

Special Issue S7: "Collegiality as a Management Practice"

Guest Editors: Andrew Enaifoghe, University of Zululand; Hannah Muzee, Stellenbosch University

The Value and Challenges of Employee and Workplace Collegiality in the Institute of Higher Learning

*Andrew Enaifoghe

Department of Business Management, University of Zululand, Richards Bay Campus, South Africa.

*Correspondence: andyransey@gmail.com

Received: Nov 29, 2021; Revised: Apr 21, 2022; Accepted: Apr 22, 2022; Published: May 30, 2022

COPYRIGHT: Andrew Enaifoghe. This is an open-access article published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). This permits anyone to copy, distribute, transmit, and adapt the work, provided the original work and source are appropriately cited.

CITATION: Enaifoghe A. 2022. The Value and Challenges of Employee and Workplace Collegiality in the Institute of Higher Learning. Management and Economics Research Journal, 8(S7): 1-11, Article ID 9900053. DOI: 10.18639/MERJ.2022.9900053

ABSTRACT

The study explored the importance, value, and challenges of employee collegiality in the workplace at the institute of higher learning. Workplaces such as universities have traditionally been disconnecting places where "collegial cooperation among academic staff is not common practice, for them to take the time to talk or work together." Employees require ways to connect in ways that benefit their students, contribute to making their work more interesting, and shape humans in such a way that it remains dynamic and pertinent. For a long time, the workplace has been subject to rationalizing reforms, not least in correlation with the exceptional development and transition from elite to mass education. There has been an explosion in the emergence of various modes of organizing, allocating resources, and evaluating results. Premised on a review of existing literature, this article highlights the significance of collegiality among employees at the workplace and identifies the major positive outcomes of truly collaborative and collegial backgrounds in the institutes of higher learning. The study finds that collegiality is a proficient trait or attribute as well as a management theory; it is the companionship and cooperation between colleagues who share responsibility.

KEYWORDS: Collegiality, Workplace, Institutes of Higher Learning, Profession, Academics.

1. INTRODUCTION

The importance and benefits of workplace collegiality are explored in this article through the value and challenges of collegiality in practice. The importance and benefits of workplace collegiality in practice are seen as "the ability to work optimally with colleagues is considered to be a valuable determinant of success, but collegiality is a challenge to assess" (Burr *et al.*, 2017). The study questioned that if you be more collegial in the workplace with colleagues, what are the possible advantages and disadvantages for the institute of higher learning? The more critical question is what exactly is collegiality, and what does it imply? The term collegiality is described as a relationship between people within an organization who work together to accomplish a common goal (Burr *et al.*, 2017).

The concept was derived from the Roman practice of distributing shared norms among government officials of the same rank to prevent an individual from having too much power. Managerialism, on the other hand, does not allow for the exploration of the social processes since it promotes being adaptable and law-abiding to instituting the wishes of leadership (Dearlove, 1997; King, 2004). Collegiality values trust, independent thought, and communication among co-workers. This promotes freedom as well as mutual respect, which can have an impact on organizational efficacy (Donohoo, 2017). In modern practice, the emphasis is less on taking responsibilities among officials of the same rank and more on making sure that all employees within an organization are treated equally with equal respect (Lorenzen, 2006).

The study begins by presenting the desired objectives of the research, accompanied by the topic of this research with an overview of the research question, which includes how the research problem is appropriate for the research design. A rationale for the paper is discussed, followed by a proposition of the value position and a summary of the literature reviewed. The processes followed in conducting this study included a literature review of key documents. The study adopted a qualitative research methodology. In collating data, the authors made use of documentary analysis. According to Dey (2005), the documentary analysis focuses on specific extracts that reflect the issues for which the researcher is seeking evidence. Thus, the researchers consulted a variety of sources such as books, reports, policy briefs, journals, articles, internet sources, news bulletins, and gazettes that were found relevant to impact the study.

2. CONTEXTUALIZING COLLEGIALITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Collegiality is a proficient trait or attribute as well as a management theory. Collegiality is the companionship and cooperation between colleagues who share responsibility. The definition of the term collegiality as a proficient behavior pattern is simple, but defining collegiality as strategic management theory is more difficult; as a result, the concept of collegiality is largely misunderstood. According to scholars, strong collegial relationships have consistently been highlighted as a contributor to workplace improvement such as the institute of higher learning and success in research (Barth, 2006; Goddard *et al.*, 2007). Jarzabkowski (2003), Retallick and Butt (2004) argued that “high levels of collegiality among staff members is one of the characteristics found most frequently in successful schools.”

Teaching staff in the institute of higher learning are increasingly being encouraged to abandon ancient traditions of isolation and individuality in light of increasing collegiality and collaborative effort and teamwork (Marks and Louis, 1997). Workplaces such as universities have traditionally been disconnecting places where “collegial cooperation among educators is not common practice, for them to take the time to talk or work together.” Employees require ways to connect in ways that benefit their students, contribute to making their work more interesting, and shape humans in such a way that it remains dynamic and pertinent (Dillon, 2003).

Furthermore, the notion that academics function more effectively when they collaborate competently is bolstered by organizational theory models that first took shape in the corporate world (Covey, 1991; Senge, 1990). Realistic teamwork is considered an essential attribute of organizational success because it develops friendships regularly to “share their ideas and expertise and develop a common understanding of organizational goals and the means to their attainment” (Leonard and Leonard, 2003). There are significant benefits that collegiality has been indicated as substantiation of the need for academic institutions to develop a more effective collegial culture.

Collegiality among teaching staff has the greatest impact on their professional growth and development (Jarzabkowski, 2003; Retallick and Butt, 2004), academic professionalism (Futernick, 2007; Hausman and Goldring, 2001), academic performance and organizational efficiency, and productivity (Cemm, 2011; Barth, 2006), student behavior, attitude, and achievement (Goddard *et al.*, 2007). Eacott (2011), Garmston and Wellman (2003) formalized paraphrasing Merriam-Webster defines collegiality as “the cooperative relationship of colleagues” as a characteristic. Collegial connections are those that are constructed on understanding and respect and enable the exchange and discourse of ideas from each member of a team (Educational Institute of Scotland, 2010; Josephsson S, Alsaker S, 2015).

Various reports explain the value of “collegiality in professional working relationships for professionals in academia, religion, law, and medicine” (Gherardi S, 2012; Nicolini D, 2012; Flinn K, Mowles C, 2014; Pepper C, Giles W, 2015). Having acquired and continuing to develop this attribute is essential among many professionals because it aids in the development of several of the critical skills of a contemporary manager. Understanding how to form and enhance collegial relationships helps to build strong and enhanced self-management through effective communication. Collegiality, on the other hand, has received little attention as a strategic management theory. Collegiality, according to Lloyd A, (2014), is practiced in societies that strive to maximize resource utilization. Collegiality is fundamentally based on friendly, valued interplay, and differences of opinion among colleagues.

It also engages a mutual decision-making process among individuals with equitable levels of responsibility. It is crucial to highlight that this does not imply that almost everyone concurs with every decision, but rather that individuals have the opportunity to express their views, ideas, and knowledge in a safe environment, which translates to improved decisions. The goal of this theory of collegiality for management is to enable each individual to have an impact on an organization by constantly developing and exchanging ideas. It is often easy to say but difficult to put into practice.

3. CHALLENGES OF COLLEGIALITY FOR EMPLOYEES IN THE INSTITUTES OF HIGHER LEARNING

Recognizing and establishing relationships for generating a positive working environment inside the department and institution is influenced, at least in part, by how successfully each member of the community bears his or her fair portion of the shared task. The difficulties that higher education institutions (HEI) face in the 21st century cannot be properly met, nor can the efforts of devoted professionals be sustained when a faculty member’s actions are divisive, uncompromising, and inflexible. Similarly, it is detrimental to a department’s morale and performance when one or more of its members assume much less responsibility for reaching a common goal (Sahlin & Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2016). These components are at the heart of that distinct, essential feature of successful interactions in academic life that is commonly called collegiality (Flinn, 2018).

The ties that form inside departments indicate collegiality. It is frequently demonstrated by the way members of the department communicate with and respect one another, collaborate to achieve a shared goal, and take equal duties for the betterment of the discipline as a whole (Rox & Mrtensson, 2015). It is not an exaggeration to argue that collegiality is the foundation of professional work in higher education. Many departments are plagued with noncollegial, rude, uncivil, and unpleasant interactions between faculty members, chair and faculty members, faculty members and staff, and faculty members and students (McGrath, 2017; McGrath *et al.*, 2016). And, via a process of elimination, the chair must deal with all of them daily.

Department chairmen are frequently encouraged to feel that this is simply the way things are—that they must fight alone to cope with a noncollegial and outright hostile faculty member or a department culture in which civility is significantly

eroded (Clavert et al., 2015). A chair, on the other hand, can take proactive actions to stem the flow of noncollegiality in the department by detecting its telltale signals (Bremer, 2015):

- Department morale is low.
- Lack of collaboration among academic members.
- Inadequate student guidance.
- There are no departmental festivities or social connections.
- More classes are being canceled due to instructors not showing up to teach.
- Faculty office hours are not held.
- Absenteeism and tardiness have increased.
- Work quality of once-productive teachers has declined.

Further to the above, new faculty members are fighting to make ends meet in a hostile environment, while older and more seasoned faculty are worn down and becoming disengaged in the department and the institution (Balogun et al., 2015). The effect of poor or lack of collegiality can also lead to increased illness and health issues and working from home more than is typical or essential increasing faculty alienation and isolation, there is a poor student and peer evaluations of teaching, there is the refusal to serve in the department, school, or university committees. Attendance at regular faculty meetings is absent or limited. What can department chairs do to foster a collegial environment?

A recent assessment of higher education management structures highlights the conflicts and issues that develop inside HEIs because of the many official and informal methods of leading and managing (Bremer, 2015). According to the review, collegial and line-oriented management responsibilities frequently overlap. In most organizations, this form of overlap provides a natural point of linkage between management hierarchies. However, the overlap can be problematic at times, resulting in fuzzy and quasi-formal requirements, “resulting in poor room for manoeuvre for the appointed leaders” (Bremer, 2015). These findings are consistent with prior research that indicates issues for both “devolved” line-management models and “emerging” collegial approaches to higher education leadership and management (Bolden et al., 2008; Bolander-Laksov & Tomson, 2017; McGrath, 2017).

Currently, there is a scarcity of empirical work in management studies, with a focus on middle management. Furthermore, little research has been conducted on collegial leaders’ understanding and experiences with change processes in higher education institutions.

4. THE BENEFITS OF COLLEGIALLY FOR EMPLOYEES IN THE INSTITUTES OF HIGHER LEARNING

Collegiality is regarded as an important aspect of an employee’s professional development and a means of increasing effective teaching for academics. Academic individualism, disconnection, and privatism are generally interpreted as risks or impediments to professional advancement for the institutions. Universities are widely regarded as the best places for academics not only to learn but also to grow professionally (Burr et al., 2017); as a result, universities are starting to reshape in ways that allow for more possibilities for academic staff to learn together (Burr et al., 2017; Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, 1995).

Collegial societies foster a collaborative working environment that supports academic innovation and eagerness while also providing ongoing support for workforce professional development (Harris, 2011). Many researchers have asserted that to have professional academic learning and efficiency in place, the establishment of operational collegial communication and sustainability is highly needed in the workplace (Owen, 2005). It has been implied that employees’ collegiality can modify guidance (Martin, 2008). As a result, lecturers must understand the value of collaboration and try to concentrate on what they have in common. Far more effective training goes unnoticed under the social conventions of privatism, whereas the employees who work in collegial setups become far more open to new experiences, in terms of teaching methods and resources.

It has been proposed that staff collegiality results in increased employee satisfaction and responsiveness (Inger, 1993). Collegiality among employees breaks the disconnection of the school learning environment and generic skills with career benefits as well as daily fulfillment. Collegiality increases the employees’ enthusiasm while decreasing emotional exhaustion (Abdallah, 2009). It also fosters a feeling of belongingness among organizational members and strengthens their bonds. Collegial belief systems can increase lecturers’ commitment to the organization (Mutchler, 2005) and profession. These features or benefits have been confirmed that collaborative working staff felt more committed and motivated toward their jobs (Walsh and Shay, 1993).

This study discovered that collegiality can impact lecturers’ motivation and professionalism, loyalty, as well as their willingness to reconfigure instructional practices. Collegiality offers more structural support to new lecturers (McLaughlin and Talbert, 2001). It tries to avoid the “sink-or-swim,” and “trial-and-error mode” that most qualified employees face in the early stages of employment. Collaboration in the workplace brings both the experienced and new lecturers together so that it strengthens the novices’ confidence and competence (McLaughlin and Talbert, 2001). Universities and colleges with a good collaborative approach and a strong collaborative team atmosphere tend to lower attrition rates than other colleges and universities (Guarino et al., 2004; Graves, 2001).

Collegiality enables employees to deal with complexity and uncertainty, effectively respond to radical shifts, and foster an environment that encourages vulnerability and building an environment (Loe, 2010; Hargreaves, 1997). University lecturers

who collaborate are said to be more adaptable in times of transition and to cope more effectively with increased responsibilities that would generally overwhelm the effort and materials of an employee who works alone (Jarvis, 2012). The best approach to championing systemic change is through building social belief systems founded on the principles of collegiality, approachability, and integrity (Loe, 2010). Furthermore, the efficacy of many academics (Jarvis, 2012; Goddard and Skrla, 2006), "individualism and non-interference norms limit the efficacy of their practice, thereby limiting the possibility of improving student learning" (Evans-Stout, 1998).

The term collegiality is considered the most significant source of energy in the institute of higher learning, and it is asserted that when lecturers have "strong emotional connections with their colleagues," their energy and morale are elevated (Graves, 2001). Hargreaves enumerated eleven advantages of university staff collaborative efforts, which include:

- i. moral support;
- ii. increased efficiency;
- iii. improved effectiveness;
- iv. reduced overload;
- v. synchronized time perspectives between teachers and administrators;
- vi. situated certainty of collective professional wisdom; political assertiveness;
- vii. increased capacity for reflection;
- viii. organizational responsiveness;
- ix. opportunities to learn; and continuous learning
- x. facilitated consensus building
- xi. decisions to adopt or abandon innovations.

The employees in the institute of higher learning can benefit greatly from the collaborative creation of advice and concepts, better communication, and desire to seek and offer assistance, resulting in increased efficiency, and expanded procedure affordances (Arnold, 2014; Cousins *et al.*, 1992). Some studies have revealed significant benefits of collegiality for teaching staff which include increased favorable perceptions toward teaching (Palaniandy, 2017; Brownell *et al.*, 1997), good communication among colleagues (Howe, 2007), workplace morale (Wasley *et al.*, 2000), an increase in trust levels (Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

The advantages of employees' higher levels of collegiality in institutions had higher academic achievement. This is perhaps the primary justification for promoting collegiality among university officials. Higher collegiality among staff is thought to lead to higher instructional practices and, as a result, higher academic achievement (Shah, 2012). It is implied that cultivating a "collegial culture" in a university would benefit academic achievement more than implementing structural change (Wald and Castleberry, 2000). The employees who participate would make greater gains in fundamental learning areas where lecturers take collective responsibility for student achievement (Shah, 2012).

In a comparative analysis of "two high-performing and two low-performing" universities in Michigan, "teachers in the high-performing schools reported more instances of collaboration than teachers in the low-performing schools" (Cipriano, 2011). As a result, "it was concluded that school culture should change to be less isolating and more collaborative" (Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, 2011). A review that concentrates primarily on "teacher collaboration as one of the best practices in Tennessee elementary schools discovered that all high-performing schools had some kind of mandated time for horizontal collaboration in place," though the occurrence of these collaborative projects differed from daily pervasive preparation time to considered necessary meetings once every 2 weeks (Arnold, 2014; Barrett, 2006). Another study showed that "fourth-grade students have higher achievement in mathematics and reading when they attended schools characterized by higher levels of teacher collaboration" (Shah, 2012).

5. THE NEED FOR EMPLOYEE COLLEGIALITY IN EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Collegiality remains one of the key factors in determining an institution's efficiency. It is presumed that the work of fostering collegiality is intertwined with the undertaking of improving schools (Barth, 1990). The collaborative effort has seemed to be the common thread that underpins many of the major innovations in the educational organizations of the 1990s. Even recent university progression research has shown that the opportunity of university officials to operate as proficient collegial societies is the most viable technique for consistent, constructive school effectiveness (Lewis, 2002). Research conducted in Chicago's low-income state schools discovered that academic institutions with strong learning organizations continued to improve four times greater than school systems without these collaborative learning cultures (Gable *et al.*, 2004).

In conclusion, workplace collaborator collegiality is essential in an era of constant growth and transformation. It is considered an opportunity to engage a large number of people in addressing increasingly challenging critical issues. A cooperative process can address a broader range of expectations and work presentations than addressing them independently with an isolated initiative. Any organization where staff collegiality is not encouraged, are likely to waste human resources and contribute to disenchantment with teaching as a career.

6. DISCUSSION OF COLLEGIALITY

Collegiality discussed in this study is not something in any organization that happens by chance; it must be structured, taught, and learned. It is stated that laying the groundwork for a collaborative and collegial culture by assembling a team of team players in an institution who work in isolation cannot produce the same results as interacting with colleagues. The study further discussed how collegiality is likely to succeed only when a considerable number of academic personnel at a particular institution are convinced that it will result in improved teaching and learning. The overall summary of the research studies on employees collegiality concludes that effective collegiality in universities is a critical source of staff professional development, student learning, and organizational effectiveness.

Collegiality is frequently regarded as unproblematic (something that “we just do”). Another point of view is that collegiality is a type of action or work that, like other personal actions, can have a significant impact on an organization’s culture. Collegiality, when viewed in this light, carries a great deal of responsibility. Collegiality differs from congeniality (having fun in each other’s company) and is distinct from, but a feature of, collaboration or teamwork (working with others). Collegiality entails getting to know one another and learning about and from one another (Hoerr, 2005). It is dependent on the quality of relationships with all other types of employees (Rogers and Holloway, 1993).

These relationships necessitate open self-disclosure to foster the trust that each will act in the best interests of the other and understand the boundaries within which they can independently manage tasks and risks on behalf of the other member of staff. The question is what are the advantages of collegiality in the employees’ workplace? A consideration of collegiality necessitates an understanding of the social context in which it occurs. Most professions are formally and informally self-regulated (Freidson, 1970). Informal self-regulation occurs daily in the workplace among employees and is governed by cultural norms and unwritten rules.

When the procedures of informal self-regulation are ignored, there is a risk that daily decisions and actions detrimental to employee satisfaction will develop and persist. Importantly, when groups do not articulate but instead “assume” a shared purpose, harmful habits of action can develop (Norros and Klemola, 1999). In today’s litigious environment, colleagues must hold each other accountable for the quality of service. Acting in isolation, as recent literature has consistently pointed out, is risky (Reckless *et al.*, 2013). Collegial interactions, on the other hand, increase the opportunity for dialogue and reflection, fostering a culture of trust wherein employees actively learn from, learn from, and teach their colleagues (Hoerr, 2005).

As a result of the collective knowledge and experience, everyone’s participation increases in ability and practices more safely in the work environment. Another question is what are the advantages of collaboration in the institute of higher learning? A more collegial, cohesive relationship among employees offers the benefit of allowing personnel to pool their resources to improve teaching and learning (Gianakos, 1997). A collegial work atmosphere fosters a sense of belonging, good communication, cooperation, and support among employees, efficiently handled conflict, high work contentment, and, as a result, high retaining employees (Duddle and Boughton, 2009). A collaborative approach to work difficulties is beneficial for individual development, and service enhancement, which can help facilitate cross-coverage through increased institutional memory. A collaborative culture provides the advantage of empowering individuals to maximize the value of their potential to contribute. Additionally, collegial leaders make it simpler for employees to voice controversial topics (Hoerr, 2005).

A collegial work environment also makes it simpler to recognize and handle troublesome employees, such as those that bully, harass, believe their needs are the most important, avoid work, or have other questionable work practices (Waggoner, 2005). When the morale of the workforce in HEI is low, the dedication, extraordinary efforts, and passion of the professional vocation demonstrated by personnel will be affected negatively (Sharp, 2017), however, this improve service resilience provided a pre-existing collegial culture exists. What steps can you take to improve your collegiality? The willingness to be opened to gain the trust of others is the main difficulty for an individual in developing a collegial approach (Jones, 1997). This is because collegiality necessitates an understanding not just of each other’s capabilities to profit from them, but also of each other’s vulnerabilities to protect them.

Chances to connect (Lister, 2003) and create professional intimacy (Rogers and Holloway, 1993) are so critical. Mutual interests, accomplishment celebrations, collaborative initiatives, interactions at external engagements, and the disclosure of sentiments and vulnerabilities related to work all contribute to professional intimacy (Rogers and Holloway, 1993). In the institute of higher learning, this includes discussing students or learners’ needs with other staff, discussing service needs with staff, witnessing staff in practice, being observed by staff in practice, teaching staff, being taught by staff, and learning along with the staff. These actions are critical because the common objective of patient well-being is more significant than the success of a single member of staff. Disagreements in viewpoint can result in feelings of disagreement, and conflict resolution training can be beneficial (Lorenzen, 2006). Learning how to separate emotions from disagreement allows you to mediate compromises and even accept conclusions with which you disagree without taking them personally. As a result, it is critical to role model positive behaviors:

keep emotions detached from decision making; focus on the task; ensure everyone feels ownership; not let negative comments that undermine individual staff members pass unchallenged; use good humor to relieve tension and keep things in perspective; and, acknowledge and celebrate success.

The question here is how do employees cultivate collegiality in their various workplaces. The key problem for every organization is to establish a clear vision that employees can relate to while also being “empowered to achieve.” A strong culture, regardless of personality, provides everyone with a clear sense of what is important (Hoerr, 2005). If employees believe they are underappreciated, then their performance will decline, which will have a detrimental influence on employees’ welfare. For individuals in positions of leadership, one trait stands out above all others: the capacity to connect with and inspire employees at all levels.

According to Nohria *et al.* (2003), leaders who present themselves as fellow employees (rather than masters) can foster positive attitudes that improve performance. A collegial culture can emerge as employees create and develop their community with management’s backing. According to Deal and Peterson (2016), many renowned organizations have developed a shared system of unstructured processes and practices that permeate work with meaning, passion, and purpose. In an attempts to impose administrative collegiality through imposing contacts among personnel, where they meet and work to implement the plans developed by others, on the other hand, allow more managerial controversies or control without enhancing staff and service development (Hargreaves, 1990).

The extent to that which someone in such a specific role is anticipated by coworkers and the general public to be able to ‘play well with others (Jones, 1997) is determined by how much of an individual’s role is self-directed as opposed to necessitating interaction with others (Lorenzen, 2006). Collegiality can be fostered by decentralizing responsibilities, rotating positions, and participating in collaborative initiatives (Frank *et al.*, 1991). Meetings should be events that provide effective protection against error hiding while also providing an opportunity for all employees to learn. Sharing accomplishments makes it simpler to communicate disappointments, to the advantage of all, with good humor and support, bringing employees closer together (Hoerr, 2005).

It is also recommended that staff at all levels be involved in selection and recruitment to maximize “team fit” and provide a clear message about how staff perspectives are appreciated. Mentoring before beginning practice improves collegiality (Scott, 2005). When someone is functioning in a noncollegial manner, supervisory intervention could be used to encourage collegiality. People frequently fail to see that their behaviors are disruptive (Lorenzen, 2006). Collegiality can be assessed via multisource feedback (Violato *et al.*, 2003). Training in giving and responding to feedback is beneficial in and of itself. To tie everything together, make collegiality an explicit goal that is evaluated in appraisals and appropriate rewards and celebrations of success, ensuring staff is appropriately motivated (Hoerr, 2005).

Last, it is important to ask the question of what disadvantages are derived from collegiality? An overemphasis on collaboration may stifle individual invention. Unique perspectives that are not backed by the existing majority’s ideals may be discounted. It may be tough to change an established opinion. This can be mitigated by defining strategic principles, such as the stipulation that while innovation is encouraged, change must be evidence-based. The process of integrating into a new job is dependent on the development of collegiality. Consider what kind of informal advice you would give to new employees.

Collegiality is built on taking the time to get to know and relate to others. Thus, a collegial decision-making method may be delayed (but has the advantage of taking into account practical factors from those with the most expertise), but it is also less sensitive to authority. Furthermore, collegiality necessitates the sharing of experiences and personal circumstances, as well as an understanding of the degree to which various individuals share common values. As a result, inclusiveness has the added drawback of being prone to favoritism and bias (Leung *et al.*, 2011), as well as being predisposed to claims of preferential treatment of colleagues over noncolleagues. The next section addressed the issues relating to employees’ collegiality in the institute of higher learning.

7. THE CHALLENGES OF COLLEGIALITY

The issue is what are the obstacles to workplace collegiality among employees? To answer the preceding question, leadership and organizational success in the institute of higher learning are inextricably linked, as they are in any other industry. While it is possible to succeed in the company without strong leadership, this feature can harm staff well-being, communication, and management. It is your obligation as a business owner to be the best leader you can be and to establish a corporate culture that delights consumers and engages staff. To achieve these aims, an increasing number of managers are choosing the collegial leadership style, but is it the best option? The principle of collegial-style management is that some or all members of an organization should participate in decision-making and share authority. Employees and stakeholders are encouraged to express their views, participate in discussions, and come to a consensus-based on shared principles. Leaders, on the other hand, must be able to establish and sustain connections with people who have varying opinions, experiences, and aspirations.

The collegial approach of school administration encourages cooperation and involvement. It distinguishes itself by shared leadership, shared principles, and shared decision-making. Unlike traditional leadership styles, which are often vertical and hierarchical, this leadership paradigm is more lateral or horizontal. All stakeholders have the right to make choices and participate actively in the management of the organization. Those who follow this style of leadership think that issues and solutions should be communicated. They aren’t scared to seek a second opinion and hear what others have to say. Leaders and

workers collaborate as a team to identify and solve issues, achieve the company's goals, and assist one another in succeeding in their jobs. This management style, like all others, has drawbacks and may not be appropriate for every business or team.

8. COLLEGIAL LEADERSHIP'S LIMITATIONS

The decision-making independence that characterizes this management style does not always result in a beneficial conclusion. For starters, it may cause friction and arguments, slowing down the organization. This scenario is more likely to occur when the decision-makers are authoritarian or highly competitive individuals. Furthermore, collegial leadership may not be the ideal solution for large firms since teams must be small enough to guarantee that everyone is on the same page. In general, decision-making in firms that follow this leadership approach is sluggish and time-consuming. Employees are obliged to attend lengthy meetings and participate in never-ending arguments. Furthermore, some individuals may show animosity or lack of interest, which can have an impact on collaboration and teamwork.

Meetings and conversations have the potential to devolve a negotiation process and spiral out of control. Everyone's ideas, objectives, and personal beliefs are taken into account. When there are significant variances between individuals, problems develop. Assume you intend to invest in the company's IT department and have discussed this with your employees. Some employees insist on new gear, such as laptops and audio-visual equipment, while others demand access to the most up-to-date software. You pay attention to what everyone says and consider both points of view, but you cannot reach a consensus.

9. COMMON IMPLEMENTATION DIFFICULTIES

The collegial management style appears to be a fine idea on paper, but it is difficult to put into practice in practice. In addition to these difficulties, they may have an impact on a company's performance and production. Giving your staff equal decision-making power may jeopardize your position as a leader. For example, you may find it tough to motivate your employees when production is low or things need to be changed. Firing and laying off employees will also become more challenging, especially if you have a close relationship with your employees. A manager with a more distant relationship with his employees is less likely to face these problems. This leadership approach is predicated on the idea that those who participate in decision-making will accept accountability for their actions.

10. NEED TO BUILD HEALTHY COLLEGIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE WORKPLACE

Having a strong and healthy collegial connection among employees is seen to be an important factor in improving school effectiveness and school improvement. Numerous benefits of teacher collegiality have been cited as evidence of the need for schools to have a more successful collegial culture. Regroupings of teachers to foster cooperation in teaching, as well as innovative configurations of teacher collegiality are essential components of constructive schools (Johnson, 1990). Despite its obvious advantages, collegiality is still a rare occurrence in most institutions (Bruffee, 1999; Heider, 2005). This part of the article discusses some of the most typical hurdles to collaboration among school instructors. The literature on employee professional collegiality has repeatedly identified several common impediments to meaningful connections (see, for example, DiPardo, 1997; Knop *et al.*, 1997; Kruse and Louis, 1997; Leonard, 1998).

Time restrictions, fractured visions, competition, conflict avoidance, and a lack of administrative assistants are among the most often mentioned (DiPardo, 1997; Friend and Cook, 2000; Johnson, 1990; Knop *et al.*, 1997). In her research, Johnson (1990) identified the structure and organization of schools as impediments to employees' interdependence and collaboration. Bureaucratic constraints, such as scheduling concerns, can stifle the growth of collegiality among employees. Some administrative procedures, particularly those that promote competitiveness, inhibit teacher collaboration (Johnson, 1990). Collegiality is further hampered by the size of the school. Teachers at smaller schools are more inclined to collaborate and participate in teamwork (Nathan, 2002; Galletti, 1999). According to Lee and Smith (1996), while cooperation is feasible in larger institutions, collective learning happens more frequently and naturally in smaller institutions.

Similarly, the diverse personalities and views of lecturers present a particular obstacle to fostering successful collegiality. It must be noted that each employee has their own opinions about what constitutes good teaching and learning; nonetheless, teamwork necessitates that all faculty members agree on their values and aims (Kruse, 1996). They must trust each other to reach an agreement. Isolation and distinct agendas will continue to prohibit teachers from working together and becoming lifelong learners unless the trust is created among them and a consensus on the school's mission is reached (Schmoker, 1999; Leonard and Leonard, 1999). Teachers must also believe in the link between individual and collegial achievement, and they must have mutual interests (Kruse, 1996).

According to Diez and Blackwell (2002), and Bezzina (2006), because employees in the institute of higher learning are cultured to operate independently in their place of work, particularly the classrooms, they are hesitant to give up part of their autonomy for cooperation to be successful. Tschannen-Moran (2001) also proposed that instructors give up part of their autonomy to reap the potential benefits of greater collegiality and teamwork.

11. CHALLENGES OF EMPLOYEES IN JOINT WORK ACTIVITY

The most significant impediment to joint work activity among educators is the all-too-common issue of time (Friend and Cook, 2000). Successful collaborative planning, consultation, and assessment need significant time investment. According to Leonard and Leonard (2003), teachers did not believe it was reasonable to ask them to use the after-school time for collaborative work. According to their findings, the greatest challenge is that;

“collegial activities mentioned by employees included the paucity of time, apparent attitude and lack of commitment by teachers, lack of compensation, resistance to change, competition, and lack of interest in doing things differently.”

Participants in their research mentioned both teachers who preferred “to work alone” and stay in their “comfort zone” and those who preferred “to work together.” “Resistance to change,” “competition” among instructors for high test results, and a true “lack of interest” in doing things differently and imaginatively were also mentioned. Tight scheduling (particularly in smaller schools), teacher personality issues, and a lack of administrative support were also mentioned as hurdles to collegial opportunities (Leonard and Leonard, 2003). In line with Leonard and Leonard’s (2003) study, the following recommendations were made for improved administrative support for building collegiality:

“schedule that would better facilitate employee interaction during the day, arranging for team teaching, providing substitute teachers to free up teachers to work together, organizing classroom allocations more effectively.”

Providing guidelines and rewards for after-school work, as well as raising the bar for instructors to cooperate in meaningful ways. Principal support is essential for developing an effective collegial culture; nevertheless, collaboration cannot be imposed, just fostered. Guskey (2003) suggested that school change necessitates staff development centered on groups of teachers sharing ideas and practices and reflecting on their practice. The formation of teaching teams, in which instructors have time to collaborate, is the foundation of schools that achieve successful systemic transformation (Darling-Hammond, 1997). Supovitz (2002) also recognized the need for proper training to reduce teacher isolation and to increase instructors’ learning instructional approaches from one another.

In the research on employee collaboration, Lewis (2004) found employees’ complaints about a lack of formal planning time, technology tools, and principal engagement, all of which interfered with the continuation of their collaboration. Howe (2007) identified physical school layout, external pressures, a lack of professional development, and a poor administrative footprint as primary barriers to school teacher collegiality in his study of an academy of a big metropolitan high school. According to Howe (2007), lower school sizes are more effective in fostering collegiality among school professionals. In an era of constant change and progress, educators must comprehend the concept of collegiality.

If employee professional development and organizational well-being are sought, school leaders and teachers must be aware of the barriers that prevent collegiality among teachers from occurring. As measures to minimize isolation may be structurally organized, school leaders and administrators must find ways to promote collegiality among their workforce. Employees must be given more opportunity and more time to help them create interpersonal relationships inside workplace settings as well as with educators outside of school grounds. Competition among employees should be avoided, and those who participate in collaboration should be commended. Lecturers, on the other hand, must broaden their horizons and reconsider their approaches to the classroom.

12. CONCLUSION

Collegiality works when the job goal is prioritized over the personal goals of employees. The most important prerequisite for a collegial approach is to treat all employees as equals. This, therefore, facilitates the open discussion of flaws as well as advantages such that it helps to create the trust required for employees to understand the boundaries within which they can act for one another. Individuals profit from learning from one another and sharing decision-making responsibilities. Collegiality can be encouraged among university staff as they contribute their full potential to improve the workplace by increasing the efficacy of sharing information and expertise and, as a result, boosting safety, work satisfaction, and service resilience.

On the disadvantage, collegiality can indeed be slow to adjust to innovation and vulnerable to personal prejudices and preferential treatment, leading to professional quandaries. Chances to interact and establish professional closeness, as well as an understanding of biases, mediation, and conflict resolution, can all help to increase collegiality. It is critical to recognize that collegiality cannot be imposed, but that appropriate rewards may inspire employees at all levels.

The employees must regard it as a less private and personalized activity, and they must accept that understanding their teaching by themselves and their colleagues is critical for their professional well-being. Teachers should use team teaching as a way to increase their professional wellness in the classroom. Teachers should use team teaching to better their lessons and be open to sharing their skills, experiences, and issues.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

REFERENCES

- Abdallah J, 2009. Lowering teacher attrition rates through collegiality. *Academic Leadership the Online Journal*, 7(1). http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical_research/531.shtml
- Arnold J, 2014. A subjective academic narrative reviewing academic collegiality. *International Educational Research*, 2(4), 26-37. doi: 10.12735/ier.v2i4p26
- Balogun J, Bartunek JM, Do B, 2015. Senior managers' sensemaking and responses to strategic change. *Organization Science*, 26(4), 960-979.
- Barrett A, 2006. Collaboration as a best practice in Tennessee elementary schools. Doctoral dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database (AAT 3234216).
- Barth RS, 1990. *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Barth RS, 2006. Improving relationships within the schoolhouse. *Educational Leadership*, 63(6), 8-13.
- Bezzina C, 2006. The road less travelled: professional communities in secondary schools. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(2), 159-167.
- Bolden R, 2016. Paradoxes of perspective. In R Bolden, M Witzel, & N Linacre (Eds.), *Leadership paradoxes: rethinking leadership for an uncertain world* (pp. 31–53). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bolden R, Petrov G, Gosling J, 2008. *Developing collective leadership in higher education*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Bremer K, 2015. Utvecklad ledning av universitet och högskolor (Betänkande av Ledningsutredningen SOU 2015) (p. 92).
- Brownell MT, Yeager E, Rennells MS, Riley T, 1997. Teachers working together: what teacher educators and researchers should know. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 20(4), 340-359.
- Bruffee KA, 1999. *Collaborative learning: higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Burr SA, Collett T, Leung YL, 2017. The value and challenges of collegiality in practice. *British Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 78(9), 486-487.
- Cemm L, 2011. *The leadership of collaboration in primary school settings*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Birmingham.
- Cipriano RE, 2011. *Facilitating a collegial department in higher education: strategies for success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clavert M, Löffström E, Nevgi A, 2015. Pedagogically aware academics' conceptions of change agency in the fields of science and technology. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 20(3), 252-265.
- Cousins JB, Ross JA, Maynes FJ, 1992. *Teacher-teacher interaction and knowledge use*. Peterborough: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Trent Valley Centre.
- Covey SR, 1991. *Principle-centered leadership*. New York, NY: Summit Books.
- Darling-Hammond L, 1997. *The right to learn: a blueprint for creating schools that work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond L, McLaughlin MW, 1995. Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(8), 597-604.
- Deal TE, Peterson KD, 2016. *Shaping school culture*. 3rd ed. Jossey-Bass.
- Dearlove J, 1997. The academic labour process: from collegiality and professionalism to managerialism and proletarianisation. *Higher Education Review*, 30(1), 56-75.
- Dey I, 2005. *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Diez M, Blackwell PJ, 2002. *Collaboration for teacher development: implications for the design and implementation of advanced master's programs*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Dillon PW, 2003. Policies to enable teacher collaboration. <http://www.teachersnetwork.org/tnpi/research/growth/dillon.html>
- DiPardo A, 1997. Of war, doom, and laughter: images of collaboration in the public-school workplace. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 24(1), 89-104.
- Donohoo J, 2017. *Collective efficacy: how educators' beliefs impact student learning*. SAGE.
- Duddle M, Boughton M, 2009. Development and psychometric testing of the Nursing Workplace Relational Environment Scale (NWRES). *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 18(6), 902-909. doi: 10.1111/j.1365- 2702.2008.02368.x
- Eacott S, 2011. *Leadership strategies: re-conceptualising strategy for educational leadership school*. Leadership and Management, 31(1), 35-46.
- Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS), 2010. *The EIS and leadership in schools*. Edinburgh: The Educational Institute of Scotland.
- Evans-Stout K, 1998. Implications for collaborative instructional practice. In D. G. Ponder (ed.) *Restructuring schools for collaboration: promises and pitfalls* (pp. 121-135). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Flinn K, Mowles C, 2014. A complexity approach to leadership development: developing practical judgement. Leadership Foundation Stimulus Paper. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.)
- Flinn K, 2018. *Leadership development: a complexity approach*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Frank P, Levene L, Piehl K, 1991. Reference collegiality: one library's experience. *The Reference Librarian*, 15(33), 35-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J120v15n33_04
- Freidson E, 1970. *Professional dominance: the social structure of medical care*.
- Friend M, Cook L, 2000. *Interactions: collaboration skills for school professionals* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Futernick K, 2007. A possible dream: retaining California teachers so all students can learn {Electronic Resource} report. California State University. www.calstate.edu/teacherquality/documents/possible_dream_exec.pdf

- Gable R, Mostert M, Tonelson S, 2004. Assessing professional collaboration in schools: knowing what works. *Preventing School Failure*, 48(3), 4-9.
- Galletti S, 1999. School size counts. *The Education Digest*, 64(9), 15-17.
- Garmston RJ, Wellman BM, 2003. The importance of professional community. *ENC Focus*, 11(7), 7-9.
- Gherardi S, 2012. *How to conduct a practice-based study: problems and methods*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gianakos D, 1997. Physicians, nurses, and collegiality. *Nursing Outlook*, 45(2), 57-58. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0029-6554\(97\)90079-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0029-6554(97)90079-8)
- Goddard RD, Skrla L, 2006. The Influence of School Social Composition on Teachers' Collective Efficacy Beliefs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 2006;42(2):216-235. doi:10.1177/0013161X05285984
- Goddard YL, Goddard RD, Tschannen-Moran M, 2007. A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and student achievement in public elementary schools. *Teachers College Record*, 109(4), 877-896.
- Graves DH, 2001. Build energy with colleagues. *Language Arts*, 79(1), 12-19.
- Guarino C, Santibanez L, Daley G, Brewer D, 2004. A review of the research literature on teacher recruitment and retention (Tech. No. TR-164-EDU). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. http://rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/2005/RAND_TR164.sum.pdf
- Guskey TR, 2003. What makes professional development effective? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(10), 748-750.
- Hargreaves A, 1990. Paths of professional development: contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6(3), 227-241. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(90\)90015-W](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(90)90015-W)
- Hargreaves A, 1997. The four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *UNICORN*, 23(2), 86-108.
- Harris H, 2011. Reforming systems: realizing the fourth way. *Journal of Educational Change*, 12(2), 159-171.
- Hausman CS, Goldring EB, 2001. Sustaining teacher commitment: the role of professional communities. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(2), 30-51.
- Heider KL, 2005. Teacher isolation: how mentoring programs can help. *Current Issues in Education [Online]*, 8(14), 3-6.
- Hoerr JR, 2005. *Art of school leadership*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Howe RJ, 2007. A study of teacher collaboration in a dependent school-within-school: how do teachers perceive their collaborative process and its effect on instruction? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Lowell.
- Inger M, 1993. *Teacher collaboration in urban secondary schools (ERIC/CUE Digest No. 93)*. New York, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. <http://vocserve.berkeley.edu/CenterFocus/CF2.html>
- Jarvis A, 2012. The necessity for collegiality: power, authority and influence in the middle. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 40(4), 480-493.
- Jarzabkowski LM, 1999. Commitment and compliance: curious bedfellows in teacher collaboration. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education and New Zealand Association for Research in Education joint Conference (Nov 29–Dec 2), Melbourne, Australia.
- Johnson SM, 1990. *Teachers at work: achieving success in our schools*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Jones DA, 1997. Plays well with others; or the importance of collegiality in a reference unit. *The Reference Librarian*, 28(59), 163-175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J120v28n59_18
- Josephsson S, Alsaker S, 2015. Narrative methodology: a tool to access unfolding and situated meaning in occupation. In S Nayar & M Stanley (Eds.), *Qualitative research methodologies for occupational science and therapy*, (pp. 70-83). London: Routledge.
- King V, 2004. Cooperative reference desk scheduling and its effects on professional collegiality. *The Reference Librarian*, 40(83-84), 97-118. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J120v40n83_09
- Knop N, LeMaster K, Norris M, Raudensky J, Tannehill D, 1997. What we have learned through collaboration: a summary report from a national teacher education conference. *The Physical Educator*, 54(4), 170-180.
- Kruse SD, 1996. Collaboration efforts among teachers: implications for school administrators. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Louisville, KY. (ERIC Document Retrieval Service No. ED 402651).
- Kruse SD, Louis KS, 1997. Teacher teaming in middle schools: dilemmas for a school-wide community. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33(3), 261-289.
- Lloyd A, 2014. Following the red thread of information in information literacy research: recovering local knowledge through interview to the double. *Library & Information Science Research*, 36(2), 99-105.
- Lee VE, Smith JB, 1996. Collective responsibility for learning and its effect on gains in achievement and engagement for early secondary school students. *American Journal of Education*, 104(2), 103-147.
- Leonard L, Leonard P, 1999. Reculturing for collaboration and leadership. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92(4), 237-242.
- Leonard L, Leonard P, 2003. The continuing trouble with collaboration: teachers talk. *Current Issues in Education [Online]*, 6(15), 3-6. <http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume6/number15/>
- Leonard P, 1998. Understanding collaborative cultures: examining values and inhibitors. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (1998), San Diego.
- Leung YL, Adesara S, Burr SA, 2011. Learning to make better clinical decisions. *BJHM* 72(11), 642-645. doi: 10.12968/hmed.2011.72.11.642
- Lewis AC, 2002. School reform and professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(7), 488-489.
- Lewis LC, 2004. Using technology for change: a case study of teacher collaboration. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(4), 1236. (AAT 3131407).
- Lister L, 2003. Reference services in the context of library culture and collegiality: tools for keeping librarians on the same pages. *The Reference Librarian*, 40(83-84), 33-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J120v40n83_04

- Loe D, 2010. Teacher transformation and critical transformation and critical collegiality in online learning environments. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Kent State University College and Graduate School of Education, Health, and Human Services.
- Lorenzen M, 2006. Collegiality and the academic library. *The Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship*, 7(2), 3-6.
- Marks HM, Louis KS, 1997. Does teacher empowerment affect the classroom? The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19(3), 245-275.
- Martin PC, 2008. Collaborative practices among teachers to serve low-achieving high school ESL students. Doctoral dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database (AAT 3297009).
- McGrath C, 2017. What we talk about when we talk about change: a study of change practice and change agency in higher education (Doctoral dissertation). Karolinska Institutet, Sweden.
- McGrath C, Barman L, Stenfors-Hayes T, Roxå T, Silén C, Bolander-Laksov K, 2016. The ebb and flow of educational change: change agents as negotiators of change. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 4(2), 1-14.
- McLaughlin MW, 1995. Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(8), 597-604. Work: individuals, colleagues and contexts (pp. 79-103). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- McLaughlin MW, Talbert JE, 2001. Professional communities and the work of high school teaching. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. *Teachers College Record*, 91(4), 509-536.
- Mutchler SE, 2005. Teacher commitment in an academically improving, high-poverty public school. Doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.
- Nathan J, 2002. Small schools: the benefits of sharing. *Educational Leadership*, 59(5), 71-75.
- Nicolini D, 2012. Practice theory, work, and organization: an introduction. Oxford: OUP.
- Nohria N, Joyce W, Robinson B, 2003. What really works. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(7), 42-52.
- Norros L, Klemola U, 1999. Methodological considerations in analysing anaesthetists' habits of action. *Ergonomics*, 42(11), 1521-1530. doi: org/10.1080/001401399184866
- Owen S, 2005. The power of collegiality in school-based professional development. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(1), 1-14.
- Palaniandy S, 2017. Collegiality versus instructional support. *JISTE*, 21(2), 3-6.
- Pepper C, Giles W, 2015. Leading in middle management in higher education. *Management in Education*, 29(2), 46-52.
- Ramirez FO, Christensen T, 2013. The formalization of the university: rules, roots, and routes. *Higher Education*, 65(6), 695-708.
- Reckless I Reynolds D, Newman S, Raine J, Williams K, Bonser J, 2013. Avoiding errors in adult medicine. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Retallick J, Butt R, 2004. Professional well-being and learning: a study of teacher-peer workplace relationships. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 5(1), 85-99.
- Rogers JC, Holloway RL, 1993. Professional intimacy: somewhere between collegiality and personal intimacy? *Family Systems Medicine*, 11(3), 263-270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0089049>
- Roxå T, Mårtensson K, 2015. Microcultures and informal learning: a heuristic guiding analysis of conditions for informal learning in local higher education workplaces. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 20(2), 193-205.
- Sahlin K, Eriksson-Zetterquist U, 2016. Collegiality in modern universities—the composition of governance ideals and practices. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 2016(2-3), 33640.
- Schmoker M, 1999. Results: the key to continuous school improvement (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Scott ES, 2005. Peer-to-peer mentoring: teaching collegiality. *Nurse Educator*, 30(2), 52-56.
- Senge P, 1990. *The fifth discipline*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Sharp T, 2017. Has NHS workforce morale hit rock bottom? *BMJ*, 356, 361.
- Shah M, 2012. The importance and benefits of teacher collegiality in schools a literature review. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46(2012), 1242-1246
- Supovitz JA, 2002. Developing communities of instructional practice. *Teachers College Record*, 104(8), 1591-1626.
- Tschannen-Moran M, 2001. Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(4), 308-331.
- Violato C, Lockyer J, Fidler H, 2003. Multisource feedback: a method of assessing surgical practice. *BMJ*, 326(7388), 546-548. doi: 10.1136/bmj.326.7388.546
- Waggoner J, 2005. When colleagues are brats. *Academic Leader*, 21(8), 3-5.
- Wald PJ, Castleberry MS, (Eds.), 2000. Educators as learners: creating a professional learning community in your school. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Walsh K, Shay M, 1993. In support of interdisciplinary learning: the climate factor. *Middle School Journal*, 24(4), 56-60.
- Wasley PA, Fine M, Gladden M, Holland NE, King SP, Mosak E, et al., 2000. Small schools: great strides—a study of new small schools in Chicago. New York, NY: Bank Street College of Education.