Re-examining and developing the notion of academic citizenship: a critical literature review

ALBIA, Joclarisse and CHENG, Ming <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7310-4981>

Citation:

Copyright and re-use policy

Higher Education Quarterly WILEY

Re-examining and developing the notion of academic citizenship: A critical literature review

Joclarisse Albia[1] 🔟 | Ming Cheng[2]

[1]Faculty of Education, Edge Hill University, Ormskirk, UK

[2]Sheffield Institute of Education, College of Social Sciences and Arts, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK

Correspondence
Joclarisse Albia, Faculty of Education, Edge Hill University, St. Helens Rd., Ormskirk L39 4QP, UK.
Email: 24323390@edgehill.ac.uk, clarissealbia@gmail.com

Abstract

The notion of academic citizenship has been largely associated with the service role which is a part of academic work seen as additional to teaching and research. The changing landscapes of higher education and the increasing diversity of academic work have prompted debates on what academic citizenship means. This paper challenges the conventional association of academic citizenship with the service role and presents a critical review of the key themes and issues explored in extant literature on the subject. Drawing upon the general view of citizenship as practice, it proposes that the different dimensions of academic work be seen integratively, with academic citizenship reframed beyond the service role. We argue that academic citizenship needs to be conceptualised as a practice of enactment, that is, by the values, processes and means by which it is enacted and asserted as academics draw on freedoms, autonomy and individual motivations.

KEYWORDS
academic citizenship, academic work, engagement, institutional culture, service role

1 | INTRODUCTION

The notion of academic citizenship is a key debate in higher education studies. Primarily it has been explored in relation to academic roles and functions and conventionally associated with the "service" dimension of academic

work, that is, activities outside of teaching and research intended to support the university and its civic mission in wider society (Macfarlane, 2005, 2007; Ward, 2003). The wide array of activities that fall within this service role—from administration and management, to reviewing articles and supporting peers, and engaging in knowledge exchange (Pfeifer, 2016)—and the increasing diversity of academic work as a result of changes in higher education landscapes (Blair, 2018; Whitchurch, 2009) make academic citizenship a complex concept. It is a topic that can be intertwined with conversations on evolving academic identities, the rights and obligations of academics, and on power and autonomy in the university, amongst many things. In management research, some studies have approached academic citizenship as the service role from the lens of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB)—discretionary and altruistic acts linked to other variables such as institutional culture, organisational commitment, job satisfaction and performance (Callaghan et al., 2016; Hammer et al., 2019; Inelmen et al., 2017). To say that the subject remains under-researched (Beatson et al., 2022) is not only an understatement; the general unfamiliarity of the term within the wider academic community also invites an exploration into how it has been understood and discussed so far in the literature.

The purpose of this literature review is two-fold. First, it aims to analyse and synthesise the current literature on academic citizenship by looking into how this notion has been discussed and elaborated, including some of the emerging issues in the ongoing discourse. Second, the review also seeks to identify—and question—the assumptions that have underpinned the conventional understandings of academic citizenship as part of critically re-examining and developing this concept. We do this in the Discussion section where we draw upon perspectives of citizenship as practice (Andreouli, 2019; Condor, 2011) and propose that academic citizenship should be approached as more than a set of activities described or defined as "service". Academic citizenship should be examined as a *practice of enactment*, one that pays attention not only to the undertaking of certain activities having moral, altruistic or civic merit but also to how academics draw on freedoms, autonomy, values and individual motivations in their participation in a range of academic work viewed integratively.

2 | METHODOLOGY

The paper is based on a literature review of 47 articles that offer theoretical, conceptual and empirical perspectives on academic citizenship. These articles were selected from bibliographic databases such as EBSCO and WorldCat. Firstly, keyword searches were done to identify the texts. We used as primary keywords "academic citizenship" and "faculty citizenship". The initial search yielded over 140 texts that also featured related keywords including "service", "academic service", "faculty engagement" and "organisational citizenship behaviour". Secondly, these texts were sorted to identify those that were relevant for this review. For articles to be considered, they had to be published in English, no earlier than 2000, and appearing in journals, books (or as book chapters), reports, and/or as part of a conference presentation/proceeding. Their abstracts were then read and reviewed.

As we were interested in exploring discourses on this subject in the specific context of higher education and in relation to academic work and roles, we decided to exclude texts that focused on students and those that did not pertain to higher education such as secondary school settings. We also excluded several articles that carried relevant keywords such as "academic citizenship behaviour" but upon closer scrutiny of their abstracts showed that they leaned more towards management topics and were less focused on dimensions of academic work. Texts that contained relevant keywords in their titles/abstracts and/or discussed notions of academic work but were published earlier than 2000 were considered instead as seminal work. At this stage, the final list of 47 texts was settled. Each of the articles was read in full to extract data which were then organised into themes according to the key questions that guided our review:

- What conceptual perspectives have been used to describe and define academic citizenship?
- What issues have emerged concerning discussions of academic citizenship?

Of the 47 articles considered in this review, 25 were empirical papers, whereas 22 were conceptual papers which focused on theoretical and/or conceptual discussions in the form of books/book chapters, reports, commentaries and discussion essays in journals. Of the 25 texts drawn from empirical studies, 15 were qualitative in design, comprising mostly single- and multi-site case studies, with one an ethnography and another a phenomenological study. The remainder employed quantitative (mainly surveys) and mixed methods designs. These empirical articles were largely from the US context, a few were from the UK, and the rest were studies from other countries including Hungary, China, Italy, Russia, South Korea, Sweden, South Africa and Turkey. Texts which did not mention a specific country of practice (including many of the conceptual papers) were designated as referring to general academia/higher education context (see Table 1).

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Conceptual perspectives in the understandings of academic citizenship

As presented in Table 1, 35 of the 47 selected texts explicitly described and positioned their discussion of academic citizenship as "service" or referred to this third role within academic work. Twelve of these 35 articles explored definitions and typologies of the service role as academic citizenship; academics' perceptions and attitudes towards the service dimension of academic work; examples and forms of these service activities; and the extent to which this service role as academic citizenship is valued in universities and wider academic settings. A similar number of articles, many of them from the US, discussed the concept of academic citizenship specifically as a form of civic service or public engagement.

Eight articles approached academic citizenship as institutional service and explored related issues such as institutional autonomy, governance and attitudes towards administrative and institutional work. A small number of these "service-themed" texts on the subject applied the conceptual lens of organisational citizenship behaviour to elaborate on academics' participation and engagement in service activities as forms of academic citizenship behaviour. The remaining 12 of the 47 articles which did not explicitly explore academic citizenship as the "service" role, featured broad strokes of discussion. These included articles that talked about academic citizenship in relation to general ideas of citizenship obligations, academic work and roles, the third mission of the university, and associated concepts such as academic labour, geographies of space, and sense of being and otherness.

3.1.1 | Service: A catch-all term for academic citizenship

As reflected in the great majority of the texts reviewed, what emerges as a dominant conceptual frame in discussions of academic citizenship in current literature is its association with the service dimension of academic work. Indeed, the University of York (2022) provides an apt illustration of this association as it defines academic citizenship as "activities additional to 'normal' teaching and research" (para. 1). The US-based Mount St Joseph University (2022) describes faculty citizenship as "supporting the primary role of teaching" (p. 2). Similarly the University of Exeter (2022) lists a range of activities that come under this service function ranging from undertaking committee and administrative or managerial roles, to taking part in community and outreach activities.

In the texts examined, typologies of "service" as academic citizenship have been offered. The most simplistic of these is the binary categorisation of internal and external service where the former pertains to activities supporting the institution (students, departments and university) and the latter relates to contributions to the discipline and broader profession and the wider public community (Ward, 2003). Other authors such as Macfarlane (2006, 2007) have described academic citizenship as a tier of the service role: service to students, collegial service, institutional service, service to the discipline or profession, and public or civic service. These ideations consider

TABLE 1 Summary of texts reviewed.

Article type		
Empirical papers	25	
Conceptual papers	22	
Books/book chapters	4	
Commentaries/discussion essays	17	
Report	1	
Study design (for empirical papers)		
Qualitative studies	15	
Single case studies	6	
Comparative/multi-site cases	7	
Ethnography	1	
Phenomenology	1	
Quantitative studies	6	
Mixed methods	4	
Contexts of texts[a]		
General academia/higher education	15	
US	18	
UK	7	
Australia	8	
Europe	4	Some texts specific to certain countries, e.g., Sweden, Hungary, Italy
China	1	
Russia	1	
South Korea	1	
Turkey	1	
South Africa	1	
Themes[a]		
General citizenship	12	
Academic citizenship as "service"	35	
Defining academic citizenship as service	12	Typologies/categories/examples of service role activities; rewards and promotion of service activities; perceptions, views and attitudes towards service role activities; mapping service activities as academic citizenship; decline of academic citizenship
Institutional service	8	Administration and management as form of institutional service; perceptions towards institutional service; engagement in institutional service; institutional autonomy; institutional work as contribution of the academic citizen

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Civic service/public engagement as academic citizenship	12	Civic service as scholarship of engagement; academic culture and institutional structure and promotion of civic/public scholarship; integrating civic service in teaching and research
Service work as organisational citizenship behaviour	3	Engagement in service activities in relation to wellbeing, academic traditions/institutional culture, engagement, collegiality
Total number of texts reviewed	47	

[a]Multiple responses/recording.

academic staff as members of these units and communities, and position the service work they do as their contributions and responsibilities as "valued integral academic citizens" (University of Exeter, 2022, para. 1). This positioning of the service role as part of academic work would appear to be derived from Boyer's (Boyer, 1990) scholarship of application/engagement (service), one of the four types of scholarship expected of academics along with the scholarship of teaching and learning, scholarship of discovery (research), and scholarship of integration (interdisciplinary work).

3.1.2 | Service as broad form of engagement

Academic citizenship as the service role in this sense can be regarded as a form of engagement to emphasise the act of participating in the various communities with which academics identify. Szelenyi and Rhoads' article (2013) specifies four quadrants of academic citizenship and maps academics' engagement in their work along scopes of reach (local or global) and their alignment with individualist or collectivist intentions. The first quadrant is called locally informed collectivism and is evidenced in activities where the academic engages at the local level outside of the self and family, for example delivering philanthropic activities to help the local community. The second is globally informed collectivism where one partakes in activities that contribute to collective action at the broader levels of the nation, region and the world. An example is integrating critical social perspectives in teaching and instruction of students. The third quadrant is referred to as locally informed individualism, with examples of activities that focus on the academic's personal success and rights, such as taking on roles in the university as part of professional development or career advancement. Finally, the fourth quadrant is globally informed collectivism, which looks at an academic's personal and individual engagements to develop a richer understanding of the wider community, such as one's membership in professional organisations (Szelenyi & Rhoads, 2013).

These quadrants illustrate academic citizenship as the "range of academic decisions and actions" (Szelenyi & Rhoads, 2013, p. 428) that staff undertake in relation to their working lives and professional commitment. The typology also seems to suggest that academic citizenship is not limited to "service" activities. This lends support to arguments that a more integrated outlook towards academic work—and certainly on these three functions—should be applied (Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007; Colbeck, 2002). Moreover, in positioning academic citizenship as the engagement in a broad range of activities that can be either inward- (for the individual) or outward-facing (as community member), the four quadrants model also acknowledges the role of intrinsic and personal influences in one's participation. This coheres with the idea that intrinsic motivation figures in academics' engagement in certain forms of academic work, that is, their work is driven not just by their desire or the expected responsibility to contribute to the wider common good of the university or the discipline, but also by their own personal and professional motivations (Shaker, 2012).

3.1.3 | Service as a form of organisational citizenship behaviour

Other commentators have used the management concept of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) to examine the service role as academic citizenship. Here, academic citizenship as service has been explored in relation to motivation, performance, organisational efficiency and functioning. Studies by Hammer et al. (2019) and Lawrence et al. (2012), for instance, have looked at the relationships between academics' organisational commitment, service to the institution and their academic citizenship behaviour. What appears different in this positioning of academic citizenship is that the OCB perspective regards the undertaking of these service activities as discretionary behaviour driven more by individual choice (Podsakoff et al., 2000) rather than as part of their formal job description or as a form of responsibility (Tagliaventi et al., 2019). Whereas for other commentators, academic citizenship as the service role is *expected* in that it brings obligation that academics must uphold, the OCB lens frames academic citizenship as service which is voluntary and rendered beyond the academic's call of duty. It is also a civic virtue that emanates from the academic's commitment to the organisation (Podsakoff et al., 2000). In other words, activities within this service role as academic citizenship stem from one's sense of altruism, are not necessarily part of the job, and therefore any reward or pay may also be discretionary.

3.2 | Issues emerging in discussions on academic citizenship as service

In this section, we present some of the key contextual issues surrounding the subject of academic citizenship in the papers reviewed. Some of the texts covered many issues but gave more weight and emphasis on certain themes of interest. We have highlighted here the issues upon which we base our argument for a critical re-examination of the subject of academic citizenship.

3.2.1 | Influence of university traditions and institutional culture

The positioning of academics as members of or belonging to multiple communities (Brackmann, 2015; Pfeifer, 2016) situates the work they do, along with their rights and responsibilities, within these communities or units. It is then through these communities where understandings and constructions of citizenship are formed and, more importantly, where academic citizenship is established and validated. As Tienou (2018) has suggested, the discussion of academic citizenship should be framed within these communities as it is one's belongingness in a community that merits the "deliberate practice of citizenship" (p. 27). In most cases, the common frame of reference for this "community" is the university or institutional community.

Macfarlane (2006, 2007) claimed that the different traditions of universities in the UK and US point to distinct areas of focus. He asserts that UK universities draw from Oxbridge ideals of autonomy and self-governance and that they emphasise the institutional service dimension of citizenship, whereas in the US discourse, there is a stronger leaning towards the civic and public dimension of the service role as academic citizenship (Macfarlane, 2006). O'Meara et al. (2011) appeared to support this claim as they observed that in the US, common keywords associated with the service role included service-learning, community engagement, and extension. The texts from the US included in this review seemed to confirm this as their exploration of academic service work largely focused on themes of wider engagement, such as the institutionalisation of civic and community engagement in universities (Brackmann, 2015; Sandmann & Weerts, 2008; Shaker, 2012), or academics' perceptions of their civic service activities (Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007; Buchanan et al., 2006). In contrast, most of the empirically based articles from the UK explored academic citizenship as the service role more specifically from the angle of institutional service, with focus on academics' perspectives on

their administration and university service activities in relation to the performative cultures of the institution (Bolden et al., 2014; Macfarlane, 2011; Pedersen & Minnotte, 2018).

Insights from these studies have pointed to the influence of institutional cultures in academics' understandings of their service role and subsequently their ideations of academic citizenship and being academic citizens. Institutional cultures reflecting university missions that promote a sense of involvement with the community, can encourage staff's wider civic engagement (as in the case of the US), particularly if the necessary structural support such as staff training and funding are provided (O'Meara et al., 2011; Shaker, 2012). Similarly, in the UK, the role of university leadership in shaping wider institutional culture has been highlighted as crucial to address the feelings of isolation and vulnerability of staff as they participate in institutional service work (Bolden et al., 2014; Pedersen & Minnotte, 2018).

3.2.2 | Performative culture and the decline of academic citizenship

There has been an observed imbalance in the three key dimensions of academic work: teaching, research and service, with less attention given to service than to teaching and research (Thompson et al., 2006). Studies have found that service, particularly institutional service, remains a commitment that many academics in the UK find overwhelming (Knight & Trowler, 2000). Research shows that service obligations can negatively impact staff's research productivity, disproportionately affecting women academics (Pedersen & Minnotte, 2018). These echo the findings of an earlier study in the US by Misra et al. (2011) which reported that more women associate professors tended to take on major service roles; and whilst male and female academics spent the same amount of time on activities deemed as service to the profession, women academics spent more time than their male peers on institutional service work. In South Korea, Shin (2010) reported that academics spent an average of 6.0 h every week on administrative work and 4.7 h on other forms of service activities. He also observed that compared with their Western peers, South Korean academics spent more time on off-campus or external service activities and less time on on-campus (administrative) service.

The imbalance of the roles is further highlighted in reward schemes, particularly in certain types of institutions such as research universities where academics may be less interested in teaching and community engagement than in research outcomes (O'Meara, 2011). The study by Tagliaventi et al. (2019) on the interplay of research and academic citizenship amongst Italian academics observed an "organisational paradox" (p. 7) as academics found it difficult to integrate their research and service functions because the latter is not properly rewarded. They also noted that some institutions only recognised external or public service but not forms of institutional citizenship. Macfarlane (2006) shared a similar observation that the service role is not adequately addressed in rewards and promotion guidelines despite the fact that institutional mission statements in some UK and overseas universities articulated the value of the service role. Szelenyi and Rhoads' (2013) comparative study of Chinese and Hungarian academics likewise found that academics who were high achieving and academically competitive in research tended to have a lower sense of institutional obligation. They observed in these staff a more inward orientation that favours self or personal goals more than broader, outward-looking aims. As commentators have pointed out, the service role tends to be regarded as "mindless activity" (Ward, 2003, p. 11) or simply an add-on (Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007). These tendencies, along with the performative culture in universities that privilege research performance, result in what has been observed as the decline of academic citizenship (Beatson et al., 2022; O'Meara, 2011; Sandmann & Weerts, 2008).

3.2.3 | Influence of the discipline

Part of this observed decline, particularly in as far as institutional service is concerned, can also be linked to academics' loyalty and attachment to their discipline or what has been dubbed the 'cosmopolitan attitudes' of staff

(Clark, 1987; Macfarlane, 2011; Thompson et al., 2006). This contrasts with localised attitudes wherein academics have more loyalty to their institution than to their discipline (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). The discipline is regarded as separate from the university and greatly influences how academics organise their activities, with most academics tending to view academic work as more a disciplinary endeavour rather than as distinct research or teaching at the university (Malcolm & Zukas, 2009). This certainly suggests that primacy is given to the discipline as the community through which academic work is positioned, whilst treating the university as a secondary space, more a geophysical site where work for the discipline can be located.

Standards of the discipline also prescribe what is valued as scholarly academic engagement. Some disciplines are more receptive to certain types of service activities (O'Meara et al., 2011), in turn influencing how institutional reward schemes are devised. Mainly in the US context, studies have found that academics in the applied and hard sciences were more likely to report their public engagements than their peers in the pure and soft sciences (Doberneck & Schweitzer, 2017). Those in education, agriculture and health tended to report their service work as community engagement and contribution, more so than those in mathematics, science and the humanities (Vogelgesang et al., 2010). Concerning knowledge exchange as part of the service role (and as such, as academic citizenship), hard forms of knowledge exchange activities such as patenting and spin-off firms were more common in engineering and science subjects, whilst softer forms such as consultancies were the norm in social sciences, arts and humanities (Philpott et al., 2011).

In this matter of situating academic work and subsequently academic citizenship, Clark (1987) pointed to the department as the space where work in the discipline and the institution can converge. Vogelgesang et al. (2010) took a similar view that the culture of the department can play a role in fostering certain forms of engagement. This invites an examination into how departments, as the space where the university and discipline practice meet, are shaping the articulation and understanding of academic work and, ultimately, their role in fostering academic citizenship.

3.2.4 | Politics of service work

Power relationships are critical in discussions on academic citizenship (Sümer et al., 2020). Some of the texts reviewed for this article pointed to the privileging of certain forms of service, such as external and public service, over on-campus service activities like those connected to administration and student and teaching objectives (Macfarlane, 2007; Shin, 2010; Tagliaventi et al., 2019), an issue that contributes to the decreased sense of institutional citizenship. Intersections with other variables such as gender and rank have also been explored. In the US, more junior academics were found to serve in less prestigious committees such as curriculum groups, whilst senior academics were on governance and personnel committees (Porter, 2007). Studies in the UK and US have also revealed that women academics and those from minority groups tend to deal with more committee work and institutional service than their male peers (Pedersen & Minnotte, 2018; Vogelgesang et al., 2010).

These observations from the empirical studies we reviewed have resonance in Sümer et al.'s (2020) proposition of gendered academic citizenship. Here, the authors present a different typology of academic citizenship, one which maps the interplay of employment contracts and gender with the rights, recognition and decision-making participation of academics. On one end of this spectrum of citizenship types is full academic citizenship characterised by a strong sense of membership, belonging and recognition; it is common amongst tenured academics and those on permanent and full-time contracts. This full academic citizenship yields a high sense of autonomy and the scope for staff to participate fully in decision making. The other end of the spectrum is non-citizenship, which can be observed amongst part-time academics including PhD candidates and those on short-term contracts. This group enjoys few basic entitlements, are seen as disposable by their institutions, and have no voice in decision making. In between these two groups in the typology are limited academic citizenship and transitional academic citizenship, often associated with junior staff including postdocs and early career academics. They occupy less prestigious academic positions, have lesser benefits and entitlements, and have limited

voice in institutional decision making. It is these two groups in the mid-spectrum where most women academics can be found. The authors noted that women academics who hold less prestigious institutional positions and with poorer promotion prospects than full citizens tended to have limited citizenship; and women who are early career researchers or in their postdoc period tended to have transient membership and a limited sense of belonging, therefore a transitional form of citizenship (Sümer et al., 2020). These insights into the micropolitics of service work (Macfarlane, 2007) provide further support to observations that the service function is undervalued, as well as illustrate the intricate dynamics of the service role in certain groups of academics.

4 | DISCUSSION: A RETHINKING OF ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP AS "SERVICE"

The association of academic citizenship with the service role as revealed in our review of texts seems to point to its anchoring to the view of citizenship as a function of status. This derives from traditional Marshallian ideas of citizenship wherein the individual, as a member of a legal or political unit, has certain rights and responsibilities (Lister & Pia, 2008; Turner, 1997). Apart from conferring entitlements, citizenship involves the obligation to contribute to the community (Leydet, 2017) or, in the case of institutional citizenship particularly, to the functioning of the university. It also very much echoes republican and communitarian views of citizenship that position the individual as part of a public sphere and with a duty to contribute to the common good (Dagger, 2002; Lister & Pia, 2008). Even from the perspective of organisational citizenship behaviour where such service work is seen as voluntary and not formally part of the job, the academic citizen's altruistic and voluntary contribution and engagement in the affairs of the community is a civic virtue that contributes to the good of the organisation. This traditional perspective of citizenship is also underpinned by the "good citizen" model of citizenship (Stevenson et al., 2015) where the academic is regarded as a good worker-citizen who shares and identifies with the values of the organisation and undertakes forms of service work as part of a civic and moral responsibility. These would provide support to the observation that the subject of academic citizenship is mainly considered as a "virtuous undertaking" (Davids, 2022, p. 2) because of its association with values such as loyalty and commitment, and the university and academic's sense of obligation and contribution to wider society.

Yet, some critics argue that this traditional approach to citizenship tends to overlook the fact that citizens do not always obey prescribed rules or mandated duties. They can challenge them or make claims on the entitlements they possess, effectively allowing them to renegotiate meanings of citizenship (Andreouli, 2019; Haste, 2004; Isin, 2008). As such, citizenship must instead be approached as a practice (Andreouli, 2019) or a construct in order to unpack its complexities and ambiguities (Condor, 2011). This alternative view in general citizenship discourse finds relevance in our examination of academic citizenship given the shifts in contemporary higher education settings wherein, as White (2013) remarked, there is a clear tension between the public and private spheres of academia. Certainly, the changing nature of academic work, driven by equally dynamic higher education landscapes, merits deeper investigations into how academics are navigating certain tensions in their contexts in light of these shifts, and how they are re-constructing ideas of what it means to be an academic citizen.

Undoubtedly, attempts in extant literature to categorise academic citizenship into forms and typologies of the service role have been helpful in offering essentialist and normative views of academics' "service" duties. What these typologies in the literature have reiterated is the fact that academics—and the scope of their participation in academic work—are not limited to a single group or community such as the university (institution). In our review, we find that the studies and papers that explored perceptions and attitudes towards service activities have been helpful in bringing to light the privileging of certain forms of academic work and in developing conversations on the less important dimension that is the service role. However, what is lacking in the available literature on this subject, including these typologies of academic citizenship as service, is critical questioning of academics themselves on how they regard themselves as *academic citizens* and in what ways they are constituting and enacting

their citizenship within their spheres of community, especially in the face of performative tensions and issues of power and institutional autonomy.

The conventional (if not synonymous) association of academic citizenship with the service dimension of academic work also offers a prescriptive and reductionist perspective of academic citizenship as confined to this third role. Some of these service activities—for instance, pastoral care of students, research-related mentoring of colleagues, or programme leadership as part of administration—reflect and overlap with the teaching and research functions. As studies such as those by Tagliaventi et al. (2019) and Colbeck (2002) have rightly observed, whilst the three dimensions of teaching, research and service are thought to be discrete roles, in reality it is difficult to categorise academic activities solely under one of these roles. This assertion is even more relevant in light of observations that the boundaries of these traditional notions of academic work are becoming more blurred (Blair, 2018), necessitating the adoption of a more integrative frame when looking at academic work (Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007). One can argue that this is where the conundrum of associating academic citizenship with the service role lies. Is this third role—service—a fitting equivalent or characterisation of the notion of academic citizenship? Where do the boundaries of academic citizenship as service lie vis-à-vis teaching and research?

Applying the view of citizenship as practice (Andreouli, 2019; Condor, 2011) to the understanding of academic citizenship can accommodate, firstly, a more integrative outlook on academic work, and secondly and consequently, a conceptualisation of the concept of academic citizenship that is more rich and encompassing and goes beyond its association with the service role. This standpoint demands attention to how academics as citizens are making sense of their experiences within their social and cultural contexts (Haste, 2004) and the role of structures and institutions in the constitution of their citizenship (Stevenson et al., 2015). We exploratively refer to this view of academic citizenship as a *practice of enactment*. It invites the framing of academic citizenship as a process by which academics assert and enact claims, rights and entitlements as they carry out and participate in an integrative set of academic work rather than as distinct, delineated roles. It means interrogating the forms and degrees of autonomy that academics have access to, and how they are drawing on these to carry out teaching, research, service and other engagements, or how they are contesting and challenging certain contextual structures as a way of asserting their identity as member-citizens. It also means asking how, in this process of enacting and asserting claims, academics may be excluded as *citizens* or alternatively may be redefining their ideas of *being* academic citizens.

5 | CONCLUSION

Our review of current literature on the subject of academic citizenship reveals its conventional and seemingly default association with the service dimension of academic work, referring to any and all activities outside of the functions of teaching and research. This notion of service as academic citizenship derives from two main perspectives: one that sees engagement in academic citizenship as a responsibility; and the other that views it as a form of organisational citizenship behaviour, discretionary and voluntary action that falls outside of the formal job description. The typologies of the service role as academic citizenship, as described in many of the texts on the subject, point also to the important observation that academic citizenship is in tension with teaching and research roles, as well as noting its purported decline due to a performative culture in academia that privileges research outputs and certain forms of academic work over others. In current discourses in the literature, there have been strong calls for a reconciling of the definition of service and, by association, of academic citizenship (Blair, 2018; Davies, 2017; Ward, 2003).

We contend that whilst such a reconciliation may be a useful exercise, the notion of academic citizenship is far more complex and nuanced than its conventional association with the service role. Current texts including empirical studies on this subject have predominantly focused on categorising service activities and examining the perspectives and attitudes of academics towards their service activities in relation to institutional culture or

university leadership. Although these approaches are helpful, there is a need to extend the discourse beyond the normative and prescriptive explorations of academic citizenship as service. The changing nature of academic work invites all the more an unpacking and reconceptualisation of academic citizenship as something negotiated and enacted in practice as academics participate in a whole gamut of academic work, not just the service role. Future research along these lines could examine, for example, how academics draw upon forms of freedom and autonomy, whether at the individual or institutional level, to navigate the tensions in their undertaking of academic work. New studies could also explore the creative, subtle, and indirect ways by which academics are challenging structures in their contexts as a means of expressing and asserting their standing as citizens of academia.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

ORCID

Joclarisse Albia https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7172-0062

REFERENCES

Andreouli, E. (2019). Social psychology and citizenship: A critical perspective. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *13*(2), e12432. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12432

Beatson, N. J., Tharapos, M., O'Connell, B. T., de Lange, P., Carr, S., & Copeland, S. (2022). The gradual retreat from academic citizenship. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *76*, 715–725. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12341

Blair, E. (2018). Rebundling higher educational research, teaching and service. *Confero: Essays on Education, Philosophy and Politics*, *6*(1), 35–54. https://doi.org/10.3384/confero.2001-4562.181005

Bloomgarden, A. H., & O'Meara, K. (2007). Faculty role integration and community engagement: Harmony or cacophony? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *13*(2), 5–18. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0013.201

Bolden, R., Gosling, J., & O'Brien, A. (2014). Citizens of the academic community? A societal perspective on leadership in UK higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39*(5), 754–770. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.754855

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. *Issues in Accounting Education*, *7*(1), 87. https://search.proquest.com/docview/210940462

Brackmann, S. M. (2015). Community engagement in a neoliberal paradigm. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *19*(4), 115–146. http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/view/1533

Buchanan, D., Sharpe, A., & Stevenson, J. M. (2006). Academic citizenship and public service for modern higher learning in a post-civil rights era. *Journal of College and Character*, *7*(4), 6. https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1193

Callaghan, C., Coldwell, D., Papageorgiou, E., & Fried, A. (2016). Academic citizenship and wellbeing: An exploratory cross-cultural study of South African and Swedish academic perceptions. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *30*(1), 80–105. https://doi.org/10.20853/30-1-555

Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Colbeck, C. L. (2002). Integration: Evaluating faculty work as a whole. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2002*(114), 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.45

Condor, S. (2011). Towards a social psychology of citizenship? Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *21*(3), 193–201. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1089

Dagger, R. (2002). Republican citizenship. In E. F. Isin & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship studies* (pp. 145–158). Sage Publications Ltd.

Davids, N. (2022). Professing the vulnerabilities of academic citizenship. *Ethics and Education*, *17*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2021.2013636

Davies, M. (2017). Academic citizenships. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, *71*(1), 12–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2016.1243223

Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2017). Disciplinary variations in publicly engaged scholarship: An analysis using the Biglan classification of academic disciplines. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *21*(1), 78–103. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1318

Hammer, D. P., Bynum, L. A., Carter, J., Hagemeier, N. E., Kennedy, D. R., Khansari, P., Stamm, P., & Crabtree, B. (2019). Revisiting faculty citizenship. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *83*(4), 7378–7473. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7378

Haste, H. (2004). Constructing the citizen. *Political Psychology*, *25*(3), 413–439. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00378.x

Inelmen, K., Selekler-Goksen, N., & Yildirim-Öktem, Ö. (2017). Understanding citizenship behavior of academics in American- vs Continental European-modeled universities in Turkey. *Personnel Review*, *46*(6), 1142–1164. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-06-2015-0182

Isin, E. F. (2008). Theorizing acts of citizenship. In E. F. Isin & G. M. Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 15–43). Palgrave Macmillan.

Knight, P. T., & Trowler, P. R. (2000). Department-level cultures and the improvement of learning and teaching. *Studies in Higher Education (Dorchester-on-Thames)*, *25*(1), 69–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/030750700116028

Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Bell, A. (2012). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education*, *53*(3), 325–352. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-011-9230-7

Leydet, D. (2017). Citizenship. In E. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Fall 2017 ed.). Stanford University. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/citizenship

Lister, M., & Pia, E. (2008). *Citizenship in contemporary Europe*. Edinburgh University Press.

Macfarlane, B. (2005). The disengaged academic. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *59*(4), 296–312. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2005.00299

Macfarlane, B. (2006). *The academic citizen: The virtue of service in university life*. Routledge.

Macfarlane, B. (2007). Defining and rewarding academic citizenship: The implications for university promotions policy. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *29*(3), 261–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800701457863

Macfarlane, B. (2011). Professors as intellectual leaders: Formation, identity and role. *Studies in Higher Education*, *36*(1), 57–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903443734

Malcolm, J., & Zukas, M. (2009). Making a mess of academic work: Experience, purpose and identity. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(5), 495–506. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510903186659

Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011, January 1). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe*, *97*, 22–26. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25799863

Mount St. Joseph University. (2022). *Faculty citizenship*. https://mymount.msj.edu/ICS/icsfs/B-Faculty_Citizenship.pdf?target=23c1ecc9-49aa-4d74-a212-14182b627695

O'Meara, K. A. (2011). Faculty civic engagement: New training, assumptions, and markets needed for the engaged American scholar. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose:" Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 177–198). Temple University Press.

O'Meara, K. A., Sandmann, L., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D., Jr. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, *36*(2), 83–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-010-9159-3

Pedersen, D. E., & Minnotte, K. L. (2018). University service work in STEM departments: Gender, perceived injustice, and consequences for faculty. *Sociological Focus (Kent, Ohio)*, *51*(3), 217–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2018.1393607

Pfeifer, H. L. (2016). How to be a good academic citizen: The role and importance of service in academia. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *27*(2), 238–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2015.1128706

Philpott, K., Dooley, L., O'Reilly, C., & Lupton, G. (2011). The entrepreneurial university: Examining the underlying academic tensions. *Technovation*, *31*(4), 161–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2010.12.003

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3), 513–563. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(00)00047-7

Porter, S. R. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees? *The Journal of Higher Education*, *78*(5), 523–541. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2007.0027

Sandmann, L., & Weerts, D. (2008). Reshaping institutional boundaries to accommodate an engagement agenda. *Innovative Higher Education*, *33*(3), 181–196. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-008-9077-9

Shaker, G. G. (2012). The generosity of an urban professoriate: Understanding faculty as donors and academic citizens. *Metropolitan Universities*, *23*(3), 5–25. https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/muj/article/view/20517

Shin, J. C. (2010, December). *Scholarship of Service: Faculty perceptions, workloads and reward systems* [Paper presentation]. International Conference on the Changing Academic Profession Projects, Hiroshima, Japan. https://rihe.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/publications/wp/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/102973.pdf

Stevenson, C., Dixon, J., Hopkins, N., & Luyt, R. (2015). The social psychology of citizenship, participation and social exclusion: Introduction to the special thematic section. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *3*(2), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i2.579

Sümer, S., O'Connor, P., & Le Feuvre, N. (2020). The contours of gendered academic citizenship. In S. Sümer, P. O'Connor, & N. Le Feuvre (Eds.), *Gendered academic citizenship: Issues and experiences* (pp. 1–36). Springer International Publishing.

Szelenyi, K., & Rhoads, R. A. (2013). Academic culture and citizenship in transitional societies: Case studies from China and Hungary. *Higher Education*, *21*, 217–244. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9614-z

Tagliaventi, M. R., Carli, G., & Cutolo, D. (2019). Excellent researcher or good public servant? The interplay between research and academic citizenship. *Higher Education*, *79*, 1057–1078. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00456-7

Thompson, P., Constantineau, P., & Fallis, G. (2006). Academic citizenship: An academic colleagues' working paper. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *3*(2), 127–142. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-006-9010-8

Tienou, T. (2018). Faculty as institutional citizens: An invisible but essential aspect of vital sustainability. *Insights Journal*, *4*(1), 25–32. https://insightsjournal.org/faculty-as-institutional-citizens-an-invisible-but-essential-aspect-of-vital-sustainability/

Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (Eds.). (1993). *Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: Faculty socialization as a cultural process (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6)*. The George Washington University.

Turner, B. S. (1997). Citizenship studies: A general theory. *Citizenship Studies*, *1*(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621029708420644

University of Exeter. (2022). *Citizenship development*. https://www.exeter.ac.uk/staff/exeteracademic/yourdevelopment/citizenshipdevelopment/

University of York. (2022). *Academic-promotion criteria: Academic citizenship*. https://www.york.ac.uk/admin/hr/pay-and-grading/promotion/citizenship/

Vogelgesang, L. J., Denson, N., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2010). What determines faculty-engaged scholarship? *The Review of Higher Education*, *33*(4), 437–472. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.0.0175

Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. (Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series No. 29)*. Jossey-Bass. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED476222

Whitchurch, C. (2009). The rise of the blended professional in higher education: A comparison between the UK, Australia and the United States. *Higher Education*, *58*(3), 407–418. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9202-4

White, M. (2013). Higher education and problems of citizenship formation. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *47*(1), 112–127. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12002