

***'International Partnership in Academia:
an Ethical Challenge?'***

SAR/University of Oslo, 12th - 13th November 2015.

Measuring Academic Freedom In Europe: An Empirical Analysis

© Klaus Beiter

Terence Karran

University of Lincoln



Measuring Academic Freedom In Europe: An Empirical Analysis

- ❖ PREVIOUS EMPIRICAL ANALYSES
- ❖ *CONSTRUCTING AND PILOTING THE SURVEY*
- ❖ *SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND AWARENESS RAISING*
- ❖ *SOME PRELIMINARY RESULTS*
- ❖ *FUTURE WORK*

Previous Empirical Analyses

Despite its importance, until recently, no comparative analyses of academic freedom, with respect to both *de jure* and *de facto* protection, against a common benchmark had been attempted. Early work by Karran (2007, 2009) adopted a “top down” approach to assess academic freedom in the EU nations, in terms of *compliance*, *qualified compliance*, or *non-compliance* with the 1997 UNESCO *Recommendation* in respect to institutional autonomy and governance, academic freedom, and academic tenure.

Previous Empirical Analyses

This “top-down” approach, although useful, did not include international agreements which operated in differing nation states, and avoided the technical minutiae of national legislation and the operation of such laws within the EU countries. EU funding enabled the appointment of Marie Curie Fellows, with whose help, building on the previous work, made possible a thorough and detailed “bottom up” examination of the legislation to provide a nuanced, detailed picture, which was previously lacking.

Standard scorecard “to measure” the right to academic freedom

Country	A. The Ratification of International Agreements and Constitutional Protection (20%)	B. The Express Protection of “Academic Freedom” in HE Legislation (20%)	C. The Protection of Institutional Autonomy in HE Legislation (20%)	D. The Protection of Self-Governance in HE Legislation (20%)	E. The Protection of Job Security (including “Tenure”) in Relevant Legislation (20%)
Austria 63,5%	<p><u>1. The Ratification of International Agreements (10) 8,5</u></p> <p>1.1. Global Level (6)</p> <p>1.1.1. <i>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</i> [0–1,5] 1,5</p> <p>1.1.2. <i>Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</i> [0–1,5] 1,5</p> <p>1.1.3. <i>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</i> [0–1,5] 1,5</p> <p>1.1.4. <i>Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</i> [0–1,5] 0</p> <p>1.1. Regional Level (4)</p> <p><i>European Convention on Human Rights</i> [0–4] 4</p> <p><u>2. Constitutional Protection (10) 9</u></p> <p>2.1. Provision on Right to Freedom of Expression [0–1–2] 2</p> <p>2.2. Provision on Right to Academic Freedom [0–1–2] 2</p> <p>2.3. Reference to Institutional Autonomy [0–0,5–1] 1</p> <p>2.4. Reference to Academic Self-Governance [0–0,5–1] 0</p> <p>2.5. Robustness of Provisions [0–2–4] 4</p> <p><u>Total: 17,5</u></p>	<p>[0–2,5–5–7,5–10 (x2)] 10</p> <p><u>Total: 10x2=20</u></p>	<p><u>1. Provision on Institutional Autonomy [0–2–4] 2</u></p> <p><u>2. Autonomy in Detail (8) 6</u></p> <p>2.1. Organisational (2)</p> <p>2.1.1. Determination of Rector [0–0,5–1] 1</p> <p>2.1.2. Internal Structures [0–0,5–1] 1</p> <p>2.2. Financial (2)</p> <p>2.2.1. State Grant [0–0,5–1] 1</p> <p>2.2.2. Commissioned Research [0–0,5–1] 1</p> <p>2.3. Staffing (2)</p> <p>Positions in HE Institutions, Requirements for Positions and Recruitment/Promotion of Academic Staff [0–1–2] 1</p> <p>2.4. Academic (2)</p> <p>2.4.1. Selection of First-Cycle Students [0–0,5–1] 0</p> <p>2.4.2. Accreditation of First-Cycle Programmes [0–0,5–1] 1</p> <p><u>3. Extent of Governmental Powers [0–2–4] 2</u></p> <p><u>4. Institutional Independence vis-à-vis Private Interests [0–2–4] 2</u></p> <p><u>Total: 12</u></p>	<p><u>1. Provision on Academic Self-Governance [0–1–2] 1</u></p> <p><u>2. Academic Self-Governance at Institutional Level (12) 7</u></p> <p>2.1. Senate – Composition [0–1,5–3] 3</p> <p>2.2. Rector (3)</p> <p>2.2.1. Academic Position/Qualification [0–0,5–1] 0</p> <p>2.2.2. Determining the Rector [0–0,5–1] 0,5</p> <p>2.2.3. Dismissing the Rector [0–0,5–1] 0,5</p> <p>2.3. Participation in Strategic Decision-Making (Through Senate or Otherwise) [0–1,5–3–4,5–6] 3</p> <p><u>3. Academic Self-Governance at Faculty/Departmental Level (6) 1</u></p> <p>3.1. Collegial Bodies (3)</p> <p>3.1.1. Existence of Collegial Bodies [0–0,5–1] 0</p> <p>3.1.2. Composition of Collegial Bodies [0–1–2] 0</p> <p>3.2. Dean/Head of Department (3)</p> <p>3.2.1. Academic Position/Qualification of Dean/Head of Department [0–0,5–1] 0,5</p> <p>3.2.2. Determining the Dean/Head of Department [0–0,5–1] 0,5</p> <p>3.2.3. Dismissing the Dean/Head of Department [0–0,5–1] 0</p> <p><u>Total: 9</u></p>	<p><u>1. Duration of Contract of Service (8) 2</u></p> <p>1.1. Regulatory Framework [0–2–4] 2</p> <p>1.2. Situation in Practice [0–2–4] 0</p> <p><u>2. Termination of Contract of Service on Operational Grounds (6) 1,5</u></p> <p>2.1. Provision on Termination on Operational Grounds in HE Legislation [0–1,5–3] 1,5</p> <p>2.2. Protection in the Case of Termination on Operational Grounds in Terms of Civil Service/Labour Legislation [0–1,5–3] 0</p> <p><u>3. Prospect of Advancement Based on Objective Assessment of Competence [0–1,5–3–4,5–6] 1,5</u></p> <p><u>Total: 5</u></p>

Definition of Right to Academic Freedom Indicators (Example)

B. The Express Protection of “Academic Freedom” in Higher Education Legislation [0–2,5–5–7,5–10: To achieve a weighting of 20%, the mark /10 is doubled.] (20)

10 = 1. Full compliance: There are provisions on academic freedom largely in compliance with generally agreed criteria on the right to academic freedom which show that this right serves as a guiding principle for activity within HE (as would be evidenced by “academic freedom” forming part of a general part of the HE Act on “general principles” and/or it being referred to in various contexts throughout HE legislation).

7,5 = 2. Between full and partial compliance: (a) There are provisions on academic freedom which show that the right to academic freedom serves as a guiding principle for activity within HE, but the provisions reveal certain deficits when assessed in the light of generally agreed criteria on the right to academic freedom, *alternatively*, (b) there are provisions on academic freedom largely in compliance with generally agreed criteria on the right to academic freedom, but the latter does not clearly serve as a guiding principle for activity within HE, *alternatively*, (c) the overall situation may be described as one between full and partial compliance.

5 = 3. Partial compliance: (a) There is a mere reference to academic freedom, *alternatively*, (b) there are provisions on academic freedom, but these reveal more serious deficits when assessed in the light of generally agreed criteria on the right to academic freedom, *alternatively*, (c) the overall situation may be described as one of partial compliance.

2,5 = 4. Between partial and non-compliance: (a) There is a *mere* reference to academic freedom, but there are deficits when assessed in the light of agreed criteria on the right to academic freedom, *alternatively*, (b) there are provisions on academic freedom, but there are substantial deficits when assessed in the light of agreed criteria on the right to academic freedom, *alternatively*, (c) the overall situation may be described as between partial and non-compliance.

0 = 5. Non-compliance: There is no reference to academic freedom at all.

Table 1: Country Ranking: International Agreements and Constitutional Protection

Country	Percentage & Score /20 in brackets
1. Portugal, Spain	100 (20)
2. Finland	95 (19)
3. Slovakia	90 (18)
4. Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia	87,5 (17,5)
5. Latvia, Sweden	82,5 (16,5)
6. Czech Republic, Greece	77,5 (15,5)
<i>Average</i>	77,23 (15,45)
7. Belgium	70 (14)
8. Cyprus, Denmark, France, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Romania	62,5 (12,5)
9. Hungary, Ireland	57,5 (11,5)
10. Malta, United Kingdom	55 (11)

Table 2: Country Ranking: – Protection of “Academic Freedom” in HE Legislation

Country	Percentage & Score /20 in brackets
1. Austria, Croatia, France, Latvia, Lithuania, North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany), Slovakia	100 (20)
2. Germany	87,5 (17,5)
3. Bavaria (Germany), Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Ireland, Luxemburg, Romania, Spain	75 (15)
<i>Average</i>	59,38 (11,88)
4. Belgium, Cyprus, Flanders (Belgium), Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Wallonia (Belgium)	50 (10)
5. Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom	25 (5)
6. Estonia, Malta	0 (0)

Table 3: Country Ranking – Protection of Institutional Autonomy in HE Legislation

Country	Percentage & Score /20 in brackets
1. Finland	75 (15)
2. United Kingdom	67,5 (13,5)
3. Croatia, North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany)	65 (13)
4. Ireland	62,5 (12,5)
5. Austria	60 (12)
6. Lithuania	55 (11)
7. Estonia, Flanders (Belgium), Malta	52,5 (10,5)
8. Latvia	50 (10)
9. Poland	47,5 (9,5)
<i>Average</i>	46,29 (9,26)
10. Germany	46,25 (9,25)
11. Bulgaria, Denmark, Italy, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Portugal	45 (9)
12. Belgium, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain	42,5 (8,5)
13. Cyprus, Czech Republic, Romania	40 (8)
14. France	35 (7)
15. Sweden, Wallonia (Belgium)	32,5 (6,5)
16. Bavaria (Germany)	27,5 (5,5)
17. Greece	22,5 (4,5)
18. Hungary	12,5 (2,5)

Table 4: Country Ranking – Protection of Academic Self-Governance in HE Legislation

Country	Percentage & Score /20 in brackets
1. Bulgaria	72,5 (14,5)
2. Croatia	70 (14)
3. Cyprus, North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany), Poland, Romania, Slovakia	62,5 (12,5)
4. Germany	61,25 (12,25)
5. Bavaria (Germany), Spain	60 (12)
6. Portugal	57,5 (12,5)
7. Czech Republic, Slovenia	55 (11)
8. Greece, Latvia	52,5 (10,5)
9. Austria, Hungary	45 (9)
<i>Average</i>	42,99 (8,6)
10. Italy, Wallonia (Belgium)	40 (8)
11. Belgium	37,5 (7,5)
12. Flanders (Belgium)	35 (7)
13. Denmark, France	32,5 (6,5)
14. Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta	30 (6)
15. Netherlands	27,5 (5,5)
16. Estonia	22,5 (4,5)
17. Finland, Ireland, Sweden	15 (3)
18. United Kingdom	0 (0)

Table 5: Country Ranking – Job Security (including “Tenure”) in Relevant Legislation

Country	Percentage & Score /20 in brackets
1. Greece	100 (20)
2. France	77,5 (15,5)
3. Italy	57,5 (11,5)
4. Spain	55 (11)
5. Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia	52,5 (10,5)
6. Cyprus, Flanders (Belgium)	50 (10)
7. Bulgaria	47,5 (9,5)
8. Belgium	46,25 (9,25)
9. Malta, Sweden, Wallonia (Belgium)	42,5 (8,5)
10. Bavaria (Germany), Germany, Hungary, North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany)	40 (8)
<i>Average</i>	37,19 (7,44)
11. Netherlands, Romania	35 (7)
12. Denmark, United Kingdom	27,5 (5,5)
13. Austria, Lithuania, Poland	25 (5)
14. Croatia	22,5 (4,5)
15. Finland, Latvia	15 (3)
16. Czech Republic	10 (2)
17. Estonia, Luxemburg, Slovakia	7,5 (1,5)

Table 6: Overall Country Ranking: Academic Freedom in Europe

Country	Total (%) & Grade (A-F)
1. North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany)	71 B
2. Croatia	69 C
3. Spain	66,5 C
4. Bulgaria	65,5 C
5. Germany	64,5 C
6. Austria	63,5 C
7. France	61,5 C
8. Portugal	61 C
9. Slovakia	60,5 C
10. Latvia	60 C
11. Lithuania	59,5 D
12. Bavaria (Germany)	58 D
13. Italy	56 D
14. Greece	55,5 D
15. Finland	55 D
16. Poland	54,5 D
17. Romania	53,5 D
18. Cyprus	53 D
<i>Average</i>	<i>52,56 D</i>
19. Ireland, Slovenia	52,5 D
20. Czech Republic, Flanders (Belgium)	51,5 D
21. Belgium	49,25 E
22. Wallonia (Belgium)	47 E
23. Luxemburg, Netherlands	44 E
24. Sweden	39,5 F
25. Denmark	38,5 F
26. Hungary, Malta	36 F
27. United Kingdom	35 F
28. Estonia	34 F

Previous Empirical Analyses

The similarities of the results of the “top down” and “bottom up” analyses indicated the relative strength of the method. However, *de jure* protection of academic freedom is irrelevant unless it is reflected in the *de facto* situation in university departments. Very little empirical research has been done to assess the reality of academic freedom, as it is experienced by faculty staff in their day to day teaching and research activities, or in their participation in university governance.

Measuring Academic Freedom In Europe: An Empirical Analysis

- ❖ *PREVIOUS EMPIRICAL ANALYSES*
- ❖ *CONSTRUCTING AND PILOTING THE SURVEY*
- ❖ *SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND AWARENESS RAISING*
- ❖ *SOME PRELIMINARY RESULTS*
- ❖ *FUTURE WORK*

Constructing and Piloting the Survey

There have been very few attempts to survey academic freedom by using a questionnaire, and they are limited in scope. Halsey's 1992 study looked at the British h.e. system, while Rupe's 2005 doctoral thesis looked at higher education attorneys' perceptions of academic freedom in the USA. Hence, the creation of a questionnaire on academic freedom in Europe (and elsewhere) took a great deal of time and effort - the final survey we used was version ten, or thereabouts.

Constructing and Piloting the Survey

A paper version of the survey was piloted among academic staff in the College of Social Science at the University of Lincoln. The surveys were sent out using the internal mail and were accompanied by a letter, which explained the purposes of the study, and provided information on anonymity and non-disclosure. About 300 surveys were sent out, and 60 returned. On the basis of comments we received, the survey was further refined and split into two separate (“Main” and “Optional”) surveys.

Measuring Academic Freedom In Europe: An Empirical Analysis

- ❖ *PREVIOUS EMPIRICAL ANALYSES*
- ❖ *CONSTRUCTING AND PILOTING THE SURVEY*
- ❖ **SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND AWARENESS RAISING**
- ❖ *SOME PRELIMINARY RESULTS*
- ❖ *FUTURE WORK*

Survey Distribution

On grounds of cost and convenience, it was decided not to distribute the survey by post but make it available via the Web using the survey monkey programme. Three different versions of the two Main and Optional surveys were created - in English, French and Spanish. The on-line survey was tested and timed (it took about 15 minutes for the Main Survey) . To provide an incentive, all people completing the survey were given the possibility of entering into a lottery to win one of three iPads.

Survey Distribution

The front page of the survey



SAFE

Academic Freedom Survey

This Survey seeks to determine your personal experience regarding the protection of academic freedom. The Survey has been designed as part of a research project on academic freedom conducted at the University of Lincoln, UK and is funded by the European Union through Marie Curie research funds. The findings will be made known in academic journals and also generally to the public.

This Survey has 4 Sections (A.-D.). Each Section starts on a new page. You can move forward and backward to another Section. It should not take you more than 20 minutes to complete the Survey.

Should you wish to do so, you may answer Sections in separate sessions – answers will be saved, provided you use the same computer.

Your answers will only be submitted once you press the "Done" button at the end of the Survey (at the end of Section D.).

If you prefer not to answer questions in Parts C and D on yourself and your academic work and responsibilities, feel free not to answer any or all of them.

All those participating in the Survey (and providing their email address at the end of Section D.) stand the chance of winning one of three iPads. The winner will be determined by lottery.

Raising Awareness – “Top Down”

Printed letters were sent by post to each of the heads (Rectors, Vice Chancellors, Presidents, etc.) of each higher education institution in each of the European states, explaining the purpose of the survey, and requesting them to send out an internal “all staffs” email to all academic staff in their organisation, giving the survey monkey URL for the questionnaire. Some Vice Chancellors replied via email or post, indicating their desire to help with the research. A few replied to say that they would not take part.



Professor Ralf Hemmingsen,
Rector's Office,
Københavns Universitet,
Nørregade 10,
POB. 2177,
DK-1017 Copenhagen K,
Denmark.

3rd February 2015

Dear Professor Hemmingsen,

Participation of academic staff from the Københavns Universitet in a survey on academic freedom.

We are writing to you to seek your support in encouraging staff from the Københavns Universitet to participate in an EU funded on-line survey on academic freedom. Academic freedom is a universal right that all staff working in higher education acknowledge as an essential component of academic life, both as an individual liberty with respect to their teaching and research, and in terms of institutional autonomy and governance. At institutional level, the right of universities to self-governance and autonomy, free from governmental control over decisions about what should be taught and researched, is seen as vital for their successful working. However, in many nations, the *de jure* constitutional and legislative protection for academic freedom is limited or poorly defined. Consequently, institutional policies and norms, allied to departmental culture, are often as important in providing *de facto* protection for the academic freedom of staff, as legal instruments. Most research into academic freedom concentrates on legal frameworks, as yet no empirical work has been undertaken on the *de facto* protection for, and staff experiences of, academic freedom and institutional autonomy in higher education institutions in the EU states, and elsewhere.

Raising Awareness – “Bottom Up”

Education International, (a global federation of teachers' trade unions with 401 member organizations in 172 nations) agreed to send an email to each of their higher education affiliate organisations, asking them to contact their members and encourage them to complete the survey. Some higher education staff associations and trade unions were contacted directly. For example the Sveriges universitetslärarförbund, in Sweden sent out an email to each of its members, encouraging them to participate in the survey.



Education International
Internationale de l'Éducation
Internacional de la Educación
Bildungsinternationale

Head Office

5, Bd du Roi Albert II
1210 Brussels, Belgium
Tel +32 2 224 06 11
Fax +32 2 224 06 06
headoffice@ei-ie.org
<http://www.ei-ie.org>

President

Susan Hopgood

General Secretary

Fred van Leeuwen

**TO ALL MEMBER ORGANISATIONS IN HIGHER
EDUCATION**

Brussels, 24 April 2015

Re: Survey on academic freedom

Dear Colleagues,

Academic freedom is a universal right that all staff working in higher education acknowledges being an essential component of academic life, both as an individual liberty with respect to their teaching and research duties, and in terms of institutional autonomy and governance. At institutional level, the right of universities to self-governance and autonomy, with freedom from governmental control over decisions about what should be taught and researched, is seen as vital for their successful working.

However, in many nations, the de jure constitutional and legislative protection for academic freedom is either limited or not well defined. Consequently, institutional policies and norms, allied to departmental culture, are often as important in providing de facto protection for the academic freedom of staff, as legal instruments. All research so far completed into academic freedom concentrates on legal frameworks, and as yet no empirical work has been undertaken on the de facto protection for, and staff experiences of, academic freedom and institutional autonomy in higher education in the EU states, and elsewhere. Consequently, in order to analyse the extent, character and strength of extra-legal informal protection for academic freedom, which operates via institutional and departmental norms, academics at Lincoln University in the UK have devised an online survey to gather data on the knowledge, experience and opinions of academic staff with regards to academic freedom. This survey can be accessed by going to the webpages at:





Measuring Academic Freedom In Europe: An Empirical Analysis

- ❖ *PREVIOUS EMPIRICAL ANALYSES*
- ❖ *CONSTRUCTING AND PILOTING THE SURVEY*
- ❖ *SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND AWARENESS RAISING*
- ❖ **SOME PRELIMINARY RESULTS**
- ❖ *FUTURE WORK*



Some Preliminary Results

The response rate has varied considerably between different universities and nation states. Despite our request, some Rectors evidently “forgot” to send out an email to their staff. We are now attempting to target individual academics by email, but this takes a great deal of time and effort. So far the main survey has been completed by more than 2600 people, of which circa 500 are from Norway. This number of responses means we can be quite confident of the veracity of our findings.



Are you familiar with the following international instruments to protect academic freedom?

Response	1997 UNESCO Recommendation		1988 Lima Declaration	
%				
No	83.1	86.2	91.5	90.8
Yes	16.9	13.8	8.5	9.2



Does your the department, in which you work, have an official policy document on academic freedom?

Response (%)		
No	38.9	31.1
Yes	12.0	16.8
I Don't Know	49.1	52.0



I have an adequate working knowledge of the concept of academic freedom

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	11.1	12.2
Agree	35.8	52.6
Neither Agree nor Disagree	23.6	23.5
Disagree	22.2	9.4
Strongly Disagree	7.4	2.2



Has the protection of academic freedom in your university altered in recent years?

Response (%)		
Greatly Diminished	18.5	8.4
Diminished	29.1	39.7
Unchanged	21.3	27.7
Increased	4.1	3.4
Greatly Increased	0.5	0.6
I Don't Know	26.6	20.2



The protection for academic freedom provided by my university is very important to me.

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	46.5	48.4
Agree	38.0	40.3
Neither Agree nor Disagree	16.6	9.9
Disagree	1.5	1.2
Strongly Disagree	0.6	0.2



My university has provided me with an adequate introduction to the concept of academic freedom

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	1.9	3.0
Agree	8.0	15.5
Neither Agree nor Disagree	16.9	27.2
Disagree	33.8	30.6
Strongly Disagree	39.5	23.7



My university's regulations and practices effectively protect academic freedom

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	3.8	4.3
Agree	18.0	29.0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	42.0	41.4
Disagree	23.6	20.6
Strongly Disagree	12.7	4.7



It is important that complaints of academic freedom violations can be directed to a departmental/faculty grievance body

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	44.4	42.6
Agree	44.8	48.9
Neither Agree nor Disagree	8.7	7.3
Disagree	1.2	0.6
Strongly Disagree	0.9	0.6



There should be specific protection for academic freedom, beyond that existing for freedom of speech

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	36.3	31.0
Agree	35.7	45.3
Neither Agree nor Disagree	21.9	19.0
Disagree	5.5	4.3
Strongly Disagree	0.6	0.4



Tenure for academic staff is essential to maintain academic freedom

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	47.2	52.3
Agree	32.4	31.6
Neither Agree nor Disagree	14.1	11.2
Disagree	5.5	3.3
Strongly Disagree	0.9	1.6



Public universities should be available without fees for (at least) national students

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	41.4	57.3
Agree	28.3	30.5
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15.2	8.3
Disagree	11.5	2.6
Strongly Disagree	3.6	1.2



Public universities should be less under the control of the government

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	23.1	15.3
Agree	32.9	29.0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	28.9	32.7
Disagree	12.2	18.6
Strongly Disagree	3.0	4.3



My individual academic freedom for teaching is very important to me

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	63.6	63.5
Agree	31.8	32.6
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3.7	3.7
Disagree	0.6	0.0
Strongly Disagree	0.3	0.2



My individual academic freedom for teaching has declined in recent years

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	12.2	4.3
Agree	26.9	20.7
Neither Agree nor Disagree	34.1	37.5
Disagree	20.8	29.8
Strongly Disagree	6.0	7.7



My individual academic freedom for research is very important to me

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	70.4	76.7
Agree	26.1	21.0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2.9	2.1
Disagree	0.3	0.0
Strongly Disagree	0.3	0.2



My individual academic freedom for research as declined in recent years

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	12.8	5.8
Agree	29.2	31.1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	32.6	32.0
Disagree	19.8	23.9
Strongly Disagree	5.5	7.2



My institution's autonomy is very important to me

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	48.1	47.8
Agree	37.3	39.2
Neither Agree nor Disagree	11.8	10.7
Disagree	2.1	2.1
Strongly Disagree	0.8	0.2



My institution's self governance is very important to me

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	50.0	49.0
Agree	38.3	42.1
Neither Agree nor Disagree	10.1	7.0
Disagree	1.1	1.4
Strongly Disagree	0.4	0.4



My institution's autonomy has declined in recent years

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	15.0	7.1
Agree	34.5	38.8
Neither Agree nor Disagree	31.4	32.0
Disagree	14.1	18.5
Strongly Disagree	5.0	3.7



My institution's self governance has declined in recent years

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	24.7	17.3
Agree	29.1	36.3
Neither Agree nor Disagree	29.1	28.9
Disagree	12.9	15.5
Strongly Disagree	4.2	2.1



I would welcome additional information on the rights and responsibilities associated with academic freedom

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	34.6	26.8
Agree	47.9	52.4
Neither Agree nor Disagree	12.5	15.3
Disagree	3.9	4.8
Strongly Disagree	1.1	0.6



In my university personal performance assessment is too dependent on attracting research funding

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	14.7	16.6
Agree	23.4	33.0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	28.3	27.3
Disagree	26.8	20.2
Strongly Disagree	6.8	2.8



Academic freedom includes comments made by academics outside of their subject specialisms

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	33.8	27.7
Agree	39.8	47.0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	19.8	21.0
Disagree	5.3	4.1
Strongly Disagree	1.2	0.2



The Rector should be appointed from the university, and staff should be able to determine the process of nomination, election and appointment

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	30.8	33.2
Agree	31.4	35.0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	22.9	21.4
Disagree	10.8	7.1
Strongly Disagree	4.1	3.3



The senate should be competent to determine strategic issues (e.g. the university's budget)

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	28.3	24.4
Agree	43.2	47.9
Neither Agree nor Disagree	21.4	21.2
Disagree	6.4	5.1
Strongly Disagree	0.7	1.4



Having to apply for funds for specific projects stops me from choosing topics that my “academic instinct” tells me are worth while

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	23.7	23.4
Agree	36.6	40.2
Neither Agree nor Disagree	25.6	19.7
Disagree	11.5	13.8
Strongly Disagree	2.6	2.8



I would welcome additional information on the constitutional/legislative protection for academic freedom in my nation

Response (%)		
Strongly Agree	32.3	23.2
Agree	50.0	57.2
Neither Agree nor Disagree	12.9	15.2
Disagree	4.3	3.8
Strongly Disagree	0.6	0.6



Because of your academic views have you been subjected to/threatened with denial of promotion?

Response (%)		
Yes	16.0	5.5
No	84.0	94.5



Because of your academic views have you been given different/fewer/additional teaching or research duties?

Response (%)		
Yes	16.9	9.6
No	83.1	90.4



Because of your academic views have you been subjected to bullying by academic colleagues?

Response (%)		
Yes	23.7	17.1
No	76.3	82.9



Because of your academic views have you been subjected to psychological pressure by someone in your institution?

Response (%)		
Yes	22.2	16.7
No	77.8	83.3

Because of your academic views have you been subjected to/threatened with sexual abuse or assault in your university?

Response (%)		
Yes	0.9	0.4
No	99.1	99.6

Because of your academic views have you been subjected to/threatened with sexual harassment in your university?

Response (%)		
Yes	0.3	2.6
No	99.7	97.4

Measuring Academic Freedom In Europe: An Empirical Analysis

- ❖ *PREVIOUS EMPIRICAL ANALYSES*
- ❖ *CONSTRUCTING AND PILOTING THE SURVEY*
- ❖ *SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND AWARENESS RAISING*
- ❖ *SOME PRELIMINARY RESULTS*
- ❖ **FUTURE WORK**

Future Work

Responses to the survey keep coming in and the findings of the survey will form the basis for various academic papers, giving us the opportunity to explore academics' experiences and opinions with regard to academic freedom. So, for example, we will be able to explore: whether women have a different experience of academic freedom from men; whether p.t. academics feel that their academic freedom is less well-protected; whether older staff have a different perception of academic freedom, etc.

Future Work

The survey works well, but needs refinement in the light of respondents' comments, so we can create a well tried and tested research tool that will become an acknowledged best practice benchmark instrument within academia. Using the survey for other nations should allow us to produce a global index for academic freedom, encompassing most nations - we have already used a similar survey of African states. Future work might include versions of the survey in different languages for studies of different countries.

**PLEASE ENCOURAGE YOUR FRIENDS &
COLLEAGUES TO COMPLETE THE SURVEY!!!**

The survey is available on-line in

English

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/AcademicFreedomSurvey>

French

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/AcademicFreedomSurveyFR>

Spanish

<https://surveymonkey.com/s/AcademicFreedomSurveyES>

Thank you for listening! 😊

If you would like a copy of this presentation, or copies of articles and papers on academic freedom, then please contact us by email:

kbeiter@lincoln.ac.uk

tkarran@lincoln.ac.uk