Leadership and Emotional Intelligence: A Study of University Library Directors and Their Senior Management Teams
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Drawing on the results of a survey sent to library directors and senior management team members working in Association of Research Libraries member libraries in the Western United States, this study explores the ideal emotional intelligence traits of both academic library directors and the members of their senior management teams. Respondents were asked to identify the top ten ideal traits needed by directors and senior management team members. The study explores the extent to which each respondent agreed on the most important emotional intelligence traits for each organizational role. Results include lists of the top ten ideal traits for each organizational role and the top ten ideal shared traits for library leaders.

Emotional intelligence (EI), which deals with managing the emotional climate of an organization, has been called the “sine qua non of leadership.”¹ As Goleman originally conceived, EI consisted of five domains: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills.² The first three domains encompass personal competencies or traits that focus on knowing and managing emotions in oneself, and the other two describe social competencies or traits that relate to knowing and managing emotions in others.³ Each domain had a varying number of traits, totaling 25 in all. These traits are composed of skills that can be learned and of abilities that, while originally innate, can be enhanced by training.⁴ In 2002, Goleman, together with Boyatzis and McKee, revised the EI model based on an examination of more than 600 corporate managers in a variety of settings and reorganized the five domains into four: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. The original 25 traits were reduced to 18. Goleman et al. observed that highly effective leaders typically show “strength in a half dozen or so EI … [traits]”⁵ enabling them to move workplace emotions in a positive direction.⁶

The number of EI traits possessed by leaders affects their degree of success in running organizations.⁷ A leader’s high EI has been linked to the emotional climate...
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of an organization and its financial or operational success. Leadership, however, is not confined to one person (that is, to the boss). Others in the organization may also be leaders, influencing those whom they supervise and impacting the top leader’s effectiveness.

An organization’s top leader seldom works directly with every staff member in an organization. Particularly in large or complex organizations, a senior management team aligns “the actions of larger numbers of people to the organization’s vision and goals.” If possessing a number of EI traits is valuable for the leader of an organization, perhaps it is equally valuable for the senior management team members.

**Problem Statement**

Leadership studies in academic libraries tend to focus on the library director. However, in university libraries, leadership is typically distributed between a director and those members of the senior management team who are in decision-making positions (for instance, associate or assistant university librarians). No study has examined the EI domains and traits that directors and their teams consider most important. This study fills that void by examining which traits both groups consider most important for a library director and a senior management team member to possess. It also explores the extent to which library directors and senior management team members agree on the most important EI traits for each organizational role.

Identifying which traits are most important to possess based on the leadership role the individual plays in an organization provides a more nuanced understanding of EI in leadership teams. Understanding which traits are identified as needed most for each organizational role will enable directors to deploy existing strengths more intentionally. It will also help senior management team members to identify and develop the traits most valuable for their organizational responsibilities. An increased EI awareness will also enable library directors to build strengths in areas where the entire team’s collective skills are lacking. Thus, library directors can more fully manage their team’s emotional intelligence skills and abilities and, through the team’s effect on the emotional climate of the organization, increase the overall effectiveness of the library. In addition, understanding which EI traits are seen as most important for which leadership levels might have organizational implications for recruitment, retention, and succession planning and educational value in helping graduate schools and leadership institutes focus their training.

**Literature Review**

*General Writings*

In their comprehensive review of EI in the workplace, Zeidner et al. analyze the concept of EI and the associated set of traits in the occupational environment. They discuss some of the areas where concepts and terminology are unclear in the research literature, but they conclude that “over three decades of psychological assessment research has vindicated the importance of taking social and emotional traits into consideration when attempting to predict occupational effectiveness.”

Much of the research on workplace effectiveness focuses on the top leader to identify what traits comprise effective leadership. A popular assumption is that leader effectiveness translates into organizational effectiveness. This assumption is borne out by research that links the degree of EI a leader demonstrates to workplace measures of the leader’s or the organization’s success.

Dulewicz and Higgs’ research on the EI traits of individual business leaders supports the top-leader-centric focus of EI studies. Using data from their 1995 study of traits from boards of directors and data from their 1999 study of general managers from a variety of countries, they identified those traits related to EI. They found that “the elements of EI are
amongst some of the important attributes required for effective leaders,” and that “the higher one rises within an organization, the more important EI becomes.”

Leaders with positive emotional styles enhance the ability of followers to engage effectively in problem solving and creativity. Studies have found that leader EI is particularly influential on team performance. Among the evidence of the importance of EI is an analysis of sales managers, which showed a positive correlation between the leader’s mood and the financial performance of the sales force. Rosete and Ciarrochi, who studied senior managers in the Australian public service sector, found that leader EI positively correlated to workplace performance both at an individual leader level and an organizational level. In academic settings, Heiken identified “a modest positive relationship between emotional intelligence and the practice of leadership” among school administrators, while Tang found significant correlation between the EI and measures of leadership effectiveness of both U.S. and Taiwanese academic leaders. Noble’s analysis showed that EI traits are frequently listed in job advertisements for community college deans.

Researchers conducting leadership and management studies advocate for a more complex, nuanced approach to studying leadership within organizations. In particular, O’Toole, Galbraith, and Lawler argue that a monocentric focus on the top leader may be culturally biased, and there is a need to develop a new model where “leadership would come to be thought of as a team sport.” They argue that, because of increasing complexity, “shared leadership has become almost a necessity when it comes to leading change within organizations.” EI’s importance in the success of work teams has been extensively researched. Analyzing the traits that distinguish effective teams from mediocre ones, Druskat and Goleman found that the most distinguishing characteristics were all EI traits. As Goleman et al. argue, the “team at the top” needs to maximize its effectiveness by putting its “emotional intelligence to work.”

Carmeli examined senior chief financial officers in government agencies who possessed a high level of EI and then analyzed the extent to which their EI correlated with other measures of work attitudes and outcomes. The more EI traits possessed, Carmeli found, the higher the positive correlation with work attitudes and work performance. He concluded that his findings were important for organizations “which recognize the critical role the top management team plays in their success.” Gardner and Stough’s examination of EI in “high level” managers showed a statistically significant relationship between transformational leadership and overall emotional intelligence. A transformational leader uses many EI traits by inspiring followers to commit to a shared organizational vision and goals, challenging followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes, and mentoring and coaching followers to develop their own leadership capacities. Since transformational leadership styles correlated positively with leadership effectiveness, Gardner and Stough concluded that EI assessment could be used to identify and develop those managers with leadership potential.

Library and Information Science Literature

Much of the research and writing on library leadership mirrors the more popular approach of general management and leadership studies—that of focusing on the leader at the top. Expanding one area of a leader’s traits, Hernon and Rossiter used Goleman’s original five domains (to study the EI traits of directors of libraries with membership in the Association of Research Libraries [ARL]). They identified those traits that directors considered the most important for a director to possess. In follow-up interviews with a subset of directors, they found that many of those interviewed believed that, while no one person could master all the EI traits,
the director and “the senior management
team, as a whole, would possess the entire
set.” Hernon extended his work on the
most important EI traits valued by library
leaders by comparing the four EI domains
and traits with attributes developed from
the distributed model of leadership.35

Study Hypotheses
The study proposed two hypotheses:

1. There will be no statistically signifi-
cant difference ($p = .05$) between the traits
that library directors (LDs) choose for a
director and the traits they choose for a
senior management team member (SMT).

2. There will be no statistically signifi-
cant difference ($p = .05$) between the traits
that senior management team members
(SMTs) choose for a director and the traits
they choose for a senior management
team member (SMT).

Procedure
Participants
The potential study population was staff
from 19 academic libraries that are ARL
members and located in the region of the
Western United States: Alaska, Arizona,
California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho,
Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon,
Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Table
1 identifies those 19 ARL member librar-
ies. Between November 2006 and January
2007, when the author was contacting
directors to determine willingness to
participate, the director’s position was
vacant in six libraries, reducing the study
group to 13.

| Table 1
Western Regional ARL Libraries |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARL Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young. Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Univ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P =$ Participating institution; $NP =$ Non-participating institution; $NQ =$ Not qualified to participate
In addition to identifying the study population, table 1 indicates the number of LDs and SMTs in each library. The senior management teams, excluding the directors, range in size from 2 to 13. In some libraries, SMTs were responsible for traditional organizational divisions such as public or technical services. In other libraries, directors defined the senior management team more broadly, including financial or personnel officers or representatives of the library faculty or support staff.

Once the institutional review boards of Simmons College and Stanford University approved the study, an initial e-mail message describing the study and requesting the library’s participation was sent to the 13 directors, with a follow-up telephone call two weeks later. Contact via phone and e-mail continued until every LD responded. Of the 13 libraries contacted, eight agreed to participate. After a director communicated the library’s agreement to participate, each LD or SMT was mailed a copy of the survey instrument, together with a cover letter, two copies of the consent form (one to be signed and returned with the survey, one for the respondent’s records), and a stamped addressed envelope to return the completed survey to the author.

**Measures**

**Pretesting the survey instrument.** The study consists of two parts; the first is the reorganization and pretesting of the survey instrument that Hernon and Rossiter used to study ARL library directors, and the second is the survey itself. The original five domains and associated traits used were mapped to the revised four domains: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. The traits were redistributed and then pretested using five volunteers whose libraries were not part of the study population, including two library directors, two senior management team members, and one human resources director.

The individuals engaged in the pretest were asked to determine whether the traits from the original fifth domain were appropriately distributed in the new four-domain model. In two instances, when more than one pretester suggested moving a trait from one domain to another, those traits were relocated. In three cases where only one pretester suggested changing a trait’s domain, the author conducted a phone interview with the pretester to determine how important the change was. When pretesters disagreed about where the trait should be located (two instances), the final decision was made by the pretester who was the human resources director. Based on feedback that Hernon and Rossiter received from some directors, respondents to this survey instrument were asked to identify their top 10 traits in each domain. Several pretesters advised that most LDs and SMTs would not be comfortable responding unless it was clear that they were not being asked to rate their current library director or team members.

**Final survey instrument.** In response, the survey directions and section subtitles were modified so that respondents were asked to identify and rank the top 10 traits for an ideal library director and an ideal senior management team member in four domains: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management (see Appendix for a complete listing of traits organized into the four domains with domain definitions). Respondents had the option in each domain to add additional traits. Three respondents each added one trait in the self-awareness domain. In each domain, respondents ranked the top 10 traits for an ideal LD and the top 10 traits for an ideal SMT. Respondents originally ranked traits as 1 = high rank and 10 = low rank, but all traits were recoded 1 = low and 10 = high. Any trait not ranked between 1 and 10 was coded 0 so that all cells had a value and no data would be missing for the statistical analyses comparing ranks.
Data Analysis

Frequencies were generated for all traits. Traits were ranked from highest to lowest based on their means, and then the traits with the ten highest means were selected for each group, by domain. Where there were ties in trait means, all traits up to the trait with the 10th highest mean are listed. If library directors (LDs) ranked a trait for a particular role highly but senior management team members (SMTs) did not, SMT rankings are still presented for the trait for the sake of comparison, and if SMTs ranked a trait highly but LDs did not, the LDs’ trait information was still similarly shown.

After the top items were identified for each role in each domain, the mean ranks for LDs’ perceptions of a trait for a specific organizational role were compared to SMT perceptions of the same trait for the same role, using the Mann-Whitney U test that compared director and SMT rankings for each trait for each role. For example, this test was used to compare LD and SMT perceptions of the importance of self-confidence in the LD’s role. Mean ranks are presented in the tables that follow, along with the Z statistic that was used to assess the statistical significance of the difference in ranks. Additionally, to compare LDs’ and SMTs’ perceptions of the value of the same competence for both the LD role and the SMT role, Wilcoxon signed rank tests were conducted. The Wilcoxon signed rank test, a nonparametric test, was used because the data were rank data and not symmetrical about the median. It is useful in determining the significance of the difference between two correlated samples—that is, LDs’ perceptions both of the LD and SMT role. Similar analyses were conducted to compare SMT perceptions of the value of the same competence for SMT and LD roles. Where signed rank tests indicated that LDs or SMTs valued a trait more highly for one role than another, superscript letters designate these traits in the tables that follow.

Next, analyses identified traits that both LDs and SMTs agreed were important for either the LD role or the SMT role. Frequencies were run to obtain means and standard deviations for these items for the sample as a whole. For each role, the items with the highest five means (including any in which the ranks were tied) were selected and shown. As above, differences in the overall ranking of these items among each other were compared using nonparametric Friedman’s rank test. Where the analysis showed that the mean ranks did not differ significantly from each other, they were designated as having a comparable rank. Where the analyses identified significant differences in ranks, these are marked in the tables that follow.

Finally, analyses then identified traits that both LDs and SMTs agreed were important across both leadership roles. Each group’s rankings of the importance of traits in the LD and SMT role were averaged into one value for the sample as a whole, controlling for the different size of the two initial sets of rankings. Frequencies were run to obtain means and standard deviations for these items again for the sample as a whole. The items with the highest 5 means (including any in which the ranks were tied) were selected. Differences in the overall rankings among these items were compared using Friedman’s rank tests. Where the analyses identified significant differences in ranks, these are indicated in the tables that follow.

Results

Eight libraries out of 13 agreed to participate, providing 47 potential LD and SMT respondents. The number of returned surveys totaled 28 with 6 LDs and 22 SMTs, resulting in a 60 percent response rate (see table 1). One returned survey was eliminated due to ranking errors, leaving 21 SMT responses. In the tables for each domain, traits were abbreviated.

Self-awareness domain. Table 2 shows frequencies and mean ranks for the importance of self-awareness traits for both an ideal LD and an ideal SMT ranked by the LDs and by the SMTs. Traits are listed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-awareness traits for LD</th>
<th>Self-awareness traits for SMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDs (M (S.D.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know where he/she is taking the organization</td>
<td>7.50 (2.66)^0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to listen and delegate</td>
<td>5.33 (3.50)^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic self-understanding</td>
<td>4.83 (4.67)^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>4.50 (4.68)^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect scholarship, etc.</td>
<td>4.00 (4.43)^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>2.67 (2.74)^1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect individuality/diversity</td>
<td>2.67 (1.75)^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive for self-improvement</td>
<td>2.50 (3.89)^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive ability</td>
<td>2.50 (3.99)^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of proven leadership</td>
<td>2.33 (3.83)^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>2.17 (2.86)^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate</td>
<td>2.17 (3.25)^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of humor</td>
<td>1.83 (2.56)^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge assumptions</td>
<td>1.83 (2.86)^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual integrity/humility</td>
<td>.00 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive for task completion</td>
<td>2.00 (3.35)^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the effect of feelings</td>
<td>2.00 (2.53)^1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N for LDs = 6, for SMT = 21. Superscript numbers show the top 10 ranks for each group (1 = lowest chosen, 10 = highest chosen, 0 = not chosen). Superscript * LD view of two roles differ, ^ SMT views of two roles differ. * p < .05.
in descending rank order as ranked by the LDs for the ideal LD.

The table indicates that LDs identified the top five traits for an ideal LD as: knowing where he or she is going/taking the organization, ability to listen and delegate, realistic self-understanding of oneself, self-confidence, and respect for scholarship, learning, and teaching. The SMTs agreed with three of the LDs’ top ranked traits: knowing where they are taking the organization, being able to listen and delegate, and possessing realistic self-understanding, but added two more: cognitive ability and being articulate.

LDs and SMTs also ranked the ability to listen and delegate and the trait of possessing a realistic understanding of oneself among the five most important for an ideal SMT. The trait of the cognitive ability to deal with complex scenarios or situations was also rated as important for the ideal SMT by both LDs and SMTs. LDs ranked respecting scholarship, learning, and teaching as more important for an ideal SMT than SMTs did for their role.

Superscript letters in table 2 indicate where the LDs or SMTs ranked traits as different in importance for an ideal individual in his or her role compared to an ideal individual in the other group’s role. Superscript a indicates that the LDs’ view of the importance of the trait for each of the roles differed significantly (p < .05). Superscript b indicates that the SMTs’ view of the importance of a trait for each of the roles differed significantly (p < .05). For example, table 2 shows that both LDs and SMTs rated the trait of knowing where he or she is taking the organization as more important for an ideal LD than for an ideal SMT. SMTs ranked both the ability to listen and delegate and the ability to respect individuality and diversity as more important traits for their role than for the LD role. LDs considered it more important for an SMT to be articulate than SMTs considered it to be for an ideal individual in the SMT role.

Self-management domain. Table 3 shows the frequencies and mean ranks for the importance of the self-management domain traits for both an ideal LD and an ideal SMT ranked by the LDs and by the SMTs. Traits are listed in descending rank order as ranked by the LDs for the ideal LD.

The table indicates that LDs identified the top five traits (with one tie) that an ideal LD should have as: articulating a direction for the library; integrity; a commitment to job, organization, and profession; honesty; being comfortable with change; and having skill at diagnostic, strategic, and tactical reasoning. The SMTs agreed with two of those: articulating a direction for the library and integrity. However, the top five traits SMTs listed as most important for an ideal LD also included (with one tie) being innovative/creative, having a broad knowledge of issues, being comfortable in making judgment calls, and asking the “right/tough” questions. LDs ranked the trait of being driven to achieve beyond expectations as a more important trait for an LD than SMTs did.

LDs and SMTs also ranked having integrity, having a broad knowledge of issues, and being comfortable with change as among the five most important self-management traits for an ideal SMT. LDs rated commitment to job, organization, and profession as more important for an ideal SMT than SMTs rated it for their own role. Both LDs and SMTs rated the ability to articulate a direction for the library as more important for an ideal LD than for an SMT. For the trait of being innovative/creative, LDs did not rank it among their top ten for either leadership role. SMTs, however, ranked it the eighth highest self-management trait for ideal LDs to possess and ninth highest for an ideal SMT to possess.

Social awareness domain. Table 4 shows the frequencies and mean ranks for the importance of social awareness domain traits for both the ideal LD and SMT ranked by the LDs and by the SMTs. Traits are listed in descending rank order as ranked by the LDs for the ideal LD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-management traits for LD</th>
<th>Self-management traits for SMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDs (M (S.D.))</td>
<td>SMTs (M (S.D.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate direction for library</td>
<td>8.33 (1.87)</td>
<td>6.66 (3.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>6.00 (3.41)</td>
<td>4.33 (4.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to job, etc.</td>
<td>5.00 (5.48)</td>
<td>1.90 (2.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>3.33 (3.27)</td>
<td>1.95 (3.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable with change</td>
<td>3.33 (3.88)</td>
<td>2.48 (3.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill at diagnosis/strategy</td>
<td>2.83 (3.82)</td>
<td>1.14 (2.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad knowledge of issues</td>
<td>2.67 (4.13)</td>
<td>3.10 (3.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask the right/tough question</td>
<td>2.67 (4.18)</td>
<td>2.67 (3.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven to achieve</td>
<td>2.67 (3.27)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort with judgment calls</td>
<td>2.50 (2.74)</td>
<td>3.10 (2.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage of convictions</td>
<td>2.33 (3.61)</td>
<td>.67 (2.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>1.83 (2.99)</td>
<td>2.10 (3.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>1.83 (2.79)</td>
<td>1.76 (3.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable temperament/balance</td>
<td>1.83 (3.25)</td>
<td>.95 (1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic organizational awareness</td>
<td>1.67 (2.07)</td>
<td>1.95 (3.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative/creative</td>
<td>1.17 (2.86)</td>
<td>3.33 (3.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of perspective</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>2.43 (3.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable with ambiguity</td>
<td>1.17 (.41)</td>
<td>2.29 (3.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible in adapting to change</td>
<td>1.17 (.41)</td>
<td>2.14 (3.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High energy level</td>
<td>3.17 (4.22)</td>
<td>.81 (2.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to compromise</td>
<td>1.50 (3.67)</td>
<td>2.62 (3.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N for LDs = 6, for SMT = 21. Superscript numbers show the top 10 ranks for each group (1 = lowest chosen, 10 = highest chosen, 0 = not chosen). Superscript * LD view of two roles differ, b SMT views differ. ** p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social awareness traits for LD</th>
<th>Social awareness traits for SMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LDs</strong></td>
<td><strong>SMTs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M (S.D.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>M (S.D.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having integrity</td>
<td>8.33 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract, build and retain talent</td>
<td>7.67 (2.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercises good judgment</td>
<td>5.33 (3.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine belief in the abilities of and good faith in, others in organization</td>
<td>4.50 (3.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat people with dignity</td>
<td>4.17 (2.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good interpersonal skills</td>
<td>4.00 (4.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an environment that fosters accountability</td>
<td>4.00 (3.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep organization focused on high quality service</td>
<td>3.67 (4.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to others</td>
<td>2.33 (2.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2.33 (3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to understand, anticipate and harness native behaviors of staff</td>
<td>1.67 (4.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good listening skills</td>
<td>1.67 (3.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable with team culture</td>
<td>4.33 (4.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being open minded</td>
<td>1.83 (3.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N for LDs = 6, for SMT = 21. Superscript numbers show the top 10 ranks for each group (1 = lowest chosen, 10 = highest chosen, 0 = not chosen). Superscript a LD view of two roles differ, b SMT views differ. * p < .05
LDs identified the top five traits for an ideal LD as: having integrity; ability to attract, build, and retain talent; exercising good judgment; having a genuine belief in the abilities of, and the good faith of, others; and treating others with dignity/respect. The SMTs agreed with four of the ideal LD traits that LDs chose but also included having good interpersonal skills among their top five competencies for an ideal LD. LDs ranked it next highest in their list, just missing their top five.

LDs and SMTs also ranked integrity and good judgment as important social awareness traits for an ideal SMT. Good interpersonal/people skills; the ability to understand, anticipate, and harness staff; and comfort with team culture were rated as important for the ideal SMT by both LDs and SMTs. SMTs rated the most important trait for an SMT as the ability to attract, build, and retain talent; however, LDs did not consider this an important trait for an ideal SMT and rated it as significantly less important for an SMT than for themselves. The SMTs considered it more important that an ideal SMT be accessible to others than that an ideal LD be accessible. Correspondingly, LDs considered it less important for the LD than for SMTs to have good listening skills.

**Relationship management domain.** Table 5 shows the frequencies and mean ranks for relationships identified by both an ideal LD and an ideal SMT ranked by the LDs and by the SMTs. Traits are listed in descending rank order as ranked by the LDs for the ideal LD.

Table 5 indicates that LDs identified the top five relationship management traits an ideal LD should have as: being visionary—able to build a shared vision and rally others around it; being effective in leading change; being able to motivate people to develop and adhere to a shared vision; being able to change shape the library's culture; and being able to bring issues of broad importance to the academic community. The SMTs agreed with three of the LDs' choices, listing as among their top five LD traits: being visionary, effective in leading change, and able to motivate people to adhere to a shared vision. Traits SMTs listed in their top five for an ideal LD also included the ability to function in a political environment and ability to gather outside resources.

Table 5 shows that LDs and SMTs had more consensus on the relationship management traits an ideal LD should possess and less consensus on the traits each group identified for an ideal SMT. LDs rated the top traits (with one tie) for the ideal SMT as: an ability to change shape the library's culture, being collaborative, having resonance (inspiring people to work together), leading in a shared decision-making environment, being an enabler and facilitator, and possessing expertise in building and leading teams. Of those traits that the LDs chose for an ideal SMT, the SMTs agreed with one, that of leading in a shared decision-making environment. The other four top relationship management traits SMTs considered most important for the ideal SMT were: being effective in leading change, motivating people to develop and adhere to a shared vision, having the ability to function in a political environment, and engaging in consensus building in carrying out strategic direction.

SMTs chose three traits as important for both LDs and SMTs to possess: being effective in leading change, motivating people, and functioning in a political environment. LDs considered it significantly more important for LDs to be able to motivate people to develop a shared vision than for SMTs to employ that trait. SMTs considered the traits of being able to both build consensus and to lead in a shared decision-making environment as more important for the ideal SMT than for the ideal LD.

**Ideal director traits.** Table 6 shows the frequencies and mean ranks for responses about traits that both groups considered the most important for the LD’s role. Traits marked with a superscript 1 were rated as significantly more important than traits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Management</th>
<th>Relationship management traits for LD</th>
<th>Relationship management traits for SMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDs</td>
<td>SMTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary—able to build a shared vision and rally others around it</td>
<td>6.83 (4.58)</td>
<td>7.00 (3.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective in leading change</td>
<td>6.33 (2.66)</td>
<td>3.95 (3.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate people to develop and adhere to a shared vision</td>
<td>5.50 (4.09)</td>
<td>4.48 (4.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change/shape library’s culture</td>
<td>4.83 (3.87)</td>
<td>3.24 (3.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring issues of broad importance to the academic community</td>
<td>4.33 (4.23)</td>
<td>2.76 (3.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to function in a political environment</td>
<td>3.67 (3.72)</td>
<td>6.90 (3.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>3.67 (3.83)</td>
<td>1.90 (3.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonance (inspiring people to work together, inspiring excellence</td>
<td>3.33 (4.46)</td>
<td>1.81 (2.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to gather outside resources</td>
<td>3.00 (1.55)</td>
<td>4.24 (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead in a shared decision-making environment</td>
<td>2.33 (3.61)</td>
<td>1.62 (2.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for librarians’ role in higher education</td>
<td>2.00 (2.10)</td>
<td>2.05 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus building in carrying out strategic direction</td>
<td>1.67 (2.87)</td>
<td>2.33 (3.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage reasonable risk taking</td>
<td>.17 (.41)</td>
<td>2.29 (2.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/foster partnerships</td>
<td>1.67 (2.87)</td>
<td>2.24 (2.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabler and facilitator</td>
<td>5.67 (4.08)</td>
<td>2.52 (3.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise in building/leading teams</td>
<td>4.17 (3.66)</td>
<td>3.38 (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize individual commitment</td>
<td>2.83 (3.13)</td>
<td>2.76 (1.41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N for LDs = 6, for SMT = 21. Superscript numbers show the top 10 ranks for each group (1 = lowest chosen, 10 = highest chosen, 0 = not chosen). Superscript a LD view of two roles differ, b SMT views differ.
ranked with a superscript 2. The two traits ranked as most important for an ideal LD were knowing where he or she is taking the organization and articulating a direction for the library. The second set of traits considered important for an LD included being visionary—able to build a shared vision and rally others around it, being able to function in a political environment, and being able to motivate people to develop and adhere to a shared vision. Although the ability to gather outside resources was not among the top traits considered as most important for an LD, it is listed in this table for comparison purposes.

Ideal senior management team member traits. Table 7 shows the frequencies and mean ranks for traits that both groups considered the most important for the ideal SMT’s role. The top trait identified is the cognitive ability to deal with complex scenarios or situations. All other traits identified as most important for an ideal SMT were from either the social awareness domain (2 traits) or the relationship management domain (4 traits). Both these domains are defined as those clusters of EI traits that facilitate working with others.

Ideal shared leadership traits. Table 8 shows the frequencies and mean ranks considered most important for both the LD and SMT ideal roles. Traits listed as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Important Ideal Library Director Traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked traits</td>
<td>M (S.D.)</td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know where he/she is going—taking the organization</td>
<td>7.93 (2.99)</td>
<td>3.54 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate direction for library</td>
<td>7.14 (3.35)</td>
<td>3.17 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary—able to build a shared vision and rally others to it</td>
<td>6.96 (3.98)</td>
<td>3.22 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to function in a political environment</td>
<td>6.19 (3.55)</td>
<td>2.70 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate people to develop and adhere to a shared vision</td>
<td>4.70 (4.02)</td>
<td>2.37 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to gather outside resources</td>
<td>3.96 (3.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings of the importance of traits in the LD role are presented for the sample as a whole (N = 27). The items with the highest 5 averages (including any where the ranks were tied) were selected and are shown. Items marked 1 are statistically comparable in rank [X^2(1) = .80, ns] and rank higher than items marked 2 [X^2(4) = 9.97, p < .05]. Final trait did not rank among the top five but was added for comparison purposes.

| TABLE 7                                                                 |                                                                 |                                                                 |
| Most Important Ideal Senior Management Team Member Traits              |                                                                 |                                                                 |
| Ranked traits                                                          | M (S.D.)             | Mean Rank |
| Cognitive ability to deal with complex scenarios or situations         | 6.07 (3.69)          | 4.94 1    |
| Ability to understand, anticipate, and harness native behaviors or approaches of staff | 4.30 (4.13)          | 3.93 1    |
| Lead in a shared decision-making environment                           | 4.11 (3.62)          | 4.04 1    |
| Consensus building in carrying out strategic direction                 | 3.74 (3.76)          | 3.98 1    |
| Accessible to others                                                   | 3.63 (3.50)          | 3.70 1    |
| Expertise in building and leading teams                                | 3.56 (3.53)          | 3.67 1    |
| Enabler and facilitator                                                | 3.22 (3.80)          | 3.74 1    |

Note: Rankings of the importance of traits in the SMT role are presented for the sample as a whole (N = 27). The items with the highest 5 averages (including any where the ranks were tied) were selected and are shown. Items marked 1 are statistically comparable in rank [X^2(6) = 7.39, ns].
most important included the ability to listen and delegate, having integrity, exercising good judgment, and having good interpersonal skills. Two other traits that were considered somewhat less important were effectiveness in leading change and having a realistic self-understanding. The one leadership trait that received no rating by either group for either role was that of narcissism (at an acceptable level).

**Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis 1 (no significant difference in the competencies LDs selected for an ideal LD or an ideal SMT) was supported except for one trait. Directors ranked attracting, building, and retaining talent as significantly more important for an LD to possess than for an SMT (LDs’ mean negative ranks = 0.00, mean positive ranks = 5.50, \( z = -2.81, p < .005 \)). SMTs also ranked several competencies as more important for an SMT than an LD to possess, including being able to listen and delegate (SMTs’ mean negative ranks = 8.54, mean positive ranks = 8.33, \( z = -2.24, p < .03 \)), respecting individuality and diversity (SMTs’ mean negative ranks = 5.50, mean positive ranks = 1.50, \( z = -2.11, p < .04 \)), being accessible to others (SMTs’ mean negative ranks = 6.50, mean positive ranks = 6.50, \( z = -2.04, p < .04 \)), being collaborative (SMTs’ mean negative ranks = 7.11, mean positive ranks = 4.67, \( z = -1.97, p < .05 \)) and being able to lead in a shared decision-making environment (SMTs’ mean negative ranks = 9.00, mean positive ranks = 4.00, \( z = -2.73, p < .006 \)).

**Discussion**

The findings suggest that different competencies are needed by individuals in each role, reflecting the primary tasks of that role. Often in an organization, the top leader’s primary role is to create change while the director’s management team focuses on running the organization and implementing change. The list of the five top-ranked competencies that all respondents consider most important for an LD to possess indicates that an LD must be able to create a vision for change,

| TABLE 8 Most Important Shared Ideal Leadership Traits |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Ranked traits                   | M (S.D.) | Mean Rank |
| Ability to listen and delegate  | 7.00 (2.04) | 4.52 1  |
| Having integrity               | 5.57 (3.07) | 3.63 1  |
| Exercises good judgment        | 5.43 (2.89) | 3.56 1  |
| Good interpersonal/people skills| 4.80 (3.21) | 3.39 1  |
| Effective in leading change    | 4.35 (2.49) | 3.02 2  |
| Realistic understanding of oneself; emotions, strengths, weaknesses, needs, and drives | 4.00 (3.86) | 2.89 2  |

Note: Rankings of the importance of traits in the LD and SMT role were averaged into one value for the sample as a whole (\( N = 27 \)), for which the means are presented above. The items with the highest 5 averages (including any where the ranks were tied) were selected and are shown. Items marked 1 are statistically comparable in rank (\( X^2(3) = 4.44, ns \)) and rank higher than items marked 2 (\( X^2(5) = 13.23, p < .03 \)).
communicate that vision, and then motivate staff to support that change. Hernon and Rossiter also found that the five most valuable competencies respondents listed in the motivation domain for LDs were competencies focused on vision and persuasion—the ability to build a shared vision and rally others around it, to articulate a direction for the library, and to motivate people to develop and adhere to a shared vision. Hernon, Powell, and Young were the following: leading in a shared decision-making environment, interpersonal/people skills, and conflict resolution—all competencies that respondents ranked highest for SMTs to possess in this study. SMTs considered it more important for SMTs to attract, build, and retain talent than LDs considered it important for the SMT role. As managers, SMTs are repon-
sible for ensuring that they have the right mix of talent to meet new customer needs and must engage in succession planning as the population of academic library workers ages.51 Perhaps LDs are less aware of these needs than SMTs because SMTs have not communicated their staffing situations clearly to their directors or because LDs feel that the ability to attract and retain staff is an outcome of the LD's responsibilities to motivate and inspire.

On the other hand, LDs believed that respect for scholarship was more important for the SMTs than SMTs believed it was for their own role. LDs may interpret respecting scholarship as part of the ability to align the library with the broader academic enterprise that libraries serve, whereas SMTs may be more internally focused on the organization and may not think in this larger context when asked to identify the key competencies for their role.

Integrity, good judgment, an ability to listen, people skills, effectiveness in leading change, and self-understanding were ranked as the top competencies that any leader should possess and that individuals—no matter where they are in an organization—would like any leader they follow to possess. These foundational competencies complement the specific competencies of the LD and the SMT.

**Directions for Future Research**

Although there is a large body of research studying the chief economic officer's (CEO's) leadership skills and how the top leader affects organizational performance,52 workplace leadership presents researchers with additional layers of complexity since leadership can be exercised throughout the organization by individuals with varying levels of power, responsibility, and skill.53 Noting that leadership is often shaped by its context, one respondent in this study observed, “The roles of a director or assistant dean [SMT] vary in the organization, thus, requiring skills to match .... the best person in either role is the one that recognizes what is needed at that moment.” Future research might explore the interdependent and perhaps changing relationship between top leaders and the leadership capacity and skills of individuals throughout the organization. Also, if ideal EI competencies vary by organizational role, it might be interesting to undertake a longitudinal study that follows a group of library managers to identify possible changes in the EI competencies they exercise, or which they perceive as needed, as their organizational roles and responsibilities change. A final area of future study could be to assess the EI traits possessed by library management teams, what traits they collectively need but lack, and how they proceed to learn those skills.

Because this study was limited in the geographic region it studied and the type of library, future research might extend the study of these core competencies to a broader sample of LDs and SMTs in non-ARL libraries, perhaps even in non-U.S. libraries. Many studies have shown that leadership is a culturally dependent construct—does this hold true for leadership in academic libraries? Or does the nature and mission of academic librarianship transcend cultural differences, leading to a shared vision of the traits needed for academic library leaders? Beyond the library profession, it might be interesting to explore whether these lists of top traits offer a useful way to characterize the EI competencies of leaders and managers in nonlibrary organizations.

**Limitations of the Study**

Two conditions limit the study’s applicability. First, the small sample size limits the reliability of the statistical analyses performed. Another limitation was touched on by respondents in Hernon and Rossiter’s study of LDs’ EI traits. Respondents noted that the importance of a trait may be contextual: that is, dependent on specific situations or organizations. As a result, they reported that they had difficulty choosing a limited number of traits.54 Their observations were echoed...
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by three of the respondents in this study. One respondent stated that “it was very difficult to rank these 1–10—I don’t have a lot of confidence that my answers would be the same if I took this [survey again] in two weeks.” A second respondent found it difficult to put the competencies in a meaningful order, stating that “These competencies work together so it is hard to prioritize in a vacuum. Also, I think the relative priorities are in a narrow band.”

A third limitation of this study is that some of the traits include several components that could be given different priorities for different roles. For example, the trait “attract, build, and retain talent” includes three potentially very different aspects of staff management. LDs rated this trait second highest in importance for themselves and lowest out of ten for the SMT role. However, SMTs rated this as the highest trait in the social awareness domain for their role as well as third highest for the LD. The difference in rankings between the groups may not be due to a difference in role interpretation but a difference in emphasis within the competence. Perhaps LDs focused on attracting staff as critical to an LD’s role, and SMTs responded positively to the aspects of building and retaining staff. The breadth of some competencies permits wide interpretation.

Conclusion

The three lists developed from this study—the ideal traits for a library director and for a senior management team member and the list of shared ideal leadership traits for all leaders—create a foundation of leader skills that may be useful in a number of venues. Although some of the traits identified as most important build on an individual’s innate personal qualities, many researchers and practitioners agree that EI traits can be acquired and strengthened through practice and training. EI skill improvement can be developed through formal coursework, workshops and leadership institutes, mentoring, on-the-job coaching, analytical tools, and, finally, rigorous self-scrutiny and practice.

Library directors and senior management team members can use these lists as an assessment tool to analyze the traits they collectively possess and those they might need to acquire. As hiring opportunities arise, they can use the lists, informed by their analyses, to help them recruit and hire to balance their team’s overall EI traits. Graduate schools and leadership institutes can use these lists to assess pretraining skills, offer focused EI training, and identify posttraining outcomes. Newer librarians wishing to develop their leadership skills can use the list of shared traits for all leaders and ideal SMT traits to focus their own development efforts, while SMT members interested in a director position can become more competitive by comparing their EI traits to those of an ideal library director and developing any missing skills.

While these three lists of EI traits do not comprehensively define the skills and abilities an academic library leader needs to be successful, they are critical to realizing a core responsibility of leadership—influencing people to work together to achieve a purpose. The top EI traits identified in this study are tools leaders can use to build that social contract between leaders and followers by identifying and communicating a vision, motivating people to buy into that vision, and then organizing them to work together effectively toward that vision. The respondents’ choices of traits by organizational roles reflect a sophisticated and nuanced understanding that leadership is not just the responsibility of the man or woman at the top but is a shared and interdependent endeavor. Just as the organizational responsibilities of director and senior management team members complement each other, so do the traits needed to fulfill those roles effectively.

It would be interesting to extend this exploration of role-based traits to another level within the senior management team members’ roles in the organization. When
they are interacting with their middle management team members, do they employ more of the ideal traits of a director to complement the traits they expect or experience from their middle management team members? If individuals from more levels and other areas of responsibility were queried, would other levels or groupings of EI traits emerge as ideal sets for different roles within the library organization?

The results of this study confirm Goleman's conclusion that no one leader can or needs to develop competency in the full range of EI traits leaders need.56 Academic library leaders do not need to possess every EI trait to ensure organizational success. In fact, quite the opposite, since no one individual can be perfect and "The best ones don't try to be—they concentrate on honing their strengths and find others who can make up for their limitations."55 If a library's director and his or her senior management team recognize the complementary nature of their roles and partner to build the EI traits that would make them the most effective, they will then be better able to perform as a true "team at the top." By understanding the shared and complementary nature of their leadership, they can work together to create an emotionally intelligent organization that can more effectively achieve the library's vision and goals.
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### Domain: Self-Awareness

*Includes traits associated with emotional self-awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self-confidence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to listen and delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to hone one's ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of ego (or ego is not a barrier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive ability to deal with complex scenarios or situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive for continual self-improvement at a holistic level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive for task completions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know where he or she is going—taking the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism (an acceptable level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic understanding of oneself; emotions, strengths, weaknesses, needs, and drives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize how one's feelings affect others and one's job performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of proven leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect individuality and diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect scholarship, learning, and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual integrity and humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to tolerate frustration and delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Actively supportive of management team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Willingness to take responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Instill confidence in others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain: Self-Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes traits associated with self-control, transparency, adaptability, achievement, initiative, and optimism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ability to compromise
- Ability to figure out what is going on without having to be told
- Articulate direction for the library
- Ask the “right”/“tough” question
- Broad knowledge of issues
- Comfortable with ambiguity
- Comfortable in making judgment calls
- Comfortable with change
- Commitment to job, organization, institution, and profession
- Courage of convictions
- Diplomatic
- Driven to achieve beyond expectations, motivation
- Endurance
- Evenhanded
- Flexible in adapting to change or overcoming obstacles
- Good oral and written presentation skills
- Handle stress well
- High energy level
- Honesty
- Initiative
- Innovative, creative, seeks out, and acts on, challenges and new opportunities, think outside the box
- Integrity
- Open-minded
- Optimism (even in the face of failure)
- Propensity for reflection
- Realistic organizational awareness
- Receptivity to change
- Sense of perspective
- Skill at diagnostic, strategic, and tactical reasoning
- Stable temperament and ability to maintain an emotional balance under constant tensions
- Trustworthy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Domain: Social Awareness</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Includes traits associated with empathy, organizational awareness, and service</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand, anticipate, and harness native behaviors or approaches of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract, build, and retain talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being open-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable with team culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an environment that fosters accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural sensitivity &amp; record of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercises good judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure out what is going on without having to be told</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine belief in the abilities of, and the good faith of, others in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give praise generously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good interpersonal/people skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good listening skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep organization focused on high-quality service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtfully consider the feelings of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat others as equals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat people with dignity/respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand small-group dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide range of work experiences in different sizes of organizations and different job levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain: Relationship Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Includes traits associated with inspiration, influence, developing others, change catalyst, conflict management, teamwork, and collaboration</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to function in a political environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to gather outside resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for librarians’ role in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring issues of broad importance to the academic community, fostering wide discussion and action when appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build rapport with a wide circle of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change/shape the library’s culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus building in carrying out strategic direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and foster partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective in leading change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabler and facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage reasonable risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish credibility with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise in building and leading teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly (with a purpose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good people networking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help participants in meetings, consortia, and cooperative endeavors to be results oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead in a shared decision-making environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize individual commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate people to develop and adhere to a shared vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonance (inspiring people to work together to solve problems, inspiring excellence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a role model of desired behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerate some mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary—able to build a shared vision and rally others around to it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>