

Please cite the Published Version

Sterling, Mark  and Blaj-Ward, Lia (2025) Mapping Academic Citizenship: Institutional Documents and Individual Experiences. In: Re-envisioning Academic Citizenship. Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds, pp. 29-78. ISBN 9781836083610 (Print) ; 9781836083580 (Online) ; 9781836083603 (Epub)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83608-358-020251002>

Publisher: Emerald Publishing Limited

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/641595/>

Usage rights:  [Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Additional Information: This is an author accepted manuscript of a chapter published in Re-envisioning Academic Citizenship, by Emerald.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

Chapter 2: Mapping academic citizenship: Institutional documents and individual experiences

Abstract

Discussion of academic citizenship has been linked in recent years to redesigned academic career frameworks. Attempts to evaluate citizenship, collegiality and service formally in decisions about individual promotion have been both welcomed and regarded with mistrust in universities across the world. This chapter examines a selection of actual academic career framework documents and analyses how citizenship, collegiality and service are included in these documents, reflecting to a greater or lesser extent the universities' stated strategic ambitions.

Analysis of actual frameworks is followed by five scenarios of citizenship being enacted by academics in different roles and at different stages in their professional journey. Each of the five scenarios responds to a prompt from the literature and draws on conversations with three purposively sampled interviewees. The scenarios and accompanying commentary offer positive examples of citizenship which would meet and exceed threshold citizenship criteria in career frameworks: scholarly peer review and journal editorial work; integrating citizenship as a professional development opportunity into a research project; an informal science communication initiative which draws on contributions from different disciplines; a contribution to a university's EDI agenda from a position of allyship; and reflection on how to develop a mentoring scheme for academics for a post-pandemic context. The chapter closes with reflection on increasing the scale and visibility of impactful ways of enacting citizenship.

2.1 An opening note on recognition of academic citizenship in universities

Academic citizenship in the various manifestations we highlighted in the opening chapter is fundamental to university life. Its value, however, has only recently begun to be recognised more substantially and consistently in institutional documents which map out academic roles. Writing with reference to the US higher education context in 1996, Boyer noted: *'I don't know of any institution engaged in evaluating service in a peer review'* (Boyer, 1996, p. 136). In 1999, again in the US context, the American Association of University Professors debated whether to include collegiality as a formal criterion for promotion decisions (AAUP, 1999), noting resistance to this in the academic community. A couple of decades later, AAUP (2016) advised against the use of a distinct collegiality

criterion, arguing that if collegiality was to be formally assessed this should be in the context of teaching, research and / or service activities, while the American Society of Higher Education (Alleman et al., 2017) noted additional challenges with regard to collegiality enactment and expectations. Attitudes towards the inclusion of academic citizenship in evaluation criteria are gradually changing, however. Also in the US context, Taylor et al. (2024) argued that academic citizenship, defined as '*community-focused public scholarship that speaks to a broader audience outside of academia*' (p 174), should be incentivised through promotion and tenure processes. Academic citizenship has become substantially more visible in UK academic career frameworks introduced both shortly before as well as after the 2020 global pandemic (Sterling et al., 2023; Grove, 2019), yet there is still work to be done on the detail of how it is enabled and rewarded across the world.

A collaborative reflective piece from the University of Sydney, Australia, captures the complexity of working towards a shared understanding of collegiality among the academic community.

Invited reflective piece

Collegiality in academic culture

What happens to a university when it requires and rewards academic staff collegiality? We are on the road to finding out.

In late 2023, the University of Sydney embarked on a nine-month co-design process to build a new Academic Excellence Framework for academic staff recognition and reward. The Framework, completed in 2024, is designed to help academics focus their efforts on valuable, impactful work. Once fully implemented, the Framework will underpin all aspects of the academic staff lifecycle, from hiring, to probation, confirmation (tenure), and promotion.

The new Framework includes items and activities that one might expect as part of core academic work; it details activities in Education, Research, and Service. During the co-design, which entailed hundreds of meetings and conversations across the University, it became very clear that staff also wanted to foster a university culture in which good citizenship was recognised and rewarded. Through these conversations, and the University Executive's convictions that positive workplace culture is crucial, the idea of an underpinning 'Collegiality' platform for the Framework was born.

Universities are full of critical thinkers. As soon as we settled, as a community, on the idea that collegiality should underpin our work, staff began voicing concerns about what it meant. They worried that collegiality could not be measured accurately because it is subjective, and hence should not be included as an expectation of staff. They worried that a requirement for collegiality would disadvantage and potentially punish neuro-diverse staff. They worried that expectations of collegiality would morph into a push to remove individualism – the term ‘cookie-cutter behaviour’ was bandied around. The academic freedom banner was raised above the crowd. One staff member publicly invoked the idea of the collegial university as a totalitarian state.

There are valid threads in this fabric of concern. Collegiality is subjective and very difficult to measure. Ultimately, our collegiality is gauged by the way others experience their interactions with us. The same behaviour will be experienced differently by individuals, depending on their state of mind and social constructions. There is no possibility that people will be perfect colleagues all the time, and there should not be an expectation of unerringly norm-conforming behaviour from anyone. A University, like society, thrives on diversity.

The authors of this piece are the sponsor of, and key leaders on, the Academic Excellence Program. Together, we considered the staff concerns. We needed a definition and operationalisation of collegiality that did not force staff into ritualised behaviours or, worse, competitive collegiality.

As a group, we asked ourselves ‘What do we see as the foundations of being a good colleague?’ We each had a slightly different perspective.

Annamarie felt that collegiality manifests as an orientation toward the professional success of others. Rather than being solely motivated by their own advancement, collegial academics facilitate the day-to-day progress and career trajectories of others in the way that they model and mentor for disciplinary and institutional values.

Scott felt collegiality hinges on kindness because, in the context of the academy, the necessary virtues of analysis and criticism together with contemporary managerial approaches often need to be paired with a stronger recognition of the human dimensions of work. Reflecting on kindness is a prompt, not for anodyne niceness, but to understand how concern for our colleagues shapes our choices about the ways we work, and work with others.

Susan felt that collegiality grows out of accountability, because accountability drives and is supported by concern for one’s impact on others. An accountable colleague is one

who takes responsibility for their actions and who, ideally, uses that internal locus of control to do better by others.

In developing the University's description of the Collegiality foundation, we kept each of these things in mind, building descriptions of daily practice surrounding four core ways of working.

At the University of Sydney, we require good colleagues to demonstrate through their work that they are curious, fair, inclusive, and responsible. Our Collegiality foundation is shown below.

Collegiality at the University of Sydney	
As we work together, we are:	In our daily practice as good colleagues, we:
Curious We are positive, curious, constructive and solutions-focused	- Actively listen to others and explore competing views with an open mind - Operate with good faith and give people benefit of the doubt - Welcome and provide open, constructive and thoughtful feedback As Leaders, facilitate open and honest dialogue that fosters collective problem-solving
Fair We act with fairness, care, and compassion towards every member of the University	- Treat all colleagues and students with dignity and empathy - Engage with others in a professional manner at all times, even when we disagree - Speak up, express concerns, or take appropriate action for colleagues in uncomfortable situations As Leaders, build a culture of transparency, opportunity and equity
Inclusive We work to build a welcoming and inclusive workplace for all colleagues and students	- Acknowledge and respect First Nations peoples' values, culture, and knowledge - Recognise and value diverse strengths and contributions - Reduce or remove barriers to participation As Leaders, celebrate breadth of efforts, experiences and achievements
Responsible We exercise a sense of responsibility towards all of the University community	- Contribute to the purpose and success of the University - Own our successes and failures, using both as a chance for reflection and improvement - Are willing to help out and create valuable opportunities for others As Leaders, work with our staff or team to achieve shared goals and foster a sense of belonging.

Professor Susan Rowland PFHEA GAICD, Vice-Provost

Dr Scott McBride, Lead, Program Architecture, Academic Excellence Program

Professor Annamarie Jagose FAHA, Provost and Deputy Vice Chancellor

University of Sydney, Australia

An initiative to reward citizenship in academic careers in an institution with a presence in five countries is outlined by Professor Valérie Moatti in a blog for Global Focus (Moatti, 2021). She elaborates on this in a reflective piece included below.

Invited reflective piece

Rewarding citizenship at the ESCP Business School

Founded in 1819, ESCP Business School is an old but vibrant and endearing institution. The ESCP faculty has been a family for decades, with a dominant French culture. Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, ESCP has expanded by developing several European campuses (London, Madrid, Berlin and Turin). In the second half of the 2010s, its strong growth has been fuelled by more than doubling the number of students and the rapid development of the European campuses and their respective faculties and staff.

In this new context, we have been committed to preserving the ESCP's unique DNA and the social glue between people, and especially between faculty members, despite cultural, historical and geographical boundaries. "Organisational Citizenship" was inscribed in the early 2010s by Dr Frédérique Alexandre-Bailly, one of our former Deans of Faculty, as one of the five dimensions (in addition to teaching, research, external visibility and management) used to assess ESCP professors. It was a way of making explicit, and therefore easier to transfer, what makes the ESCP DNA so unique. More specifically, "Organisational Citizenship" aims to capture faculty contributions beyond traditional academic activities, and also faculty behaviour towards their peers and the institution. In other words, Organisational Citizenship encompasses tasks and activities that make faculty members "good colleagues", such as mentoring junior faculty in the classroom, substituting when needed, but also sharing in the success of the school through community building and activities. In practice, this includes supervising undergraduate and graduate theses, interviewing incoming students, coordinating course content across campuses, and contributing to the programme portfolio and academic curriculum development.

Most of these contributions are difficult to measure and evaluate. This is probably one of the reasons why most universities around the world focus on core activities, namely teaching and research, which are easier to measure (through publication output and teaching evaluations). At ESCP, we used to do this informally and it was quite successful at the time when the faculty was relatively small, social ties between professors were strong and there was a high geographical and cultural concentration. However, given the strong and rapid growth, the internationalisation of the faculty profile and the European expansion, it became almost impossible and deeply unfair to manage it in this way.

In 2018, when I started my first mandate as Dean of Faculty, I initiated a project to address challenges signposted by faculty, including a strong sense of unfairness between campuses, profiles, generations and types of contributions. This project eventually led to the design and implementation of a new framework for faculty management called MyESCP, as detailed in my EFMD article. This new framework aims to better recognise the different forms of faculty contribution and to inscribe in stone the fact that every faculty member, regardless of profile, background and campus, has a duty to contribute intellectually, to teach and to be a citizen, formalised through concrete expectations. In short, MyESCP offers four different paths (symbolised by the four letters E, S, C and P) with specific weights and proportions between different activities to take into account preferences, competences and stage of career development. In this context, each professor, regardless of the path and timing of his or her career development, must participate in at least 15 student recruitment interviews and supervise at least 7 master's or bachelor's theses per year. Overall, the new framework has helped to clarify expectations and reduce differences between campuses and faculty members.

Professor Valérie Moatti,
Former Dean of Faculty
ESCP Business School

We juxtapose to the ESCP project a similarly successful initiative, in the UK context, offered by Dr Tanita Casci.

Invited reflective piece

Building a community of scholars: Collegiality in academia

Academic research thrives on building on each other's ideas — synchronously or otherwise — to increase knowledge, insight, or practical application. Being part of a collaborative community is also what inspires people to join academia in the first place. In recent years, however, researchers have described a different experience, one that is based on individualism and toxic power imbalances. To counter this trend, organisations have taken the opportunity to promote not only the achievement of the individual but also how that individual has shown collegiality, that is, how they have supported the careers of others.

Collegiality benefits both the research system and the members of the research community. It is clear how collegiality benefits individuals. Academia — like so many professional environments — runs on unwritten rules and undocumented wisdom. Those who are new to the academy, such as those who are early in their career and / or those from different backgrounds, gain from guidance to understand the professional norms, how to develop and share ideas, how progress to the next career stage, and how to meet future collaborators.

Collegiality, however, benefits institutions too. The advancement of collegiality can be motivated by instrumental reasons, e.g. to increase the chances of securing increasingly competitive research funding or of joining international collaborations. And there are reputational reasons too. Universities have traditionally demonstrated the value of investing in research by referring to academic outputs or benefits to society. Now, funders and governments are beginning to demand — in the UK, this includes through the national assessment exercise — that organisations describe how they support careers in and beyond the institution and indeed beyond academia. Evidence of support for careers includes a variety of mechanisms, from transparent promotion pathways to the provision of mentoring and coaching, through to documenting the career destinations of staff and students.

An example of how collegiality can be rewarded is provided by the University of Glasgow (UK), which in 2019–20 revised its promotion criteria to include a requirement for professorial applicants to demonstrate collegiality in all qualifying dimensions, such as academic outputs, grant capture, supervision, esteem, learning and teaching practice, impact, and leadership, management and engagement (Casci and Padgett, n.d.). The promotion documentation also contained examples of how collegiality can be evidenced: sharing applications for funding, passing on the opportunity to give conference talks, commenting on early drafts of manuscripts, and introducing colleagues to one's networks.

Far from being punitive or burdensome, the criteria rewarded what our most esteemed individuals are already doing. If we think about the most inspiring individual we have met in academia, chances are it is someone who helped us to think differently about a situation or who gave us the confidence to grasp an opportunity. Chances are also that the person was collegial as well as successful by more traditional measures.

Collegiality will outlive the current policy trend. Collegiality sustains the collaborative, international community that academia has become; it is also an example of the reflective focus on how research is done rather than what is done. The future community of scholars will attract, retain and reward the behaviours that support the whole system, and not just the individual.

Dr Tanita Casci

Director, Research Strategy & Policy Unit

University of Oxford, UK

In this chapter we trace the presence of academic citizenship, as an umbrella concept encompassing the various meanings of collegiality, service and engagement beyond the campus gates, in a number of career framework policy documents. These were in use at the time of writing the book in various universities in the UK, the context we are writing from. We follow up with five scenarios, each prompted by a meaningful quote from the literature we reviewed and each refined with the help of three different purposefully sampled interviewees. The scenarios illustrate how different forms of citizenship, salient in the framework documents, can be enacted and – importantly – supported, for the benefit of institutions and communities, in different academic roles and contexts, and at different stages of an academic career. Support helps amplify the positive impact of academic citizenship and enables progression of individual careers in ways that sustain action with community benefit.

2.2 The place of academic citizenship in academic career frameworks

Academic career framework policies and promotion criteria make explicit institutional expectations about academic citizenship in a variety of ways, as we found in the 31 UK-based career framework documents we analysed (see the Appendix to this book for methodological detail). The concept of academic citizenship was included explicitly, most

often through the actual use of the term ‘citizenship’ or ‘service’, less frequently through reference to collegiality. Collegiality appeared primarily in connection to collegial behaviour, culture or environment, while examples of collegiality as governance were labelled ‘leadership’, ‘institutional citizenship’ or ‘service to the university’.¹ Only brief reference to citizenship was made in some documents, others elaborated on the concept in a paragraph, while explanation in the more detailed frameworks ran to three pages. Some universities referred to citizenship as a core underlying requirement, expected of all staff, and in addition to separate pathway criteria. Where more substantial sets of criteria related to citizenship were included separately from criteria formally categorised as teaching or research, they carried a variety of labels, listed alphabetically in Table 2(a). There was no identifiable pattern in how citizenship was reflected in the criteria in specific university mission groups or categories (e.g., the Russell Group) or in terms of location in one of the four UK nations.

Table 2(a) Category and subcategory labels for academic citizenship criteria (internally and externally oriented) in academic career framework documents

Academic citizenship
Academic citizenship and leadership
Academic excellence in civic and institutional contribution
Academic leadership
Citizenship
Citizenship and inclusion
Citizenship and leadership
Collegiality, leadership and management
Contribution
Corporate contribution to the university ²
Engagement
Engagement, impact and enterprise
Engagement, innovation and impact

¹ Dawson et al.’s (2022) analysis of policy documents explored whether collegiality (defined as collegial governance and as respectful, collaborative, constructive relationships) was briefly mentioned in a selection of policy documents from 129 universities in the United States and Canada, defined and exemplified, or fully assessed either as a separate criterion or within the dimensions of teaching, research or service. They found that collegiality appeared more frequently in the documents of research-oriented universities, though it is unclear in their discussion where collegiality and service overlap and how service is defined. This pattern was not apparent in the frameworks we analysed.

² This category label was replaced in the newer version of the career framework document we looked at by ‘academic citizenship and leadership’ but we included it here as an interesting example of a change in perspective.

Enterprise and engagement
Enterprise and external engagement
External affairs
External and professional engagement
External engagement
Impact, outreach, engagement
Influence and leadership
Innovation and engagement
Innovation and impact
Innovation, civic mission and international
Institutional citizenship
Knowledge exchange
Knowledge exchange: Employer engagement and skills pipeline
Knowledge exchange: Engaging publics through discipline leadership
Knowledge exchange: External partner engagement, innovation and growth
Knowledge exchange: Social innovation and community engagement
Knowledge exchange: Workforce development and Lifelong Learning provision
Knowledge transfer and external engagement
Leadership
Leadership (Academic citizenship, High quality management, Change and innovation)
Leadership and citizenship
Leadership and management
Leadership, management and collegiality
Management
Management and course / education management
Management and leadership
Professional standing and wider engagement
Service and leadership
Service to the university and to the academic community
University / Academic service and good citizenship

While academic citizenship was present in some form in all the framework documents included in our analysis, some universities linked this overtly to their strategic ambitions, included citizenship as a core component of all pathways, positioned it at the core of their ambition to deliver on their triple mission in an integrated way, and offered detailed guidance on how it could be evidenced. At the other end of the continuum were universities which included a brief mention of expectation of collegiality, without additional detail. Some frameworks included an overarching statement about adherence to a University's values and code of practice, and acting in a way that is informed by a collegial

ethos and mindset (e.g., taking personal accountability, and placing collective interest above individual priorities). Academic citizenship was expected to be demonstrated across all areas of activity, regardless of its focus, complexity and reach, though in at least one case it was specified as a requirement at the higher levels of the academic hierarchy.

In frameworks where more detail about the criteria for academic citizenship was provided (e.g., University of York), listing activities (*'involvement in departmental policy initiatives'*) was combined with language that qualified forms of citizenship or contribution (*'active and effective contribution to policy formation'*). Criteria referred to behaviours (e.g., *'assiduous performance of duties as supervisor'*) as well as to commitment (*'willingness to volunteer in one-off duties'*). The purpose of academic citizenship and its desired impact were articulated more explicitly and specifically in some frameworks than in others.

Academic citizenship criteria were usually grouped into one category. Where more than one category was available, these were largely differentiated on the basis of institution-internal or institution-external orientation. A closer look at category content, however, revealed overlap between the two. External orientation included the discipline community, the higher education sector or stakeholders in other sectors. Other sectors were represented by public bodies, non-governmental organisations, learned societies, commercial entities, or beneficiaries of philanthropy. Some of the universities whose framework documents we explored included a distinct career pathway with a specific focus on engagement with other sectors. External-facing citizenship through knowledge exchange and impact on communities and society was more clearly delineated on these pathways, though the majority of frameworks, regardless of the number of pathways they included, articulated expectations of engagement with and impact in other sectors, either within distinct sets of promotion criteria or woven into criteria for research and / or education. Two of the universities whose academic career frameworks we analysed linked external engagement explicitly to their immediate locality. There was no discernible hierarchical relationship in the framework documents between internally-oriented and externally-oriented citizenship. Notwithstanding, the extent to which different forms of citizenship were made visible varied, potentially sending out implicit messages about hierarchy.

The reach and significance of impact of various forms of academic citizenship increased from one career stage to another. Reference to leadership was made to differentiate between career stages. While earlier stages carried the expectation of contribution, more senior roles carried the expectation of significant and sustained

leadership. Taking up formal and informal leadership roles, on a shorter or longer term basis was viewed as a form of citizenship, with increasing levels of responsibility as role holders progressed in seniority. In some frameworks there was a clearly articulated expectation that colleagues with leadership or managerial roles would support the implementation of university strategy and achievement of KPIs, manage teams with diverse levels of experience, leave a positive legacy when moving on from a position of leadership, and step up during difficult periods of change. In some cases, differentiation was made between 'Management and administration' on the one hand and 'Academic leadership' on the other.

'University citizenship' or 'institutional citizenship' were used in a number of academic career framework documents to refer specifically to internally-oriented activities. Internally, at department, school, college or university level, academics are encouraged and expected to carry out a fair share of duties on committees, working groups, working parties, networks and panels in areas such as education quality assurance and enhancement, research ethics, or staff recruitment; to contribute to varying degrees to the development of policy and the optimisation of processes; and to do so while promoting and facilitating collaborative working across academic and professional services. Citizenship was also equated to stepping in to support others, behaving ethically and challenging inappropriate behaviour. Acting as a trade union representative to facilitate better relationships between academics and the employing universities was also valued as a form of citizenship.

University strategic priorities to which citizenship criteria aligned explicitly in some frameworks were equity, diversity and inclusion, sustainability and climate action towards Net Zero, health and wellbeing, and collaborative working. These were mentioned both in the context of creating a positive work and study culture, and in the context of sector benchmarking and enhancing a university's reputation. Reputation-confirming and reputation-enhancing accolades flagged in framework documents included the UK-wide National Student Survey, the UK Research Excellence Framework, the UK Knowledge Exchange Framework, and nationally or internationally recognised charters related to equity, diversity and inclusion (gender-linked Athena SWAN, Stonewall, the Race Equality Charter, or Disability Standards). Positive advocacy for the university and helping raise a university's profile to maximise its impact were listed as examples of citizenship. Citizenship also referred to activities to support the financial sustainability of universities and diversify income streams.

Enabling other colleagues within a university to use their full potential in support of a university's mission was a recurrent example of academic citizenship in career frameworks. Specific examples included organising induction, mentoring colleagues to progress in their career, acting as a role model, setting up collaborations with a developmental component and carrying out developmental peer review. There was an expectation that academic citizens would actively engage in professional development themselves and share their learning more widely. Colleagues' development sat at the intersection between citizenship of an institution and citizenship of an academic discipline.

While all forms of citizenship would ultimately benefit students, activities more directly reflective of student-oriented citizenship involved developing and delivering new programmes and curricula, credit-bearing or otherwise; student mentoring and other forms of student career development (e.g., through embedding enterprise and professional activity in curricula); pastoral work; engagement with student associations; and assisting with graduation events. Student-oriented citizenship varied to the extent to which it was closer to the taught core of the academic experience or directed towards the broader student experience at university. Examples of citizenship to benefit potential new students like outreach and widening participation through engagement with schools and through university open days or offer holder events were also included.

Citizenship commitments linked to the day-to-day running of an institution sat alongside commitments to the academic citizens' 'home' discipline or to the higher education sector more broadly. Academics were encouraged to engage in multi-institutional collaboration, organise conferences, set up research consortia, take up increasingly more complex roles in discipline-specific associations, learned societies or other sector bodies, edit journals and carry out peer review, support promotion applications, act as external examiners, or support sector academic quality and standards in a range of other advisory roles.

Alongside collaboration within an institution (whether linked to a UK-based campus or one based elsewhere), or within the higher education sector, career frameworks placed value on externally-oriented citizenship, supportive of communities outside physical or metaphorical campus gates. One framework made explicit reference to their Coronavirus Screening Service, others referred more generically to voluntary or civic activities endorsed by their universities, board-level work for schools or colleges, partnership with the cultural or heritage sector, or contribution to public policy and government work. Evidence of external citizenship in the framework documents we looked at included the impact generated through consultancy, collaborative working with external partners,

research and innovation activity on the economy, culture, environment, health and quality of life.

There was acknowledgement in the frameworks that activities listed were indicative. We are mindful that narratives of individual experience constructed in applications for promotion, outside the remit of our research, may choose to emphasize some aspects over others while aiming for an integrated, holistic picture. Interpretations of criteria will depend on the background of selection panel members and referees. We are also mindful that the criteria we analysed were generic, institution-wide. The way in which the criteria are evidenced depends in no small measure on expectations in discipline-specific cultures or on the way an applicant has been enabled to engage in various forms of academic citizenship.

While all academic citizenship criteria are open to interpretation, 'leadership' is potentially the most at risk of being misconstrued, particularly when linked to formal roles. In an invited reflective piece included below, Professor Bruce Macfarlane makes a case for conceptualising formal leadership as duty to serve, carrying forward into the twenty-first century the values of humility, openness, respectfulness, and tolerance associated with academic citizenship.

Invited reflective piece

Duty to serve

Leadership is very often represented by universities as something separate or distinctive from academic citizenship or service but it is really a form of service in itself. A modern caricature of academic leaders is that they are devotees of neo-liberalism and management speak; overpaid, uncaring bullies pursuing a lucrative career option, in love with performance indicators and the empty rhetoric of managerialism. Academic leaders or managers are believed by some to have, as one of my colleagues put it some years ago, 'gone over to the dark side'. Then, there is the alternative caricature of the golden age of the collegial Western university where 'administration' was performed by benign gentlemanly administrators. The current reality of academic leadership lies somewhere in-between these two largely inaccurate representations of present and past.

In order to reconnect academic leadership with academic citizenship we need to conceptualise leadership as part of the duty to serve. This means that being an academic leader should not be thought of as a purely self-centred career choice by the excessively ambitious, nor an unwelcome collegial obligation that is purely a temporary distraction

from scholarly interests. Instead, leadership needs to be recast as a duty to serve in order to promote the liberal values – humility, openness, respectfulness, and tolerance – which are core to academic life protecting common cultural norms such as collegial self-governance, merit-based systems for appointment and promotion, and rigorous peer review. There are many real threats to these values such as individualism connected with bibliometrics, cronyism in academic appointments, uncollegial behaviours, and censorship in the face of rising nationalism and intolerance within wider society. We cannot afford an army of critics of academic leadership free riding on the privileges of academic life but unwilling to serve as leaders themselves. The duty to serve is much more than a professional obligation; it is a vital means of upholding the values and standards of the academic profession that make universities special institutions.

Professor Bruce Macfarlane

The Education University of Hong Kong

2.3 Enacting academic citizenship: Five scenarios

How academic citizenship – in its many forms – is enacted to lead to outcomes recorded in a variety of documents and mapped onto institutions' reward criteria will vary depending on the specific institutional context to which the academic claims allegiance, as well as on individual career stage, personal experience and academic capital. The frameworks we analysed in the previous section provide examples of forms of citizenship that are valued in academia. To bring these to life, we offer five scenarios of academics at different career stages, modelling academic citizenship with both internal and external focus, with continued relevance for universities' triple mission in society; an overview is available in Table 2(b). The scenarios and accompanying commentary are designed to illustrate citizenship that meets and exceeds threshold criteria in academic career framework documents. They reflect leadership, formal and informal, at all career stages. They are underpinned by an ethical way of being in academia (Dwyer and Black, 2021), which values *'long-term approaches of mutual learning that build connection, and which help us do our collective and individual part to bring wholeness, integrity, potential and possibility into the academy and beyond'* (p. 14). They are by no means exhaustive – we acknowledge there is a myriad of ways to show collegiality and be of service to others, to which no single book can do full justice. What the scenarios and accompanying

commentary offer readers of this book is an opportunity to reflect on enablers (and barriers) to academic citizenship, and to use insights from that reflection to effect change in their own contexts.

Each scenario is prefaced by a meaningful quote from our reading that resonated with us and helped shape the core of the scenario. The scenarios and accompanying commentary merge insights from the literature, from our analysis of career framework documents and from three different interviews each, with purposefully sampled higher education colleagues (details are included in the Appendix to this book). They foreground a variety of ways in which the academic expertise of the scenario protagonists underpins and is integrated into the enactment of academic citizenship, in contrast to a view of service as a completely separate area of activity.

Table 2(b) Scenarios of academics enacting citizenship

Scenario protagonist and academic role ³	Form of academic citizenship and context	Orientation / beneficiaries
Francesca, Professor Emerita, climate economics	Review and editorial commitments for scholarly journal	Scholarly knowledge-making community
Edith, mid-career academic, wildlife ecologist, principal investigator on interdisciplinary project	Leading and developing a newly formed research team into rounded professionals, in the context of a bounded, externally funded research project	Early career researchers and commitment to own professional development mid-career
Atifa, early career academic, product design	A small-scale, informal knowledge exchange initiative which includes students and the general public	Students and members of the general public
Robert, mid-career academic, psychology of disability	Stepping outside a discipline specialism to lead a strand of the equity, diversity and inclusion strategy work within a university	A university-wide community, inclusive of all occupations and professional levels
Nazir, late-career academic in senior leadership role	Commissioning and sponsoring the review of a	Colleagues in academic, managerial and other

³ Scenario protagonist names are fictional and were chosen following guidance from Lahman et al. (2022).

	university-wide mentoring scheme	graduate-level roles in a university
--	-------------------------------------	---

2.3.1 A retired professor who is maintaining her review and editorial commitments for a scholarly journal

'I am a retired academic' Sandra Acker wrote in a 2017 'Points for debate' piece, reflecting on her Professor Emerita role. She continued, *'Yesterday, I agreed to assess an American professor's portfolio for promotion and to review a submission for a journal. Why do I say yes to these unpaid tasks?'* (p. 637). Acker's quote, purposefully selected as the starting point for our first scenario, is an apt illustration of how commitment to academic citizenship endures beyond a formal relationship with an employing university. Emeritus arrangements at professorial level are one way in which universities maintain connections to retired academics who continue to make valued and valuable contributions to knowledge in their field, sustaining scholarly work and enhancing retirement experiences (Cahill et al., 2021). The scenario in this section – Francesca, a retired academic – spotlights review and editorial commitments for scholarly journals, a fundamental form of citizenship in academia. It explores ways in which peer review can be sustained and enhanced going forward into the twenty-first century, as well as being used as a vantage point from which to increase equity in academic knowledge sharing.

Francesca is Professor Emerita in Climate Change Economics, three years into her retirement and is often called on to advise policy makers and speak at high profile events, with specialist as well as general audiences. As well as balancing speaking and advisory engagements with dedicating her attention to her elderly mother and a variety of other pastimes she had been looking forward to in her retirement, Francesca has maintained her peer review and editorial commitments to leading journals in her field. In an editorial advisory capacity, Francesca appreciates the challenges that executive editors have but is gently steering conversations towards including a broader range of author voices in these leading journals.

Francesca has been troubled recently by the persistent way in which what is usually termed 'the global North' continues to impact the global South in her specialist field, climate economics. Negative economic effects of global warming, she notes, are experienced most poignantly in the global South. Meanwhile, scholarly debates about climate economics pay insufficient attention to global South viewpoints and there is a

noticeable imbalance in who makes decisions about the knowledge to be shared through scholarly publishing. The global pandemic has intensified this imbalance and added urgency to the need to address it.

Peer review – a practice which confers legitimacy and credibility on knowledge disseminated within and beyond academia – has been flagged as unsustainable in the current context (Lindebaum and Jordan, 2021; Ellwanger and Chies, 2020). Although a gradual move away from metrics to evaluate research is noted (Nicholson, 2024), the value placed on citation metrics in rankings, league tables and decision-making processes with regard to research funding allocation has been reflected in the exponential increase in the volume of publications. This increase has not been matched by reviewer availability, and while reviewers are not yet an ‘*endangered species*’ (Ellwanger and Chies, 2020), there is potential risk that they could become that if due attention is not paid to how reviewer experience is gained, developed and rewarded (Tight, 2024), or how better parity of esteem can be achieved between actual writing for scholarly publication and performing peer review.

Writing from the perspective of journal editors, Lund Dean and Forray (2018) note there is a need to ‘*re-frame reviewing not as a service but as a requirement for the entire academic enterprise to flourish*’ (p. 167) to ensure reviewers are appropriately recognised and rewarded so that knowledge-making processes are appropriately supported. The acknowledgement which closes Lipton’s (2022) article is a telling example of the constructive peer review experience Lund Dean and Forray are advocating for:

I thank the editors and anonymous reviewers for their generous and critical engagement with earlier versions of this article. The process of academic reviewing, revising and resubmitting was a joyous and affirmative experience. One where author, editor, reviewers, the article, its references and ideas became tangled together, written and responded to in a dialogical way that truly offered spaces for new imaginings and creative engagement. Such response-able reviewing has inspired in me new ways of being and doing in all aspects of peer review, and for that I am most grateful. (Lipton, 2022, pp. 577-578)

The intellectual contribution that reviewers make to the development of an individual piece of writing as well as to the broader academic field in which that piece is located is also

highlighted by Horta and Jung (2023), who add to Lund Dean and Forray's (2018) suggestions on how to mitigate against reviewer fatigue and incentivise constructive review practice. Francesca's constructive contribution to intellectual flourishing in her field is discretionary, as she is comfortably retired and can easily balance her broader life commitments with maintaining an intellectual interest in her field. However, academics at other stages in their career may need a different form of recognition of their efforts, in order to be able to manage the varying expectations that come with an academic role.

Francesca's deep understanding of climate economics and her equally deep awareness of the imbalance between economic development and climate justice underpin her commitment to disseminating knowledge from parts of the world that are less economically advantaged but hold greater insight into globally beneficial ways to reverse climate change (IMF, 2021). Through her editorial commitments she can influence journals with a higher profile and standing to place greater value on local, vernacular knowledge, partner with journals from emerging research ecosystems (Mills et al., 2021) and ensure they have reviewer pools with relevant expertise. She can create peer reviewer development opportunities for scholars from the global South who have an emerging profile. To offer potential new reviewers opportunities to shadow the review process, Francesca could also advocate for a more transparent peer review process, carried out on platforms such as PLOS (n.d.), which allows sharing of review reports and earlier drafts alongside the final, journal-approved piece of writing. Participation in peer review can also be leveraged to build scholarly networks. Cultural differences to how networks develop will need unpacking to ensure that benefits are realised. A step above broadening the reviewer pool, Francesca's reflection, supported by studies such as Nishikawa-Pacher et al. (2023), de Sousa et al. (2023), Dewidar et al. (2022) or Waldrop and Likis (2022), on her own development in an editorial role as well as on lack of equity in editorial board membership could help underpin initiatives to support reviewers from the global South transition into editorial positions.

Reflecting on Acker's (2017) quote which sparked the scenario, individual intellectual curiosity and commitment to shaping the academic field to which one claims allegiance need to be met by institutional arrangements that acknowledge the value of this form of citizenship and facilitate its enactment. External leverage for these arrangements can come from initiatives with supra-national reach such as the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA, 2022) and from knowledge-making communities that cut across national higher education systems. However, individual academics also need to ensure that they remain committed to enacting the day-to-day business and long-term mission of the university which employs them.

2.3.2 A mid-career academic who is shaping a research project into a development opportunity for her project team

A question with continued relevance in higher education is: *'what form of academic identity and career development does current knowledge organization within and outside of academia make room for and with what consequences?'* (Gustafsson, 2022, p. 8). Echoing the views of many before her, Gustafsson (2022) notes that service requires early career researchers to commit time that they are usually advised to expend on academic activities more directly linked to what is considered to be the core of an academic identity, namely research and academic publications. Having a rounded profile, however, is essential to securing a position in academia from which to make a more substantial impact within and beyond one's area of expertise. The scenario of Edith, a mid-career academic, illustrates how a research project can be built into a broader development opportunity for the project team.

Edith, a wildlife ecologist, has recently secured a substantial research grant – her first on this scale – to study the behaviour of snow leopards in their natural habitat and their interaction with local communities which depend on livestock herding. It is not the first grant on which she is a Principal Investigator, but it is the first substantial grant that has helped her create researcher posts and that comes with time and funding earmarked for professional development. Edith will soon be recruiting and has to think carefully about the development opportunities she will create for her project team members. Her grant application emphasized the need for multi-disciplinary knowledge-making and specified a requirement to recruit both scientists with expertise in fieldwork, camera traps and telemetry, and social scientists who can support conservation efforts through developing an understanding of community responses to potential threats from snow leopards to their livelihood.

Careful balancing would be required in the project to ensure the interests and the needs of different disciplinary audiences are equitably met, and that suitable practical and further research recommendations are developed. As well as supporting the project researchers in the knowledge-making aspects of the work, Edith will have to encourage them to build connections with external organisations beyond a more narrowly defined disciplinary community, and she will have to bear in mind her own professional development as well.

Edith will need to maintain awareness of how project team members will be gradually clarifying their role and place within the larger project, and supporting each other to build a professional identity as researchers in a complex field. Agreeing on a shared language and developing a shared understanding can be a challenge in any project, but particularly more so in one that brings together expertise from different academic fields and that links to stakeholders outside academia. Collaboratively developing a code of conduct or project handbook (Tendler et al., 2023; Picot and Grasham, 2022) offers a sound basis from which to build equitable relationships, ensure their sustainability beyond the lifespan of a specific project, and respectfully acknowledge contributions from the field. The code or handbook would be a collective academic citizenship contribution by Edith's team, a model that others within the same institution or externally could integrate into their own context as appropriate.

Thinking about opportunities to enact academic citizenship with an externally-oriented remit, a point for Edith to consider is whether at any stage in the project she could make space for engagement in citizen science projects as a desirable criterion. A US-based case study (McNew-Birren and Gaul-Stout, 2022) notes ways to harness societal value from citizen science activities related to threatened species and providing supportive habitats. Edith would need to bear in mind language barriers and the need for a translator, given that fieldwork will be carried out in a different country. Alternatively, Edith could consider whether a service opportunity similar to the one described by Gustafsson (2022) – a multi-disciplinary fellowship programme for early career researchers to make scientific knowledge policy-relevant – or elements of this might be more appropriate to help build the academic identity and professional networks of the researchers she is recruiting. A third option to bear in mind would be an international end-of-project conference along the lines of that discussed by Meredith (2021), an event focused on the '*social and solidarity economy*' (p. 755) which brought together multiple stakeholder groups from within and outside academia, used two languages for official communication, and acted as '*the start of new conversations, rather than purely the transmission of conclusions from previous ones*' (p. 755).

The scenario notes that Edith is taking up her first official team leadership role. To carry this out successfully, in addition to seeking support from the steering group assigned to her project, she could potentially take inspiration on how to support teamwork and team development from colleagues she met during doctoral research but who left academia to work in other sectors. Edith may also want to reflect on who, in addition to steering group

members, might be in a position to support her to influence upwards and sideways in her department and institution, to ensure enough resource is available to her from her department and institution to develop her team. Some of these details will have been clarified at the stage of putting together the application, but institutional landscapes do not stand still. Equally importantly, while Edith and other experienced colleagues within the project's immediate and wider context will be mentoring the research team members, there are potentially plenty of opportunities within the team for reverse and reciprocal mentoring, which should be explored and acknowledged as part of the project aims and intended legacy.

An interviewee in Kligyte's (2023) research on collegiality in Australian academia offers a useful role model for Edith herself. Michelle (interviewee pseudonym) is a sustainability specialist who collaborates extensively and leads projects with contributors from '*multiple sectors: governments, communities, universities and industry partners*' (p. 5). The success of Michelle's projects relies on her ability to create '*new relational configurations that previously did not exist*' (p. 10), to listen carefully to project partners' needs, to manage risk in relationships and to ensure project outcomes are of equitable value to all project members, academic and otherwise. If Edith's team benefit from a collegial environment internally within the institution and from models of how to build external collegial relationships, they will more likely go on to replicate this when they progress in their careers.

2.3.3 An early career academic who collaborates with colleagues on a science communication project

In some environments early career researchers can be discouraged from engaging in service since there is a perception that it is more important to focus on other elements of academic activity to secure a permanent position or obtain promotion. However, Pfeifer (2016) argues that strategically aligned service is integral to early career researchers' development as rounded academic professionals, offering them greater opportunity to integrate into an institution, participate in professional networks, access professional development and develop their teaching and research in a societally-relevant way. Activities which bring university staff, students and members of the wider community together in a shared space are vivid illustrations of universities' purpose as connectors in society, making an academic citizenship contribution to public good. One example of academic contribution to public good is science communication. Nerghes et al. (2022) note that

Over the last decades, a rhetorical shift has taken place in the area of science communication in that calls for dialogue between scientists and non-scientists, as well as calls for more participatory approaches to science communication, have taken precedence over the scientific literacy deficits rhetoric. (p. 3/29).

Atifa's science communication scenario below uses science with a broad meaning of scholarly knowledge rather than referring to a more narrowly defined set of subject areas.

Atifa is an early career academic who has channelled her interest in outdoor activities into a product design doctorate on running shoes for women and several patents. Working collaboratively with two colleagues – a sports scientist and coach who runs marathons and an Arts and Humanities academic – Atifa facilitates bi-monthly workshops on campus. These are open to university students and the wider public and combine input and activities which cover a range of topics about the science and art of running.

Atifa's workshops are attracting audiences of up to fifty participants in person. The workshops do not generate income; in-person participants are charged a symbolic fee to secure commitment to attend and to cover refreshments. At the end of a full year of workshops, Atifa is hoping to reflect on the experience and evaluate the benefits, so that she can put together a more substantial business case. Her university is generally supportive of her initiative but Atifa is quickly learning that estate and time resource needs to be managed carefully and sustainably for maximum impact.

Atifa's evaluation of the workshops could start with reflection on how they combine elements of information transmission, dialogue and participation, as defined and discussed by Nerghes et al. (2022) among others, and cover the range of goals that Nerghes et al. list – for example, 'to correct misunderstandings or perceptions', 'to help people make decisions' or 'to collectively learn, reflect, solve problems' (p. 10). Although presented as competing and contradictory in some of the literature, none of these are mutually exclusive, rather, they are an array of options to meet specific relevant needs at specific points in time. Specialist and general public participants in initiatives similar to the ones that Atifa runs exchange academically validated knowledge and input into the knowledge-making process in ways that are mutually beneficial. Atifa's workshops could

potentially generate ideas for further research or actual product development projects. Conversations initiated at the events that Atifa and her colleagues run could lead to collaborations and attract funding from external sources. They could also branch into a 'live project' for students designing a website for a local parkrun group, or creating a virtual tour of the site so that diverse community members with a variety of life circumstances are encouraged to participate. Statistics about women engagement in sports (generally lower than men's, and linked to health outcomes) could offer further justification to organise events that encourage uptake of running (or other form of physical activity inclusive of disability), particularly if linked to the regional area in which Atifa's university was located.

Atifa's scenario integrates insights from science and humanities disciplines with immediate practical relevance for everyday activities and general wellbeing. It focuses on knowledge which is less likely to be perceived as controversial or as politically and ethically challenging and offers an example of citizenship that early career academics could readily engage in. A qualitative, interview-based piece of research from South Africa (Riley et al., 2022), however, raises interesting questions about the career stage at which scientists are more likely to engage confidently in science communication. Other aspects that Riley et al. put forward as worthy of consideration are the risk that media exposure carries to reputation and credibility, the language to use especially in contexts like South Africa where 11 official languages are in use – and consequent translation challenges arising, the relationship between scientific and vernacular or indigenous knowledge, or ways to identify appropriate audiences or communication outlets.

Individual conceptions of the purpose and value of science communication impact how it is practised, as does support that knowledge creators receive to build communication with the wider public into the knowledge-making process. In disciplines where conventional academic discourse prevails over ways of speaking and writing that are more inclusive of a general public audience, support for communicating with the general public may be less readily forthcoming, as Skov and Bengtsen (2023) note in a study of humanities supervisors in the Danish context. The supervisors interviewed construed this as part of the neoliberal impact agenda, and were less likely to be willing and / or able to support doctoral researchers to lift research insights off the pages of a humanities research publication. A support network crossing academic discipline lines, as exemplified by Atifa's scenario, could compensate for the absence of doctoral supervisor support in this area and enable the creation of public good.

To develop her understanding of how her initiative can be placed into the broader institutional context and build a well-argued case for senior management, Atifa could take

inspiration from Johnson's (2022) account of designing and implementing a knowledge exchange strategy in a Politics / International Relations department. To think through options available to expand her reach and impact, Atifa could use Murphy and McGrath's (2018) study as a point of reference. Murphy and McGrath offer an example of a multi-stakeholder collaboration between academics, the local accounting profession and the regional association of high school career advisors to design a career learning opportunity. Atifa's range of stakeholders is different, yet the resource-related factors impacting on the collaboration are quite similar.

On-campus forms of academic citizenship that link university-internal participants with members of the wider public, such as Atifa's initiative, make use of a university's existing resources and need to be accounted for in budgets and resource reviews, as well as assessed for potential risks. They could easily be deprioritised in favour of core university business unless externally funded, though additional constraints might apply in that case, or justified with reference to how they loop back into education or research. Writing such forms of citizenship into academic career framework documents and other relevant policies would make it more likely that their potential to spark a variety of mutual benefits will be recognised and achieved.

2.3.4 A mid-career academic who makes a substantial contribution to his university's equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) ⁴ agenda from a position of allyship

A valuable form of academic citizenship oriented internally within an institution is allyship to colleagues who belong to equity groups. In an autoethnographic account of her experience as a visibly disabled wheelchair user, Inkle (2018) highlights expectations placed on her:

I have also often been directly requested to undertake unpaid and unacknowledged work in order for universities to improve their practices, including working with HR to develop an 'on-boarding' policy for disabled staff, reviewing current fire evacuation policies, and liaising with architects to ensure building designs are wheelchair accessible. (p. 1375)

⁴ We refer to EDI, the preferred label in the UK context, for consistency, though note here the variation in how the triple concept is represented in the US (DEI) and the cultural and legal nuances that equity, diversity and inclusion carry in other national contexts.

Without support from allies, the burden of academic citizenship linked to disability can inadvertently fall on the small number of academics who identify as disabled. Leading work related to one or several aspects of a university's equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) agenda is an example of academic citizenship that contributes to creating good working environments in universities, inclusive of a wide range of talent. Equity, diversity and inclusion are core values in a global higher education system, though they are framed, resourced and implemented differently in different national higher educational systems (Álvarez-Castillo et al., 2021) and are yet to be fully achieved.

The scenario of Robert below draws on individual scholarly interest and personal experience to underpin a contribution to an institution-wide initiative aiming to respond to current issues and help build a sustainably inclusive organisational culture for the future.

Robert chose to study psychology for his undergraduate degree, partly to understand the complex experience of disability of a member of his extended family. His deep interest led to postgraduate study and to a lectureship soon after completing his doctorate in a university with a global outlook and a stated commitment to excellence in research. His academic career progressed linearly.

When his university announced an intention to review and enhance equity, diversity and inclusion among its staff, Robert found himself in an excellent position to make a substantial contribution to this initiative, drawing on his personal lived experience and his academic knowledge. Robert was however aware that his personal experience and theoretical knowledge might not be sufficient to support his contribution to the initiative and that any well-intended action could potentially be perceived negatively and could unsettle the university community. He was also aware that less enthusiastic university community members could perceive the initiative as a tick-box exercise and might be reluctant to engage fully and constructively in the process. To pre-empt this to the best of his ability, he enlisted the support of an Organisational Development colleague as a 'thinking partner'. Working collaboratively, Robert and his colleague used their complementary strengths to draft an outline for a series of all-staff workshops that would generate rich insights to underpin action.

In order to create an action plan to fully embed EDI into the fabric of the university across all areas of activity, Robert could choose disability as an angle from which to start the

conversation. Robert does not identify as disabled himself but has a personal as well as intellectual and professional interest in this. Studies on academic citizenship and EDI note that while direct experience offers valuable perspective, it is important that advocacy for an equitable and inclusive academia is not seen as something that falls solely within the remit of those who identify as disabled (Buller, 2021).

Robert would want to run a fully accessible set of workshops taking care to explain accessibility features transparently, as an additional opportunity to raise awareness of disability inclusion among all participants, not just ones with visible disabilities or who might benefit from adjustments themselves. To plan the workshops, he could look for inspiration in a chapter by Ellingson (2021), an autoethnographic account of negotiating barriers on a US campus – bureaucratic ones, such as the requirement to regularly renew a disabled parking permit, or physical ones, such as access to a charging point for an electric scooter to travel across the extensive campus space. Ellingson's (2021) account is framed as a scholarly text which '*draws on irony and feminist readings to theorise and exemplify autoethnography as a way of producing knowledge that provokes and evokes*' (Brown, 2021, p. 7). To provoke deep thinking and impactful action towards making academia more inclusive of different abilities, Robert's workshops could be extended to generate (auto)ethnographic accounts, adding depth to numeric information that the institution collects as part of its statutory reporting commitments and helping to generate a more compelling narrative about the need for change. A safe space would need to be created in which disclosure⁵ could be carried out appropriately in a way that leads to constructive solutions. Higher education statistics reveal that disclosure rates are low among academics in higher education across the world (e.g., Hassard et al., 2024). Some conditions can be managed privately without the need for formal disclosure, and the choice whether to disclose selectively, fully or not at all is ultimately a personal one. However, personal choices could be constrained by perceived barriers in the workplace (stigma, career and reputation risk, lack of support, unnecessarily complex formal processes); lack of attention to perceived barriers and lack of openness and transparency can undermine aspirations and efforts to build an inclusive, supportive workplace culture in which academics can participate fully to the benefit of students and other stakeholders.

Robert's scenario will more readily resonate in some national contexts than in others. Disability is one dimension of the EDI conversation, and the way various EDI dimensions are conceptualised in employment legislation documents and / or workplace cultures can vary substantially from one national setting to another (Klarsfeld et al., 2022).

⁵ The term 'disclosure' carries medical connotations and has been replaced in some contexts with 'sharing' as a more inclusive option.

Workshops about diversity-linked dimensions carried out in context-appropriate ways can generate an immediate sense of wellbeing among participants through allowing them to feel heard about challenges they experience (Brown and Ramlackhan, 2022). They can underpin university policy development and can build momentum for policies to then be implemented as initially intended. Their success is dependent in no small measure by academics like Robert taking up leadership – a form of academic citizenship – of a strand of the university's EDI initiative, and projecting leadership as '*the collective responsibility of a community of engaged citizens*' (Bolden et al., 2014, p. 765). We explore the link between academic citizenship and disability further in Chapter 3 but highlight here the importance of collaboration in enacting citizenship and of equitable uptake of citizenship tasks.

2.3.5 A senior academic who is sponsoring the redesign of a mentoring scheme he introduced prior to the pandemic in his university

Two essential questions linked to continued importance of mentoring – a celebrated form of academic citizenship are posed by Tam and Bell (2020) in their summary of a mentoring working group meeting, held online in Spring 2020 due to the arrival of the global pandemic:

How can we develop a range of different mentoring approaches for people to reflect on, tailor and integrate appropriately into their own / institutional practices? And how can we model the kind of academy we want in coming years through changes in our mentoring practices? (Tam and Bell, 2020)

These questions are explored in our book through Nazir's scenario.

Nazir had benefited substantially from mentoring at the start of his academic career, to develop his knowledge of the institutional context in which he was working and access a wider support network, beyond immediate peers in his academic specialist area. As his experience grew and he took on more complex and senior roles with a university-wide remit, he decided to set up a formal mentoring scheme for academic and professional services colleagues in his university. The mentoring scheme had been running

successfully for several years. The pandemic, however, had unsettled ways of working in Nazir's university and had made him aware that the mentoring scheme will need to be rethought. The pandemic-induced shift to digital working was followed up by an emphasis on integrating digital and in-person interaction and on maintaining the best of both worlds.

Reflecting on his experience and on his interactions with colleagues (and students) both physically on his university's central metropolitan campus and in virtual spaces, Nazir realised it would be useful to provide more elaborate guidelines on virtually enhanced learning partnerships and review the mentoring scheme. This would offer his colleagues a better professional development experience and therefore put them in a better position to deliver on the university's mission. Nazir's university had a well-established and highly effective digital infrastructure, and there was plenty of scope to consolidate and expand on some valuable informal mentoring that had organically arisen as a result of the pandemic. There was also scope to reflect on whether mentoring opportunities were equitably accessible to colleagues in Nazir's university.

An unexpected positive outcome of the pandemic-driven shift to digital working was that learning partnerships could form more easily across institutional and geographic boundaries and time zones. While not having a similar restorative effect to walking together in daylight in a natural environment that van den Berg and Beute (2021) highlight in a study which links wellness to walk-and-talk coaching in the Netherlands, virtual platforms connect mentors and mentees with different institutional affiliations and compensate for the lack of available mentors within an institution flagged up by Yarberry and Sims (2021) in a US-based case study. Virtual platforms offer access to a potentially broader and more diverse pool of mentors, leading to potentially richer mentoring relationships which follow a different rhythm to one constrained by arrangements required to meet in the same physical location. Participants in a virtual mentoring relationship could still enjoy physical nature simultaneously in different locations – digital hardware and connectivity allow talking and thinking in motion. The way virtual components could enhance mentoring relationships could be laid out in revised guidelines. Nazir could consider setting up a project for an academic colleague with a human resource specialism, who could explore the feasibility of various options to enhance the formal mentoring scheme. The project would create space for that colleague to exercise academic citizenship – drawing on a core research specialism but stepping outside this to enable learning within the institution and beyond. The mentoring scheme could include

mentors from other universities and even sectors, still within an institutionally assured framework to maximise the learning and benefits for individuals and the institution.

Examples of mentoring that expands beyond one-to-one relationships and that is underpinned by an ethics of care could inform revised guidelines for mentoring schemes. One such example is available in Schriever et al. (2021), whose co-mentoring experience began in the context of a formal mentoring programme before the pandemic and continued beyond this, evolving into a collaborative, mutual learning arrangement among three colleagues. Experience and expert knowledge of academic work were as important for relationship-building in Schriever et al.'s case as were a care-full commitment to reciprocity (Hawkins, 2019); to seeing academic identities as more than publication output numbers, individual author h-indexes, grant income secured or doctoral completion rates; to '*ways to flourish together*' (p. 60) and a '*kinder and more hopeful culture*' (p. 75). Work and non-work dimensions of identity were intertwined rather than separate; the authors connected over a shared history of career interruptions due to maternity leave or caring commitments. They protected regular meeting time in their calendars and ate together. Schriever et al.'s account does not explicitly address the point that the pandemic will have unsettled academic practices or understandings of academic roles, thus impacting on mentoring expertise and mentor-mentee role reversal, and it may not offer an example that would apply in any context. However, it could be used to echo a point made by a contributor to Tetzlaff et al. (2022) that '*Now might be a good time to try different mentoring formats, even if you felt in the past they were not a good fit*' (p. 776).

A mentoring initiative that built connections outside rather than inside an institution and that could serve as an example of how to grow mentoring connections more organically is discussed by Brown et al. (2023). The nine co-authors of Brown et al. (2023) – nine women in a variety of roles and with a range of discipline, cultural and institutional affiliations in Australia and New Zealand – drew on their experience of participating in a women's leadership programme to co-design principles of leadership in higher education for a post-digital world. Their shared interest and recognised expertise in digital learning and teaching placed them in the spotlight when universities moved their activities online as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. Mentoring in the context of the programme supported them to work together in mutually beneficial ways, though the online platform they chose to interact on occasionally hindered collaboration across digital walls – '*we circumvented institutional platforms in the end and moved to a private cloud solution*' note the authors. A more formal mentoring initiative set up prior to the pandemic in the US context but of particular relevance to Nazir's scenario is Oberhauser and Caretta's (2019) specialist group (the Geographic Perspectives on Women) within a

discipline-specific scholarly association (the American Association of Geographers). The stated mission of the group was to *'create spaces of inclusivity of women (and those who identify as women or female) and raise their scholarship, voice, and visibility'* (p. 1671). Mentoring was central to fulfilling the group's mission, and opportunities were created to generate outputs valued in academia such as invited talks and co-authored written pieces. The group removed other anticipated barriers to participation by organising smaller, more intimate meetings and making events free to attend. Reflection on how the group can achieve full inclusivity and not inadvertently discourage participation resulted in a name change from Geographic Perspectives on Women to Feminist Geographies Speciality Group,⁶ to *'develop more diverse membership through efforts that encourage mentoring focused on not only professional advancement, but also ones that engage with issues around mental and emotional health'* (p. 1678).

The initiatives discussed in Schriever et al. (2021), Brown et al. (2023) and Oberhauser and Caretta (2019) developed organically, sparked by the drive and enthusiasm of committed academics who recognised a need and wished to make a difference. They were not mandated institutionally. Institutional support, however, is fundamental to scaling up mentoring initiatives in a sustainable, logistics-aware way, provided this is carried out with critical appreciation of the ethos and purpose of these initiatives. Support also pre-empts the risk of initiatives being carried out (too much) above and beyond workload allocation, which would impact negatively on other work commitments as well as potentially leading to burnout. A formally advertised scheme with clear guidelines on how to engage in a mentoring relationship would open up opportunities for mentees from underrepresented backgrounds who may need more support with navigating academia.

Nazir's scenario illustrates how one form of academic citizenship – setting up a mentoring scheme – can be revisited in a pandemic-transformed context to generate additional, institutionally-endorsed opportunities for citizenship to be enacted by academic colleagues. As academics progress in their career and gain broader perspective of the institutional context, they can and are expected to use their insight both to model good citizenship and to create opportunities for others to do so in a way that aligns individual strengths and interests with institutional benefits.

⁶ The UK-based WHEN – Women's Higher Education Network – specify that in their case 'women' include *'cisgender women, trans women and non-binary people who are comfortable in a female centred community'* <https://www.whenequality.org/>.

2.4 Closing reflection on recognising and resourcing academic citizenship

The richness and complexity of academic citizenship make it challenging to evaluate, yet the important contribution it makes to academic life and to the academic mission in society offers a strong rationale for time and effort to be spent on unpacking its various meanings and exploring context-relevant enablers. Academic career framework documents such as the ones we analysed earlier in the chapter map out expectations for enactment of academic citizenship at different career stages and underpin decisions about recognition of success at each stage. The way expectations are met and exceeded for some forms of academic citizenship could easily become invisible despite the value they carry, and may lend itself more readily to being documented in alternative formats. Service oriented towards communities external to a university in particular is an activity that *'academics are often ill-prepared to track and document'*, as Kelly and Given (2024, p. 443) note. While sophisticated bibliometric tools are available to count and map citations, measures of societal impact – other than crude ways to indicate financial gain or benefits – are insufficiently developed. Narrative format CVs, particularly in a hybrid form which includes output lists and contextualising text (Bordignon et al., 2023), enable their authors to showcase activities not traditionally celebrated as part of education and research and to highlight a broader range of types of impact (e.g., non-monetary / financial benefit of community-engaged activities in a broad range of disciplines with less clearly defined links to professions and practice). They are a means of *'thinking outside the realm of checklists and outputs'* (Smith et al., 2014, p. 843). Luxemburg-based funding bodies have successfully introduced narrative CVs into their programmes, which have Luxemburg-based applicants but international reviewers, and adoption of the narrative is increasing globally (FNR, 2024). A risk that needs to be mitigated in relation to narrative CVs, however, is that while they give more control to authors to share career stories and receive recognition for the full spectrum of activities they engage in, there may be over-emphasis on the persuasive power of the narrative at the expense of the quality and depth of the impact being narrated (Kramer and Bosman, 2024).

While framework documents may put forward a clear message about the value of community and collaboration, the examples they provide and the evidence they request about individual contribution could inadvertently undermine that message and encourage academics to competitively seek and prioritise forms of citizenship deemed to be more prestigious over ones which require more effort and are less likely to be publicly celebrated. Recognition of collaborative effort is more likely to nurture citizenship in support of a university's mission. The scenarios we provided and the accompanying

commentary illustrate the importance of collaborative input (from all colleagues within a university, regardless of the nature of their role) to ensure that academic citizenship initiatives are successful. Our five scenarios reflect a view of citizenship as artisanship. They echo Brew et al.'s (2018) discussion of the concept of '*academic artisan*' which overlaps with '*shokunin*', a Japanese term denoting not only technical expertise but also '*an attitude and social consciousness...a social obligation to work one's best for the general welfare of the people, [an] obligation both material and spiritual*' (Odate, 1984, quoted in Brew et al., 2018, p. 119). Artisanship brings out more fully the meaningfulness of academic work in general and academic citizenship in particular.

The degree of formality and the scope of academic citizenship contributions will inevitably vary. Depending on their scope, some forms of academic citizenship will need resourcing, either as (nominal) time in academic workloads or as validation, endorsement or sponsorship in the case of large-scale initiatives. While our five scenarios of academics enacting citizenship indicate career stage, and we appreciate that more senior academic roles carry an expectation of enacting citizenship with an increasingly wider reach, we caution that creating a hierarchy of citizenship activities corresponding to career stage would be unhelpful and potentially detrimental.

Explicitly or implicitly, the scenarios in this chapter point to various aspects of equity, diversity and inclusion that cannot be absent from conversations about academic citizenship. We engage with these aspects in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4 we explore how the arrival of generative artificial intelligence could enhance various forms of academic citizenship. In the final chapter, among other things, we offer our definition of academic citizenship and guidelines for individuals and institutions to enact, support, evaluate and celebrate academic citizenship in its manifold forms.