exact science. In addition, the lists of attributes are based

on more evidence than what the directors reported over a twelve-day period and only ARL directors provided the attributes. However, it does seem safe to conclude that the lists of both attributes and activities indicate that directors of academic libraries must be campus leaders, engaged in planning with university administrators, heavily involved in fundraising, in regular communication with other library administrators and staff, concerned with evaluation, and knowledgeable of bibliographic instruction/information literacy. Indeed, some of these and other activities/attributes emphasized in the lists above correspond rather well with the roles of leadership in academic research libraries identified by Michael A. Keller: master practitioner; advocate; steward; judge and power broker; mentor and colleague; and strategist, risk taker, and innovator.²⁰

In another related study, Mintzberg raised the question, What do managers do? and then said that “even managers themselves don’t always know.” He noted that “ignorance of the nature of managerial work” should not continue because it has implications for the workplace and for the teaching of management.²¹ Furthermore, “if there is a single theme that runs through ... [his] article, it is that the pressures of the job drive the manager to take on too much work, encourage interruption, respond quickly to every stimulus, seek the tangible, and avoid the abstract, make decisions in small increments, and do everything abruptly.”²²

This study does not replicate Mintzberg’s research, but it seems that there are distinct differences between the managers he studied and those participating in this study. First, the library directors did not refer to the pressures of the job and having too much work to do. This does not mean that these were not present; rather, such matters were not a focus of the research. Second, any library director today must

be able to engage in multitasking; this is a “given” and the directors understand it. Third, the library directors reflected on issues and gathered information to make informed decisions. There is no evidence that they rushed to make a decision or responded “quickly to every stimulus.” Fourth, some of them indicated that they read a wide variety of literature and all of them interact with people in different settings, exchanging information. The eleven directors were engaged in both management and leadership. As players at the institutional level and in donor relations, library leaders must work and communicate effectively with a broad range of people within and outside the college or university.

Study Limitations

Naturally, the findings of this study only reflect the actual time period of data collection. No attempt was made to depict an entire academic term or year. Clearly, during these other times directors could—and undoubtedly do—participate in other activities. Furthermore, although the eleven directors may not be representative of the population of ACRL and ARL directors, this sample provides a foundation upon which others can build. Still, given the care they took in data collection, the authors feel that the findings are representative of a twelve-day period for study participants. Another limitation is that the authors did not conduct an in-depth investigation of each campus and its institutional and organizational culture; thus, the findings provide only a general snapshot.

Further Research

There were some striking differences among the directors regarding their list of activities and the amount of time they allotted to each of them. Those individuals at sites A and B, for instance, tend to perform a wide variety of daily activities

and to accomplish their work in much smaller blocks of time than most of the other directors. They were often interrupted and had to switch their focus to different topics, perhaps returning to the original topic hours later. Furthermore, the eleven directors apparently have different interests and strengths; as well, there are probably significant differences in institutional and library cultures and environments. As some of the participants explained, directors adapt to the cultures already in place, but those cultures are subject to change. For example, when seeking a new director, the institution may decide it wants someone with different strengths, attributes, and interests from the person departing the position. Naturally, expected attributes, strengths, and skill sets change over time. A new director is influenced by the culture more than he or she can change it. Still, that person identifies the strengths and weaknesses in the organization and deals with the weaknesses. Complicating matters, the library staff must adapt to the managerial and leadership styles of a new director and in any changes in those styles over time. Clearly, these perceptions of the directors merit examination.

It would seem that future research might engage in longitudinal case studies in which researchers monitor individual institutions and libraries from the time before the arrival of a new director to several years thereafter. What changes in institutional and library cultures occur? How does a new director go about implementing his or her managerial and leadership styles? How successful is he or she? Such research should go beyond self-reports of directors and the perceptions of library staff as reflected in surveys.

Employing a quantitative method and random samples, studies might seek generalizability of the findings by focusing on a portion of the Carnegie classification

and comparing the activities of directors at institutions of similar control (private or public), size, and mission.²³ Such investigations might provide gender balance among the participants and factor in the length of time spent in the position. Such research also might consider whether the libraries are primarily a main library operation or have branch libraries. Large library systems might include law or medical libraries.

Further research on leadership also should address the topic from the perspective of emotional intelligence, which Daniel Goleman refers to as "the sine qua non of leadership."²⁴ As he explains, emotional intelligence in the workplace encompasses *self-management* (self-awareness, self-regulation, and motivation) and *managing relationships with others* (empathy and social skill).²⁵

Conclusion

One might usefully ask how the foregoing information on leadership attributes and activities can be applied to that person's own leadership aspirations. A review of these qualities and activities in the context of one's perceived strengths and weaknesses might reconfirm one's leadership aspirations and/or suggest some areas needing more skill sets. An overall compatibility with multitasking would seem to be very important, given the variety and overlapping activities that have been found in the diary findings. Rush Miller, Hillman University Librarian, University of Pittsburgh, articulately addressed the multitasking issue when he exclaimed, "goodness, when I read the list of attributes, I am amazed that any of us can possibly do all of this at once!"²⁶ As figures 1 and 2 illustrate, the directors do, in fact, engage in an impressive number and range of activities within and beyond the particular library.

And, it is always well to remember that

leadership represents a set of capabilities that follow the path of the presently known to the unfolding future. A recently issued environmental scan by OCLC rather dramatically positions libraries in the twilight zone between the rational order of our historical mandate and the free-associating, unrestricted, and disorderly characteristics of the Web.²⁷ Because leadership is both a present and a future-oriented activity, one should always be thinking about next steps and nurturing those capabilities that will facilitate its arrival.

APPENDIX

Notes

1. See Peter Herson, Ronald R. Powell, and Arthur P. Young, *The Next Library Leadership: Attributes of Academic and Public Library Directors* (Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited, 2003); ———, "University Library Directors in the Association of Research Libraries: The Next Generation: Part One," *College & Research Libraries* 62 (Mar. 2001): 116–45; ———, "University Library Directors in the Association of Research Libraries: The Next Generation: Part Two," *College & Research Libraries* 63 (Jan. 2002): 73–90
2. In addition to the sources cited in note 1, see Eileen McElrath, "Challenges That Academic Library Directors Are Experiencing as Perceived by Them and Their Supervisors," *College & Research Libraries* 63 (July 2002): 304–21; Karin Wittenborg, Chris Ferguson, and Michael A. Keller, *Reflecting on Leadership* (Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources, 2003); Catherine J. Matthews, "Becoming a Chief Librarian: An Analysis of Transition Stages in Academic Library Leadership," *Library Trends* 50 (spring 2002): 578–602. Most of these writings contain an extensive literature review.
3. Chih-Feng P. Lin, *Changes in Stated Requirements of Director Positions of Academic Libraries in the U.S.: A Content Analysis of Qualifications and Job Expectations as Advertised in Selected Professional Periodicals* (Boston: Simmons College, 2000; unpublished); ———, "Changes in Stated Job Requirements of Director Positions of Academic Libraries in the U.S.," *Journal of Information, Communication and Library Science* 8 (fall 2001): 9–25.
4. Peter H. McCracken, "The Presence of the Doctorate among Small College Library Directors," *College & Research Libraries* 61 (Sept. 2000): 400–408. According to the Carnegie classification (see note 14), a small college is a Baccalaureate I institution.
5. Stanley J. Wilder, *Demographic Change in Academic Librarianship* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2003).
6. Ole Pors-Niels and Carl Gustav Johannsen, "Job Satisfaction and Motivational Strategies among Library Directors," *New Library World* 103 (2002): 199–208; ———, "Library Managers and Management 2001: A New Danish Survey," *New Review of Information and Library Research* 7 (2001): 186–200.
7. Pors-Niels has developed a 270-variable survey instrument that examines both management and leadership. He intends to collapse it into a 100-question form.
8. Colin Robson, *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell, 1993), 254.
9. Don H. Zimmerman and D. Lawrence Wieder, "The Diary: Diary-Interview Method," *Urban Life* 5 (Jan. 1977): 481.
10. See, e.g., Katrina Byström and Kalervo Järvelin, "Task Complexity Affects Information Seeking and Use," *Information Processing & Management* 31 (1995): 191–213.
11. Henry Mintzberg, *The Nature of Managerial Work* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980), 22.
12. W. Thomas Porter Jr., "Time and Self-Management," *Journal of Accountancy* 145 (June 1978): 58–64.
13. Mintzberg, *The Nature of Managerial Work*, 21. Please note that figure 1 reprints the diary used in one study.
14. Robert L. Adcock, "Time, One More Time," *California Management Review* 14 (winter 1971): 29.
15. *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2001).
16. For the five-point scale, see the section on diary instructions.
17. This director adjusts his workday so that he can devote time to his young children. He engages in e-mail communication before they awake and go to school. He also volunteers in one

of their classes and attends parent–teacher conferences.

18. See note 1.

19. See Hernon, Powell, and Young, "University Library Directors in the Association of Research Libraries: The Next Generation: Part Two."

20. Michael A. Keller, "Scattered Leaves: Reflecting on Leadership," in Wittenborg, Ferguson, and Keller, *Reflecting on Leadership*, 33–51.

21. Mintzberg, "The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact," *Harvard Business Review* 68 (Mar.–Apr. 1990): 163.

22. *Ibid.*, 174.

23. See note 15.

24. Daniel Goleman, "What Makes a Leader?" *Harvard Business Review* 82 (Jan. 2004): 82. (The other papers in this issue provide complementary perspectives on emotional intelligence.)

25. *Ibid.*, 88.

26. Rush Miller, comments, in Hernon, Powell, and Young, *The Next Library Leadership*, 47.

27. *The 2003 OCLC Environmental Scan: Pattern Recognition, A Report to the OCLC Membership*, ed. Alane Wilson (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., 2004).

Diary (Nonroutine Activities)

Please complete *one form per nonroutine activity* and provide sufficient detail about the activity. Data collection begins on a Monday and ends on Friday of the following week; however, complete entries for any work-related activity undertaken in the evening or on the one weekend. (You may write on the back of this page, if necessary.)

Date: _____ Time started: _____ Time stopped: _____

1. Describe your activity in detail.
2. Even if the activity is nonroutine, how typical is it of your "typical" workweek?

Not typical at all		Somewhat typical		Very typical
1	2	3	4	5

3. Please state/describe the purpose of this activity.

- a. Was the activity conducted?

In person
 By mail/campus mail
 By e-mail
 By phone
 As part of walk-through (tour) of library
 Other (please specify) _____

- b. Did you meet with someone? Yes No

If yes, one person more than one person (number)____.
 Position of person(s): _____

- c. Was the meeting scheduled? Yes No

Did it occur physically inside/outside any/all of the library buildings?

Inside (Where [e.g., your office]) _____
 Outside (Where) _____

- d. Did the activity concern the:

Library
 University
 Higher education in general
 Professional associations
 Personnel
 Other (please specify) _____

4. Any other comments?
