

The gradual retreat from academic citizenship

Nicola J. Beatson¹  | Meredith Tharapos²  |
Brendan T. O'Connell² | Paul de Lange³ | Sarah Carr⁴ | Scott Copeland⁵

¹Department of Accountancy and Finance, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

²School of Accounting, Information Systems and Supply Chain, RMIT University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

³Tasmanian School of Business and Economics, University of Tasmania, Hobart, TAS, Australia

⁴Otago Business School, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

⁵School of Commerce, University of South Australia, Adelaide, SA, Australia

Abstract

This paper critically explores the notion of academic citizenship, evaluates its importance and argues that faculty have shifted away from engaging in collegial activities to behaviour that is purposefully targeted towards the attainment of academic performance metrics. We highlight the significant implications and challenges for the academy of a gradual retreat from academic citizenship in an era characterised by academic capitalism. We argue that university management urgently need to foster a culture of collegiality that fully appreciates and nurtures academic citizenship, particularly amongst junior faculty as they represent the future of the academy. Furthermore, we call for academic citizenship activities to be explicitly recognised in academic performance metrics and workloads to facilitate prioritisation by faculty.

Astratta

Questo articolo esplora criticamente la nozione di "cittadinanza accademica", ne valuta l'importanza, e sostiene che la professione accademica si è spostata dall'impegnarsi in attività collegiali a comportamenti mirati al raggiungimento di metriche di rendimento. Sottolineiamo le significative implicazioni e le sfide per l'accademia dovute ad un graduale ritiro dalla "cittadinanza accademica" in un'epoca caratterizzata dal "capitalismo accademico". Sosteniamo che la gestione universitaria abbia urgente bisogno di promuovere una cultura della collegialità che apprezzi pienamente e nutra la "cittadinanza accademica", in particolare tra i giovani accademici, in quanto rappresentano il futuro dell'accademia.

Inoltre, richiediamo che le attività legate alla “cittadinanza accademica” siano esplicitamente riconosciute nelle metriche di rendimento e nei carichi di lavoro affinché la professione accademica sia facilitata nell’assegnazione delle priorità.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Academic citizenship occupies a pivotal role in the ecosystem of academia, both internal and external to the university itself (Nørgård & Bengtsen, 2016), yet it is often underacknowledged and underappreciated within universities (Ward, 2003). Academic citizenship is a term used to capture activities that support and offer services to both the university and wider society, other than research and teaching (Lawrence et al., 2012; Macfarlane, 2007b; Nixon, 2008; Nørgård & Bengtsen, 2016). More specifically, Macfarlane and Burg (2018) define academic citizenship as ‘a set of attitudes and activities connected to internal and external service work supporting the infrastructure of academic life and the wider civic mission of the university’ (p. 3). Nørgård and Bengtsen (2016, p. 4) describe it in broader terms as ‘the intertwining of participation in, engagement between, and mutual responsibility of, universities and society’. It encapsulates virtues such as engagement, care (guardianship), loyalty, collegiality and benevolence (Macfarlane, 2007a, 2007b; Nørgård & Bengtsen, 2016). These disparate service activities include peer review of manuscripts, guest editorships, mentoring of junior colleagues, student consultations, engaging and developing links with industry and professional bodies, undertaking leadership positions and participating in committees within the university.

The time and energy available for faculty to devote to the more intrinsic notion of academic citizenship is being eroded by mandated academic performance metrics—a hallmark of the contemporary university environment operating in an environment characterised by academic capitalism (Macfarlane, 2005; Marginson & Considine, 2000; Morrish, 2020; Münch, 2014). Faculty are increasingly under pressure to achieve quality research outputs, adopt innovative and engaging teaching practices, and undertake a range of academic citizenship activities (Kinman, 2001; Lawrence et al., 2012; Macfarlane, 2007b; Winefield et al., 2003).

An interesting question to first consider is *Why does academic citizenship appear to be in decline?* as reported by researchers such as Macfarlane (2005) and Lawrence et al. (2012), when many would consider it to be an important component of faculty life? Specifically, most faculty believe that academic citizenship is important for both career development and to give back to the academy (Lawrence et al., 2012). Yet it would also seem that faculty in the face of factors, such as rising workloads (Lewis, 2014; Martin-Sardesai et al., 2017) and ever increasing performance metrics (Guthrie & Parker, 2014; Lucas, 2006), are now placing less emphasis on academic citizenship activities that are not measured or monitored by university management (Hornibrook, 2012).

While academic citizenship activities critically support research and teaching, along with the academy more broadly defined, academic citizenship has largely been ‘overlooked or trivialised as little more than “administration” rather than essential to the preservation of community life’ (Macfarlane, 2005, p. 299). This paper explores the notion of academic citizenship, critically evaluates its importance, and explores possible explanations for the gradual retreat by many faculty from academic citizenship activities.

This paper contributes to the literature on academic citizenship by building on prior work (e.g., Macfarlane, 2005; Shils, 1997) that has critiqued the evolution of faculty roles and what it means to be an academic (Burnes et al., 2014; Lawrence et al., 2012; Tytherleigh et al., 2005). We also add to prior research (such as, Lawrence et al., 2012) on the potential relationship between academic citizenship and organisational commitment. While Lawrence et al. (2012) examined the influence of demographic variables, they did not consider the potential impact of university workload models or performance evaluation systems, or the rising workloads of faculty. This

paper underscores the significant implications and challenges for the academy of a gradual retreat from academic citizenship brought about by the increasing emphasis placed by universities on academic performance metrics in an era characterised by academic capitalism.

2 | ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP

As mentioned earlier, academic citizenship represents the collegial contribution of faculty to the culture, community and civic purpose of a university and society in general (Lawrence et al., 2012; Macfarlane, 2007b; Nixon, 2008; Nørgård & Bengtsen, 2016). Neumann and Terosky (2007) categorised academic citizenship into three general types: service to one's discipline (such as manuscript reviews, responding to academic research surveys, engagement with professional bodies), community service (such as outreach, public service) and institutional service (such as committee representation, governance work).

Despite its importance to the survival and success of the academic ecosystem, academic citizenship is underacknowledged, underappreciated and viewed within universities as being 'less meaningful and important than the more easily defined (and rewarded) roles of teaching and research' (Ward, 2003, p. 2). Kerr (1994) highlighted the apparent decline of academic citizenship: 'my greatest concern about academic ethics is with the decline of academic "citizenship" across American higher education, and less with the performance of specific contractual obligations as in teaching and research' (p. 149). He proceeded to chide faculty for their reluctance to recognise their responsibilities and for concentrating on their own affairs and not those of the institution (Kerr, 1994).

There has been little published research on academic citizenship in comparison to studies examining research activities and teaching and learning activities; both of which have been widely studied. Exceptions to the dearth of research in this area are Lawrence et al. (2012) and Macfarlane (2005, 2007b). In studying the potential relationship between academic citizenship and organisational commitment, Lawrence et al. (2012) found that individual characteristics such as time spent on research and time spent on teaching were significant negative predictors of time spent on institutional service. Interestingly, they also found that individual characteristics such as gender and years of employment were not significant predictors of academic citizenship when time spent of research and teaching activities was included in the model. Turning to job characteristics, faculty who indicated that their institutions highly valued academic citizenship activities reported spending more time on these activities.

In the contemporary university environment, faculty are under pressure to meet or exceed increasingly higher research expectations and teaching and related administrative workloads (Guthrie et al., 2019; Vesty et al., 2018) as a result of universities adopting a more corporatised managerial style of leadership (Agyemang & Broadbent, 2015; Martin-Sardesai et al., 2017; Münch, 2014; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), as outlined in the following section.

3 | ACADEMIC CAPITALISM

During the 1980s, higher education in many countries underwent substantial changes in the ways in which it was financed and governed (Johnson & Taylor, 2019), with the most pronounced of these being a sharp decline in governmental funding (Barringer, 2016). These environmental changes resulted in a marked increase in competition by universities for resources and status (Münch, 2014; Taylor & Cantwell, 2018) and a shift in institutional practice (Johnson & Taylor, 2019; Marginson & Considine, 2000).

Slaughter and Leslie (1997) use the term 'academic capitalism'¹ to encapsulate the way public research universities have adopted neoliberal tendencies such that higher education policy is treated as a subset of economic policy, particularly in the pursuit of income. Academic capitalism is defined as 'institutional and professorial market or market-like efforts to secure external moneys' (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, p. 8), with market efforts referring

to institutional and faculty behaviours directly involved with the free market, and market-like efforts being those approaching involvement in the market. Market behaviours denote 'for-profit activity' on behalf of the institution including patenting (and subsequent royalties and licensing), associated companies, arms-length corporations such as university medical centres and university-industry profit-based partnerships. Market-like behaviours encapsulate institutional and faculty competition for income from external sources such as external grants and contracts, endowment funds, university-industry partnerships and student fees but are not directly engaged in 'for-profit activity' (Slaughter & Leslie, 2001).

Engaging in academic capitalism results in not only increased income for universities, but also enhanced reputation and esteem as competitive grants are secured from prestigious organisations (Münch, 2014; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). However, the competitive market tends to consist of a 'great number of demanders for funds from a small number of suppliers, or even a near monopolistic position of a central supplier' such as a national government research foundation (Münch, 2014, p. 1). Münch (2014) state that this monopolistic structure of competition generates a 'strong tendency toward uniformity and conformity to centrally established standards of research' (p. 1) such that globalised academic capitalism is now a central feature of the contemporary university and the global knowledge society (Frank & Gabler, 2006; Frank & Meyer, 2020). Furthermore, these changes in institutional practice have resulted in a move away from valuing knowledge as a public good towards an 'academic capitalist knowledge regime' where university faculty and administrators seek opportunities to monetise and privatise knowledge (Johnson & Taylor, 2019; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Research has always been a core element of universities' mission; however, its importance has become more pronounced due to its potential to generate income and contribute to institutional status in global rankings (Marginson, 2016). This has resulted in rising pressure on faculty to secure research funding and produce scholarly outputs in highly rated journals (Gonzales, 2014) as promotion, tenure and compensation levels are increasingly tied to research outputs (O'Meara, 2011). Faculty are frequently 'told what to teach, how to teach, what research to conduct and where to publish' (Burnes et al., 2014, p. 905) with increasingly higher targets set in academic workload models, as outlined in the following section.

4 | ACADEMIC WORKLOADS

There is a general perception that the pace of academic work has intensified (McCarthy et al., 2017) and workloads are increasing to untenable levels (Coates et al., 2009; Long et al., 2020; Papadopoulos, 2017; Tight, 2010). Academic workloads for what Macfarlane (2011) terms as an 'all-round' academic include research and teaching activities, along with service and administrative tasks. Increasing class sizes and pressure to generate quality research outputs and achieve other academic performance metrics, all with diminishing resources, have resulted in faculty attempting to perform all elements of academic practice. As a consequence, many have experienced higher levels of stress and significantly lower levels of commitment both from, and to, their organisations (Tytherleigh et al., 2005; Wolf, 2010), leaving many to feel exhausted and 'burnt out' (Vesty et al., 2018).

Concerns about formal academic workload models are commonplace amongst faculty (Hemer, 2014; Wolf, 2010) due to models seeming to 'omit some key variables, or use inappropriate rules of weighting and exceptions' (Wolf, 2010, p. 247). While teaching and research are well defined and heavily monitored and evaluated in academic workloads, academic citizenship remains largely unaccounted for due to it being 'broad-ranging, eclectic, and contingent on institutional "type"' (Neumann & Terosky, 2007, p. 283). In essence, academic citizenship is an abstract concept which can be interpreted in multiple ways leading to it being largely ignored in these university performance management systems and academic workload models (Macfarlane, 2007b).

Furthermore, academic work has 'stretched' (Coaldrake, 2001, p. 16) to accommodate the reality of the contemporary university in an era characterised by academic capitalism, leading Macfarlane (2011) to question the viability and wisdom of attempting to be an 'all-round' academic. Macfarlane (2011) laments that

...academic citizenship offered by 'all-round' academics does not fit comfortably in a higher education environment...with clearly defined boundaries and performative pressures that do not reward activities that cannot be evidenced as 'outputs' (such as refereed papers or research grants). (p. 71)

Exacerbating the rising workloads, the increased use of 'stretch targets' for performance evaluation purposes mean faculty are devoting more time to achieving their key performance metrics, such as publications in highly ranked journals and applications for research grants (O'Connell, De Lange, Martin-Sardesai, et al., 2020; O'Connell, De Lange, Stoner, et al., 2020). This focus has arguably led to unintended consequences. For example, Macfarlane (2005) argues that the 'erosion of academic self-governance has led to the decline of political literacy in academic life and that a range of other forces... have damaged social and moral responsibility and the responsibilities implied by community involvement' (p. 296). Moreover, in their quest to meet required research and teaching output targets, faculty have been found to be neglecting academic citizenship activities (Hornibrook, 2012). In particular, activities falling under the banner of academic citizenship are avoided altogether or allocated a lower level of prioritisation to meet the more measurable activities associated with research and teaching.

Given the critical role academic citizenship plays in the general eco-system of the academy, a critical examination of the gradual retreat by faculty from its associated activities is both timely and necessary. Now that we have provided an overview of academic citizenship and academic workloads in an era characterised by academic capitalism, we will critically consider the issue of workloads and their impact on faculty priorities.

5 | DECLINE OF ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP

The decline of academic citizenship can be attributed to a combination of institutional and individual factors.

In terms of institutional factors, the socialisation process through which faculty have emerged has evolved (Lewis, 2014), with academic citizenship situated in a collegiality model of operation (Bush, 1997). We argue that the collegiality model, where power and decision making is shared and proceeds through a process of discussion that eventually leads to consensus, rarely exists in its truest form in the academic capitalism era. Top-down decision making, with a focus on individual accountability, is now the dominant model. Faculty find themselves in direct competition with each other when striving to achieve mandated teaching and research performance criteria. In this environment, universities place immense pressure on faculty to regularly publish in highly ranked journals and to consistently obtain competitive research grants in fulfilment of required performance metrics and exercises (Guthrie & Parker, 2014; Martin-Sardesai et al., 2017). Faculty are also expected to employ the latest digital technologies and pedagogies, and design cutting edge content for deployment on learning management systems and across multiple delivery modes. While pressure has always been placed on faculty to achieve in these areas, expectations have noticeably intensified in corporatised universities (Parker, 2012). For faculty, meeting these requirements is extremely time consuming and stressful, leaving little time for other activities that are not directly monitored and measured (Hornibrook, 2012).

Of course, what is considered important and not so important in academic culture will vary across institutions. However, academic workload models and performance indicators provide a powerful signal to faculty as to what is valued (Guthrie & Parker, 2014; Papadopoulos, 2017). Academic citizenship activities are rarely recognised in these models and indicators (Neumann & Terosky, 2007). Hence this suggests a deeper issue at play, namely the impact of ever rising workloads and expectations on academic activities (Lewis, 2014; Martin-Sardesai et al., 2017). By increasingly driving faculty towards a narrow set of tasks and finely defined key performance indicators, universities are arguably ignoring the fundamental activities that enable the academic eco-system to survive. If faculty do not mentor their more junior colleagues or for example, decline to act as ad hoc reviewers for journals, then the sustainability of the academy is placed at risk.

Our analysis also calls into question the efficacy of a focus on academic capitalism (Münch, 2014). University strategic plans focus on building institutional prestige and recognition through research domination, rising income levels and increasing student employability and satisfaction (Parker, 2012). We argue that research domination drives a 'virtuous circle' whereby increased research outputs in leading journals and prestigious grant success result in universities ascension in global university rankings. This in turn positively impacts on student demand (especially from full fee-paying international students who tend to favour highly ranked universities). Prestigious universities can command higher student tuition fees than their lower ranked counterparts. The increased income can then be used to fund initiatives to further enhance the university's status, including hiring faculty with stellar research records or building cutting edge facilities to attract quality faculty and students. These actions in turn drive further improvement in institutional prestige and rankings. As highlighted by Parker (2012, p. 1154), 'research has arguably become a commodity prized by university management, employed for university competitive profiling and revenue stream generation, and drilled down to the commercial market branding of individual academics'.

It should be recognised that increasing university income through the process outlined above, together with other market and market-like behaviours associated with academic capitalism, has resulted in some positive outcomes. Increased research productivity, less reliance on government support for universities and closer ties with industry would generally be regarded as desirable outcomes. However, we argue that it has also led to a devaluation of other important aspects of university life, including academic citizenship activities and a focus on the greater public good. Universities have become self-serving in their quest for ever rising resources and prestige. It follows that universities urgently need to recognise and return to their broader obligations to the academy and society in general or risk becoming increasingly stratified with greater inequality in the availability of resources as proposed by Münch (2014).

Turning to individual factors, faculty themselves are implicit in the demise of academic citizenship. Faculty recognise the stark reality within the contemporary university of the need to achieve mandated key performance indicators and measurable research outputs, as these dictate career and income success (Guthrie et al., 2019; Martin-Sardesai et al., 2017). The focus by faculty on key performance indicators has created a competitive environment within university departments leading to both winners and losers (Lewis, 2014). The most productive researchers are promoted, 'head-hunted' (and even offered financial incentives), while unproductive researchers are offered incentives to accept early retirement or to move into teaching intensive roles (Agyemang & Broadbent, 2015). We argue this has resulted in faculty undertaking a more strategic evaluation of their priorities and time allocation than may have been the case in the past, and implementing behavioural modifications aimed at driving higher research productivity. Parker (2007) identified some of these strategies, including entrenchment in 'particular methodological paradigms, "hunting in packs" to spot subjects, theories and methodologies welcomed by these journals, and seeking efficient short-term data collection/analysis approaches to produce speedier publications in volume' (p. 1161). We also argue that ambitious faculty keen for promotion have become more instrumentalist, with less focus on the idealistic or intrinsic motivations of their role, and more on achieving required metrics. We contend that in such circumstances, faculty create a hierarchy of priorities where unrecognised activities, such as academic citizenship, tend to rank last.

6 | IMPLICATIONS OF A DECLINE IN ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP

The implications of the demise in academic citizenship for faculty, universities, academe and society in general, are significant and far reaching. In terms of faculty, we argue new entrants to academe will struggle to obtain adequate mentoring including quality feedback comments on draft research papers and assistance with the development of cutting-edge teaching materials from their more senior colleagues in the academic capitalism era. As noted earlier, senior faculty adopting an instrumentalist approach will prioritise behaviour aimed at achieving mandated

performance metrics over academic citizenship activities directed towards developing junior colleagues. If junior faculty are not sufficiently mentored and developed from the outset, their academic careers will be inhibited due to an inability to publish in highly ranked journals and contribute to university income through prestigious grant success. Junior staff who are not meeting mandated research performance metrics risk failing probation requirements and therefore having their position terminated, or being offered a teaching-focused role, further exacerbating the stress and burnout levels amongst faculty already prevalent in academe (Vesty et al., 2018). Junior faculty are unlikely to engage in academic citizenship activities due to their unfamiliarity with the practice of collegiality and absence of role models in this area. Ultimately, the decline in academic citizenship activities towards, and by, junior faculty will likely negatively affect the future reputation and global ranking of their university if publication and grant success rates decline.

In considering the implications of a retreat from academic citizenship at an institutional level, we argue universities will struggle to find appropriately skilled faculty to undertake committee representation, leadership and administrative roles, or engage in governance work. Rather than these roles being undertaken by faculty with the required skills and knowledge, they may be directed towards faculty who feel obligated to accept the role in order to retain their position. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, faculty new to these roles are unlikely to receive sufficient mentoring. Inexperienced faculty undertaking these types of roles can expose universities to ineffective governance designed to safeguard their operations, thereby risking reputational and financial damage.

Turning to the academy more broadly, we argue that a retreat by faculty from engaging in academic citizenship activities has the potential to significantly impact key activities, such as the ad hoc journal and conference peer-review process. Indeed, the future sustainability of the entire academy may be jeopardised by a significant decline in academic citizenship.

Notwithstanding the above implications, it should be highlighted that academic citizenship activities can yield both direct and indirect benefits to faculty through their participation. For example, volunteering to review for prestigious journals places the academic's name firmly before the journal editor which may lead to enhanced publication success in the future, particularly for junior faculty. However, other activities such as examination of PhD candidate's theses, acting as conference chairs and discussants, and assisting with conference organisation, do not always carry the same extrinsic rewards. We posit that already lengthy journal review times (Emrouznejad et al., 2008; Fogarty & Jonas, 2013) may be further exacerbated and the quality and quantity of comments made by reviewers and examiners may be significantly compromised due to the difficulty of finding faculty who are both available and have the required expertise. A lower level of prioritisation of academic citizenship activities such as these will severely compromise the academic eco-system.

Another implication is an increased focus on key performance metrics and the accompanying rise of academic capitalism and the accompanying increased competition is unlikely to contribute to enhanced performance because of the loss of the benefits from a more collegial working environment (Münch, 2014). The result of the intense competition for resources and status by universities reflected in global ranking systems is the dominance of the comprehensive Anglo-American science university (Marginson, 2011). Münch (2014) contends this will ultimately lead to an inefficient stratification of universities characterised by uniformity of research and reduced autonomy, thereby compromising the future of open knowledge for public good. However, Marginson (2011) suggests that the:

...antidote to status competition, one that creates space for the global public good to evolve, is... the *communicative world of flat networks and collegial relations*, which lends itself to open, *democratic collaborative forms* and gives authority to knowledge from anywhere. (p. 430, italics added)

One way for universities to restore a culture of collegiality is to explicitly recognise and acknowledge academic citizenship activities when evaluating the performance of their faculty.

In sum, the implications of a decline in academic citizenship demand that universities urgently reorientate the culture amongst faculty in general, and in particular, early career faculty. This can be achieved by reconfiguring performance metrics to measure and recognise academic citizenship activities, in addition to providing mentoring to junior faculty that reinforces the broad role that faculty play in furthering teaching and research for the public good.

7 | CONCLUSION

Building on prior literature on academic citizenship (see, e.g., Macfarlane, 2005, 2007b; Shils, 1997), academic capitalism (Münch, 2014) and what it means to be an academic (Burnes et al., 2014; Lawrence et al., 2012; Tytherleigh et al., 2005), our paper provides important insights into the decline of academic citizenship by considering influential factors at both the individual and institutional levels and the adverse implications of this deterioration. We also add to prior work (Lawrence et al., 2012) examining the relationship between academic citizenship and organisational commitment where the impact of rising workloads, and/or the advent of university workload models and performance evaluation metrics on faculty actions, has not been specifically considered. We also add to the literature on academic capitalism (Münch, 2014; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Taylor & Cantwell, 2018) by emphasising one of its innate weaknesses, a failure to reward and recognise certain key activities undertaken by faculty. Increased competition and focus on research and for-profit activities has come at the expense of important roles that contribute to the academy and society more broadly. We also critique the implications of a declining ethos of academic citizenship. Our concern is that this phenomenon threatens the very foundation and fabric of academia.

Our analysis has implications for faculty as they seek to manage their careers within institutional constraints and expectations. Furthermore, our analysis has implications for university management when designing and implementing academic performance measures incentivising faculty to higher levels of achievement. There is a clear need for academic workload models and performance measures to explicitly capture academic citizenship activities. Prior research (see, e.g., Ferreira & Otley, 2009; Otley, 1999) highlights that employees focus their attention on activities that their managers recognise and reward. Importantly, university management need to develop a culture that fully appreciates and nurtures academic citizenship and recognises the critical role that these activities play in contributing to the advancement of the academy and society more generally.

We argue that increasing time demands emanating from research and teaching have diminished time devoted to academic citizenship. This outcome possibly reflects the reality of contemporary faculty life and the pervasive impact of academic capitalism. This suggests that socialising faculty to an ethos of academic citizenship is a responsibility that rests with the professoriate. They must impress upon their junior colleagues the importance of institutional and wider service, and act as role models by themselves undertaking such activities. This culture, when combined with academic workload models and performance metrics that explicitly recognise these activities, should prove successful in establishing appropriate behaviours.

In considering avenues for future research, in-depth interviews with faculty to examine their level of engagement with activities encompassed within the notion of academic citizenship would enable the generation of deeper insights into attitudes towards academic citizenship. Interviews with university senior management would also provide an institutional perspective on this issue.

In conclusion, most would agree that faculty play an important role in the broader aspects of the academy and society. The authors' hope is that academic citizenship can be reinstated as a vital and valued aspect of academic life. We recognise that some activities are difficult to measure, and not all activities of value are easily measured by academic performance metrics. Yet, it is vital that university management take meaningful steps towards explicit recognition of these activities and that the professoriate act as mentors and exemplars through their whole-hearted participation in academic citizenship activities.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All listed authors have substantially contributed to the manuscript and have agreed to the final submitted version.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

ORCID

Nicola J. Beatson  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4481-8982>

Meredith Tharapos  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8456-5671>

ENDNOTE

- ¹ Other researchers have adopted alternative terms to capture this phenomenon, albeit with divergent views as to its effectiveness and desirability. Some of these terms are the 'enterprise university' (Marginson & Considine, 2000), the 'corporatised university' (Parker, 2012), the 'neo-liberal university' (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000) and the 'toxic university' (Smyth, 2017).

REFERENCES

- Agyemang, G., & Broadbent, J. (2015). Management control systems and research management in universities. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 28(7), 1018–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-11-2013-1531>
- Barringer, S. N. (2016). The changing finances of public higher education organizations: Diversity, change and discontinuity. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 46, 223–263.
- Burnes, B., Wend, P., & By, R. T. (2014). The changing face of English universities: Reinventing collegiality for the twenty-first century. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(6), 905–926. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.754858>
- Bush, T. (1997). Collegial models. In A. Harris, N. Bennett, & M. Preedy (Eds.), *Organizational effectiveness and improvement in education* (pp. 68–79). Open University Press.
- Coaldrake, P. (2001). Rethinking academic and university work. *Higher Education Management*, 12(2), 7–30.
- Coates, H., Dobson, I., Edwards, D., Friedman, T., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, L. (2009). *The attractiveness of the Australian academic profession: A comparative analysis*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11343/28921>
- Emrouznejad, A., Parker, B. R., & Tavares, G. (2008). Evaluation of research in efficiency and productivity: A survey and analysis of the first 30 years of scholarly literature in DEA. *Socio-economic Planning Sciences*, 42(3), 151–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2007.07.002>
- Ferreira, A., & Otley, D. (2009). The design and use of performance management systems: An extended framework for analysis. *Management Accounting Research*, 20(4), 263–282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2009.07.003>
- Fogarty, T. J., & Jonas, G. A. (2013). Author characteristics for major accounting journals: Differences among similarities 1989–2009. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 28(4), 731–757. <https://doi.org/10.2308/iace-50520>
- Frank, D. J., & Gabler, J. (2006). *Reconstructing the university: Worldwide shifts in academia in the 20th century*. Stanford University Press.
- Frank, D. J., & Meyer, J. W. (2020). *The university and the global knowledge society*. Princeton University Press.
- Gonzales, L. D. (2014). Framing faculty agency inside striving universities: An application of Bourdieu's theory of practice. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(2), 193–218.
- Guthrie, J., & Parker, L. D. (2014). The global accounting academic: What counts! *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 27(1), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-10-2013-1504>
- Guthrie, J., Parker, L. D., Dumay, J., & Milne, M. J. (2019). What counts for quality in interdisciplinary accounting research in the next decade: A critical review and reflection. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 32(1), 2–15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-01-2019-036>
- Hemer, S. R. (2014). Finding time for quality teaching: An ethnographic study of academic workloads in the social sciences and their impact on teaching practices. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(3), 483–495. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.841647>

- Hornibrook, S. (2012). Policy implementation and academic workload planning in the managerial university: Understanding unintended consequences. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34(1), 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.642329>
- Johnson, J. A., & Taylor, B. J. (2019). Academic capitalism and the faculty salary gap. *Innovative Higher Education*, 44(1), 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-018-9445-z>
- Kerr, C. (1994). Academic citizenship in decline. In C. Kerr, M. L. Gade, & M. Kawaoka (Eds.), *Higher education cannot escape history: Issues for the twenty-first century* (pp. 149–156). State University of New York Press.
- Kinman, G. (2001). Pressure points: A review of research on stressors and strains in UK academics. *Educational Psychology*, 21(4), 473–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410120090849>
- Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Bell, A. (2012). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(3), 325–352. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-011-9230-7>
- Lewis, J. M. (2014). Individual and institutional accountability: The case of research assessment. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 73(4), 408–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12105>
- Long, W., Barnes, L., Northcote, M., & Williams, A. P. (2020). Accounting academic workloads: Balancing workload creep to avoid depreciation in the higher education sector. *Education, Society and Human Studies*, 1(2), 55–83. <https://doi.org/10.22158/eshs.v1n2p55>
- Lucas, L. (2006). *The research game in academic life*. Open University Press.
- Macfarlane, B. (2005). The disengaged academic: The retreat from citizenship. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 59(4), 296–312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2005.00299.x>
- Macfarlane, B. (2007a). *The academic citizen: The virtue of service in university life*. Routledge.
- Macfarlane, B. (2007b). Defining and rewarding academic citizenship: The implications for university promotions policy. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 29(3), 261–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800701457863>
- Macfarlane, B. (2011). The morphing of academic practice: Unbundling and the rise of the para-academic. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(1), 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2010.00467.x>
- Macfarlane, B., & Burg, D. (2018). *Rewarding and recognising academic citizenship*. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Marginson, S. (2011). Higher education and public good. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(4), 411–433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2011.00496.x>
- Marginson, S. (2016). Global stratification in higher education. In S. Slaughter & B. J. Taylor (Eds.), *Higher education, stratification and workforce development: Competitive advantage in Europe, the US and Canada* (pp. 13–34). Springer.
- Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge University Press.
- Martin-Sardesai, A., Irvine, H., Tooley, S., & Guthrie, J. (2017). Organizational change in an Australian university: Responses to a research assessment exercise. *The British Accounting Review*, 49(4), 399–412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2017.05.002>
- McCarthy, G., Song, X., & Jayasuriya, K. (2017). The proletarianisation of academic labour in Australia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(5), 1017–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1263936>
- Morrish, L. (2020). Academic freedom and the disciplinary Regime in the Neoliberal University. In S. Dawes & M. Lenormand (Eds.), *Neoliberalism in context: Governance, subjectivity and knowledge* (pp. 235–253). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Münch, R. (2014). *Academic capitalism: Universities in the global struggle for excellence*. Routledge.
- Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. L. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(3), 282–310. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2007.0018>
- Nixon, J. (2008). *Towards the virtuous university: The moral bases of academic practice*. Routledge.
- Nørgård, R. T., & Bengtson, S. S. E. (2016). Academic citizenship beyond the campus: A call for the placeful university. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(1), 4–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1131669>
- O'Connell, B. T., De Lange, P., Martin-Sardesai, A., & Agyemang, G. (2020). Measurement and assessment of accounting research, impact and engagement. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 33(6), 1177–1192. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-05-2020-4560>
- O'Connell, B. T., De Lange, P., Stoner, G., & Sangster, A. (2020). Impact of research assessment exercises on research approaches and foci of accounting disciplines in Australia. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 33(6), 1277–1302. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-12-2019-4293>
- O'Meara, K. (2011). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 161–220). Springer.
- Otley, D. (1999). Performance management: A framework for management control systems research. *Management Accounting Research*, 10(4), 363–382. <https://doi.org/10.1006/mare.1999.0115>
- Papadopoulos, A. (2017). The mismeasure of academic labour. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(3), 511–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1289156>

- Parker, L. D. (2007). Developing research journals and qualitative inquiry: The role of the editorial board. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 4(3), 168–182. <https://doi.org/10.1108/11766090710826628>
- Parker, L. D. (2012). From privatised to hybrid corporatised higher education: A global financial management discourse. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 28(3), 247–268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0408.2012.00544.x>
- Shils, E. (1997). *The calling of education: 'The academic ethic' and other essays on Higher Education*. University of Chicago Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (2001). Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism. *Organization*, 8(2), 154–161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508401082003>
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2000). The neo-liberal university. *New Labor Forum*, 6, 73–79.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state and higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smyth, J. (2017). *The toxic university: Zombie leadership, academic rock stars and neoliberal ideology*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Taylor, B. J., & Cantwell, B. (2018). *Unequal higher education: Wealth, status and student opportunity*. Rutgers University Press.
- Tight, M. (2010). Are academic workloads increasing? The post-war survey evidence in the UK. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 64(2), 200–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2009.00433.x>
- Tytherleigh, M. Y., Webb, C., Cooper, C. L., & Ricketts, C. (2005). Occupational stress in UK higher education institutions: A comparative study of all staff categories. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 24(1), 41–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436052000318569>
- Vesty, G., Sridharan, V. G., Northcott, D., & Dellaportas, S. (2018). Burnout among university accounting educators in Australia and New Zealand: Determinants and implications. *Accounting & Finance*, 58(1), 255–277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12203>
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. Jossey-Bass.
- Winefield, A. H., Gillespie, N., Stough, C., Dua, J., Hapuarachchi, J., & Boyd, C. (2003). Occupational stress in Australian university staff: Results from a national survey. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 10(1), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.10.1.51>
- Wolf, A. (2010). Orientations to academic workloads at department level. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(2), 246–262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143209356362>

How to cite this article: Beatson, N. J., Tharapos, M., O'Connell, B. T., de Lange P., Carr, S., & Copeland S. (2021). The gradual retreat from academic citizenship. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 00, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12341>