

March 2014

# The Language of Academic Librarianship: The Discourse of Promotion and Tenure

Mary K. Bolin

*University of Nebraska--Lincoln*, [mbolin2@unl.edu](mailto:mbolin2@unl.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/librarianscience>



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

---

Bolin, Mary K., "The Language of Academic Librarianship: The Discourse of Promotion and Tenure" (2014). *Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries*. 309.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/librarianscience/309>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# THE LANGUAGE OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANSHIP: THE DISCOURSE OF PROMOTION AND TENURE

Mary K. Bolin

## ABSTRACT

*This article examines the discourse of appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) documents for academic librarians. Discourse analysis can illuminate the social role of language, social systems, and social practices.*

*This qualitative research analyzes the APT documents for librarians from a group of US universities (n = 50) whose librarians are tenured faculty (n = 35). Linguistic features were examined to identify genre (text type) and register (language variety) characteristics.*

*The documents showed strong relationships with other texts; vocabulary from the language of human resources (HR); grammatical characteristics such as nominalization; passive constructions; few pronouns; the “quasi-synonymy” of series of adjectives, nouns, or verbs; and expression of certainty and obligation. The documents have a sociolinguistic and social semiotic component. In using a faculty genre, librarians assert solidarity with other faculty, while the prominent discourse of librarians as practitioners detracts from faculty solidarity.*

---

Advances in Library Administration and Organization, Volume 32, 213–264

Copyright © 2014 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 0732-0671/doi:10.1108/S0732-067120140000032004

*This research is limited to librarians at US land grant institutions. It has implications for other research institutions and other models of librarian status.*

*This research can help academic librarians fulfill their obligations by understanding how values encoded in these documents reflect positive and negative approaches.*

*Higher education and academic librarianship are in a state of flux. Understanding the discourse of these documents can help librarians encode appropriate goals and values. Little has been written on the discourse of librarianship. This is a contribution to the understanding of librarians as a discourse community and of significant communicative events.*

**Keywords:** Academic libraries; faculty status; discourse analysis

Academic librarians are part of the community of scholars, practitioners, and other professionals in a college or university. Like other professional communities, academia has ways of talking about matters of significance for members of the community. Discourse reflects the social role of language, and discourse analysis can illuminate social systems and practices. Texts reflect the assumptions, values, and practices of the communities that produce them. In the workplace, documents encode values and tradition and perpetuate institutional memory. They are open to interpretation, and discourse analysis and other sociolinguistic approaches can shed light on the way the values of a profession are put into practice.

This article is a qualitative examination of texts that represent the discourse of academic librarian faculty status to discover the values, ideologies, conflicts, and concepts encoded there. While this article presents some grammatical and linguistic analysis, its purpose is to discover how those grammatical features encode meaning. Universities have written texts that contain criteria for the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) of faculty members. Those are referred to in this article as “APT documents.” APT documents are used by all faculty in a university, and the documents analyzed here are an adaptation of those general faculty documents. The documents have been analyzed using an approach to discourse analysis described below.

In the academic workplace, words are significant. Employees of a university have been schooled in critical thinking, careful expression, and

fine distinction. The role of the faculty in a university has been historically guarded and set apart. The documents that encode the status and requirements of faculty reflect that special role. For more than 50 years, US librarians have a means of achieving that role and recognition, and have made great strides in achieving either faculty status or a strong model of academic staff status with many things in common with faculty status.

Bolin (2007) devised a typology of librarian status at US 1862 land grant universities. These land grant universities are public institutions designated by the Morrill Act of 1862. There is one in each state of the United States (Association of Public and Land Grant Universities, n.d.) The typology examined employee group (faculty or staff) and then further subdivided the faculty group into three types. The resulting typology consisted of the following:

- Type 1: Librarians are faculty with professorial ranks (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) and tenure ( $n = 21$ ).
- Type 2: Librarians are faculty with non-professorial ranks (Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, Librarian I, I, III, etc.) and tenure ( $n = 14$ ).
- Type 3: Librarians are faculty without tenure ( $n = 5$ ).
- Type 4: Librarians are professional staff ( $n = 10$ ).

Seventy percent (35 institutions) of these land grant universities have librarians who are tenure-track faculty (Types 1 and 2 above). Documents from those 35 institutions were analyzed for this research, with closer analysis, excerpts, and examples from 22 of those 35 included here.

APT documents are a means of admitting new members to the community of scholars. The documents communicate the values of the community through their linguistic features. APT documents from different universities have characteristics in common, which helps define the genre (type of text) and register (language variety).

The following is an excerpt from one of the APT documents used for this study:

University of Tennessee Libraries Promotion and Appointment Criteria

Preface

The purpose of promotion and/or continuous appointment is to recognize the faculty members who have accomplished certain milestones in their careers ...

The faculty members of the Libraries have agreed to the shared values that are embodied in the Libraries' Mission Statement ...

#### Mission Statement

The mission of the University Libraries, as an integral part of the University of Tennessee ...

Our role is to provide access to and preservation of information resources and to teach individuals ...

#### Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

Criteria/Expectations for Continuous Appointment and Promotion to Associate Professor ...

The Library Faculty applies rigorous standards .... The recommendations are based on demonstrated and documented ... as well as evidence that the faculty member has met and will continue to meet expectations for continuous appointment. ...

It is expected that typically 70–75% of a faculty member's time will be spent in performing responsibilities in ... assigned areas as stated in the position description, with the additional time being spent in relevant scholarly/creative activities and service/outreach. ... The areas to be used in evaluating candidates for continuous appointment and promotion to associate professor are listed below:

1. *Performance in assigned areas of responsibilities for the University Libraries:*  
...
2. *Scholarly/Creative Activities:*  
...
3. *Service/Outreach to the University Libraries, the University, the profession, and the public:*  
...

The discourse of these documents has been analyzed using a genre and register analysis that incorporates Halliday's (1978, 1985) concepts Field, Tenor, and Mode, referred to hereafter as "FTM/G-R" ("Field-Tenor-Mode/Genre-Register"). The FTM/G-R instrument was adapted from Měchura (2005). The analysis also uses the techniques and approaches of Halliday and Hasan (1976), Lemke (1988, 1995), Fairclough (1989, 1995, 2003), Swales (2004), and Bhatia (1993).

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND THEORETICAL LENSES FOR DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

*Discourse* has been defined as “language in use,” spoken and written texts in their social context. The analysis of discourse is informed by and undertaken within many disciplines. Halliday (1978) describes language as a “social semiotic,” a system of signs that encodes social meaning. A text is “realized by” sentences that express ideational meaning (content, what it is “about”), interpersonal meaning (participants and relationships), and textual meaning (linguistic cohesion, and how elements of the text relate to each other).

The techniques used in this project begin with the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) of Halliday (1978, 1985), a sociolinguistic approach that analyzes the ways in which syntactic and lexical elements create meaning. SFL uses “system networks,” intersecting systems in which speakers have choices. Choices are constrained by social identities and situations. The options chosen in the system networks create “registers” of a language. Halliday calls register “a recognizable language variety” (1978, p. 7), identified by the syntactic and lexical options chosen by speakers. Examples of registers are the language of mathematics, law, business, or advertising. Halliday defines “register variables” that encode aspects of meaning. “Field” is the register variable associated with ideational meaning. “Tenor” encodes interpersonal meaning, while “Mode” is associated with textual meaning.

The other discourse analysis approaches used in this article build on Halliday or are influenced by him. An important framework is Swales’s (1990, 2004) genre analysis. Hoey (2001) focuses on methods of analyzing written texts. The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Fairclough (1989, 1995, 2003) critiques the ideologies and power relationships encoded in text. Lemke’s (1988, 1993, 1995, 1998, 1999) approach to text semantics combines SFL with CDA, looking at opposing ideologies represented in texts and aspects of meaning such as attitude or evaluation. Explorations of the genres used in organizational communication by Yates (1989) and Yates and Orlikowski (1992, 2002), Orlikowski and Yates (1994) are also important to this research.

A discussion of genre and register begins with a “discourse community,” e.g., librarians, academic librarians, or university faculty. Discourse communities use genres to communicate, and genres use particular registers. A genre and register analysis includes discussion of authorship, authority,

attitude, patterns of interaction, and intertextuality (relationship of a text with other texts). The data for this project come from a genre that uses an academic register combining the language of librarianship, higher education, and human resources (HR). The analysis of such documents sees them as part of a “communicative event” (Hymes & Gumperz, 1986). Communicative events have rules and expectations that members of a discourse community learn and understand.

Librarians as a discourse community use genres such as research articles, shared standards, and formative professional statements on ethics and censorship. The genres used by librarians are realized by a library register that includes jargon and terms of art. Professional librarians have different areas of expertise, but they have a set of professional beliefs and values in common that are communicated to new members of the community.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review focuses on faculty status for librarians in the United States and linguistic approaches to discourse analysis. More extensive literature reviews on both these topics are found in Bolin (2007, 2008a, 2008b).

### *Faculty Status for US Librarians*

Joachim (1968) looks at the origins of the issue and its development up until the time he was writing, more than 40 years ago. McAnally (1963) traces the roots of faculty status from 25 years previously. Writing again a few years later, McAnally (1971) observes that the profession was held back from achieving faculty status in the early 20th century by “housekeeping” and the low quality of library education. In the early 1970s, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) issued a series of statements and guidelines aimed at standardizing and codifying the meaning of faculty status (ACRL, 1973, 1974, 1975, 2000, 2001, 2006, 2010). These documents include model APT criteria. Hill (1994, 2005) has written persuasively of the need for librarians to “wear [their] own clothes” as faculty.

Veaner (1982, 1994) discusses librarianship as a profession that is “discontinuous,” with a basis in theory, and programmatic responsibilities that

require constant reinvention. In Veaner's paradigm, responsibilities are not based on tasks, but "everything is assigned and nothing is assigned" (1994).

Huwe and Irving (2002) describe the University of California (UC) peer review system for librarians that is used at all UC campuses. They quote McClelland (1997) on the traditions that are present in the professoriate today, "university-magisterial (black gown), labor union solidarity (blue collar), and discipline-professional (white smock)" (Applicability to Other Settings section, para. 1).

Wyss (2010) surveyed library school faculty members to discover their attitudes regarding faculty status for academic librarians. These faculty members focus on the functional aspects of librarianship. Coker, van Duinkerken, and Bales (2010) describe the current challenges of faculty status and argue for its necessity and value. Parker (2011) argues for faculty status for academic law librarians, including organizational support and consistent policies. Best and Kneip (2010) analyzed content from top-tier LIS journals and surveyed their authors to find that academic librarians prefer to publish in the most prominent journals. Wirth, Kelly, and Webster (2010) analyzed the research output of librarians at a research university, finding the need to develop a more inclusive definition of scholarship and acceptable publication outlets. Loesch (2010) argues that academic librarians are prepared for the future because of their teaching role and faculty status and urges them to join teaching faculty in the classroom. Hosburgh (2011) examines the models of faculty status that exist for librarians, to help new librarians make wise career choices.

### *Discourse Analysis*

Linguistic approaches to discourse analysis are associated with sociolinguistics and the work of Labov (1973), Hymes and Gumperz (1986), and others. The close connection between sociolinguistics, anthropology, sociology, and ethnography is illustrated by the "ethnography of communication" (Saville-Troike, 1989) in which people are members of a speech community and participate in speech events or communicative events.

SFL is associated with the work of Halliday (1978, 1985), Halliday and Hasan (1976), Martin (2001, 2002), and others, and is a sociolinguistic approach to grammar and discourse that is based on language in use.

Saussure (1959) describes syntagmatic relations and paradigmatic relations. Syntagmatic relations are the combination of syntactic elements



(subject-predicate-object). The paradigmatic dimension is the ability to choose and substitute words in a syntactic structure.

Cohesion is the situation “where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent upon another” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 4). Types of cohesion include reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, and a number of types of lexical cohesion. Common forms of lexical cohesion include reiteration, e.g., repetition or synonymy. Collocation is another form of lexical cohesion, consisting of words that are lexically associated.

Metaphor is deeply embedded in language. Lexical metaphors are an important part of lexical cohesion. In contrast to these lexical metaphors, Halliday (1985) uses “grammatical metaphor” to refer to the transfer of meaning from one grammatical form to another. An example is nominalization in which a process, usually expressed by a verb, is expressed by a noun, e.g., promote/promotion. This kind of grammatical metaphor is common in academic and scientific discourse.

Lemke (1993) discusses language as a social semiotic and social action. Lemke (1995) uses the term “discourse formation” to refer to the “persistent habits of speaking and acting, characteristic of some social group, through which it constructs its worldview.” Fairclough (1995) emphasizes how much of all discourse is formulaic and conforms to social and cultural expectations.

Discourse theories with a social aspect begin with Bakhtin (1935), whose contributions include *dialogicality* (the degree to which a text is a dialog between communities or points of view) and *heteroglossia* (the “voices” in a text). Intertextuality is an essential principle of social semiotics (Kristeva, 1984). Fairclough (2003) discusses intertextuality in terms similar to Lemke’s (1995) “intertext,” saying that “for any particular text or type of text, there is a set of other texts and ... voices which are particularly relevant, and potentially incorporated into the text” (p. 47).

Halliday (1978) defines text as the “basic unit of semantic structure” (p. 60). Hoey (2001) describes text as a “site for interaction” (p. 11) and describes “culturally popular patterns of text organization [as] ... emplates, schemata, scripts” which are lexically signaled, i.e., can be recognized by lexical choices. Patterns include Problem-Solution (p. 123); Goal-Achievement (p. 145), and a number of others. Some texts are “colonies” (pp. 74, 75) texts whose meaning does not derive from its sequence, such as newspapers, cookbooks, journals, and reference books.

Lemke (1995) describes orientational meaning, which shows what is “evaluative” rather than what is “true” (p. 43). “Evaluative attributes” of a

statement or proposition include warrantability (reliability), probability, and certitude, and show the “attitudinal stance” of a speaker (p. 43).

Modality is the expression of both evaluation and “truth.” Modality is the “affinity” or lack thereof between speaker and hearer, and is an indicator of solidarity or power. Fairclough (2003) states that knowledge exchange is “epistemic” modality, while activity exchange is “deontic” (pp. 167, 168).

Lemke (1995) describes register as the grammatical and semantic features that identify the language of social situations. The register, plus internal structure, equals genre (p. 27). Swales (1990, 2004) describes phenomena that influence the use of genres by academic discourse communities, including generification. Generification is the increasing prominence of genres of organizational communication, seen in performance evaluations and similar activities in universities, which “have become document-rich, multi-stage administrative undertakings” (p. 5).

Much of the literature on genres considers groups of related genres. Swales describes a “genre chain” as a “chronological ordering, especially when one genre is a necessary antecedent for another” (p. 19). Fairclough (2003) also discusses genre chains, “different genres which are regularly linked together” (p. 31).

Genre networks are “the totality of genres available for a particular sector” (Swales, 1990, p. 20). Swales calls them a “key Bakhtinian notion of intertextuality.” They represent the influence of genres on other genres, e.g., “the emergence of ... the conference poster ... out of elements of the research paper” (p. 20).

Yates and Orlikowski (1992, 2002) and Orlikowski and Yates (1994) write genre repertoires, sets, and systems. Templates and forms embed rules, and there are degrees and types of “normative scope” (pp. 302–304). Genres change over time, as people interact with genre rules (p. 306).

Lemke (1998) discusses how language creates relationships between participants. He identifies “classes of evaluative attributes” in the context of the heteroglossic voices found in communities. Discourse encodes ideational meaning, but also “axiological” meaning; that is, value-orientation.

Lemke’s seven dimensions of value orientation are as follows:

- Desirability/Inclination: *Wonderful/Horrible*
- Warrantability/Probability: *Possible/Doubtful*
- Normativity/Appropriateness: *Necessary/Appropriate*
- Usuality/Expectability: *Normal/Surprising*

- Importance/Significance: *Important/Significant*
- Comprehensibility/Obviousness: *Understandable/Mysterious*
- Humorousness/Seriousness: *Hilarious/Ironic/Serious*

## METHODOLOGY

This research focuses on appointment documents for librarians from 1862 land grant universities ( $n = 50$ ) whose librarians are tenured faculty ( $n = 35$ ). This subset was created to focus on a manageable number of texts from institutions with a similar model of faculty status for librarians. The texts were analyzed using the FTM/G-R instrument to examine linguistic features and to identify genre and register characteristics. The process is an iterative one in which repeated passes through the data discover new features and relationships. Twenty of the 35 documents were chosen for close analysis. Documents were selected to represent institutions of various sizes in all regions of the United States.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*FTM/G-R Discourse Instrument (Adapted from Měchura [2005])*

The characteristics of the documents examined during this research are described and discussed below. This general discussion is followed by excerpts from APT documents and further comments and analysis.

*Field (What Is the Text About?) Ideational Meaning: Experiential*

The experiential content of these documents is the responsibilities of academic librarians. They describe what librarians do and how those things fit into the university mission. The documents describe work, expertise, and obligation. They are about hiring and promotion, and the work of higher education.

Academic librarians use these texts as part of the construction of their social identity. They express the values of the academic community, the value of teaching, the role of research in society, the life and obligations of a scholar. The words in these documents are sober, earnest, and formal.

The texts are carefully and exhaustively worded. Parallel constructions (so that one can easily compare assistant and associate professor, for example) are common, and there is an effort to cover everything and close all loop-holes, while at the same time remaining somewhat general. The experiential meaning in these documents is reflected by concepts or ideas that recur frequently. The concepts use elements of the discourse formations (the social semiotic uses of language described by Lemke [1998]) that are recognizable to librarians.

Recurring concepts include continuity, sustained effort, increasing expertise; significance; responsibility and accountability; service to library users; competence/“competencies”; equivalence of librarians and teaching faculty; areas of specialization; institutional mission; research and scholarship, job performance; librarianship as a profession; rank; independence vs. collegiality.

*Ideational Meaning: Logical*

The APT documents make existential assumptions about a range of phenomena and social constructs such as teaching, research, and service and the idea that information is a commodity that library users can be given “access” to. Promotion and tenure as concepts are social constructs, as are university administrative structures: deans, provosts, vice presidents, and governance by the board of trustees or regents. Existential assumptions about libraries and librarians include organizational elements such as reference, instruction, and cataloging.

*Semantic Domains*

Semantic domains are the subjects from which lexical items are drawn. The semantic domains of these documents are higher education, librarianship, and HR.

*Transitivity: Process, Semantic and Grammatical Roles,  
and Circumstance*

*Process*

The processes found most often in these documents are material processes of *doing*: performing the activities of librarianship. Mental processes are also found in these texts. They include the process of weighing evidence on candidates for promotion: “consider,” “evaluate,” etc.

### *Semantic and Grammatical Roles*

SFL assigns semantic roles to the participants in different process types. In a material process, the doer of an action is the Agent, while the object of that action is the Goal or Beneficiary. In a mental process, the “doer” of the process is the Senser, while the object of that process is the Phenomenon.

“The candidate,” “librarian,” or “faculty member,” who will perform the activities described in the material processes, is the Agent in those clauses. The candidate is also the Beneficiary of the material process of being appointed, promoted, or tenured. Librarians as a collegial group are the Senses of the mental processes of judgment and evaluation whose phenomena are the “quality” or “significance” of the accomplishments in a dossier.

### *Circumstance*

Circumstance includes the representation of time and place. Time is represented in the timetables associated with APT. Place is represented by references to the university and the library. Each document pertains to a single institution and that institution’s practices, although the documents have much in common.

### *Tenor (Who Are the Participants? Interpersonal Meaning)*

#### *Author*

These texts have no personal author, but explicit and implicit corporate authors are the librarians and administrators who composed and approved them. The documents are the product of a continuous process of writing and revision. The changes reflect changes in university policy and changes in practice.

#### *Audience*

The audience for these texts is everyone involved in the APT processes. That includes librarians, administrators, candidates for positions, librarians seeking promotion or tenure, and those involved in peer review of colleagues.

#### *Relative Status (Speech Functions)*

Speech functions include statements, demands, offers, and questions. Nearly the only speech function found in these documents is the statement, i.e., declarative clauses.

*Social Distance*

These documents maintain a high level of social distance between the “candidates” who will be appointed and the organization that has created the criteria for appointment. The vocabulary is stilted, officious, and inspirational, full of nominalizations, metaphors, and abstractions that put distance between author and audience. Solidarity between writer and reader is low.

*Personalization*

The documents are written in the third person, with few pronouns. The author is not present in the text in a personal way.

*Standing (the Author’s Knowledge and Authority)*

The author is not a single person, but an organization or collegial body. The library documents represent the mission, standards, and regulations of the university and governing bodies, and therefore have a high degree of both knowledge and authority.

*Stance (Attitude, Agency, Modality)*

Stance is the text’s degree of dialogicality, and includes attitude, agency, and modality.

Nominalization is ubiquitous in these documents. Swales (1990) describes its use in scientific prose as a way of condensing information. It has that effect in these texts, but also lends an officious and impersonal tone.

These texts are low in dialogicality, and low in their openness to difference. The documents are the embodiment of the collegial process: a peer group of scholars, who use the values of the academy and of their particular discipline to create standards for admitting new members.

The texts contain numerous value judgments. They state what the organization values, including abstract qualities such as “excellence,” but also what constitutes scholarship or which activities fulfill responsibilities better than others. The most prominent evaluative statements in these texts are those describing the importance of “job performance” in meeting the criteria.

A number of Lemke’s (1998) “classes of evaluative attributes” are found in these texts. Desirability is expressed in descriptions of the qualities and activities sought in appointees, including expertise, scholarship, and service. These texts are high in warrantability, stating what must and will happen. A high degree of normativity and appropriateness are present. Along with the certainty of what must or will happen, there is the certainty that those

qualities and activities that the organization needs are fitting and proper. Along with normativity comes usuality. These texts describe a range of what is appropriate or normative, but also what is likely to be the general or usual situation. The texts are high in the importance/significance dimension of evaluative meaning. They describe something extremely significant: the conditions for career success, as well as the idea that achievements must be significant. While they try to avoid giving a recipe for promotion, APT documents attempt to make the criteria clear and to make expectations known and comprehensible. Seriousness is related to significance. The texts have legal weight. They have a real impact on the lives of those who are affected by them.

Mental and material processes are the most common types found in the texts examined here, but agency is reduced, primarily by the passive constructions and an impersonal tone that emphasizes “what” more than “who.” The documents are the collective thought, will, and action of the faculty and administration of the university.

The documents express both activity exchange (authority: deontic modality) and knowledge exchange (certainty: epistemic modality). Epistemic modality is generally expressed through statements, while deontic modality is expressed through modal verbs. The organization expresses its needs and wields its power through these standards. The declarative statements are often demands stated declaratively (what one “must” do to be promoted). The texts emphasize individuality, options, balance, and choice, but their purpose is to tell people what to do. The texts avoid giving an exact formula for promotion and tenure, but speak with certainty on the qualities, attitudes, activities, and expertise that are required. They speak with certainty about the mission and values of the institution. The documents were written to communicate obligations to members of the organization.

*Mode (What Makes the Text a Text? Textual Meaning)*

*Spoken/Written*

These written texts often include the document’s history of writing and revision and the individuals and groups who have written and approved it.

*Action/Reflection*

This axis is a measure of spontaneity. APT documents are obviously the antithesis of spontaneity. They are produced through careful editing and revision, and must be approved by several groups and individuals.

Moreover, they are tied to the contents of other written texts (e.g., governing board regulations), which further reduces their spontaneity.

### *Interactivity*

APT documents have neither a single personal author nor a single audience. The texts are consulted during hiring, evaluation, reappointment, and promotion. Copies may be sent to applicants for a position. They will certainly be used during any appeal or grievance procedure. They are written and maintained by librarians, approved by others in the administrative hierarchy, consulted by candidates for promotion and tenure, library administrators, and faculty voting on promotion and tenure.

### *Schema*

These texts follow a prescriptive schema that is consistent and predictable. They are frequently in outline form. The parts of the texts include prefatory matter, a description of the role of the library and librarians in the university, a description of the rank system, criteria for appointment to each rank, examples of activities and accomplishments that meet the criteria, documentation to support the criteria, procedures and timetables for carrying out yearly activities relating to APT.

These documents are often embedded in other documents, including a larger procedural document that includes information about the promotion dossier, procedures, or appeals. Library documents may be separate and may use, cite, quote, or adapt text from a general faculty handbook.

### *Patterning*

These texts are “colonies” (Hoey, 2001), texts made up of other texts and not necessarily meant to be read in order. They have a Goal-Achievement pattern (Hoey, 2001). The text answers the questions, “what is the goal?” and “how can it be achieved?” The overall structure of the text is driven by two concepts: the university mission and the ladder of faculty ranks.

### *Thematic organization*

“Theme” is the new information presented in a clause, and “Rheme” is the “residue.” Theme is the “topic” of the clause, while Rheme is a “comment” on the topic. For example, the following is from a library faculty appointment document at a land grant university in the United States:

UTK librarians [**Theme: new information; topic**] are equal partners with other academic faculty in the pursuit of the University goals for instruction, research, and service



**[Rheme: given information; comment; residue].** The special mission of librarians in the complex, changing environment of higher education **[Theme]**, is twofold **[Rheme]**:

### *Cohesion (Lexical, Logical)*

Cohesion is created primarily through lexical; collocation of words in lexical phrases; and synonymy. Pairs of two and series of three nouns, adjectives, and verbs are ubiquitous. The importance of concepts is reinforced by definitions, interpretations, and examples.

Lexical cohesion is also created through the use of metaphor. There are pervasive and overarching metaphors that are found in most of these texts. They include things like the idea of growth and progress as a characteristic of a successful career. There are also metaphorical uses of words like *high*, *level*, *depth*, *advance*, *tangible*, *strong*, and *rank* that create cohesion throughout the text.

Semantic relationships represent paradigmatic relations (Saussure, 1959), in which different words can be fitted into a paradigm. Synonymy is the most common semantic relationship found in these documents. Synonymy is found in the use of *research*, *creative activity*, and *scholarship*, together, interchangeably, or with some distinction made among them. Likewise, words like *teaching*, *instruction*, and *educational process* are a form of synonymy and create cohesion.

Logical cohesion is created in a number of ways. The most obvious is the outline form that organizes the contents. That structure is a form of “signaling” (Hoey, 2001), letting the reader know what is coming, and connecting it to what has gone before.

The parallel constructions that are found throughout these documents, e.g., language describing requirements for the rank of Assistant Professor is described in language that is repeated with appropriate changes in the criteria for Associate Professor, create both lexical and logical cohesion and represent paradigmatic relations.

### *Intertextuality and Voices*

These documents draw on an intertext (Lemke, 1995), a network of texts used and recognized by a community. The first segment of the intertext is the profession of librarianship. The *ALA Code of Ethics* (2008) is arguably the primary text in the intertext of US librarianship. The language of the *Code of Ethics* and similar texts permeates the discourse of librarianship in

the United States. One principle within the *Code of Ethics* is as follows: “We strive for excellence in the profession by maintaining and enhancing our own knowledge and skills, by encouraging the professional development of co-workers, and by fostering the aspirations of potential members of the profession” (para. 12). The concepts and vocabulary of this principle are found over and over again in the appointment documents. The second segment of the intertext drawn on in appointment documents is faculty status for librarians. The ACRL statements on faculty status encode principles and ideas that are echoed in appointment documents. The *Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians* (ACRL, 2006), for example, states that “the college and university library performs a unique and indispensable function in the educational process” and goes on to add that “[t]he librarian who provides such guidance plays a major role in the learning process.” Those ideas are found throughout library appointment documents. Both the *Code of Ethics* and the *Joint Statement*, along with other ACRL statements and guidelines, are frequently cited explicitly in appointment documents. A third segment of the intertext consists of HR documents such as job descriptions and performance evaluations which are familiar in nearly every workplace. A final segment is the plans, guidelines, and standards issued by universities.

Those and other intertext segments underlie the heteroglossia found in the texts which represents the voices of different groups and points of view in an organization. The heteroglossic opposition between faculty and administration expresses the tension between individual and organizational goals.

The *ALA Code of Ethics* expresses the basic ideology of librarianship in the United States, including service to library users, intellectual freedom, confidentiality, neutrality, separation between private convictions and interests and professional responsibility, and professional excellence. The discourses of librarianship differ on how these principles should be interpreted. While there is significant agreement among librarians about intellectual freedom issues, there are various discourses on the meaning of “service” and “excellence” and different voices that express those discourses. Lemke (1999) identified the voices of reference, instruction, and collection development in his study of academic library discourse. In Lemke’s view, “[t]he Reference Orientation voice articulates a discourse formation in which primary positive valuations attach to servicing the user’s needs for information” (p. 30). In heteroglossic opposition was the Instruction Orientation voice, which advocated instructing users in how to find information rather than simply providing the information to them.

This illustrates how contrasting voices and opposing discourses can still be based on the same ideology: the idea that librarians should use their expertise to provide services to users.

The ALA sample promotion and tenure documents (ACRL, 2010) are a crucial part of the intertext for academic librarian appointment documents. The schema for the sample includes:

- I. Appointment
  - A. General Policies
  - B. Probationary Appointments
- II. Promotion in Academic Rank
  - A. General Professional and Scholarly Qualifications of the Library Faculty
  - B. Criteria for Promotion to Specific Ranks
  - C. Procedures for Promotion to Specific Ranks
- III. Tenure (Continuous Appointment)

This schema is used as a format for virtually all of the documents assembled for this research.

Ideology, discourses, and voices are related to the idea of intertextuality. Librarianship has an ideology with multiple discourses, and texts contain voices that express those discourses. There is also an ideology of US higher education with multiple discourses and voices. There are also ideologies, discourses, and voices associated with HR decisions, the realm of employment and the rules and practices for hiring, firing, or promoting.

The discourses of librarianship found in the appointment documents include comments about:

- Professionalism
- Faculty status
- “Wearing Our Own Clothes” (Hill, 1994)
- Competencies
- Librarianship as teaching
- Scholarship

### *Genre and Register*

The documents compiled for this research are from a genre that is being called “Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Documents.” The register is “academic” language, a mix of language commonly used in

higher education, HR, and librarianship, with a ceremonial and legalistic tone created by the formal lexis. Swales's (2004) situation-driven analysis of genres begins with the environment by identifying the discourse community and its communicative purpose, the communicative events, placing the genre in this context, and doing an FTM analysis of the text. Bhatia (1993, pp. 22–34) also begins with the communicative situation. One of his steps is “selecting corpus” (p. 23), i.e., assembling examples to analyze, followed by the choice of one “long single typical text” (p. 24) for close analysis.

The register and genre represented in these texts have a number of salient characteristics, including the schema that the documents follow. The schema is connected to the fact that the text is a “colony” (Hoey, 2001), a text that is meant to be consulted in any order. The text and its sections may be numbered or identified in some other way. Another feature is the formal and impersonal tone, with no personal author, few pronouns, and numerous passive constructions. The process being described is more prominent than the participants. Nominalization contributes to the impersonal and formal tone.

These texts are high in both epistemic and deontic modality, expressing certainty and obligation. The modal verbs *must*, *shall*, *should*, and *will* encode a high degree of warrantability, the certainty that what is being asserted is true, and a clear deontic modality. The texts do not contain commands, but they are characterized by declarative statements that say what should, must, or will happen. Cohesive devices include lexical repetition and synonymy. These words may not normally be considered synonyms, but reinforce each other, e.g., “quality and significance,” “type, scope, and impact.” These quasi-synonymous collocations are examples of “overwording” (Fairclough, 1989, p. 110). The high lexical density, frequent nominalizations, superfluous adjectives, and collocations of three nouns, verbs, or adjectives exhibit overwording.

While the register features make this genre recognizable, it is the use of these texts that is crucial. These documents play an important role in university culture. The register and genre are familiar to members of the discourse community who recognize the triad “Teaching—Research—Service.” Interwoven with the description of faculty responsibilities are HR jargon and administrative concerns, seen in the discussion of position descriptions and phrases like “demonstrated effectiveness.” The discourse formations of librarianship and higher education occur throughout, but the language of hiring and performance evaluation is also prominent in these texts. The HR register is also heard in the consideration of whether achievements are “outstanding,” “significant,” etc.

University appointment documents are a stable genre, part of a genre set or chain that includes vacancy announcements, letters of application, search committee documents, letters of reference, and other texts associated with hiring. Part of the genre set is associated with faculty promotion and tenure, including candidate portfolio and external peer review letters. These documents are part of the “document-rich” generification (Swales, 2004) in which organizations conduct many communicative events with the help of recognizable document genres. The documents are continuously updated, and many include a provenance with dates of revision and approval. University bylaws, memoranda, etc., are explicitly cited. They represent the authority of the university administration and the collective voice of the faculty.

#### *Analysis of Typical Texts*

Bowen (2009) describes the qualitative approach to document analysis, including the concept of ‘saturation’ as a way of determining how many documents to examine. Saturation occurs when analysis begins no longer yields new information. Saturation was clearly reached in the analysis of these APT documents. They all follow a similar or even identical schema, and the content and language have much in common. All documents received some degree of analysis, with 20 out of 35 being analyzed closely. Examples from those 15 are included here.

#### *Examples of Field, Tenor, Mode, Genre, and Register Characteristics*

The FTM/G-R analysis describes the characteristics of the 33 texts that were examined. Table 1 presents specific examples from 15 of these texts that were used for close analysis, and which are from land grant universities of various sizes and in various regions of the United States. This analysis focuses on the most salient characteristics of the APT genre, using the format of the FTM/G-R instrument. Following the table of excerpts are longer excerpts from a number of documents.

#### *Synthesis of FTM/G-R Characteristics*

The following are excerpts that illustrate a number of the characteristics from Table 1. Each excerpt is numbered, with the source and comments

below the excerpted text. Excerpts 9–24 are all from one document, the APT document of the University of Illinois. This approach follows the method recommended by [Bhatia \(1993\)](#) who describes assembling examples to analyze, followed by the choice of one “long single typical text” (p. 24) for closer analysis.

**Excerpt 1.**

The University Libraries are integral to the discovery, synthesis, transmission, and application of knowledge. The mission of the Libraries states that “The University Libraries are a leader in advancing intellectual discovery, information literacy, and lifelong learning. The Libraries connect students and scholars to the world of information and ideas. As an active participant in the worldwide community of scholars, the Libraries foster the teaching, research, service, and outreach goals of Penn State. They select, create, organize, and facilitate access to resources that are relevant to the University’s programs and pursuits.” By furthering this mission, members of the Libraries’ faculty facilitate the integration and application of existing knowledge to create new knowledge, and promote learning, teaching, and research. The complexity of this mission requires a Libraries’ faculty diverse in expertise and responsibilities. The Libraries’ Promotion and Tenure Criteria are designed to promote evaluation of each faculty member’s unique contributions to the Libraries, the University, and the community of scholars.

*Source:* Pennsylvania State University.

Comments: This paragraph illustrates many things about the Field, Tenor, Mode, Genre, and Register of academic library APT documents. The intertextuality of these documents is illustrated by the reference to the Libraries’ mission statement. The phrase “discovery, synthesis, transmission, and application of knowledge” is a quote from the University’s mission statement, indicating the role of the library in carrying out that mission. The phrase “learning, teaching, and research” or some variation is probably found in all the APT documents in this or any other academic library population. It represents collocation as a cohesive device, and is from the discourse formation of higher education. In just this one paragraph are numerous examples of the “series of three” (or more) nouns, adjectives, or lexical phrases that are characteristic of bureaucratic writing. These series create cohesion, through parallel construction, synonymy, and repetition, and use the discourse formations of academic librarianship and higher education. They create distance between author and reader with high epistemic (certainty) and deontic (obligation) modality. These series include “teaching, research, service, and outreach,” “intellectual discovery, information literacy, and lifelong learning,” and “the Libraries, the University, and the community of scholars.” This paragraph describes the roles and relationships of the university, the libraries, and the libraries’

**Table 1.** FTM/GR Analysis of Typical Documents.

Field (What is the text about?)	Examples are direct quotes from documents.
Ideational meaning: Experiential	<p>Example: Statement on Promotion and Tenure to the Library Faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</p> <p><b>Source: University of Illinois</b></p> <p>Comment: The Experiential meaning of these documents is clear: they are about rank, promotion, and tenure for academic librarians.</p>
Ideational meaning: Logical	<p>Example: C. ASSISTANT PROFESSORS are expected:</p> <p><b>Source: University of Tennessee</b></p> <p>Comment: Classification (e.g., various faculty ranks) is an element of logical meaning.</p>
Semantic domains	<p>Example: Washington State University Library Faculty Handbook Criteria for Merit Increases, Promotion, and Granting of Tenure</p> <p><b>Source: Washington State University</b></p> <p>Comment: Semantic domains include librarianship, academia, and various aspects of HR.</p>
Transitivity:	
Process	<p>Example:</p> <p>Research that contributes new knowledge is the most difficult to produce but also the most highly valued type of contribution made by Library Faculty, especially in the area of librarianship. The candidate may also, however, engage in original research in other scholarly disciplines. The Library Faculty distinguishes between refereed publications and non-refereed publications, regardless of format. While the most important characteristic of an article is its quality, in general, articles in refereed journals with international or national reputations will be considered to be more significant than those appearing in all other refereed journals.</p> <p><b>Source: Louisiana State University</b></p> <p>Comments: This passage illustrates the process types that are common in these texts: “contributes,” “made,” and</p>

**Table 1. (Continued)**

	<p>“engage” are all material processes. “Distinguishes” is a mental process.</p>
Semantic Roles	<p>Example: All library faculty, whatever their area of responsibility, contribute to the teaching mission of the University by selecting information, making information available through various formats, and/or providing instruction on the access and use of information. <b>Source: Mississippi State University</b> Comment: “All library faculty” represents the semantic role of Agent.</p>
Circumstance	<p>Example: This document is intended primarily to assist tenure-track Library Faculty who are preparing for reappointment, tenure and promotion review by the Eligible Voting Library Faculty. <b>Source: Louisiana State University</b> Comment: <i>Circumstance</i> is indicated here: the purpose to which process and semantic roles are being put.</p>
<b>Tenor (Who are the participants? Interpersonal meaning)</b>	
Author	<p>Example: (Criteria approved 1/5/87 by Library Faculty; subsequent revisions approved by Library Faculty) <b>Source: Washington State University</b> Comments: These texts have no personal authors. The corporate authorship is sometimes explicit, as in this example.</p>
Audience	<p>Example: Promotion in rank delineates benchmarks on a career path. All library faculty should continue to grow, progress, and develop along a professional path. Every person employed by the University is expected to meet high standards of integrity, collegiality and objectivity and to further the goals of his/her department, the Library, and the University. <b>Source: Mississippi State University</b> Comment: The audience for this text is primarily the library faculty who are candidates for promotion and tenure.</p>



**Table 1.** (Continued)

Audience	<p>Example:</p> <p>Library faculty members are specialists in providing access to all types of information, the development of collections (resources), bibliographic control and organization, instruction (including but not limited to a classroom setting), reference and advisory services, development of information systems, administration and planning, and public appearances in the interest of the multifaceted areas of professional library activity.</p> <p><b>Source: Mississippi State University</b></p> <p>Comment: The audience for this text from the same document is university administrators and others outside the library who may not understand the professional expertise of librarians.</p>
Relative status (speech functions)	<p>Example:</p> <p>A candidate's scholarly and creative work shall be evaluated in terms of its originality, depth, and significance in the field.</p> <p><b>Source: University of Illinois</b></p> <p>Comments: APT documents consist almost entirely of declarative statements. This is an example of one such statement, which cloaks an imperative ("do this") as a declarative ("this shall be done"). It is an implied command for both candidates and evaluators.</p>
Social distance	<p>Example:</p> <p>Continuous appointment is the most significant reward that the University can bestow on a faculty member. The Library Faculty applies rigorous standards before recommending faculty members for continuous or "tenured" appointments. The recommendations are based on demonstrated and documented achievement during a faculty member's probationary period, as well as evidence that the faculty member has met and will continue to meet expectations for continuous appointment.</p> <p><b>Source: University of Nebraska—Lincoln</b></p> <p>Comments: This is an example of the formal tone that creates distinct social distance in these documents. The words "rigorous," "demonstrated and documented,"</p>

**Table 1.** (Continued)

	<p>“probationary period,” and similar vocabulary and constructions lend distance between text and reader.</p>
Personalization	<p>Example:</p> <p>A strong service profile at the local, regional, and national levels is highly valued among K-State Libraries faculty. Candidates must demonstrate non-directed service beyond their assigned area of responsibility (directed service). Teaching and/or development of courses or workshops conducted for audiences external to K-State Libraries may be considered.</p> <p><b>Source: Kansas State University</b></p> <p>Comment: The use of formal terms such as “candidates” and the passive voice of “is highly valued” and “may be considered” are part of the impersonal tone of these documents.</p>
Standing	<p>Example:</p> <p>University of Kentucky Regulations, Administrative Regulation 2:7, Responsible Office: Provost, Date Effective: 10/6/2011, Supersedes Version: 7/01/2008</p> <p><b>Source: University of Kentucky</b></p> <p>Comment: The imprimatur of the university and the explicit statement of responsibility and effective dates are an example of the things that lend authority to these documents.</p>
<b>Stance (Attitude, Agency, Modality)</b> [deontic and epistemic modality and classes of evaluative attributes]:	
Deontic modality	<p>Example:</p> <p>The candidate must perform at a high professional level in his or her areas of specialty and contribute to the educational, research, and service functions of the university.</p> <p><b>Source: Texas A&amp;M University</b></p> <p>Comments: “Modality” encodes power relationships. This excerpt above includes one of 13 occurrences of the word “must” in this particular document, indicating a high level</p>

**Table 1.** (Continued)

	of deontic modality, the indication of norms or expectations.
Epistemic modality	<p>Example:</p> <p>Associate Professors also provide leadership in the development of library services and programs and in appropriate professional organizations or learned societies at the state, regional, and/or national levels.</p> <p><b>Source: Oklahoma State University</b></p> <p>Comments: Epistemic modality expresses certainty. This excerpt is an example of the high epistemic modality of these documents, in which the university and its faculty express certainty about what is required of candidates.</p>
Evaluative attributes	<p>Example:</p> <p>University Librarian is the highest tenured rank. University Librarians are responsible for highly complex technical, bibliographical, and public service or other functions having a significant impact on successful library operations. Mature professional judgment, a broad perspective of the library and the university, and excellent analytic skills are required to work at this level.</p> <p><b>Source: University of Florida</b></p> <p>Comment: This passage illustrates several evaluative attributes, including Warrantability (certainty), Desirability (these responsibilities are positive and praiseworthy), Normativity (these responsibilities are expected), and Significance (these responsibilities are important).</p>
<b>Mode (What makes the text a text? Textual meaning)</b>	
Spoken/written	All texts assembled and examined for this research are written.
Action/reflection	<p>Example:</p> <p>Originally Issued: 11/10/61 Revisions: 1/7/00; 09/01/2010</p> <p><b>Source: Rutgers University</b></p> <p>Comments: Action/reflection is a measure of spontaneity. These documents are the antithesis of spontaneity, with strings of revision dates, as in this excerpt, showing their editing history.</p>

**Table 1. (Continued)**

<p>Interactivity</p>	<p>Example:</p> <p>Timeline for Annual Review of Library Faculty The following timeline provides an approximate schedule for the A&amp;D process. Library faculty should follow the calendar issued each year in the fall by the Dean of Libraries.</p> <p>August: Associate Dean of Libraries for Planning and Assessment prepares preliminary list of faculty scheduled for RPT review in the coming year; Dean of Libraries distributes to all faculty.</p> <p><b>Source: Oklahoma State University</b></p> <p>Comment: This excerpt is the beginning of a long, detailed timeline that indicates the roles played by administrators, faculty, and candidates, including their interaction with the APT documents.</p>
<p>Schema</p>	<p>Example:</p> <p>Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review Process Chart . . . . . 2</p> <p>Section 1 – Standards for Library Faculty Ranks . . . . . 3</p> <p>1.1 Assistant Professor . . . . . 3</p> <p>1.2 Associate Professor . . . . . 3</p> <p>1.3 Professor . . . . . 3</p> <p>Section 2 – Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion . . . . . 4</p> <p>2.1 Appointment . . . . . 4</p> <p>2.1.1 Assistant Professor . . . . . 5</p> <p>Standard Library Tenure-Track Timeline . . . . . 5</p> <p>2.1.2 Associate Professor . . . . . 5</p> <p>Standard Library Tenure-Track Timeline . . . . . 5</p> <p>2.1.3 Professor . . . . . 5</p> <p>2.2 Tenure . . . . . 6</p> <p>2.3 Promotion . . . . . 6</p> <p>Section 3 – Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion . . . . . 7</p> <p>3.1 Assistant Professor, first reappointment . . . . . 7</p> <p><b>Source: Oklahoma State University</b></p> <p>Comment: This excerpt is from a table of contents that is typical of these documents and the schema that they follow.</p>
<p>Patterning</p>	<p>Example:</p> <p>AUBURN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE FEBRUARY 2013</p> <p><b>Source: Auburn University</b></p> <p>Comments: APT documents are “colonies” (Hoey, 2001) – texts composed of other texts that are not</p>

**Table 1.** (Continued)

	required to be read from start to finish. They follow a Goal-Achievement pattern, as indicated by the title of the document excerpted above.
Thematic Organization	<p>Example:</p> <p>Scholarship often requires teamwork and other collaborative relationships, particularly because of the growth of interdisciplinary and collaborative programs. When work that is a result of joint effort is presented as evidence of scholarship, clarification of the candidate's role in the joint effort must be provided.</p> <p><b>Source: Iowa State University</b></p> <p>Comments: Theme and Rheme are the presentation of a clause's topic and comment, or new and given information. In the sentences above, Theme is represented by "Scholarship" and "Work that is a result ...." Rheme is "often requires and teamwork ..." and "is presented as ...." Theme and Rheme help carry the text's message from beginning to end: the Rheme of the first sentence (teamwork, etc.) becomes the Theme of the second ("work that is the result of a joint effort").</p>
Intertextuality	<p>Example:</p> <p>The University standards establish expectations for all faculty (Professorial, Lecturer, and Librarian) at SDSU and provide a conceptual context in which college and departmental standards are placed. Departments will develop their own standards to contextualize the university standards and make them more specific to the discipline.</p> <p><b>Source: South Dakota State University</b></p> <p>Comment: This passage defines the intertextual relationship of the library (and other departmental) promotion and tenure standards with the general university standards.</p>
Voices	<p>Example:</p> <p>A. Activities encompassed in the term "Practice of Librarianship" include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• providing intellectual and physical access to information in the research and instructional collections of the Libraries and other information repositories and resources</li> <li>• furthering the teaching and research missions of the University through administrative, managerial, development and supervisory activities</li> </ul>

**Table 1. (Continued)**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improving instruction through integration of information resources into the curriculum, development and application of technological innovations, development of curricular support, new courses, or other related work.</li> <li>• interacting with library users at all levels; developing and maintaining communication and interaction with other members of the University community</li> <li>• formulating and implementing Libraries' policies and procedures related to the instructional mission of the Libraries and the University</li> </ul> <p><b>Source: Colorado State University</b></p> <p>Comments: This list of responsibilities is written in the HR voice, including impersonal and bureaucratic language. This HR voice is in heteroglossic opposition to the voices of librarianship and higher education that also appear in these documents.</p>
<p><b>Cohesion (lexical, logical):</b></p>	
<p>Collocation</p>	<p>Example:</p> <p>B. Criteria for Initial Appointment at, and for Promotion to, Each Rank</p> <p>Library faculty may be appointed to the following academic non-teaching titles: assistant librarian, associate librarian, and librarian. Individuals holding non-teaching titles shall also receive faculty rank as indicated in board policy 405.1.</p> <p><b>Source: University of Arkansas</b></p> <p>Comment: "Appointment" and "promotion" are frequently collocated with "rank," which creates lexical cohesion.</p>
<p>Repetition</p>	<p>Example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of automated circulation, reserves, and/or interlibrary loan systems.</li> <li>2. Demonstrates understanding of agreements governing resource sharing among WSU campuses and programs, between WSU and relevant library consortia, and between WSU and providers of Direct Document Delivery services.</li> <li>3. Demonstrates competence in managing and fulfilling requests for material through circulation, interlibrary loan, and/or document delivery services.</li> </ol> <p><b>Source: Washington State University</b></p> <p>Comments: This excerpt demonstrates both lexical and logical cohesion through the use of repetition. The</p>

**Table 1.** (Continued)

	<p>repetition of “demonstrates” ties the text together and the outline form creates logical cohesion.</p>
Synonymy	<p>Example:</p> <p>Products developed through these processes are public, open to review, and available for use by others. Scholarship and creative activity can take many forms, including but not limited to the following:</p> <p><b>Source: New Mexico State University</b></p> <p>Comments: “Public, open to review, and available for use ...” are a form of synonymy, as are “Scholarship and creative activity.” The synonymy in these documents are part of the exhaustive nature of the discourse of promotion and tenure, the attempt to give candidates adequate information and sound advice.</p>
Synonymy	<p>Example:</p> <p>Assesses and evaluates skillfully the literature of disciplines in order to anticipate needs and build Library collections.</p> <p><b>Source: University of Illinois</b></p> <p>Comments: “Assesses and evaluates” are synonymous. The “overwording” that is characteristic of this genre and register is typified by use of synonyms and of superfluous adverbs like “skillfully.”</p>
Synonymy	<p>Example:</p> <p>A candidate’s scholarly and creative work shall be evaluated in terms of its originality, depth, and significance in the field.</p> <p><b>Source: University of Illinois</b></p> <p>Comment: “Originality, depth, and significance” is a series of three which are largely synonyms in this register, expanding on the notion of quality.</p>
Synonymy	<p>Example:</p> <p>Effectively initiates, revises, and disseminates departmental routines by directing staff and determining work flow.</p> <p><b>Source: University of Tennessee</b></p> <p>Comment: This statement takes many words to say “manages” or “supervises” and exhibits overwording and the “series of three” that is frequently found in these documents.</p>

**Table 1. (Continued)**

<p>Metaphor</p>	<p>Example:</p> <p>iv. editorship of scholarly books, conference proceedings, periodicals, exhibition catalogs, etc. (to be evaluated in terms of the depth and degree of scholarship demonstrated);</p> <p>v. creative works, performances, exhibits, translations and digital resources (to be evaluated in terms of the depth and degree of scholarship demonstrated);</p> <p><b>Source: Ohio State University</b></p> <p>Comment: The repetition of the word “depth” (which appears frequently in these documents, along with similar metaphorical uses of words like advance, growth, etc.) is a metaphorical indication of the obligation to be increasingly engaged and expert as a librarian and scholar.</p>
<p>Outline structure (signaling)</p>	<p>Example:</p> <p>Contents</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1</p> <p>    1.1 Authority and Interpretation . . . . . 1</p> <p>    1.2 Values and Assumptions . . . . . 2</p> <p>2. FACULTY RANKS AND STATUS . . . . . 5</p> <p>    2.1 Definition of Faculty Ranks . . . . . 5</p> <p>        2.1.1 Instructor . . . . . 5</p> <p>        2.1.2 Assistant Professor . . . . . 5</p> <p>        2.1.3 Associate Professor . . . . . 6</p> <p>        2.1.4 Professor . . . . . 6</p> <p><b>Source: Virginia Tech University</b></p> <p>Comment: The outline structure that is found in most of these documents signals the reader about what to expect, and creates cohesion and connection.</p>
<p>Parallel construction</p>	<p>Librarian II</p> <p>Librarians at this rank have demonstrated professional development evidenced ...</p> <p>Librarian III</p> <p>Librarians at this rank have a high level of competence in performing professional duties requiring specialized knowledge or experience. ...</p> <hr/> <p>Librarian IV</p> <p>Librarians at this rank show evidence of superior performance at the highest levels of specialized work and professional responsibility.</p> <p><b>Source: University of Maryland</b></p> <p>Comment: The repetition of “Librarians at this rank ...” creates lexical and logical cohesion in this text.</p>



faculty. The paragraph includes important discourses of higher education (e.g., a global presence) and librarianship (e.g., the expertise of librarians in giving access to scholarly resources).

**Excerpt 2.**

The Libraries guidelines for promotion to the highest librarian rank, Librarian 4, include achievement of specific criteria for the promotion to Librarian 3, but in each instance more is expected, i.e., high performance as a librarian, more significant publications, and evidence of a national or international reputation. As stated in the WSU Faculty Manual, "... Promotion is not to be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a given term of service. It is rare for a faculty member to attain the level of distinction expected for promotion to professor, or equivalent, before the sixth year in rank as Associate Professor, or equivalent rank. In both cases, demonstrated merit, and not years of service, is the guiding factor." Libraries faculty who are promoted to Librarian 4 have a distinguished record of research and professional activities in addition to excellence in the practice of librarianship.

*Source:* Washington State University.

Comments: "Library faculty who are promoted ... have a distinguished record" expresses warrantability, a high degree of epistemic modality: a guarantee that anyone who has been promoted has a distinguished record. The epistemic modality may be intended, or it may be a more typical cloaking of deontic modality as a statement (rather than saying "must have a distinguished record"), placing obligation upon those who wish to be promoted. This passage includes intertextuality: a quote from the university's Faculty Manual, and uses "high" used as a metaphor for significant performance and advance rank.

**Excerpt 3.**

**CATEGORY II: RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE & PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES**

Since "The everyday professional activities of librarians [may] bring them into contact with the entire realm of knowledge" (from Geahigan, Priscilla, et al, "Acceptability of Non-Library/Information Science Publications in the Promotion and Tenure of Academic Librarians," *College & Research Libraries*, Nov. 1981: 571–575), research/scholarly/creative and professional activities in any area will be supported by the Libraries and will be given credit in assignment of merit ratings and promotion and tenure decisions. See Sec. 3.b.1.a. for Professional Activity Time (PAT) Guidelines. Research/scholarly/creative and professional contributions will be evaluated for quality, quantity, and professional significance. Credit in the form of increased merit rating should be awarded at the time of publication, funding, exhibition, or performance. The following activities are examples and are not listed in priority order.

Comments: The idea that librarians might produce scholarly and creative activities from outside the field of library and information science is part of the discourses of librarianship, and contains heteroglossic oppositions. One part of the discourse is the idea that librarianship is informed by many other fields, and that librarians are conversant with many fields. At the same time, librarians come to the field with a variety of educational backgrounds, with other advanced degrees in many cases. A third element is the idea that librarians should do research on topics that will contribute to the theory and practice of librarianship.

**Excerpt 4.**

UTK librarians are equal partners with other academic faculty in the pursuit of the University goals for instruction, research, and service. The special mission of librarians in the complex, changing environment of higher education, is twofold: 1) selecting and maintaining the library's collections, and 2) providing access to information and the required supporting services.

Specifically, librarians apply professional knowledge in a variety of functions: selecting, acquiring, and organizing materials and services; teaching in both formal and informal settings; providing organization and management of the staff and resources that facilitate access to materials and services for our community of users.

Finally, UTK librarians have an obligation to remain professionally informed, to disseminate the results of their scholarly work, and to seek opportunities for service.

*Source:* University of Tennessee.

Comments: This is a felicitous expression of the balance of partnership and equality with a particular role and expertise. The discourse of faculty status for librarians is clearly expressed in these three paragraphs, which describe the programmatic role of librarians as well as their professional and scholarly obligations.

**Excerpt 5.**

The following guidelines provide examples of representative activities for the evaluation of performance:

Communicates and cooperates with faculty, students, and library staff in furthering the objectives and priorities of University, academic departments, and the Library.

Demonstrates understanding of the operations and services of the Library divisions and their inter-relationships, and one's position within the Library organization, by an ability to interpret, integrate and promote these operations and services.

Translates knowledge of the curriculum and University policies into effective Library services.

Demonstrates effective teaching methods in classroom settings or other group presentations.

Stimulates use of libraries and other information resources by integrating effective formal, instructional materials (e.g. videotapes, slides, etc.).

Remains aware of professional librarianship interests by reading and attendance at conferences and courses.

Cooperates with other libraries and institutions to facilitate research and to develop regional and national library services.

Demonstrates familiarity with information retrieval techniques.

Assesses and evaluates skillfully the literature of disciplines in order to anticipate needs and build Library collections.

Comments: This list of responsibilities is like one that would be used for performance evaluation by supervisors. The description of library responsibilities is rather general, but this is one place where this document deviates distinctly from the university-level document, which has no sections on assessing teaching, research, and service “Assesses and evaluates” is an example of synonymy and is a good example of overwording.

**Excerpt 6.**

F. Access Services

Demonstrates competence in establishing and maintaining procedures designed to facilitate user access to WSU library collections and resources, and to the collections and resources made available through agreements with other colleges, universities, organizations, and institutions.

1. Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of automated circulation, reserves, and/or interlibrary loan systems.
2. Demonstrates understanding of agreements governing resource sharing among WSU campuses and programs, between WSU and relevant library consortia, and between WSU and providers of Direct Document Delivery services.
3. Demonstrates competence in managing and fulfilling requests for material through circulation, interlibrary loan, and/or document delivery services.
4. Demonstrates understanding of copyright law and licensing agreements as related to access services.
5. Demonstrates understanding of services available to distance users.

6. Demonstrates ability to generate statistical analyses of access services and to communicate relevant information to appropriate units and individuals within the Libraries.
7. Demonstrates competence in space/stacks planning and management.
8. Demonstrates sensitivity to the needs of library users.
9. Demonstrates competence in monitoring financial transactions (e.g., fees, fines, transaction charges) and providing budgetary accountability through appropriate reports.

*Source:* Washington State University.

Comments: “Managing and fulfilling” is from the language of HR, and is overwording and synonymy. The repetition of “demonstrates” creates cohesion throughout. The nominalizations that represent the qualities or achievements that are “demonstrated” are a form of synonymy: “competence,” “knowledge,” “understanding,” etc. While it is common to find descriptions of specialization in these documents, the descriptions here are more detailed and exhaustive than nearly any other in the examples compiled.

**Excerpt 7.**

Recommendations for reappointment, promotion and tenure are based on the Eligible Voting Library Faculty members’ analysis of a candidate’s total record, both quantitative and qualitative, as it is documented in a candidate’s dossier. The tenured Library Faculty value quality of achievements more than quantity of activities. In addition, a candidate’s record must show a pattern of on-going professional growth, indicating the candidate is currently active and productive and will continue to be so.

*Source:* Louisiana State University.

Comments: This passage illustrates a number of things. The first sentence contains numerous nominalizations: recommendations, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and analysis. Agency is unusually prominent. The Library Faculty (tenured and untenured) are mentioned several times as Sensors in the mental processes of analyzing, valuing, expecting, and understanding. The sentence that begins “The tenured Library Faculty value quality” is unusual. Agentless passive constructions such as “Quality is valued ...” are far more common in these texts. The concepts of sustained effort and continued learning and growth are expressed with strong deontic modality: “candidate’s record must show a pattern.”

**Excerpt 8.**

Research that contributes new knowledge is the most difficult to produce but also the most highly valued type of contribution made by Library Faculty, especially in the area of librarianship. The candidate may also, however, engage in original research in other

scholarly disciplines. The Library Faculty distinguishes between refereed publications and non-refereed publications, regardless of format. While the most important characteristic of an article is its quality, in general, articles in refereed journals with international or national reputations will be considered to be more significant than those appearing in all other refereed journals.

Comments: “The most difficult to produce but also the most highly valued type of contribution.” This section is straightforward and candid in its view of research. The “desirability” and “significance” attributes are high, with research in library science being evaluated as the most desirable. Agency is again explicit: “The Library Faculty distinguishes ....” This passage illustrates the process types that are common in these texts: “contributes,” “made,” and “engage” are all material processes. “Distinguishes” is a mental process.

**Excerpt 9.**

STATEMENT ON PROMOTION AND TENURE TO THE LIBRARY FACULTY  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Introduction

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library provides professionally managed collections and information services that meet the needs of the instructional, research, and public service constituencies of the University. The University of Illinois Library faculty are partners with other academic faculty in the pursuit of the University's goals for instruction, research, and service. Librarians apply professional knowledge in a series of related functions: selecting, acquiring, and organizing materials; teaching in both formal and informal settings; and providing organization and management of the staff and resources that facilitate access to materials and services for our users.

*Source:* University of Illinois.

Comments: This is an upfront statement of what the library does for the university and the partnership of library faculty and “other academic faculty.” These are active sentences with subjects who are agents: the organization and the people in the organization.

The discourse of professionalism and librarianship as a profession are found here, beginning with the words “professionally-managed collections,” which is a common phrase in library texts, and which refers to the expertise of professional librarianship. The brief summary of the domain of librarianship is a part of a discourse formation of the profession: words like selecting, acquiring, organizing, materials, and collection are all used in ways that have specific connotations in the discourse of librarianship. “Selecting” implies that a librarian with expertise in a particular subject

chooses “material,” a term which covers books, journals, sound recordings, databases, etc., that it is “acquired” through the professional expertise (knowledge of sources and accounting) of acquisitions librarians and staff, and “organized,” i.e., cataloged and housed by those with expertise in those areas. The product of those activities is the “collection.” Librarians give “access” to the collection and other materials, and do “instruction” and “reference” to teach users how to find and use material.

Cohesion is created by the repetition of “library faculty,” “university,” “faculty,” and “librarian” throughout this text. The University of Illinois librarians are always referred to as “library faculty.” The sentence that begins “Librarians apply” refers generally to the profession of librarianship.

**Excerpt 10.**

The faculty of the UIUC Library have an obligation to remain professionally informed, to pursue the discovery of new knowledge related to their field of expertise, to disseminate the results of their scholarly work, and to seek opportunities for service to the Library, campus, state, nation and profession.

Comments: This paragraph expresses deontic modality in assigning obligation to the library faculty. Expertise and service are invoked as values of librarianship. A common Theme in these texts is the need to keep learning and acquiring new knowledge and skills throughout one’s career. This is standard advice in any workplace, and also of particular significance in librarianship, which is driven by technology, and informed by many other fields.

The word “pursue” is a common metaphor in this kind of text: it implies zeal in scholarship.

**Excerpt 11.**

The faculty of the UIUC Library is governed by University statements on promotion found in Article IX of the Statutes, in Communication Number 9 from the Office of the Provost, and in Communication Number 13 from the Office of the Provost regarding “Review of Faculty in Year Three of the Probationary Period.”

Comments: This is an example of intertextuality which is a common feature of all college or departmental faculty appointment documents: the reference to the university standards on which departmental standards must be based.

**Excerpt 12.**

Promotion and Tenure

Tenure is granted when retention of the faculty member is expected to advance the quality of the University Library, as evidenced by the candidate’s performance in the

areas of 1) librarianship and 2) research, creative, and scholarly activity, with consideration also given to 3) valuable professional service. It is the policy of the UIUC Library that the level or scope of administrative responsibility shall not be a criterion for advancement in rank.

Comments: “Librarianship” is used as a synonym for “teaching” in the tripartite university mission. Research is described as “research, creative, and scholarly activity,” using all the common terms together, in a form of synonymy. Service is downplayed, with the words “consideration also given to” and “valuable.”

The policy that administrative responsibility is not a criterion for promotion is an expression of the discourse of faculty status, the concept of collegial governance, and is a reference to a competing discourse, the traditional hierarchy in library organizations, in which there are “supervisors,” and in which promotion may connote promotion up the hierarchical or managerial chain.

Metaphors in this paragraph include “advance” and “level or scope.”

**Excerpt 13.**

1. For promotion to Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor shall show tangible evidence of achievement and a high likelihood of sustaining contributions to the field and to the department in the future, including:

1. Excellence in librarianship, including a demonstrated high level of expertise;
2. A strong record of scholarly publishing, constituting a significant contribution to the literature;
3. Evidence of valuable public/professional service at the Library, campus, state, regional, national, or international level.

Comments: The concepts of accountability, continuity, and expertise are common in these documents, and are expressed here with “tangible evidence,” “Sustaining contributions ... in the future,” and “demonstrated high level of expertise.”

Research is emphasized in a straightforward way, with high deontic modality, in this document, much more clearly than the hedging found in many examples. “Valuable” service is another way of saying “significant.”

The words “high level,” “strong,” and “tangible” are all used metaphorically.

**Excerpt 14.**

2. For promotion to Professor

Comments: Cohesion is created by the repetition of “For promotion to ...” from one rank to another.

**Excerpt 15.**

3. Candidates for promotion to Professor shall demonstrate promise fulfilled, including:
  - Excellence in librarianship through outstanding performance over a sustained period of time;
  - A sustained record of research and publication demonstrating a major impact in the field;
  - Evidence of attainment of national or international stature in the field, including leadership at local, regional, and national levels or participation at the international level.

Comments: “Shall demonstrate promise fulfilled” is very formal and rather stilted. The concept of sustained effort is found in the expectations for both job performance and research. The expectations for “valuable” service are higher at this level. Research must have a “major impact” (beyond “significant”).

**Excerpt 16.**

4. Review for Promotion and Tenure

Areas of review for promotion to all ranks are expressed in a general fashion in the Statutes.

Section 3e of Article IX states:

In determining appointments to, and salaries and promotion of the academic staff, special consideration shall be given to the following: (1) teaching ability and performance; (2) research ability and achievement; and (3) ability and performance on continuing education, public service, committee work, and special assignments designed to promote the quality and effectiveness of academic programs and services.

Comments: There is an intertextual reference to university documents. “Academic staff” refers to all the faculty of the university. “Staff” is used both as a hyperonym (word above in the hierarchy) of faculty and as an antonym of faculty.

**Excerpt 17.**

5. Within the UIUC Library, these areas are defined as librarianship; research, creative and scholarly activities; and professional service. Elements of these areas for review are described below:

The library defines teaching as librarianship, and broadens research to include other creative and scholarly activities. It narrows or condenses the university’s description of service.

A. Librarianship

The educational role of academic librarianship is evidenced in the following: developing, providing access to, managing, and preserving the Library’s diverse collections and



instructing students, faculty, and others in the use of the Library's collections, services, and resources. These activities support the University Library's primary role in providing service to the instructional, research, and public constituencies of the University, and may include a combination of, but are not limited to, the following...

Comments: Theme and Rheme (the presentation of new information) are seen above in "The educational role of academic librarianship" (Theme) "is evidenced ..." (Rheme), and "These activities" (Theme) and "support ..." (Rheme).

**Excerpt 18.**

- Selection, evaluation, acquisition, and preservation of Library materials;
- Analysis, cataloging, classification, description, and indexing of materials to provide access to the collections;
- Leadership in administrative and operational responsibilities;
- Organization and retrieval of information;
- Design and development of new electronic resources;
- Reference service; interpretation of the Library's collections, procedures, and services to library users; and related public service functions, such as exhibits, newsletters and other library publications;
- Instruction of library users in research methods and in the selection and evaluation of relevant information resources;
- Instruction of students in credit courses offered through teaching departments;
- Development of instructional materials in print as well as electronic formats;
- Development and/or presentation of workshops and lectures on the Library's resources and programs.

Comments: This list defines "librarianship," by enumerating the areas of specialization that are found in an academic library. Nominalization is found throughout the list, e.g., "selection," "organization," "development." The description of responsibilities is written in the language of job descriptions: "Selection, evaluation, acquisition, and preservation" and other exhaustive lists. There is a form of synonymy and what Fairclough (1989, p. 110) calls "overwording" in phrases such as "design and development." The words are not true synonyms, but essentially refer to the same thing.

The section begins by saying "the educational role of librarianship," equating librarianship with the university's teaching function, but not construing it narrowly to include only activities such as library instruction. It also says that librarianship "supports" the university teaching function (along with research and service), rather than asserting that it is part of it. That ambiguity and ambivalence about whether academic librarianship is a form of teaching or merely supports the university's teaching mission, illustrates several aspects of the discourses of faculty status: is librarianship a form of teaching, the "equivalent" of teaching, or not teaching or like teaching at all, but another academic pursuit that need not make comparisons?

**Excerpt 19.**

B. Research, Creative, and Scholarly Activities

A candidate's scholarly and creative work shall be evaluated in terms of its originality, depth, and significance in the field. There should be evidence that the faculty member has been continuously and effectively engaged in scholarly activity of high quality and significance. The Faculty Review Committee and the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee shall look for evidence that the scholarly accomplishments of the candidate make a significant contribution to the field of librarianship or other discipline.

Comments: "Shall be evaluated" has a high degree of warrantability, but is really a statement with deontic, rather than epistemic, modality. It cloaks a command rather than making a prediction. The word "shall" is rarely found in American English in any context other than formal legal, religious, or other ceremonial texts. "Evaluate" is a mental process, as is "look for." "Engaged" describes both material and mental processes. "Depth" and "high" are used metaphorically. "The Faculty Review Committee and the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee" are the Agent in the last sentence of the paragraph, as well as being the Theme of the sentence. "Evidence" connotes accountability. "Originality, depth, and significance" is a series of three which are largely synonyms in this register, expanding on the notion of quality. "Significant/significance" appear three times in this paragraph, emphasizing the concept and creating cohesion.

**Excerpt 20.**

The Committees shall consider the type, scope, and impact of the research or other creative work, and consider both the evidence offered by the candidate and that solicited by their members from external referees at other research universities. The dossiers of candidates should demonstrate a strong record of publication. The faculty member's degree of responsibility for jointly produced scholarship and creative works shall be considered in the evaluation.

Comments: "Consider" is a mental process. "External referees at other research universities" describes a different community than simply librarians or even academic librarians. "Peers" may imply that they should have faculty status if they are acting as outside peer reviewers for promotion. The Themes in this paragraph are: "The Committees," "The dossiers," and "The faculty member's degree of responsibility." The Themes in each clause move topics through the text. Research may be theoretical or applied, and may be specific to the fields of library science and information studies or may pertain to a disciplinary area to which the faculty member brings particular expertise. Methodologies shall be based on standards used in social science and humanities research. This is rather prescriptive, but also meant to explain to both those outside and those inside the library what the norms for library research are.

**Excerpt 21.**

Articles formally accepted for publication will be considered. Books or other monographic material will be considered when the final manuscript has been accepted by the publisher. Uncompleted or works not accepted for publication will be considered only as supplemental evidence in the promotion decision. In general, works that undergo

considerable scrutiny before publication (e.g., by referees, editorial boards, anthology editors, etc.), will be deemed of highest value. Consideration will be given to the significance and reputation within its field of a journal or publisher.

Comments: This paragraph illustrates the use of repetition as a cohesive device. The word “considered,” along with “consideration” and “considerable,” are repeated throughout. The passive voice and nominalizations: “Consideration will be given;” “works not accepted for publication will be considered” contribute to the reduced agency of this text. The lack of explicit agents is part of the impersonal and formal tone, but also due to the topicalization of the process, i.e., the Theme of this passage is what will happen, not who will do it. The metaphorical use of “strong” and “highest” are seen again in this paragraph, creating cohesion.

### **Excerpt 22.**

Publications and creative works are evaluated in the following manner:

- Books, monographs, critical editions, refereed articles, chapters in books, and other publications based on original research shall be accorded special importance as evidence of scholarly achievement.
- Reference works shall be judged scholarly works when they present new data, knowledge, or theoretical frameworks, widely disseminate practical or theoretical knowledge in new and needed forms, and/or incorporate scholarly research findings and interpretations.
- Guides to the literature shall be evaluated according to the level of scholarship, the impact of the work in its field, and the quality of the publication itself.
- Papers in published conference proceedings shall be evaluated in terms of the extent to which they present original research.
- Reviews of scholarly works shall be evaluated in terms of the depth and scholarship of the review and the type and quality of the journal in which it is published and the importance of the work being reviewed.
- Editorships shall be evaluated in terms of the depth and degree of scholarship demonstrated and the importance of the publication to the field.

Comments: This list describes a rigorous and straightforward view of research, with little special pleading for librarians. Publications are ranked very explicitly. The Scholarship discourse is seen very clearly in this text. “Depth” and “level” are used metaphorically and their repetition is a cohesive device. The repetition of “shall be evaluated” creates cohesion.

### **Excerpt 23.**

#### **C. Service**

Participation in the work of professional organizations sustains and enhances a faculty member’s capabilities. Professional activities are regularly carried out within organizations at the local, regional, national, and international levels. For these reasons a strong

service profile is valued. Special recognition shall be given to committee work and offices held at the state, national, or international level. Participation in faculty governance at the college and campus levels also constitutes an important service component. Service may include such activities as holding offices or committee memberships in professional societies, delivering invited papers or public lectures, serving on editorial boards, refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, organizing conferences, preparing grant proposals for campus or public agencies, and serving as a consultant.

Comments: Service is presented here as a way of learning. Many documents include continuous learning or education as an obligation, sometimes under the heading “professional activities” or “professional development.” Continuing education is part of the discourse of professionalism: the need to keep knowledge and skills up-to-date. For librarians, it is also the need to bolster scholarly credentials and to be informed by other fields. The paragraph Theme moves from “Participation” to “Professional activities” to “For these reasons, etc.”

**Excerpt 24.**

Supplemental documentation:

University Library Bylaws

Communication Number 9: Promotion and Tenure

Communication Number 13: Review of Faculty in Year Three of the Probationary Period

University Library Calendar for Promotion and Tenure

University Library Strategic Plan

This document supersedes the following previous statements:

“Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Termination,” adopted April 3, 1981 by the Library Faculty; “Criteria and procedures for appointment, promotion, and tenure approved by the University of Illinois Library faculty February, 1975,” and “Criteria for tenure below the rank of associate Professor” adopted April 30, 1976 and amended July 28, 1976; Statement on Promotion, Tenure, & Appointments to the Library Faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign adopted June 17, 1994. This final version of the document was approved and adopted by the University of Illinois Library Faculty February, 2000.

Comments: The links and citations to other documents and history of writing and revision are typical of this genre. The links demonstrate intertextual relationships and the notes on revision is an indication of authorship and standing.

This text has a Goal-Achievement pattern. It describes the elements necessary for promotion and tenure, and then describes what those elements consist of. The genre has a characteristic structure, a schema that includes prefatory statements about the organization and the APT process, and then sections that name the ranks and criteria for appointment, followed by examples of evidence of meeting those criteria, and information about assembling a dossier, the timetable, steps, and persons involved in the process, and so on. The document has a high degree of intertextuality, with references to university promotion and tenure documents in several places, as well as related documents, and previous versions of this document. "Library faculty" is from the discourse formation of academic librarianship, and it expresses several things: the distinction between the faculty and staff in the library, and the distinction between "librarians" as a professional group and "library faculty" as a collegial one. This document is written in the voice of the faculty itself. It is high in deontic modality, expressing the obligations of community members and the requirements for admission into the community. The administrative voice is not prominent in this document. The ideology of librarianship is found in this text. It is seen in the description of the library functions and how they support and carry out the university's mission. The assumptions and beliefs of librarianship include the desirability of organizing and providing access to information, and teaching people how to use information systems so that they can find information independently. That ideology values expertise, cleverness, and efficiency in applying expertise. It sees librarianship as a helping profession as well as one that can use technology to provide that help. The discourses of librarianship and of faculty obligation are textured together in this document in a way that straightforwardly presents librarianship as a primary educational activity, and, at the same time, presents research and publication as achievable obligations of librarians.

## CONCLUSION

Genres of discourse play a part in the construction of social identities. Appointment documents are used to define and assert the faculty and professional roles of academic librarians. Winter (1988) summarizes the knowledge base of librarianship, calling it "a form of applied metascience concerned with three forms of cognitive organization" (p. 72). The three forms are the organization of knowledge, the organization of bibliographic information, and the organization of "bodies of literature" (p. 72). Together they are a map of the expertise and responsibilities of librarians. The appointment documents reflect this knowledge base in their descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of librarians, in which those three areas are repeatedly expressed.

The discourse of librarianship as a profession is strong in all the documents. McClelland's (1997) typology of professions ("university-magisterial [black gown], labor union solidarity [blue collar], and discipline-professional [white smock]") sheds light on the roles and identities of

librarians and teaching faculty. The professoriate may be solidly black gown in their history and traditions, but teaching faculty are a broad and varied group, with plenty of white smock and a measure of blue collar. Librarians may be more blue collar in their egalitarianism and white smock in their professional practices, but they can still don the magisterial black gown.

A number of other interesting things are found in the discourse of these texts. They are a recognizable genre used by universities for the appointment of faculty, including librarians. They are part of the communicative event of faculty APT. APT documents are part of a chain or set of genres. The genre is specialized, and its “normative scope” (Yates & Orlikowski, 1992) is fairly narrow. The documents assembled for this study are more alike than different. Fairclough (1995) and Lemke (1995) both discuss the normativity of most texts, and the idea that “we speak with the voices of our communities” (Lemke, 1995, p. 30). These APT documents speak with the voice of the library profession, of the parent institution, and of higher education in general, and while each has its idiosyncratic characteristics, they bear a strong resemblance to each other.

Texts without pronouns, full of nominalizations, full of “must,” “shall,” and “will,” are not meaningful in themselves. They are meaningful because we recognize what they are used for, because of our expectations and experience with texts. The documents demonstrate academic librarians’ ability to participate in faculty culture and to be a part of both the academic discourse community and that of librarians. The documents demonstrate the strategies that librarians have used to map their responsibilities and expertise onto the landscape of teaching, research, and service. They demonstrate the willingness and ability of librarians to embrace research and publication as an obligation and as a source of professional strength and satisfaction.

A striking characteristic of these documents is their use of the HR register. Many of them have lists of qualifications and activities from job descriptions for librarians. One reason is to make the expertise and responsibilities of librarians clear and to draw the parallel between their role and that of teaching faculty. The effect, however, is what Veaner (1982) critiques as the “application of excessively task-oriented, nonconceptual definitions of librarianship and use of inappropriate, industry-derived technical terminology (e.g., ‘job description’) to detail professional positions” (p. 8). The heteroglossic opposition between practice and scholarship is matched by an opposition between the “conceptual” and the “nonconceptual” expression of responsibilities. The need to operate outside the realm of tasks coexists with the need to see that lots of tasks are completed.

The desire of organizations for employees with the right “competencies” can devolve into White’s (1983) colorful description, the search for “docile drones with basic skills.”

The strong HR aspect in these documents can be seen as an expression of the voice of university administration. Accountability and assessment are important issues in higher education. The detailed descriptions of what goes into a record of excellent performance, and what “counts” for promotion and tenure is an expression of two other things: the need to mentor new librarians, and the continuous maturing of faculty status for librarians. While there is evidence that faculty status is widespread and successful, the documents still reflect the need to make the case.

The communication of power and authority is an essential aspect of texts like APT documents. Seen from a CDA perspective, there is a clear power relationship and power differential in these texts. There is a pervasive presence of high deontic modality, which expresses obligation. The culture of librarians is open-minded and tolerant, but also normative. Academic culture in general is normative. Appointment criteria represent a negotiation between university administration, the interests of various disciplines, and the faculty themselves. The heteroglossic oppositions among those groups can be seen in appointment documents, but the texts are not dialogical. They express the interests of the larger organization above all, in a way that clearly expresses the university’s power and authority.

The appointment documents have a significant sociolinguistic and social semiotic component. In using a faculty genre, librarians are asserting their equivalence to and solidarity with other faculty. At the same time, the strong discourse of librarians as practitioners, especially when it expresses itself using the HR register, has the effect of detracting from faculty solidarity, even when it is meant to describe the role of librarians in the university’s academic program. Veaner’s (1982, 1994) “persistent personnel issue,” the “nonconceptual” description and understanding of the programmatic responsibility of academic librarians, still persists. The present “document-rich” (Swales, 2004), “textually-mediated” (Kristeva, 1984), and legalistic environment of higher education may aggravate the persistence of nonconceptual, task- and competency-based definitions of responsibility. On the other hand, no matter how it is described, the work of librarians is “cerebral and indeterminate” (Veaner, 1994, p. 399). The success of academic librarians in winning the status that they have sought reflects political victories and recognition of significant contributions, but also a recognition by librarians of their “programmatic responsibility,” where “everything is assigned and nothing is assigned.”

## REFERENCES

- Association of College and Research Libraries. (1973). ACRL model statement of criteria and procedures for appointment, promotion in academic rank, and tenure for college and university librarians. *College & Research Libraries News, September/October*, 192–195, 243–247.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (1974). ACRL standards for faculty status for college and university librarians. *College & Research Libraries News, May*, 112–113.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (1975). *ACRL statement on the terminal professional degree for academic librarians*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association/Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2000). Faculty rank, status, and tenure for librarians. In *1999 academic library trends & statistics*. Chicago, IL: ACRL.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2001). Faculty status and collective bargaining statements: Final versions. *College & Research Libraries News*, 304–306.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2006). *Joint statement on faculty status of college and university librarians*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/jointstatementfaculty>
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2010). *A guideline for the appointment, promotion and tenure of academic librarians*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/promotiontenure>
- Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. (n.d.). *A-P-L-U about us*. Retrieved from <http://www.aplu.org/page.aspx?pid=249>
- Bakhtin, M. (1981[1935]). Discourse and the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Best, R. D., & Kneip, J. (2010). Library school programs and the successful training of academic librarians to meet promotion and tenure requirements in the academy. *College & Research Libraries, 71*(2), 97–114.
- Bhatia, V. J. (1993) *Analysing genre*. London: Long.
- Bolin, M. K. (2007). *A typology and discourse analysis of the status and appointments of librarians at land grant universities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Bolin, M. K. (2008a). Librarian status at US research universities: Extending the typology. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 34*(5), 416–424.
- Bolin, M. K. (2008b). A typology of librarian status at land grant universities. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 34*(3) 220–230.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40.
- Coker, C., van Duinkerken, W., & Bales, S. (2010). Seeking full citizenship: A defense of tenure faculty status for librarians. *College & Research Libraries, 71*(5), 406–420.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.



- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman. (English language series; no. 9)
- Hill, J. S. (1994). Wearing our own clothes: Librarians as faculty. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 20(2), 71–77.
- Hill, J. S. (2005). Constant vigilance, bafelish, and foot surgery: Perspectives on faculty status and tenure for academic librarians. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 5(1), 7–22.
- Hoey, M. (2001). *Textual interaction: An introduction to written discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Hosburgh, N. (2011). Librarian faculty status: What does it mean in academia? *Library Philosophy & Practice*. Retrieved from <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/hosburgh.htm>
- Huwe, T. K., & Irving, G. (2002). *U.C. Librarian peer review: Another model for faculty self-governance*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Institute of Industrial Relations. Retrieved from [http://www.iir.berkeley.edu/faculty/huwe/peer\\_review.html](http://www.iir.berkeley.edu/faculty/huwe/peer_review.html)
- Hymes, D. H., & Gumperz, J. (Eds.). (1986). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Joachim, M. (1968). *A brief history of the development of faculty status for librarians*. Prepared for the Committee on Academic Status. Retrieved from <http://www.iu.edu/~inula/documents/core/InULA's%20role/joachim.html>
- Kristeva, J. (1984). *Revolution in poetic language*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Labov, W. (1973). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lemke, J. L. (1988). Text structure and text semantics. In R. Veltman & E. Steiner (Eds.), *Pragmatics, discourse, and text: Systemic approaches*. London: Pinter.
- Lemke, J. L. (1993). Discourse, dynamics, and social change. *Language as Cultural Dynamic* (Special issue of *Cultural Dynamics*, M. A. K. Halliday, Issue Editor).
- Lemke, J. L. (1995). *Textual politics: Discourse and social dynamics*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Lemke, J. L. (1998). Resources for attitudinal meaning: Evaluative orientations in text semantics. *Functions of Language*, 5(1), 33–56.
- Lemke, J. L. (1999). Discourse and organizational dynamics: Website communication and institutional change. *Discourse Society*, 10(1), 21–47.
- Loesch, M. F. (2010). Librarian as professor: A dynamic new role model. *Education Libraries*, 33(1), 31–37.
- Martin, J. R. (2002). Meaning beyond the clause: SFL perspectives. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 52–74.
- Martin, J. R. (2001). Language, register, and genre. In A. Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analysing English in a global context* (pp. 149–166). London: Routledge.
- McAnally, A. M. (1963). Privileges and obligations of academic status. College and research libraries, 24, 102–108 (March). In L. C. Branscomb (Ed.), (1970), *The case for faculty status for academic librarians*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- McAnally, A. M. (1971). Status of the university librarian in the academic community. In ACRL Committee on Faculty Status (1975), *Faculty status for academic librarians: A history and policy statements* (pp. 1–30). Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- McClelland, C. E. (1997). Professors and professions. *Academe*, 83, 44–47 (May/June).

- Měchura, M. B. (2005). *A practical guide for functional text analysis: Analyzing English texts for field, mode, tenor and communicative effectiveness*. Retrieved from <http://www.prettydata.eu/mbm/FunctionalTextAnalysis.pdf>
- Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (1994). Genre repertoire: Examining the structuring of communicative practices in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 541–574.
- Parker, C. A. (2011). The need for faculty status and uniform tenure requirements for law librarians. *Law Library Journal*, 103(1), 7–38.
- Saussure, F. (1959). *Course in general linguistics*. London: Peter Owen.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1989). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: B. Blackwell.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series).
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and application*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series).
- Veaner, A. B. (1982). Continuity or discontinuity: A persistent personnel issue in academic librarianship. *Advances in Library Administration and Organization*, 1, 1–20.
- Veaner, A. B. (1994). Paradigm lost, paradigm regained? A persistent personnel issue in academic librarianship, II. *College & Research Libraries*, 55(5), 389–402.
- White, H. S. (1983). Defining basic competencies. *American Libraries*, 14(8), 519–526.
- Winter, M. F. (1988). *The culture and control of expertise: Toward a sociological understanding of librarianship*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press. (Contributions in Librarianship and Information Science, no. 61).
- Wirth, A. A., Kelly, M., & Webster, J. (2010). Assessing library scholarship: Experience at a land grant university. *College & Research Libraries*, 71(6), 510–524.
- Wyss, P. A. (2010). Library school faculty member perceptions regarding faculty status for academic librarians. *College & Research Libraries*, 71(4), 375–388.
- Yates, J. (1989). *Control through communication: The rise of system in American management*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Yates, J., & Orlikowski, W. J. (1992). Genres of organizational communication: A structural approach to studying communication and media. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(April), 299–326.
- Yates, J., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2002). Genre systems: Structuring interaction through communicative norms. *Journal of Business Communication*, 39(1), 13–35.

**APPENDIX: LIST OF 1862 US LAND GRANT  
INSTITUTIONS WHOSE LIBRARIANS ARE  
TENURE?-TRACK? FACULTY**

Asterisk indicates documents that were analyzed for this project

\*Auburn University

URL: <http://www.lib.auburn.edu/tenure/prep3rdyear.htm>

Clemson University

URL: <http://www.lib.clemson.edu/policies/tenure.htm>

\*Colorado State University

<http://lib.colostate.edu/images/about/goals/facultycode/CSULFacultyCodeCurrent.pdf>

Iowa State University

URL: <http://www.lib.iastate.edu/cfora/pdf/3000002.pdf>

\*Kansas State University

URL: [http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/add/lib/lib\\_2003.doc](http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/add/lib/lib_2003.doc)

\*Louisiana State University

URL: <http://www.lib.lsu.edu/committees/lfpc/guidelines>

\*Mississippi State University

URL: <http://library.msstate.edu/library/policies/pt2006.pdf>

Montana State University

URL: <http://www.montana.edu/wwwprov/workload.htm>

\*New Mexico State University

<http://lib.nmsu.edu/depts/admin/promotiontenure.shtml>

\*Ohio State University

URL: <http://library.osu.edu/sites/staff/apt/critproc.html>

\*Oklahoma State University

<http://www.library.okstate.edu/access/ils/johnson/Library%2520Faculty%2520Handbook%2520Final2009.pdf>

Oregon State University

URL: <http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/promo.html>

\*Pennsylvania State University

URL: <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/policies/ulhrg07.html>

Purdue University

URL: <http://www.itap.purdue.edu/apm/docs/PromotionPolicy%20rev.%2008-21-2006.pdf>

\*Rutgers University

URL: <http://academicappointmentsmanual.rutgers.edu/promotions/librarianpromo.shtml>

\*South Dakota State University

URL: <http://www.sdstate.edu/about/policies/faculty/upload/SDSU-Faculty-Handbook.pdf>

\*Texas A&M University

URL: [http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/tenure\\_promotion/Tenure\\_and\\_Promotions\\_Guidelines\\_Library.pdf](http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/tenure_promotion/Tenure_and_Promotions_Guidelines_Library.pdf)

University of Alaska

URL: [http://www.uaf.edu/provost/promotion\\_and\\_tenure/promotion\\_and\\_tenure\\_review/ACCFT/RegionalReviewProcess.pdf](http://www.uaf.edu/provost/promotion_and_tenure/promotion_and_tenure_review/ACCFT/RegionalReviewProcess.pdf)

\*University of Arkansas

URL: <http://libinfo.uark.edu/webdocs/humanresources/facpersonnel/doc.pdf>

\*University of Florida

URL: <http://www.uflib.ufl.edu/pers/facultyeval/tenurerank.html>

University of Hawaii at Manoa

URL: [http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/faculty/tenure\\_promotion\\_contract\\_renewal/pdf/tenure\\_promotion\\_criteria\\_guidelines.pdf](http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/faculty/tenure_promotion_contract_renewal/pdf/tenure_promotion_criteria_guidelines.pdf)

University of Idaho

URL: <http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/fsh/1565.html>

\*University of Illinois

URL: <http://www.library.uiuc.edu/committee/promo/pta.html>

\*University of Kentucky

URL: <http://www.uky.edu/Regs/AR/ar015.pdf>

\*University of Maryland

URL: <http://www.faculty.umd.edu/FacultyAppointment/titles/library.htm>

\*University of Nebraska—Lincoln

URL: [http://libr.unl.edu:2020/intranet/phpdocs/FAC\\_coart-prom-tenure-criteria-2004.php](http://libr.unl.edu:2020/intranet/phpdocs/FAC_coart-prom-tenure-criteria-2004.php)

University of Nevada

URL: [http://www.unr.edu/vpaf/business\\_finance/forms/uam.pdf](http://www.unr.edu/vpaf/business_finance/forms/uam.pdf)

University of New Hampshire

URL: <http://www.library.unh.edu/admin/faculty/pt/info.htm>

University of Rhode Island

URL: [http://www.uri.edu/facsen/CHAPTER\\_7.html](http://www.uri.edu/facsen/CHAPTER_7.html)

\*University of Tennessee

URL: <http://www.lib.utk.edu/lss/lpp/criteria.html>

University of Vermont

URL: <http://bailey.uvm.edu/deans/ARP-Jan-2001.html>

\*Virginia Tech University

URL: <http://www.lib.vt.edu/libfacpolicies/ppca2013.pdf>

\*Washington State University

URL: [http://www.wsulibs.wsu.edu/sites/default/files/docs/2009rev\\_WSU\\_Library\\_Faculty\\_Handbook.pdf](http://www.wsulibs.wsu.edu/sites/default/files/docs/2009rev_WSU_Library_Faculty_Handbook.pdf)