Sheffield Hallam University

Academic citizenship beyond the service role: Views of academics in England and the Philippines

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

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

https://shura.shu.ac.uk/34488/

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

CHENG, Ming and ALBIA, Joclarisse (2024). Academic citizenship beyond the service role: Views of academics in England and the Philippines. Studies in Higher Education. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html

Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive
http://shura.shu.ac.uk

- Albia, J., & Cheng, M. (2024). Academic citizenship beyond the service role: Views of academics in England and the Philippines. *Studies in Higher Education*, https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2431580.

Academic Citizenship beyond the Service Role:

Views of Academics in England and the Philippines

Joclarisse ALBIA

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

Ming CHENG

Sheffield Institute of Education, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK

Correspondence details:

Joclarisse ALBIA (corresponding author)

clarissealbia@gmail.com

Faculty of Education, Edge Hill University, UK

ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0001-7172-0062

Ming CHENG

Sheffield Institute of Education, College of Social Sciences and Arts

[1] Affiliation at time of research; corresponding author's new affiliation details is as follows: Graduate Institute of Education, National Chung Cheng University, Chiayi, Taiwan

Sheffield Hallam University, UK

ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-7310-4981

Academic Citizenship beyond the Service Role:

Views of Academics in England and the Philippines

Abstract:

The evolving nature of academic work in higher education invites a deep questioning of the conventional view of academic citizenship as the service role. Drawing insights from a multi-site case study of academics in England and the Philippines and taking a social psychological approach to citizenship, the paper reveals that for academics who work in highly performative contexts, academic citizenship means more than a 'service' role. It is perceived as a notion that integrates their activities, ideals and values as well as the ways they approach their work – how they see themselves as *being* academic citizens. Academic citizenship goes beyond the undertaking of activities with moral, altruistic and civic merits. This paper proposes the view of academic citizenship as a *practice of enactment* not simply a function of membership status. It encompasses the processes and means by which academics use freedoms and autonomy at their disposal, and the value they see as central to their membership in their academic communities.

Keywords: Academic citizenship, academic work, service role, autonomy, academic freedom

Introduction

This paper explores the concept of academic citizenship beyond its conventional association with the service role, the third dimension of academic work loosely described as anything that does not fall within the teaching and research functions (Pfeifer 2016; University of York n.d.). We question this traditional association and the premise of academic citizenship as a function

of membership status (Albia and Cheng 2023). We employ a social psychological approach that interprets academic citizenship as practice (Andreouli 2019) to unpack the nuanced meanings that academic staff ascribe to the concept. Drawing on data from interviews with 26 academics in a research university in England and one in the Philippines, the paper argues that academic citizenship transcends a normative set of service activities with civic, altruistic or moral merit. Academic citizenship should be viewed as a 'practice of enactment' where academics exercise their motivations, freedoms and autonomy in their participation in academic work (Albia and Cheng 2023).

The conventional association of academic citizenship with the service role has been supported by existing typologies of service in the literature, such as Macfarlane's (2005) five tiers of service work: student service, collegial service, institutional service, disciplinal service, and civic/public service. Other studies have drawn from the management concept of organisational citizenship behaviour (Organ 1988, quoted in Podsakoff et al. 2000) to probe the engagement of academics in work that is discretionary or falls outside of official job descriptions. Such engagement is typically mediated by variables such as organisational commitment and organisational performance, highlighting the altruistic nature of the work (Hammer et al. 2019). Given its association with these values, academic citizenship has been regarded as a virtuous activity (Davids 2022).

However, the shifting landscape of higher education is challenging the three traditional roles of teaching, research and service (Blair 2018). One observation is that this service dimension of academic work, already regarded as the least important amongst the three (Bloomgarden and O'Meara 2007), is in decline as a result of the performative, metrics-focused agenda in higher education (Beatson et al. 2022). It has become academic housekeeping particularly in the case of institutional service (Heijstra, Steinþórsdóttir, and Einarsdóttir 2017).

Whilst this role covers other forms such as public service that are given premium in other contexts, the privileging of research has led to an imbalance of the traditional academic roles (Beatson et al. 2022; Macfarlane 2005; Pfeifer 2016). Brew et al. (2018), for instance, have challenged the predisposition to label certain kinds of academic work as service, because it does not adequately capture what such work means for academics. It is therefore important to examine this conventional understanding of academic citizenship as the service role and ask the central question: *How do academics in England and the Philippines understand the concept of academic citizenship?*

Academic citizenship as the service role

Pfeifer (2016) described a good academic citizen as one who renders academic service, and explained the notion of *service* as engagement in activities where academics share their expertise and skills with others for the betterment of the university, the profession and the wider society. Such description corresponds with Macfarlane's (2005) point that academics' service activities are what connect them to their societies and the world. These activities, as manifestations of academic citizenship, encompass a range of work types such as administration and management work in departments or the wider university; mentoring colleagues and peer reviewing; engaging in outreach and widening participation activities; and contributing to knowledge exchange and transfer (Mount St Joseph University n.d.; University of Exeter n.d.; University of York n.d.).

In a study of academics from the UK, US, Canada, Australia and Southern Europe, Macfarlane (2006) categorised academic citizenship as orientated around an academic's specific communities and groups: customer service for students, service as administration in the university, collegial service for the discipline, civic service for the public and wider society, and integrated learning. This interpretation reinforces the view that academics are members of

multiple communities (Brackmann 2015) and that they have a "moral obligation" to these groups (Macfarlane 2006, 68).

In contrast, other studies on organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) characterised service work as voluntary behaviour falling outside of the job description and linked to personal choice and motivation (Hammer et al. 2019; Podsakoff et al. 2000). For example, Hammer et al. (2019) revealed that the service behaviour of academics in a US university was closely tied to their collegiality and contributions towards department productivity. From this perspective, service work as academic citizenship is discretionary action: it is not necessarily an articulated expectation or responsibility that comes with being an academic, and therefore does not form part of promotion and reward guidelines (Albia and Cheng 2023).

These two perspectives on academic service – as an explicit part of an academic's role or as discretionary behaviour – are not mutually exclusive. Both views are underpinned by the idea of the good citizen (Andreouli 2019; Stevenson et al. 2015). Classical citizenship discourse pivots on the notion of a good worker-citizen who is altruistic and complies with institutional norms and values (Stevenson et al. 2015). From this perspective, academic citizenship as service highlights the academic as a citizen who contributes to the betterment of the department, university, discipline and wider civic society through their acts of goodwill or duty. This association with values such as loyalty, care, benevolence, and universities' obligations to society explains why academic citizenship is conceived as a virtuous undertaking (Davids 2022).

Valuing of academic citizenship as the service role

The service dimension of academic work has been regarded as an add-on to the traditional functions of teaching and research (Bloomgarden and O'Meara 2007). These service activities can take time away from research activities, something which is particularly an issue for

women academics and those from minority groups (Pedersen and Minnotte 2018).

The privileging of certain forms of academic work compounds the problem of the lack of clarity and consistency on what the service role is (Bolden, Gosling, and O'Brien 2014). In higher education around much of the world, there is a marked emphasis on the research role, largely driven by a performativity agenda and a metrics system centred on publications (Beatson et al. 2022). These demands may influence academic staff's stance towards the service elements of their jobs. For example, academics in Chinese and Hungarian research universities appeared to feel pressured to engage in research, but the high-achieving staff had a weaker sense of institutional academic citizenship than their lower-performing peers (Szelenyi and Rhoads 2013). Similarly, academics with a strong sense of belonging to their discipline tend to be more research-leaning than their teaching-focused peers who identify more closely with their university (Davids 2022).

There have been calls to reconcile definitions of the service role and, subsequently, of academic citizenship (Brew et al. 2018). This is because the notion of academic work is changing as academics are expected to engage in other types of activities (Blair 2018). Whilst the conventional roles of teaching, research and service are not necessarily exclusive, the increasing diversity of academic work makes the boundaries between these functions more blurred (Blair 2018; Davies 2017). It is important to question whether the conventional description of academic citizenship as the service role remains relevant and adequate. Conflating academic citizenship with service limits understandings of academic citizenship to a normative, prescriptive set of *service* activities although they are virtuous and vital in principle. This restricted view can overlook how academics might be reconciling their participation in academic work within changing contexts, including performativity pressures,

and how they might come to regard and establish themselves as academic citizens in the process (Albia and Cheng 2023).

A social psychological approach to citizenship as practice

The conceptualisation of academic citizenship as the service role arguably reflects the good citizen model found in traditional citizenship discourse. This focuses on the relationship between the citizen and their rights and duties (Jones and Gaventa 2002). It emphasises the role of the individual as one who works for and contributes to the wider good of the community and complies with institutional or group norms and values. Such a view can be reductionist as it ignores the influence of the broader social and cultural settings (Stevenson et al., 2015).

The social psychological approach to citizenship discourse acknowledges that the construct of citizenship is complex and contested (Condor 2011) and affirms the importance of paying attention to the practices and processes of making citizens (Barnes, Auburn, and Lea 2004; Isin 2008). Citizens are not merely followers – they are also critical movers and doers who can challenge existing norms and rules or make claims on the rights they hold (Andreouli 2019). From this perspective, one explores how the notion of citizenship is understood and enacted, how it may be tied to social structures and institutions (Andreouli 2019; Condor 2011), and the processes through which citizenship is negotiated (Stevenson et al. 2015). This examination allows one to move away from prescriptive and normative lenses; rather, the focus becomes the citizen as a participant in the way they come to understand and attach meanings to their citizenship within a social, cultural and historical context (Haste 2004). This naturally invites an examination of the context within which citizenship is enacted. This aligns with the case study design adopted in this research as we examined academics' constructions of academic citizenship within the contexts of two research universities in England and the Philippines.

Within this tradition, Dreier's theory of persons (2009, 2011) provides an additional analytical lens to examine academics as citizen-participants and probe how they constitute and negotiate structures and arrangements, as well as their understandings of academic citizenship during their participation in academic work. The manner in which they challenge or subscribe to certain expected responsibilities and obligations can be considered to be what Isin (2008) called the practice and process of being and becoming citizens. In exploring how academics see their participation in academic work as exemplifications of academic citizenship, we therefore seek to delve beyond model citizenship behaviour.

Methodology

A multi-site case study approach was used for this study from the view that multiple cases are a means to explain and describe the phenomenon within distinct contexts, paying attention to the particulars and conditions of each case within which the phenomenon or event is observed (Stake, 2005). This approach aligns with the focus of this paper's enquiry to explore the constructions of academic citizenship within the context of the cases.

The two cases are a research university in England and the Philippines. These are regarded as typical or exemplar cases (Stake, 1995) of research universities in these countries. The English university operates within a developed socio-economic setting and is patterned from the Anglo-Saxon model of HE. The Philippine university situates in a middle-income country and is shaped in the American tradition. Both universities are public and research-intensive institutions. They are highly regarded for their teaching excellence at the national level, have extensive research collaborations with the private sector, and have strong presence in their local communities.

The general commonalities the study sites share but also their points of contrast in terms

of HE traditions and socio-economic contexts, suggest possible similarities and particular distinctiveness in academic ethos, practices and expectations. This opens the space for exploring what might be nuanced ways of describing academic work and consequently, constructions of the academic citizen. Some commentators have maintained that despite the pervasiveness of a research culture, the situations of research universities are still often contingent on the stages of development in the country where they are located (Arai et al. 2007). This means that expectations upon academic staff may still vary considerably, a point that resonates with Krause's (2009) commentary that academics in Western and non-Western contexts may have their own ways of describing and valuing the academic work they do. Whilst much of the foundations of contemporary academic life may have been greatly influenced by Western HE models and traditions, descriptions and views of academic work are also still shaped by distinctive institutional level mechanisms, local and national needs and HE expectations.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 26 academics: 12 from the English university and 14 from the Philippines. They were selected from business and economics; mathematics; engineering; and sociology as these disciplines are well established in the chosen universities. As it is not the study's intention to draw or establish interconnections between discipline and variables such as gender, position or ethnicity (the last item is not applicable in the Philippine university), the participants were purposively selected based on the broad criteria of contract type (full-time permanent contracts) and length of time at the university (have been with the university for at least two years) to ensure some substantial familiarity with the institution and the wider higher education sector. Three participants were academics who also held university-level leadership positions related to outreach and external engagement and research (See Table 1). Potential participants were initially identified based on the information provided on the staff directory published on the university/faculty website. Email invitations

were sent out after securing approval from the heads of department. Ensuring a more balanced ratio of male and female respondents in the English case is an acknowledged limitation, as some disciplines are more male-dominated such as engineering (Heijstra, Steinþórsdóttir, and Einarsdóttir. 2017). The Covid-19 pandemic and the industrial action in the UK HE sector also created challenges in recruitment in the English case. We then also employed snowballing technique in the English university to reach out to and recruit more academics for the study.

Informed consent was secured from all the participants. Interviews lasted from 60 to 90 minutes and explored the attributes that academics associated with academic citizenship and the work that exemplifies their views of citizenship. It also explored their perceptions of the institutional and wider HE contexts of their work. English is an official medium of instruction and business in the Philippines, so the interviews in the Philippine case were carried out largely in English with a few Filipino words in the conversations.

Reflexive thematic analysis (Braun et al. 2018) was utilised to analyse the data and to bring out patterns of meaning and generate themes. Carried out by a single coder, the coding process began with the reading and re-reading of the interview transcripts as part of familiarisation with the data, to identify interesting points and initial connections in the responses. Codes were then generated through inductive coding via NVivo. Initial codes were added using techniques such as descriptive coding and value coding (Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña 2014). The initial codes were grouped and organised into categories, which were then considered as initial themes. They were further reviewed and grouped and presented here as the general thematic statements.

Findings

Three overarching themes emerged from the interviews: (1) academic citizenship is more than

a service role; (2) the importance of the *personal* in the exercise of academic citizenship; and (3) academic freedom as descriptive of autonomy (See Table 2). In this section, we elaborate on what these themes mean. We draw upon the view of citizenship as practice and point to the nature of academic citizenship as *negotiated,* derived from the ways and processes academics undertake academic work.

More than a service role

Interviews with academics in both universities revealed that academic citizenship cannot be relegated to a distinct *service* role that is separate from other aspects of their work. When asked to share examples exemplifying academic citizenship, the participants referred to activities that reflected how they see themselves as members of an academic community, such as teaching, engagement with research networks, external examination, and peer reviewing.

A 'responsibility' to the institution

For nearly all the participants in the Philippine university, being academic citizens was associated with their perceived 'responsibility' to the university. These responsibilities were mainly related to their teaching role such as instruction in the classroom, supervision and advising, and even philanthropic activities to support students. PH Participant 2, a male manager and lecturer who has been teaching at the university for over 10 years, explained:

> When you say academic citizenship the first thing that comes to mind really is, "Is it my being a teacher?" So if you talk about the university as a country and you talk about citizenship, [it's] being a teacher or the position of being a teacher.

The views of academic citizenship imply belonging to the university and the concomitant responsibility of such belonging. Whilst for some this responsibility referred generally to things that contribute towards the mission and vision of the institution, the emphasis on the teaching role was predominant amongst the participants. This was exemplified by PH Participant 9, a

female manager and lecturer who has been with the university for over 20 years:

> A large part of being in the academe as a faculty member is your ability to teach well. They say it is not really teaching but the creation of knowledge, which is research. But for me, the teaching part is very important because the reason why we are in the academe in the first place, is to make sure that we are able to develop students… I would say that the first obligation is to teach and mentor, and the second part is the creation of knowledge in research.

Participants in the Philippines appeared to equate the academe with the university and see teaching as their raison d'etre for being in academia. Their sense of citizenship – viewed through the lens of responsibility – can be attributed to them being strongly anchored in the university. The anchoring stems from socialisation and induction processes that heavily underscore loyalty to the institution (Macfarlane 2006).

A 'contribution' to the knowledge culture of the collective

For the participants in the English university, the notion of academic citizenship is tied to activities that revolve around their 'contribution' to a knowledge culture. These activities include research mentoring, external examining, and collaborations with partners to foster connectivity with wider sectors of society. The majority of these participants characterised their work not only as *service* but also as research that contribute to the furthering of knowledge of the collective. EN Participant 12, a male sociology lecturer who has been with the university for less than five years, elaborated this point:

> I don't think it's roles and responsibilities, and I don't think it's service per se… To be an academic citizen I think it's more about the things you do outside your job that you do to further communities… camaraderie and to further society or social groups of knowledge and interaction that benefit people in one way or the other.

This finding echoes studies particularly in Western settings of academics as cosmopolitans who identify strongly with their discipline and less so with their university (Clark 1987; Ward 2003). The discipline plays a central role in organising academic activities because academics tend to see their work as disciplinary endeavours more than as institutional responsibilities (Malcolm and Zukas 2009).

Attributes of academic citizenship

Academics in both universities linked academic citizenship to particular attributes. For academics in the Philippine university, the academic citizen is one who exhibits the defining values of the institution: *excellence* and *accessibl*e. According to PH Participant 9, being an academic citizen of the university requires 'excellence in all – in everything that you do, whether that is inside the classroom, outside the classroom, in public service, in research, in the way you deal with people'. This view again points to the academics' strong anchoring and identification with the institution, given that the notion of excellence is reiterated in university parlance and its formal statements of mission and policies.

The participants in England suggested that the attributes of academic citizenship are related to the standards that academics are expected to uphold as members of the collective: *autonomy* and *plurality*. For instance, EN Participant 4, a male academic in sociology who has worked at the university for 11 years, asserted that academic citizens should be 'wholeheartedly committed to ensuring the plurality of perspectives and approaches to the production of knowledge in the world'.

In both universities, the attributes identified by the participants can be considered not only as "virtues of academic citizenship" (Macfarlane 2006, 115) which emphasise the moral dimension of professional life, but also as values that academics cherish as they participate in academic work. However, a subtle difference between the two cases needs to be highlighted.

In the Philippine university, the participants described the qualities of the individual academic citizen – who and what they should be – which mirrored the values of the university and suggest strong identification with their institution. In contrast, participants in the English university interpreted academic citizenship not so much in terms of values or traits exhibited by the individual academic citizen, but more as principles or standards that are characteristic of the collective of scholars, the community they identify themselves with (the discipline).

The personal in the exercise of academic citizenship

This theme refers to the important role of an academic's individual beliefs, values, and motivations in their decisions and participation in academic work and, ultimately, in how they exercise their academic citizenship. In a higher education landscape that privileges research, this *personal* dimension is an instrument for the individual academic to find compromise between what they value in their work as a member of an academic community and the demands and expectations of said community.

Academics in both universities conveyed a sense of personal conviction to carry out activities that they consider crucial to what makes them academic citizens. In the Philippine university, teaching was the academic's 'primary responsibility', but younger academics wanted to balance this mandate with the increasing expectations of their research function. This was apparent in some participants' references to being 'smart' and 'strategic' as they undertake academic work. PH Participant 8, a mid-level, female lecturer in the economics department, had this to say:

> When I [started at] the university, I really started [as an instructor].... I did not have any research then, and that motivated me. I told myself, "I should have at least one publication every year. I should be able to attend at least one conference" because that is what is needed.

The picture for the participants in England was slightly different, with the majority of them regarding engagement in academic work as a matter of the individual focusing on what they consider to be important. EN Participant 3, a male early-career academic in the sociology department, explained that there was a tension between the work academics are *paid to do* and the work they *want to do*. For him, it is a case of juggling both and 'finding time' to do the latter, especially if it is something felt to be important to one's academic identity.

Two senior academics, one in each case, illustrated this personal dimension in operation, in different ways. PH Participant 7 is a female academic in mathematics who has worked at the university for over 40 years. Despite feeling left out and 'demoralised' by the growing emphasis on research performance, she found fulfillment as a teacher rather than as a researcher, and it was through teaching that she framed her contribution to the university as an academic citizen. EN Participant 4, on the other hand, appeared to be unperturbed by the pressures of the Research Excellence Framework metrics in UK higher education.

> I haven't changed any of the things that I would do. I'm somebody who publishes reasonably for my field and discipline. Publishing hasn't been a big issue for me, and the places where I publish are the places where I want to.

This participant acknowledged his relatively successful publishing record, and paradoxically this success appears to empower him not to slavishly play the metrics game to the extent that others might. He conveys a sense of confidence and autonomy to publish his work as he sees fit. Both of these participants' stances, albeit contrasting, suggest that they possess certain academic and intellectual capital (Bourdieu 1995, quoted in Heijstra, Steinþórsdóttir, and Einarsdóttir 2017) that some colleagues may lack and which in turn lets them choose to focus on the academic pursuits of most value to them. For PH Participant 7, this capital may have arisen from her long career at the university which has established her relative power and scope

of influence. For EN Participant 4, his senior academic status and proven track record may have accrued advantages including security of esteem.

Another illustration of the role of the personal dimension in the exercise of autonomy was found in the responses of two participants in the English university. EN Participant 8, a female lecturer in the mathematics department, highlighted the element of personal choice as she reflected on her position as a teaching-focused academic among research-focused peers in a research-intensive university.

> I personally, at least currently, am not particularly focused on trying to advance and get promotion, whereas some people are, so that makes them much more strategic about what they do and what they don't.

EN Participant 9, a male lecturer in the engineering department, implied that the pursuit of promotion can be difficult and uncertain. Even where staff outputs fulfil the promotion criteria, the outcomes are often not assured. Both these individuals chose to undertake work that they personally value, opting out of the metrics game and accepting the implications for promotion.

Across the illustrations above, the dimension of the *personal* in the exercise of academic citizenship appears to pivot on the individual's intrinsic valuing of certain pursuits. It is each academic's personal sense of what is important and valuable as academic work that informs their participation in certain forms of academic activity. In other words, the participants use certain freedoms at their disposal, no matter how limited, to take on work that is central to what makes them academic citizens, even if that work is not highly valued by their university.

Academic freedom as descriptive of autonomy

Participants in both universities also alluded to notions of academic freedom in their ideas and enactment of citizenship. For the Philippine participants, academic freedom is closely associated with their autonomy as academics: their participation in academic work, particularly

teaching, that they consider central to their identity as academic citizens, is linked especially to a sense of institutional academic freedom. These participants described academic freedom as ‘not being dictated what topics to research’, ‘flexibility and not being structured on doing things’, ‘being able to suggest and assert ideas’, being able to ‘do some things on your own and having the free time’, and ‘not having to conform, unlike in the industry’. They used these notions of academic freedom to justify *why* they do what they do and their sense of being empowered despite the increasing emphasis on performativity in the university. The participants drew upon this sense of academic freedom to describe how they consider themselves to be academic citizens. Additionally, there was a prevailing impression that academic freedom is an institutional hallmark. For example, PH Participants 4 and 13 related it to the university’s charter and tradition.

In a similar vein, the academics in the English university described academic freedom as how they see the work they do at the university, but specifically as members of the collective and the wider academic profession. EN Participant 1, a male senior lecturer in the economics department, described academic freedom as critical to the exercise of his academic citizenship:

> [Academic freedom] is the right to criticise without fear or favour of anyone in your own institution… and not being scared to raise questions about what’s going on here… You’ve got to fight for academic freedom because it’s so important. If there’s one part of society that has room to think about issues on the wider society, to ponder, it’s academics. And if they see something that they feel isn’t right or is going wrong, they are usually the ones positioned to have the evidence to put forward a coherent line of reasoning.

His remarks echoed the sentiments that academic freedom is not only a right and an institutional hallmark, but also a principle that is inherent to academia as a democracy. Resonant in his response was how he also sees his role in safeguarding academic freedom as a value. Based on

such a definition, he alluded to using his leadership position to become the voice of peers who may have limited agency, to question certain decisions in the university.

Definitions of academic freedom have been bisected between individual academic's professional freedom and institutional autonomy (Aberbach and Christensen 2018; Bacevic 2024). The varied interpretations echo Hornosty's (2000) point that the practice of academic freedom occurs within a particular socio-economic and political context, and its interpretation is shaped by the values, beliefs and norms of the society, as well as the social and institutional climate of the university. The above interpretations touch on two traditions of this notion: the German view relating to the undertaking of duties in the profession, and the American tradition that emphasises the safeguarding of the right to expression of views (Aberbach and Christensen 2018; Schmidt and Langberg 2007). Within the Philippine context, these traditions are reflected in the discourse of academic freedom as "social criticism" (Nemenzo 1977, 17) and the academic's freedom to undertake scholarship in their discipline (Aquino 2011). In the English setting, academic freedom is recognised more than a right, but also as an integral fabric of academic life and of the democratic university. It is defined in the Education Reform Act of 1988 as an academic staff's freedom "to question and test received wisdom and to put forward ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or the privileges they may have". The autonomy offered by academic freedom in the UK carries not only the substantive elements of the freedom to teach and research (Karran and Mallinson 2018), but also of freedom of speech and employment rights i.e., protection from unfair dismissal (Bacevic 2024). In both sites, this underscoring of academic freedom as a fundamental tenet and value of the profession (Schmidt and Langberg 2007) ties closely to notions of individual autonomy, participation and membership in the academic community.

Discussion

In this section, we draw further on the social psychological approach to citizenship as practice to weave together the themes from the study, and then we develop the reconceptualisation of academic citizenship. Here, we offer three observations based on the thematic findings.

Firstly, it is evident in the first theme – academic citizenship as *more than a service role* – that the idea of citizenship as membership status continues to underpin understandings of citizenship. Participants ascribed meanings of citizenship to status as members of a community. In the Philippine case, participants identified strongly with their university as the community; their views on their 'responsibility' as academic citizens were strongly anchored on institutional mandates, values and mission. It is through their institutional identity that participants legitimised their academic citizenship and rationalised their participation in academic work. In the English case, the participants' notions of community reflect a more complex social context for their engagement in academic work. For many of them, the 'collective' is the discipline – a community of like-minded individuals bound by similar interests and scholarship. Thus, it transcends the university. Tienou (2018) has argued that academic citizenship should be examined within the frame of the communities to which academics belong, because it is these communities that merit the practice of citizenship. The first theme of the study, that citizenship goes beyond service, also suggests the pervasiveness of certain narratives – those of the good citizen model (Andreouli 2019; Stevenson et al. 2015) and of academic citizenship as a virtuous notion and pursuit (Davids 2022). Whether citizenship is viewed as responsibility to the institution or as contribution to the collective, the common thread is that academics see their work as extending beyond themselves, beyond personal gain or honour.

The second observation is that the participants do not characterise academic citizenship narrowly as a typology of academic 'service' activities, but rather as the integration of activities, ideals and values – the means by which they see themselves as *being* academic citizens. This is evident in the second and third themes, *the personal in the exercise of academic citizenship* and *academic freedom as descriptive of autonomy.* The second theme suggests that there is a strong sense of intrinsic motivation driving academics to carry out their responsibilities and/or contribute to the good of the community. Academics may find themselves balancing the relationship between their obligations as members of their community and their personal motivations and values ascribed to the work they do. This mimics the interaction of the public and private spheres in traditional citizenship discourse wherein the individual manages their private affairs and is also expected to contribute towards the good of the community (Lister and Pia 2008).

When there is a conflict between these public and private spheres, the individual adopts stances and/or actions to negotiate the competing demands. This act or process of finding the middle ground – that is, reconciling personal interests and values with their responsibilities as a member of a community – reflects the process of *enacting* academic citizenship. Academic citizenship in this case, whether at the level of the university or of the discipline as the collective, reflects the personal drives and values of academics and their exercise of the individual freedoms and autonomy accessible to them. Where academics choose to 'play smart' or make time for the things they value, these decisions and actions indicate what is important to them as citizen-participants in academia. Their stances evidence their agency as participants (Dreier 2011) in academic work. In this agentic process of negotiation and decision-making, individuals as citizens manifest their capacity for critical engagement and flexibility (Condor 2011), allowing them to reconstruct how they come to see themselves as *being* citizens.

These points lead to the third observation that academic citizenship can be a *practice of enactment.* Tied to the earlier above point on academics' exercise of agency, this notion of a practice of enactment emphasises Dreier's (2011) view of individuals as embodied beings as they participate in a social practice. As embodied beings, these participants are not free-floating members of their communities. Their actions, as evidenced in their participation, reflect their being agents. In viewing academic citizenship as a practice of enactment, we turn our attention to the agency exercised by academics, that is, how they draw on certain freedoms, autonomy, values and personal motivation in undertaking academic work that they regard as an integrative whole and not only those confined to work with moral or altruistic merit.

This also highlights what Dreier (2009, 2011) suggests of the ability of embodied individuals to either reproduce the status quo or change it by using the conditions in their social context to which they have access. How the academics in the two universities exercise academic freedom, for instance, to justify and legitimise the work they do, or use it to question the system, points to their scope of influence. The same can be said of academics who chose to focus on teaching despite the research emphasis in their institution. Adopting these personal stances particularly in the face of tensions in their context, allows them to identify what their participation means for them (Dreier 2009). These reflections also cohere with the thesis of the social psychological view of citizenship wherein citizens can perform acts that challenge, maybe even disrupt, norms and rules and in so doing, are able to renegotiate what being a citizen means (Andreouli 2019). These can be regarded forms of what Isin (2008, 39) describes "acts of citizenship as those that transform forms and modes…by bringing into being new actors". Academic citizenship viewed as a practice of enactment is therefore not so much about categorising academic work as service (or which type of service) but of how academics display their *being* actors and agents.

The traditional discourse on the subject of academic citizenship tends to conflate it with the service role: it offers a limited, arguably flawed, perspective because it fails to capture all the activities that academics value in their participation as member-citizens. As gleaned from the findings, academic work types that fit within the conventional typologies of the service role undoubtedly exemplify academic citizenship, but so then do teaching and research activities. More than this, we also see how the idea of being academic citizens is also constituted through the processes and means by which academics can assert the value of what they do, exercise autonomy, and even challenge certain contextual structures.

Conclusion

The concept of academic citizenship needs to be understood beyond the service role. Applying a social psychological approach to citizenship, we propose that academic citizenship is a *practice of enactment*, emphasising the processes and manner by which it is asserted and constituted as academics draw upon the freedoms and autonomy at their disposal. This practice of enactment involves negotiation between the academics' personal interests, motivations and values, and the expectations and demands on them as members of the academic communities they identify with, be it the university or the discipline. It is in this process of negotiation that the freedoms accessible to academics become crucial. The greater the freedom that academics possess, the more they feel empowered in undertaking academic work that they consider important to what makes them academic citizens. In offering this view of academic citizenship, we extend the discourse on the subject beyond the undertaking of activities with moral, altruistic, and civic values. We take it forward to encompass how academics draw on freedoms, autonomy, values and individual motivations in academic work and how academics *are* and *become* citizens of the academy, particularly within an increasingly performative higher education landscape.

This research does not seek to establish representativeness of research universities in England and the Philippines, as it intends to offer theoretical implications for universities in similar contexts (Mason 2018). Future research can benefit from a more diverse set of academics taking part, in particular more women from the chosen disciplines as well as academics on part-time and fixed-term contracts, in order to explore further interconnections of themes with the nuanced factors of gender, discipline and rank/position. Future enquiries could consider how the notion of academic citizenship is conceptualised by academics in teaching-oriented universities, in order to illuminate potential similarities and differences in perspectives. Ethnographic approaches might yield rich accounts of how academics challenge, contest and assert their claims to their citizenship in their academic lives. Another interesting line of enquiry is to investigate how issues of institutional power influence the formation of academic citizenship mindsets, to broaden the discourse on the subject as a practice of enactment. Finally, the value of the service role in university academic life, the re-emphasis on public service and its implications in the role of the university towards building national and global citizenship, should continue to be explored.

Disclosure Statement

The authors report that there are no competing interests to declare.

References

Aberbach, Joel D., and Tom Christensen. 2018. "Academic Autonomy and Freedom under Pressure: Severely Limited, or Alive and Kicking?" *Public Organiz Rev* 18*:* 487-506. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-017-0394-2

Albia, Joclarisse E., and Ming Cheng. 2023. “Re-examining and developing the notion of academic citizenship: A critical literature review.” *Higher Education Quarterly,* 77: 709-721. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12428

Andreouli, Eleni. 2019. “Social Psychology and Citizenship: A Critical Perspective.” *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 13(2): e12432. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12432

Aquino, Ricmar. 2011. “The Extent of Academic Freedom in Philippine Education.” *IAMURE International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* 2(1). https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=2444

Arai, Ken-ichi, Thomas Cech, Jean-Lou Chameau, Iain Mattaj, Janez Potocnik and John Wiley. 2007. “The future of research universities. Is the model of research-intensive universities still valid at the beginning of the twenty-first century?.” *EMBO reports,* 8(9), 804–810. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.embor.7401052

Bacevic, Jana. 2024. “No Such Thing as Free Speech? Performativity, Free Speech, and Academic Freedom in the UK.” *Law and Critique*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10978-023-09373-2

Barnes, Rebecca, Timothy Auburn, and Susan Lea. 2004. “Citizenship in Practice.” *British Journal of Social Psychology* 43(Pt 2): 187-206. doi:10.1348/0144666041501705

Beatson, Nicola J., Meredith Tharapos, Brendan T. O’Connell, Paul de Lange, Sarah Carr and Scott Copeland. 2022. “The Gradual Retreat from Academic Citizenship.” *Higher Education Quarterly* 76: 715-725. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12341

Blair, Erik. 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, Alan H. and KerryAnn O'Meara. 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, Richard, Jonathan Gosling and Anne O'Brien. 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

Brackmann, Sarah 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>

Braun, Virginia, Victoria Clarke, Nikki Hayfield and Gareth Terry. 2018. "Thematic Analysis." In *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences,* edited by Pranee Liamputtong, 1-18. Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-2779-6_103-1

Brew, Angela, David Boud, Lisa Lucas and Karin Crawford. 2018. "Academic Artisans in the Research University." *Higher Education* 76(1): 115-127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0200-7

Clark, Burton R. 1987. *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Princeton, New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Condor, Susan. 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

Davids, Nuraan. 2022. "Professing the Vulnerabilities of Academic Citizenship". *Ethics and Education* 17(1): 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2021.2013636

Davies, Mathew. 2017. "Academic Citizenships." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 71(1): 12-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2016.1243223

Dreier, Ole. 2009. "Persons in Structures of Social Practice." *Theory & Psychology* 19(2): 193-212. doi:10.1177/0959354309103539

Dreier, Ole. 2011. "Personality and the Conduct of Everyday Life." *Nordic Psychology* 63(2): 4-23. https://doi.org/10.1027/1901-2276/a000030

Education Reform Act 1988, c. 40. 1988. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/40/contents

Hammer, Dana P., Leigh Ann Bynum, Jean Carter, Nicholas E. Hagemeier, Daniel R. Kennedy, Parto Khansari, Pamela Stamm and Brian Crabtree. 2019. "Revisiting Faculty Citizenship." *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 83(4): 7378-473. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7378

Haste, Helen. 2004. "Constructing the Citizen." *Political Psychology* 25(3): 413-439. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00378.x

Heijstra, Thamar Melanie, Finnborg Salome Steinþórsdóttir and Thorgerdur Einarsdóttir. 2017. "Academic Career Making and the Double-Edged Role of Academic Housework." *Gender and Education* 29(6): 764-780. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1171825

Hornosty, Jennie. 2000. "Academic Freedom in Social Context." In *Academic Freedom and the Inclusive* University, edited by Sharon Kahn and Dennis Pavlich, 36-47. Vancouver, Toronto: UBC Press.

Isin, Engin. 2008. "Theorizing Acts of Citizenship." In *Acts of Citizenship,* edited by Engin Isin and Greg Nielsen, 15-43. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, Emma and John Gaventa. 2002. *Concepts of Citizenship: A Review*, *IDS Development Bibliography No. 19*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Karran, Terrence and Lucy Mallinson. 2018. "Academic Freedom and World-Class Universities: A Virtuous Circle?" *Higher Education Policy* 32(3): 397-417. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-018-0087-7

Krause, Kerri-Lee. 2009. "Interpreting changing academic roles and identities in higher education." In *The Routledge International Handbook of Higher Education,* edited by Malcolm Tight, Ka Ho Mok, Jeroen Huisman and Christopher Morphew, 413-425. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lister, Michael and Emily Pia. 2008. *Citizenship in Contemporary Europe*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Macfarlane, Bruce. 2005. "The Disengaged Academic." *Higher Education Quarterly* 59(4): 296-312. https//doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2005.00299

Macfarlane, Bruce. 2006. *The Academic Citizen: The Virtue of Service in University Life.* London: Routledge.

Malcolm, Janice and Miriam Zukas. 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

Mason, Jennifer. 2018. *Qualitative Researching* (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Miles, Matthew, Michael Huberman and Johnny Saldaña. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Mount St. Joseph University. n.d. "*Faculty Citizenship*." Mount St. Joseph University. Accessed July 27, 2022. https://mymount.msj.edu/ICS/icsfs/B-Faculty_Citizenship.pdf?target=23c1ecc9-49aa-4d74-a212-14182b627695

Nemenzo, Francisco Jr. 1977. *The Continuing Relevance of Academic Freedom.* Third World Studies Center. https://upd.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/UPDate-Vol4-Num1-5-The-continuing-relevance-of-academic-freedom.pdf

Pedersen, Daphne E and Krista Lynn Minnotte. 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, Heather 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

Podsakoff, Philip M, Scott B. MacKenzie, Julie Beth Paine and Daniel G. Bachrach. 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

Schmidt, Evanthia Kalpazidou and Kamma Langberg. 2007. "Academic Autonomy in a Rapidly Changing Education Framework: Academia on the Procrustean Bed?" *European Education* 34(4): 80-94. https://doi.org/10.2753/EUE1056-4934390406

Stake, Robert E. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stake, Robert E. 2005. "Qualitative Case Studies." In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 443-466. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stevenson, Clifford, Nick Hopkins, Russell Luyt and John Dixon. 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

Szelenyi, Katalin and Robert A. Rhoads. 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

Tienou, Tite. 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/

University of Exeter. n.d. "*Citizenship Development.*" University of Exeter. Accessed July 27, 2022.https://www.exeter.ac.uk/staff/exeteracademic/yourdevelopment/citizenshipdevelopment/

University of York. n.d. "*Academic-Promotion Criteria: Academic Citizenship.*" University of York. Accessed July 27, 2022. https://www.york.ac.uk/admin/hr/pay-and-grading/promotion/citizenship/

Ward, Kelly. 2003. *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. (Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series No. 29*). USA: Jossey-Bass.

Table 1. Interview participants

Indicators		EN University	PH University
Discipline	Sociology	3	2
	Economics / Business	2	4
	Mathematics	2	3
	Engineering	4	3
	Others	1	2
Gender	Female	2	9
	Male	10	5
Length of stay in the university	2-5 years	6	--
	6-10 years	1	4
	11-15 years	3	4
	16-20 years	1	1
	Over 20 years	1	5
N		**12**	**14**

Table 2. Thematic summary of findings

General Themes	EN University	PH University
Academic citizenship as more than a service role	'Contribution' to the knowledge culture of the collective: citizenship defined in terms of academic work that contributes to the knowledge of the collective or community of scholars; mainly in terms of research engagements	'Responsibility' to the institution: citizenship described as academic work that covers responsibilities to the university and contributions to institutional vision and mission; mainly centred on teaching-related activities
	Attributes of academic citizenship: 'autonomy' and 'plurality'; anchored on the principles and standards of the collective of scholars	Attributes of academic citizenship: 'excellence' and 'accessible'; anchored on university values and viewed as an individual trait to be exhibited by the academic citizen
Importance of the personal in the exercise of academic citizenship	Intrinsic valuing of participation in academic activities that are personally important to being academic citizens	
	Finding time for work 'paid to do' vs what they 'want to do' Personal choice in pursuing teaching track in a research university	Being 'strategic' and 'smart' Balancing teaching as primary responsibility with increasing research expectations
Academic freedom as descriptive of autonomy	Autonomy in academic work linked to academic freedom as a characteristic value/principle of academia as a democratic space	Autonomy in academic work linked to a sense of institutional academic freedom