Historical roles

3

When reviewing literature regarding academic librarians as faculty, two distinct themes emerge. Scholars from a library background assert that academic librarian duties are similar enough to those of tenure-track faculty that the librarian position should be considered true faculty. Conversely, most literature written from the higher education perspective regards the academic librarian as a form of subfaculty, if the work even thinks to include a discussion on librarians at all. Here, the position will be that of the latter stance; academic librarians are not on the same level as tenure-track faculty.

First through a historical narrative and then through preliminary comparison, it becomes apparent in the American experience that although tenure-track faculty and academic librarians share the similar responsibilities and expectations regarding research, instruction, and service, the substance of the activities is inherently different. While the basis of this discussion is within the framework of American history, the experience, particularly involving biases, extends far past the borders of the United States. The following chapter will outline the literature regarding these professional roles, as well as discuss the difficulties facing women in higher education in the context of a chronological description.

3.1 Role of academic faculty

The contemporary role of academic faculty is something that has been scrutinized through a good deal of literature to include Finkelstein (1984), Boyer (1990), Lucas (2006), and Schuster and Finkelstein (2006). Still, the actual faculty roles have shifted over time, beginning as lecturer and evolving into the current research–instruction–service model (Thelin, 2004). Therefore, it seems apt to briefly describe the basic modifications that have taken place through the history of American higher education.

Historically, the faculty of early American colleges would probably be better classified as "instructors" or "tutors" as opposed to a practiced professoriate who lectured on all topics of instruction instead of specializing in one discipline or another. The early faculty came from an established social class, though their wages did not reflect upon their upbringing. "The faculty were similar to clerics in that they were expected to teach for the privilege of affiliating with the college" (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 32). Stratification of the role, such as junior and senior positions, did not occur until the mid-19th century. Not until the late 1800s did the notion of a career as a professor become a viable and respected opportunity, leading to the growth of faculty size and disciplinary specializations (Finkelstein, 1984).

Colleges seemingly existed as more of a male finishing school (all early colleges were male-only) that prepped young gentlemen for civil positions such as ministers, doctors, and public servants (Lucas, 1994), although early faculty often dealt

The Academic Librarian as Blended Professional. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100927-7.00003-X
Copyright © 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

with mischief among the student body. “Drunkenness was rampant, as were violent assaults, uncontrolled gambling, and debauchery of one sort or another” (Lucas, 1994, p. 111). As a result, interactions between faculty and students occurred both within the classroom and on the grounds of the campus, as “college life was characterized by perpetual tensions between students and faculty” (Thelin, 2004, p. 21). As such, the early faculty also carried a “headmaster” disciplinary role in addition to their instructional roles.

The concept of the position’s role began to change in the 1800s as bidding wars orchestrated by institutions, particularly the University of Chicago and its president William Rainey Harper, began to push faculty salaries upward (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). The commoditization of the job also afforded the ability of faculty to reduce their in-class teaching time as well as schools to attract scholars from fields to this point not traditionally academic, such as scientists who did research in addition to teaching duties (Lucas, 2006). Additionally, the Morrill Act passage in 1862 noticeably enhanced the number of positions available, which in turn provided for the subdivision of “professorial ranks into assistant, associate, and full, and [systematized] the procedures for advancement in rank and the probationary period prior to tenure” (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007, p. 51). The key attribute of the faculty around the turn of the 20th century was that they were full-time employees.

Indeed, the stratification of the ranks provided the basis for institutions (and their administrators and boards of directors) to create expectations of the incoming faculty’s function, such as education level, teaching requirements, and publication. The former role of exclusive instruction was essentially eliminated as “promotion, tenure, salary, and professional esteem were all associated with research and scholarship” (Lucas, 2006, p. 305). Colleges also codified their organizational structures, introducing administrative positions that supported the educational goals of the system, albeit in a business-like mode (Lucas, 2006). It also bears importance because it introduced the concept of academic freedom among the professoriate.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was founded in 1915, with the intention of stemming a series of well-publicized academic firings around the turn of the 20th century (Fruman, 2009). Establishing a codified structure of tenure and its subsequent privileges became a primary goal of the AAUP. In addition, faculty desired the provision of “freedom of expression and economic security” (Gappa et al., 2007). “It took decades for many colleges and universities to accept that unless professors were secure in their jobs, after a probationary period of no more than seven years, genuine academic freedom would be constantly threatened” (Fruman, 2009, p. 342). The AAUP spent 25 years of negotiations with the colleges themselves to produce the “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” that ultimately defined academic freedom and tenure as the model of the professoriate.

In addition, the introduction of seminal college funding programs such as the GI Bill (Mettler, 2007; Pusser, 2006), the National Merit program (Turner, 2006), and the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 and its succeeding editions (Pusser, 2006), as well as innovations to travel (Turner, 2006) during the middle decades of the 20th century created an influx of students with the ability to attend collegiate institutions. In response to these mainly federal- and state-backed initiatives, faculty enjoyed an

"academic job market [that] became a seller's market, in which individual professors negotiated premium salaries and the average salary improved significantly" (Gappa et al., 2007, p. 52). The professoriate became a highly desirable and respected position.

This "golden age" of faculty was not to last, however, as social and economic concerns arose (Sorey & Gregory, 2010). As mentioned, though violence between parties on campus was not a new concept, those conflicts occurred either out of drunken buffoonery or dissatisfaction with college rules and regulations (Bledstein, 1976). Instead, these later demonstrations of the 1960s and 1970s carried a political shade that compromised the notion of the institution of the faculty. Tied to political remonstrations of the era, "student protests during the late 1960s and early 1970s attacked irrelevant courses and uninspiring teaching. Since the protests took place at universities with the greatest concentration of leading scholars, they exposed the myth that all that is required to be a good teacher is to know one's subject" (Gaff & Simpson, 1994, p. 168). In essence, students of this era, inspired by the questioning of political authority of the time, latched on their own dissatisfactions with the educational system and its faculty to the ongoing protests.

This development is not necessarily a detriment because it demonstrates a growth of cultural and communal awareness by the student base, thereby indicating that some of the educational development garnered in a college education took hold. However, it predicated a general downtrend in the esteem of the profession, especially when financial considerations also drove institutions to find means to alter personnel regulations. This resulted in the (still continuing) downturn in the number of the tenured faculty and the revision of instructional roles around academe (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Marcus, 2000; Nelson, 2008).

Resulting from the decline of tenured numbers was the increased amount of part-time and contract faculty employed in the instructional role. "Outside academe, the tendency in the 1990s was to reduce the number of full-time staff who had rights to their jobs and to employ temporary staff…the universities…were among the last bastions of career security and norms of professionalism" (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 361). Resistance to the adjunctification of the faculty did not last though, as by 1995, 41 percent of faculty was part-time, almost double of that in 1970 (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

The reduction in full-time roles was caused "not by a shortage of qualified candidates but by the desire of administrators to save money at a time of rapidly increasing expenditures" (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 223). Administrators were beginning to see a reduction in the amount of federal and state monies supporting the institution of higher education and as a corollary, sought to trim down faculty expenditures. Consequently, these changes "helped institutions balance the budget, but at the same time they diminished faculty professionalization because they did not adhere to the traditional core values that included not only teaching but also research, public service, service to the institution, and commitment to a career in which they were judged by their peers" (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 364).

Full-time and tenure-track faculty still retained their previous responsibilities though (Lucas, 2006). For example, total workloads remained heavy and participation in service, both internal to the institution and in external associations were emphasized. By the 1990s, full-time instructors were working around 53 hours per week (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

For tenure-track faculty, this included not only the expected responsibilities of teaching, but also research and service, both to the public and to the institution (O'Meara, LaPointe Terosky, & Neumann, 2008). Mentoring (Houser, Lemmons, & Cahill, 2013; Lechuga, 2011) and advising (Baker & Griffin, 2010) are commonplace responsibilities of contemporary faculty. Consequently, despite the adjunctification of the faculty, in many sectors, the professor's role has returned to its previous incarnations with the reemphasis on research and publication (Lucas, 2006).

Therefore, in summary, the role of the faculty in American higher education has evolved from primarily a lecturer to a researcher, instructor, and service-minded individual. As well, contemporary conditions of the higher education field have split the professoriate into increasingly distinct full-time or part-time positions, although the permanent positions and their responsibilities largely reflect the later historical model. The evolution of academic librarian roles follows a similar path to that of the faculty.

3.2 Role of academic librarians

Similarly to faculty roles, the role of academic librarians and its evolution has also been discussed extensively in historical analyses (DeVinney, 1986; Greer, Grover, & Fowler, 2007; Mullins, 2012; Rubin, 2004). In its current incarnation, academic libraries offer a substantial connectivity to the university academic collective, as they provide assistance and guidance to both students and faculty. Libraries and their librarians aid the acquisition of information for the student that supplements in-class learning. Historically, however, an academic librarian's role followed an evolutionary path similar to that of the faculty as the position progressed from a stationary data organizer into a dynamic and multifaceted university role.

The concept of the academic librarian is a relatively more modern development that coincided with the evolution of the faculty role during the 19th century. The position of academic librarian emerged in the 1800s as the model of the collegiate institution itself evolved. Rubin (2004, p. 278) cites three specific catalysts that led to the development of the academic librarian role: changes in the curriculum, the rise of the research model, and the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. As mentioned, the curriculum shifted from a liberal arts and classics-based core to more pragmatic disciplines (Lucas, 2006). This changed the faculty's instructional techniques from lecture-based learning to a model that required more research outside of the classroom, particularly at the library (Hanson, 1989).

The research model university developed from both the alteration to the instructional style and American's borrowing the German university form (Adrian, 2003). "The seminar model of teaching was emphasized and students were encouraged to consult a wide variety of published sources" (Rubin, 2004, p. 280). The university repositories required professionals to sort through and direct students and faculty to these materials, creating the need for a librarian.

The Morrill Land Grant Act produced federally backed universities across the country. The act provided land for the establishment of institutions that expanded educational curriculum beyond classical studies to include mechanical and agricultural arts (Duemer, 2007), again denoting the need for more research outside the classroom. As well, the goal was to expand access to academe to more than just the individuals

who could afford to entertain the idea of attending a Harvard or Yale. As mentioned, the Morrill Act created a building boom. The legitimacy of the universities rested upon their ability to develop academic repositories, again generating a need for formal academic librarians (Rubin, 2004).

Thus, as the role expanded, the education required to practice as a librarian developed as well. Rubin cites the major influence of Mevil Dewey as the driving force behind the codification of library science as a discipline. "Dewey was not alone in promoting the field of librarianship and library education, but he was a central figure whose energy and devotion advanced the profession" (Rubin, 2004, p. 441). Dewey was instrumental in establishing the first library school at Columbia in 1887 and helped organize the American Library Association, not to mention the eponymous library classification system (O'Reilly, 2013). Though O'Reilly (2013) faults Dewey for helping establish an ideology that library work was less demanding and therefore deserved less compensation, his work nevertheless led to the organization and proliferation of library science programs.

By 1919, 15 library programs existed (Maack, 1986) and a variety of degree levels—bachelor's and master's—emerged (Robbins-Carter & Seavey, 1986). A review of the value of these 15 schools led to the Williamson Report of 1923, which above all recommended that library education take place at the university (Hansen, 2004). The report "affirmed that a substantial part of librarianship was, or should be, a form of education…and forced the profession to consider the importance of consistency and high quality in the curricula, administration, and teaching in library schools" (Rubin, 2004, p. 450). Essentially, library education was formulized, and it somewhat minimized the likelihood of an oversaturation of the degree. In fact, currently in 2014, there are only 63 American Library Association-accredited programs in the United States, Canada, and Puerto Rico (American Library Association, 2014a).

Subsequent to the addition of the Morrill Act, other government supported initiatives followed, increasing the number of financially capable students. Work-study, a federal program that subsidized student labor on campus, continued to be provided for students during the Great Depression (Lucas, 2006). The introduction of influential college funding programs such as the GI Bill (Mettler, 2007; Pusser, 2006), the National Merit program (Turner, 2006), and the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 and its succeeding editions (Pusser, 2006) created an influx of students with the ability to attend collegiate institutions. All of these initiatives led to an ever-increasing need to expand and professionalize the librarian positions that would be needed to supplement the educational learning of the rapidly expanding student base.

As with the faculty, librarian's status increased throughout the 20th century, when the scope of the librarian role expanded as universities branched out and associated technology improved and increased in availability. As opposed to being confined to the physical space of the libraries, academic librarians were able to explore marketing and interaction avenues in different departments across physical and virtual academic campuses. Graham (2004) asserts that the evolved definition of "an academic librarian is an individual possessing a Master's in Library Science and working in a college or university library or library system" (p. 11). This is a generalization of the role, as academic librarians participated in instruction (Sproles, Johnson, & Farison, 2008), collection development (Bracke, Herubel, & Ward, 2010), peer mentoring

and management (Fyn, 2013), and their own research and subsequent productivity (Schrimsher & Northrup, 2013).

Academic librarians also gained several modes of outreach and interaction with students on campuses, such as invited lectures, roving reference (where librarians carrying laptops aid research at different locations on campus), and in-class instruction, but the marketing of their abilities was usually done by the individual librarian by a variety of means (Aguilar, Keating, Schadl, & Van Reenen, 2011). As well, Shupe and Pung (2011) note that in the "traditional model, the librarian managed informational resources of the local holdings in the library" (p. 409). The physical library and collection were no longer the boundaries of expertise, as advancing technology has resulted in the availability of more research tools for the librarians to utilize (Cardina & Wicks, 2004). The changes in the ability to outreach increased the spaces and spheres of influence within which academic librarians could operate.

The role of the academic librarian certainly evolved with this influx of technology. Tucci (2011) supports integrating librarians into the academic community outside of the library, particularly with faculty/librarian relationships, as a means to enhance student-learning outcomes. The popular suggestion to accomplish this is through embedment of the librarian in the classroom or program office, either virtually (Bennett & Simning, 2010; Hawes, 2011) or physically (Freiburger & Kramer, 2009; Tumbleson & Burke, 2010). Another means to interact with the campus community is through the highlighting of librarian experience (Nunn & Ruane, 2011).

As a result of these opportunities, and similarly to the tenure and non-tenure track counterparts though, librarians have experienced an increase in the volume and complexity of their work, although the status of the position continuously changes. They operate in many professional spaces at varying degrees of involvement and acceptance and as a result, fit the description of a blended professional. With faculty, many of the instructional roles are being filled by part-time and adjunct faculty. Librarians find that their roles are being reclassified as nonfaculty staff (Dunn, 2013) or filled by differently qualified individuals, such as non-MLS-holding librarians (Simpson, 2013). These trends have reignited the debate as to the actual and perceived role of the librarian in the academy.

3.3 Perception versus actuality of the librarian role

Perceptions of the academic librarian's role among members of the academic community remain questionable due to misconceptions about librarian instructional efficacy and training, scholastic ability, and service related activities (Association of College & Research Libraries, 2012). Librarians themselves view their position as seminal to an institution's mission (Lynch et al., 2007). "As academic personnel, librarians are at the core of the University's teaching, learning, research and service mission" (St. Jerome University Librarians' Handbook, 2012).[1] Yet the rest of the academic faculty,

[1] St. Jerome University (St. Jerome) is the pseudonym for the real university at which the case study occurred. Citations related to St. Jerome will not be listed with the references due to the potential for human subject identification.

particularly the deans and provosts, view libraries and librarians as a merely pragmatic means of finding information and are supplemental, not primary to the university's mission (Lynch et al., 2007). This is due to ambiguity in the description of the roles of faculty and librarians, as on the surface, they appear similar. Delving into the specifics makes the differences in the levels of the individuals.

O'Meara, LaPointe Terosky, and Rice (2008, p. 5) provide a standard description of faculty role:

> *As professionals, faculty apply their developed knowledge, skills, and values to complex problems, challenges, and goals for the benefit of society. Professionals such as faculty have significant autonomy and privilege and are expected to commit themselves to the highest standards of excellence and ethical behavior in exchange for this autonomy…Faculty, as professionals, will continue throughout their careers to update their knowledge, skills, and ethical and practical competence in the service to their profession.*

This description, though thorough, is nonetheless nebulous because a variety of professions may fit into that definition. Few, if any, librarians will not assert the value of their skill-base when addressing any variety of problems, and ethical behavior is something of an expected understanding in higher education. Librarians also assert privilege in their roles when compared to their colleagues, and frequently publish and participate in scholarly practices associated with their profession. Compare the above depiction to the definition of academic librarians from St. Jerome University's (the site of this study) Librarians' Handbook:

> *Librarians at the University are responsible for acquiring, organizing, managing, and providing access to a multitude of scholarly resources. In addition, librarians may fulfill research consultation and instruction responsibilities in the University. The multiplicity of functions performed and the varied specialties possessed by librarians at the University reflect the diversity of the Libraries' programs, collections, and related service obligations. All librarians share a responsibility to perform at the highest level of professional competence, provide consistently high quality service to students and faculty, and to engage actively with and meaningfully contribute to the academic and research enterprise of the University (p. 19).*

Here, librarians categorize materials, teach on campus, retain professional competence, and participate in service and research activities. While the description leaves room for more of a service-based orientation, the librarian role may be interpreted as comparable to the faculty.

St. Jerome's Faculty Handbook echoes much of what has been said about the expectations of the faculty role, specifically concerning instruction, research, and service. "Candidates for renewal, promotion and tenure will be evaluated in light of the missions of the University which are teaching, research and scholarship, both theoretical and applied, and service" (p. 26). The St. Jerome University Librarians' Handbook also addresses these responsibilities. Beginning with instruction, the St. Jerome University Librarians' Handbook states that librarians are responsible for "instruction

responsibilities in the University" (p. 19) and "teaching courses or giving lectures beyond the library's instruction program" (p. 24). Librarians do engage in a good deal of instruction in the university, both in person (Hall, 2013; Margino, 2013) and virtually (LaGuardia, 2011; Stiwinter, 2013). As well, they cater to varying levels of educational expertise, covering undergraduate (Clark & Chinburg, 2010; Lieberthal, 2009), graduate (O'Malley & Delwiche, 2012; Shaffer, 2011), and faculty (Watson et al., 2013). Extensive research demonstrated the efficacy of librarian instruction in a variety of settings, including community colleges (Arp, Woodard, & Warren, 2006; Johnson, 2004), 4-year institutions (Clark & Chinburg, 2010; Cooke & Rosenthal, 2011), graduate schools (O'Malley & Delwiche, 2012; Shaffer, 2011), and in distance settings (Charnigo, 2009; Hemmig & Montet, 2010; Hines, 2008; Shiao-Feng & Kuo, 2010). Research suggested that the actual institution, library, or funding had less influence on the quality of the instruction than the individual librarian themselves (Hines, 2008). Roles did not predicate effectiveness; motivation did.

Opponents of librarians as faculty suggest the role and responsibilities of librarians differs too drastically from traditional faculty. Of the conversation, Coker, van Duinkerken, and Bales (2010) note that "academic librarians do not often 'teach,' at least in the manner typically attributed to teaching faculty, nor are librarians required to obtain the PhD for employment (leading to the conclusion that they must play catch-up in research or their research is of lower quality)" (p. 408). Other institutions have librarians instructing formal for-credit classes similar to the faculty, usually dealing with information literacy (Rogers, 2013). At St. Jerome though, the instruction that the librarians perform is more workshop oriented (Hanz & Lange, 2013; Jacklin & Robinson, 2013) or through individual consultations (Meyer, Forbes, & Bowers, 2010). The comparison of the instruction between faculty and librarians at the institution of study, while still defined as instruction, is fundamentally different.

Next, consider research requirements. Faculty are expected to research and publish. "Genuine excellence must be exhibited in the areas of teaching or research and scholarship and high competence must be exhibited in both" (St. Jerome University Faculty Handbook, p. 27). Librarians also carry the expectation that they will contribute to the field through scholarship. "Librarians have privileges and responsibilities commensurate with their academic role as professional faculty at the University. As members of a profession, librarians are expected to keep current with and contribute to the advancement of the profession" (St. Jerome University Librarian Handbook, p. 24). Academic librarians publish. A recent study found that from a survey of 347 active collegiate librarians, 78 percent actively published researched material (Baruzzi & Calcagno, 2015). Lamothe (2012) advocated publishing due to its facilitation of discussion among individuals in the academic environment. "Writing and publishing is an opportunity for conversation among professionals where ideas are exchanged, agreed upon or argued, elaborated, and clarified" (Lamothe, 2012, p. 157). This can also include collaborative ventures, as librarian and faculty collaboration has been proven successful (Kennedy & Monty, 2011).

Due to mixed responsibilities of librarians at different institutions though, librarians do not always emphasize their professionalism through publication (Lamothe, 2012). This likely contributes to the misunderstanding of the role of the librarian around

campuses. Tenure-track faculty have to publish. An easy way for librarians to gain their attention, if not respect, is to do the same. Hansson and Johannesson (2013) found that despite the knowledge of the processes, the daily duties of the librarians (ie, collection development, research consultations, etc.) took away from the librarians' time for research, and in fact, Schrimsher and Northrup (2013) suggest such duties make them wary of that researcher role. This is unfortunate because as Wolfe, Naylor, and Drueke (2010) assert, "reference librarians are perfectly positioned to collaborate with other stakeholders…[as] they operate in integrated virtual and physical worlds, where the human and the computer work together" (p. 110). Opportunities are therefore missed due to misconceptions about the actual role and abilities of the academic librarians.

Moreover, the nature of the institution shapes the productivity of the academic librarian. At some institutions, librarians are full, tenure-track members of the faculty; at other institutions, they may be professional or contract faculty, or even staff. These differences affect the productivity of the librarians, as for example, the tenured faculty librarian will have publishing expectations that the librarian staff will not have to address. However, tenured faculty librarians regularly do not have the same goals as their counterparts in academic departments. "Often, the publishing and service requirements for tenure are lower for librarians than for other tenured faculty. This is not because of a lack of academic rigor, but rather because of a lack of time and funding" (Coker, van Duinkerken, & Bales, 2010, p. 415). This partly is due to the fact that the responsibilities of librarians, tenured or otherwise, inherently differ from the traditional faculty.

The relative quality of library publications also bears reflection. Nixon (2013) revisited a 1985 article by Kohl and Davis that ranked the value of library journals by aspects such as acceptance rate and impact factors. Acceptance rates are the percentages of submitted manuscripts that are subsequently published. A lower acceptance rate traditionally has meant more scrutiny in the editorial process and therefore more quality in the finished product (Haensly, Hodges, & Davenport, 2009). Impact factors measure the number of citations taken from recent issues of a specific journal; the higher the number, the more influence that journal has on the field. Nixon (2013) cited the top library journals as *College and Research Libraries*, *Information Technology and Libraries*, and *Journal of Academic Librarianship*. Compare the acceptance rates and impact factors to top journals in a different field, such as Higher Education. Beach (2014) lists *The Journal of Higher Education*, *The Review of Higher Education*, and *Research in Higher Education* as leading journals in that field. For a list of acceptance rates and impact factors of the top three journals in the fields of Library Science and Higher Education, see Table 3.1.

All of these journals are peer-reviewed, meaning that article submissions are judged for worthiness by members of the (theoretically) same academic community. It is considered an extra level of quality assurance since it adds additional scrutiny to the arguments presented. The comparison of the acceptance rates shows that all of the higher education journals had a substantially lower acceptance rate when compared to the library journals. In addition, the impact factor tended to be higher for the higher education journals. These statistics are not flawless. For example, the way in which acceptance rates are calculated is not universal (Perry & Michalski, 2010), and the

Table 3.1 The acceptance rates and impact factors of the top three journals in the fields of Library Science and Higher Education

Journal title	Review process	Acceptance rate (%)	Impact factor
College and Research Libraries	Peer reviewed	30	0.683
Information Technology and Libraries	Peer reviewed	40	0.528
Journal of Academic Librarianship	Peer reviewed	40	0.87
The Journal of Higher Education	Peer reviewed	8	1.157
The Review of Higher Education	Peer reviewed	6–10	0.758
Research in Higher Education	Peer reviewed	11–20	1.221

Statistics are from: Nixon, J. M. (2013). Core journals and information science: Developing a methodology for ranking LIS journals. College & Research Libraries. Retrieved from http://crl.acrl.org/content/early/2012/07/23/crl12-387.short?rss=1 and Cabell's Directory (2011). Education journals impact factors and acceptance rates. Retrieved from http://classguides.lib.uconn.edu/content.php?pid=65298&sid=1310559.

impact factor can be manipulated by self-citation (Mannino, 2005). However, if these criteria are one of the considerations when judging the quality of faculty productivity during tenure review, they cannot be discounted (Campanario, 2010).

Finally the question of service is considered. Service is an inherent aspect of faculty work. "Departments are established to carry out programs of instruction, research and scholarship, and public service in particular fields of knowledge" (p. 12) and "some specific administrative or service functions may also be attached to the teaching, research, or clinical focus" (p. 17). While service can be a nebulous term, O'Meara et al. (2008) categorize service as institutional, disciplinary, community, and scholarly (p. 76). Institutional service refers to the work done at the employing university, such as interdepartmental committee work and disciplinary service follows a similar vein, only the service comes through work in professional organizations. Community service affects the process of providing information to the community at large. Scholarly service is the interesting frame, because it pertains to the professional expertise of the faculty member. Scholarly service, therefore, may concern dissertation and thesis committee advisement and participation, academic advising, and other forms of direct mentorship.

Similarly, librarians are charged with providing "service to the University and/or the University Libraries through participation in the work of committees, task forces and special projects at the University, Libraries, or departmental level" and "service to the community through participation in educational service activities external to the University community such as library boards, literacy programs, or other appropriate volunteer work" (St. Jerome University Librarians' Handbook, 2012, p. 24). Librarians are expected to serve on a variety of institutional committees (St. Jerome

University Librarians' Handbook, 2012). Just like the faculty, librarians are meant and expected to participate in all manner of disciplinary service activities and national associations, such as the American Library Association. In fact, the Association of College and Research Libraries—the university-oriented division of the American Library Association—had 11,944 members in 2013 (American Library Association, 2014b). In addition, many librarians have supplemental memberships in subject-specific associations, such as a chemistry librarian retaining an affiliation in the American Chemical Society (Bennett, 2011). Librarians also participate in community service outside of the university, providing information and resources to the larger population (de la Pena McCook, 2000; Press & Diggs-Hobson, 2005).

The scholarly frame is where the service models of faculty and librarians diverge. At some institutions, academic librarians serve as advisers to members of the student population (Kelleher & Laidlaw, 2009), but not at St. Jerome. In fact, part of the difficulty faced by librarians in the scholarly service sector deals with their terminal degree level. In order to serve on doctoral dissertation or master's thesis committees, faculty members must have an equivalent degree (St. Jerome University Academic Catalog, 2014). Given that the terminal degree for a librarian is often at the master's level, this limits their ability to serve in that capacity in a doctoral granting institution.

Another issue with librarians is that the role becomes blended between *service* and *services*. In contrast to the service provided by the faculty, librarians are viewed as auxiliary service personnel, present to assist students and faculty with the simple acquisition of resources. Service, not instruction or research, is viewed as their primary role. Steven J. Bell, president of the Association of College and Research Libraries, states: "We see ourselves as being closely connected to the educational mission, yet librarians are often perceived as academic-support personnel" (Dunn, 2013). In this manner, academic librarians frequently are viewed as service-oriented, noncollaborative subfaculty (Given & Julien, 2005; Julien & Given, 2002; Wyss, 2010). This position or marketing affects other issues, such as librarian participation in governance issues. Librarians are often left out of decision-making processes available to other faculty members around campus, to their detriment. "[Librarians] should be involved in library governance, and that involvement in university governance improves the perception among the teaching faculty of academic librarians" (Wyss, 2010, p. 381). Despite the discussed evolution of the role of the librarian, the perception of their work in service to the community is often mitigated and renders their influence ineffective.

Academic librarians fill a variety of roles on campus—researcher, collaborator, administrator, instructor—that blend some of the responsibilities of traditional faculty with the role of a librarian. Yet their comparative position on campus is tenuous, as the services provided by librarians often supersede their instruction and research endeavors. Whereas with faculty service appears to be a tertiary consideration, it is the primary focus of the academic librarian, potentially to the detriment of the perception of their role and identity. At the same time, the level, type, and quality of instruction and research performed by libraries appears to be of lesser substance than that offered by the academic faculty.

Because of the relative ambiguity of their professional and academic roles, the librarians fit the concept of a blended professional. The question then becomes

whether or not their role influences their perceptions of their personal professional identities. This becomes all the more relevant when considering female role and identity throughout higher education, particularly as faculty and academic librarians.

3.4 Women in higher education

If academic librarians are to be considered second-tier in faculty due to their roles, they share similar perceptive experiences with women, particularly women faculty, in higher education. Based upon their roles, academic librarians have historically found it difficult to gain ascendancy of any kind within the professoriate. Female members of the academic community have long experienced the same difficulties and operate in a similar plane of third space, struggling to obtain even equality in academe.

Even so, women and other underrepresented minorities first obtained faculty positions in the 18th and 19th centuries. For example, in 1783, Washington College hired Elizabeth Callister Peele and Sarah Callister to instruct in painting and drawing (Washington College, 2013), and Sarah Jane Woodson Early was the first female African American college professor at Wilberforce College in 1858 (Lawson & Merrill, 1984). Opportunities were not plentiful, but one of the first successful incarnations of female higher education was the Southern Women's Colleges of the 1800s. Several contributions of women's education during this period include the creation of elective courses, standardization of instruction, growth of the public school system, and furthering employment opportunities (Farnham, 1994). Most importantly, in a fixed and male dominant society, these colleges demonstrated that women could learn and be successful outside the home.

Women in the Southern Women's Colleges were educated in curriculum on par with what was being taught at the men's colleges and the Seven Sisters. Math, English grammar, and sciences (botany, astronomy, mineralogy, anatomy) were commonplace courses. "The classics were considered the core of a liberal arts education and the fact that by custom they were not forbidden to Southern women as inappropriate to their gender is of special significance" (Farnham, 1994, p. 73). The women were also taught a variety of classical and foreign languages, such as Greek, Latin, French, and Spanish, and the education was on par with counterpart male institutions (Thelin, 2004). For instance, the Southern Carolina Female Collegiate Institute at Barhamville had an (native German) instructor that taught both German and instrumental and vocal music (Farnham, 1994). In contrast to prevailing society, in the collegiate environment, men and women were found to be intellectual equals, although parity of access was not ensured.

One might mention the contemporary existence of northern women's colleges such as the Seven Sisters, the first of which, Mount Holyoke College, was founded in 1837. These colleges were established as female "companion" schools to their male-only Ivy League counterparts (Rosenberg, 2004). Unfortunately, they also had similar restrictions to race and ethnicity well into the 20th century, paralleling faults of access similar to Ivy League schools at the time (Johnson, 2008; Rosenberg, 2004). For example, Barnard's Dean Virginia Gildersleeve developed a series of complicated application forms, tests, and subjective interviews similar to those utilized at Princeton at the time

meant to limit the number of nonwhite, Christian women admitted (Karabel, 2005; Rosenberg, 2004). Indeed, Barnard did not admit an African American woman until the 1920s (Rosenberg, 2004).

Despite the shortcomings regarding race equality, the education received at women's-only institutions was stout. The students' acquisition of knowledge represented a level of curricular and civic education that might translate to a measureable production of public good in an assortment of social eras, including the present. These schools succeeded in spite of the societal restrictions in place during their time of operation. The same cannot be said for other incarnations of male-only educational institutions, due to varying combinations of restricted or flawed access, curricular shortcomings, or financial limitations.

The integration of women and faculty into male-only institutions was a slow and progressive journal. Echoing Oberlin's original model, coeducational institutions began to emerge after the Civil War at institutions like Cornell University, although single-sexed colleges continued to be the overwhelming standard (Thelin, 2004). Admissions opportunities emerged, as between 1890 and 1910, women accounted for 40 percent of undergraduate enrollment (Thelin, 2004, p. 226). It did not result in a plethora of higher-level graduates though. Columbia only conferred eight doctorates to women in 1900 (Rosenberg, 2004, p. 91). In addition, many of the leadership positions and clubs on campuses remained exclusive to men, either in practice or policy (Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

Later programs, like the GI Bill in the 1940s and Title IX in the 1970s, increased access for women and provided increased entry into traditionally male disciplines such as engineering and the sciences (Cohen & Brawer, 2010). Enrollment percentages continued to increase in favor of female students. In 1976, women represented 48% and 46% of the undergraduate and graduate population, respectively; by 1993, that percentage jumped to 56% and 54% (Cohen & Brawer, 2010, p. 334). Again though, the progress was sluggish and deliberate, with equitable treatment difficult to find. Yale did not even admit a female student until 1969 (Harvard Crimson, 1968). For the female faculty, improvements equally were trying.

3.5 Female faculty and administration

The historical female faculty role and experience might be best summed up with the statement that equal distribution of and compensation for the professorial roles were (and still are) not on level with male faculty (Bowen, 2005; Chisholm-Burns et al., 2012; Fowler et al., 2004; Guillory, 2001; Lanier, Tanner, & Guidry, 2009). The initial difficulty of equality emerged in the curricular offerings to which women had access.

Women were somewhat preemptively placed in detrimental spaces that limited their opportunities within academe. While the curriculum at the Southern Women's Colleges and Seven Sisters was on par with what was studied at male institutions, it often remained in the classical and liberal arts fields. Women were slow to receive admittance to scientific fields, and when they eventually did matriculate and graduate, employment opportunities were few. "Women students were often pigeonholed

and thwarted in the curriculum and in campus life; and most, invidiously, those who completed advanced degrees encountered blatant discrimination in the academic job market" (Thelin, 2004, p. 143). Slow acquisition of degrees and positions continued until World War II (Cohen & Brawer, 2010).

Professional opportunities for women following World War II were more obtainable on a larger scale than in any previous era, and a move toward more diversified and inclusive curriculum ensued (Lucas, 2006). Women in the profession increased by 13% from 1945 to 1975 (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). That does not speak to the true struggle. Even today, despite the fact that women now receive the majority of conferred doctorates. Women account for only 23% of full professors (Mason, 2011). "Academic women…continue to be 20% less likely than men to perceive equitable treatment. Moreover, the percentage of women strongly agreeing that gender equity has been achieved is only half that of men" (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 139). In spite of studies showing a higher level of intrinsic motivation in female faculty, thereby indicating a propensity for academic productivity that exceeds that of male counterparts (Chen & Zhao, 2013), financial recognition for female faculty remains lower.

Salary differential is far from equal, especially at the higher ranks of the professoriate (Fowler et al., 2004). Only one in four college presidents are women (Ward & Eddy, 2013). No one single factor can be pinpointed as the culprit for these present inequities, though several explanations have been offered. For instance, gender biases have been cited as reasons for the dearth of women in leadership positions (Bagilhole & White, 2008; Fulmer, 2010; Garn & Brown, 2008). By far, the most cited factor is time on the job, which predicates the possibility of time of service, amount of publications, and tenure prospects (Guillory, 2001). That discussion then leads to the implications of maternity leave.

Child rearing also impeded professional growth and development of the female faculty role, particularly in tenure where expectations of productivity are established. "It is noteworthy that women on the tenure-track are more likely than men to avoid marriage, delay parenting, or limit the number of children they raise" (Jackson, 2008, p. 227). Mason (2013) suggested that having children as a young professional negatively affected professional development because professors "get little or no childbirth support from the university and often receive a great deal of discouragement from their mentors." Gibbard Cook (2004) reiterated that children also hampered job possibilities due to a lesser amount of relative mobility when compared to nonparents. Available childcare for working moms in higher education is problematic as well (Jackson, 2008). Consider the simple biological window. If female faculty wish to have children, then it likely will occur during when it is physically feasible to conceive, either during their doctoral studies or during the first few years of postdoctoral work (Gibbard Cook, 2004). It then becomes a matter of choice: work and potentially struggle as a professional mother, or lose time and productivity in the workforce.

Additionally, any increase in women faculty members and doctoral recipients has not promoted an equally friendly work environment. Politics and sexist work environments have also impeded women gaining stronger footholds in leadership roles (Ward & Eddy, 2013). "Despite earning doctorates in ever-increasing numbers, many women…are eschewing academic careers altogether or exiting the academy prior to

the tenure decision because both groups experience social isolation, a chilly environment, bias, and hostility" (Trower & Chait, 2002). Such working environments amplify job-related stress and workplace dissatisfaction (Lease, 1999).

Thus, research suggests that while opportunities are available, the environments in which women faculty's identity may be shaped are historically and contemporaneously inequitable, and this creates complicated and challenging spaces of influence. "[Female faculty] in the coeducational university faced marginalization at every turn. They were expected to be simultaneously a part and apart from the faculty culture" (Thelin, 2004, p. 144). Female faculty, in essence, was tiered into a caste system of rank in higher education setup for inequity, and interestingly, this leveled perception is similarly felt by faculty academic librarians in the third space of the professoriate.

3.6 Faculty identity and historical narrative critique

Similar to the analyses on roles, the professional identity of collegiate faculty has been explored in a variety of settings. For example, scholars have analyzed full-time faculty, both tenure-track (Abu-Alruz & Khasawneh, 2013; Lieff et al., 2012) and non-tenure-track (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Tenure-track faculty defines its identity through a combination of the department environment, communication with colleagues and mentors, and personal motivations and initiatives (Lieff et al., 2012). Nontenure-track faculty are something of a hybrid (Levin & Shaker, 2011). They require the same form of training and education as tenure-track (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006), but occupy a position that is often lacking the benefits (actual and perceived) of tenure-track faculty, such as autonomy and job security (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Depending upon the institution, academic librarians may obtain either position, although the suggested perceptions around academic campuses tend to force librarians into a placement similar to nontenure track faculty.

Part-time or adjuncts' identity, both at community colleges and 4-year institutions, has also been considered in literature (Daffron, 2010; Dolan, 2011; Levin, Walker, Haberler, & Jackson-Boothby, 2013; Outcalt, 2002; Thirolf, 2013, 2012), though the research suggests that the experience is mixed. The mission of community colleges is inherently different, as they serve continuing, community, and teacher education in addition to traditional college-aged students, and therefore the roles of the faculty accordingly adjust (Vaughn, 2006). They also have a high ratio of adjunct instructors limiting the cohesiveness of departments and organizations within the actual college (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). However, the core role of the profession, instruction, does not change. "It is readily apparent that the distinctiveness of the clientele served by community college faculty exists in nominal form only" (Outcalt, 2002). In essence, the professors are still teaching college students, regardless of their own professional title and instructional platform. As was mentioned though, these conversations considered full-semester instruction as the standard, which librarians at St. Jerome do not perform.

Academic librarians carry similar traits to nontenure-track faculty and adjuncts, at least in their perception around campus. They fulfill many roles, but balance between the faculty role and function of academic librarians has been greatly discussed

(Bhuiya, 1981; Jablonski, 2006; Wyss, 2010, 2008). For example, Hosburgh (2011) noted that librarian roles affect tenure opportunities, salary, and research or presentation funding. Indeed, even the term "blended librarian" has found traction in literature (Bell & Shank, 2004; Shank & Bell, 2011); however, in that context, "blended" referred to the actual role and the relative skills connected with librarianship, not the perception, or professional identity, associated with the position in academe.

The identity of academic librarians only has been examined in passing. Bennett (1987) suggested that institutional structures promoted a secondary identity for librarians, but does not delve into the professional identity. Downing (2009) utilized social identity theory to examine the roles of librarians, finding that the roles were influenced by variables such as race, gender, and age. The key component of Downing's study was to assert that a diverse workplace benefits that collective library whole. What about the individual though? How does that personal identity influence concepts of professionalism? This question concerning the professional role and identity of the academic librarian is a major gap in both higher education and library science literature.

A major frame by which librarians have yet to be formally analyzed is blended professionalism, put forth by Whitchurch (2009). As noted earlier, blended professionals are individuals who operate internally and externally through a variety of academic and professional realms (Whitchurch, 2009), which is precisely what academic librarians do in the course of their daily work. To this point, the discussion has noted "binary perceptions" among the faculty and the librarians (Whitchurch, 2013). Each side marginalizes the role of the other, thereby creating strain. However, the expansion of the historical roles of both faculty and librarians calls into question this inherent bias, as "a diversifying workforce raises questions about what it means to be a professional in contemporary higher education" (Whitchurch, 2013, p. 8). All parties in higher education appear to be moving to a "third space" of interaction, one that transcends purely academic and professional roles (Whitchurch, 2009). The concept of third space is employed here "as a way of exploring groups of staff in higher education who do not fit conventional binary descriptors" (Whitchurch, 2013, p. 21). As is customary in higher education literature though, Whitchurch did not consider academic librarians in the blended professional role.

Based in part on Giddens (1992) self-identity theory and Rhoades (2007, 2005) managed professional identity theories, Whitchurch's system provides a model to develop professional identity through the criteria of *spaces, knowledges, relationships, and legitimacies*. *Spaces* are the physical, virtual and theoretical (through third space) spheres in which an individual operates, though the blended professional readily adapts to change and operates outside of formal organizational boundaries. *Knowledges* are assimilated professional and academic knowledge, which may be utilized to investigate organizational activity and link together multiple settings on campus. *Relationships* allow the blended professional to network, function in academic conversation, develop cross-unit alliances, and establish autonomy of one's own organization. Finally, *legitimacies* are the letters after an individual's name on their business card and the relative productivity of the academic and professional person; they allow and establish access into academic environments. The malleable nature of these active roles develops the perceived professional identity of the individual. By examining

academic librarian usage of Whitchurch's criteria of spaces, knowledges, relationships, and legitimacies (outlined in Appendix A), the function of the librarian and the subsequent professional identity may be mapped.

The goal of this work will be a qualitative case study analysis of how the blended professional role and identity of faculty academic librarians shapes their development as professionals. How do these librarians see themselves as faculty? Does their experience hinder or promote their academic achievements, communication, or collaborative opportunities? Do they believe their abilities to develop are similar to other faculty? Do the librarians feel loyal to certain departments or individuals in their field? These universal questions speak to the function of identity in the professional and will address a gap in both the academic library and higher education literature both in the United States and abroad. It is significant in this way because it will provide a new structure through which academic librarians may analyze their role, standing, and potentially development in the academy. It can identify barriers for librarians (internal and external) for finding promotional opportunities and establishment of full faculty status.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter established that the role of tenure-track faculty varied over time, but the present incarnation is one that emphasizes research, instruction, and service as the primary tenants of faculty output and behavior. Further, it detailed the evolution of the academic librarian from an isolated repository position to one that becomes increasingly complicated due to escalation in technology and professional expectations. Still, the comparison of the research, instruction, and service conducted by librarians does not equally balance with that of tenure-track faculty. If it may be accepted that activities of librarians in this manifestation are not equivalent, the study might be able to better establish the true academic and professional role and identities of this particular group.

The corollary to that notion is gender, as this chapter also inferred that women have experienced a history of inequality as both students and faculty in higher education. Since this study solely will consider the identity of female academic librarians, it suggests that any environment in which the librarians work will provide obstacles to professional development. Until now, professional role and identity of academic librarians has been largely ignored by higher education literature, providing a significant gap in the literature and provides the basis for this study. The following chapter will detail the methodology through which this work was conducted.

References

Abu-Alruz, J., & Khasawneh, S. (2013). Professional identity of faculty members at higher education institutions: a criterion for workplace success. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, *18*(4), 431–442.

Adrian, W. (2003). Perils of the life of the mind: lessons from the German university. *Christian Higher Education*, *2*(2), 155.

Aguilar, P., Keating, K., Schadl, S., & Van Reenen, J. (2011). Reference as outreach: meeting users where they are. *Journal of Library Administration*, *51*(4), 343–358.

American Library Association (ALA). (2014a). *Directory of ALA-accredited master's programs in library and information studies*. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/directory.

American Library Association (ALA). (2014b). *ALA's membership statistics by division, 2000-present*. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/membership/membershipstats_files/divisionstats#acrl.

Arp, L., Woodard, B. S., & Warren, L. A. (2006). Information literacy in community colleges. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, *45*(4), 297–303.

Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). (2012). Guidelines for academic librarians without faculty status. *College & Research Libraries News*, *73*(3), 161–162.

Bagilhole, B., & White, K. (2008). Towards a gendered skills analysis of senior management positions in UK and Australian universities. *Tertiary Education & Management*, *14*(1), 1–12.

Baker, V. L., & Griffin, K. A. (2010). Beyond mentoring and advising: toward understanding the role of faculty "developers" in student success. *About Campus*, *14*(6), 2–8.

Baruzzi, A., & Calcagno, T. (2015). Academic librarians and graduate students: An exploratory study. *Portal*.

Beach, A. (2014). *Higher education journals and publications*. Retrieved from http://homepages.wmich.edu/~abeach/HEjournals.htm.

Bell, S. J., & Shank, J. (2004). The blended librarian: a blueprint for redefining the teaching and learning role of academic librarians. *College & Research Libraries News*, *65*, 372–375.

Bennett, G. E. (1987). *Conventions of subordination: An interpretive analysis of the professional identity of academic librarians* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from proquest dissertations and theses.

Bennett, M. (2011). The benefits of non-library professional organization membership for liaison librarians. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *37*(1), 46–53.

Bennett, E., & Simning, J. (2010). Embedded librarians and reference traffic: a quantitative analysis. *Journal of Library Administration*, *50*(5/6), 443–457.

Bhuiya, M. A. (1981). *The faculty image of academic librarians in colleges and universities of Pennsylvania: A measure of attitude* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from proquest dissertations and theses.

Bledstein, B. J. (1976). *The culture of professionalism: The middle class and the development of higher education in America*. New York: Norton & Co., Inc.

Bowen, R. W. (2005). Gender inequity. *Academe*, *91*(2), 128.

Bowen, H., & Schuster, J. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Bracke, M., Herubel, J. M., & Ward, S. M. (2010). Some thoughts on opportunities for collection development librarians. *Collection Management*, *35*(3/4), 255–259.

Campanario, J. M. (2010). Empirical study of journal impact factors obtained using the classical two-year citation window versus a five-year citation window. *Scientometrics*, *87*, 189–204.

Cardina, C., & Wicks, D. (2004). The changing roles of academic reference librarians over a ten-year period. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, *44*(2), 133–142.

Charnigo, L. (2009). Lights! Camera! Action! Producing library instruction video tutorials using Camtasia Studio. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, *3*(1), 23–30.

Chen, Y., & Zhao, Q. (2013). Gender differences in business faculty's research motivation. *Journal of Education for Business*, *88*(6), 314–324.

Chisholm-Burns, M. A., Spivey, C. A., Billheimer, D., Schlesselman, L. S., Flowers, S. K., Hammer, D., & Vaillancourt, A. M. (2012). Multi-institutional study of women and underrepresented minority faculty members in academic pharmacy. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *76*(1), 1–13.

Clark, S., & Chinburg, S. (2010). Research performance in undergraduates receiving face to face versus online library instruction: a citation analysis. *Journal of Library Administration*, *50*(5/6), 530–542.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college* (5th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., & Kisker, C. B. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

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.

Cooke, R., & Rosenthal, D. (2011). Students use more books after library instruction: an analysis of undergraduate paper citations. *College & Research Libraries*, *72*(4), 332–343.

Daffron, E. (2010). The university chameleon: identity and time issues faced by faculty in dual positions. *Academic Leadership (15337812)*, *8*(4), 14.

de la Pena McCook, K. (2000). Reconnecting library education and the mission of community. *Library Journal*, *125*(14), 164.

DeVinney, G. S. (1986). Academic librarians and academic freedom in the United States: a history and analysis. *Libri*, *36*, 24–39.

Dolan, V. (2011). The isolation of online adjunct faculty and its impact on their performance. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *12*(2), 62–77.

Downing, K. E. (2009). *The relationship between social identity and role performance among academic librarians* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from proquest dissertations and theses.

Duemer, L. S. (2007). The agricultural education origins of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. *American Educational History Journal*, *34*(1), 135–146.

Dunn, S. (2013). Do librarians need tenure? Depends on which ones you ask. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://chroniclevitae.com/news/139-do-librarians-need-tenure-depends-on-which-ones-you-ask.

Farnham, C. A. (1994). *Education of the southern belle: Higher education and student socialization in the antebellum south*. New York: NYU Press.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). *The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since world war II*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Fowler, N., Arens, K., Gilbert, L. A., Payne, S. M., Reichl, L. E., & Staiger, J. (2004). Graphic stories: representing the status of female faculty. *Feminist Studies*, *30*(3), 689–701.

Freiburger, G., & Kramer, S. (2009). Embedded librarians: one library's model for decentralized service. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, *97*(2), 139–142.

Fruman, N. (2009). The AAUP: a moral autopsy. *Academic Questions*, *22*(3), 340–350.

Fulmer, C. L. (2010). Unpacking evidence of gender bias. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, *8*(2), 81–97.

Fyn, A. F. (2013). Peer group mentoring relationships and the role of narrative. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *39*(4), 330–334.

Gaff, J. G., & Simpson, R. D. (1994). Faculty development in the United States. *Innovative Higher Education*, *18*(3), 167.

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.

Garn, G., & Brown, C. (2008). Women and the superintendency: perceptions of gender bias. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, *6*(1), 49–71.

Gibbard Cook, S. (2004). Mothers in the faculty pipeline. *Women in Higher Education*, *13*(8).

Giddens, A. (1992). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Given, L. M., & Julien, H. (2005). Finding common ground: an analysis of librarians' expressed attitudes towards faculty. *Reference Librarian*, *43*(89/90), 25–38.

Graham, J.-B. (2004). What's in a name? *Alabama Librarian*, *54*(1), 10–14.

Greer, R. C., Grover, R. J., & Fowler, S. G. (2007). *Introduction to the library and information professions*. London: Libraries Unlimited.

Guillory, E. A. (2001). The black professoriate: explaining the salary gap for African-American female professors. *Race, Ethnicity & Education*, *4*(3), 225–244.

Haensly, P. J., Hodges, P. E., & Davenport, S. A. (2009). Acceptance rates and journal quality: an analysis of journals in economics and finance. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, *14*(1), 2–31.

Hall, R. A. (2013). Beyond the job ad: Employers and library instruction. *College & Research Libraries*, *74*(1), 24–38.

Hansen, D. (2004). Professionalizing library education, the California connection: James Gillis, Everett Perry, and Joseph Daniels. *Library Trends*, *52*(4), 963–987.

Hanson, E. R. (1989). College libraries: the colonial period to the twentieth century. *Advances in Library Administration and Organization*, *8*, 171–199.

Hansson, J., & Johannesson, K. (2013). Librarians' views of academic library support for scholarly publishing: an every-day perspective. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *39*(3), 232–240.

Hanz, K., & Lange, J. (2013). Using student questions to direct information literacy workshops. *Reference Services Review*, *41*(3), 532–546.

Harvard Crimson. (1968). *Man and woman at Yale*. Retrieved from http://www.thecrimson.com/article/1968/11/18/man-and-woman-at-yale-pa/.

Hawes, S. (2011). Playing to win: embedded librarians in online classrooms. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, *5*(1/2), 56–66.

Hemmig, W., & Montet, M. (2010). The "just for me" virtual library: enhancing an embedded eBrarian Program. *Journal of Library Administration*, *50*(5/6), 657–669.

Hines, S. (2008). How it's done: examining distance education library instruction and assessment. *Journal of Library Administration*, *48*(3/4), 467–478.

Hosburgh, N. (2011). Librarian faculty status: what does it mean in academia? *Library Philosophy & Practice*, 31–37.

Houser, C., Lemmons, K., & Cahill, A. (2013). Role of the faculty mentor in an undergraduate research experience. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, *61*(3), 297–305.

Jablonski, J. A. (2006). *Conceptualizing the field of library and information studies: The perspective of LIS faculty and LIS practitioners in the United States* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from proquest dissertations and theses.

Jacklin, M., & Robinson, K. (2013). Evolution of various library instruction strategies: using student feedback to create and enhance online active learning assignments. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library & Information Practice & Research*, *8*(1), 1–21.

Jackson, L. D. (2008). Reflections on obstacles and opportunities: suggestions for improving the retention of female faculty. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *31*(2), 226–232.

Johnson, W. G. (2004). Information literacy standards and library instruction. *Community & Junior College Libraries*, *13*(1), 25–32.

Johnson, J. M. (2008). *Southern women at the Seven Sister colleges: Feminist values and social activism, 1875–1915*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Julien, H., & Given, L. M. (2002). Faculty-librarian relationships in the information literacy context: a content analysis of librarians' expressed attitudes and experiences. *Canadian Journal of Information & Library Sciences*, *27*(3), 65–87.

Karabel, J. (2005). *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale and Princeton*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kelleher, M., & Laidlaw, S. (2009). A natural fit: the academic librarian advising in the first year experience. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, *16*(2/3), 153–163.

Kennedy, R., & Monty, V. (2011). Faculty-librarian collaboration and the development of critical skills through dynamic purposeful learning. *Libri*, *61*(2), 116–124.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(1), 56–87.

LaGuardia, C. (2011). Library instruction in the digital age. *Journal of Library Administration*, *51*(3), 301–308.

Lamothe, A. R. (2012). The importance of encouraging librarians to publish in peer-reviewed publications. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, *43*(2), 156–167.

Lanier, P. A., Tanner, J. R., & Guidry, B. N. (2009). A comparison of gender and gender-related issues in the business disciplines. *Public Personnel Management*, *38*(3), 51–70.

Lawson, E., & Merrill, M. (1984). *The three Sarahs: Documents of antebellum black college women*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

Lease, S. H. (1999). Occupational role stressors, coping, support, and hardiness as predictors of strain in academic faculty: an emphasis on the new and female faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, *40*(3), 285–307.

Lechuga, V. (2011). Faculty-graduate student mentoring relationships: mentors' perceived roles and responsibilities. *Higher Education*, *62*(6), 757–771.

Levin, J. S., & Shaker, G. G. (2011). The hybrid and dualistic identity of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *55*(11), 1461–1484.

Levin, J. S., Walker, L., Haberler, Z., & Jackson-Boothby, A. (2013). The divided self: the double consciousness of faculty of color in community colleges. *Community College Review*, *41*(4), 311–329.

Lieberthal, S. P. (2009). Teaching undergraduate business students to access public company information: assessing students' use of library resources. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, *14*(3), 230–247.

Lieff, S., Baker, L., Mori, B., Egan-Lee, E., Chin, K., & Reeves, S. (2012). Who am I? Key influences on the formation of academic identity within a faculty development program. *Medical Teacher*, *34*(3), e208–e215.

Lucas, C. (2006). *American higher education: A history* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Lucas, C. (1994). *American higher educaiton: A history* (1st ed.). New York: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Lynch, B. P., Murray-Rust, C., Parker, S. E., Turner, D., Walker, D. P., Wilkinson, F. C., & Zimmerman, J. (2007). Attitudes of presidents and provosts on the university library. *College & Research Libraries*, *68*(3), 213–227.

Maack, M. N. (1986). Toward a new model of the information professions: embracing empowerment. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, *38*, 283–302.

Mannino, D. M. (2005). Impact factor, impact, and smoke and mirrors. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, *171*(4), 117–118.

Marcus, J. (2000). American academic tenures in decline. *Times Higher Education* (Suppl. 1429), 64.

Margino, M. (2013). Revitalizing traditional information literacy instruction: exploring games in academic libraries. *Public Services Quarterly*, *9*(4), 333–341.

Mason, M. A. (2013). The baby penalty. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/The-Baby-Penalty/140813/.

Mason, M. A. (2011). The pyramid problem. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/The-Pyramid-Problem/126614/.

Mettler, S. (2007). *Soldiers to citizens: The GI Bill and the making of the greatest generation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, E., Forbes, C., & Bowers, J. (2010). The research center: creating an environment for interactive research consultations. *Reference Services Review*, *38*(1), 57–70.

Mullins, J. L. (2012). Are MLS graduates being prepared for the changing and emerging roles that librarians must now assume within research libraries? *Journal of Library Administration*, *52*(1), 124–132.

Nelson, C. (September 2008). Across the great divide. *Academe*, 11–15.

Nixon, J. M. (2013). Core journals and information science: developing a methodology for ranking LIS journals. *College & Research Libraries*. Retrieved from http://crl.acrl.org/content/early/2012/07/23/crl12-387.short?rss=1.

Nunn, B., & Ruane, E. (2011). Marketing gets personal: promoting reference staff to reach users. *Journal of Library Administration*, *51*(3), 291–300.

O'Malley, D., & Delwiche, F. (2012). Aligning library instruction with the needs of basic sciences graduate students: a case study. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, *100*(4), 284–290.

O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008). *Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.

O'Reilly, M. (2013). Melvil's girls: still struggling to survive. *Feliciter*, *59*(2), 35–38.

Outcalt, C. L. (2002). Toward a professionalized community college professoriate. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2002*(118), 109.

O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008). *Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.

Perry, S. D., & Michalski, L. (2010). Common acceptance rate calculation methods in communication journals: developing best practices. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *65*(2), 168–186.

Press, N., & Diggs-Hobson, M. (2005). Providing health information to community, members where they are: characteristics of the culturally competent librarian. *Library Trends*, *53*(3), 397–410.

Pusser, B. (2006). Higher education, markets, and the preservation of the public good. In D. W. Breneman, B. Pusser, & S. E. Turner (Eds.), *Earnings from learning: The rise of for-profit universities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rhoades, G. (2005). Capitalism, academic style, and shared governance. *Academe*, *91*(3), 38–42.

Rhoades, G. (2007). The study of the academic profession. In P. J. Gumport (Ed.), *Sociology of higher education: Contributions and their contexts* (pp. 113–146). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Robbins-Carter, J., & Seavey, C. A. (1986). The master's degree: basic preparation for professional practice. *Library Trends*, *34*, 561–580.

Rogers, E. (2013). Teaching government information in information literacy credit classes. *Georgia Library Quarterly*, *50*(1), 13–22.

Rosenberg, R. (2004). *Changing the subject: How the women of Columbia shaped the way we think about sex and politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rubin, R. E. (2004). *Foundations of library and information science* (2nd ed.). New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.

Schrimsher, R. H., & Northrup, L. A. (2013). Helpful hints for every librarian's nightmare: publishing an article. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, *20*(1), 87–94.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: Restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Shaffer, B. A. (2011). Graduate student library research skills: Is online instruction effective? *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, *5*(1/2), 35–55.

Shank, J. D., & Bell, S. (2011). Blended librarianship: [re]envisioning the role of librarian as, educator in the digital information age. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, *51*(2), 105–110.

Shiao-Feng, S., & Kuo, J. (2010). Design and development of web-based information literacy tutorials. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *36*(4), 320–328.

Shupe, E. I., & Pung, S. K. (2011). Understanding the changing role of academic, librarians from a psychological perspective: a literature review. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *37*(5), 409–415.

Simpson, B. (2013). Hiring non-MLS librarians: trends and training implications. *Library Leadership & Management*, *28*(1), 1–15.

Sorey, K., & Gregory, D. (2010). Protests in the sixties. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *28*(2), 184–206.

Sproles, C., Johnson, A., & Farison, L. (2008). What the teachers are teaching: How MLIS programs are preparing academic librarians for instructional roles. *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, *49*(3), 195–209.

Stiwinter, K. (2013). Using an interactive online tutorial to expand library instruction. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, *18*(1), 15–41.

Thelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thirolf, K. Q. (2012). The faculty identities of community college adjuncts teaching in the humanities: a discourse analysis study. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, *36*(4), 269–278.

Thirolf, K. Q. (2013). How faculty identity discourses of community college part-time faculty change over time. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, *37*(3), 177–184.

Trower, C. A., & Chait, R. P. (2002). Faculty diversity: too little for too long. *Harvard Magazine*, *104*(4), 33–37.

Tucci, V. K. (2011). Faculty/Librarian collaboration: catalyst for student learning and librarian growth. *Science & Technology Libraries*, *30*(3), 292–305.

Tumbleson, B. E., & Burke, J. J. (2010). When life hands you lemons: overcoming obstacles to expand services in an embedded librarian program. *Journal of Library Administration*, *50*(7/8), 972–988.

Turner, S. (2006). For-profit colleges in the context of the market for higher education. In D. W. Breneman, B. Pusser, & S. E. Turner (Eds.), *Earnings from learning: The rise of for-profit universities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vaughn, G. B. (2006). *The community college story* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Ward, K., & Eddy, P. L. (2013). Women and academic leadership: leaning out. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://chronicle.com/article/WomenAcademic-Leadership-/143503/.

Washington College. (2013). *Art and art history*. Retrieved from http://www.washcoll.edu/catalog/art-and-art-history.php.

Watson, S. E., Rex, C., Markgraf, J., Kishel, H., Jennings, E., & Hinnant, K. (2013). Revising the "one-shot" through lesson study: collaborating with writing faculty to rebuild a library instruction session. *College & Research Libraries*, *74*(4), 381–398.

Whitchurch, C. (2009). The rise of the blended professional in higher education: a comparison between the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States. *Higher Education*, *58*(3), 407–418.

Whitchurch, C. (2013). *Reconstructing identities in higher education: The rise of third space professionals*. New York: Routledge.

Wolfe, J. A., Naylor, T., & Drueke, J. (2010). The role of the academic reference librarian in the learning commons. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, *50*(2), 108–113.

Wyss, P. (2008). Library faculty member perceptions regarding faculty status for academic libraries (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from proquest dissertations and theses.

Wyss, P. (2010). Library school faculty member perceptions regarding faculty status for academic librarians. *College & Research Libraries*, *71*(4), 375–388.