The Disengaged Academic: the Retreat from Citizenship

Bruce Macfarlane, Thames Valley University

Abstract

Citizenship education has developed against the backdrop of civic disengagement. However, as attention has focused on the incorporation of citizenship education into the school curriculum, the responsibilities of citizenship incumbent on the academic community within higher education has been largely overlooked. This paper examines the reasons for the apparent decline of academic citizenship through an analysis of three elements of citizenship. It 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, including underfunded massification and research audit, have damaged social and moral responsibility and the responsibilities implied by community involvement. It is concluded that adjustments to reward and recognition structures and professorial leadership are vital if the academic is not to become increasingly disengaged from the service role.

Introduction

We live in an age of civic disengagement. The decline of voter participation and community volunteering, in old and new democracies alike, are often cited as examples of this phenomenon. In the UK general election held in June 2001 less than 60 per cent of the population turned out to vote, the lowest figure since the end of the First World War. While there was a slightly higher voter turnout at the general election of May 2005, a pattern of longer-term decline appears to be now established. In the United States, barring the unusually divisive 2004 Presidential contest, there has been a similar decline in voter turnout during the twentieth century. Participation in elections is popularly said to be a barometer of our trust in politicians and the political process itself (Baston and Ritchie, 2004). Being a 'good citizen' means more than just turning up to vote every four or five years. It is also symptomatic of falling levels of civic engagement in community, charitable and religious organisations. While the numbers of non-profit making organisations

may have grown substantially over the past few decades, people engage with them by sending money rather than participating in meetings and other activities. In *Bowling Alone*, Robert Putnam (2000) shows that Americans today are less engaged in virtually all aspects of social and community life than they were in the 1960s.

Citizenship is a dynamic, shifting notion rather than a static one. In the 19th and early 20th century it was strongly associated with displays of individual and collective patriotism (Vink, 2004). Conscription of the British armed forces was not introduced until March 1916 in spite of the slaughter in the trenches of the First World War. During the 1939–1945 conflict, the purchase of government (or war) bonds was seen primarily, on both sides of the Atlantic, as a good citizen's obligation rather than a financial investment (Coles, 1993). After the Second World War, young British men continued to be 'called up' to do a 2-year stint of 'national service', which only ended in the early 1960s. In a time of confusion and transition, it is still too early to say whether notions of European citizenship are largely symbolic or genuinely 'post-national' (Vink, 2004). While many might welcome a weakening connection between citizenship and military service, at least in some national contexts, it is important to consider what has happened to our sense of communal obligation.

There are many explanations offered for civic disengagement. Popular ones include the breakdown of the nuclear family, the mobility of labour, fear of crime, the pressures of modern working practices, the growth of technology resulting in a 24-hour consumer society, and the mass media providing people with many alternative ways of spending their leisure time. Others put the blame on the free market politics of the 1980s and 1990s 'designed to root out the culture of service and citizenship which had become part of the social fabric' (Marquand, 2004, p. 2). This, according to Marquand, promoted a more selfish and consumer-orientated society that destroyed the historic balance between the public and private domains created during Victorian times.

Civic disengagement has provoked a 'moral panic' (Cohen, 1972) inasmuch that politicians and the mass media have focused in particular on falling voter turnout among 18–24-year-olds as a public expression of youth alienation (Maitles, 2000). A flurry of conferences, committees and national commissions charged with explaining and offering potential solutions to this phenomenon have followed in the wake of this attention. In the US, the Pew National Commission on Civic Renewal and the Council on Civil Society, co-sponsored by the University of Chicago and the Institute of American Values, reported

their concerns at the end of the 1990s. In the UK, despite the recommendation of the Public Administration Select Commission following the poor voter turnout at the 2001 general election, a proposed 'Rewarding Democracy Commission' failed to gain sufficient support in the House of Commons.

Concern about youth alienation from democratic processes has led, at least in part, to the introduction of citizenship education in schools. This has stemmed, in part, from angst about the low levels of voter participation by young citizens in the 18–24 age bracket, in particular. In 2002, following the recommendations of an Advisory Group under the Chairmanship of Sir Bernard Crick, citizenship education became a statutory element of the English school curriculum. In defining the elements of a citizenship education, the Crick report drew on a rich literature and tradition. In the ancient Greek and Roman city states, citizenship meant 'involvement in public affairs by those that had the rights of citizens: to take part in public debate and, directly or indirectly, in shaping the laws and decisions of a state' (Crick, 1998, p. 9). While early Greek and Roman society provide a model of citizenship, in many respects, it is one ill-suited to the inclusive ideals of modern democratic society. Today, citizenship is conceived as including all members of society rather than excluding women and slaves as it did in ancient Greek society. The Crick report further cites T. H. Marshall's work on citizenship (Marshall and Bottomore, 1992). Marshall identified the three elements of citizenship as the civil, the political and the social, a model influential on the Crick Advisory Group. It determined that political literacy, community involvement, and social and moral responsibility should form the core of the citizenship curriculum designed to help secondary school pupils become 'active, informed, critical and responsible citizens' (Crick, 1998, p. 9). School pupils from the age of 5 to 11 would also learn about citizenship in combination with personal, social and health education.

The academic citizen?

The rise of citizenship education in response to the perceived crisis in civic engagement has generated a good deal of academic attention. There are now journals, conferences, research centres and societies devoted to the furtherance of work in the area. However, the citizenship responsibilities of the academic community within the context of their university lives has tended to be overlooked in this flurry of activity mainly directed at the education of children and young adults.

The role of university academic staff is rarely expressed in terms of their citizenship or 'service' role. It is more usually understood in terms of the dual claims of teaching and research. Academics, it is said, are employed for their knowledge of their subject or profession, their ability to further that knowledge through research, and to help students learn through their teaching activities. Anything they do apart from this is sometimes referred to as 'administration' duties and carries negative connotations (Staniforth and Harland, 1999). Such activities are often perceived as 'non-core' (McInnes, 1996) and are regarded as an un-welcome and dysfunctional distraction from research and teaching. However, 'service' consists of activities such as counselling students, mentoring junior or less experienced colleagues, developing links with employers or community groups, interacting with professional groups, or contributing to a university committee or working party. Service activities constitute the 'glue' that keeps academic communities and the universities they work in going and connected to the world around them (Burgan, 1998). They support teaching and research activities through service work such as teaching observation, mentoring, reviewing of academic papers and the organisation of conferences. Yet, in the conceptualisation of academic life, the role of service has been, by and large, overlooked or trivialised as little more than 'administration' rather than essential to the preservation of community life.

There are those who argue that academic staff should exercise citizenship responsibilities in relation to their own academic community and the wider world which universities serve (Kennedy, 1997; Shils, 1997; Ward, 2003). However, there has been little attention paid to the direct link between the concept of citizenship and the responsibilities of academic staff. Mapping how the principles of citizenship apply to academics would seem especially pertinent given that many within the higher education (HE) community are involved, either directly or indirectly, in inculcating students with a respect for elements of our 'common culture' (NCIHE, 1997). A preparedness to tolerate and respect the views of others is one such element (Barnett, 1990). It is also relevant to consider whether the 'civic disengagement' thesis in regard to wider society applies within the academic community. Are university lecturers less prepared or interested in exercising their responsibilities as 'academic citizens'? If so, why has this occurred? This paper will suggest that academics are increasingly disengaged from their citizenship role based on an analysis of contextual forces affecting HE systems. However, clearly further empirical research is required to test the central thesis of this paper.

Political literacy	Participating in decision-making processes at all levels within the university and respecting due process
Community involvement	With the unit, department, faculty, discipline-based community, local community, government and wider society
Social and moral responsibility	Nurturing students, supporting academic and professional colleagues, developing and defending knowledge, communicating with the public

Figure 1 Elements of academic citizenship.

In exploring the concept of 'academic citizenship' there are important implications arising from the application of the Crick committee's three components of citizenship: political literacy, social and moral responsibility, and community involvement (see Figure 1). They imply a willingness to participate actively in decision-making processes within the department and institution, a recognition of the need to serve a series of overlapping communities, and social and moral obligations in relation to these communities such as nurturing students, supporting colleagues, developing the discipline or profession and communicating with the wider public. However, it is important to consider the extent to which this ideal reflects the reality of contemporary academic life. The evidence suggests that the obligations of academic citizenship have been 'hollowed out' by a range of forces affecting university faculty in parallel with the civic disengagement of wider society. The reasons for this, together with a more detailed explanation of how the elements of citizenship translate to academic life, will form the basis for the subsequent analysis contained in this paper.

Political literacy

Service in academic life is fundamentally about citizenship inasmuch that it demands participation as a member of a community of scholars rather than simply the individualised (and perhaps, selfish) pursuit of research and teaching interests. While devotion to individual scholarly agendas is a common collective interest of academic communities, there

is an ancient tradition of self-governance. At root, to be an academic citizen demands active interest in decision-making processes as a member of a university. Here, decision making takes place at different levels: the department, faculty (or school) and university level.

At the university level, the role of academic staff in decision-making processes has a long tradition in UK universities. At Oxford and Cambridge, founded in the 12th and 13th centuries, respectively, most academic staff are members of the governing body of the institution known as 'Congregation' at Oxford and 'the Regent House' at Cambridge. Sovereignty at the college level also lies with academic staff, known as 'Fellows' (Palfreyman, 2001). Most modern UK universities though are far removed from this pure form of academic democracy as a self-governing 'community of scholars' (Goodman, 1962; Evans, 1999). Academic democracy is more weakly established at the UK universities founded by Acts of Parliament and Royal Charters from the 19th century to the 1960s. These provided for a substantial proportion of academic staff to be represented on university councils or senates. The position of academic staff in the post-1992 universities (or former polytechnics) is even further marginalised. These institutions were transformed into universities in 1992 but as corporations, with Boards of Governors between 12 and 24 members. Up to 13 members are required to be 'independent' with experience of industry, employment or a profession. This 'stakeholder model' of university governance largely excludes academic staff, just two members from which may join the Board of Governors. Thus, in most UK universities, the vast majority of academic staff has little or no practical role in the governance of the institution. A similar picture emerges on an international basis. In a research study of academic staff in 14 countries in the 1990s, it was reported that just 5 per cent of staff felt they had any influence in shaping policy at institutional level and over 60 per cent considered they had no impact whatsoever (Lewis and Altbach, 1995). In the intervening 10 years it is unlikely that this feeling of political disenfranchisement has reversed as the casualisation of academic labour has accelerated.

In a UK context, the decline in self-governing processes has been exacerbated by the fact that two thirds of universities have been formed since 1960 (Scott, 1995). Much of the expansion which has occurred to satisfy rising student numbers has been met by the post-1992 sector, where academic democracy is at its weakest. This, though, does not necessarily imply that academic staff in older, and often more research-intense, universities fully appreciate their comparatively privileged position. In parallel to the disengagement with political processes of cit-

izens in mature western democracies, Braxton and Bayer (1999) found that staff in US research universities had a weaker commitment to governance than their counterparts in less prestigious institutions.

An important shift has taken place in the balance between hierarchy and collegiality within most modern universities. While hierarchical authority has always been present in universities, collegiality no longer plays such a strong balancing role. Hierarchy is about vesting decision-making authority in designated leadership roles, as might be commonly found in many business organisations. By contrast, collegiality works on the basis of members having an equal authority in decision-making processes, the results of which must be respected by all (Becher and Kogan, 1992). At the department and school or faculty level, academic democracy has also been in decline. In this regard, collegiality is a word closely associated with the concept of academic self-governance and co-operation in joint and consensual decision-making processes (McNay, 1995; Knight and Trowler, 2001; Tapper and Palfreyman, 2002). The emphasis is on inclusiveness developing communal consent for change. In its purest form 'collegiality' implies the full participation of academics in a federal structure of colleges balancing the power of the university at the centre (Tapper and Palfreyman, 2002). The weakened position of most academic staff in modern governance structures, even at Oxford and Cambridge universities, is symbolic of the shift away from a collegial to a more bureaucratic and managerial culture. Such concerns are by no means new though and apply to university systems in the US as well as the UK (Goodman, 1962). The 'gentleman amateur' model of academic leadership has been replaced by an increasingly professional one. Senior decision-making positions in the management of university life such as Pro Vice Chancellor, Dean and Head of Department have traditionally been filled through the rotation of senior staff (Middlehurst, 1993). Professorial authority to fulfil such duties has been based on academic reputation and influence on decision-making bodies such as the Senate (Middlehurst, 1993). The 'leadership' of departmental colleagues is now increasingly undertaken on a permanent rather than 'rotational' basis by academics who have chosen 'management' as a career route or by professional managers from non-academic backgrounds in business and public service industries. In an Australian context, permanent managerial deans emerged in the 1990s while in the UK there is evidence that academics are now undertaking managerial roles at an earlier stage in their university careers (Moodie, 2002; Deem et al., 2001).

Decline of collegial governance has taken place within most universities at all levels. This includes the Oxbridge colleges, the ancient bas-

tions of academic self-governance, where academic demos act more as a constraint rather than the driver of policy development (Tapper and Palfreyman, 2002). At the highest level, the university vice chancellor is now regarded as a representative of the university's corporate self-interest rather than that of the academic community. It was not until the early 1990s that the vice chancellor of Cambridge University ceased to serve for a maximum of two consecutive academic years (Johnson, 1994). Similarly, at lower levels, faculty deans and department heads are now commonly permanent appointees rather than serving on a rotational basis (Moodie, 2002; Deem et al., 2001). This trend might be attributed to increased demands for the accountability of the university to its modern 'stakeholders', the reliance of most institutions, to a greater or lesser extent, on government funding and the equating of a university education with the norms and lexicon of a service industry. The legitimacy of such interests have been asserted in the UK by the Lambert Model Code of Governance which proposes a strengthening of the role of governors from commercial and industrial organisations in order to make university governance more efficient (Buckland, 2004). Arguably, such change contrasts favourably in some respects with the consensual but often slow and inefficient nature of collegial decision-making processes. The excessive power collegial processes can give to opponents of change and the individual incompetence it can hide (Tapper and Palfreyman, 2002) further appear ill-suited to the fast moving demands of a more competitive, global environment for educational services.

Why, it might be asked, should academic staff play a significant role in the governance of university affairs? After all, are they not just employees like anyone else? There is both a *de jure* and *de facto* means of responding to this question. In the UK, prior to 1987, academic staff, unlike any ordinary employee, could gain 'tenure' whereby, following a successful probationary period, they would be secure in their positions until retirement, free to express unpopular views and conduct research without fear of dismissal (Russell, 1993). Tenure is an entitlement which academics in a number of other university systems, including the US, continue to enjoy. This places the academic in a position of privilege and immense responsibility to act in a way which does not abuse the trust of tenure. While the legal protection afforded by tenure may have disappeared for UK academics, they are still, in other respects, more than just 'an employee'. This is attested to by the considerable *de facto* power and authority which academics continue to possess. They interview and admit students, design the curriculum, create intellectual knowledge

through research and publications and, crucially, determine the life chances of learners through their dual role as teachers and examiners. They are not simply 'service providers'.

However, there is no doubt that the 'political literacy' of academic staff has been damaged by the decline of collegial decision making, the rise of a management culture in universities and the loss of tenure. There are other factors that have contributed to the disengagement of the academic from decision-making processes at all levels. One of the most significant of these is the casualisation and increasing atomisation of academic labour. In the UK and the US there have been growing numbers of part-time and casual staff employed for a number of years (Ainley, 1994; Nelson and Watt, 1999; Benjamin, 2000). The development of e-learning, the inclusion of more professional and practice-based subjects into HE institutions, and the separation of teaching and research functions prompted by government funding regimes have prompted further divisions and subdivisions of academic labour, often without full status. Specialist roles include 'teaching-only' and 'research-only' staff, lecturer practitioners in the health sciences and web developers. Service roles tend to be multifaceted and poorly defined, if at all. Such categories of staff cannot reasonably be expected to fulfil the range of unspecified tasks often carried out on the basis of goodwill. This trend has put the remaining members of full-time faculty under increasing pressure to cover the citizenship tasks previously shared among an academic community, proportionately larger to the student intake in modern mass HE.

The pressures that have eroded academic self-governance do not, however, justify a retreat from political literacy and engagement. While academic freedom might be a necessary right, this implies certain duties. One of the most prominent of these is the duty to become involved in governance, which helps to ensure academic freedom is preserved in practise. As Burgan (1998, p. 16) states, 'freedom, after all, involves process, as well as principle.'

Community involvement and social and moral responsibility

Community involvement should stem from political literacy and an understanding of the overlapping communities which academics serve: the student body, the department, faculty or school, discipline, local community, government and wider society. Social and moral responsibility flows from an understanding, and acceptance, of the importance

of this multiple series of communities. As indicated earlier, social and moral responsibility, in Crick's terms, implies obligations in the nurturing of students, supporting academic and professional colleagues, developing and defending knowledge and communicating with the public.

It is commonplace to speak, often glibly, of a 'community of scholars', implying that university academics share a sense of common values, purposes and identity. The evidence suggests though that there has been a withering of any sense of a common academic 'culture'. Culture is, of course, a tricky term that is perhaps easier to recognise on the basis of experience than to adequately define. However, McNay (1995) has provided a useful conceptual framework that makes it possible to describe some of the differences between university cultures. He identifies four cultures: the collegium, bureaucracy, corporation and enterprise, all present to some extent in universities. The first of these, the collegium, is based firmly in the autonomous tradition (Burgess, 1977) most closely associated with Oxford and Cambridge universities where there is a strong culture of academic autonomy based on consensual and informal processes. The other cultures represent the forces of regulation ('bureaucracy'), executive power ('corporation') and the free market ('enterprise'). The collegium is central to a sense of collective, academic identity. It consists of a culture based on the claims of academic freedom including an assertion of the importance of academic self-governance. It rests on consensual decision-making processes within an autonomous community, but the decline of this culture has been marked. McNay (1995) reports a notable shift in the perceptions of staff with regard to the presence of each of these cultures. Over a 10-year period, McNay found the collegium went from being the dominant culture to having the weakest presence.

This process has been accelerated by a range of forces. One of the most obvious reasons for the decline of the collegium has been the massification of HE. In the UK student numbers in HE grew markedly in both the 1960s and, more recently, between the late 1980s and early 1990s (NCIHE, 1997). The latter period witnessed a 40 per cent expansion of student numbers in Australian universities (Layer, 2002). The participation rate in England currently stands at around 43 per cent of 18–30-year-olds and is set to rise to 50 per cent by 2010 in parts of the UK which have not already achieved this target (DfES, 2003). The university has simply got bigger and this growth of student numbers and, to some extent, staff numbers has eroded the sense of community possible in smaller size institutions.

The arrival of mass HE is one of the factors identified by Edward Shils (1997, p. 42) as contributing to the 'disaggregated university'. The growth of student numbers, more funds for the appointment of academic staff, increased career mobility and the proliferation of subdisciplines were other factors cited by Shils as damaging the internal unity of the university. Moreover, Shils' analysis does not stand in isolation. Drawing on interviews with academic staff at UK universities, Silver reports little sense of 'a culture that rested on a community of interest, shared norms, assumptions and even values that were clearly associated with the institution itself' (Silver, 2003, p. 162). On this basis it might appear that the university has become merely a legal entity of disparate individuals rather than the 'intellectual corporation' envisaged by Shils (1997).

Arguably, though, it is possible to sustain a sense of community where a residential collegiate model survives, consisting of both students and resident faculty, as at large contemporary elite universities, such as Oxford, Cambridge or Yale. The benefits of the collegiate model have been recognised since the 19th century as an important ingredient in student character development (Barnes, 1996). The collegiate model fits less comfortably though with contemporary economic realities both in terms of the economies of scale connected with running modern organisations or the affordability of the residential college in an age of universal HE. Students in the UK are increasingly likely to live at home in order to study at their local university, an unsurprisingly pragmatic decision when the value of a contemporary HE is seen largely in terms of economic benefits rather than character development. While the importance of the collegiate model to student development is often cited, working in relatively small communities is also of significance to academic staff. According to Thomas and Chickering (1983), individuals in very large educational establishments encounter 'redundancy', not in the literal sense of a termination of employment, but in their sense of a loss of involvement. The scale of the modern university means that there is now an increasing need for professional administrators and managers disconnected rather than drawn from the academic community. A range of other factors has placed a strain on the internal unity of the university as a community. The fragmentation of academic knowledge and the availability of the Internet mean that individual scholars are increasingly likely to relate to colleagues remote from the department or immediate university environment. The conditions of modern mass HE have also eroded the concept of the university as a community from a student perspective. The campus-based model is under strain as the cost of a uni-

versity education rises. Students now enter academic studies with pragmatic concerns to obtain a degree leading to a lucrative career, with the collective life of the university coming a poor second (Thomas and Chickering, 1983).

Identity with community in academic life consists of a series of overlapping layers. The university is 'onion like' (Middlehurst, 1993) with multiple layers. Academics work as part of an HE system, a disciplinary or professional network, a university, a department, a teaching or research team, a class of students and so on. Among this series of communities, identity in terms of the discipline is often considered to be of paramount importance given that most academics have served an apprenticeship as a student themselves. While the nature of university life may have become more impersonal resulting in a weaker sense of institutional community, the first point of identity for most academics is commonly acknowledged as their 'tribe' (Becher, 1989). Here, there is a shared set of values, interests and norms of behaviour. This implies the discipline, rather than the institution, has long been the basis of community in academic life. In this regard it would be illusory to suppose that there was ever a 'golden age' of institutional commitment.

However, along with the mass university, academic life has become increasingly specialised. Epistemological fragmentation has resulted in a rapid expansion of subdisciplines in many disciplinary fields. Within the study of education, for example, there is a growing fragmentation, reflected by the range of special interest groups, journals, scholarly societies and published book titles, that has resulted in the emergence of a number of specialised communities which have become separated, like grain silos, from each other. These 'silos', reflecting the interests of subcommunities within a field of intellectual enquiry, exist in all disciplinary territories to a greater or lesser extent. However, as Becher (1989) has shown, some academic tribes are more 'convergent or tightly knit' than others. Educational studies, by contrast, are in Becher's terms, a more 'divergent or loosely knit' area, and an intellectual territory where its members lack cohesion or a common sense of identity. Nixon has characterised education studies as 'strangely rootless' in this sense (Nixon, 2002, p. 5). Educationists have tend to tunnel into sector-specific areas (such as early years education, primary schooling, secondary schooling, post-16 education, adult education, continuing education, distance education, etc.) or into aspect-specific areas (such as curriculum studies, special and inclusive education, assessment, policy studies, gender studies, etc.) To forge a career within educational studies, academics have to identify with, and find a space within, one or

other of these areas, each with its own journals, networks, conferences and gatekeepers. A similar picture emerges in the fragmented nature of academic identity in other disciplines.

This fragmentation is due, at least in part, to the epistemological fragmentation that increasingly drives academic careers. In the age of audit, government funding for university research in the UK, Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere in the world is contingent on outcome and 'impact' measures such as refereed papers. In this competitive context, the career-minded academic is probably best advised to specialise in one subdisciplinary niche than question how the 'whole' fits together. The Research Assessment Exercise in the UK has added new impetus to epistemological fragmentation. There is evidence that these processes, associated with heightened demands for performativity, have damaged intellectual collegiality. While collegiality in terms of decision-making processes is connected with the political literacy of academic staff, intellectual collegiality 'stimulates academics of different ranks and interests to pursue in common very difficult intellectual goals' (Tapper and Palfreyman, 2002, p. 49). Research audit exercises tend to privilege and reward the intellectual achievement of individuals working in highly specialised, rather than inter-disciplinary, academic fields. Burgan (1998) asserts that the emphasis on research has led to the 'outsourcing' of service activities to a growing army of middle managers. There is also evidence to suggest that this trend has damaged commitment to student advising and other more informal aspects of the academic service role (Brown, 2002).

In addressing engagement with the community, it is important not to lose sight of the relationship between academics and civic society. It has long been recognised that universities should contribute to the development of the societies of which they are a part. The Victorian civic universities and the US land grant universities were most closely associated with this tradition during the expansion of HE in the mid to late 19th century. Both the Robbins (1963) and Dearing reports (NCIHE, 1997) on UK HE recognise the central role of universities and colleges in reflecting and shaping the common cultural values of a democratic society. However, the growth of state funding for HE since the Second World War and the decline of 'donnish dominion' (Halsey, 1992) has led to a subtle shift in this relationship as the economic role of the university has taken centre stage. The nature of a common culture has also become more diffuse because of the increasing ethnic diversity of the UK and the increasing importance of the mass media as an alternative means of 'transmission' (NCIHE, 1997). This has led to a retreat from

the broader civic role of the university, redefining, in the process, the relationship between academics and the wider society they serve. This is now perceived in hard-edged terms such as 'knowledge transfer' rather than more broadly based contributions to civic society. While institutional mission statements speak of the 'community' and service to 'society' at large, the basis upon which this rhetoric translates into the working practise of academic staff is less clear (Boland, MacLabhrainn and McIlrath, 2004).

Conclusion

This paper has sketched a largely unpromising picture of the state of academic citizenship. In common with the disengagement thesis more generally within society, academic citizenship appears to be in a similar state of crisis and retreat. The evidence suggests that the collegiality of faculty life has been replaced by a less communal and more isolated existence. Institutional communities are strained by the growth in the size of universities; discipline-based communities are ever more fractured and specialised; and academic relations with students have become increasingly impersonal in the wake of massification. It follows that if you do not feel part of a community, you are unlikely to know the moral obligations of kinship.

The challenges of this crisis are multiple and relate to questions of academic and professional identity as well as institutional processes and structural change across HE at large. In recovering the idea of academic citizenship there is a need for institutions to place more explicit emphasis on the importance of the service role within reward and recognition structures. This is commonplace at many US universities, where there is a stronger service tradition, but more rarely elaborated in such detail at comparable UK institutions that continue to characterise the academic role outside of teaching and research as 'administration' or 'management'. Even where the importance of service is acknowledged, it is not easily 'measurable' in the modern parlance of 'inputs', such as teaching hours, or 'outputs', such as published research papers (Macfarlane, 2005). Moreover, the perception of academic staff is that such work is rarely acknowledged in recognition and reward systems (Macfarlane, 2005).

However, commitment to service has never been purely about reward and promotion. There is a long and rich tradition of faculty embracing their citizenship responsibilities as an integral part of their academic identity serving a variety of communities. In this respect, the responsi-

bility for ensuring that academic citizenship survives lies squarely with the senior professoriate. The emergence of a non-professorial management culture within university life might mean that many service duties are no longer seen as necessarily core to the role of a professor. The professoriate though play a vital role in acting as role models (Tight, 2002). In so doing, they need to model the commitment to service if the importance of academic citizenship is to survive.

References

Ainley, P. (1994) *Degrees of Difference: Higher Education in the 1990s*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Barnes, S. V. (1996) England's Civic Universities and the Triumph of the Oxbridge Ideal. *History of Education Quarterly*, 36 (3), pp. 271–305.

Barnett, R. (1990) *The Idea of a Higher Education*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Baston, L. and Ritchie, K. (2004) *Turning out or turning off? An analysis of political disengagement and what can be done about it*. London: Electoral Reform Society.

Becher, T. (1989) *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Becher, T. and Kogan, M. (1992) *Process and Structure in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Benjamin, E. (2000) Overreliance on Part-Time Faculty: An American Trend. *International Higher Education*, (Fall), pp. 7–9.

Boland, J., MacLabhrainn, I. and Mcllrath, L. (2004) *Universities, Students and Communities: Promoting Civic Engagement through Service Learning*. Paper presented at the Society for Research into Higher Education Annual Conference, Bristol, 10–12 December 2004.

Braxton, J. M. and Bayer, A. E. (1999) *Faculty Misconduct in Collegiate Teaching*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Brown, S. (2002) Student Counselling and Students' Failure. In M. Peelo, and T. Wareham (eds.) *Failing Students in Higher Education*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press, pp. 139–150.

Buckland, R. (2004) Universities and Industry: Does the Lambert Code of Government Meet the Requirements of Good Governance? *Higher Education Quarterly*, 58 (4), pp. 243–257.

Burgan, M. (1998) Academic Citizenship: A Fading Vision. *Liberal Education*, 84 (4), pp. 16–21.

Burgess, T. (1977) *Education After School*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Cohen, S. (1972) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. London: MacGibbon and Kee.

Coles, R. (1993) *The Call of Service: A Witness to Idealism*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Crick, B. (Chair) (1998) Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship, 22 September, 1998. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

DfES (2003) *The Future of Higher Education: Creating Opportunity, Releasing Potential, Achieving Excellence*. London: The Stationery Office.

Deem, R. et al. (2001) Managing Contemporary UK Universities – Manager-Academics and New Managerialism. *Academic Leadership*, 1 (3), pp. 1–18 (on-line), www.academicleadership.org/volume1/issue3/index.html

Evans, G. (1999) *Calling Academia to Account: Rights and Responsibilities*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Goodman, P. (1962) *The Community of Scholars*. New York: Random House.

Halsey, A. H. (1992) *Decline of Donnish Dominion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, G. (1994) *University Politics: F.M. Cornford's Cambridge and His Advice to the Young Academic Politician*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kennedy, B. D. (1997) *Academic Duty*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Knight, P. T. and Trowler, P. R. (2001) *Departmental Leadership in Higher Education*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Layer, G. (2002) Developing Inclusivity. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 21 (1), pp. 3–12.

Lewis, L. S. and Altbach, P. G. (1995) Faculty Versus Administration: A Universal Problem. *International Higher Education*, 2 (Fall), pp. 2–4.

Macfarlane, B. (2005) Placing Service in Academic Life. In R. Barnett (ed.) *Reshaping Universities: New Relationships between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press, pp. 165–177.

Maitles, H. (2000) Political Education in Scotland: An assessment of effectiveness. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Edinburgh, 20–23 September 2000.

Marquand, D. (2004) *The Decline of the Public: The Hollowing-Out of Citizenship*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Marshall, T. H. and Bottomore, T. (1992) *Citizenship and Social Class* (First published by T. H. Marshall in 1950). London: Pluto.

McInnes, C. (1996) Change and Diversity in the Work Patterns of Australian Academics. *Higher Education Management*, 8 (2), pp. 105–117.

McNay, I. (1995) From the Collegial Academy to the Corporate Enterprise: The Changing Cultures of Universities. In T. Schuller (ed.) *The Changing University?* Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press, pp. 105–115.

Middlehurst, R. (1993) Leading Academics. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Moodie, G. (2002) Fish Or Fowl? Collegial Processes in Managerialist Institutions. *Australian Universities Review*, 45 (2), pp. 18–22.

NCIHE (1997) Higher Education in the Learning Society. Report of the National Committee. London: HMSO.

Nelson, C. and Watt, S. (1999) *Academic Keywords: A Devil's Dictionary for Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Nixon, J. (2002) Inaugural Lecture: Education, Leadership and Civil Society. School of Education, University of Sheffield, 15 May 2002.

Palfreyman, D. (2001) The Ancient Collegiate Universities: Oxford and Cambridge. In D. Warner and D. Palfreyman (eds.) *The State of UK Higher Education: Managing Change and Diversity*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press, pp. 9–28.

Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Robbins, Lord (1963) Higher Education: Report of the Committee Appointed by the Prime Minister Under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961–1963. London: HMSO.

Russell, C. (1993) *Academic Freedom*. London: Routledge.

Scott, P. (1995) *The Meanings of Mass Higher Education*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Shils, E. (1997) *The Calling of Education: The Academic Ethic and Other Essays on Higher Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Silver, H. (2003) Does a University Have a Culture? *Studies in Higher Education*, 28 (2), pp. 157–169.

Staniforth, D. and Harland, T. (1999) The Work of an Academic: Jack of All Trades, Or Master of One? *The International Journal of Academic Development*, 4 (2), pp. 142–149.

Tapper, T. and Palfreyman, D. (2002) Understanding Collegiality: The Changing Oxbridge Model. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, pp. 47–63.

Thomas, R. and Chickering, A. (1983) Insitutional Size, Higher Education and Student Development. In S. Goodlad (ed.) *Economics of Scale in Higher Education.* Surrey: The Society for Research into Higher Education, pp. 41–56.

Tight, M. (2002) What Does It Mean to Be a Professor? *Higher Education Review*, 34 (2), pp. 15–32.

Vink, M. (2004) The Unbearable Lightness of European Citizenship. *Citizenship*, *Social and Economics Education*, 6 (1), pp. 24–33.

Ward, K. (2003) *Faculty Service and the Scholarship of Engagement*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.