Does Tenure Matter? Factors Influencing Faculty Contributions to Institutional Repositories

Anne M. Casey

Does Tenure Matter?
Factors Influencing Faculty Contributions to Institutional Repositories

Anne M. Casey *Library Director, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University*

Abstract

INTRODUCTION Institutional repositories (IRs) provide colleges and universities a way to ensure stability of access to and dissemination of digital scholarly communications. Yet, many institutions report that faculty willingness to contribute to IRs is often limited. This study investigates faculty attitudes about IR contributions by tenure status and category of material. **METHODS** Two focus group interviews were conducted in the spring of 2009 among English department faculty at a large Midwestern university. One group consisted of tenured faculty and the other of tenure-track and adjunct faculty. **RESULTS** Both groups recognize the benefit of open access to research materials but expressed concern about their intellectual property rights. Untenured faculty spoke more about non-print research. Both groups also shared concerns about contributing instructional materials, primarily in regard to plagiarism and outdated materials. In regard to faculty service, the tenured group discussed many items they would contribute, while the untenured faculty mentioned very little. **DISCUSSION** Some minor differences emerged related to experience and tenure status in regard to contributing research and instructional artifacts, but the major variation was the strong support tenured participants gave for contributing service items, compared to the untenured faculty, who did not view this category positively. Tenured faculty viewed the IR as a way to document their own service activities, investigate those of colleagues, and had fewer concerns about plagiarism or other negative effects in the service category. **CONCLUSION** Promoting faculty contribution of service-related items to an IR may be a way to encourage larger numbers to participate.

Implications for Practice:

- Since tenured faculty who participated in this study were most positive about contributing materials related to service, librarians may want to target this type of material when they solicit first-time contributors to an institutional repository (IR).

- Tenured and untenured faculty may have different reasons to make their works openly accessible in an IR. Understanding these reasons and approaching faculty from the standpoint of what is in their best interest may improve willingness to contribute.

- Discussions about contributing to an IR, such as those that occur in a focus group, enable faculty to question their assumptions and clear up misconceptions. Holding information sessions on a regular basis may encourage more faculty contributions to IRs.

INTRODUCTION

The role of faculty in higher education is to advance knowledge through teaching, research, and service. Their scholarship is disseminated throughout the scholarly community through a process known as scholarly communications, which is one of sharing research, theories, concepts, and scholarship for the purpose of maintaining a dialogue that advances knowledge and understanding in a given topical or subject area. The traditional means of scholarly communications has been through publication in print books, journals, and conference proceedings. However, with the advent of the Internet and other digital technologies, disseminating faculty work electronically has gained in prominence.

The ability to disseminate research electronically has opened the academic community to new practices, such as open access publication, which is defined as digital, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions (Suber, 2010). Open access literature is accessible to anyone through general search engines on the Internet and can include electronic versions of previously-published print material as well as items born digital.

Institutional repositories (IRs), which, in part, provide a means to digitize and disseminate scholarly communications, are part of the open access movement. They are digital collections that capture and preserve the intellectual output of a single academic community and provide a method of dissemination, stewardship, and long-term preservation of the intellectual work created by that institution (Hawkins, 2006). They offer a means to safeguard the creative works of faculty and students as well as the records of institutional life and to disseminate them to the larger scholarly community.

Faculty can contribute published written works, such as journal articles, either as pre-prints or post-prints; creative endeavors, such as art works or performances; grey literature or unpublished research such as white papers, technical reports, conference proceedings, or datasets; instructional materials, such as syllabi or digital learning objects; and the artifacts of service work such as planning documents, in the institutional repository. These materials are then assigned standard subject headings and other descriptors in order to enable efficient discovery. Through the repository they are accessible together in one place on the Internet, where they will display as results in searches on general Web search engines such as Google. The potential benefits to faculty of an IR are the possibility of enhanced professional visibility and increased discovery of their works due to their creative materials being available in an open access resource (Crow, 2002). However, many institutions report that faculty have been slow to embrace the idea of contributing to IRs (Davis & Connolly, 2007; Mercer, Rosenblum, & Emmett, 2007; Abrizah, 2009, Cullen & Chawner, 2011).

The purpose of IRs, in part, is to serve as open access repositories of the intellectual output of the faculty at their institutions and to showcase the tangible results of those pursuits globally. Therefore, the success of IRs depends on contributions from the faculty. Yet, not all faculty contribute to IRs at their institutions, and the proportion of those who do varies by discipline. No study has explored the extent to which the faculty of one department in the humanities contributes to IRs or has examined whether rank (tenured or untenured) affects their willingness to contribute. This study fills that void by probing the primary reasons faculty are willing or reluctant to contribute; specific types of materials they are more willing to contribute; and any variations by tenure status.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Faculty Tenure

In 1915, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) formalized much of the current system of employment for faculty in higher education when they issued a declaration of principles outlining tenure of employment. These were further developed in the *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* (American Association of University Professors, 2006). Tenure is the guarantee of a position after an established probationary period of generally no more than seven years and is marked by a set of requirements the faculty member needs to fulfill in the categories of instruction, service, and research (Boyer, 1990). Further, faculty members generally need to provide evidence of continued output in the three categories to achieve promotion. Generally faculty committees review the work of colleagues according to a set of established criteria and recommend whether the individual should be granted tenure or promotion. However, in current practice, the research requirement often weighs more heavily in tenure

and promotion decisions than do those of instruction or service because research output is easier to measure and more likely to garner professional notice for the individual as well as the institution (Finnegan & Gamson, 1996). Indeed, 75.7 percent of the members of the Modern Language Association (MLA), who participated in a 2005 survey, rank scholarship as the primary component in tenure and promotion decisions (MLA, 2007).

Among the criteria that faculty use to judge colleagues' research for tenure and promotion decisions is its acceptance in a peer-reviewed publication, some of which have higher credibility than others. Tenure and promotion committees generally consider peer review to be the most important consideration in tenure and promotion decisions (Harley, Earl-Novell, Acord, Lawrence, & King, 2008). Moreover, the prevailing opinion seems to be that print publications are more likely to undergo stringent peer review than electronic-only publications (Harley, Earl-Novell, Arter, Lawrence, & King, 2006). In addition, humanities faculty seem to equate peer review with print publications to a greater degree than do those in other disciplines (Housewright & Schonfeld, 2008). Tenure and promotion requirements, which appear to emphasize publication in traditional formats, contribute to a culture that fosters conservatism in tenure-track faculty, who strive to meet accepted requirements in order to attain tenure (Nir & Zilberstein-Levy, 2006; Harley, Acord, Earl-Novell, Lawrence, & King, 2010). Yet, faculty are publishing in non-traditional sources that include non-print, non-subscription, and open access journals and there is a growing concern that tenure and promotion committees must develop methods to assess scholarship in new formats (Olson, 2008).

Scholars in the humanities are increasingly recognizing the need to reexamine traditional tenure requirements in light of changing scholarly communications. The MLA (2002; 2007) issued recommendations to departments of language and literature to discuss the dramatic changes in scholarly communication and to develop guidelines for assessing electronic publications and web archives, such as IRs. In addition, ideas for different methods of evaluating scholarly research are occurring in the humanities including post-publication review in history (Townsend, 2010) and open review in languages and literature (Fitzpatrick, 2011). These methods involve disseminating a creative work for critical feedback from experts in the field through blogs or other social media

rather than through traditional processes.

Faculty Willingness to Contribute to Institutional Repositories

As academic institutions implement IRs, they often find reluctance among faculty to contribute. In a survey of directors at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), two-thirds responded that the majority of faculty members at their institutions were not contributing (Association of Research Libraries, 2006). Jantz and Wilson (2008) found faculty contributions to IRs in ARL institutions to be low or non-existent in one-third. Furthermore, Schonfeld and Houseright (2010) discovered in a 2009 survey that less than 30 percent of faculty in U.S. colleges and universities were contributing to IRs. In addition, studies of IRs at several institutions such as Cornell (Davis & Connolly, 2007), the University of Rochester (Foster & Gibbons, 2005), the University of Kansas (Mercer, Rosenblum, & Emmett, 2007), the University of Malaya (Abrizah, 2009), and New Zealand's eight universities (Cullen & Chawner, 2011) also reveal some reluctance on the part of faculty to contribute.

In addition, there are disciplinary differences among the faculty who contribute. Those in the sciences contribute to a higher degree than do those in the social sciences and humanities. A 2009 Ithaka survey of faculty found that fewer than 10 percent of faculty in departments of literature deposited materials compared to more than 20 percent of those in economics departments and more than 40 percent of physics professors (Schonfeld & Houseright, 2010). Jantz and Wilson (2008) found that IRs in ARL member institutions contain five percent humanities content as opposed to 27 percent social sciences and 67 percent sciences. In addition, a 2004 analysis of 24 IRs in Great Britain revealed that only 19 percent of the content was from the arts, humanities, and social sciences combined (Allen, 2005).

Faculty cite a variety of reasons for their hesitation to contribute to IRs. These include a learning curve for new technology, copyright issues, concerns over whether contributing to an IR is equated with publishing, fear that low quality of some material in the repository would taint their research, and worries about plagiarism (Davis & Connolly, 2007). Other disadvantages are a hesitation to deposit materials critical of the university, concerns about plagiarism of their intellectual property, the belief

that the current faculty tenure and promotion evaluation process focuses on measures of print-based research productivity (Wust, 2006), lack of time (Xia, 2007), uncertainty about the institution's ability to support the repository over a long period of time (Seaman, 2010), and extra workload for staff (Cullen & Chawner, 2011). Among the reasons English faculty surveyed at Louisiana State University gave for their reluctance to contribute are protecting unsold screenplays from potential content theft and the belief that freely distributing unpublished work would destroy the livelihood of authors whose work is commercial (Lercher, 2008). Humanities faculty state that timeliness of dissemination is not important in their field (Davis & Connolly, 2007), the most important requirement for tenure and promotion is a published monograph (Harley et al., 2010), and that faculty in some humanities disciplines tend to keep new ideas private until they are well-developed, which can take years (Harley et al., 2008), thus not perceiving contributing to IRs to be of benefit to them.

On the other hand, the reasons that faculty give for willingness to contribute are also numerous. Kim (2011) found, in a survey of faculty at land-grant institutions in the United States, that preserving[1] copies of their works in a digital format is the primary reason for contributing. In addition, faculty at the University of Malaya in Malaysia (Abrizah, 2009) and in New Zealand (Cullen & Chawner, 2011) cite altruism or the desire to share their creative works with others to be an important motivator. Seaman (2010), in interviews of humanities faculty at Dartmouth College, found that participants view the ability of an IR to feed content to a faculty profile page and to promote their work as important to them. Faculty at Cornell University list that they might be likely to contribute to ensure permanence, timeliness of the research appearing, and the ability to fix a time to the first appearance of a new creative work (Davis & Connolly, 2007). Foster and Gibbons (2005) report that the faculty at the University of Rochester considered the most important criteria for an IR are that it would be maintained permanently and that it allow others to find, use, and cite their work. Other advantages include the fact that IRs provide a means to preserve their materials and to give them a count of the number of times they are downloaded (Kim, 2007),

as well as to increase awareness of research within the institution and to showcase it externally (Wust, 2006).

Tenure and promotion issues as an influence on faculty willingness to contribute to IRs do not appear very often in the literature. However, European humanities faculty listed *increased chance of promotion* as a possible advantage of contributing (Allen, 2005) and some faculty in a study of university IRs in New Zealand state that depositing research has helped in career advancement (Cullen & Chawner, 2011). In addition, a survey of faculty in the University of California system reveals that a majority believe existing tenure and promotion requirements are not keeping up with the evolution of scholarly communication (University of California, 2007).

METHODS

The setting for the study is a public university in the Midwest region of the United States. Founded as a teachers' college in the 19th century, this institution expanded rapidly in the latter third of the 20th century. Since 1990, it has added several doctoral degrees and its Carnegie Classification changed from Master's/Large- to Doctoral/Research-intensive. Both changes led to a stronger emphasis on research at the university. In fact, the university lists the enhancement of the infrastructure for research and creative activities as one of its five strategic priorities.

In order to support this priority more effectively, the library led several efforts to seek university financing for an IR. Due to decreased state funding and a lack of understanding of the value of IRs to support research activities, these efforts failed repeatedly. In 2007, the library administration decided to fund a two-year trial of an IR software system and to provide staff time to lead the development of a small scale repository. The IR development and implementation team, which was led by a librarian, consisted of staff from the library and the information technology department, as well as faculty from several academic departments, including English Language and Literature. The IR became operational in March 2008.

As a member of a team of librarians who advocated for an IR at her university, the investigator was part of the development and implementation team and participated in promoting the IR to faculty. Librarians promoted

---

[1] Though Kim (2007; 2011) discusses preservation as a factor in faculty willingness to contribute to an IR, it is unclear whether the author refers to true digital preservation or merely continuity and stability of access to the material.

contributions to the IR at faculty and academic administration meetings for several months with limited success. At the end of the first year they analyzed the content and made an interesting discovery. The IR contained 108 items, of which 35 or 32.4 percent had been contributed by faculty from the English department. Since this was not the norm in other IRs, the investigator created a study to discover what made the difference at this institution. With permission of the Institutional Review Boards at Simmons College, where she was a student, and the study institution, the investigator conducted focus group interviews with English department faculty in the spring of 2009.

English Language and Literature is one of the largest departments at this university and faculty are active in research and scholarship, including the publication of monographs and journal articles as well as making contributions to subject encyclopedias and dictionaries and presenting at conferences. Granting both B.A. and M.A. degrees, the department offers courses in composition, creative writing and linguistics, as well as American and British literature. The English department faculty numbered 56 in the 2008-2009 academic year.

(Table 1 provides a breakdown of the 56 faculty by tenure status and rank.)

In April 2009, the investigator invited all 56 members of the English faculty to participate in the study with the intent of conducting four focus group interviews of five to eight participants, one each to correspond to the following groups: the tenured full professors; the tenured associate professors; the tenure-track assistant professors; and the non-tenured full-time temporary faculty. Twenty-one of the 56 faculty members responded to the invitations for a response rate of 37.5 percent. Thirteen of them indicated their availability while eight declined.

Due to the low response rate, the investigator chose to assign the volunteers to one of two focus groups rather than to the four originally planned. The first consisted of eight tenured faculty members, while the second contained five untenured members of the faculty. With the assistance of the library's bibliographer/liaison to the English department, the investigator moderated the focus group interviews. She provided a list (see Table 2) of examples of items that could be contributed to an IR on a whiteboard in the meeting room. She derived

Table 1. English Department Faculty by Tenure Status and Rank in 2008-2009

Status	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Temporary		Totals
	25	9	22		56
Rank	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Temporary	
	17	8	9	22	56

Table 2. Sample Types of Institutional Repository Submissions

Research	Teaching	Service
Books	Syllabi	Committee work
Articles	Instructional support materials	• Technical reports
Plays/screenplays	PowerPoint slides	• White papers
Book reviews	• Lectures	• Planning documents
Grant material	• Conference presentations	Consulting reports
Encyclopedia articles	Creative works of student advisees	Department newsletters

this list from the English department bylaws, which specify examples of documentary evidence for tenure and promotion qualification in the three areas of instruction, research, and service. The moderators recorded the interview sessions with the permission of the participants. The investigator transcribed the recordings and examined them through content analysis.

RESULTS

Contributions to the IR

In the tenured focus group, two participants replied that they had contributed published book chapters and journal articles to the IR. The other six reported that they had not contributed; however four of them volunteered that they had been considering doing so but had questions or lacked time to learn the process. None of the participants in the untenured group had contributed any items to the IR.

Categories of Items Contributed

In the research category, tenured faculty specified a small number of item types they would be willing to contribute, namely peer-reviewed published works, if not limited by copyright. Several agreed that open access to previously published material would make it more generally accessible and thus might raise the impact of a particular work if it were cited more frequently. In addition, unpublished creative work that highlighted local collections or that might be of interest to limited audiences was considered appropriate to contribute in order to make it accessible. One participant added that contributing material to the IR offered a way to share work outside of traditional publication venues.

The untenured faculty discussed a wide range of item types beyond print that they would consider contributing, such as datasets, blogs, and media. They volunteered that peer-reviewed published work as well as works of limited interest or obscure publication might be worth contributing because they would find larger audiences through open access.

In regard to items from the teaching category, participants stated that circumstances might influence their willingness to contribute particular items. In the tenured group, most agreed that limited electronic access to syllabi and other instructional materials might be useful for assessment, program review, and accreditation. There was also general agreement that PowerPoint slides of conference presentations as well as student theses, dissertations, and capstone projects were valuable to contribute because they often consist of materials others want access to but cannot easily find.

The untenured faculty agreed that they might contribute university or department-approved model syllabi as examples for others teaching the same course. They also would be willing to contribute PowerPoint slides of conference presentations and encourage the contribution of student papers for the same reasons as their tenured colleagues. One additional item type they discussed was a model of an assignment required to be taught in all composition classes because new faculty often struggle with teaching this assignment.

The types of items that tenured faculty were willing to contribute in the service category consisted of committee and other institutional reports as well as planning documents. One participant commented that new faculty committees often reinvent processes because it is difficult to access historical documents. Another reason given for willingness to contribute items from this category was that it might be useful to similar departments or committees at other universities. The group also discussed the potential usefulness of contributing the tenure and promotion notebooks faculty are required to assemble. One participant remarked that contributing the elements of this notebook to the IR would save time, resources, and make the materials easily accessible to the tenure and promotion committee as well as to prospective employers should the faculty member be job-hunting at some future point. The untenured participants considered that some types of departmental or committee reports might be interesting to others both internally and externally.

Neither group had many types of items that they were reluctant to contribute in the research category. The tenured faculty stated that it would be difficult to judge the reliability of unpublished material. The untenured group also saw dependability as an issue and added that poor quality material would reflect unfavorably on their institution. Both groups saw contributions of ongoing research too early as a possible deterrent to publication.

The discussion of reluctance to contribute types of items

in the teaching category was the dominant one in both groups. Several times after the moderator had directed the conversation to another question, a participant led the group back to a discussion of reluctance to contribute types of instructional items. Much of the conversation among the tenured faculty focused on the themes of ownership, currency of an item that is updated regularly, and the amount of time and effort it takes to develop many of these items in comparison to the short time it would take another to download and possibly appropriate the item. The one concern raised in this category regarding submission of student materials was that those of poor quality would reflect badly on the university.

The discussion among the untenured faculty about contributing instructional items contained many of the same themes. Ownership and the concern about someone appropriating intellectual property were discussed as was the currency of items that are updated regularly. One participant commented that the syllabi of newer practitioners are probably not as useful to others.

The tenured faculty discussed no items they would be reluctant to contribute from the service category. The discussion among the untenured faculty centered primarily on departmental and committee minutes. The participants did not think that many would be interested in their internal committee documents and that if the faculty themselves needed access; the documents were located on an internal drive.

Reasons for Willingness and Reluctance to Contribute

The primary general reasons that tenured faculty gave for willingness to contribute was to make their published material more easily accessible to colleagues, to students, and the tenure and promotion committee. In addition, they stated that it was partially their responsibility to assist in the dissemination of student work. They also saw the increased access to internal documents as a way to make bureaucratic procedures more transparent. Further, those who had contributed stated that a primary reason was either their own participation on the IR development committee or the recommendation of a colleague on that committee.

The untenured faculty shared some of the same reasons as their tenured colleagues, especially increased accessibility to previously-published materials. Other reasons they

gave were possible increased impact of their work, the capability to link to work from a curriculum vitae, as well as the ability to gather materials from a variety of publications in one place. An additional reason that this group offered was having the opportunity to collaborate with colleagues within and outside the university on works-in-progress.

The reasons for reluctance to contribute were more numerous among the tenured faculty than were the reasons they specified for willingness to contribute. Among them were several that related to ownership and a potential for plagiarism, as well as a lack of understanding of intellectual property rights. In addition, a significant amount of discussion in this group revolved around the concept of the IR lacking a context. Participants were unsure of the benefits of contributing peer-reviewed items that mingled with other works of uncertain quality. They remarked that the lack of categorization in the IR leads to it being amorphous. Further discussion centered on the control the IR committee seemed to have over the acceptance and deletion of content as well as the negative impact that widespread contribution to IRs might have on traditional scholarly publishing. One participant remarked that timeliness of dissemination is not as important in the humanities and so may render the need for open access less vital than in other disciplines, although others in the group disagreed.

The untenured faculty group had fewer reasons for reluctance. Among them were issues of ownership, copyright confusion, and uncertainty about quality. In addition, they raised a concern that it might be difficult to distinguish what was necessary to be open access for the sake of transparency and what could be potentially damaging if cited out of context. In addition, this group discussed that open access to some material, such as previously-published essays that might be republished in a book, could hurt potential future sales.

Use of Materials in an IR

Among the tenured faculty, four responded that they had knowingly used materials from this university's or other institutions' IRs, while two others believed that they had found materials in other IRs based on the type of website to which a general search engine had led them. None of the participants in the untenured faculty group were aware of having used materials from any IR.

Of those who had used materials in an IR, one reported referring students to specific items in the university's IR. Two reported searching for information at other institutions that had programs similar to those they were currently running or had in the past. In one case, the investigator would categorize the information as fitting the teaching category and the other as fitting the service category. The fourth participant had been searching for strategic planning materials at other institutions.

Other Findings

There was an additional finding that surfaced in the course of both focus groups. That is a lack of understanding about open access publication and IRs in general. This was manifested in some cases by the advancement of incorrect assumptions but primarily by questions the participants asked. Throughout both discussions, participants frequently asked questions about how difficult it might be to contribute to the IR and what possible negative consequences there might be for contributing. These questions were sometimes answered by more knowledgeable focus group participants and other times by the moderator. At the end of both groups, participants indicated that the dispelling of some incorrect assumptions and the answers to many of the questions left them with a far more positive impression of the IR and an increased willingness to contribute their materials.

DISCUSSION

Much of the discussion in both focus groups reveals that the participants share many of the same reasons for reluctance or willingness to contribute as do faculty who participated in other studies. In general, there was an uncertainty among the participants about the relative merits of contributing to an IR. They all saw the benefit of making some categories of their work more openly accessible. In particular, they were very interested in providing universal electronic access to materials that had already been peer-reviewed and published in a less accessible format. They believe that enhanced access might lead to increased impact due to more people reading and citing their works. In addition, open access might make it easier for members of the tenure and promotion committee to evaluate their works and thus lead to more favorable tenure and promotion decisions. In addition, the tenured faculty saw value in making the results of some service activities accessible so others in

similar departments might use them as examples.

There was also a strong consensus in both groups that open access to other categories of materials, such as syllabi and instructional support materials, might open them to a risk of plagiarism and the misuse of their intellectual property. In addition, untenured faculty saw little of the service work that they did as being of any interest to those outside their committees or department.

Participants questioned the benefits to them of contributing items to a system that accepted any faculty submission, regardless of its content or quality. They expressed the opinion that the peer-review process and system of scholarly publishing offers a context in which they know where to look for trustworthy material in their subject areas. They acknowledged that traditional scholarly publishing restricts access to their work but are not yet convinced that the additional access provided by the university's IR is worth the risk of placing it out of context alongside material that has not been peer-reviewed.

Throughout the discussion in both groups, participants asked a variety of questions related to IRs in general and the university's in particular. It was obvious that most did not understand why the university had developed the IR and were often pleased to learn ways in which it might benefit them, particularly in providing access to works of limited interest outside the university as well as to the work of their student advisees. Through the discussion these questions elicited, faculty suggested ways in which adaptations to the IR might make them more willing to contribute their creative works. Among these was the establishment of categories that separated peer-reviewed work from general faculty work and from student work.

While the discussions in both groups were similar in many ways, there was some variation between them. The most significant differences were the variety of types of research materials discussed by the untenured faculty compared to the discussion in the tenured group, which focused on articles and book reviews. This difference might be linked to the fact that the untenured faculty are concentrating on completing their research requirements and more attuned to different types of works they can develop. However, it might also be reflective of the fact that the untenured group consisted primarily of members of Generation X, who might be more familiar with different technologies,

while those in the tenured faculty group were generally older.

The other area of difference was in the service category. Where the untenured faculty had difficulty conceiving types of materials from this area that might be candidates for IR submission, the tenured faculty discussed this type of contribution at length. Both groups acknowledged that tenured faculty at the university concentrate more of their efforts on the service requirements of their work after receiving tenure and are more knowledgeable about items from this category. The tenured faculty considered types of materials that would benefit internal audiences, such as program review and planning materials, as well as those that might help colleagues in English departments elsewhere, such as plans to improve a writing center. They admitted to seeking this type of material at other institutions' IRs and indicated willingness to share similar material openly. Indeed, since the environment in which they conduct this work is often more collaborative than that of their research and instruction activities, they are more attuned to sharing the results and consider the IR a good place to do so, providing there is a way to categorize them separately from peer-reviewed materials and student contributions.

No reasons for willingness or reluctance to contribute arose that were distinct to English faculty. The participants suggested that the amount of contribution that was made by faculty members from this department had more to do with the fact that two of their members served on the IR planning committee and had encouraged colleagues to contribute.

Limitations of the Study

The faculty members who participated in this study represent a small proportion of those in the department. They are not representative of the department or of English faculty in general. In addition, only two of those in the department, who had contributed to the IR, were available at the time of the scheduled interviews because of end-of-the-semester obligations. If other contributing faculty had been present, the discussions may have centered on different types of contributions. In addition, the tenured faculty members, who spoke about their willingness to contribute some types of service items more readily than teaching or instructional artifacts, had, in fact, not made contributions to the IR, so were

speaking in the abstract.

Because so few faculty members were available to participate in the discussions, the proposed four groups, consisting of full professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors, were collapsed into two. One group was comprised of various ranks of tenured faculty members and the other of tenure-track and adjunct faculty members. It is possible that with more homogeneous focus groups, the discussion would have been different.

CONCLUSION

Most studies of faculty perceptions toward IRs have focused primarily on research materials and secondarily on items in the teaching category. However, this study also included an examination of potential contributions from the service area of faculty work. The untenured faculty, who are concentrating on research and teaching at this point in their careers, do not engage strongly in leadership in the service area. The tenured faculty, on the other hand, are often expected to devote time to leading committees, advising graduate students, and developing support programs such as a writing center or first-year experience programs. These service activities are generally performed in the collaborative environment of a committee or task force and the materials generated belong to the group or the institution, rather than the individual.

Some artifacts of service work are undoubtedly too specific to the department to be of much interest elsewhere. However, much of the work created through service activity might be valuable for internal and external groups doing similar work and does not appear to carry the same concerns about plagiarism or quality as do teaching and research items. By making this material openly accessible, faculty can not only provide concrete documentation of the work they are doing in this area for career advancement, they can also share ideas and strategies more easily with colleagues who might benefit from them. IR developers might increase faculty contribution to IRs by discussing the merits of contributing service-related materials, particularly with tenured faculty, who tend to be more heavily involved in service work.

This study investigated a small number of faculty members from one academic department. The willingness of the tenured faculty to contribute artifacts from the service

category was fairly strong compared to their opinions on contributing their creative works in the areas of research or instruction and far more pronounced than that of their untenured colleagues. It may be unique to this group of people, but if it is not, the contribution of service-related resources may be a way for librarians to encourage tenured faculty especially to begin depositing their scholarly materials to IRs. Further research might include quantitative and qualitative studies among larger groups to determine whether the contribution of service artifacts provides a more viable avenue for faculty to begin participating in IRs.

REFERENCES

Abrizah, A. (2009). The cautious faculty: Their awareness and attitudes towards institutional repositories. *Malaysian Journal of library & Information Science*, *14*(2), 17-37.

Allen, J. (2005). *Interdisciplinary differences in attitudes towards deposit in institutional repositories*. (Master's thesis, Manchester Metropolitan University). Retrieved from http://eprints.rclis.org/archive/00005180/01/FULLTEXT.pdf

American Association of University Professors. (2006). 1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure with 1970 interpretive comments. Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/EBB1B330-33D3-4A51-B534-CEE0C7A90DAB/0/1940StatementofPrinciplesonAcademicFreedomandTenure.pdf

Association of Research Libraries. (2006). I*nstitutional repositories: SPEC Kit 292*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carter, H., Snyder, C. A., & Imre, A. (2007). Library faculty publishing and intellectual property issues: A survey of attitudes and awareness. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *7*, 65-79. doi: 10.1353/pla.2007.0003

Crow, R. (2002). The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper. Washington, DC: Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition. Retrieved from http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/ir_final_release_102.pdf

Cullen, R., & Chawner, B. (2011). Institutional repositories, open access, and scholarly communication: A study of conflicting paradigms. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *37*(6), 460-470. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2011.07.002

Davis, P. M., & Connolly, M. J. L. (2007). Institutional repositories: Evaluating the reasons for non-use of Cornell University's installation of DSpace. *D-Lib Magazine*, *13*(3/4). doi: 10.1045/march2007-davis

Finnegan, D. E., & Gamson, Z. F. (1996). Disciplinary adaptations to research culture in comprehensive universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, *19*(2), 141-177.

Fitzpatrick, K. (2011). Peer review, judgment, and reading. *Profession*, 196-201. doi:10.1632/prof.2011.2011.1.196

Foster, N. F., & Gibbons, S. (2005). Understanding faculty to improve content recruitment for institutional repositories. *D-Lib Magazine*, *11*(1). doi:10.1045/january2005-foster

Harley, D., Acord, S. K., Earl-Novell, S., Lawrence, S., & King, C. J. (2010). Assessing the future landscape of scholarly communication: An in-depth exploration of faculty values and needs in seven disciplines. University of California Center for Studies in Higher Education. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/15x7385g#

Harley, D., Earl-Novell, S., Acord, S. K., Lawrence, S., & King, C. J. (2008). Interim report: Assessing the future landscape of scholarly communication: An in-depth study of faculty needs and ways of meeting them. University of California Center for Studies in Higher Education. Retrieved from http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/docs/SC%20Draft%20Interim%20Report%20060808.doc.pdf

Harley, D., Earl-Novell, S. Arter, J., Lawrence, S., & King, C. J. (2006). The influence of academic values on scholarly publication and communication practices (Research & Occasional Paper Series No. CSHE.13.06). Retrieved from the University of California Center for Studies in Higher Education website: http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/docs/ROP.Harley.AcademicValues.13.06.pdf

Hawkins, B. L. (2006, May/June). Advancing scholarship and intellectual productivity: An interview with Clifford M. Lynch. *Educause Review*, 44-56.

Housewright, R, & Schonfeld, R. (2008). Ithaka's 2006 studies of key stakeholders in digital transformation in higher education. Retrieved from http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/library-survey-2006

Jantz, R. C., & Wilson, M. Y. (2008). Institutional repositories: Faculty deposits, marketing, and the reform of scholarly communication. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *34*(3), 186-195. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2008.03.014

Kim, J. (2007). Motivating and impeding factors affecting faculty contribution to institutional repositories. *Journal of Digital Information*, *8*(2). Retrieved from http://journals.tdl.org/jodi/article/viewArticle/193/177

Kim, J. (2011). Motivations of faculty self-archiving in institutional

repositories. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *37*(3), 246-254. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2011.02.017

Lercher, A. (2008a). [Preprint of] A survey of attitudes about digital repositories among faculty at Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge. Retrieved from www.lib.lsu.edu/faculty/lercher/Repositories.doc

Mercer, H., Rosenblum, B., & Emmett, A. (2007). A multifaceted approach to promote a university repository. *OCLC Systems & Services 23*(2), 190-203. doi:10.1108/10650750710748496

Modern Language Association. (2002). The future of scholarly publishing. Retrieved from http://www.mla.org/pdf/schlrlypblshng.pdf

Modern Language Association. (2007). Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion. Retrieved from http://www.mla.org/pdf/taskforcereport0608.pdf

Nir, A. E., & Zilberstein-Levy, R. (2006). Planning for academic excellence: Tenure and professional considerations. *Studies in Higher Education 31*(5), 537-54. doi:10.1080/03075070600922725

Olson, G. A. (2008, June 6). Certifying online research. Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/jobs/news/2008/06/2008060601c.htm

Schonfeld, R. C., & Houseright, R. (2010). Faculty survey 2009: Key strategic insights for libraries, publishers, and society. Retrieved from http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/research/faculty-surveys-2000-2009/Faculty%20Study%202009.pdf

Seaman, D. (2010). Discovering the information needs of humanists when planning an institutional repository. *D-Lib Magazine*, *17*(4). doi:10.1045/march2011-seaman

Suber, P. (2010). Open access overview. Retrieved from http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm

Townsend, R. B. (2010). Assessing the future of peer review. Retrieved from http://blog.historians.org/profession/1065/assessing-the-future-of-peer-review

The University of California. Office of Scholarly Communication and the California Digital Library eScholarship Program. (2007). Faculty attitudes and behaviors regarding scholarly communication: Survey findings from the University of California. Retrieved from http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/responses/materials/OSC-survey-full-20070828.pdf

Wust, M. G. (2006). *Attitudes of education researchers towards publishing, open access, and institutional repositories* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta). Available from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (AAT MR22185)

Xia, J. (2007). Assessment of self-archiving in institutional repositories: Across disciplines. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *33*(6), 647-654. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2007.09.020

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Anne M. Casey
Library Director

Hunt Library
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
600 S. Clyde Morris Blvd.
Daytona Beach, FL 32114

Anne.Casey@erau.edu