THE INTERNATIONAL
JOURNAL of DIVERSITY
in Organizations, Communities & Nations

Volume 10

A Glass Half Full or Half Empty?: A Comparison of Diversity Statements among Russell Group v. US Research Universities

Kathleen K. OMara and Elizabeth Morrish

COMMON GROUND

www.Diversity-Journal.com

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DIVERSITY IN ORGANISATIONS, COMMUNITIES AND NATIONS
http://www.Diversity-Journal.com

First published in 2010 in Champaign, Illinois, USA by Common Ground Publishing LLC
www.CommonGroundPublishing.com.

© 2010 (individual papers), the author(s)
© 2010 (selection and editorial matter) Common Ground

Authors are responsible for the accuracy of citations, quotations, diagrams, tables and maps.

All rights reserved. Apart from fair use for the purposes of study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the Copyright Act (Australia), no part of this work may be reproduced without written permission from the publisher. For permissions and other inquiries, please contact
<cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com>.

ISSN: 1447-9532
Publisher Site: http://www.Diversity-Journal.com

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DIVERSITY IN ORGANISATIONS, COMMUNITIES AND NATIONS is peer-reviewed, supported by rigorous processes of criterion-referenced article ranking and qualitative commentary, ensuring that only intellectual work of the greatest substance and highest significance is published.

Typeset in Common Ground Markup Language using CGCreator multichannel typesetting system
http://www.commongroundpublishing.com/software/

A Glass Half Full or Half Empty?: A Comparison of Diversity Statements among Russell Group v. US Research Universities

Kathleen K. OMara, State University of New York, NY, USA
Elizabeth Morrish, Nottingham Trent University, England, UK

Abstract: The term diversity is ubiquitous in university mission statements, strategic plans, recruitment brochures, and university websites. This paper argues aims to compare university diversity statements from US Research Tier 1 universities with those from the elite UK Russell group universities In order to compare the language of diversity, we have used the techniques of corpus linguistics. A corpus is an electronic collection of sample texts which can then be processed by software, in this case the Oxford Wordsmith Tools (Scott 1996) package. This enables a corpus to be searched for frequent words, concordances (the linguistic environment of target words), and collocations (the company that those words keep). The resulting analysis suggests that there are differences between US and UK diversity statements, significant enough that they cannot be said to conform to the same 'genre'. There is overall similarity in terms of vocabulary choice and of grammatical structures used (nominalizations, modalities etc), however, the UK Russell group diversity statements display a modality position of certainty, which resonates with the noun commitment. In contrast, US Research university diversity statements are formulated more as aspirations, and focus on benefit to the community, but claim a less certain outcome. Diversity is seen as 'a good thing' and signified by multiple linguistic markers of appreciation. The word frequency analysis of the diversity statements suggests that they are largely made up of semantically vague lexical items – Strategically Deployable Shifters - which contribute little to the overall meanings of the statements. These words, e.g. excellence, diversity, respect, even equality are multi-functional, polysemic abstractions which invoke fair play. Discursively embracing diversity commits institutions to recognizing little difference, and certainly not to institutional or structural change, rather diversity is seen as the property of individuals, and is congruent with the project of the neoliberal university.

Keywords: Diversity, Equity, Community, Commitment, Corpus Analysis, Mission Statements, Minoritized, Strategically Deployable Shifters,

Diversity's evolution

> Northwestern University is deeply committed to student, faculty and staff diversity – diversity of race and ethnicity, of gender and sexual orientation, of political perspective and economic condition. A diverse community is essential to achieve our mission of creating the best possible learning environment and educational experience. *Provost Daniel Linzer.*

The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations
Volume 10, 2010, http://www.Diversity-Journal.com, ISSN 1447-9532
© Common Ground, Kathleen K. OMara, Elizabeth Morrish, All Rights Reserved, Permissions: cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com
COMMON GROUND

THE TERM *diversity* is ubiquitous in university mission statements, periodic strategic plans, student recruitment brochures, and university websites. Diversity is "good," a signifier of everything and nothing. In the United States the word diversity has replaced "affirmative action" and "historically underrepresented groups" in discussions about faculty, staff and students, and reveals a discursive shift which mirrors the trajectory of US case law, which we discuss below. The shift is not semantic but one of meaning and policy (Tapia, 2007). Among UK institutions the "commitment" to diversity followed on the 1992 Further and Higher Education Act which ended the binary divide that maintained a large difference in funding and resource allocation between universities and polytechnics and ushered in an expansion of higher education opportunities for UK students that was a shift from elite to mass higher education (Gombrich 2000). The interest in diversity coincides with the full arrival of neoliberal capitalist policies, with a particular emphasis on being globally competitive. In the deeply corporatized university of the twenty-first century, diversity accompanies *excellence*, *transferable skills*, and *accountability* as markers communicating "we are competitive players."

The history of this interest in diversity rests in the U.S. model of post World War II mass higher education, the civil rights movement, the Black students' movement and the federal legislation in response to these from the 1950s to the 1970s which aimed to ameliorate historic injustices, i.e., exclusion based on race, national origin and religion, then gender, age, physical disability, etc. Maher and Tetreault (2007:6) comment that the consequences of post-war social and military policy have left a legacy in US universities. Firstly, the Cold War which fuelled scientific research in universities; secondly the GI Bill, which granted a certain period of free tuition for persons who had served in the military during World War II. This, they argue, as did Katznelson (2005: 114), amounted to affirmative action for white men (2007:14), especially since limitations on access and college places meant that fewer Black applicants were able to benefit. Katznelson pushes the origins of (in) equality legislation back to the purported race blind New Deal federal laws (e.g., Fair Labor Standards Act, Social Security) which by excluding jobs predominantly done by Blacks and by turning benefits administration over to local governments, widened the U.S. racial hierarchy. That precedent, federal legislation administered in biased fashion by Southern Democrats and Northern Urban political machines, set the pattern for federal redress of discrimination and helped fuel the Civil Rights movement, followed by the Black Campus Movement in which students forced universities through a series of protests and boycotts to provide some semblance of student and faculty diversity and initiate new curricula, e.g., Black Studies (Rogers 2009:464,468).

In the past four decades, U.S. universities have employed affirmative action policies to increase the participation of U.S. born members of minoritized racial and ethnic groups, especially African American, Latino and Native American, (AALANA) in higher education, where historically they were underrepresented, i.e., denied access. Those policies which often applied to decisions about which students to admit and which faculty members to hire, led to controversy, strange new concepts such as reverse racism, and repeated legal challenges resulting in U.S. courts changing the terms of their use and shrinking the legal space for race based affirmative action applications. One result or adaptation to these increased restrictions is US universities switch in focus from increasing AALANA representation to achieving broad cultural diversity (e.g. by nationality, gender and sexual identity, age) among students, staff and to some extent curricula.

Critical way stations on this journey from civil rights and affirmative action to diversity include the landmark 1978 case *Regents of California v. Bakke* in which the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against racial admission quotas, but noted that there was a compelling interest to have diversity in the student body. In *Hopwood v. Texas* (1996), the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit questioned the enduring vitality of *Bakke* and ruled against race conscious admissions in Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. More recently, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003) supported the University of Michigan Law School's race conscious admissions policy, reaffirmed *Bakke,* and ruled that race can be one of many factors considered by institutions in selecting students because it enhances "a compelling interest in obtaining the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body." These rulings on affirmative action in higher education have concluded that diversity is a proper goal of universities, and reasoned that higher educational institutions' own educational missions can best be implemented with diverse student bodies.

In the United Kingdom, ideas of equality and diversity rest in anti-discrimination legislation which emerged later than in the US, following increased immigration from Britain's colonies and former colonies in the post-war period of independence movements. Foundational legislation includes the Equal Pay Act of 1970, the Sex Discrimination Act of 1975, and the Race Relations Act of 1976 which all applied to public institutions including higher education institutions (GMC 2007, 1-2). Amendments enhancing the force of law have subsequently been enacted, e.g., Sex Discrimination Act (Amendment) 1986, Sex Discrimination (Gender Reassignment) Regulations, 1999, and Race Relations Act (Amendment) 2000 as well as new legislation such as the Human Rights Act, 1998 synchronising UK law with that of the European Union, The Disability Discrimination Act, 2000, amended 2005, Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Act, 2003, the Gender Recognition Act, 2004, Employment Equality (Age) Act, 2006, and the Equality (Sex) Act, 2006. Policies and practices surrounding equality and diversity thus hang on the scaffolding of anti-discrimination laws.

Professional advocates for diversity in the workplace have contributed to the shift away from affirmative action in the US. Patti DeRosa of ChangeWorks Consulting, for example, argued "Affirmative action means if you come to the party, you can get in the door…diversity and inclusion is what happens once you are inside the door," a characterization which demands close scrutiny. The former is defined in the US as a "legally mandated process" emerging from Equal Employment Opportunity laws of the 1960s, whereas "diversity and inclusion" are administratively driven processes within institutions (Woog 2008). Other analysts see the substitution over time of diversity for affirmative action or representation as a move which shifted the emphasis from the obstacles encountered by large segments of the US population in securing access to higher education, to an interest in securing representation of many types of people as defined by language, religion, nationality, various other cultural features and sometimes sexual identity. In particular, diversity concerns intersected with globalisation and acquired an international aspect, resulting now in an emphasis on understanding and appreciating the worlds' nations and ethnic groups. This shift from the affirmative action focus on US born minoritized groups to international inclusion has resulted in a literal interpretation of diversity (Tapia 2007, B34). When nearly thirty per cent of US citizens are AALANA—African American, Latino, Asian American or Native American—the diversity "commitment" paradoxically favors hiring the foreign born faculty member or recruiting an international student, not the historically and structurally disadvantaged group member. Problematic practices result, i.e., hiring a psychiatrist's daughter from Buenos Aires

to mentor Nuyorican (people of Puerto Rican heritage, living in New York) students or a post doc from Pakistan or Nigeria to teach STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) courses; though admirable efforts, they fail to address the need of US AALANA students for mentors and models from their own communities. Further, it alienates some students more, leaving them feeling deeply isolated on predominantly white campuses, and not "included." At the same time, US universities, led by the elite institutions (Ivy League and public research universities) have enthusiastically endorsed the principle that diversity (however defined) is good, and an institution's claim on excellence requires adherence to the principle. Similarly, the expansion of higher education in the UK since the early 1990s has resulted in the admission of many more students who identify as Asian, African-Caribbean, African and Muslim rather than British, who literally embody diversity. Another UK consideration of diversity is reflected in the "deliberate diversity" of Cambridge University which signifies the diversity of curricula, resources and quality of institutions.

In this paper we will explore whether, because of their different histories and contexts, diversity statements from elite US and UK universities can be said to be drawn from the same or different genres. We will also question whether the attitudes and pledges claimed in these statements can be said to be genuine in terms of making a difference for the constituencies which fall within their remit. We ask what limitations are imposed by both the intent and interpretation of the statements, and how policies which impact on minorities might be conceived differently, to restructure institutions and empower those who work within them.

Corpus Analysis of Texts

The evolutionary development of "diversity" in US universities, and the establishment of diversity as an administrative policy in UK universities in the past decade or so, has led us to a closer examination of the discourses on diversity, equity, and inclusion that have become standardized in US and UK university policy statements. To that end we have collected electronic corpora of diversity statements from a selection of British and American universities as a basis of analysis and comparison. This paper aims to examine the discourse of university policy statements on diversity, equity and inclusion. We aim to discover whether there can be said to be a 'genre' of diversity statements with a common lexical core of items, grammatical constructions and attitudinal indicators as revealed by an appraisal analysis (Martin and White, 2005). Implicit in the collection of diversity statements from US Research universities and UK Russell group universities is that we will be pursuing a comparison between the statements of these groupings.

Sinclair (1991: 171) defines a corpus as 'a collection of naturally-occurring language text, chosen to characterize a state or variety of a language'. A linguistic corpus consists of texts in an electronic format which can then be processed by software, in this case the Oxford Wordsmith Tools (Scott 1996) package. This enables a corpus to be searched for key words, and all forms of a word may be searched, e.g. searching on *divers** would identify occurrences of *diversity* and *diverse*. We can also look at stretches of text in which the key word is embedded; linguists call this collocation – literally, the company a word keeps. Examining a word's collocations can help to build up a semantic profile of that word which can contribute to revealing any underlying discourses and ideologies in the corpus. Stubbs (1996) argues that the semantic patternings revealed by these techniques can contribute to the production of certain discourses in the corpus and he defines a discourse as 'recurrent phrases and con-

ventional ways of talking, which circulate in the social world, and which form a constellation of repeated meanings' (Stubbs, 1996: 158). We are able, then, to make verifiable statements with corpus techniques, although in this paper we supplement this analysis with a more qualitative approach based on the Appraisal framework (Martin 2000; Martin and White 2005).

Most work in corpus linguistics has involved building large corpora, often consisting of millions of words, and consisting of texts taken from different genres and collected in different media. Despite this, when the purpose is to examine particular text types, such as diversity statements, a much smaller corpus can usefully uncover the language patterns which are not easily revealed by mere reading of the texts.

The corpora we have analysed here consist of diversity statements from a range of universities in the UK and US. The UK corpus consists of the research-intensive Russell group universities, e.g. LSE, Birmingham, Cambridge, and the US corpus has a similar group for comparison – a selection of Tier 1 research universities, e.g. Harvard, MIT, UCLA. The Russell group corpus has 3388 words (17 institutions) and the US research corpus has 5120 words (17 institutions). These corpora were gathered by searching university websites for diversity statements. Generally there was a one-paragraph statement with links to more particular gender, race, disability and equality statements. The former text is what was collected for the corpus. The US Research university statements are on average longer and more discursive, and this is the reason for the larger size of corpus in this case.

Appraisal Framework

The framework of Appraisal (Martin 2000; Martin and White 2005) aims to reveal a speaker/writer's intersubjective stance. In previous approaches (Fairclough 1989, 1992) this has been taken to be indicated by **modality** features in a text. These features reveal a speaker/ writer's authority in a text (relational modality) or other attitudes towards evaluation of truth (expressive modality) (Fairclough 1989: 126-7).

Authority in a text may be revealed by use of declarative sentences which assert propositions, e.g. 'the sun will rise'. There will be degrees of affinity which a speaker/ writer will wish to assert about their propositions, however, and modality choices are where equivocations and hedging are located. This may be done by adverbial choice, e.g. 'probably the sun will rise', or by choice of verb, e.g. 'I believe the sun will rise', or 'I doubt the sun will rise'. More revealing, however, are markers of **attitude**. Martin and White (2005) elaborate a framework where attitudinal markers can be further divided into markers of **Affect**, **Judgement** and **Appreciation**.

Affect indicates a speaker/ writer's emotional response embedded within a text**.** It encodes feelings of positive, negative, happy, sad etc. **Judgement** indicates assessment of behaviour or persons – veracity, normality, capability, propriety. **Appreciation** reveals the value that is assigned to things, experiences etc. It may encompass reaction (what impact did it have), composition (did it hang together), valuation (worthwhile). Broadly, these axes of the framework can be seen as assessing emotion, ethics and aesthetics (Martin and White 2005: 42).

Martin and White comment that judgement and appreciation, particularly are likely to be sedimented into everyday 'common sense' reactions to phenomena and persons. Appreciation, encodes values assigned to things, and in terms of judgement, indeed, some of these are

formalised into laws. Fairclough (1992) talks about the naturalization of discourse, so that some hegemonic discourses circulate without challenge or intervention, and achieve the status of becoming 'natural' and beyond such challenge. We aim to trace these themes in our appraisal analysis of the diversity statements.

Analysis of Corpora

See Appendix I

Word Frequency

In the following section, we start with a word frequency list as this can begin to reveal information about themes within the texts comprising the corpus. A comparison of frequent words can then suggest lexical items which we can then subject to an analysis of collocations. We compiled two lists of words which had at least 9 instances within each (separate) corpus. Using word frequency and collocation analysis together can provide a good overview of the main themes, discourses and ideologies prevalent in each of the sub-corpora and can reveal the main discursive similarities and differences between them.

We notice a similarity of frequent lexical items in these statements: *university*, *diversity*. However, there are a wider range of different lexical items deployed in the US Research statements (48) compared with the Russell group ones (30). We notice straight away that *affirmative* and *action* are no longer frequently occurring words. In fact, at just 8 tokens each, they just fail to reach the criteria we have set. This reflects the change of emphasis mentioned in the introduction from "affirmative action" to "diversity".

The categories of diversity often appear in list form, and so collocate strongly with each other. We note there is a different order of frequency for US and UK:

US	UK
Gender	Gender
Disability	Age
Sexual	Race
Race	Disability
Ethnicity	Sexual
Religion	Belief (7)
Age (9)	

We note that many of these frequent lexical items overlap with those found in university mission statements (Sauntson and Morrish, 2010): *university, student, staff*. However, many other lexical items included in the frequent word lists are what Urciuoli (2000) has termed Strategically Deployable Shifters (SDS). It is interesting to note that these nouns seem to be fairly vague and abstract. It could be argued that, because nouns such as *respect*, *community*, *diversity* and *excellence* (this last item appears only as a frequent word in the US Research corpus) are used so frequently in the statements, that their meanings start to become questionable. With so many US research universities claiming 'excellence', how can one tell

which ones really are the most excellent? SDS are defined as, "a lexical item or expression deployed in different discursive fields so that, in effect, people using term X in a referring expression in field A are engaged in a different pragmatic activity from those using the formally identical term X in field B. The salient interpretation of the term depends on the relation of its user to its audience and so shifts with context" (Urciuoli 2000). We will argue in the conclusion that it is the semantic indeterminacy of these words which reduce the reliability and integrity of the diversity statement.

Collocation

As well as word frequency, it is important to see the company a word keeps – these are collocates – words which are most often found in the same semantic environment as the target word. US Research frequent collocates include *equity* and *diversity,* as well as *diversity* and *inclusion.* The adjective *diverse* modifies *set, pipeline, community, inclusive, group*,* and *population*.

Collocates for the Russell corpus only include *equality* and *diversity*; while the adjective *diverse* modifies: *student, abilities, staff, needs and experiences, university community, population, culture, inclusive environment*, and *workforce*. There seem to be a rather broader spread of implications for the Russell group for diversity, with a more vague appeal to *culture, environment, needs* and *experiences*. The US Research group seems to view the implications of diversity more in specifically human terms of *population, group* and *community*, but significantly not *faculty*. As we will argue later, the reach of diversity may not be sustained into hiring practices.

In each corpus, the occurrence of the noun *diversity* represents about 2% of the total words. Collocates of *diversity* in the Russell group corpus are: *equality, university, policy, commitment.* In keeping with the wider range of lexical items occurring in the US Research corpus, there are also a wider range of collocates with *diversity*. These include *equity, office, staff, faculty, community, inclusion, statement, committed, excellence, promote, student, university, academic, awareness, campus, council, plan, provost.* This pattern contrasts with the finding above, that the adjective *diverse* modifies a wider range of lexical items in the UK Russell corpus, than in the US Research corpus.

Significantly, it is apparent from reading US diversity statements that there is an *office of equity and diversity*, or *diversity and inclusion*. These are the heirs of former affirmative action and multicultural campus offices, another by-product of the 1970s campus anti-discrimination efforts. In the 1990s these offices became institutionalized as offices of multiculturalism and were frequently headed by a high ranking manager, e.g., vice provost or vice president. The University of Wisconsin Madison (Tier 1 US Research corpus) acknowledges this shift thus:

> Between April 1996 and August 2006, we were known as the Equity and Diversity Resource Center and, prior to that, we were known as the Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance. The name changes reflect the evolution of our mission and the expansion of the scope of our campuswide responsibilities.

With the expansion of new managerialism in higher education, universities restructured again and their managers often reverted to director status, becoming ubiquitous as directors

of diversity and inclusion, but accountable, and therefore required to produce their own strategic plan to complement the university's revised mission and strategic plan. A statement on diversity, as Gaye Tuchman noted about one public university aiming for tier one status, proclaimed its revised mission as, "to help students prepare for life" and work in "an ever more diverse society" (2009, 166).

In the UK, a diversity office is still a rarity in universities though non Russell Group institutions are initiating them; most institutions satisfy themselves with a *policy* and a *commitment*. This difference of emphasis is further illuminated when we realise that in the US Research corpus, *community* collocates with *diversity* and *university*. Other co-occurring lexical items are *diverse, respect, inclusiveness*. On a simple analysis of frequency, it is interesting to notice almost three times as many occurrences of *community* in the US Research corpus (37:13) in which it is the 17th most frequent item whereas in the Russell group it is the 36th. Clearly, creating a diverse *community* has a much higher priority in US universities. The focus on *community* is another SDS. It can, and once did, reference the older civil rights era goals and discourse, especially the 1960s "beloved community," brotherhood of all men of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Council [SCLC]. However, it most often connects with "community engagement" which means with the institution's local community. This concern with being perceived and evaluated as "engaged" and of economic service to the local community has led the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to develop a new "classification" for higher education institutions to earn, a "community engagement" classification, developed a half dozen years ago (Zuiches et al, 2008). The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has been classifying institutions in support of its research and policy analysis since 1970 and its rankings are uniformly accepted.

By contrast, the Russell group corpus has 9 mentions of *legislation*, which does not occur in the US text. This speaks of perhaps different motivations for diversity policies; in the U.S. they are portrayed as creating community and engaging with the local community, perhaps even alluding to an historic goal; in the UK they are a required response to legislation which was also citizen driven, but more by trade unions. A sustained eight year mass campus effort for diversity by black and white US university students explains the historic, if not present, difference in emphasis (Rogers 2009). In the US the standard legally required equal opportunity/non discrimination policy is four decades old and connotes no disadvantage or "equal access at the door," whereas promoting diversity is an institutional policy to encourage the creation of an inclusive environment. This difference in focus is also apparent in the section below, where we examine linguistic indicators of attitude.

Legislation in the Russell group corpus collocates with *relevant, equality*, discrimination.* In UK statute there is anti-discrimination legislation on age, disability, gender, race and ethnicity. Of these, only disability anti-discrimination is separately specified for educational contexts (Special Educational Needs and Disability Act, 2001). The term *legislation* does not occur anywhere in the US research corpus (although University of Wisconsin-Madison does mention compliance with Federal and State laws).

The Russell group corpus features 13 occurrences of *respect*. In its nominal usage, it collocates with *dignity, understanding*. There are also 4 prepositional usages, *in respect of* which precedes *disability, gender and race, all areas of equality, recruitment and selection,* and *admissions*. There is a different selection of collocations for *respect* in the US Research corpus, which has no prepositional usages but 15 nominal ones. *Respect* collocates, often in

a listing formation, with *inclusion, accountability, engagement, dignity, diversity,* and *appreciation*, which almost suggests that these terms are viewed as partial synonyms, or at least the presence of one implies the assertion of the other terms in the list.

The US research corpus has 17 occurrences of *excellence* and this collocates with *diversity*, e.g. *excellence and diversity*; and *academic*, e.g. *academic excellence*. In the Russell corpus *excellence* collocates with *achieve** and *pursuit*. It is significant in the US corpus, that *excellence* is imagined to be achieved through *diversity*. This rhetorical linkage is absent in the Russell group corpus, and the word does not even feature at all in the frequent word list (the actual number of occurrences in the Russell group corpus is 7).

Modality

In terms of word classes, the range of adjectives is very restricted in both corpora. *Diverse* and *committed* are common to both US Research and Russell group. Verbs are restricted to mainly the copula (*is*) and auxiliary (*is, are, have*), modal verbs (*can, will, may*) for the US research. In the Russell group corpus there are common occurrences of the copula *is/ are*, and the modal auxiliary *will*. This suggests a more frequent modality position of certainty in the Russell corpus (justified by the appeal to necessary compliance with legislation), which resonates with the noun *commitment*. In contrast, US research diversity statements are formulated more as aspirations, with less certain outcome.

Some linguistic features are common to all documents written in a formal style. Sometimes a process can be expressed as an entity, e.g. the choice of 'formulation' as a noun, rather than 'we formulate' as a verb. These nominalizations are, "propositions that are fully packaged as 'things'" (Thompson 1996: 210) and they are treated in texts as fully established facts, made concrete as entities. Their status and validity is not negotiable as that of propositions is. With nominalization, it is the process which is objectified (Thompson 1996: 171) and so a human agent does not need to be specified. This is very useful in the case of diversity statements as it blurs the locus of responsibility. Fairclough (1992: 182) writes that nominalization shares a function with the passive in this way, in removing the agent. "Nominalization turns processes and activities into states and objects, concretes into abstracts". There are many instances in the US corpus where the nominalization itself is positioned as agentive and this grammatical construction is almost absent in the UK corpus. Instead, in the UK, the diversity *policy* is more often agentive. In the US corpus, however, the nominalization which is most frequently positioned as agentive is *diversity* itself, e.g.:

Columbia University
Diversity is one of the things that make Columbia vibrant, dynamic and exciting.
Dartmouth College
Diversity at all levels is critical to Dartmouth's mission of providing an environment that combines rigorous study with the excitement of discovery.

Examples of other agentive nominalizations are in bold below:

Brown University
To provide **leadership** for the **formulation** and **oversight** of policies
Exposure to a broad range of perspectives, views and outlooks is key to fostering

Arizona State
Representation reflects the extent to which our students, staff, faculty and administrators proportionately reflect the regional and national populations served by our public institution. **Inclusion** encompasses **empowerment** and voice among all members of the university community in the areas of scholarship, teaching, learning and governance.

In the final paragraph of the Brown University statement (next section below), we see a stance which indicates 'unreality' or a yet-to-be-fulfilled state. Examples are: 'seek to achieve'; 'work to ensure' and 'placing emphasis on'. These mitigate or dilute the urgency of the process or proposition, in this case the achievement of diversity and equality.

In the UK Diversity statements, conviction is more pronounced in terms of a modality of certainty and the nominalization *commitment* or the adjective *committed*. The use of present tense main verbs (e.g. protects, accepts, is treated…) and the copula 'is' act to endow these propositions with certainty.

Examples are below:

University of Glasgow
"Legislation protects the rights of these groups to ensure that discrimination is prevented and that they are given equal access to employment, education and other services. We are **committed** to compliance with all current and relevant anti discrimination legislation … By adopting this Policy the University accepts its responsibility to ensure that discrimination does not take place and that everyone in the University is treated fairly and equally. We have therefore made the **commitment** to create an inclusive environment where discrimination is challenged and equality is positively promoted".
University of Liverpool
The University of Liverpool is **committed** to promoting an environment which recognises and values people's differences, capitalises on the strengths those differences bring to the institution and supports all staff and students in maximising their potential to succeed.

Appraisal Analysis

Two exemplar diversity statements were chosen from each group. They can be considered typical in their lexical choices, but also, as we will argue, in their choice of linguistic appraisal markers. Nouns and noun phrases are in Black; adjectives in *italics*; **verbs in bold**.

Cardiff University
Equality and Diversity
Cardiff University **is** *committed* [Judgement: Positive Tenacity] to **supporting, developing and promoting** [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] equality and diversity in all of its practices and activities and **aims to establish** an *inclusive* [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] culture, *free* [Judgement: Positive Propriety] from discrimination and *based* on the values of dignity and respect.
The University **strives to achieve** [Judgement: Positive Tenacity] a *diverse* [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] student and staff body and **to ensure** [Judgement: Positive Capacity] that our vision of equality and diversity **is** at the heart of all aspects of our

work. The University **aims to promote** [Judgement: Positive Tenacity] *good* [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] relations between all members of staff and students in an environment where people's *diverse* abilities and backgrounds **are treated** with respect. Cardiff University **is** *committed* **to meeting** [Judgement: Positive Tenacity] its *legal* and *moral* [Judgement: Positive Propriety] obligations of **eliminating** discrimination [Judgement: Positive Tenacity] and **promoting** equality [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] on the grounds of age, disability, gender, race, religion or belief and sexual orientation. All staff **have** a responsibility **to comply** [Judgement: Positive Tenacity] with the University's Equality and Diversity Policy. [Word count 183]

The Cardiff University statement shows 9 (5% of word count) Judgement and 3 (1% of word count) Appreciation markers throughout the text. This pattern is typically of the Russell group corpus as a whole. Markers of judgement, especially the most frequent marker of positive tenacity indicates a commitment to dependability. Linguistic markers of judgement of social sanction (of which tenacity is one category) encode the writer's acknowledgement of legal edicts which demand compliance. These are also recognized in the use of linguistic indicators of judgement as social sanction (Judgement: positive propriety) since there may be penalties associated with non-compliance (Martin and White 2005).

Brown University
Mission :
In 2003, President Ruth J. Simmons **created** the Office of Institutional Diversity (OID) **to provide** leadership for the formulation and oversight of policies related to pluralism and equity, and **initiate** [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] programs and practices that **promote** [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] diversity, inclusion and *fair* [Judgement: Positive Propriety] treatment of all members of the community. The associate provost and director of *institutional* diversity **leads** [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] the work in OID.
The Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) **is** part of the OID. It **provides** services related to *affirmative* [Judgement: Positive Propriety] action; *equal* [Judgement: Positive Propriety] employment opportunity; sexual harassment awareness and prevention; faculty and staff employment disability management; and complaint resolution.
Philosophy:
Diversity **is** the foundation of the *academic* enterprise. Exposure to a *broad* range of perspectives, views and outlooks **is** key **to fostering** [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] both breadth and depth in *intellectual* [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] knowledge.
Diversity policies and programs at Brown **are designed** to: (1) **redress** [Judgement: Positive Propriety] *historical* patterns of exclusion and (2) **foster** [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] opportunities **to embrace** [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] the *greatest* [Appreciation: Positive Composition] mix of ideas, opinions, and beliefs so *important* [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] to the achievement of *academic* [Judgement: Positive Veracity] excellence. Accordingly, the term diversity **is used** at Brown in the *broadest* [Appreciation: Positive Composition] sense **to encompass** many things such as race, color, religion, age, national and ethnicity origin, disability, status as a veteran, language, socio-economic background, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression,

> political ideology, theoretical approach and the list can go on. It is through the interaction among individuals from a *diverse* [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] set of experiences, histories and backgrounds that *true intellectual* [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] diversity **is achieved** [Resultative].
> At Brown, we **seek to achieve** [Judgement: Positive Tenacity] diversity in our *living, learning* and *working* environments by **placing** emphasis on [Judgement: Positive Tenacity] the recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff from a *wide* range of backgrounds and experiences. We also **work to ensure** [Judgement: Positive Tenacity] diversity in our *curricular* and *co-curricular* offerings, and we **invest** [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] in the *structural* supports **needed to manage** our *lively, provocative,* and *stimulating* [Appreciation: Positive Valuation] community. [Word count 365]

The Brown University statement contains 7 (2% of word count) Judgement and 14 (4% of word count) Appreciation markers throughout the text. Clearly in this text, and typically in the US Research corpus as a whole, linguistic markers of Appreciation predominate. Appreciation, as has already been stated, encodes the writer's views on the value of things. Most of the markers of appreciation concern positive valuation, indicating how beneficial or worthwhile the proposition is. These statements reference judgements (or appeals to legal edict) very little, although judgements of morality (propriety) are present.

Conclusion and Some Implications

A comparison of concordances, collocations and keywords, using Wordsmith corpus analysis software, suggests that there are differences between US and UK diversity statements, significant enough that they cannot be said to conform to the same 'genre'. Despite the lack of an identifiable generic template across US and UK diversity statements, we find in the texts a common set of categories of diversity. There is also overall similarity in terms of vocabulary choice and of grammatical structures used (nominalizations, modalities etc). However, we find that diversity statements conform less to a generic structure than university mission statements (Sauntson and Morrish 2010). Most commonly, UK Russell group diversity statements display a modality position of certainty, which resonates with the noun *commitment*. Diversity is seen as broadening the culture and experience of students. In contrast, US Research university diversity statements are formulated more as aspirations, and focus on benefit to the *community*, but are framed with a less certain outcome. The use of nominalizations as grammatical agent blurs the locus of agency and responsibility. Instead, in the US Research corpus, diversity is seen to be endorsed as 'a good thing' and signified in the texts by multiple markers of appreciation. However in the UK Russell corpus, the force of legislation inspires the frequent appeal to markers of judgement.

The word frequency analysis of the diversity statements suggests that they are largely made up of semantically vague lexical items – Strategically Deployable Shifters (Urciuoli (2000) - which contribute little to the overall meanings of the statements. It is precisely because the merit of these items; *excellence, diversity, respect,* even *equality* is beyond criticism that they are rarely the sites of overt struggle in the academy (Sauntson and Morrish 2010). SDSs are multi-functional and polysemic abstractions which seem to invoke virtue and fair play. They are not quantifiable, and, even though they may be subject to audit, the parameters of their measure will also shift with great regularity. Urciuoli (2000) has remarked that their

meaning is secondary in importance to the *invocation* of *diversity*, *excellence* etc. In a later article, Urciuoli (2003) noted that the use of *diversity* is relatively recent, and that this strategically deployable shifter has displaced a previous buzzword - *multiculturalism*. Whereas *multiculturalism* signified racial identity and "membership in a group historically located outside of the walls of corporate life", *diversity* and its collocate *excellence* seem to resonate with precisely these alignments. Moreover, the semantic range of *diversity* encompasses identities which cannot be accommodated by the assumed racial otherness of *multiculturalism*: gender, age, sexual identity etc. In other words, *diversity* is a marketable signifier – its invocation masquerades as the cultural capital of the university, to be bestowed on all who tread within its walls and resonating with the promise of corporate success. Maher and Tetreault (2007: 5) argue that the term diversity was formerly seen as impeding excellence. Now, it appears in the US statements, at least, that diversity is a pre-requisite for excellence. Universities may even compete with each other to become employers of choice for women and previously excluded groups (Bendix-Petersen and Davies 2010 forthcoming). In this way, in the US corpus, universities can make the claim that *excellence* is imagined to be achieved through *diversity*. Indeed, this term features frequently in the marketing literature of US universities (Urciuoli, 2003). By contrast, UK Russell group universities imply that they will develop excellence in their diverse population.

In our findings, we suggest that in the UK Russell Group corpus, the adjective *committed* signals an attitude consistent with meeting an obligation imposed by the legally-binding legislation. This sits in contrast to our finding that US Research statements indicate appreciation and an inherent value attributed to diversity. The US Research group seems to view the implications of diversity in more specifically human terms of *population*, *group* and *community*, but significantly not *faculty*. In fact, there is very little focus on what is perhaps the most important factor in diversifying a campus, and creating leadership – hiring. In our US Research corpus, *recruitment* of faculty is mentioned just three times, and *hiring* just once. Moreover, despite the appeals to legislation, *recruitment* is mentioned just twice in the UK Russell Group corpus, and then not specifically to academic staff. Even in the face of mandatory diversity policies and statements of intent to diversify the faculty of university campuses, there has been little success in achieving this stated goal. Maher and Tetreault (2007) write that faculty whose intellectual interests most closely reflect the interests of diversity are rarely offered the endorsement of an academic department, or granted the relative autonomy of hiring new members (2007: 26). In this omission, universities reveal the gulf between what they say and what they do when required to render themselves auditable (Bendix-Petersen and Davies 2010 forthcoming). While gender equity assumes a high profile in terms of 'performance indicators', and actual percentages of women and minoritized faculty and students may increase, this is rarely accompanied by institutional and structural change.

Bendix-Petersen and Davies (2010 forthcoming), citing Deleuze (1994) distinguish between approaches to diversity which are categorical, as opposed to those which are continuous. The former seeks to attain measurable outcomes in terms of auditable categories of persons. The Deleuzian or continuous approach to diversity is concerned with creating new forms of knowledge or research, and allowing difference to evolve, rather than bringing it back within the realm of the 'same'. Thus, difference should give one a competitive edge, but not threaten the status quo; what is preferred is a kind of conservative difference (Bendix-Petersen and Davies 2010 forthcoming).

Most often in these statements, *diversity* is seen as the property of individuals, and is congruent, then, with the project of the neoliberal university (Urciuoli 2003). Some diversity must be visible to be convincing. In effecting this substitution, universities have evaded the social history of the term *multiculturalism*, together with its connotations of pluralism and disadvantage. It remains to be argued, however, who *has* diversity in the academy. It is not clear from the corpora we have collected, which individuals embody this, and precisely whether that property renders them central or marginal to the academy. Other measures need to be applied. We may surmise that some individuals embody a pre-approved categorical status which renders them valuable to the university in achieving its necessary targets which are published in strategic plans and mission statements and publicized on website recruitment pages. Since the quality of diversity resides materially or bodily in the individual, the fact that they have been admitted as students or hired as faculty and staff, is the realisation of the goal or the core value of the university. *Inclusion*, which connotes acceptance and belonging, is too empty a term, too undefined to be auditable, thereby it forecloses contestation.

The way in which these policies are presented and communicated acts to constrain expressions of resistance and further marginalizes those who identify as different within the academy, especially ALAANA students in the US and racialized minorities and immigrants in the UK. As several students characterized their campus to one of us, "all of the diversity here is on the campus website, not the classroom."

References

Bendix-Petersen, E. and Davies, B. 2010 forthcoming. In/Difference in the neoliberal university. LATISS (Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences).

Deleuze, G. 1994. *Difference and Repetition*. Trans. Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Oxford: Polity Press.

General Medical Council. 2007. Valuing diversity Guide-General Principles of Anti-Discrimination Legislation. *http://www.gmc-uk.org/about/valuing_diversity_anti_discrimination.asp. Accessed 11 March 2010.*

Gombrich, Richard. 2000. British Higher Education Policy in the last Twenty Years: The Murder of a Profession. *http://www.atm.damtp.cam.ac.uk/people/mem/papers/LHCE/uk-higher-education.html* 28th January 2000

Katznelson, Ira. 2005. *When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth Century America*. NY: W.W.Norton & Co.

Maher, Frances A. and Tetreault, Mary K.T. 2007. *Privilege and Diversity in the Academy*. New York: Routledge.

Martin, J.R. and White, P.R.R. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Martin, J.R. 2000. Beyond exchange: appraisal systems in English. In Hunston, S. and Thompson, G. (eds.) *Evaluation in Text. Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 142-75.

Rogers, Ibram. 2009. On the American Black Campus Movement in 1968. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*. 21:4. 464-473.

Scott, M. 1996. *Wordsmith Tools*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stubbs, M. 1996. *Text and Corpus Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sauntson, Helen and Morrish, Liz. 2010. Vision, values and international excellence: The 'products' that university mission statements sell to students. In Molesworth Mike, Nixon, Elizabeth and Scullion, Richard (Eds). *The Marketisation of UK Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*. London: Routledge.

Tapia, Richard A. 2007. True Diversity Doesn't Come from Abroad. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 54:5. B34.

Thompson, G. 1996. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Tuchman, G. 2009. *Wannabe U: Inside the Corporate University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Urciuoli, Bonnie. 2003. Excellence, leadership, skills, diversity: marketing liberal arts education. *Language and Communication*. 23. 3-4. 385-408

Urciuoli, Bonnie. 2000. Strategically deployable shifters in college marketing, or just what do they mean by 'skills' and 'leadership' and 'multiculturalism' ? Language and Culture Symposium 6. *http://language-culture.binghampton.edu/symposia/6/index.html*

Woog, Dan. 2008. What Affirmative Action and Inclusion Mean to Workers. *http://career-advice.monster.com/job-search-essentials/diversity-inclusion/*

Zuiches, James J. & The N.C. State Community Engagement Task Force. 2008. Attaining Carnegie's Community Engagement Classification. *Change*. January/February 2008, 42-45

Appendix I

Frequency of Content Words = or > 9 Nouns are in Black; Adjectives in Blue; Verbs in Red

UK Russell Group

University	81
Equality	76
Diversity	69
Staff	33
Students	27
Discrimination	25
Committed	20
Policy	20
People	16
Environment	14
Community	13
Gender	13
Members	13
Opportunity	13
Respect	13
Diverse	12

Ensure	12
Age	11
Race	11
Achieve	10
Action	10
Disability	10
Potential	10
Sexual	10
Aim	9 (5 verbal usages)
Inclusive	9
Legislation	9
Orientation	9
Promoting	9
Support	9

UK Russell Group

University	81
Equality	76
Diversity	69
Staff	33
Students	27
Discrimination	25
Committed	20
Policy	20
People	16
Environment	14
Community	13
Gender	13
Members	13
Opportunity	13
Respect	13
Diverse	12

Ensure	12
Age	11
Race	11
Achieve	10
Action	10
Disability	10
Potential	10
Sexual	10
Aim	9 (5 verbal usages)
Inclusive	9
Legislation	9
Orientation	9
Promoting	9
Support	9

About the Authors

Dr. Kathleen K. OMara
Professor of History and Africana Studies, Kathleen O'Mara's primary research areas are Western and Northern Africa, especially urban history, gender and sexuality. Her current project is a history of Tema, Ghana and the emergence of new social networks and communities in greater Accra. She also has researched and published on US LGBTQ campus organizations, and other aspects of contemporary academic life including diversity, affirmative action, women's academic leadership and marketization.

Dr. Elizabeth Morrish
Dr. Liz Morrish who possesses a PhD in Phonetics from Leeds University is subject head of linguistics at Nottingham Trent University, UK. She is active in research in linguistics and queer theory and co-authored with Helen Sauntson New Perspectives on Language and Sexual Identity (Palgrave, 2007.She also manages the blog Resisting the Neoliberal Academy.