Collegiality: A singular concept?
Definitions and conceptualizations of collegiality in the U.S. and internationally
Wylie V. Easterling
Indiana University - Bloomington

Collegiality among faculty in American higher education institutions has been described in faculty-focused literature, though not extensively. Not only has it been mentioned, but also it is described as an essential element of a healthy college or university faculty (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Walvoord, 2000). Collegiality is treated in literature about the faculty profession as an important value, as a thing sometimes revered, and an ultimate ideal to attain. When surveyed, faculty refered to collegiality as something that is valued when present and missed when absent in their units and institutions (Absher, 2009; Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005; Walvoord et al., 2000; Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998). When absent, faculty and institutions are encouraged to foster it across different social, cultural, and geographical contexts (Bode, 1999; Boice, 1992; Gappa, Austin & Trice; Massy, Wilger, & Colbeck, 1994; Sorcinelli, 1992). But what exactly is it, and how does the literature about the faculty profession define and conceptualize collegiality?

This paper seeks to answer these questions through an exploration of studies and writings that either have directly addressed the meaning of collegiality in a higher education faculty context, or give distinct mention to the attributes or role of collegiality. The purpose of this document is to examine – not redefine - a valued ideal in higher education – faculty collegiality – from multiple perspectives and in multiple contexts to create a richer understanding of the many facets of what collegiality in higher education is and is not. This effort is based on the hypothesis that with a deeper, more nuanced understanding of what collegiality means that faculty and institutions can better promote and foster collegiality when and how it is appropriate to do so. While exploring this topic, special note will be made of contextual factors that may affect potential meanings of the word collegiality or the forms it takes, especially with regard to faculty status, gender, ethnicity, and international higher education.

**Collegiality: Definitions and Themes**

**Starting Points**

Is there one definition of collegiality? The following sections will begin by examining attempts at defining collegiality, and then explore themes present in the literature regarding collegiality. Bess (1992) contends that not only is there no one definition for collegiality, but also that there are multiple forms of collegiality, each of which are vague concepts in and of themselves and dependent upon a specific work context. Bess continues by writing that collegiality has certain, cultural, structural-organizational, and behavioral forms that are undergirded with values of reciprocity, cooperation, civility and equality. According to Bess, cultural collegiality focuses on shared values in a culture of reciprocity, structural collegiality on governance and organization, and behavioral collegiality on acts of an interpersonal nature beyond the requirements of the culture or organization.

Collegiality is heavily defined in the literature using the following terms: Community, respect, value of peers and their work, concern for colleagues, highly valued peer interaction, and a feeling of belonging (Austin, Sorcinelli, & McDaniels, 2007; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Bode, 1999; Sorcinelli, 1992). Social connections, friendships, and collaborative research and teaching – sometimes required by cultures and organizations – are key elements to some for a truly collegial environment and the absence of these characteristics and feelings of isolation from faculty peers are potential signs of an environment with a lack of collegiality (Gappa, Austin, &Trice; Hatfield, 2006). Bode (1999) offers a similar impression of what collegiality may be in a study of new faculty, summarizing the impressions faculty gave of what collegiality meant to them:

> [C]ollegial environments were described as possessing a sense of community, where the interactions were formal and reciprocal, many teaching and scholarly colleagues were available, the support was both social and intellectual, the quality of support was high, and the offices of new faculty were conveniently located (p. 132).

Bode (1996) also provides characteristics of more collegial and less collegial environments to supplement these perceptions. In more collegial environments, these above traits are present, while less collegial units lack (to different degrees) community, cooperation, collaboration, social interaction, and mutuality amongst faculty members.

As mentioned above, collegiality can also be defined through its absence. Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck (1994) – to be discussed in more detail later – describe a "hollowed" collegiality they observed in their study of academic departments. A hollowed collegiality lacks the traits Bode (1999) describes – community, faculty involvement in governance, and civility - or they exist only at a surface level, thus giving a veneer of collegiality. In this case, collegiality is little more than a few traditional acts faculty do together, with little interaction or cooperation. Even though a hollowed collegiality is empty of collegiality, it still points to a collegiality that emphasizes faculty interaction, collaboration, mutual support and community as key components. Additionally, Norman, Ambrose and Huston (2006) state that a lack of collegiality, which they use to include incivility in units, fractured community, lack of information sharing and collaboration, and aloofness on the part of some faculty, is the most frequently mentioned reason given by faculty for being dissatisfied with their jobs (p. 352). Both a hollowed collegiality and descriptions of un-collegial departments can tell as much about what collegiality is perceived to be as the more discrete and pro-collegiality descriptions above.

**Collegiality As Structure or Organization**

A description of collegiality as a structure tells of a way that equality in decision-making processes is maintained between faculty members, mutual cooperation and reciprocity of interaction is fostered, and power is shared and fairly distributed amongst a faculty so that all have a theoretically equal voice (Bode, 1999; Bess, 1992). Hatfield (2006) describes a similar view of collegiality – a "status" definition that focuses more on position and less on behaviors or actions. When collegiality is considered to be structural in nature, faculty have equal status, an inclusion in unit or institutional governance, a key role in curricular, departmental, and/or institutional decision making, and in the functions and happenings of the institution (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Walvoord 2000). Shared governance of a unit or institution is at the heart of a structural collegiality, wherein faculty have full investment in and co-ownership of the decisions made, including maintaining its own membership, such as in the tenure and promotion process (O'Meara, 2004; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). This does not mean that unanimity will or should be the ideal, but instead implies that colleagues will cooperate with and respect each other in decision-making processes, negotiate with others in their unit with whom they may disagree, and collaborate to make the decisions that must be made (Massy, Wilger, & Colbeck, 1994). A structural collegiality places power, ability and the responsibility to act on a faculty of academic unit, things that are their responsibility to wield with respect to others, to protect vigorously, and to make evident in a unit's actions and activities.

**A Cultural Collegiality**

Collegiality is also a set of shared values and ideals that defines both the nature of the individual faculty member and the faculty institutional unit. A cultural collegiality creates shared values and norms, such as academic freedom and the autonomy of the college-level

teacher (Bess, 1992; Walvoord, 2000). These values both protect individual rights yet are honored, reciprocated, and valued by faculty without necessary mandates to do so – one just sees a mutual respect as part of "collegiality." To be more precise, Bess' (1992) cultural collegiality goes beyond assumptions of reciprocity – in an ideal world would respect and support the work of a peer regardless of whether or not they expected the other to do the same for them. This "cultural collegiality" assumes values that can create a collegial culture that may or may not permeate the activities of faculty members: academic freedom, autonomy for professional practice, shared governance and equality. These assumptions and this definition of a "cultural collegiality" are much in line with the implicit and explicit definitions of collegiality offered by the AAUP in their 1999 statement *On Collegiality As A Criterion For Faculty Evaluation*. In this ideal presented in the AAUP statement, members of a faculty have an equal voice and power, act with a sense of "collective responsibility," and do so in a spirit of reciprocity – at least in theory (Bode, 1999; Massey, Wilger, & Colbeck, 1994).

**Collegiality As Behavior**

Collegiality can also be expressed through actions, works and other behaviors that reflect collegial structures and ideals These behaviors are also a manifestation of the nature of what collegiality is – something that is expressed through outward action towards and with one's peers. Hatfield (2006) presents a similar collegiality that is based on behaviors as having three dimensions: conflict management in a unit, a shared set of social behaviors (such as congeniality) in a shared culture, and what Hatfield calls "organizational citizenship," or the acting out on these behaviors and contributing to a civil, collaborative, and respectful environment. This is similar to the "behavioral collegiality" of Bess (1992), where faculty peers are respectful of each other in tangible ways and evident in how collegial faculty act towards one

another – treating their peers as equals but beyond the requirements of both a cultural and structural collegiality. These behaviors are reflective of personal and/or collective initiative to be both good citizens (also, Hatfield, 2006) and to be friendly, helpful, and giving to one's peers without expectation of reciprocity.

Examples of collegial behaviors and attitudes-made-real include: verbal and nonverbal signs of respect; civility in interactions with each other; self-motivated collaboration and cooperation on departmental, teaching, and scholarly activities; and intentional, professional interactions between peers (Bode, 1999, p. 305; also, AAUP, 1999; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Hatfield, 2006). This is similar to the accounts of the collegial interaction ultimately experienced by the new teachers in Boice's (1992) report – tangible expressions of equality, compassion, collaboration and power-sharing/shared decision-making. Furthermore, one key collegial behavior to some is intellectual collaboration – where faculty are not disconnected as scholars, but also research, write, and work together, in addition to providing scholarly support for each other, being available for critique of peer's work, and facilitating information sharing within the unit or institution (Twale & De Luca, 2008; Norman, Ambrose, & Huston, 2006; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Bode, 1996).

In this context, collegiality is something a faculty member lives and does – cooperating, collaborating in governance, teaching responsibilities, researching, being civil to one another, and sharing portions of (at least) their professional lives with their peers (Massy, Wilger, & Colbeck, 1994). Furthermore, it is difficult for collegiality to be made manifest without interaction between colleagues and the presence of shared space, time, commitments and activities. Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck also add that without common activities, places and

spaces for collegiality to develop and be shown in the actions of faculty, it will languish or not exist.

**Collegiality As a Tool for Socialization**

Collegiality is also described in the literature in much more pragmatic, utilitarian terms. For example, collegial structures, values, and behaviors can have a strong socializing effect, and their absence can also prompt some to change careers or make substantial changes to their lives in order to adapt. A lack of community and collegial support – casual conversation, mentor and peer interaction, for example - has been shown to increase faculty dissatisfaction, and be a factor in some leaving the academic profession (Norman, Ambrose, and Huston, 2006; Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005; Walvoord et al., 2000; Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998). At the same time, when new faculty perceive that collegiality exists in their unit, this can enhance their job satisfaction, increase morale, and provide new faculty with others who can share their own experiences with difficult professional situations, the balance of faculty and family life, and other issues prevalent in American faculty work lives (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). When collegiality is present, the collegial behaviors, values, and interactions of senior faculty can facilitate the socialization of new faculty (Bode, 1999). Without a collegial atmosphere and environment, meaningful interaction may be tenuous at best, and uncivil at worst - creating a less fertile environment for healthy socialization of new faculty.

## Collegiality: Its Presence and Absence

For new faculty, serving in a unit or department with strong collegial values, structures, and actions can ease the transition for new faculty, and the lack thereof can easily undermine

professional growth and possibly give rise to feelings of discouragement about one's place in that unit.  As mentioned above, feelings of collegiality in all of its forms seem tied to issues of job satisfaction and stress. When collegiality is present, it matches the expectations new faculty seem to have for the values of collegiality in action, and when it is valued as an essential element of faculty work and life its presence can mean mutual growth as professionals, for new and old alike (Sorcinelli, 1992).

**Collegiality Versus Feelings of Isolation**

In contrast, the absence of collegiality can sometimes take the form of a growing sense of isolation and hopelessness inside faculty members, that can then lead to a growing feeling of job dissatisfaction, and possibly lead to one leaving the academic profession altogether (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998). Upon joining a faculty, initial hopes for meaningful and scholarly interaction give way to feelings of isolation, loneliness and a lack of professional support and collaboration (Boice, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1992).  Autonomy, incivility, institutional politics, personal differences, a lack of time, possibly unrealistic demands for research and teaching, and the demands of the tenure and promotion process easily contribute to these feelings and to subverting collegiality (Massy, Wilger, & Colbeck, 1994).

As a further blow to the expectations for an ideal form of collegiality, Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck (1994) report that while collegiality is touted as an ideal, few departments are truly collegial in nature.  Instead, collegiality in these departments is "hollowed," or an empty veneer of civility that is little more than a flimsy collection of: knowledge-sharing events among colleagues; group decision-making regarding teaching offerings and assignments; and collective participation in the promotion and tenure process.  Besides these elements, these authors found a façade of civility that allows a department or unit to function in a more fair and equitable

manner.  Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck also put this façade in opposition to a truly collegial department, which has a shared commitment with tangible signs of this commitment (actions, words, collaboration, shared goal-setting) to fostering and working in a spirit of collegiality. While vestiges of the ideal of collegiality are in place, the departments studied showed a collegiality that was expressed as being a shared value, but was not put into practice or made an actuality.

**Collegiality and Civility (or Incivility)**

In the different sections above, collegiality has been described using many words: collaboration, cooperation, equality, equity, respect, professional interaction, and civility. A civil unit is one that is courteous, avoids overt conflict and minimizes disagreement (Massy, Wilger, & Colbeck, 1994) and is part of organizational citizenship (Hatfield, 2006), though civility is relative to social, generational and other forces and heavily dependent on the perspectives of individuals and what these individuals perceive as being "civil" or "uncivil" (Twale & De Luca, 2008).  In their extensive treatment of faculty incivility, Twale and De Luca present incivility not as an absolute concept, but a breakdown of civil interactions, attitudes and structures that promote unit or institutional health that can take many forms.  These include but are not limited to: bullying behaviors, aggressive and/or manipulative behaviors (including passive-aggressive behaviors, gossip and competition, among others), indifference, retaliatory actions, and open hostility or intimidation.

Though civil behaviors and a civil work culture may prevent open hostility and allow peers in a unit to work together, civility is not equivalent to collegiality.  Collegiality implies a support system and spans the responsibilities of faculty while civility is more focused on behavior sand attitudes that can sometimes underlie collegial actions, such as respect or

indifference or bullying (Twale & De Luca, 2008).  At the same time, Twale and De Luca

discuss how units can appear to be collegial in structure and behavior, yet very uncivil attitudes

or behaviors can be taking place, with either collegial behaviors serving as a mask for incivility

or collegiality giving safe refuge to bullies, such as how tenure and academic freedom can make

bullies untouchable by discipline or efforts to correct uncivil behaviors.

An emphasis on civility and collegiality does not mean, though, that disagreements

cannot exist or that all faculty in a unit must be in lockstep intellectually or socially.  According

to the AAUP (1999) statement *On Collegiality As A Criterion For Faculty Evaluation*, collegial

departments can have disagreements on a professional level, and not everyone has to agree or

suppress dissenting views for true collaboration to exist (also, Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).

Civility allows a unit to function in a healthy manner (Finkelstein, 2009; Massy, Wilger, &

Colbeck, 1994), as does collegiality – just in a different way.

**Collegiality, Academic Freedom, and Faculty Evaluation**

If collegiality is essential, as some argue, it can be argued that being collegial or

supporting a collegial culture should be formalized as an expectation for a new faculty member

through the tenure process or in faculty evaluations (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).   In other

words, collegiality would be considered as a necessary area to show accomplishment, alongside

the traditional areas of scholarship, teaching and service.  The tying of collegiality – which does

not have one clear-cut definition as this paper shows – to faculty tenure and promotion has its

opponents, most notably the AAUP.  The AAUP's *Committee A on Academic Freedom and*

*Tenure* released its statement mentioned above in 1999 precisely to warn against what it saw as a

dangerous proposition to add collegiality as a criteria for faculty evaluation and tenure.

In their statement, the AAUP offered an argument against the addition of collegiality as a fourth category for tenure and promotion that both emphasizes the importance of collegiality and minimizes its impact on promotion and tenure decisions. For the AAUP, faculty or administrative requirements of collegiality could result in faculty homogeneity. If collegiality is defined as "institutional harmony" or in a way where faculty may feel pressured not to contradict prevailing desires or wishes of an administrator, unit or other office of an institution out of a fear of being labeled as not being collegial, this could seriously impinge on the academic freedom of faculty. This could suppress what the AAUP sees as a healthy level of academic disagreement and conflict, as opposed to a surface-level harmony forcibly imposed by a fear of difference or dissent. Also, using collegiality as a criteria for tenure or promotion is redundant, since to the AAUP collegiality is already an integrated and necessary component of any faculty member's scholarship, teaching and service. According to this view, no faculty member could effectively complete these tasks without being collegial (also, Hatfield, 2006).

There are also other concerns relating to collegiality and faculty evaluation. Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) present an overview of some of the dangers of tying collegiality to the tenure and promotion process, including how collegiality could be used as a means to discriminate against current and prospective faculty based on ethnicity, gender, and other criteria deemed "inappropriate" by individuals in power in a college or university. Additionally, if collegiality were to be defined as civility, homogeneity or not being offensive to the institution or administration, a faculty member could be legitimately disciplined for uncivil behaviors such as bullying, indifference and manipulation (Twale & De Luca, 2008). In these cases and with regard to the AAUP statement, though, collegiality would not be condemned or vilified itself, but how it has been defined and how different definitions of collegiality could be applied are at

issue. The AAUP recognized the need for and place of collegiality, but expressed a concern that, if framed in specific ways, it could be used to manipulate, control and discriminate in the faculty evaluation, tenure, and promotion process.

**Definitions of Collegiality Found in Suggestions for Improvement**

In the literature studied, there are some pieces that define collegiality, some that state there is a lack of it, or others that examine collegiality alongside many other faculty issues for a myriad of reasons. There are also some authors who discuss collegiality or the lack thereof in units or institutions, and also offer prescriptions to promote or increase collegiality. In these prescriptions are some definitions that are of some use, but these prescriptions parallel the definitions used within different texts.

For example, Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) discuss a proposed framework for the faculty profession, and one of five essential elements of this framework is faculty collegiality, defined both as a decision-making organizational structure and in terms of relationships and collaboration. As a possible framework, they offer suggestions to foster collegiality, which further expand on their presentation of what collegiality is: including faculty in shared governance activities and decision-making processes at the department through institutional levels; physically positioning faculty offices and shared spaces to reduce social isolation through the reduction of physical isolation; providing events such as lunches focused on scholarship and/or faculty life; promoting faculty learning communities; and, creating special non-academic social events to bring faculty together outside of an institutional context. Furthermore, Gappa, Austin, and Trice define collegiality in terms of governance and community, and the emphasis on activities to involve faculty with the decision-making process.

Other texts do the same.  Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck (1994) present suggestions that reduce feelings of isolation and increase faculty involvement with each other, much like Gappa, Austin, and Trice above.  This reflects a similar value of specific views of collegiality, especially as a reaction again a "hollowed collegiality."  How collegiality is framed also sets the terms for the suggestions given to foster it.

### Collegiality: Faculty Status, Gender and Ethnicity in U.S. Institutions

### Collegiality and Faculty Status

In this section, attention turns to how collegiality may be defined within certain populations, and issues related to collegiality in these contexts – specifically new and adjunct faculty, gender issues in academic units, and minority faculty status and collegiality.  New faculty members enter the profession with many expectations about their new profession, and one of these is an expectation by new faculty that there will be a high level of collegiality, peer collaboration, and community (Austin, Sorcinelli, & McDaniels, 2007).  As for how new faculty expectations are met, there are mixed results. For example, some report high satisfaction with department chairs, mentors, and peers while others report strong feelings of isolation and lack of support with and in their unit at large (Austin, Sorcinelli, & McDaniels; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Bode, 1999; Boice, 1992). Additionally, Austin, Sorcinelli, and McDaniels comment that the increased time and tenure-related burdens placed by institutions, units and department chairs on new faculty can easily diminish time and energy to be more collegial, as opposed to more senior faculty (also, Sorcinelli, 1992).  One word of caution – though these studies do not necessarily contradict each other in how either the researchers define collegiality for study participants or participants themselves define collegiality, when examining these and other

results like those cited in this paper, the reader should look for differences in how different studies define collegiality when considering how to interpret the results.

In terms of non-tenure track faculty, little literature exists on how these faculty members perceive or define collegiality. There are concerns that both contract-renewable, full-time faculty and part-time faculty are much more isolated and lack the benefits of and opportunities for collegiality that their full-time, tenure-track counterparts have (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Fagan-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, & White, 2006). Usually excluded from collegial governance and regular interaction and collaboration with their tenure-track peers, contingent faculty of many different forms can be marginalized in social, cultural and organizational terms which could hypothetically lead to feelings of a lack of collegiality, though a more extensive exploration of this possibility is needed to substantiate this claim.

**Collegiality And Gender Issues**

In addition to concerns of faculty status, factors such as gender and ethnicity can complicate things when seeking a general conceptualization or a definition of collegiality. In terms of gender, Trautvetter (1999) conducted a study in which a majority of female participants reported a lower level of collegial interaction than males, and males reported a higher level of research-related collaborations and interactions than females, though collegiality was not defined within this report – either by the participants or the researchers. The report also showed activities between male and female collaborators (especially mentors) were different in many forms for the faculty studied. For example, males tended to find mentors in less time than females, though faculty of both genders reported finding or being assigned a mentor with the same frequency. Also, females in the study reported less contact with their mentors but of a more complex nature, including both professional and personal issues as areas covered in

mentoring relationships.  Finally, in a sign of possible inequalities, the new male faculty

members reported being involved in research collaborations with colleagues with a greater

frequency than the females studied.

Additionally, other studies have shown that women in faculty positions tend to be less

satisfied with the levels of collegiality they experience (Austin, Sorcinelli & McDaniels, 2007;

Bode, 1999; Trautvetter; Boice, 1992).  Given differences in expectations a unit, profession or

society may place on male and female faculty in institutions, including expectations about family

commitments, time devoted to work versus outside activities, and personality traits (Aguirre,

2000), women can encounter challenges relating and working with colleagues in certain more

traditionally male-dominated units.  Also, gender-related power dynamics and incivility related

to male-dominated power dynamics can create an environment of academic bullying that could

act to the detriment of female faculty in some institutions (Twale & De Luca, 2008).  Female

faculty may also experience difficulty with finding mentors, especially other women if desired,

in some disciplines or professional fields, and either feelings of gender-related isolation or token

status can further impede professional growth and decreased feelings of collegial relations in a

unit or institution (Austin, Sorcinelli, & McDaniels, 2007; Colbeck, 2006; Tierney & Bensimon,

1996; Aguirre, 2000).

But there are multiple perspectives on the issue of collegiality and gender.  Tierney and

Bensimon (1996) report the responses of two women when asked to discuss their feelings of

collegiality in their respective departments.  The first woman felt no connection or collegiality

and mentions the absence of cultural, behavioral and structural collegiality in her quote below:

> I have zero collegiality in my department.  They don't know what I do.  I feel alienated,
> not on an equal footing with the men.  Sometimes I have lunch in the faculty club and see
> the guys from my department eating together.  In the three years I have been here, no one
> has asked me to have lunch (p. 89).

The second woman's response was different, both in her positive comments about her colleagues and her response to an inquiry about collegiality focusing on a *congenial* atmosphere, as opposed to a collegial one:

> It is a very congenial group. Most of U.S. have lunch together almost every day. We know where to look for each other. Even though I am the only woman, I always feel I can go over (p. 89).

These examples, though just two from many, indicate another wrinkle in the effort to define collegiality in the face of social and professional issues: discrimination and collegiality through the lens of gender will differ from department to department and from individual to individual (Tierney and Bensimon, 1996; also, Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).

There still is a question as to what degree a particularly gendered perspective affects how that person defines collegiality. Additionally, it can be said that there is a desire for a collegial environment, such as those studied by Absher (2009) – including women and minority faculty – but there is a question of whether or not caution is exercised in assuming that collegiality means the same to everyone across strata and social constructs. The literature studied does not approach this issue, but there is the possibility that if a male or female faculty member is asked to define collegiality in detail that there may be gender-based trends in certain institutions, disciplines or national/cultural contexts.

**Collegiality and Ethnicity**

Adding even more complexity to collegiality as a concept is the added dimension of ethnicity. For this section, any discussion of ethnicity will be limited to an American higher education context, with international concerns – also burdened with ethnicity-related issues – being addressed in the next section. Aguirre (2000) documents many collegiality-related work issues present for minority faculty: underrepresentation and token status; overt and covert

discrimination; and a feeling of isolation due to both deep and superficial reasons – anything

from having a different physical appearance to being from a significantly different cultural

context (also, Austin, Sorcinelli, & McDaniels, 2007; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Persistent

feelings of discrimination, overt racism, structural inequalities and institutional obligations (such

as being asked as the sole non-white faculty member in a unit to serve as a minority

representative on a committee) can create a greater burden or reduce opportunity for minority

faculty (Aguirre; Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1999).

According to Aguirre (2000), there are pressures on minority faculty to be "good

citizens" by serving the institution as any other faculty member would, such as serving on unit or

institutional committees, yet also being representative of "minority faculty" in Predominately

White Institutions (PWIs) by serving in minority-specific or diversity-centric roles in addition to

the standard expectations. Minority faculty in such a position may feel as if they constantly also

need to prove themselves to others, or have to live in two worlds – a predominantly Caucasian

one, and their own (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). This increased demand and dual-status can

create excess burdens, increased isolation and place barriers to meaningful collegial interaction

(Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1999). Also, this dual status can mean

that faculty may feel as if they are in two worlds, but may not be able to find a mentor in either

one (Alger, 2008). When ethnicity or the minority status of a faculty member is factored in,

collegiality is an inexact concept than how it can be used in the more generic literature on

collegiality.

### Collegiality: An International Context

Multiple searches of academic and scholarly online databases produced little research on

collegiality in higher education institutions outside of the United States, based upon keyword

searches in multiple academic and scholarly online databases.  What does exist can be specific to a single discipline, field of practice, or fragment of the greater international academic community, but it can give a look into how collegiality continuea to be a highly contextualized concept when examined in different national and cultural contexts.   Additionally, more writing and research may be available, but may be either less accessible or embedded in larger works specific to a national higher education context.  The different accounts of how collegiality may be defined that are listed below are not focused on one country, but represent the literature that was found.

**The Value and Decline of Collegiality Internationally**

In international literature, collegiality is addressed from a structural/organizational perspective in some texts.  There is a concern that changes in academic institutions worldwide from a structural collegiality with shared governance and/or faculty input into the academic and institutional decision-making processes to a more top-town "corporate" style in some countries are harming the nature and prevalence of collegiality in international institutions (Cummings & Finkelstein, 2009).  Based on data from the Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey, Aarrevaara (2010) notes that faculty surveyed from the UK, Italy and Finland indicated a more top-down management style – one that somewhat mimics a corporate or government structure – and lower feelings of (structural) collegiality in their institutions.  Based on the same data, Cummings and Finkelstein state that over half of all respondents described their institutions as having a top-down management style, as opposed to a more (structurally) collegial one, and that fewer forty percent felt that their was collegiality in decision making in their institutions.  Furthermore, the CAP data presents a picture of faculty who believe they have considerable

influence at the department level, but have little at the institutional level (Coates, Goedegeburre, van der Lee, & Meek, 2008; Aarrevaara; Cummings & Finkelstein).

What this set of works can contribute to this discussion is that collegiality is being discussed internationally, but seems as if it is constrained in the same way as the U.S.-based conversation: how are faculty being surveyed defining collegiality, and how does that align with the researchers' definitions. The focus of the above articles is more on collegiality as structure, and while examining a study on the value placed on collegiality, there should also be an awareness of the definitions and assumptions that may be underlying. Also, the literature that could be found from outside the U.S. seems to have more of a focus on a collegiality that is structural/ organizational in nature, and forms a body of work that show concerns with the form of collegiality in international contexts. Included in this body are articles like that written by Elton (2008) that argue that changes to a more top-down management style have adversely affected collegiality in the UK. There is an awareness of a change in the role or substance of collegiality internationally, and both the conversation on this awareness and the changes themselves could easily impact how faculty globally view and define collegiality in their institutions and at-large.

**Collegiality in International Planning Education**

One of the few places where collegiality has been overtly defined and discussed as the focus of a paper outside of the U.S. is in planning education, such as the article by Thomas (2005) on the nature of collegiality in planning education units in the UK. Through this context, collegiality seems different from how it has been described because collegiality is contrasted with competition – competition for resources, funding opportunities, students, and prestige – and less so with feelings of isolation. Civility appears to heavily though not fully factor into a

defining of collegiality as friendly interaction and cooperation, as opposed to cut-throat politics and gamesmanship.

Balducci (2005), in a reply to the Thomas article, offers up comments that introduce the reader to the nature and state of collegiality in Italy. In this short essay, Balducci contrasts the state of collegiality in planning education units with the UK, drawing attention to the fact that Italian units are funded more through formulas based on student numbers and other factors and less on a private, competitive model for obtaining funding, possibly creating less competition between peers. At the same time, Balducci – following the trend seen above in the section on the CAP survey results - seems to credit changes in contemporary society on a global level and changes in management styles with decreasing a more historical, elite collegiality (an "old boy's club" of sorts), thereby creating more segmentation and competition in Italian higher education.

**Other International Examples**

Finally, more passing references to collegiality appear with regard to international higher education literature, specifically related to Canadian institutions. An example of this is Peterson and Wiesenberg (2006), which was an article that compared human resources development (HRD) and adult education faculty in both the U.S. and Canada. Referring exclusively to Canadian universities, Rajagopal (2002) explains how an increase in the number of part-time faculty in Canadian universities – with women comprising a large majority of the part-time faculty studied - is creating a problem related to faculty (structural) collegiality. According to this study, full-time faculty are still resistant to including part-time faculty in traditional (structural) collegial decision-making processes. This is, according to Rajagopal, creating a division between a shrinking full-time faculty retaining a structural collegiality and a growing

part-time faculty in Canada who are either left out of this structural collegiality or have a severely diminished voice.

## Conclusion

The goal of this paper is not to define, defend, or promote collegiality as much as to call into question attempts to define it in one unique way and to provoke thought as to what collegiality actually means in theory and in practice. Collegiality has many aspects – cultural, structural, behavioral, and beyond – and these aspects themselves can be very dependent upon an individual's needs, an institution or units unique definitions of collegiality, a person's status as a faculty member, cultural or gender-specific experiences, and an individual's ethnicity or country of origin and practice. This complexity should not discourage interest in collegiality and how it is defined, but this level of complexity should be a part of professional discourse of faculty, institutional leaders and scholars of faculty issues when using and applying the word "collegiality." Additionally, further research regarding how collegiality is defined and conceptualized would be helpful, not in forging one true definition, but in further exposing and examining the complexities that exist underneath what seems like a simple word.

# References

Aarrevaara, T. (2010). Academic freedom in a changing academic world. *European Review, 18*(S1), 55-69.

Absher, B. M. (2009). Attraction and retention of females and minorities in Christian higher education. *Journal of Research on Christian Education, 18*(2), 160-189.

Aguirre, A. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: recruitment, retention, and academic culture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Alexander-Snow, M., & Johnson, B. J. (1999). Perspectives from faculty of color. In R. J. Menges and Associates (Ed.), *Faculty in new jobs* (pp. 88-117). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Alger, J. (2008). How to recruit and promote minority faculty: Start by playing fair. Retrieved July 8, 2010, from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/diversity/Alger.htm.

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(7), 803-830.

American Association of University Professors. (1999). *On collegiality as a criterion for faculty evaluation.* Retrieved April 5, 2010, from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/collegiality.htm.

Austin, A. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & McDaniels, M. (2007). Understanding new faculty: Background, aspirations, challenges, and growth. In R. P. Perry & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An evidence-based perspective* (pp. 39-89). Dordrecht: Springer.

Balducci, A. (2005). Collegiality within a mass university system: Reflections from Italy. *Planning Theory & Practice, 6*(2), 249 - 251.

Barnes, L. L. B., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(4), 457-469.

Bode, R. K. (1999). Mentoring and collegiality. In R. J. Menges and Associates (Ed.), *Faculty in New Jobs* (pp. 88-117). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bode, R. K. (1996). *Collegiality encountered by new faculty*. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.

Boice, R. (1992). *The New Faculty Member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coates, H., Goedegebuure, L., van der Lee, J., & Meek, L. (2008). *The Australian academic profession in 2007: A first analysis of the survey results.* Retrieved July 5, 2010, from http://www.une.edu.au/chemp/resources/project/cap/cap080311analysis.pdf.

Colbeck, C. L. (2006). How female and male faculty with families manage work and personal roles. In S. J. Bracken, J. K. Allen, & D. R. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and worklives* (pp. 31-50). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Cummings, W., & Finkelstein, M. (2009). Global trends in academic governance. *Academe, 95*(6), 4.

Fagan-Wilen, R., Springer, D., Ambrosino, B., & White, B. (2006). The support of adjunct faculty: An academic imperative. *Social Work Education, 25*(1), 39-51.

Finkelstein, N. G. (2009). Civility and academic life. *South Atlantic Quarterly, 108*(4), 723-740.

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hatfield, R. (2006). Collegiality in higher education: Toward an understanding of the factors involved in collegiality. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 10*(1), 11-19.

Massy, W. F., Wilger, A. K., & Colbeck, C. (1994). Departmental cultures and teaching quality: Overcoming "hollowed" collegiality. *Change, 26*(4), 10-20.

Norman, M., Ambrose, S. A., & Huston, T. A. (2006). Assessing and addressing faculty morale: Cultivating consciousness, empathy, and empowerment. *Review of Higher Education, 29*(3), 347-379.

Peterson, S. L., & Wiesenberg, F. P. (2006). The nature of faculty work: A Canadian and U.S. comparison. *Human Resource Development International, 9*(1), 25-47.

Rajagopal, I., & Farr, W. D. (1992). Hidden academics: The part-time faculty in Canada. *Higher Education, 24*(3), 317-331.

Rosser, V. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(3), 285-309.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Vol. 50. Developing New and Junior Faculty* (pp. 27-37), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Thomas, H. (2005). Pressures, purpose & collegiality in UK planning education. *Planning Theory & Practice, 6*(2), 238 - 247.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Trautvetter, L. C. (1999). Experiences of women, experiences of men. In R. J. Menges and Associates (Ed.), *Faculty in New Jobs* (pp. 88-117). San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

Walvoord, B. E. F. (2000). *Academic departments: How they work, how they change*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, v. 27, no. 8. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.