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An original questionnaire concerning academic freedom policies and
practices was created and mailed to 1,264 faculty members from 316 private
baccalaureate colleges and universities. There is a lack of empirical research
on faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. The
variables under investigation included faculty members’ demographics, work
attributes, experiences with academic freedom, and institutional
characteristics, as well as policies and practices with regard to academic
freedom. A total of 331 faculty members completed and submitted the
questionnaire. Out of the 56 variables studied, a total of 17 variables
emerged as significant predictors of faculty satisfaction with academic
freedom.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Academic freedom “encompasses the autonomy of the university itself as an institution dedicated to knowledge, the freedom of the faculty to teach and pursue their research, and the freedom both of the faculty and of students to learn” (De George, 2003, p. 12). The degree of academic freedom allowed at a university has implications not only for the range of ideas taught, but also for the range of speakers and programs on campus, the range of books and media explored, and the range of faculty positions voiced in public outside of the university. Examples of current controversial topics whose presence on campus has been influenced by the university’s stance on academic freedom are evolution and creationism, abortion, and positions on war. This study focused on the academic freedom of faculty members in a higher education setting. Academic freedom, the free pursuit of knowledge stands as the sacred core of higher education and is key for faculty members to teach, to research, and to publish in their area of specialty.

In order to understand academic freedom, it is vital to review its historical roots. Academic freedom has been a critical part in the development not only of American higher education, but of ancient Greek
education. During the fifth century B.C.E., Greeks had engaged in the quest for knowledge. These curious first thinkers began to create their concepts of physics, philosophy, and atomic theory (Tredennick, 1969). The Sophists, or Wise Men, emerged. The Sophists “were really able and had something positive and valuable to impart; but others encouraged skepticism by stressing the two-sidedness of every question, or undermined faith in real values by preaching a kind of subjectivism or relativism” (p. 7). The Wise Men encouraged cleverness and efficiency and even charged those who utilized their services (Tredennick). Charging a fee for services was appalling for the philosophers of the time.

According to Poch (1993), during the time of Plato, intellectuals in the ancient academy were “dedicated to the art of critical debate, the posing of questions, and the search for solutions” (p. 3). These intellectuals were concerned with simply seeking the truth, which is the underlying notion for academic freedom.

The desire to pursue knowledge emerged again during the Middle Ages. Examples of institutions in this era that promoted truth seeking were the universities of Paris, Bologna, and eventually, Oxford and Cambridge in England (Poch, 1993). During that time “medieval professors had opportunities to explore and contribute to new realms of knowledge as long as they did not trespass on the doctrinal authority of the church” (p. 3). Even with the church’s restrictions on academia, these professors were pivotal in
the selection of the administration, which had the ability to create the foundations for policies concerning academic freedom (Poch).

Following the emergence of academic freedom in Western Europe, the first signs of academic freedom appeared in colonial America as well. Various issues related to the development of academic freedom had arisen in American colleges. In colonial America, many of the institutions of higher education were founded on the basis of sectarianism or denominationalism (Rudolph, 1990). Before 1770, “Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, New Jersey, King’s, Philadelphia, Rhode Island, Queen’s, and Dartmouth” (p. 3) were developed to serve multiple purposes. The colonial colleges not only were spreading the religious word of such groups as the Calvinists, the Quakers, the Baptists, and the Anglicans, but were forming respectable men who would manage society, advance learning, develop future scholars, instill citizenship, and create teachers (Rudolph). These men were the elite in society, who were educated for leadership roles to guide the general population.

The American professor was entitled to research, to teach, and to inquire, a freedom expressed by the German word Lehrfreiheit (Rudolph, 1990). Professors utilized these freedoms inside the classroom and believed that freedom of speech would protect them outside of the classroom as well. “The American professor took advantage of the American commitment to the idea of freedom of speech and thereby advanced the principle that the
professor might enjoy outside of the classroom the same rights, the same freedoms, as other Americans” (p. 413). Unfortunately, some professors whose ideas ran counter to those of governmental administrations were victims of the first violations of academic freedom; they lost their positions. For example, at the University of Wisconsin in 1894, economist Richard T. Ely “spoke favorably of strikes and boycotts; for this economic heresy he was tried by a committee of the board of regents” (p. 414). At Marietta College in 1897, professor of political science James Allen Smith spoke out against monopolies and was dismissed from his faculty position (Rudolph). These professors wrongly assumed that their freedom of speech allowed for any self-expression.

With the growth of the system of U.S. higher education from 1860 to 1950, the importance of protecting academic freedom became more significant, and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was created in 1915 to protect professors’ rights. The mission of the AAUP is the protection of academic freedom and “developing standards for sound academic practice and...working for the acceptance of these standards by the community of higher education” (AAUP, 2007b, para. 1). The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure was developed by the AAUP to further protect the academic rights of faculty members nationwide (AAUP, 2003). The AAUP (2003) has stated that
institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights. (para. 3-4)

Prior to the inception of the AAUP, no formal policies or practices existed that institutions of higher education could follow to ensure academic freedom nationwide.

Violations of academic freedom have continued to occur in recent years. At the University of South Florida in 2001, Sami Al-Arian, professor of Computer Science and Engineering, was terminated from his position (The United Faculty of Florida, 2007). When Professor Al-Arian was off campus “he was very active in, and very outspoken on, a number of pro-Palestinian and Islamic issues” (para. 1). Campus administrators became concerned with Professor Al-Arian’s extracurricular affairs.

A federal grand jury indicted Professor Al-Arian on the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act in February 2003 (The
United Faculty of Florida, 2007). A letter of dismissal was then released to Al-Arian. Al-Arian’s activities outside of his contract with the University of South Florida led to his firing.

The United Faculty of Florida protects faculty contracts, due process, academic freedom, and tenure. It contends that Al-Arian’s accusation was not definite proof that his off-campus activities worked against the U.S. government by helping foreign powers. Since the bombings of the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, there has been a heightened awareness of those involved with Palestinian and Islamic affairs. The United Faculty of Florida was insistent that regardless of Al-Arian’s off-campus behavior, they must “defend his freedom of speech and his right to due process” (The United Faculty of Florida, 2007, para. 8).

Another faculty member, Ethnic Studies Professor Ward Churchill at University of Colorado at Boulder, was recently released from his tenured position for addressing unpopular and controversial topics in a book and during public discussions (Ward Churchill Solidarity Network, 2007). The Faculty Assembly of the Indiana School of Liberal Arts at Indiana University at Purdue University “viewed this as an attack on critical thinking, which ought to be protected on campuses everywhere, and asks that the University of Colorado at Boulder rescind this decision immediately” (para. 6). Professors Al-Arian and Churchill did not have protection for their actions
off-campus, similar to just as Ely and Smith, the faculty members in the past, did not. The controversy regarding faculty members’ actions has not disappeared, even with the creation of the American Association of University Professors.

In addition to faculty facing issues regarding academic freedom, other college campuses are facing them as well. According to the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA, 2006), campus presentations, speakers, and displays have entered the contested arena of academic freedom. For example, Florida’s state universities followed the Florida Administrative Code, which required all campus presentations to be approved first by university regulations (OPPAGA). The community colleges in Florida did not have a standard set of rules for presentations, since the rules vary by institution (OPPAGA).

Private colleges are not exempt from the tension surrounding academic freedom and campus presentations. For instance, church-related institutions, including The University of Notre Dame and St. John’s University, have recently forbidden the production of the play called *The Vagina Monologues* on their campuses. The play consisted of frank stories of young women’s experiences with their sexuality (Ensler, 2007).

At the University of Notre Dame (UND), an academic department sponsored the play production until January, 2006. The President of UND, Rev. John I. Jenkins, addressed the situation in his speech on *Academic*
Freedom and Catholic Character (Jenkins, 2006). According to Jenkins, The Vagina Monologues are “egregiously contrary to or inconsistent with the fundamental values of a Catholic university” (para. 40). He stated that his concern was sponsorship, not the censorship of the production. Later Jenkins reversed his decision, indicating the difficulty of determining how to interpret and to apply academic freedom (Wycliff, 2006).

Background of the Problem

Academic freedom may be viewed as a right and a responsibility. It is a faculty member’s right in the classroom, in research, and in publication, to share and investigate pertinent information related to their subject matter. Professors may view academic freedom as a responsibility as well, because they have specialized in a field of study and must communicate unbiased information to their students and society. The AAUP has defined academic freedom the academic rights and responsibilities of faculty members, in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The faculty members utilized in this study were all employed at private baccalaureate institutions and their protections for academic freedom were different from those of faculty who are employed at public institutions. “Since First Amendment rights and other federal constitutional rights generally do not apply or limit private institutions … legal arguments concerning the freedom to teach in private institutions are usually based on contract law” (Kaplin & Lee, 2007, p. 277). Even with the use of contract law,
many private institutions followed the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Since academic freedom is a right, it must be protected by adequate college policies and practices. The OPPAGA studied academic freedom policies at 11 public universities and 28 community colleges in 2006. The statements on academic freedom contained policies on faculty teaching and classroom freedoms. Policies regarding faculty responsibilities were also specified in the academic freedom policies. “The institutional academic freedom statements enumerate academic freedom principles but do not provide specifics about how academic freedom should be monitored, implemented, or enforced” (OPPAGA, 2006, p. 3).

Even though policies and practices are in place to protect academic freedom, there was a lack of information on faculty satisfaction with academic freedom and its protection. Through this study, faculty members’ experiences, whether positive or negative, limited or extensive, influenced their satisfaction with academic freedom. For example, faculty members who worked at institutions where violations of academic freedom have occurred may be much more dissatisfied than those where violations have not occurred. The only way to learn about the influence of experiences with academic freedom was to survey faculty members.
Problem Statement

This study focused on faculty who worked at private baccalaureate colleges and universities. These private baccalaureate institutions were nonprofit and instructed undergraduate and graduate students. By conducting a questionnaire of faculty concerning academic freedom, I was able to determine what factors, if any, influenced their satisfaction with current policies and practices concerning academic freedom. The factors studied included faculty members’ demographics, work attributes, experiences with academic freedom, and institutional characteristics, as well as policies and practices with regard to academic freedom. The results of this study, determining what predicts faculty satisfaction with academic freedom, benefits institutions concerning the creation and modification of policies and practices related to academic freedom.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. This study explored if faculty members at private baccalaureate colleges were knowledgeable about and satisfied with current policies and practices in relation to academic freedom, since there has not been extensive research on this topic. The factors that influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom were also explored.

Research Questions

The research questions that this study answered are the following:
1. What faculty demographics, if any, influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

2. What faculty work attributes, if any, influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

3. What past experiences, if any, influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

4. What academic disciplines, if any, influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

5. What college characteristics, if any, influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

6. What college or university policies and practices created to protect academic freedom, if any, influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

7. What types of involvement with creating and implementing academic freedom policies and practices, if any, influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

**Significance of the Study**

This study on faculty experiences with academic freedom and policies and practices was significant for several reasons. Exploratory research was conducted on numerous faculty and institutional characteristics that proved to influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. Moreover, by revealing the involvement that faculty members have currently
and in the past with academic freedom, the questionnaire showed how this involvement has influenced satisfaction. In addition, findings demonstrated that faculty members are satisfied with certain institutional policies and practices regarding academic freedom, and these findings are an indicator for institutions to follow those policies. If faculty members are not satisfied, the findings encourage institutions to consider creating them. In other words, this new knowledge may be utilized by college administrators to modify institutional policies and practices in order to enhance faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

Why Private Baccalaureate Colleges and Universities

This study was devoted specifically to private baccalaureate colleges and universities since they use the contract system in regards to faculty protections. This differs significantly from public institutions of higher education where faculty members are automatically protected by constitutional law and therefore have all of the necessary freedoms guaranteed. At private baccalaureate colleges and universities, contracts, which are binding when signed, vary from institution to institution; and the constitutional protections are not necessarily guaranteed. If the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure are not specified in the contract, then these protections are not guaranteed for faculty members at private baccalaureate institutions. Faculty may sign away or give up freedoms simply in order to teach at a private institution. Also,
contracts at religious institutions may include additional clauses that impinge on academic freedom. Contract law permits private institutions the inclusion of all pertinent information in their faculty contracts. Since academic freedom is a right and responsibility for all faculty members, it is appropriate to learn about the contracts. Academic freedom may survive only if the contract permits the faculty members to teach, research, and publish freely in their area of specialty.

Theoretical Frameworks

There were two theoretical frameworks for this study: attitude theory and involvement theory. Both attitudes and involvement impact how individuals react in various situations. An overview of the connections between the theories and satisfaction with policies and practices concerning academic freedom were discussed. The first theoretical framework, attitude theory, was concerned with the connections between past experiences and attitude development. The second, involvement theory, was related to the amount of time and energy faculty dedicated toward campus life.

Attitude theory. Attitude theory is a type of learning theory. Learning theories are based on behavior theory or the stimulus-response approach to similar experiences (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). “Learning theories are concerned with the processes whereby a given response becomes associated with (or conditioned to) a given stimulus” (p. 22). Attitude has been defined as “a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently
favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object” (p. 6).

Attitude theory is used in this research because it connects past experiences with policies and practices related to academic freedom and faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

Faculty members bring the attitudes they have learned over the years with them to their work environments. Attitude theory helped me discover if faculty members’ past experiences with academic freedom were indicators of current satisfaction with academic freedom. If attitude theory is accurate, faculty members’ positive past experiences with academic freedom would be related to a higher level of current satisfaction with academic freedom, a particular type of attitude. In other words, attitude theory suggested a relationship between past experiences with academic freedom and the current level of satisfaction with academic freedom.

**Involvement theory.** Astin (1985) developed involvement theory, which is applied to both students and faculty. The theory simply stated that individuals in a college community “learn by becoming involved” (Astin, p. 133). Those in academic environments had the option of choosing the level of time spent participating in campus life and interacting with other people on campus. A high level of involvement helped maximize the development of cognitive and affective outcomes, one of which was satisfaction. Research has found that faculty members who were more involved in campus life were more satisfied overall with the institution (Astin, 1991).
For the purposes of this study, participation referred to a faculty member’s involvement in developing and implementing policies and practices regarding academic freedom. Such involvement had a number of benefits. For one thing, involvement helped faculty members develop their talents. In this case, involvement with the policies and practices related to academic freedom permitted faculty to become more aware of their own experiences and whether their rights to academic freedom were protected. Moreover, faculty members who were involved directly in policy creation would impact the academic freedoms that other faculty will enjoy. Also, if a violation of academic freedom occurred, these involved faculty members would be pivotal in correcting the issue and assisting other faculty so that further infractions do not occur.

Involvement theory suggested that both the quantity and quality of involvement with developing and implementing the policies and practices with regards to academic freedom were crucial. It implied that faculty involved to a high degree would not only be more knowledgeable about these policies and practices, but they would also have a higher level of satisfaction with them.

Integrating the theoretical frameworks of attitude theory and involvement theory allowed me to explore the factors related to satisfaction with academic freedom. All of the inputs, or experiences brought with the faculty members, along with environmental measures, which included
institutional characteristics, academic freedom policies and practices, and faculty involvements in the creation and implementation of academic freedom policies and practices, were used to determine what influence, if any, the examined factors had on satisfaction with academic freedom.

**Data Analysis Framework**

The data analysis framework for this study was Astin’s (1991) input-environment-outcome (I-E-O) model, which permitted me to block or group together the variables used in this study. This model took into consideration the items individuals bring with them into an environment. The I-E-O model suggested that input and environmental variables together impact the end result in the study, or the outcome. The I-E-O model enabled researchers “to produce information on how outcomes are affected by different educational policies and practices” (p. 37). The educational policies and practices in this research were those associated with academic freedom. The outcome variable for this study was faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

The I-E-O model was comprised of three main parts: input measures, environmental measures, and outcomes (see Figure 1). Input measures had been defined as “fixed or invariant characteristics . . . and characteristics that can change over time” (Astin, 1991, p. 70). The environmental measures in the I-E-O Model “encompass everything that happens . . . during the course of an educational program that might conceivably influence the outcomes.
Figure 1. Astin’s (1991) I-E-O Model

under consideration” (p. 81). Two types of environmental measures existed: between-college and within-college measures (see Figure 2).

The I-E-O Model encompassed two types of outcomes: cognitive and affective (Astin, 1991) (see Figure 1). Cognitive outcomes were related to reason and logic, while affective outcomes centered on attitudes and feelings. In this study the dependent variable was an affective outcome, namely, satisfaction with academic freedom, which was self-reported by faculty from the questionnaire they completed (see Figure 2).

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom may be seen in Figure 2. Within a total of three blocks, the figure demonstrated how I envisioned the variables that influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. Astin’s (1991) I-E-O model, which was
the data analysis frameworks of attitude theory and involvement theory for this study, and the two theoretical frameworks were combined to create the conceptual framework. Attitude theory suggested the inclusion of past experiences with academic freedom as one of the faculty variables to be included in this study. Involvement theory suggested the inclusion of a number of variables that were included as within-college measures in the environmental block of the I-E-O model.

![Conceptual framework for the study of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom](image)

**Figure 2.** Conceptual framework for the study of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom
The first block in this conceptual framework contained input variables from Astin’s (1991) I-E-O model. Input variables included past experiences with academic freedom, faculty demographics of sex and race, and faculty work attributes such as tenure status, faculty rank, administrative position, number of years at the current institution, academic discipline, principal activity in current role, member of the faculty senate, and holding an office in the faculty senate. The second block in this conceptual framework consisted of the environmental measures. These measures included both between-college measures and within-college measures. The between-college measures were institutional size, location, race, religious affiliation, faculty senates, tenure, contracts, letters of intent, and collective bargaining. The within-college measures were the policies and practices concerning academic freedom, the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure in faculty handbooks, faculty involvement in creating and implementing the policies and practices for academic freedom, and faculty members’ current involvement with violations of academic freedom.

The final block of the conceptual framework was the outcome, which was faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. I hoped that this conceptual framework, which incorporated the I-E-O model and attitude and involvement theories, would uncover the predictors, if any, related to faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.
Limitations

There were numerous limitations of this study, centering around the faculty members participating, the topic, the questionnaire, and the lack of generalizability of the questionnaire findings.

The sample to be questioned was a limitation in that it included only faculty members employed at private baccalaureate institutions and these faculty members had different responses to the questions than those individuals who were employed at other types of institutions. Therefore, the findings from this study would apply only to faculty who are employed at private baccalaureate institutions.

Another limitation was a lack of representation of academic disciplines. The faculty members chosen at random to complete the questionnaire were from departments within the broad Arts and Science categories of Natural Science, Social Science, Fine or Performing Arts, and the Humanities. Faculty from academic disciplines not included in this study may have had views on academic freedom that differed from those of faculty targeted for this study.

A limitation also was the number of questionnaires returned from each group. The goal was to collect responses from four major groupings of Arts and Sciences disciplines. A representative or balanced sample may not be obtained from each of the four groupings or from any given college. For
example, all of the faculty members who responded could be from the same discipline, or the faculty may have responded from a given college.

Faculty attribution was another limitation of this research. Every faculty member developed satisfaction with academic freedom from past work experiences. Attribution guided how faculty members reacted in current work situations, especially if these situations resembled past occurrences where a violation of academic freedom transpired. The subjects of the study may have been hesitant to trust others or may question academic freedom policies and practices that failed to protect them in the past. The current work environment may be free of inadequacies, but this does not dispel the attribution that may have developed over the years from exposure to other college environments. Humans have a habit of relating past experiences to the present. Consequently, it is important to note that any two people can interpret the components of a situation differently, because each person carries unique personal characteristics and history. Therefore, faculty members’ independent experiences impacted their responses to the questionnaire, which are based on their attributions.

In addition, a limitation of the study may be deciding to what institution I associate the attribution. The research attempted to control for the influence of past experiences over current ones, but the research is limited to the current period of time. It is not longitudinal in nature and does not focus on changes over a number of years, which would enable me to
determine where to attribute the faculty members’ satisfaction with academic freedom.

The weakness of this study was the assumption that the responses on the questionnaire reflected satisfaction or dissatisfaction with environmental policies and practices related to academic freedom at the current institution. This was a weakness due to the design of the research, a one-time cross-sectional survey with a predetermined population (Frankel & Wallen, 2003). A longitudinal survey, one that studies individuals multiple times to discover changes, would have allowed me to learn if satisfaction with academic freedom was related to past or present work experiences (Frankel & Wallen).

The response rate was limited because of the sensitive nature of the topic. Faculty members who in the past have experienced a frustrating situation related to academic freedom may not want to revisit it. In addition, they may still be employed at the institution where the incident occurred, and therefore feel uncomfortable responding to the topic. These faculty members may deem it safer simply to do their job and to avoid conflict. Academic freedom is a sensitive topic for those who value its importance but who do not have the protection that they need. Furthermore, if faculty do not fully understand the policies and practices regarding academic freedom, this may also limit the response rate. Lastly, some individuals may believe that there is no issue to discuss.
Varying definitions of academic freedom may have been another limitation. Some faculty may view academic freedom as restricted to their classroom lectures and discussion and the activities at their institution. They may not consider their off-campus lives, behaviors, and decisions to be associated with academic freedom. Faculty at these private baccalaureate institutions may have had jobs at various types of institutions in the past and therefore may define academic freedom in different ways. To overcome limitation, the questionnaire defined academic freedom in sufficient detail this to ensure that all participants responded to questions based on a common definition for academic freedom.

The closed-ended nature of the responses was another limitation of the questionnaire. By definition, a closed-ended questionnaire collects only limited information, while respondents may have other concerns that will not be addressed. The answer choices as well may be limited for the respondents. Open-ended answers are not an option for this study, because I was unable to address the additional concerns expressed by the respondents. If faculty insert additional comments to their copy of the questionnaire, I was unable to collect such responses from the remaining faculty completing the questionnaire.

Finally, the paper form and the electronic form of the questionnaire were limitations. With such a questionnaire, a lack of personal connection existed; the respondents could not immediately contact me for a response to
clarify something or to ask questions. However, the paper form and the electronic form of the questionnaire did permit the respondents to answer at their leisure.

**Delimitations**

There were two delimitations for this study. First, there was value in conducting research for its own sake. It was a goal of mine to add to the current body of knowledge on faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

Another delimitation was the type of institution utilized for this study, private baccalaureate colleges. There was value in studying the policies and practices related to academic freedom at these institutions. Public institutions are protected by constitutional law, unlike private institutions which are solely protected by contract law.

**Glossary**

**Academic freedom.** “Encompasses the autonomy of the university itself as an institution dedicated to knowledge, the freedom of the faculty to teach and pursue their research, and the freedom both of the faculty and of students to learn” (De George, 2003, p. 12).

**Attitude.** “A learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975, p. 6).

**Baccalaureate colleges.** Those institutions where “bachelor’s degrees accounted for at least 10 percent of all undergraduate degrees and
they awarded fewer than 50 master's degrees” and are “not identified as Tribal Colleges or as Special Focus Institutions” (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2006a, para. 17).

**Contract** is “an appointment for a specific and limited period of time, with no assurance (or proscription) of continued employment beyond the expiration date” (Chait & Ford, 1982, p. 14).

**Cross-sectional survey** is “a survey in which data are collected at one point in time from a predetermined population or populations” (Frankel & Wallen, 2003, G-2).

**First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution** states that “congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances” (U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, 2007, para. 11).

**Free speech** is “speech that is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution” (Merriam-Webster, 2007, para. 1).

**Longitudinal survey** is “a study in which information is collected at different points in time in order to study changes over time (usually of considerable length, such as several months or years)” (Frankel & Wallen, 2003, G-4).
Policies are “a clear statement of a philosophy” (Fortunato & Waddell, 1981, p. 303).

Privately-controlled institutions “serve public purposes and the public welfare, though their management is largely independent of governmental authority” (Pattillo, 1990, p. 2).

Procedures are the actual implementation of a particular policy (Fortunato & Waddell, 1981).

Survey research is “research that deals with the incidence, distribution, and relationships of educational, psychological, and sociological variables in nonexperimental settings” (Wiersma, 2000, p. 461).

Tenure is known as continual appointment with specific years and states that there should be documentation issued for termination (AAUP, 2003).

Work attributes are work-related characteristics that have been defined as “professional status”, “managerial role”, and “position in the status hierarchy” (Paddison, 1987, p. 9).

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the experiences of faculty members in private baccalaureate colleges and universities to determine if they were satisfied with academic freedom and current policies and practices in relation to academic freedom. The questionnaire created for this study attempted to achieve this purpose. Since faculty members are entitled to the
AAUP’s *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the protections for academic freedom should have already been in place. Simply by being a faculty member, they were responsible with academic freedom. Protection for the responsibility of academic freedom on college campuses should be ensured through their policies and practices. Faculty experiences concerning these policies and practices indicated if the faculty members were indeed satisfied. Data collected from the questionnaire was valuable for college administrators at private baccalaureate colleges nationwide who are responsible for creating policies and practices concerning academic freedom.

The following chapters described the process and results of determining the factors that influenced the satisfaction with academic freedom of faculty members in private baccalaureate colleges and universities. Chapter Two discussed the literature on academic freedom. Information in the second chapter included a historical review on academic freedom and the AAUP, examples of faculty work attributes that were gathered on the questionnaire. Court cases involving the policies and practices concerning academic freedom, and the two theoretical frameworks, were discussed. Chapter Three was concerned with the methods for data collection and analysis that were utilized in this study. A description detailed the components of the questionnaire and how it was administered to faculty members who were employed at private baccalaureate colleges. Chapter Four discussed the findings from the questionnaire. The final
chapter was concerned with conclusions, implications for theory and practices, and recommendations for further study.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

This chapter was concerned with the literature related to faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. The faculty members who completed an original questionnaire were employed at private baccalaureate colleges and universities. The questionnaire was created to gather information on faculty members’ experiences with academic freedom. At this time, there is a lack of empirical research on this topic and therefore this research is warranted.

The purpose of this chapter was to explore the variables that may or may not be related to faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. The chapter opened with an explanation of the conceptual framework of the study, and then discussed the reasons for studying private baccalaureate colleges and universities. Next, the history of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the organization that first addressed academic freedom in the United States, was presented. A brief history and definition of tenure followed, along with information on collective bargaining and faculty contracts at private colleges and universities. Next, all of the facets of academic freedom were examined in detail, followed by the pivotal court cases involving academic freedom at institutions of higher education. After
that, the two theoretical frameworks were presented. The next section outlined the data analysis framework. Then the faculty demographics, sex and race, were explored, followed by the work attributes utilized in this study, including faculty rank, tenure status, number of years at the current institution, academic discipline, administrative position, principal activity in current role, member of the faculty senate, and holding office in the faculty senate. A summary completed the chapter.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework for this study may be seen in Figure 2. The framework consisted of three sections, including the potential variables that may impact faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. This conceptual framework is based on the data analysis framework, which is Alexander Astin’s (1991) input-environment-outcome, or I-E-O model, along with the two theoretical frameworks for the study, namely attitude theory and involvement theory. Details outlining the conceptual framework are in the following paragraphs.

The first section in this conceptual framework included input variables from Astin’s (1991) I-E-O model, which were measures that typically may not be modified. These measures included faculty demographics like sex and race, and faculty work attributes such as faculty rank, tenure status, number of years at the current institution, academic discipline, administrative position, principal activity in current role, member of the faculty senate, and...
holding office in the faculty senate. This initial section also incorporated attitude theory, which was concerned with consistent learned notions, whether positive or negative, concerning an object, person, or event (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Faculty brought with them their past experiences with academic freedom, both good and bad, as an input to their job.

The second section in the conceptual framework consisted of environmental measures. The two types of environmental measures, between-college and within-college, covered all aspects of the college environment, and they may have influenced the outcome of the study (Astin, 1991). The between-college measures were the institutions’ demographic characteristics: institutional size, location, race, religious affiliation, faculty senate, tenure, contracts, letters of intent, and collective bargaining. The within-college measures were the policies and practices concerning academic freedom, the AAUP’s *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* in faculty handbooks, faculty members’ actual involvement in creating and implementing the policies and practices for academic freedom, and faculty members’ involvement with violations of academic freedom. According to Astin (1985), the greater the involvement of the faculty member, the greater his or her satisfaction with the institution.

The final section of the conceptual framework was the outcome, which was faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. This outcome was located in the affective domain in that it had to do with attitudes and feelings.
Why Private Baccalaureate Colleges and Universities

This study focused on collecting information concerning satisfaction with academic freedom from faculty members who were employed at private baccalaureate colleges and universities. The questionnaire created for this research demonstrated if faculty involvement with academic freedom lead to satisfaction with the policies and practices related to academic freedom. If faculty involvement with academic freedom showed satisfaction with the policies and practices created to protect academic freedom, this may encourage other college administrators to consider adopting these policies.

For this research, only private baccalaureate college and universities were studied because faculty members at these institutions were protected by faculty contracts. Faculty at public colleges and universities were protected by constitutional law, rather than contract law. Faculty at private institutions may have given up protections if statements, such as the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, were absent from their contracts.

In addition to faculty contracts, collective bargaining groups have been established on college campuses to protect faculty members’ rights. Collective bargaining and faculty contracts are explained in this chapter. In the following section, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is discussed, followed by a brief history of tenure. The AAUP was designed to protect faculty members’ academic freedom and tenure.
History of the American Association of University Professors

The AAUP originated from three other academic organizations: the American Economic Association; the American Political Science Association; and the American Sociological Society (AAUP, 1915). A joint committee was formed to review university issues concerning academic freedom and academic tenure. By December 1914, the three academic organizations presented a report on their findings; and by January 1915, the AAUP was developed to address the issue of academic freedom.

A committee of 15 faculty members was selected to review university cases. Within the first year, 11 cases were evaluated by the committee (AAUP, 1915). The cases were “diverse in character, ranging from dismissals of individual professors to dismissal or resignation of groups of professors, and including also the dismissal of a university president, and the complaint of another university president against his board of trustees” (AAUP, 1915, p. 4). The committee was unable to address all 11 cases during the first year, and only the five most important cases were selected.

In addition to addressing the most important cases, the AAUP created a general declaration of principles concerning academic freedom. The AAUP has defined academic freedom as having three main components: “freedom of inquiry and research; freedom of teaching within the university or college; and freedom of extra-mural utterance and action” (AAUP, 1915, p. 6). According to the AAUP, all of the five initial cases included faculty members
who were acting as citizens and discussing topics outside of the university, some of which were political in nature. The general principles of academic freedom were presented under three headings: the basis of academic authority, the nature of the academic calling, and the function of the academic institution. Practical proposals were also stated in the general principles booklet.

The basis of academic authority was the board of trustees, which was ultimately in control of a university or college. In 1915, the AAUP was concerned with the boards of trustees’ degree of control. For example, it decided that at a proprietary college, the board members must respect a gift made to the college, regardless of their opinions of the donor’s position (AAUP, 1915). Another example from 1915 was the AAUP’s decision that a board of trustees at a church-related university or college was not responsible for ensuring that religion was carried through in daily activities (AAUP, 1915). Academic freedom should be respected with regards to religion occurring in programs and traditions directed by others from the campus community. This decision was beneficial for the campus, protecting it from pressure from the board. These two examples concerned institutions that were a private or proprietary trust.

Public colleges or universities were a public trust. As long as these institutions sought public funds, they must act to serve the public need. The trustee members at public institutions may not obstruct a professor. For
instance, boards from the 1915 era violated academic freedom by excluding unpopular topics from teaching, and they did not treat the professors as respected specialists in their fields. The AAUP (1915) stated that these boards should not have the moral right to limit the topics taught in class; this violated academic freedom.

The second section of the general principles, the nature of the academic calling, indicated that professional scholars were men who were considered to be independent, to have dignity, and to be of high quality in a chosen field of study (AAUP, 1915). These men should work in an honest fashion and should freely report their research findings to students, the public, and other professors without fear of reprisal (AAUP, 1915).

The AAUP encountered cases concerning professors’ freedom, and therefore they made the following statement:

university teachers should be understood to be, with respect to the conclusions reached and expressed by them, no more subject to the control of the trustees, than are judges subject to the control of the President, with respect to their decisions (AAUP, 1915, p. 12).

By comparing professors to judges, the AAUP was sending a strong message to trustees.

The third section of the general principles was the function of the academic institution. The AAUP mentioned three purposes for colleges and universities: promoting inquiry and human knowledge, instructing students,
and developing experts to serve the public. The first function, the promotion of inquiry and human knowledge had been increasing in the area of scientific research (AAUP, 1915). Professors needed to be free to research and to publish their results.

The second function, to instruct students, at one time was the sole purpose of higher education. More importantly, faculty members needed to be free to impart the knowledge they have gained to students.

This leads to the third function, developing experts for the community. The public continually calls on experts to solve issues involving economics and the social and political sciences (AAUP, 1915). Training these experts will only occur if professors have the freedom to be on the cutting edge, to propose nontraditional ideas, and to investigate and to publish results, regardless of controversy.

The responsibility of the university as a whole is to the community at large, and any restriction upon the freedom of the instructor is bound to react injuriously upon the efficiency and the morale of the institution, and therefore ultimately upon the interests of the community (AAUP, 1915, p. 15).

The general principles outlined responsibilities of the college professor. Professors are supposed to be honest in communicating truth, since the common person does not have access to the research itself. The professors should also teach with discretion, slowly introducing sensitive and
controversial topics, since the students, especially during the first two years of college, are immature. Students were unable to fully comprehend some topics, and they needed to build character slowly (AAUP, 1915). The AAUP stated that professors should have freedom of speech in both their classroom discussions and outside university involvements. Professors should not fear that their involvement in organized movements, such as political groups, would impact their job security.

The second part of the general principles included four practical proposals regarding tenure for universities to implement: faculty committees on reappointments, the definition of tenure of office, formulation of grounds for dismissal, and judicial hearings before dismissal. According to the AAUP, several institutions had already executed some of these proposals by 1915.

1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure

In 1940, the AAUP readdressed the Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure. These statements were a joint endeavor of the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges, which is now the Association of American Colleges and Universities. The 1940 statements were a rewording from the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

According to the AAUP, institutions’ main purpose was to protect the common good, which was reliant on the freedom to seek the truth and clarification. Academic freedom was redefined in 1940 as being
essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research.

Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth.

Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights (AAUP, 2003, para. 4).

The AAUP’s original and continual purpose is to protect faculty members’ academic freedom and tenure. The general declaration of principles concerning academic freedom was created to maintain a level of protection for faculty members, as long as they taught, researched, and published on their area of specialty. Faculty may enjoy the protections of academic freedom and tenure when their institutions ascribe to the AAUP’s 1940 Statements.

**History of Tenure**

During the late 1800s, college professors only had bachelor’s degrees, training in theology, and no system of raises or promotions (Hofstader & Metzger, 2001). “Although a professor usually held office indefinitely on good behavior, his tenure depended upon usage and had no legal status: he could be fired at will by the governing board; in many institutions a hearing was not required” (Hofstader & Metzger, p. 230). These professors were not as tied to their teaching positions, since they did not have the opportunity to further their education, and they had their students constantly reciting in the
classroom instead of engaging in stimulating discussions and conducting experiments. Intellectual satisfaction was lacking, and therefore, many of these early faculty members changed their profession.

By 1915, the AAUP was established; and they created the Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure. “In every institution there should be an unequivocal understanding as to the term of each appointment; and the tenure of professorships and associate professorships” (AAUP, 1915, pp. 26-27). The definition of tenure also included that if state governing boards may not develop contracts “for more than a limited period,” they must announce reappointment rules (AAUP, p. 27). Reappointment should be automatic for faculty, unless they act immorally.

The AAUP revisited the definition of tenure in 1940. The updated definition is cited completely below.

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society (AAUP, 2003, para. 5).

In 1957, the Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure was developed by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, or Committee A. These regulations encompassed the
terms of appointment, including special conditions; probationary or continuous tenure; termination of the appointment by the faculty member or the institution; dismissal procedures; actions by the governing boards; and the imposition of sanctions other than dismissal. Additional regulations encompassed terminal salary, the length of time that the salary will be paid until the end of service, protection against discrimination, faculty members’ political involvements, and grievance procedures (AAUP, 2001).

Tenure was developed by the AAUP to protect academic freedom. If a faculty member does not have tenure, the faculty member should be notified in writing of the appointment or renewal of service. In addition, faculty members must be notified of the protections of academic freedom in the appointment or renewal of service.

**Collective Bargaining**

In order to protect academic freedom, institutions of higher education have created options such as collective bargaining. “Faculty and administrators should be actively involved in the development, periodic review, and revision of the institution’s policy on academic freedom” (Goonen & Blechman, 1999, p. 137). The policies and practices related to academic freedom may also be developed and implemented in an efficient and effective manner through administrators or collective bargaining (Goonen & Blechman, 1999). Faculty unions existed in a number of public colleges and
universities campuses nationwide to allow faculty to organize and to make changes on campuses. The AAUP (2008)

promotes collective bargaining to reinforce the best features of higher education. The principles of academic freedom and tenure, fair procedures, faculty participation in governance, and the primary responsibility of the faculty for determining academic policy will thereby be secured (para. 4).

According to Poskanzer (2002) “unionization at private colleges and universities … is governed by federal labor law, most significantly the National Labor Relations Act (NRLA)” (p. 186). Under NRLA, employers must bargain with the faculty over salary, hours worked, and other terms; but they do not have to bargain over the protections of academic freedom. Either side may opt to not discuss topics as well, making collective bargaining unworkable at some private institutions.

In order to obtain faculty attitude toward collective bargaining, a questionnaire was mailed to 539 faculty members from various disciplines (Bigoness, 1978). A total of 222 faculty members completed and returned the questionnaires, a 41% response rate. “Faculty members who were highly involved in their jobs were found to be less favorably disposed toward collective bargaining than their less job-involved colleagues” (p. 232). This study indicated that the faculty members who were more involved at work
believed that the current set of policies and practices with regards to collective bargaining were satisfactory.

This research uncovered if the faculty members employed at private baccalaureate colleges and universities have collective bargaining on their campuses. Furthermore, this research revealed if faculty members were involved with the collective bargaining process on campus. Collective bargaining may or may not prove to be a predictor variable of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

**Faculty Contracts**

Collective bargaining was not the only tool devised to protect academic freedom at institutions of higher education. Faculty contracts were an alternative to collective bargaining. Faculty members who were employed at private institutions were bound by contracts, not by constitutional law. The contract indicated all of the teaching responsibilities and additional obligations for the academic year, including religious beliefs and codes of conduct (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). Some colleges have selected to use a letter as opposed to a contract. “Particularly for faculty at private colleges, contracts are a very important source of faculty and institutional rights and responsibilities” (Kaplin & Lee, 2007, p. 186).

Authors have noted that faculty contracts should contain additional information on teaching responsibilities and other obligations. Goonen and Blechman (1999) have stated that there should be “within the faculty
contract an official institutional statement that details the scope of academic
freedom within the institution, applicable restrictions, if any, and procedures
that would be followed to grieve the infringement of academic freedom” (p.
137). The document should also state “if the policy of the institution espouses
to the provisions of the AAUP 1940 Statement … a copy of the AAUP
statement should be provided in full” (p. 137).

The questionnaire created for this research inquired as to the existence
of faculty contracts on the campuses of private baccalaureate colleges and
universities. These contracts have been created to protect academic freedom,
along with describing the teaching responsibilities, other institutional
obligations, and regulations. Various private institutions use a letter of
intent rather than a contract, but both forms of communication should
contain information regarding the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on
Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Academic Freedom

Regardless of institutional type, faculty members must have the ability
to be freely engaged in the pursuit of knowledge. This pursuit of knowledge
may be achieved if academic freedom is protected. Academic freedom was
concerned with protecting faculty members’ rights to teach, to research, and
to publish. “Academic freedom allows educational institutions to pursue their
goals without interference from external entities and allows faculty within
educational environments to discover, disseminate, and advance knowledge
without interference from administrators and governing boards” (Smith, 2005, p. 24). In the following paragraphs, specific examples of academic freedom are examined.

**Freedom in publishing.** Faculty members must have the freedom to select topics and publish their research findings. “Publications are usually viewed as speech and afforded constitutional protection” in public institutions (Smith, 2005, p. 29). Unlike at public institutions, faculty at private colleges and universities are protected by contract law and the AAUP statements (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). Regardless of faculty members’ publications, the college administration may not retaliate in a negative fashion. Research and publications related to the faculty members’ area of specialty were protected by academic freedom. Research and publications were typically protected by faculty contracts as long as the faculty members do not include biased information.

**Freedom in teaching.** In outlining faculty rights in teaching, the 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure, the AAUP (2003) included all materials related to the faculty members’ area of specialty. This policy only covered the subject matter taught with regards to the course; outside information disseminated in the classroom was not protected by the AAUP policy.

Smith (2005) has commented on faculty members’ academic freedom in the classroom teaching.
Faculty members are usually given leeway to determine the appropriate teaching methods for their content and development of assignments to fulfill course objectives. Course content, teaching methods, learning exercises, and examination methods related to the subject matter are usually outside the realm of judicial analysis (Smith, p. 30).

Faculty members must ensure that their classroom discussion is directly related to their course content in order to be protected by the AAUP. It would not be in the best interest of faculty members to introduce controversial material that is unrelated to the course. Faculty should also have the freedom to teach without interruptions from students.

**Grading and evaluation.** College students have a tradition of challenging their professor’s grading policies. Unhappy with their own work, they often challenge the instructor, hoping to receive a higher mark. “Professors must follow their institution’s grading policies and procedures, including grading scale, submission of grades for review, and filing of grades on or before the deadline” (Smith, 2005, p. 34). Professors may not be forced to modify a grade that truly represents the student’s work. According to Smith (2005), the courts have not protected professors who fail to follow their institution’s grading policies. These grading policies should be included in the faculty handbook and governance documents.
In addition to grading procedures, faculty should abide by their institution’s policies regarding the evaluation of faculty. Faculty members may not agree with standardized or multiple choice evaluation forms, believing that these forms do not adequately review their work for the term completed (Smith). However, if faculty members want to remain employed by an institution and have their academic freedom protected, it is in their best interest to cooperate and use the selected evaluation forms. Administrators rely on the information collected from student evaluations in order to analyze faculty members from the students’ perspective. Using the forms protects academic freedom, since the forms are an example of the policies and practices implemented by the institution.

Curriculum. With regards to the course curriculum, the teaching methods utilized in class should not offend students, and the classroom subject matter should be presented in a neutral fashion (Smith, 2005). Students should be challenged to use logic to critique multiple sides of an issue or problem. On the other hand, students may contest the course curriculum if it violates their personal or moral beliefs (Smith). Some college courses examine language, persuasive communication, or discuss history—topics that may potentially offend students. As long as the professor presents the related course material in a professional manner, and does not call the students by a slang or derogatory word, the course content is protected (Smith). However, when a faculty member directs course content toward a
student in a negative fashion, problems arise. It is the primary goal of the faculty member to impart knowledge to the students in guiding them through the course. Attacking, insulting, or offending the students, hampers the attainment of this goal.

**Internet.** The Internet has enabled students and professors worldwide to access an abundance of material to further pursue knowledge, and consequently, has increased the depth of classroom discussion in both the physical classroom and online. Faculty members and students alike create web pages concerning their educational and personal interests. All faculty, staff, and students must heed the policies and practices related to Internet content when the content is related to an institution (Smith, 2005). This is especially true if the institution supplies the computers and the servers.

The AAUP (1997) has created statements on academic freedom and electronic communications. The “expression in cyberspace is obviously different in important ways from print or oral expression...such factors do not appear to justify alteration or dilution of basic principles of academic freedom and academic inquiry within the academic community” (AAUP, 1997, para. 2). Faculty members must be extremely careful when using the Internet for course curriculum. Personal communication allows the professor to clarify student questions immediately or to make a correction. Once a questionable e-mail is sent or posted on a college web page, further ramifications may follow. Some institutions require their faculty members to include a
disclaimer on their web page, indicating that the values of the page are not necessarily shared by the institution (Smith, 2005). The policies and practices concerning academic freedom should include information on how professors should conduct themselves in cyberspace in order to be protected.

**Extracurricular involvements.** Academic freedom for faculty members extends to extracurricular activities such as business consulting, freedom of association, writing editorials, and freedom of assembly with outside organizations such as political and religious groups. Faculty members who hold positions or work at an off-campus job not only benefit themselves, but their institution gains by their knowledge. These faculty members use the information gathered from their other job to enhance their classroom discussion and research. Their students not only read the course’s textbook, but they learn from real-life experiences of their professor—a more engaging and effective classroom method.

Faculty members are also protected in their extracurricular involvements with associations, writing editorials, and in protests (Smith, 2005). As long as these interactions do not violate institutional events or disturb functions, the faculty’s speech is protected under the Constitution. In the AAUP’s *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, faculty members who participate in extracurricular activities “should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they
are not speaking for the institution” (AAUP, 2003, para. 8). Faculty members must be careful in their extracurricular events, since the public—and even more so the students—associate a professor with his or her institution of employment, rather than viewing the professor as an individual simply speaking his or her mind.

Academic freedom encompasses the protections of teaching, researching, and publishing in one’s area of specialty. Faculty members need the freedom to select topics related to their area and to publish the findings. Faculty must have the protection to teach in their field, in a neutral fashion, without interruptions from students or the institution. The faculty members who follow institutional policies, including technology use, are typically protected by their institution. In addition, faculty members are protected in extracurricular involvements as long as they are not speaking for their institution. Faculty members need to heed the policies and practices created at their institutions to protect their academic freedom.

The Courts

Research has shown that the types of academic freedom court cases have changed over the years. Kaplin and Lee (1995) commented that “constitutional principles of academic freedom have developed into two stages, each occupying a distinct time period and including distinct types of cases” (p. 301). During the 1950s and 1960s, court cases concerning academic freedom dealt with faculties’ and institution’s freedom from political influence
(Kaplin & Lee, 1995). In these cases, the faculty members and the institution were on the same side versus the state. Three amendments were involved in these cases and under scrutiny: the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments. The First Amendment is concerned with the freedom of speech and association, the Fifth with “protection against self-incrimination,” and the Fourteenth with the guarantee of procedural due process (Kaplin & Lee, p. 301).

By the 1970s, however, there was a noticeable shift in court cases concerned with academic freedom. Now conflicts between the faculty and the institution were central. According to Kaplin and Lee (1995), the faculty wanted “freedom from institutional intrusion” (p. 301). The state was not involved in these court cases, but valid reasons for the existence of academic freedom were under question between the faculty members and the institutions that employed them.

Court cases. In the following paragraphs, two court cases related to academic freedom at institutions of higher education will be discussed. The court cases represent actual incidences of the violations of academic freedom.

The first case of academic freedom is *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (1957), which occurred at a public institution of higher education. A professor at the University of New Hampshire was under investigation for his involvement with communist organizations. Professor Sweezy refused to answer questions to the attorney general regarding his class discussions on socialism
and Marxism and on overthrowing the government (Brubacher, 1971).

Sweezy had “several affiliations with groups cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities” and “he was a coeditor of an article stating that although violence is abhorrent, it is less to be deplored when used by the Soviets than by capitalist countries” (Brubacher, p. 58).

Since the attorney general improperly questioned Sweezy and held him in contempt for refusal to answer the questions, the court reversed the decision. The attorney general had violated the professor’s rights of freedom of association and political expression. Professor Sweezy had a right to lecture and a right to associate with political groups.

The first academic freedom case involving a faculty member at a private institution is *Tilton v. Richardson* (1971). In this case, the courts were concerned with public funding and religious purposes. The Supreme Court upheld a decision to award Catholic colleges funding (O’Brien, 1994).

The court said that such grants could be made provided there was evidence that religion courses, if required, were taught according to academic requirements intrinsic to the subject matter, that teachers had a sense of professional standards, that the schools had adopted the AAUP policies on academic freedom and that there was at the school an atmosphere of academic freedom (O’Brien, p. 55).

The court cases are just two examples concerning academic freedom. Professors employed at private institutions of higher education must
carefully review their contracts, for the contracts were the most important protection. The contracts should specify how the professors conduct their business on campus and off. These contracts are key when issues arise involving the protection of academic freedom.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

For this study, there were two theoretical frameworks: attitude theory and involvement theory. Both the attitudes that have been developed over time and involvement with specific campus committees, faculty, and administration, impact how faculty members react in various situations. An overview of the connections between the theories and satisfaction with policies and practices concerning academic freedom are discussed. Attitude theory, the first theoretical framework, is concerned with the connections between past experiences and new events. The second framework, involvement theory, is related to the amount of time and energy faculty put into campus life.

**Attitude theory.** Attitude theory is a type of learning theory, which is based on behavior theory or the stimulus-response approach (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). “Learning theories are concerned with the processes whereby a given response becomes associated with (or conditioned to) a given stimulus” (Fishbein & Ajzen, p. 22). Attitude has been defined as “a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975, p. 6). Attitude theory
is concerned with attitudes that are developed over time due to past experiences.

Doob (1947) noted that an attitude is an “implicit response with drive strength which occurs within the individual as a reaction to stimulus patterns and which affects subsequent overt responses” (Doob, p. 136). When the attitude caused by the stimulus is shared by individuals, their responses can differ. For example, two faculty members may not like a third member and may show their attitude of disgust to each other in private. However, in public one may react by referring to the third faculty member in a positive fashion in public, whereas the other may avoid the person altogether at meetings.

Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) have noted that “an attitude represents a person’s general feeling of favorableness or unfavorableness toward some stimulus object” and “as a person forms beliefs about an object, he automatically and simultaneously acquires an attitude toward that object” (p. 216). Beliefs toward people, events, places, and objects have developed in the course of one’s lifetime. The beliefs have been created either through direct observation or information collected from reliable sources. These beliefs are not stagnant, they change as one becomes older or experiences new events.

There is a threshold for the number of beliefs that help to sustain an attitude. Five to nine salient beliefs are the determinants of one’s attitude toward a person, object, event, or place (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). As an
example of how these beliefs accumulate, suppose a faculty member who encounters a violation of academic freedom has firsthand experience with the feeling of disappointment and the frustration of anticipating another experience. Then if another reliable faculty member is subjected to a violation of academic freedom as well and shares the information with the first faculty member, the attitude concerning satisfaction with academic freedom becomes more negative and mistrusting. One way that these individuals might be able to modify their beliefs toward academic freedom is to become involved in creating and implementing policies and practices to protect academic freedom. Otherwise, the same negative beliefs may persist.

The notion that attitudes are learned is related to an individual's past experiences. The predispositions to react in a situation, either positively or negatively, are based on the results of past behavior. Attitude formation is the “consequences of the behavior, such as monetary rewards, punishments, social approval or disapproval, and on the effort involved in performing the behavior, as well as on social pressures to perform or abstain from performing it” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975, p. 10).

Basically, faculty members’ personal and environmental factors work off of each other to determine their behavior in situations. By the time the faculty members complete this satisfaction questionnaire on academic freedom, they have experienced years of personal and environmental experiences in their work world that have created their internal processes.
Every reaction to the questionnaire was unique and based on past experiences. Faculty members cannot control external sources, such as college or university rules or their peers’ actions, but they do base their reactions on these sources.

Attitude theory was one of the input measures in Astin’s (1991) I-E-O data analysis framework for this study. Attitude theory enabled me to discover if faculty’s past experiences were an indicator of satisfaction with academic freedom. The more experience a faculty member had with the creation and implementation of the policies and practices related to academic freedom, the more satisfied he or she should be due to the involvement. This satisfaction should be positive, as long as the interaction from the past was positive.

Faculty behaviors may be influenced by past negative interactions that will decrease their level of satisfaction with academic freedom. Attitude theory is connected with faculty member’s satisfaction with academic freedom due to their past experiences in academia. For example, a faculty member may have had a negative experience with academic freedom, such as the loss of freedom to select course materials.

**Involvement theory.** The second theoretical framework in this study is Alexander Astin’s (1985) involvement theory, which applies to both students and faculty. Involvement theory states that faculty members “learn by becoming involved” (Astin, p. 133). Those in academic environments have
the option of choosing the level of time spent participating in campus life and interacting with other people on campus. This level of involvement with campus life will determine how successful the faculty member will be. Also, involvement helps maximize the development of cognitive and affective outcomes, one of which is satisfaction. Research has found that faculty members who are more involved in campus life are more satisfied overall with the institution (Astin, 1991).

For the purposes of this study, involvement refers to a faculty member’s involvement in developing and implementing policies and practices on academic freedom. Involved faculty members directly impact the level of protection other faculty have had during their employment. They have had a thorough understanding of the policies and practices and are apt to be satisfied with academic freedom due to their involvement. This involvement helps faculty members to develop talent, which is an academic outcome. If a violation of academic freedom occurs, these faculty members are pivotal in correcting the issue and assisting other faculty so that further infractions do not occur.

Both the quantity and quality of involvement with academic freedom are crucial. Astin (1985) has noted that “the amount of ... learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of ... involvement in that program” (p. 136). It follows that faculty who spend numerous and quality hours
working on the creation and implementation of policies and practices related to academic freedom have a higher level of satisfaction with and a positive attitude toward academic freedom. In addition, are more aware of these policies and practices, while those who are not as involved are not as knowledgeable about them.

The two theoretical frameworks for this study were attitude theory and involvement theory. Attitude theory is a learning theory that is focused on a person’s attitude that has developed over time through similar experiences. This theory was selected for this research because faculty members may or may not have developed an attitude toward the policies and practices related to academic freedom, which may influence their satisfaction. The second theory for this research, involvement theory, is concerned with the amount learned by being involved in a campus environment. Faculty members who have been involved with the creation and implementation of the policies and practices related to academic freedom may or may not be more satisfied if they were involved. These theoretical frameworks allowed this research to determine if past experiences and the faculty involvement with academic freedom are related to satisfaction with the policies and practices addressing academic freedom.

Data Analysis Framework

Astin’s (1991) I-E-O Model served as the data analysis framework for this study. The I-E-O Model or input-environment-outcome model enables
researchers “to produce information on how outcomes are affected by different educational policies and practices” (Astin, 1991, p. 37). The outcome for this study was faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. The educational policies and practices in this research were those policies and practices created to protect academic freedom.

The I-E-O Model is comprised of three main parts: input measures, environmental measures, and outcomes. “Input and outcome refer simply to the state of the person at two different time points, and environment refers to the intervening experiences” (Astin, 1991, p. 22). The input measures have been defined as “fixed or invariant characteristics...and characteristics that can change over time” (Astin, 1991, p. 70). The input measures for this study are faculty demographics of sex and race and the faculty work attributes of faculty rank, tenure status, number of years at the current institution, academic rank, academic discipline, administrative position, and past work experiences, principal activity in current role, member of the faculty senate, and holding office in the faculty senate. Past work experiences are related to attitude theory, which states that behavior is developed over time by experiencing similar situations.

The environmental measures in the I-E-O Model “encompass everything that happens...during the course of an educational program that might conceivably influence the outcomes under consideration” (Astin, p. 81). The two types of environmental measures in this model are: between-college
and within-college measures. In this research, the between-college measures are characteristics of particular institutions, such as their size, location, religious affiliation, faculty senates, tenure, contracts, letters of intent, and collective bargaining. These measurements are fixed and cannot be changed. Within-college measures are educational experiences. For the purposes of this study, the within-college measures are the policies and practices concerning academic freedom, faculty involvement in creating and implementing those policies and procedures, faculty experience with violations of academic freedom, and faculty experience with academic freedom, both past and present. Both the quantity and the quality of involvement in these measures are important.

The I-E-O Model has two types of outcomes: cognitive and affective (Astin, 1991). Cognitive outcomes are related to reason and logic, while affective outcomes center on attitudes and feelings. In this study, the focus was on an affective outcome, namely, satisfaction with academic freedom, which was determined from the questionnaire completed by faculty members. Within the I-E-O data analysis framework, two theoretical frameworks were used in this study: attitude theory and involvement theory. Attitude theory comes into play in the faculty demographics, or input measures, used in this study. Involvement theory is one of the within-college measures in the Environmental Measures section of Astin’s conceptual framework.
Faculty Demographics

The faculty demographics selected for this study were sex and race. These demographics are input measures which faculty members bring with them in their roles. These characteristics may or may not impact their experiences with academic freedom. This research attempted to discover if faculty members’ sex and race impact their satisfaction with academic freedom.

Faculty Work Attributes

Faculty work attributes are the input measures utilized in this study: faculty rank, number of years at the current institution, academic discipline, administrative position, principal activity in current role, member of the faculty senate, and holding office in the faculty senate. These input measures are those items which faculty members bring with them to their experiences with academic freedom. In this exploratory research, I was trying to discover if any of these input measures were related to faculty satisfaction with the policies and practices concerning academic freedom.

Faculty rank. Faculty rank, whether professor, associate or assistant professor, may play a vital role in faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. Those individuals with tenure or contracts may believe that they are safe and therefore are satisfied with academic freedom. However, if any faculty member regardless of rank, has experienced a violation of academic freedom,
it is likely that he or she will not feel protected and therefore may be dissatisfied with academic freedom.

**Number of years at the current institution.** The faculty members selected to complete the questionnaire for this study were asked the number of years that they were employed at their current institution. This exploratory research may or may not show if the number of years employed at an institution influences faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. In addition, I was interested to learn if the faculty members with a higher number of years working at an institution would have a direct relationship for satisfaction with academic freedom.

**Academic discipline.** Faculty in the sample for this study represented four main academic disciplines: Fine or Performing Arts, the Humanities, the Natural Sciences, and the Social Sciences. These four academic disciplines were selected because each discipline is likely to exist at the private baccalaureate colleges and universities under study. Biglan (1973) has divided academic disciplines into two task areas: hard and soft. The disciplines are also considered pure or applied and non-life system or life system related. Faculty who work in the hard disciplines have been found by Biglan (1973) to be higher in connectedness; that is, they teach, research, and publish with other faculty. The hard disciplines for this study are the sciences like Chemistry, Physics, or Biology. The soft disciplines are the Social Sciences, and the Fine and Performing Arts. This study attempted to
uncover if the academic discipline of a faculty member influenced their satisfaction with academic freedom.

**Administrative position.** Administrative position is one of the work attributes that may impact faculty members’ satisfaction with academic freedom. Examples of administrative positions include, but are not limited to department chair and dean. According to Seagren, Creswell, and Wheeler (1993) there are “four major role areas for chairs: faculty, coordinator, researcher, and instructor” (p. 67).

Academic deans hold an additional leadership role in the protections of academic freedom. “The dean who understands and respects the role of faculty governance in higher education will be able to involve faculty in the essential business of planning and achieving goals for the college” (Bright and Richards, 2001, p. 16). This study attempted to learn if administrative role impacts faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

**Principal activity in current role.** Faculty members’ principal activity in their current role is another work attribute for this study. Examples of this work attribute are being an administrator, teaching, publishing, researching, or conducting services to clients and patients. This exploratory research attempted to discover if a faculty member’s principal activity impacts their satisfaction with academic freedom.

**Involvement with faculty senate.** Faculty involvement with faculty senate and holding a position in faculty senate are two work attributes for
this study. Astin (1985) has noted that individuals in a campus community learn through involvement. In addition, Astin (1991) has found that the more a faculty member is involved in campus life, more the faculty member will be satisfied with the institution. This exploratory research attempted to learn if faculty members involved with faculty senate or if holding a position in faculty senate influenced satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices.

Faculty members’ work attributes may prove to influence their satisfaction with academic freedom. Faculty rank, academic discipline, number of years at the current institution, tenure status, administrative position, principal activity in the current role, involvement in faculty senate, and holding a position in the faculty senate are the work attributes under observation for this research. This research attempted to discover which of the above variables, if any, influenced faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

Summary

The AAUP’s continuing role in the protection of academic freedom and tenure is a key element in institutions of higher education. Its 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure outlines the principle protections that faculty members need in order to fulfill their roles. In addition to the AAUP and the 1940 Statements, faculty collective bargaining and contracts are two important facets in private baccalaureate
colleges and universities that play a part in protecting academic freedom. Faculty must carefully read their contracts, which should outline the policies and practices related to academic freedom. Numerous court cases deal with academic freedom and public institutions, but very few involve private institutions. This is why the current research is warranted: to gain valuable knowledge on academic freedom issues in private institutions of higher education.

There is also a lack of research on faculty members’ work attributes that may impact their satisfaction with academic freedom, although I was able to locate many empirical studies on faculty and job satisfaction. Also, institutional characteristics were studied to learn if they have an influence on faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. Astin’s I-E-O Model was utilized as the data analysis framework in order to discover if the work attributes and environmental measures influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. The conceptual framework for this study was developed from the data analysis framework and two theoretical frameworks, attitude theory and involvement theory, to unveil this information.

In the following chapter, Chapter Three, Methodology, the questionnaire and its administration is explained, the faculty population to complete the questionnaire is described, and the study’s limitations are explored. Finally, the methods used to analyze the information collected complete the chapter.
Chapter Three

Methodology

This chapter reviews the methods to be used in this study of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. The sections in this chapter include the theoretical frameworks, the data analysis framework, the conceptual framework, the questionnaire participants, the questionnaire development, the questionnaire methodology, questionnaire design and administration, data collection and data analysis, the assumptions, the limitations of the methodology, and the summary. In order to gain knowledge about faculty satisfaction with academic freedom, an original questionnaire was created. The Higher Education Research Institute’s 2004–2005 Faculty Survey was examined for assistance with questions regarding demographic information and environmental variables (The Higher Education Research Institute, 2004). The questionnaire was designed to follow the conceptual framework for this study, which is based on Astin’s (1991) I-E-O model and incorporates two theories: attitude theory and involvement theory.

Theoretical Frameworks

The two theoretical frameworks used in this study were attitude theory and involvement theory. Attitude theory is a learning theory that is
based on repeated behaviors associated with a specific person, object, or experience (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). This theory was selected for conducting research on academic freedom because it takes into account the past experiences that faculty have had in examining influences on their current satisfaction with academic freedom.

Involvement theory is concerned with the amount of time and energy one puts into the college experience (Astin, 1985). For the purposes of this study, involvement theory refers to faculty members’ level of involvement with the creation and implementation of the policies and practices related to academic freedom. I was curious to learn about faculty members who have had experience in developing policies and practices regarding academic freedom who should be more satisfied overall with academic freedom on their campuses than those faculty who have had no experience with developing these policies and practices.

**Data Analysis Framework**

The data analysis framework for this study was Astin’s (1991) input-environment-outcome (I-E-O) model, which takes into consideration the characteristics that individuals, here faculty members, bring with them into the college or university environment. The model is designed to study the impact that both input and environmental measures have on an outcome. “Because inputs are related to both outputs and environments, any observed relationship between environments and outcomes might well reflect the
effects of inputs rather than the actual effects of environments on outcomes” (Astin, 1991, p. 64). The educational policies and practices in this research were those associated with academic freedom, and the outcome was faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

Input measures have been defined as “fixed or invariant characteristics … and characteristics that can change over time” (Astin, 1991, p. 70). Input measures that were used in this are study faculty demographics, work attributes, and past experiences with academic freedom.

The environmental measures in the I-E-O Model “encompass everything that happens … during the course of an educational program that might conceivably influence the outcomes under consideration” (Astin, 1991, p. 81). There are two types of environmental measures: between-college and within-college measures. In this research, the between-college measures are characteristics of the institutions in which the faculty respondents are working, including size, location, religious affiliation, institutional race, faculty senates, tenure, letters of intent, contracts, and collective bargaining.

“A major limitation of between-college measures is that they are generally designed to assess the environment of a total institution rather than the environment actually encountered by individual[s] within that institution” (Astin, p. 91). Most of these between-colleges measurements proposed for this study are relatively fixed and are not likely to change.
Within-college measures are educational experiences. “Most within-institution environmental variables cut across the formal organizational subunits within the institution” (Astin, 1991, p. 92). For the purposes of this study, the within-college measures will be the institutional policies and practices concerning academic freedom, faculty involvement in creating and implementing those policies and procedures, and faculty current experience with academic freedom. I was curious to discover if the greater the quantity and quality of faculty involvement in the creation and implementation of academic freedom policies and practices led to the positive outcome of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom is diagrammed in Figure 2. Astin’s (1991) input-environment-outcome (I-E-O) model was the foundation upon which the conceptual framework was built. The conceptual framework for this study utilized three main sections: inputs, environmental measures, and outcomes. Each section is explained in the paragraphs that follow.

The first section of the I-E-O model included input characteristics and the application of attitude theory. Inputs in this study were faculty demographics, work attributes, and past experiences with academic freedom. This initial section also incorporated attitude theory, which is concerned with consistent learned notions, whether positive or negative, held regarding an
object, person, or event (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). The intent of this series of questions was to gather information about past experiences with regards to academic freedom. The focus of this study was the attitude developed toward academic freedom. These past experiences with academic freedom that faculty bring with them to the job are an input.

The environmental measures are in the second section of the conceptual framework. There are two types of environmental measures, between-college and within-college. The between-college measures were the institution’s demographic characteristics: institutional size, location, race, religious affiliation, faculty senates, tenure, contracts, letters of intent, and collective bargaining. The within-college measures included the policies and practices related to academic freedom, faculty involvement with the development and implementation of policies and practices related to academic freedom, the inclusion or omission of the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure in faculty handbooks, and experience with violations of academic freedom. According to Astin (1985), the greater the involvement of the faculty member, the greater his or her satisfaction with the institution. For the purposes of this study, involvement referred to faculty involvement in creating and implementing the policies and practices related to academic freedom. I anticipated that the greater the faculty members have been involved with the development and
implementation of policies and practices related to academic freedom, the
greater their satisfaction was with academic freedom.

Within-college measures were important to study, since individual
faculty members have encountered unique communities at their institutions.
In regards to within-college variables, Astin (1991) has also noted that
although “institutions do not ordinarily record such information in any
systematic fashion, it offers the greatest opportunity for learning how
particular educational experiences affect ... development” (p. 93).

The third and final section of the conceptual framework is the outcome.
Outcomes may be cognitive or affective (Astin, 1991). Cognitive outcomes are
based on learning and academic achievement, and affective outcomes are
concerned with attitudes and satisfaction (Astin, 1991). For the purposes of
this research, the affective outcome is faculty satisfaction with academic
freedom.

The conceptual framework for the study has been selected based on the
fact that all of the faculty members who complete the questionnaire bring
with them characteristics, or inputs, and past experiences with academic
freedom. In addition, as they work in various college environments, they
continue to develop attitudes toward their experiences. In order to gain
valuable knowledge concerning the influences on faculty satisfaction with
academic freedom, the conceptual framework took into consideration both
input and environmental variables that are guessed to influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

**Questionnaire Participants**

The selection of participants who completed the questionnaire is based on the Carnegie Classification of private baccalaureate colleges (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2006b). A total of 338 institutions are classified in this category. From each of these institutions, four full-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty members who teach in the fields of Social Sciences, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Fine or Performing Arts, and the Humanities were selected at random. I hoped to obtain a representative sample of faculty members from each of these major disciplinary groupings and from each of the institutions. A total of 1,352 faculty members received the questionnaire. Faculty ranks were professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. Since a national directory does not exist to obtain a list of faculty at the institutions used for this research, I visited the websites of all 338 institutions to create a database of names and departments. Campus addresses were obtained using the *Higher Education Directory* (HEP Directory) (Higher Education Publication, 2007). Once the faculty names and addresses were obtained, the mailing was sent from The University of Toledo. A mail merge was conducted to create the mailing labels for the faculty respondents.
After visiting the 338 web pages, I had to reduce the number of private baccalaureate colleges and universities for this study to 316. Twenty-two of the institutions were not used for the purposes of this research due to issues such as: lack of faculty names on the web page, the institution no longer is in existence, there were limited academic disciplines on the web page, and if the web page was entirely written in another language than English. Even with these complications, I believed that there were an adequate number of respondents for this study.

I selected faculty members by four disciplines: Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and the Fine and Performing Arts. A total of four faculty members per institution were chosen, one from each discipline. General disciplines were used for commonality, and I rotated the disciplines every fourth institution. The four Humanities’ disciplines were History, Philosophy, English, and Foreign Language. The Social Science disciplines were Sociology, Political Science, Psychology, and Economics. For the Natural Sciences disciplines, I selected Physics, Biology, Chemistry, and Mathematics. Finally, the four disciplines for the Fine and Performing Arts were Theatre, Dance, Music, and Art.

Two men and two women were selected per institution, if possible, in order to have gender representation. Also, two tenured and two non-tenured faculty were selected per institution in order to obtain responses from both groups at the institutions under study. The tenured positions were titled
either professor or associate professor and the non-tenured positions were assistant professors. Various institutions did not include title or rank, and this is why I included questions regarding these topics on the questionnaire. If the desired faculty member could not be located from the web page, I substituted by using another academic discipline from the list in order to be consistent.

**Questionnaire Development**

An original questionnaire was developed for this study. The questionnaire is based on the HERI Faculty Survey and two theoretical frameworks. I selected the demographic questions from the HERI survey. The two theoretical frameworks, attitude theory and involvement theory, helped me to develop questions for the questionnaire. Attitude theory is concerned with repeated behaviors that are displayed with specific items or experiences (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Questions relating to past experiences with academic freedom are linked to attitude theory.

Astin’s (1985) involvement theory is connected to the concept that faculty members learn by becoming involved. Questions on the questionnaire that are related to involvement theory inquire about faculty members’ experience with violations of academic freedom and their experiences with creating and implementing the policies and practices to protect academic freedom.
There are numerous questions on the questionnaire that have to do with violations of academic freedom. The majority of court cases discussed in Kaplin and Lee’s (2007) book on law and higher education mainly involve public institutions of higher education. I was able to only locate two court cases that deal with academic freedom and private institutions.

There is a lack of empirical research on faculty satisfaction with academic freedom in private baccalaureate colleges and universities. Since there is a void in the research on this topic, I examined various aspects of academic freedom in order to create questions. Questions on academic freedom were based on Smith’s (2005) and the AAUP’s discussions on the freedoms of teaching, researching, publishing, along with freedom in extracurricular involvements. After examining the literature on academic freedom, I believe that the questionnaire is an excellent instrument for obtaining information on this topic.

**Questionnaire Methodology**

Because obtaining the level of faculty satisfaction with policies and procedures concerning academic freedom is the purpose of this study, all of the questions were constructed to focus on faculty perspectives on academic freedom. Faculty members self-reported about their current and past experiences with academic freedom. The faculty members who choose to complete the questionnaire may do so in private and at their own pace. I did
not have to contact the questionnaire participants personally, given that interviews are not going to be a research component of this study.

Quantitative studies focus on discovering outcomes and products, relationships, effects, and causes. They are concerned with individual variables and use statistical analysis (Wiersma, 2000). This study attempted to explore the impact from individual variables inherent in the faculty and the institutions, faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. This study used quantitative research due to its deductive nature and the need to rely on statistical analysis.

Qualitative research was not selected for purposes of this research because of its foundation in understanding a social phenomenon (Wiersma, 2000). Qualitative research, unlike quantitative research, is inductive, is concerned with holistic inquiry, is context-specific, and uses narrative as the data to be gathered (Wiersma). In qualitative research, the researcher takes an active role with the subjects in the study.

Questionnaire research, which was utilized in this study, has been defined as “research that deals with the incidence, distribution, and relationships of educational, psychological, and sociological variables in nonexperimental settings” (Wiersma, 2000, p. 461). A paper form of the questionnaire has been chosen over other forms. A study conducted by Hayslett and Wildemuth (2004) compared the response rates of a mail questionnaire, an electronic questionnaire announced by mail, and an
electronic questionnaire announced by e-mail. A total of 300 respondents were selected and divided into three equal groups. Each group received one of the aforementioned questionnaire options. “The overall response rate was 14 percentage points higher for the paper survey than for the two Web survey groups (combined), suggesting that paper-and-pencil surveys still hold the advantage in response rate over Web surveys” (p. 88). One reason for Hayslett and Wildemuth’s research findings is probably that a paper form is more noticeable, since fewer paper letters and questionnaires are sent in this technological era. There are additional benefits to paper form questionnaires as opposed to electronic forms (Hayslett & Wildemuth, 2004). Respondents have the option to include comments about the questions, if they have concerns. Also, the respondents are able to provide “different answers to the same question to illustrate the different ways of interpreting it, or extensive comments to explain their answers” (p. 90). Electronic questionnaires do not allow the respondents to make these comments nor to draw diagrams or additional marks on the questionnaire indicating concerns (Hayslett & Wildemuth).

A paper form of the questionnaire is also preferable to an oral questionnaire over the phone. One advantage of a paper form is that it allows for a large number of responses in a relatively short timeframe of about four weeks, whereas surveying more than a thousand people via the phone would require months. In addition, the paper form of this
questionnaire did not only avoid the cost of long distance phone calls but also eliminated the stress and waste of time incurred by having to leave messages and wait for return calls.

Overall, the paper form of the questionnaire was efficient and effective. Once the questionnaires were collected, the data was entered manually into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis purposes.

**Questionnaire Design**

The questionnaire, which is divided into a total of 15 sections, was used in this study is based on the conceptual framework (see Appendix B) found in Figure 2. Each section of the questionnaire represented a specific section from the conceptual framework.

The first set of questions on the questionnaire is related to college characteristics, such as the existence of faculty senates, collective bargaining, contracts, letters of intent, and tenure. These measures are considered between-college environmental measures, since they are concerned with academic freedom policies and practices at the institutions under review.

The between-college measures for this study are institutional characteristics—such as institutional size, location, institutional religious affiliation, and race—all of which will be obtained from IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey data (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). Both between-college and within-college measures were included in the
questionnaire because Astin (1991) has demonstrated that both types of measures have been known to influence the outcome of a study.

The second set of questions was compiled from faculty experiences serving on committees, mediation or informal resolutions, faculty experiences with violations of academic freedom on their current campuses, changes made to policies and practices related to academic freedom, and faculty involvement in developing and implementing policies and practices.

The third set of questions is concerned with the within-college environmental measures of institutional policies and practices. Faculty members were asked about the frequency that their current institution experiences violations and grievances with academic freedom. Also, they were asked to respond to what changes, if any, have been made to policies and practices, due to the violations.

The policies and practices created to protect academic freedom at current institutions is the topic in the fourth set of questions. These within-college environmental measures include the subjects of clear language on the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure in faculty handbooks, the protection of academic freedom in contracts, letters of intent, and faculty senate involvement in developing policies and practices to protect academic freedom. Involvement theory is connected to the environmental measures in this research. Astin’s (1985) involvement theory is the basis for the inquiry of these environmental factors. More specifically,
a highly motivated faculty member would put a lot of time and
energy into teaching activities, regularly seek out student advises to
monitor their progress, actively participate in departmental and
institutional functions, and make a conscious effort to integrate
research and teaching activities (Astin, 1985, p. 134).

Faculty members’ level of involvement with the policies and practices related
to academic freedom was investigated in order to discern its impact on faculty
satisfaction with academic freedom. The following section contains three
questions, all related to the within-college measures of faculty support from
current college and university administrators, deans, and department chairs.

The sixth set of questions is concerned with the subject of faculty
members’ past work experiences, the input measures connected with attitude
theory. Faculty members are first asked if a violation had occurred at a past
institution. If they answered yes, they had three more questions to answer in
this section: how the violation impacted their stay at the college or
university, if the policies and practices related to academic freedom were
modified, and if they were a part of this process.

The next set of questions ask faculty about the campus climate and
academic freedom. Faculty are asked to respond to the questions regarding
support from the administration in sustaining the protections of academic
freedom, how other faculty believe academic freedom is protected, and if
faculty at the current institution believe that they are able to make change to the policies and procedures related to academic freedom.

The eighth set of questions consists of within-college environmental measures concerning the current level of satisfaction with academic freedom in the areas of teaching, conducting research, and publishing in one’s research area, selecting content for lectures and assignments, grading students, developing course content, selecting topics for publication, involving oneself with extracurricular activities, writing editorials, designing web pages, writing campus e-mails, using college-provided evaluation forms, and freedom in participating with off-campus groups. These variables are included in the study because they are historically areas where academic freedom has come into play (Smith, 2005). Faculty members must heed the policies and practices in place to protect academic freedom in order to remain in good standing with their institutions. The HERI Faculty Survey helped me in selecting variables for this set of questions. The HERI Faculty Survey includes questions such as “Do you use your scholarship to address local community needs?”, “Engaged in paid consulting outside of your institution?”, and “Engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay?”, which are all related to academic freedom policies and practices (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004, p. 2).

The next two questions on the questionnaire served as the outcome of the study: ‘How satisfied are faculty with current policies regarding
academic freedom? and ‘How satisfied are faculty with current practices regarding academic freedom?’. In order to answer these questions, faculty members responded using a scale of one through 10, with 10 being the highest level of satisfaction with academic freedom. For the purposes of this research, the outcome was faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

The eleventh set of questions on the questionnaire is concerned with the faculty members’ current institutional religious affiliation. There was a total of four questions in this section, including the requirement of religious foundations in the curriculum, signing a statement agreeing to not teach against the institution’s religion, being a member of the institution’s religion to work there, and if there have been any violations of academic freedom at their institution due to religion. All of these questions are between-college measures related to institutional policies and practices.

The following section also consisted of a question related to the between-college measure of religious affiliation. Questionnaire participants are asked to respond using a scale of one through 10, with 10 being highest level of religious control at the faculty members’ current institution.

The next section is composed of two questions concerning a faculty work attribute, their involvement in faculty senates. If faculty members did not have a senate at their current institution, they were asked to move on to the next section. Faculty were asked about their membership in the faculty senate and if they hold an office in their senate.
The input measures, or the items that faculty members bring with them to an institution, are included in the next section of the questionnaire. By collecting this information, I developed an accurate description of the faculty members who completed the questionnaire. The items in this section included faculty work attributes such as faculty rank and administrative position, past work experiences, number of years working at the current institution, tenure status, and principal activity such as being an administrator, teaching, publishing, researching, and service to clients and patients.

The final section of the questionnaire contained two questions on faculty demographics: sex and race. These input measures proved to be relevant in this study’s research. The final question in this section was not a demographic question, it simply inquired to the faculty about receiving this study’s results via mail.

The input measures are characteristics that were included to control for their biasing influence on the outcome variable. “It is important to control as many input measures as possible in order to minimize bias in assessing the impact of college environments on … outcomes” (Astin, 1991, p. 80). Attitude theory suggests the inclusion of past experiences with academic freedom in the conceptual framework. This theory is concerned with consistent learned notions toward a person, an object, or an event (Fishbein
and Ajzen, 1975). The notions or sometimes interactions may be positive or negative.

According to Astin (1991), “the principal reason that input measures need to be controlled in studies of environmental effects is because inputs tend to be related to both outcome measures and environmental measures” (p. 74). This means that certain input measures are known to be associated with environmental measures (Astin, 1991). Many of these input variables were selected after I reviewed the Higher Education Research Institute’s (HERI) 2004 Faculty Survey (The Higher Education Research Institute). Faculty work attributes and demographic characteristics were the topics directly borrowed from the HERI Faculty Survey and were used in the questionnaire created for the present research.

**Questionnaire Administration**

The initial mailing of the questionnaires was sent in the spring semester of 2009. The mailing consisted of a cover letter (see Appendix A), the questionnaire instrument (see Appendix B), an adult consent form (see Appendix C), and a self-addressed stamped envelope. A 25% rate of return was necessary for sufficient data collection and analyzing. Since sufficient data was not collected, a second-wave mailing via e-mail was sent out a month following the first-wave mailing. The mailing was coded so that I knew who completed the questionnaires during the first wave.
Quantitative data was collected from the questionnaires, since the questions were all close-ended. Variables used in this study, such as the inputs and environmental measures, were chosen in order to learn about their influence, if any, on the dependent variable: faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

Data Collection

A mailing of 1,264 questionnaires was sent out in the spring semester 2009, to faculty members who worked at private baccalaureate colleges and universities. Four faculty members at each institution were chosen at random from the broad categories of the Social Sciences, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Fine or Performing Arts, and the Humanities. In regards to questionnaire distribution, Wiersma (2004) has stated that sending “a copy of the questionnaire along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope should be included” in the mailing (p. 177). The return envelopes and the questionnaires were coded by a numeric system, enabling me to keep track of who returned the questionnaire. This eliminated sending a second mailing to those who had already completed the questionnaire, and also allowed me to add IPEDS data to each respondent’s record of institutional characteristics, including institutional size, location, race, and religious affiliation. All responses were kept confidential. I sought approval from The University of Toledo Investigational Review Board in order to send out the mail.
questionnaire on academic freedom. The adult consent form signified my approval to use the information gathered.

**Data Analysis**

I conducted frequency distributions in order to gain a general understanding of the faculty members who have completed the questionnaire, and for the institutional characteristics variables. All of the information collected from the questionnaires was used to answer the research questions.

Learning about the independent variables that impact the dependent variable of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom was accomplished by using a blocked form of stepwise, multiple regression. This method demonstrated which independent variables, if any, impacted the dependent variable. The independent variables were those variables in the input and environmental sections of the conceptual framework (see Figure 2).

There was a total of three sections for this study: faculty demographics and work attribute characteristics, institutional characteristics, and experiences with academic freedom (see Figure 3). The conceptual framework was utilized to group the variables used in this research. By separating the input and environmental measures, I obtained a clear picture of the variables, if any, that emerged as significant predictors of the outcome of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.
Assumptions

As the researcher, I had numerous assumptions for this study. First, I assumed that the faculty members who completed the questionnaire answered the questions honestly. They had the ability to complete the questionnaire in the privacy of their office, home, or elsewhere; therefore the results should have been reliable.

I also assumed that the faculty members who completed the questionnaire believed that academic freedom was an important issue. The results from the questionnaire then provided empirical evidence about whether or not the faculty members were satisfied with the policies and practices related to academic freedom.

Faculty members who worked at a religious institution may not have had issues with academic freedom, due to the nature of their college or university. Faculty members who choose to work at these institutions may have been in agreement with the institutional policies and practices that guide academic freedom. These individuals may have accepted their positions based on the religious nature of the institution, and they understood that all of their involvements with academic freedom must have abided by the religious foundations of the college or university.

Another assumption was related to faculty tenure. Those with tenure may have had a positive attitude toward academic freedom, since they may have believed that they were protected by their tenure status.
Limitations of the Methodology

The quantitative nature of this study created limitations. The cross-sectional design was a limitation since the faculty members were questioned only at one point in time. A longitudinal study would have allowed faculty members to be surveyed two or more times over months, or even years, and thus would demonstrate if the faculty members’ attitudes changed over time.

A qualitative study would have permitted me to obtain personal, in-depth stories. These stories would have shed light on issues that I did not anticipate. Qualitative research also would have enabled me to discover
trends among the answers, if they arose. In-person communication would also have allowed me to ask additional questions.

The lack of a mixed-method study or a combination of quantitative and qualitative research was in itself a limitation of the methodology. By using both types of research, I would have been able to collect in-depth information over a period of time. Unfortunately, I did not have the time or the resources to conduct this sort of study.

Summary

In this chapter the methods utilized in the study concerning faculty satisfaction with academic freedom were discussed. This chapter reviewed the theoretical framework, the data analysis framework, the conceptual framework, the participants, the questionnaire, the questionnaire design, the number of waves, the data collection, the data analysis, the assumptions, and the summary. A total of 1,264 faculty members received the original questionnaire created for this research. The first wave of mailing was sent out in the spring semester 2009. It was hoped that 25% of the faculty who received the mailing would have completed and returned it. Since less than 25% of the questionnaires were returned, a second mailing via e-mail was sent one month later.

I hoped to shed some light on the specific input and environmental variables from Astin’s (1991) I-E-O model that impacted the outcome, faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. It was hoped that this exploratory
research would benefit not only the faculty members, but the administrators who create and implement college policies.

In the next chapter, Chapter Four, the data is analyzed in detail. Answers to the seven research questions are given at that time. The final chapter, Chapter Five, concludes with the discussion of findings, implications for theory, policy, and practices, and conclusions.
Chapter Four

Analysis of Data

Chapter Four examines the data gathered from faculty members employed at private baccalaureate colleges and universities across the United States. The questionnaire utilized in this study inquired about faculty members’ experiences and satisfaction with the policies and practices related to academic freedom. Several faculty inputs, between-college and within-college measures, and questions about the outcome, faculty satisfaction with academic freedom, were included in the questionnaire for this research. As stated in Chapter Three, 56 variables were selected for the data analysis. The variables were divided into three blocks, including: (a) faculty demographics and work attributes, (b) institutional characteristics, such as policies, practices, and institutional demographics, and (c) faculty experiences with academic freedom.

This chapter first presents the piloting of the questionnaire. The seven research questions are listed, and the statistical information on the population and on the respondents is presented. The characteristics of the questionnaire participants and institutions are outlined, followed by information on the dependent variable. The remainder of the chapter
outlines results from the blocked form of stepwise regression, which was conducted by entering all three blocks of variables into the SPSS program to identify the significant predictors for satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. A summary concludes the chapter.

Piloting of the Study

Since an original questionnaire was created, it was necessary for me to have the instrument piloted by faculty members not included in the study. Four faculty members from the same institution, one from each of the general academic disciplines selected for the study, were asked to complete the questionnaire prior to the disbursement of the mailing. The faculty members completed the questionnaire at their own pace and indicated that they understood the purpose of the study through the cover letter and questionnaire.

The four faculty members who piloted this study inquired about the respondents’ ability to contact me for clarification with the questionnaire. I explained that communication via phone or e-mail would allow the respondents to make contact for clarification. Twenty of the subsequent questionnaire respondents did e-mail me with questions regarding the questionnaire. Questionnaire respondents were unclear about the definition for letters of intent item on the questionnaire and were unsure if I wanted responses from those who were new employees at their institution. E-mailing
questionnaire respondents was an efficient way to communicate and permitted me to answer their questions.

One of the faculty members who piloted the study asked me what the incentive was for completing the questionnaire. I added the final question on the questionnaire, inquiring if respondents wanted study results via mail. By adding this question to the questionnaire, I hoped to gather additional responses. I believed that if respondents were able to receive the results, they would be more likely to complete the questionnaire. One hundred ninety-two, or 58% of the questionnaire respondents, indicated that they wanted to receive the results of the study; the other 138, or 41.7% of the questionnaire respondents, did not want to receive the results.

**Review of the Research Questions**

The research questions that this study addressed are the following:

1. What faculty demographics, if any, influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?
2. What faculty work attributes, if any, influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?
3. What past experiences, if any, influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?
4. What academic disciplines, if any, influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?
5. What college characteristics, if any, influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

6. What college or university policies and practices created to protect academic freedom, if any, influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

7. What types of involvement with creating and implementing academic freedom policies and practices, if any, influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom?

Population and Respondents

Initially, I was going to survey faculty members at 338 private baccalaureate colleges and universities defined by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2006b). The population size was reduced because I was unable to locate the specific academic disciplines selected for this study, nor specific information such as name, rank, or title on institutional websites, for faculty at a number of these 338 colleges. Due to these limitations, the population for this study was 1,264 faculty members from 316 colleges and universities.

In order to obtain the necessary information for this study, I visited the websites of the 338 private baccalaureate colleges and universities. Unfortunately, 22 of the institution’s websites did not contain the information I was searching. One website was written completely in Spanish, and could not be used for this research. The categories of academic
disciplines that were selected for this study are found in Table 1. One faculty member per academic discipline was selected from each institution. The majority of the college and university websites contained the faculty contact information for which I was searching.

Table 1

*Academic Disciplines Selected for this Research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Fine or Performing Arts</th>
<th>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During spring semester 2009, a total of 218 questionnaires were received in the mail, for an initial response rate of 17.2%. To achieve a higher response rate, I utilized Vovici, a web-based survey, to send out the same questionnaire electronically during the spring term. An additional 113 responses were obtained electronically, raising the final response rate to 26.2%.
The link to the questionnaire was e-mailed twice to the population that had not returned the questionnaire during the spring semester 2009. In addition, two reminder e-mails were sent to the faculty. I continued to collect the mailed questionnaires until the end of the spring semester.

**Characteristics of the questionnaire participants.** The characteristics of sex, academic rank, academic discipline, and race are known for the majority of the questionnaire respondents. Slightly over half of the respondents, 53.2%, were male. No statistically significant differences existed between respondents and non-respondents by sex.

Table 2 displays the frequency and percentages of faculty by rank and by response category. The majority of questionnaire respondents held the position of professor or associate professor. Faculty members who held positions other than these three options on the questionnaire, such as director or instructor, were coded as missing data. In terms of academic rank, this sample was representative of the population.

The third characteristic for the population are the academic disciplines of Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Fine or Performing Arts, and the Humanities. Table 3 displays the frequencies and percentages for faculty in this study in relation to their academic disciplines. These variables were not significant and the sample was representative of the population with regards to academic discipline.
Table 2

*Frequency and Percentage of Questionnaire Responses by Academic Rank*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th># mailed</th>
<th>Response frequency</th>
<th>% responded</th>
<th>% of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Characteristics of the respondents.** Table 4 displays questionnaire respondents’ race, administrative position, current status, and principal activity. Faculty respondents’ years at their current institution ranged from 1.5 years to 45 years. The average number of years the respondents had been employed at their current institution was 13.3 years.

For this research, race has been classified as either White or faculty of color. Faculty of color included: African American, American Indian, Asian American, Native Hawaiian, Mexican American, Multiracial, Puerto Rican, and Other Latino. The majority of questionnaire respondents, 97.6% were White. Administrative positions for questionnaire respondents were dean or department chair. Current status for questionnaire respondents was tenured, on tenure track, but not tenured, annual faculty contract, or multi-year contract. One hundred seventy-six, or 53.2% of the questionnaire
Table 3

*Frequency and Percentage of Questionnaire Responses by Academic Discipline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Discipline</th>
<th># mailed</th>
<th>Response frequency</th>
<th>% responded</th>
<th>% of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine or Performing Arts</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respondents, were tenured. The principal activities for the questionnaire respondents were administration, teaching, and publishing. Two hundred and four, or 61.6% of questionnaire respondents’ principal activity, was teaching.

In summary, the majority of the questionnaire respondents were White males. Two-fifths of the questionnaire respondents have the faculty title of assistant professor. On average, roughly one-quarter of the questionnaire respondents were from each of the four academic disciplines selected for this research. Over half (53.2%) of the questionnaire respondents were tenured, and more than three out of five (61.6%) of respondents indicated that their
principal activity was teaching. On average, faculty respondents were employed at their current institution for 13.3 years.

Table 4

*Frequency and Percentage of Questionnaire Respondents by Characteristic*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Response frequency</th>
<th>% responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Color</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On tenure track, not tenured</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual faculty contract</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-year contract</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Characteristics of the Institutions**

This section presents the institutional characteristics for this research.

The characteristics of size, religious affiliation, location, and institutional race, whether a Hispanic-Serving Institution or Historically Black College or University, were obtained from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).
The frequencies and percentages of the questionnaire responses by institutional size are categorized and are displayed in Table 5; the four size categories were small, medium, large, and extra large. Institutions in the small category had enrollment of 999 or less. Medium-sized institutions ranged from 1,000 to 2,999, and large institutions ranged from 3,000 to 9,999. Extra large-sized institutions had enrollments of 10,000 or more (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010).

The frequency and percentage of questionnaire respondents by their institutional religious affiliation is displayed in Table 6. The four largest response types were Methodist, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, and Evangelical Lutheran. For questionnaire respondents with the religious affiliation of Methodist, \(\chi^2 = .04, p < .05\), which indicated a small over-representation. Similarly, the religious affiliation of Roman Catholic had a \(\chi^2 = .03, p < .05\), which also indicated a small over-representation. The institutions with the religious affiliations of Methodist and Roman Catholic were over-represented among the questionnaire respondents, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th># mailed</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>% responded</th>
<th>% of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>35.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,999</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>61.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-9,999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
generalizations about findings involving these two variables should be done with caution.

The institutional characteristic of geographic region by questionnaire respondents is outlined in Table 7. Frequencies and percentages are displayed for the U.S. regions of New England, Mideast, Great Lakes, Plains, Southeast, Southwest, Rocky Mountains, and Far West. As Table 7 indicates, the highest responses were derived from questionnaire respondents in the Southeast. The lowest number of responses was from the Rocky Mountains.

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage of Questionnaire Responses by Religious Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious affiliation</th>
<th># mailed</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>% responded</th>
<th>% of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Lutheran</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variables of Historically Black College or University (HBCU) and Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) were the two institutional races for this study. Table 8 displays the frequencies and percentages for HBCUs and HSIs. For HBCUs, $\chi^2=.00, p<.01$, indicating an over-representation of this type of institution. With an over-representation, caution should be used
when generalizing any findings dealing with this type of institution. The HSI was a representative sample for this institutional type.

Table 7

*Frequency and Percentage of Questionnaire Responses by Geographic Region*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Region</th>
<th># mailed</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>% responded</th>
<th>% of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Frequency and Percentage of Questionnaire Responses by Institutional Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th># mailed</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>% responded</th>
<th>% of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dependent Variable

The dependent variable for this research was the combination of faculty satisfaction with policies for academic freedom and faculty satisfaction with practices for academic freedom. Responses from two questions on the questionnaire were combined for the information on the dependent variable. The first question asked faculty members to rate the following statement: *I am satisfied with the current policies on academic freedom at my institution.* The second question asked faculty members to rate the following statement: *I am satisfied with the current practices on academic freedom at my institution.* Each question had a scale from one to 10, with one being the lowest level of satisfaction and 10 being the highest level of satisfaction with academic freedom. Responses from these two questions were combined from the 1-10 scale to a 2-20 scale. Three hundred twenty-four faculty members responded to these questions on the questionnaire. Sixty-one respondents, or 18.8%, were completely satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices (M=14.76, SD=4.94).

Summary of Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were calculated for input and environmental variables for this research. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for the variables responded to by questionnaire participants.

Questionnaire respondents were representative of the population with the following variables: sex, academic rank, and academic discipline.
Slightly over half (53.2%) of the questionnaire respondents were male. Almost all of the respondents were White (97.6%), with only 2.4% of respondents being faculty of color. Over half (53.2%) of the questionnaire respondents were tenured, and more than three out of five (61.6%), indicated that their principal activity was teaching.

The institutional characteristics of size, location, the institutional race of Hispanic-Serving Institution, and the religious affiliations of Presbyterian and Evangelical Lutheran were representative of the sample. The religious affiliations of Methodist and Roman Catholic and Historically Black College or Universities were over-representative of the sample, and generalizations about findings involving them should be made with caution.

**Blocked Form of Stepwise Regression**

The research questions in this study were addressed through the use of a blocked form of stepwise regression. This method was utilized to identify if any of the input or environmental variables selected for this research had a significant influence on the dependent variable, faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices.

Stepwise regression permitted me to identify the significance of questionnaire items at the p<.05 level and to answer the research questions. The adjusted $R^2=.78$, which indicates that variables explained 78% of the variance in the dependent variable.
Regression analysis was conducted on 56 independent variables to identify their influence, if any, on the dependent variable. All of the independent variables were grouped into three blocks and entered into the regression analysis in a stepwise fashion. Factors that proved to be significant predictors of the dependent variable are displayed in Table 9. Seventeen variables were identified to be significant predictors of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

The column labeled Zero $r$ signifies the Pearson Product Moment Correlation between the dependent variable, faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices, with the independent variables. The Beta ($\beta$) weights are listed for the independent variables. Also, the number following the variable is the corresponding question number from the questionnaire (see Appendix B).

**Block 1: Faculty demographics and work attributes.** The first block included all of the faculty demographics and work attributes, answering the first four research questions. Three significant predictors were identified in the first block of variables: if there was a violation at a faculty members’ past institution, if the faculty member had tenure, and if the faculty reported being a faculty of color.
Table 9

**Predictor Variables of Satisfaction with Academic Freedom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Zero R</th>
<th>Step β</th>
<th>Final β</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Violation at past institution (22)</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>21.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tenure status (51)</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
<td>4.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty of color (56)</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>5.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Violations due to religion at institution (46)</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.06**</td>
<td>20.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Level of religious control (47)</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>4.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Administration supports the protections of academic freedom (26)</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>136.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty believe academic freedom is protected (27)</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>115.99**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Protected in writing editorials (36)</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>39.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clear protections of academic freedom in faculty handbook (15)</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>48.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Violation of academic freedom at current institution (12)</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>78.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Protected in publishing subject area (31)</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>56.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Support from college administration (19)</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>129.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty believe they can make changes to academic freedom policies &amp; practices (28)</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>81.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty senate involved in developing policies &amp; practices (18)</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>6.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Protected in choosing course content (34)</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>60.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic freedom has been a topic of grievance at college (13)</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.06**</td>
<td>-.06**</td>
<td>21.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Changes made at institution to protect academic freedom (11)</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>4.95**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n=331, M=14.8, SD=4.94, Adjusted R²=.78, *p<.05, **p<.01.
Within these three significant variables from block one, only one of the variables emerged as positive predictor of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom: reporting that they were a faculty member of color. Faculty who selected the demographic characteristic of faculty of color ($\beta = .04$, $p < .05$) were more likely to be satisfied with academic freedom than those who did not select this variable on the questionnaire. The question on the questionnaire that inquired about faculty members’ Race, asked respondents to Please fill in the circles that apply. The options were: White/Caucasian; African American/Black; American Indian/Alaska Native; Asian American/Asian; Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; Mexican American/Chicano; Multiracial; Puerto Rican; and Other Latino. I narrowed these responses to either White/Caucasian or faculty of color. Faculty of color combined all of the non-White race selections, since the number of respondents for these options was low.

The other two significant variables from the first block emerged as negative predictors of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom: (a) faculty members who reported experiencing a violation of academic freedom at a past institution, and (b) faculty members who reported having tenure.

First, faculty who have experienced a violation of academic freedom at a past institution ($\beta = -.09$, $p < .01$) was a statistically significant, negative predictor of satisfaction with academic freedom. The question on the questionnaire related to this topic was Did a violation of academic freedom
occur at a past institution? The answer choices for this question were Yes or No. Faculty members who indicated a violation of academic freedom at a past institution were more likely to be dissatisfied with academic freedom than those who did not report such a violation.

Second, faculty members who indicated having tenure ($\beta=-.04, p<.05$) emerged as another negative predictor. In regards to tenure, faculty respondents for this research were asked on the questionnaire: *What is your current status at this institution?* The answer selections were: *Tenured, On tenure track, but not tenured, Annual faculty contract, or Multi-year contract.* I combined the responses to either *tenured* or *not tenured*. In order to simply the results for this variable, the last three responses were combined to create the *not tenured* status. The faculty who indicated having tenure were more likely to be dissatisfied with academic freedom than those faculty who did not report having this status.

The bivariate correlation for the variable tenure status was positive, indicating that faculty members who have tenure tend to be more satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices than those who do not have tenure. However, this variable switched from a positive to a negative sign after the variable of a past experience of a violation of academic freedom entered the equation. This switching of signs indicates that tenure status and experiencing a violation of academic freedom share variance with the dependent variable, and that the variance explained by a violation of
academic freedom suppresses the variance explained by tenure status. The finding that tenure status is a negative predictor is counter intuitive, and is deserving of more research in future studies.

**Block 2: Institutional characteristics.** The second block of independent variables included institutional characteristics such as size, race, location, religious affiliation, and tenure system. This block addressed research questions five and six. Two predictors were identified in this block: (a) violations of academic freedom due to religion at the faculty members’ institution, and (b) the level of religious control at the faculty members’ institution.

The first predictor variable from the second block was a negative indicator, violations of academic freedom due to religion at the institution ($\beta = -.06$, $p<.01$). On the questionnaire, faculty members were asked: *Have there been any violations of academic freedom at your institution due to religion?* The two answer options were *Yes* or *No*. Faculty members who reported these violations were more likely to be dissatisfied with academic freedom than those faculty members who have not experienced a violation.

One of the two predictor variables from this block emerged as a positive indicator of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom: the level of religious control at the faculty members’ institution ($\beta = .08$, $p<.01$). Faculty members were asked on the questionnaire for this research to indicate the level of religious control at their institution. The question stated: *I view the*
level of religious control at my current institution as the following, with a scale of one being the lowest and 10 being the highest. I combined responses to this question as either being answered or not. The higher the faculty members indicated having religious control at their institution, the more likely they are satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices than those faculty members who do not work at religiously-affiliated institutions.

The bivariate correlation for the variable level of religious control was negative, indicating that faculty members who worked at a religiously-affiliated institution were less satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices than those who do not work at a religiously-affiliated institution with religious control. However, this variable switched from a negative to a positive sign after the variable, violations due to religion at institution, entered the equation. This switching of signs indicates that the level of religious control and experiencing a violation of academic freedom due to religion share variance with the dependent variable, and that the variance explained by a violation of academic freedom due to religion suppresses the variance explained by level of religious control. The finding that the level of religious control is a positive predictor is counter intuitive, and is deserving of more research in future studies.

**Block 3: Experiences with academic freedom.** The third block of independent variables incorporated faculty experiences with academic freedom and addressed the seventh research question. Twelve significant
predictors were identified in this block of variables: (a) administration supports the protections of academic freedom, (b) faculty believe academic freedom is protected, (c) faculty were protected in writing editorials, (d) clear protections of academic freedom were in the faculty handbook, (e) violations of academic freedom occurred at the faculty members’ current institution, (f) faculty were protected in publishing in their subject area, (g) faculty had support from college administration, (h) faculty believed they could make changes to policies and practices related to academic freedom, (i) faculty senate was involved in developing policies and practices to protect academic freedom, (j) faculty were protected in choosing course content, (k) academic freedom was a topic of a grievance at college, and (l) changes were made to protect academic freedom.

Nine of the 12 variables from the third block were positive indicators of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. The first variable was faculty members who reported that administration supports the protections of academic freedom (β=.23, p<.01). The questionnaire for this research asked the respondents about Support from college administration. The answer choices were: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Not Applicable. The answer choice Not Applicable was converted to missing data. The second variable was faculty believing that academic freedom was protected (β=.20, p<.01). Faculty members were asked on the questionnaire: Faculty members at your institution believe that their academic freedom is protected. The answer
choices for this question were Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Not Applicable. The answer choice Not Applicable was converted to missing data. The third variable was faculty protection in writing editorials ($\beta=.13, p<.01$). On the questionnaire for this research, faculty members were asked to rank the following: I feel protected in writing editorials. Answer choices were Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

The fourth positive variable was having clear protections of academic freedom written in faculty handbooks ($\beta=.20, p<.01$). Faculty members selected for this research were asked to respond to the following statement: Your institution clearly includes protections of academic freedom in the faculty handbook. The faculty response options to this question included: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Not Applicable. The answer choice Not Applicable was converted to missing data. The fifth indicator was faculty protection in publishing their subject area ($\beta=.07$, $p<.01$). Faculty respondents were asked to respond to the following statement: I feel protected in publishing in my subject area. Answer choices were: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. The sixth indicator was faculty having support from college administration ($\beta=.09$, $p<.01$). On the questionnaire for this research, faculty members were asked to rate this statement: The administration at your current institution supports the protections of academic freedom. The answer choices for this
The seventh positive indicator was making changes to policies and practices related to academic freedom ($\beta=.11$, $p<.01$). In regards to policy changes, faculty members were asked on the questionnaire: *Faculty members at your institution believe that they are able to make changes to the policies and practices related to academic freedom.* Answer choices were: *Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree,* and *Not Applicable.* The answer choice *Not Applicable* was converted to missing data when I reviewed the study. The eighth positive variable was faculty protection in choosing course content ($\beta=.08$, $p<.01$). Faculty members were asked on the questionnaire to rate how: *I feel protected in choosing course content.* The answer choices for this question were: *Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree,* and *Strongly Disagree.* The ninth variable was changes made to protect academic freedom ($\beta=.04$, $p<.01$). Faculty members were asked on the questionnaire: *How often has change been made at your institution to protect academic freedom?* Answer choices were: *Frequently, Occasionally,* and *Never.*

There were three negative predictors from this group of variables. The first was a violation of academic freedom at the current institution ($\beta=-.13$, $p<.01$). Faculty members were asked this question on the questionnaire in regards to a violation: *How often has there been a violation of academic freedom at your current institution?* The answer choices for this
question were: *Frequently, Occasionally, and Never.* The second negative predictor was faculty senate being involved in developing policies and practices to protect academic freedom ($\beta=-.10$, $p<.05$). Faculty members were asked on the questionnaire: *Your faculty senate is involved in developing policies and practices to protect academic freedom.* Answer choices for this question were: *Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree,* and *Not Applicable.* The answer choice *Not Applicable* was converted to missing data when I reviewed the study.

The bivariate correlation for the variable faculty senate is involved in developing policies and practices to protect academic freedom was positive, indicating that faculty members who have a faculty senate involved in developing policies and practices tend to be more satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices than those who do not have a faculty senate. However, this variable switched from a positive to a negative sign after the variable, faculty believe they can make changes to academic freedom policies and practices, entered the equation. This switching of signs indicates that the variable of faculty senate is involved in developing policies and practices, and the variable faculty believe they can make changes to academic freedom policies and practices, share variance with the dependent variable, and that the variance explained by faculty believe they can make changes suppresses the variance explained by faculty senate. The finding that faculty senate is a
negative predictor is counter intuitive, and is deserving of more research in future studies.

The third negative variable was academic freedom as a topic of grievance at college ($\beta = -0.06, p<.01$). Faculty members were asked on the questionnaire: *How often has academic freedom been a topic of a grievance at your college?* Answer choices for this question were: *Frequently Occasionally,* and *Never.* Faculty members who indicated one of these negative predictor variables were more likely to be dissatisfied with the policies and practices related to academic freedom than those faculty members who have not experienced a violation of academic freedom.

**Summary of regression analysis.** Regression analysis identified 17 significant predictors on faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. Three faculty demographic characteristics and work attributes were identified as predictors as faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. The positive predictor was faculty who reported being a faculty of color. The other two predictors were negative, faculty who experienced a violation at a past institution, and faculty who had tenure. Also, two institutional characteristics were identified as predictors, violations due to religion at the faculty members’ current institution, and the level of religious control at the faculty members’ institution. From these two predictors, the only negative predictor was the variable of faculty reporting a violation of academic freedom from their current institution. Twelve predictors were identified
from the group of variables related to faculty experiences with academic freedom. Nine of these predictors were positive and three variables were negative predictors of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. Most importantly, the regression analysis results supplied me with answers to the research questions.

**Summary**

The data gathered from the research questions, the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), and the original questionnaire enabled me to conduct statistical analysis. The analysis first provided me with descriptive statistics of the questionnaire population and the institutions. Secondly, the regression analysis identified 17 independent variables that impact faculty satisfaction with academic freedom.

The 56 variables selected for this research were grouped into three blocks for the regression analysis and entered into the SPSS software. The stepwise regression identified 17 predictor variables. The first three predictor variables were faculty members’ demographics and work attributes: (a) experiencing a violation at a past institution, (b) having tenure, and (c) being a faculty of color. The second two predictor variables were institutional characteristics: (a) violations due to religion at the institution, and (b) religious control at the institution. Finally, the remaining 12 predictor variables were faculty experiences with academic freedom:
(a) administration supports the protections of academic freedom, (b) faculty believe academic freedom is protected, (c) faculty are protected in writing editorials, (d) clear protections of academic freedom are in the faculty handbook, (e) violation of academic freedom occurred at the current institution, (f) faculty are protected in publishing subject area, (g) faculty receive support from college administration, (h) faculty believe they can make changes to the policies and practices related to academic freedom, (i) faculty senate was involved in developing policies and practices to protect academic freedom, (j) faculty are protected in choosing course content, (k) academic freedom is a topic of grievance at college, and (l) changes are made to protect academic freedom.

This chapter presented an analysis of the questionnaire results, which lays the foundation for answering the research questions and for additional explanation in the next chapter. The findings were important since they will (a) help administrators focus on the faculty involvements that may predict satisfaction with academic freedom, (b) assist administrators in the creation and modification of policies and practices related to academic freedom, and (c) enrich studies with information on faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. The statistical analysis in this chapter begins the discussion that unfolds in Chapter Five.
Chapter Five

Implications, Recommendations, and Conclusions

Chapter Four presented the findings for this study through an analysis of the data. This chapter provides a review of the study, discussion of the results, and presents a discussion concerning implications for policy and practice. Next, conclusions that can be drawn from this study are made, followed by the recommendations for further research. The chapter concludes with this study’s contribution to the literature.

Review of the Research

The purpose of this research was to examine faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. This study explored if faculty members at private baccalaureate colleges and universities were knowledgeable about and satisfied with current policies and practices in relation to academic freedom at their institutions. The literature review examined numerous variables, including (a) faculty demographics, (b) work attributes, (c) experiences with academic freedom, and (d) institutional characteristics.
This study applied two theoretical frameworks, attitude theory (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), and involvement theory (Astin, 1985), to help understand faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. Through the use of the input-environment-outcome, or I-E-O model (Astin, 1991), I created a model utilizing the variables selected for this research. The model consisted of three blocks, faculty demographics and work attributes, institutional characteristics, and faculty experiences with academic freedom.

A total of 1,264 faculty members received the questionnaire created for this research. The variables were analyzed using the stepwise method for regression analysis. A total of 17 variables emerged as significant predictors of satisfaction with academic freedom.

**Discussion of the Results**

In this section, I discussed the results from the study, and possible explanations for these results. The results were grouped by academic freedom policies, academic freedom practices, religious control, and violations of academic freedom. In each section, I individually review the variables and then explain their significance as a group.

**Academic freedom policies.** There were four variables that indicated in this research that faculty members were satisfied with the policies created to protect academic freedom. First, faculty members indicated that the protections of academic freedom were in their handbook. Contracts should include information in regards to the faculty handbook,
which contains faculty freedoms and the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of
Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. “Particularly for faculty at
private colleges, contracts are a very important source of faculty and
institutional rights and responsibilities” (Kaplin and Lee, 2007, p. 186). I
was unsure if faculty would respond negatively to this topic in regards to
clear protections, believing that the protections for academic freedom may be
absent from their handbooks. “Since First Amendment rights...do not apply
or limit private institutions...legal arguments concerning the freedom to
teach in private institutions are usually based on contract law” (Kaplin &
Lee, 2007, p. 277). One possible explanation was that faculty who recognized
that the policies and practices created to protect academic freedom were
indeed in their handbooks, may have been more likely to be satisfied with
academic freedom policies and practices. These individuals may have already
experienced a potential issue with their protections of academic freedom, and
their handbook may have contained the necessary statements to protect
them.

The second variable in this grouping was faculty satisfaction with
academic freedom and writing editorials. Faculty members must be careful
when expressing their opinions, since the public associates a professor with
his or her institution of employment. The AAUP (2003) has stated that
faculty “should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for
the institution” (para. 8). Since the faculty members who completed the
research questionnaire were employed at private baccalaureate colleges and universities, I was curious to learn if faculty would believe that they were not protected in writing editorials. Faculty members must be careful in their extracurricular events, since the public—and even more so the students—associate a professor with his or her institution of employment, rather than viewing the professor as an individual simply speaking his or her mind. Faculty who indicated that they were protected in writing editorials may be more likely to be satisfied with the policies and practices created to protect academic freedom than those faculty members who have not written or submitted any editorials. One possible explanation was that these faculty members may already have written an editorial and been protected by the academic freedom policies and practices at their institution.

The third variable in this grouping was faculty satisfaction with academic freedom and publishing in their subject area. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has stated that research and publications related to the faculty members’ area of specialty are protected by academic freedom (2003). Faculty members who reported that they were protected in publishing in their subject area were more likely to be satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices than those individuals who had not published any material. Faculty members who completed the questionnaire for this research were employed at private colleges and universities, and therefore they were not automatically afforded
constitutional protections. “Publications are usually viewed as speech and afforded constitutional protection” in public institutions (Smith, 2005, p. 29). One probable explanation was that the faculty members may already have published in their subject area without incident.

The fourth and final variable related to academic freedom policies and faculty satisfaction was choosing course content. According to Smith (2005), “academic freedom...allows faculty within educational environments to discover, disseminate, and advance knowledge without interference from administrators and governing boards” (p. 24). Policies in relation to academic freedom and selecting course content should be present in the faculty handbooks. “Faculty members are usually given leeway to determine the appropriate teaching methods for their content and development of assignments to fulfill course objectives” (Smith, 2005, p. 30). Faculty members who reported that they were protected in choosing course content were more likely to be satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices than those individuals who had not selected course content in their roles. These faculty members may have had positive experiences when selecting the content and topics for their courses.

These four variables—clear protections in faculty handbooks, freedom in writing editorials, publishing in their subject area, and choosing course content—were all related to academic freedom policies. Some authors believe that in order to maintain adequate policies to protect academic freedom,
continual policy review must occur. “Faculty and administrators should be actively involved in the development, periodic review, and revision of the institution’s policy on academic freedom” (Goonen and Blechman, 1999, p. 137). Without continued review, policies may become outdated and inadequate. In regards to this research, faculty seemed to be satisfied with the policies created to protect academic freedom. They expressed satisfaction with the clear protections in faculty handbooks. The faculty handbook at private baccalaureate colleges and universities was an important document for faculty, since these individuals are not guaranteed the automatic protections like faculty at public institutions of higher education. The faculty handbook should contain numerous policies created to protect academic freedom. In the handbook, the freedoms of writing editorials, publishing in their subject area, and choosing course content, should all be included. The faculty members who completed the questionnaire for this research may have already experienced a potential issue with their protections of academic freedom, and their handbook may have contained the necessary statements to protect them. If the faculty handbook was incomplete and it lacked the necessary policies of academic freedom, faculty members tended to be less satisfied with academic freedom.

**Academic freedom practices.** Faculty members were satisfied with the practices created to protect academic freedom, which has been indicated by four variables utilized in this research. The first variable related to
academic freedom practices was faculty who believed that academic freedom was protected. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has stated “academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning (AAUP, 2003, para. 4). Faculty members who reported that their academic freedom is protected were more likely to be satisfied with academic freedom practices then those faculty who did not report that their academic freedom was protected. These individuals may have had positive experiences when an academic freedom issue arose. A possible explanation was that these faculty members worked in environments that encouraged the freedoms to teach, research, and publish in their subject area. The practices related to academic freedom may also be developed and implemented in an efficient and effective manner through administrators or collective bargaining (Goonen and Blechman, 1999).

Faculty who believed that they were supported by their college administrators was the second variable related to faculty satisfaction with academic freedom practices. Those faculty members who believed that they were supported by their administration would typically be satisfied with the practices created to protect academic freedom. One possible explanation was that the faculty who responded positively to this question may be supported by their administration and have had positive interactions with academic freedom, and they have formed a positive attitude. Attitudes, part of attitude
theory, are connections between past experiences and new events (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975).

The third variable associated with faculty satisfaction with academic freedom practices was that faculty believed that they could make changes to protect academic freedom. These faculty members believed that they could make changes to academic freedom and are more likely to be satisfied with academic freedom practices than those individuals who have not had this experience. One possible explanation was that the faculty members who have had positive experiences in changing practices related to academic freedom had developed positive attitudes toward this experience.

The variable, administration supports the protections of academic freedom, was the fourth variable connected to academic freedom practices. Faculty who indicated that they believed that administration supported the protections of academic freedom may be more likely to be satisfied with academic freedom practices than those faculty members who have not had this experience. One potential explanation for this finding was that faculty members may have had positive experiences with academic freedom since their administrators sustained the protections of academic freedom practices. These positive experiences are associated with positive attitudes and academic freedom (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975).

After reviewing these four variables, faculty members seemed to be satisfied with the practices created to protect academic freedom. There were
four associated variables in regards to satisfaction with academic freedom practices: faculty believed that academic freedom is protected, that they were supported by their college administrators, that they could make changes to protect academic freedom, and that the administration supported the protections of academic freedom. One possible explanation for faculty satisfaction with the practices related to academic freedom was that they have already experienced these protections.

Religiously-affiliated institutions. Faculty members who were employed at religiously-affiliated institutions should be aware of the policies and practices related to academic freedom and the religion at their particular institution. Goonen and Blechman (1999) have stated that there should be “within the faculty contract an official institutional statement that details the scope of academic freedom within the institution, applicable restrictions, if any, and procedures that would be followed to grieve the infringement of academic freedom” (p. 137). Two variables were significant in regards to religiously-affiliated institutions. The first variable was the level of religious control. This variable was a positive predictor of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. The level of religious control had a negative simple correlation with the dependent variable, but has a positive beta weight in the regression model. A suppression effect may be occurring, and more research should be conducted on this variable. The level of religious control was indicated by faculty as they circled a number from one
to 10, with one being the lowest level of religious control and 10 being the highest. The more religious control that the faculty members indicated, the more satisfied they were with the academic freedom policies and practices at their institution.

The second variable associated with religion was violations of academic freedom at the faculty member’s institution due to religion. Faculty members who reported that such violations occurred at their institution were more likely to report less satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices than those individuals who were not involved with a violation of academic freedom due to religion. Attitude theory (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) would suggest one possibility: if these faculty members experienced a violation due to religion, they may have developed negative attitudes towards the policies and practices related to academic freedom.

One possible explanation may be that the institutions with strong religious affiliations had common and accepted religious beliefs, and everyone on those campuses understands that the interactions both inside and outside of the classroom are in accordance with their religious foundations. Faculty who know and understand the religious affiliations at their institution may be more satisfied with the policies and practices related to academic freedom because all of the employees at their institution share these same beliefs.

Violations of academic freedom. There were two negative variables related to violations of academic freedom and faculty satisfaction.
The first variable was if the faculty member experienced a violation of academic freedom at a past institution. If a faculty member experienced a violation of academic freedom in the past, one probable outcome was that the faculty member may have developed a negative attitude towards academic freedom policies and practices. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) have noted that "an attitude represents a person's general feeling of favorableness or unfavorableness toward some stimulus object" and "as a person forms beliefs about an object, he automatically and simultaneously acquires an attitude toward that object" (p. 216). Faculty members who experienced a violation of academic freedom may have naturally related these negative experiences with the policies and practices that were designed to protect academic freedom.

The second variable associated with violations of academic freedom was a violation of academic freedom at the faculty member's current institution. One potential explanation was if faculty members experienced a violation of academic freedom, they may have developed an attitude toward that event. In this case, a negative event had occurred, a violation of academic freedom policies and practices. Faculty members who have experienced a violation of academic freedom may have developed negative feelings and attitudes towards the protections of academic freedom that failed. Attitude theory is concerned with attitudes that are developed over time due to past experiences (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975).
Negative experiences with academic freedom policies and practices could lead to dissatisfaction for faculty members, regardless if the violations occurred at the past or current institution. This exposure to negative incidences may lessen their satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. If faculty members were surrounded by negative experiences in regards to academic freedom policies and practices, they may have also developed negative attitudes, as attitude theory has suggested (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975).

**Implications for Policy and Practice**

Based on the study's findings, recommendations were made in the following sections for various groups who have the ability to modify policies and practices related to academic freedom. These groups were college and university administrators and faculty. Implications toward attitude theory and involvement theory, the two theoretical frameworks for this study, were discussed as well in this section.

**Implications for administrators.** There were a total of four variables that may indicate positive situations for administrators and academic freedom policies and practices: (a) the level of religious control, (b) administration supports the protections of academic freedom, (c) clear protections of academic freedom in the faculty handbook, and (d) changes made to protect academic freedom.
Religious control at an institution of higher education may indicate positive faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. The administrators who are employed at religiously-affiliated institutions should follow the religious foundations at their institution when working with the faculty members. Administrators should keep in mind the notion that the faculty members may have selected to work at that particular institution due to the religious foundations, and therefore it is imperative for them to keep these foundations in academic freedom policies and practices. Goonen and Blechman (1999) have noted the importance of academic freedom and an institution’s official stand and any restrictions, if applicable. The institution’s representatives, the administrators, should make any of these policies and practices clear to faculty members when they begin to work at the religiously-affiliated institution. The institutions’ religious foundations may lead to faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices because individuals who were employed at religiously-affiliated institutions share these common beliefs.

Clarity of policies and practices related to academic freedom will lead administrators toward positive interactions with faculty members (Goonen & Blechman, 1999). The second positive indicator of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices was that the administration supports the protections of academic freedom. It was crucial for college administrations to support the protections of academic freedom, since these
policies defended their faculty members in their work. If the faculty members believed that the college administration was protecting them, they were more likely to be satisfied with the policies and practices related to academic freedom.

The clear protections of academic freedom in the faculty handbook were another variable that college administrations must heed when seeking positive interactions with faculty. In their respective roles, administrators could ensure the existence of these protections. Administrators could work with human resources to ensure that new employees are made aware of the policies and practices. Administrators may also select to be the contact person for the faculty if they need clarifications with the protections in the handbooks. If the protections do not exist, they could work with faculty to create and include them in the faculty handbook.

The final positive variable for college administrators was that changes were made to protect academic freedom. If a faculty member brings a concern in regards to academic freedom to a college administrator, the administrator should help the faculty member make changes as needed. College administrators could assemble task forces, composed of faculty members, to actively review academic freedom policies and practices.

**Implications for faculty.** There were six positive predictors that emerged from faculty in regards to satisfaction with the policies and practices related to academic freedom: (a) faculty believe academic freedom is
protected, (b) protected in writing editorials, (c) protected in publishing subject area, (d) support from college administration, (e) faculty believe they can make changes to policies and practices related to academic freedom, and (f) protected in course content. Faculty members who reported positively towards these predictors are more likely to be satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices. One way for faculty members to have positive interactions with academic freedom policies and practices is to familiarize themselves with their contract or faculty handbook, which should outline all of their responsibilities. All of the teaching responsibilities and additional obligations for the academic year, including religious beliefs and codes of conduct, should be included in the contract or faculty handbook (Kaplin and Lee, 2007).

The first positive predictor for faculty members’ satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices was if faculty members believe academic freedom is protected. If faculty members do believe that they are protected in their work, they may naturally work freely and without hesitation. Faculty members could become familiar with the academic freedom policies and practices on their campus in order to help them as they work on their campus.

The protection in writing editorials was the second positive predictor of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. Faculty members who have experience in writing editorials without ramifications
from their institution would more likely be positive toward academic freedom policies and practices. Faculty members should have the freedom to write editorials and to express themselves in public. As an employee, the faculty member could become familiar with the policies related to writing editorials.

The protection in publishing in a subject area was the third positive predictor of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. Faculty members who may have had some experience with publishing in their subject areas are more likely to be satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices. Publishing for faculty members is essential in their careers, and it is imperative they believe that they are secure with this endeavor. Faculty members could locate the policies on publications at their institution, and they could use these policies as a guide when they publish.

The variable, faculty members who believe that they are supported by college administration, was another positive predictor of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom. Those faculty members who believe that they are supported by their college administrators are more likely to be satisfied with academic freedom policies and practices. Faculty members could familiarize themselves with their administrators and the policies and practices that are set in place to protect them.

The fifth positive predictor of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices was that faculty members believe they can make changes to policies and practices related to academic freedom. As a
faculty member begins to work at an institution, he or she could meet with employees who have more years experience at the institution to become acquainted with the current academic freedom policies and practices.

Faculty members who believe that they are protected in course content were the final positive predictor of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. These individuals probably have had positive experiences with creating their courses and including various sources for their students. It is important for faculty members to be protected in course content, since it is their responsibility to teach their students freely and to include all of the pertinent information in regards to their subject matter. Faculty members could familiarize themselves with the current policies and practices related to academic freedom as they start creating their courses.

**Implications for attitude theory.** Attitude theory, the learning theory developed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), is based on the notion that attitudes develop over time through past experiences. Faculty members, in this study, have developed attitudes towards specific people, objects, events, or places in relation to academic freedom. Attitudes are not always visible on the exterior and sometimes are not revealed by individuals until a situation occurs. In regards to this study, faculty members who indicated a positive response toward satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices may have experienced complete freedom in their positions. These individuals have developed positive attitudes with academic freedom and their
experiences could be shared with new faculty members when they begin at
the institution to help instill positive attitudes.

In these situations, according to attitude theory, the learning theory
based on behavior theory or the stimulus-response approach, faculty
attitudes can only be made positive through positive interactions with
academic freedom policies and practices (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Faculty
and administrators in authority positions should heed the positive attitudes
from their faculty and attempt to create positive environments by creating
and implementing policies and practices related to academic freedom.
Instituting a committee to review policies and practices is an example of how
to create a positive environment for faculty members.

In regards to attitude theory, faculty members’ attitudes may also be
negative. Not all of the experiences that faculty members reported on the
questionnaire for this research were positive. There are four negative
variables that may impact faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies
and practices: (a) violation at a past institution, (b) violations due to religion
at institution, (c) violation of academic freedom at current institution, and (d)
academic freedom has been a topic of a grievance at college.

Faculty members who have gained negative experiences may have
developed negative attitudes towards academic freedom policies and practices
(Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). These variables are very strong negative
predictors for faculty members to have less satisfaction with academic
freedom than faculty members who have not reported these negative experiences. College administrators and faculty members alike should be aware of violations of and grievances regarding academic freedom at their institutions. If there had been a violation or a grievance, whether related to religion or not, faculty reported negatively about their satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. Therefore, college administrators and faculty members must first be aware of any violations, and work together on improving the policies and practices related to academic freedom.

Implications for involvement theory. The second theoretical framework for this research was Astin’s (1985) involvement theory, which applies to both students and faculty. Involvement theory states that faculty members “learn by becoming involved” (Astin, p. 133). Those in academic environments have the option of choosing the level of time spent participating in campus life and interacting with other people on campus. This level of involvement with campus life will determine how satisfied the faculty member will be. In relation to this research, faculty members who indicated the possibility of a positive experience with academic freedom may want to consider continuing this behavior and to try to get their peers more involved on their campus. Unfortunately, the majority of the involvement variables from this study did not emerge as predictors of faculty members’ satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices.
Therefore, if faculty members become more involved in their campus, they have the option of learning about how policies and practices are developed, and how they have an impact on these items. Academic freedom policies and practices may need to be updated at institutions, and some faculty may want to form committees to work on upgrading these policies and practices. Another possibility for faculty involvement is creating a questionnaire about experiences with academic freedom and asking faculty members at their institution to complete it. This questionnaire would help faculty members to become more involved in modifying academic freedom policies and practices and it would also add research to the current body of knowledge at that particular institution. Gathering data about the experiences of others on their campus may be one way to modify faculty attitudes towards academic freedom. If additional information is needed, faculty from other campuses could also complete the survey. By collecting information from other faculty members, current policies and practices may be modified in order to suit the needs of the faculty members.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Realizing that the findings for this research are unique to the responses collected from the faculty members, I believe that there are several areas requiring further research. First, this study was conducted with faculty members in private institutions of higher education. Public institutions were not included in the study due to numerous restrictions.
Second, since a limited number of faculty members of color responded to this questionnaire, further research is necessary on this population. Third, given that none of the academic disciplines were found to have any significance for this research, additional research might be conducted with faculty members from different academic disciplines. Fourth, a longitudinal study may uncover additional information on faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. Fifth, future research may be conducted on faculty members’ definitions of academic freedom. And sixth, religious control in private colleges and universities may be explored in greater detail.

**Research with public institutions.** Since generalizations should not be made from the results of this study to other types of academic institutions, further research needs to be conducted on satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices at public colleges and universities. One of the major differences between private and public institutions is Constitutional rights. Faculty members who are employed at the private baccalaureate colleges and universities in this study are bound by contract law and the AAUP statements (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). The faculty members who are employed at public institutions are guaranteed their Constitutional rights.

Furthermore, the contractual differences between private and public institutions of higher education are great. Administrators at private institutions have the freedom to create the faculty members’ contracts, and
the policies and practices related to academic freedom may be absent from these documents. Discovering faculty members’ perceptions of the administrators, who are the authors of faculty contracts, would be a groundbreaking study. I would be curious to learn if faculty members at private institutions of higher education have experience in creating contracts for their peers.

**Faculty of color.** Out of the 331 faculty members who completed the questionnaire for this research, only eight of them were faculty of color. I believe that further research should be conducted on this population. There was a significant relationship found between being a faculty of color and being employed at either a Historically Black College or University (HBCU) or a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI). Data should be collected from more faculty of color from private baccalaureate colleges and universities.

I am curious to learn if faculty of color who are employed at other types of institutions are satisfied with the policies and practices related to academic freedom. Since faculty of color represented such a small fraction of the respondents for this research, it is difficult to state any findings for this population. Further research should be conducted at different types of institutions to gain additional information about faculty satisfaction with academic freedom in relation to faculty of color.

**Other academic disciplines.** For this research, a total of four main academic disciplines were selected: the Humanities, Fine or Performing Arts,
Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. Four specific types of each academic discipline were also chosen (see Table 1). Since no significant correlations were found with the academic disciplines in this research, further investigation may be conducted on different academic disciplines at private baccalaureate colleges and universities. I had originally selected these disciplines due to their commonality across institutions. For future research, disciplines such as Business or Engineering, for example, or professional fields, could be examined.

**Longitudinal research.** This research is limited to the current period of time. It is not longitudinal in nature and does not focus on changes over a number of years, which would enable me to determine where to attribute the faculty members’ satisfaction with academic freedom. In this study, I attempted to control for the influence of past experiences over current ones. If a longitudinal study was conducted, I would be able to establish the influence of the current institution on satisfaction with academic freedom. In addition, a longitudinal study may validate the findings from this study.

**Definition of academic freedom.** Additional research may be conducted on faculty members’ definitions of academic freedom. Faculty members who have an experience with academic freedom may or may not interpret that particular incident as a violation. Often times, faculty members’ perception of an incident is different than that of an administrator.
This type of research could be qualitative in nature, and the main focus question could be, what do you consider to be a violation of academic freedom? I hypothesize that the answers would vary greatly.

**Religious control.** The faculty members’ view of the level of religious control may be another area of future research. This variable was found to be a positive predictor of faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. Recognizing the implications for religiously-affiliated institutions of higher education, research may be conducted on how the religious foundations at an institution impact policy creation. Creating the policies for academic freedom should be a shared responsibility of administrators and faculty members.

**Conclusions**

In regards to academic freedom policies and practices, this empirical study has uncovered important information about faculty satisfaction in private baccalaureate colleges and universities by discovering 17 significant predictors. I was able to locate previous studies on faculty satisfaction with the workplace, but was unable to locate a study on faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. In fact, I was unable to locate any study on academic freedom.

The two theoretical frameworks for this study, attitude theory (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) and involvement theory (Astin, 1985), were the fundamental components in the overall design of the research. These two
frameworks, when inserted in the I-E-O model (Astin, 1991), completed a three block system of the variables selected for this study.

Attitude theory (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) discussed how associations are made between attitudes and objects, events, and people. Attitudes are developed over time and this research uncovered faculty attitudes related to faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. Astin’s (1985) involvement theory verified the importance of learning by becoming involved. While involvement theory is a student development theory, it also pertains to others in the campus community. For the purposes of this research, faculty members were studied instead of students.

This study contributed information about institutional characteristics and academic freedom. Variables that were found to be significant were quantified, and indicators of whether the relationship was positive or negative were determined. Those who work at private baccalaureate colleges and universities may find this information useful when studying academic freedom.

The information gathered from this research has provided evidence to institutional administrators and faculty members at private institutions that they need to be active members in their communities regarding the policies and practices related to academic freedom. By categorizing the variables that were found to have a significant relationship with academic freedom, this study may assist other campus stakeholders as they work with policies.
and practices related to academic freedom. Individuals who work at public institutions may use this information as well in academic freedom policy and practice creation and modification.

Academic freedom is an essential component of private baccalaureate colleges and universities. Academic freedom “encompasses the autonomy of the university itself as an institution dedicated to knowledge, the freedom of the faculty to teach and pursue their research” (De George, 2003, p. 12). Administrators and faculty members should be actively involved in the development of these policies and practices to protect academic freedom. With the evolving issues with academic freedom in higher education, policies and practices related to protect academic freedom will become increasingly important.
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Appendix A

Cover Letter

January 12, 2009

Dear (insert faculty name here):

You have been selected to participate in research related to faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. This exploratory research will collect data on faculty experiences and involvement with academic freedom. The purpose of this research is to identify which of these experiences and involvements, if any, influence faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices. The information in this survey is being collected as part of my doctoral dissertation at The University of Toledo.

This questionnaire is being sent to 1,264 selected faculty members from 316 private baccalaureate colleges. You, along with three other faculty members from your institution have been selected at random to complete the questionnaire. College and university faculty and administrators will be able to utilize the results of this research to make changes to improve faculty satisfaction with academic freedom policies and practices.

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire soliciting information about your present and past experiences and involvements with academic freedom. The questionnaire should take 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Each questionnaire is coded numerically for identification purposes only. All of the information obtained will be kept strictly confidential, and your choice to complete the questionnaire is voluntary.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and participation with this project. Your answers are very valuable to this research, as one of my research goals is to obtain the best possible response rate to enhance the validity and the generalizability of the study's findings.

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope by February 16, 2009. Feel free to contact me with questions related to my research at (216) 513-5831 or to contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Ron Opp, at ropp@utnet.utoledo.edu.

Sincerely,

Becky M. Barger
UT Higher Education Doctoral Student
## Appendix B

### Academic Freedom Questionnaire

#### Faculty Experiences and Satisfaction with Academic Freedom Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have a faculty senate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do the faculty have collective bargaining?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you have annual faculty contracts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you have multi-year faculty contracts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you have letters of intent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have a tenure system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Serve on a committee to review the policies and practices related to academic freedom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Helped in designing policies to protect faculty expression in the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Serve on a grievance committee to handle violations of academic freedom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Been involved with a mediation or informal resolution to a grievance concerning academic freedom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Has there been change made at your institution to protect academic freedom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Has there been a violation of academic freedom at your current institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Has academic freedom been a topic of a grievance at your college?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Clear language on the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure are included in your faculty handbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Your institution clearly includes protections of academic freedom in the faculty handbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The protections of academic freedom are clearly included in the faculty contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The letters of intent from your institution contain protections of academic freedom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Your faculty senate is involved in developing policies and practices to protect academic freedom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support from:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. College administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Your dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Your department chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please indicate your response to the following statements about academic freedom in past work experiences. Fill in one response for each question.

22. Did a violation of academic freedom occur at a past institution?  
   Yes  No

If you answered no to question 22, please move down to question 26.

23. Did you leave this institution due to this violation?  
   Yes  No

24. Were policies modified to protect academic freedom after the violation?  
   Yes  No

25. Did you help with the process of modifying policies to protect academic freedom?  
   Yes  No

Please indicate your response to the following statements about campus climate with regards to academic freedom at your current job. Fill in one response for each question.

26. The administration at your current institution supports the protections of academic freedom.  
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

27. Faculty members at your institution believe that their academic freedom is protected.  
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

28. Faculty members at your institution believe that they are able to make changes to the policies and practices related to academic freedom.  
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

Please answer the following questions about your current protection of academic freedom. Fill in one box for each question.

I feel protected in:

29. teaching my subject area.  
   0 0 0 0 0

30. researching my subject area.  
   0 0 0 0 0

31. publishing in my subject area.  
   0 0 0 0 0

32. grading students.  
   0 0 0 0 0

33. participating in off-campus extracurricular activities such as social organizations.  
   0 0 0 0 0

34. choosing course content.  
   0 0 0 0 0

35. holding discussions in public.  
   0 0 0 0 0

36. writing editorials.  
   0 0 0 0 0

37. designing web pages.  
   0 0 0 0 0

38. using campus e-mails.  
   0 0 0 0 0

39. using self-designed evaluation forms.  
   0 0 0 0 0

40. assembling off-campus.  
   0 0 0 0 0

Please answer the following statement about your satisfaction with academic freedom at your current campus. Please fill in one circle, with one being the lowest and ten being the highest level of satisfaction.

41. I am satisfied with the current policies on academic freedom at my institution.

Low  High

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
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Please answer the following statement about your satisfaction with academic freedom at your current campus. Please fill in one circle, with one being the lowest and ten being the highest level of satisfaction.

42. I am satisfied with the current practices on academic freedom at my institution.
   Low       High
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

Please answer the following questions concerning your work information.

50. Are you currently serving in an administrative position as:
   ○ Dean
   ○ Department Chair
   ○ Other __________________
   ○ None of the above

51. What is your current status at this institution?
   ○ Tenured
   ○ On tenure track, but not tenured
   ○ Annual faculty contract
   ○ Multi-year contract

52. How many years have you been employed at your current institution? _____

53. What is your current rank?
   ○ Professor
   ○ Associate Professor
   ○ Assistant Professor
   ○ Other

54. In your current role, what is your principal activity?
   ○ Administration
   ○ Teaching
   ○ Publishing
   ○ Researching
   ○ Services to clients and patients
   ○ Other

Please answer the following questions about your demographic information. Fill in one box for each question.

55. Your sex
   ○ Male
   ○ Female

56. Race (Please fill in the circles that apply.)
   ○ White/Caucasian
   ○ African American/Black
   ○ American Indian/Alaska Native
   ○ Asian American/Asian
   ○ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
   ○ Mexican American/Chicano
   ○ Multiracial
   ○ Puerto Rican
   ○ Other Latino
   ○ Other

57. Would you like to receive the results from this study via mail?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

Thank you for your participation in this questionnaire.
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Adult Consent Form

ADULT RESEARCH - INFORMED CONSENT INFORMATION FOR MAIL SURVEYS
Faculty Experiences and Satisfaction with Academic Freedom

Principal Investigator: Dr. Rei Cyp, Associate Professor, 419.530.2995

Purpose: You are invited to participate in the research project, Faculty Experiences and Satisfaction with Academic Freedom, which is being conducted at the University of Toledo under the direction of Dr. Rei Cyp. The purpose of this study is to gather faculty members' views on their experiences and satisfaction with academic freedom.

Description of Procedures: This research will take place in your office. You will be asked to complete a questionnaire in which you will answer questions about your experiences with academic freedom. Your participation will take about 10 to 15 minutes.

Potential Risks: There are minimal risks to participants in this study involving loss of confidentiality. Anonymity in the questionnaire will be assured. If you stop at any time, you may stop at any time.

Potential Benefits: The only direct benefit to you if you participate in this research may be that you will learn more about faculty experiences and satisfaction with academic freedom. Others may benefit by learning about the results of this research.

Confidentiality: The research team will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing what you provided. The information you provided will be kept confidential. Although we will make every effort to protect your confidentiality, there is a low risk that this might be breached.

Voluntary Participation: Your willingness to participate in this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits in which you are otherwise entitled and will not affect your relationship with the University of Toledo. In addition, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

Contact Information: Before you decide to accept the invitation to take part in this study, you may ask any questions that you might have. If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Rei Cyp at 419.530.2995. If you have questions beyond those answered by the research team or your right as a research subject or research-related issues, you should contact the IRB Coordinator at 419.530.9044.

By continuing to the next page and completing the attached survey you are giving your informed consent to participate in this research project.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
SOCIAL BEHAVIORAL & EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

The research project described in this consent form has been reviewed and approved by The University of Toledo IRB for the period of time specified below:

SSB 198 t 153262 Number of Subjects: 1214 Project Start Date: 12/01/96 Project Expiration Date: 12/01/97

Copyright 1997. General Survey Consent Form Page 1 of 1