

**The CODESRIA Debate on Academic and Intellectual  
Freedom in Africa: The Role and Responsibility of  
African Intellectuals**

**Thesis in fulfilment of the degree of Master of Social Science in Political  
Studies**

**At Rhodes University**

**Department of Political and International Studies**

**by**

**Loyiso Cabe**

**G21C5902**

**Supervisor: Dr Bongani Nyoka**

**November 2022**

## Declaration

**Student Number:** G21C5902

I, Loyiso Cabe, hereby declare that the thesis titled *The CODESRIA Debate on Academic and Intellectual Freedom in Africa: The Role and Responsibility of African Intellectuals*, which I submitted for the degree of Master of Social Sciences at Rhodes University, is my own original work and has never been submitted to any other university before. I am also aware of the university policy on plagiarism and I certify that where I have borrowed other authors works, I have indicated by referencing.

My supervisor, Dr Bongani Nyoka and I have approved the submission of this thesis.

### **Student Signature**



Date... November 16, 2022

### **Supervisor Signature**

...  .....

Date...16/11/2022.....

## Abstract

According to Fagunwa (2011), intellectuals serve as the glue that binds societies together and serve as the foundation upon which new civilizations are created and dismantled. The Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) of 1990 entrusted intellectuals with crucial transformative tasks (roles) and responsibilities in Africa. This study explores the transformational roles and responsibilities of African intellectuals in neo-liberal and neo-colonial Africa as well as how academic freedom must be understood by African academics in accordance with the present debate on academic freedom in South Africa, which was fueled by Natrass (2020) paper. The primary premise of this study is that academic freedom in Africa today is viewed differently than it was during the CODESRIA meeting on academic freedom in 1990, and that this is because of African intellectuals not carrying out their roles and responsibilities in Africa.

In CODESRIA 1990, academic freedom referred to an academic's unrestricted, yet responsible, right to pursue their academic interests (CODESRIA 1990; Kampala Declaration 1990). African academics now understand academic freedom to be merely their own freedom, unrelated to their responsibility to use it ethically and professionally. Hence, for them, academic freedom entails the freedom to express oneself without restrictions or fear of criticism (Chachage, 2008; Natrass, 2020b; Ezzo, and Long, 2020). Looking at this current misinterpretation of academic freedom, the 1990 CODESRIA meeting is a good reference point to the debate on academic freedom in Africa and role and responsibility of African intellectuals. This is because, it was where academic freedom and the role and responsibility of African intellectuals in Africa was professionally conceptualized. Thus, this study reviews the 1990 CODESRIA debate to understand the role and responsibility of African intellectuals.

This study utilizes two theories, Social Constructivism Theory and the Social Responsibility Theory, to explain the position it has taken on the subject at hand. Thus, these theories provide an umbrella and a point of departure for understanding the context and dynamics of the ongoing conflict between academic freedom and social responsibility in South Africa's higher education institutions.

**Keywords:** Africa, Academic Freedom, CODESRIA, Social Responsibility, Neoliberalism, Colonization and decolonization, University, African Intellectuals and Social Sciences.

## **Acknowledgements**

My gratitude to everyone who contributed to making this project possible is beyond words. Without your encouragement and the chance, you gave me, I would not have been able to get this far.

Without my supervisor, Dr. Bongani Nyoka, who has provided me with great assistance, this research and the supporting literature would not have been possible. I owe my supervisor a debt of gratitude for his precious time, insightful analysis of this research paper and his very kind assistance that made this study possible. The generosity and knowledge of my supervisor have helped my study in countless ways and spared me from making many mistakes. Those mistakes that unavoidably remain are completely my own responsibility.

This research was supported by the Andrew Mellon Foundation Scholarship. I am thankful for the funding, without which this study would not have been able to be conducted. I wish that this funding would still be available to assist more deserving students like me. I am grateful to the faculty in the Politics and International Studies department at Rhodes University, especially Professor Sally Matthews, as well as the master's and doctoral students who assessed my research proposal and made suggestions that were extremely helpful to the study.

I also want to express my gratitude to Rhodes University for giving me the opportunity to conduct this research by admitting me. Thank you to the Rhodes University laboratory technicians for providing me with the resources I needed to complete my study. I would also like to convey my thanks to CODESRIA, the attendees of the CODESRIA (1990) meeting, and everyone who has used the information they shared about academic freedom and the realities of Africa. This study was successful because of the literature on CODESRIA, which also provided a solid foundation for the present problem South Africa is currently facing in higher education, notably in the field of social sciences.

Lastly, I would be guilty if I forgot to mention Athandiwe Cabe. I want to thank her for her unshakeable faith in me, which has kept my spirits and determination strong throughout this entire process.

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is the product of multiple, costly sacrifices. I would want to express my gratitude for the support and love by dedicating this work to my family, friends, and the staff and faculty at Rhodes University, Political and International Studies department.

I would also like to dedicate this study to my late, loving parents, Vumile and Nombuyiselo Cabe, whose guidance and lessons have made me a more resilient and strong man in any situation I find myself in, may you continue to rest in peace. My sister, Athandiwe Cabe, has always been by my side and is very special.

This research is also dedicated to Ernest Frissiano Honwana, Gugulethu Matsiba, Phakamile Matsiba, Alizwa Cakana, Sifiso Saiko Lubisi, Mluleki Miya, and Nelisiwe Tobo in honor of all my friends who have encouraged and believed in me throughout this research process. I will always be grateful for everything they did, especially Sifiso Saiko Lubisi for supporting me at the University of Kwa-Zulu Natal to improve my academic and research skills. This work includes my respect for the hardships of all the Rhodes University students. Everyone who studies have always aimed for victory. Despite difficulties, exhaustion, or stress that we as students might encounter, we remain committed to succeed. Siya pambili!

Finally, I honor my ancestors and the almighty God by dedicating this research to them. I thank them for guiding me through the process and for keeping me alive, mentally strong, safe, and in good health. I dedicate all this work to them wholeheartedly.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration.....	I
Abstract.....	II
Acknowledgements.....	III
Dedication.....	IV

### Chapter One: introduction

Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background and context of the study.....	1
1.1.1 Colonialism and Apartheid in South Africa.....	2
1.1.2 The Social Sciences in Africa.....	3
1.1.3 CODESRIA.....	3
1.1.4 The CODESRIA 1990 conference, challenges to academic freedom and conceptualization of academic freedom.....	4
1.1.5 The emergence of Neoliberal Principles and the Re-conceptualization of Academic Freedom.....	5
1.1.6 African intellectuals and their stance towards their roles and responsibilities in a neocolonial and neoliberal Africa	
1.1.7 The current dilemma on Academic freedom and Social Responsibility.....	6
1.2 Problem statement.....	8
1.3 Significance of this study.....	9
1.4 Questions of this Study.....	10
1.5 Objectives of this Study.....	10
1.6 Theoretical Framework for this study.....	10
1.7 Research Motivation.....	11
1.8 Data collection Methods.....	11
1.9 Data Analysis.....	12
1.10 Limitations of this Study.....	13
1.11 Structure of this study.....	13
Conclusion.....	15

### Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

Introduction.....	16
2.1 The commonly accepted “social ideas” and the rise of conflict in the society.....	16
2.2 Conceptualizing Academic freedom.....	18
2.2.1 The special theory of Academic Freedom.....	18
2.2.2 The General Theory of Academic Freedom.....	19
2.2.3 Special Theory and General Theory: Their Critique.....	20
2.3 The Social Constructivism Theory and its applicability to this study.....	21
2.3.1 The society, interaction and construction of ideas.....	24
2.4 The Social Responsibility Theory and its applicability to the study.....	27
2.4.1 Responsibility and Freedom: The emergence of conflict.....	29
Conclusion.....	32

### Chapter Three: The History and Context of Academic freedom

Introduction.....	33
3.1 Understanding Academic Freedom from past to present.....	33
3.2 The origin of the university.....	34
3.2.1 Medieval Universities: The Bologna University.....	34
3.2.2 Evolution of Ancient to Modern Universities.....	36
3.3 The history of Academic Freedom, its origins.....	39
3.4 Academic freedom in Africa.....	43
Conclusion.....	46

#### **Chapter Four: Academic Freedom in the African Context**

Introduction.....	47
4.1 Transition into democracy by African countries and the space for academic freedom in Africa.....	47
4.2 African universities, the conditions of learning in postcolonial Africa.....	51
4.3 The 1990 CODESRIA debate: The Perspective on Academic Freedom.....	52
4.4 The mission of the university and intellectuals: Their responsibility to the society...55	
4.5 The new threats to Academic Freedom: The Neoliberal Principles.....	57
4.6 The Kampala Declaration (1990), its flaws and strengths.....	58
4.7 Academic freedom and Social Responsibility of African Intellectuals, the 2020 debate on academic freedom in South Africa.....	59
4.8 Research Gap.....	61
Conclusion.....	62

#### **Chapter 5: The Role and Responsibility of African Intellectuals**

Introduction.....	64
5.1 Why is it important for intellectuals to know their roles and responsibilities when conducting social research?.....	64
5.2 What exactly is the role and responsibility of African intellectuals?.....	69
5.3 In context of ongoing debates on Academic and intellectual freedom in South Africa, what can we learn from the CODESRIA debate on this issue?.....	76
Conclusion.....	80

#### **Chapter Six: Conclusion**

Introduction.....	81
6.1 Overview of the study.....	81
6.2 Review of Chapters and discussions.....	84
6.2.1 Chapter One.....	84
6.2.2 Chapter Two.....	85
6.2.3 Chapter Three.....	88
6.2.4 Chapter Four.....	90
6.2.5 Chapter Five.....	91
6.2.6 Chapter Six.....	92
6.3 Presentation of the Research Gap.....	93
6.4 Summary.....	94
6.5 Implications of the study.....	95

6.6 Limitations of this study.....	96
Conclusion.....	97
References.....	99

# CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

## Introduction

Academic freedom has been a contentious issue amongst South African intellectuals and academics. More precisely, as said by Thompson (2020) and O'Neil (2006), South African academics consistently claim that the university does not enable them enough academic freedom. However, African academics themselves fail to understand that academic freedom in Africa, as was stated in the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) in 1990, has boundaries and is accompanied by their responsibility. This study associates the misinterpretation of academic freedom by African academics with the tendency of African intellectuals not playing their pivotal transformative roles and responsibilities in both neo-colonial and neo-liberal Africa.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to revisit the CODESRIA (1990) debate on academic freedom in Africa. Based on the insights of this debate, the study aims to understand the role and responsibility of African intellectuals.

### 1.1 Background and context of the study

Academic freedom as defined by CODESRIA (1990), refers to the right for an African academics or scholars to teach, research (*seek knowledge and analyze it*), learn and share knowledge with no outside interference. In South Africa, academic freedom is a constitutional right (see 1996 Constitution of the Republic South Africa). Moreover, academic freedom internationally is embedded in the right to education (Edmore, 2016). In this way, academic freedom is linked with human rights such as the freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of thought.

Given that academic freedom is unquestionably a constitutional right in South Africa, as CODESRIA (1990) pointed out, in Africa academic freedom is coupled with the obligation for academics to act morally and responsibly (CODESRIA 1990; Adesina 2020). That is, academic freedom has boundaries (see the Kampala Declaration 1990; Murove and Chitando 2018). Meaning, there is no free will (free agency) in academic and intellectual practice, just as there is no free will in life outside of academics. One who possesses a right or freedom is at all times bound to honor the rights and freedoms of others. Therefore, before African academics can assert that their academic freedom has been violated, they must first acknowledge the

restrictions or limitations (*terms and conditions*) on it and understand how to enforce them by being aware of their obligations to others both inside and outside of academia.

In South Africa, the basic issue this study tackles centers on whether academic freedom is currently violated or restricted and if it is handled responsibly and ethically. To understand the dilemma on academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa, many aspects need to be addressed. These include the colonialism and Apartheid (*in South Africa*), the history of social sciences in Africa, the CODESRIA and the reason for which it was formed and whether it is effective in achieving the goal for which it was designed, CODESRIA's conceptualization of academic freedom in Africa and the presence of neo-liberal principles and subsequent reconceptualization of academic freedom in Africa, as well as African intellectuals and stance towards their roles and responsibilities in a neocolonial and neoliberal Africa. Thus, this section provides the context and the background that shaped this study.

### ***1.1.1 Colonialism and Apartheid in South Africa***

The decolonization in Africa left African countries stranded and vastly damaged. This is connected to the terrible societal structures that still exist today and still govern social interactions and human conduct in both the workplace, academia and daily life (see Albertus, 2019). That is, colonialism in Africa left the socio-economic and political crises in African societies which defines the conditions under which African intellectuals conduct their research. The colonial government was autocratic, when looked at its administration structure (Lucas 2010; Edmore 2016; Cole 2017). To be more precise, the colonial government imposed a system of oppressive and discriminatory rule. The people that were oppressed and discriminated against were the indigenous people whose nations were colonized. The oppressed, given their limited economic, social, and political influence over matters affecting their countries, they became voiceless (Gann, Duignan and Turner 1969).

However, not all African nations were run in the same way. For instance, in South Africa, it was the Apartheid system that operated. There was a strong division between White people and Black people under the Apartheid system (Albertus 2019). Being Black or White determined their involvement in state matters and their access to resources. According to Musavengane and Leonard (2019), the Black people who lacked significant political, economic, and social power were the oppressed people under this system. Black people were seen as less intelligent than White people and as being inferior to them (Musavengane and Leonard 2019). That is, in South Africa, there was no culture of free intellectual or academic pursuit for the oppressed

throughout apartheid. Consequently, very few Black scholars have featured in the country to date (Sono 1994). The idea of African intellectuals as a class with regard to South Africa is historically so foreign that bringing it up would likely cause confusion, if not amusement, among the knowledge, as Sono (1994) points out.

In Africa as whole, not only in South Africa the issue of academic freedom is connected to the history of the continent. As stated by Mafeje (1994), academic freedom in Africa relates to the colonial structures in African societies inherited by native bourgeoisie from the colonial bourgeoisie during independence struggles. Moreover, as stated by Hall (2006), Africans relate to their history and experiences when touching on academic freedom. In this way, academic freedom in South Africa is connected to the cultural and ideological diversity that characterizes South Africa, where racial discrimination has been long entrenched (see Benatar 2016).

### ***1.1.2 The Social Sciences in Africa***

The social sciences conditions in Africa have always from the start been shaped by the operational systems created by the colonialism (*apartheid in South Africa*) in Africa (see CODESRIA 1990; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013; Ndimande 2013). This is because, the development as said by Ki-Zerbo (1994) and Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013) did not rebuild or transform the social sciences in Africa. It was only the substitution of the colonial rulers by the native rulers (Ki-Zerbo 1994), having the native government following on the same path as that of colonial government (Fanon 1960; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013; Mafeje 1994).

The intention of colonial governments was to further their own interests in Africa rather than to develop Africa (Akala 2021). In other words, they had nothing to do with developing the ideal social sciences environment in Africa that would facilitate the continent's development. As a result, African social sciences were left stranded during decolonization and now require the commitment of African intellectuals. As stated by Mamdani and Diouf (1994), social sciences in Africa from the 1970s to late 1980s were, for example, constituted by intellectuals and academics (Albertus 2019; Kuhn 2021) being forced to adopt self-censorship. During those times, that was related to the state-imposed brutality against African intellectuals and academics, in which those who produced or shared ideas or knowledge that were opposed to the interests of the state were imprisoned, murdered, or exiled (see Mkandawire 1999; Mamdani and Diouf 1994). It was the agenda of the state that mattered and not the freedom of intellectuals or academics.

The debate over how marginalized Africans' academic and intellectual freedom was being abused or restricted in Africa first gained popularity in the 1980s. This was evident on the African Watch Report (1990) which identified African governments as being in war with their own people. This then led to the search of an alternative by African intellectuals. The alternative was then the creation of CODESRIA.

### ***1.1.3 CODESRIA***

CODESRIA was conceptualized in 1964 and formally established as an organization by African intellectuals in Dakar, Senegal, in 1973. As said by Olokishi and Nyamnjoh (2006) and Hoffmann (2019), CODESRIA emerged as an independent pan-African intellectual organization with the mission of encouraging the production and exchange of knowledge by African intellectuals in matters pertaining to public and policy debates on Africa and globally. African societies had several problems that CODESRIA was meant to solve, including inequality, poverty, the brutality of African governments toward African intellectuals and academics, and the economic decline of Africa that posed challenges on social science research.

In essence, CODESRIA was essentially established as a development agenda tool in African social sciences because it had to relate to and deal with problems in the social sciences field as well as challenges African academics face in the academic environment in the continent (see CODESRIA 1990). In this regard, the CODESRIA's objective was to balance people's lives in both academic and everyday contexts.

CODESRIA, however, has never been capable of meeting its goals and expectations for African people. CODESRIA has never entirely closed the gap (*both in academia and daily life*) between the historically marginalized (Non-Whites) and historically unmarginalized (Whites), which still exists today. This is because, the structure and direction of CODESRIA was shaped during the Structural Adjustment Policies/ Programmes (SAPs) in Africa, the period when African nations were compelled to accept reforms in their policy formulation in exchange for assistance from donor nations or International Financing Institutions (IFIs). As it is stated by Hoffmann (2017), Ihonvbere (1993), Ihonvbere (1996) the mission, structure and even the governance of CODESRIA was heavily influenced by the donor countries or IFIs. The CODESRIA had and still has no say on this influence because, Africa as whole still relies on external funding provided by the donor countries or IFIs (see Mama 2006; Zeleza 2003; Ihonvbere 1996). The donor countries, whose mission in Africa is not to develop Africa, but to

fulfil their personal and private ambitions, as stated by Akala (2021) and Ogachi (2011) of which this is referred to as neo-colonialism (Mosala, 2022).

It is for this way that, as stated by Moyo (2016) and Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013) the colonial structure and inequality in Africa has not been addressed and transformed. For the CODESRIA to be successful in tackling inequality in Africa, it should have existed and operated independently with no external interference or influence.

#### ***1.1.4 The CODESRIA 1990 conference, challenges to academic freedom and conceptualization of academic freedom***

African intellectuals gathered in Kampala, Uganda, in 1990 under the agenda of CODESRIA in response to increasing harassment of academics across the continent (see Mamdani and Diouf 1994; Mkandawire 1999; Hoffmann 2019; Adesina 2020). Moreover, as said by Mamdani (2009), Africa's post-independence period was marked by a growing need for reforms in higher education. These reforms emphasized Africanizing the academic staff and modifying the curriculum of teaching programs in Africa to the demands of the region (Mamdani 2009). In other words, the CODESRIA (1990) meeting had to address both common socioeconomic issues, institutional barriers to academic freedom, and academic freedom itself.

As indicated by Ake (1994), academic freedom is just a privilege for middle-class academics and has no significance for non-academics and is also no more important than other basic civil rights that were or are routinely abused (see Mamdani and Diouf 1994). Accordingly, for academic freedom to be meaningful, it must be entwined with other societal freedoms. The promotion and defense of other common rights must also be a priority for academics themselves (see Mamdani and Diouf). For instance, academics must remain professional and ethical when exercising their academic freedom so that they cannot further inequality or any other social disturbance. Same applies to intellectuals, intellectuals cannot use their intellectual freedom to exert neo-colonialism. Thus, the goals of CODESRIA in Kampala in 1990 were to improve living within and outside African academia. Hence, as seen from CODESRIA (1990) the defense for academic and intellectual freedom necessitated the development of the society. This means that academic and intellectual freedom was to be linked with the problems faced by society as whole (see Ake 1994; Mkandawire 1999; Mama 2006). African academics and intellectuals would have both academic or intellectual freedom and social responsibility.

It was stated in CODESRIA (1990) that African intellectuals had to make relationships with others (*ignore identity differences*) (CODESRIA 1990). Most crucially, intellectuals had to

recognize their need to be responsible for their society (Ake 1994; Ki-Zerbo 1994; Mama and Imam 1994). In this way, academic freedom in Africa is meaningful only when it is linked with the social responsibility, because freedom comes with responsibility, as stated by CODESRIA (1990) and De la Fuente (2002).

Academic freedom, on the sight of CODESRIA (1990), relates to the freedom of African academics to pursue their academic interests as well as their duty to act ethically and responsibly (De la Fuente 2002; Adesina 2020; Akala 2021). Because, as indicated in the Kampala Declaration (1990), academia rests upon two pillars: academic freedom for academics and the responsibility of academics to behave ethically and responsibly. Meaning that, academic freedom must be used for the interests of the academia and with the responsibility. Thus, the *Kampala Declaration on Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility of African Intellectuals* of the CODESRIA (1990) meeting was designed to help scholars conducting social sciences research in Africa understand their freedom and accept their social responsibility.

### ***1.1.5 Neoliberal Principles and the Re-conceptualization of Academic Freedom in Africa***

The understanding of academic freedom from the view of CODESRIA (1990) is constantly changing in the presence of the Neoliberal reforms in Africa (Ogachi 2011; Akala 2021). The African countries during the early post-colonial periods undergone the financial difficulties that made them to resort for loans from the IFIs, notably, the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), whom in return imposed SAPs in Africa (Caffentzis 2005; Thompson 2010; Akala 2021; Ogachi 2011). As previously indicated, the SAPs through IFIs demanded that African countries embrace neoliberal concepts (neoliberalism) on their policy formulation (Caffentzis 2005; Davids 2021; Thompson 2010; Ogachi 2011; Akala 2021).

As stated by Ogachi (2011), Akala (2021) and Davis (2021) the management and structure of higher education have suffered because of this neoliberal reform. The most painful changes brought about by this reform, as stated by Akala (2021), were the conversion of education from a common good, as CODESRIA (1990) perceived it, into a private interest. In which this led to complete loss of any socialization or Africanization in Africa, leading to the adoption of profit-making practices by the university and its faculty. Consequentially, both the African universities and African academics lost sight of the true meaning of academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa (see Ogachi 2011; Akala 2021). The main mission of the

university as stated by Mamdani (2008) is to promote the research by researchers. Thus, the university is “the university is the strategic heart of education in any society”, because its main mission is to carry out research and share information to the society (Mamdani (2008: 1). Thus, knowledge is made available to society through the activities of both universities and researchers. Consequently, for the university to produce such information, it must be autonomous, and researchers (academics) must have academic freedom (see Mamdani and Diouf 1994). However, the autonomy of the university and the freedom of academics come with societal responsibilities (see The Kampala Declaration 1990). Both the university and academics are bound to stick to academic and ethical principles.

The university turned into the seller of education with the arrival of neoliberal principles, as said by Ogachi (2011) and Akala (2021). Which indicates that it switched from producing information to selling it to society (Davis 2021). Through paying tuition fees, the students then became the purchasers of the education that the university is selling (see Ogachi 2011; Akala 2021). Consequently, our modern African university does not produce and disseminate information for the benefit of society. The practical information or knowledge that gives Africans the skills they need to develop Africa for the good of African citizens' lives. In a similar vein, academics themselves have gone down the same road, abandoning their responsibilities by thinking of themselves as university employees rather than knowledge producers (see Ogachi 2011).

The university lost its mission throughout this shift because the knowledge it sells is only accessible by those who can afford it. This indicates that those who cannot afford to pay the tuition costs cannot enroll in a university and receive an education. In the meantime, this widens the socioeconomic inequality brought about by colonialism (*Apartheid in South Africa*). Academics contribute to this imbalance by disconnecting their academic freedom with other societal freedoms. Throughout this, they forget their social responsibilities and behave in a manner that is unethical and discriminatory, which causes problems in academia. Thereby, losing sight of the true meaning of academic freedom (Ogachi 2011; Akala 2021).

In essence, the neoliberal system promotes individualism and rivalry (competition) (Yandell, Doecke and Abdi 2020). Neoliberal practices have undermined the African philosophy of Ubuntu, stating that *Umntu Ngumntu Ngabantu*, which translates to "a person is a person because of or through others" (Tutu, 2004: 25–26) or "I am because we are" (Mpetsheni, 2019: 20). The tenets of the Ubuntu concept include humanity, co-responsibility, respect, dignity, and

social justice (Mabovula 2010; Mpetsheni 2019). On the other hand, neoliberalism implies the complete opposite to this. Academic freedom in Africa in CODESRIA's (1990) perspective is more related to Ubuntu Philosophy and not neoliberal philosophy.

The genuine meaning of academic freedom in Africa which includes the duty of African intellectuals to act ethically and responsible has drastically changed in the face of the Neoliberal principles in Africa.

### ***1.1.6 African intellectuals and their stance towards their roles and responsibilities in a neocolonial and neoliberal Africa***

For Mazrui (1986), an intellectual is a person who is fascinated by ideas and skills to handle many problems effectively. Therefore, possessing intellectual tendencies means that your end products are ideas. It is crucial to understand who an African intellectual is on a continent like Africa, which is home to many different ethnic and racial groups that are not only heterogeneous in their composition, historical past, and interests but also hierarchical in how they are made in terms of power relations. According to Sono (1994), defining African intellectuals must not be on what they are, but on who they are. According to Nkrumah (1970: 40), intellectuals are true revolutionaries whose goals diverge from those of the ruling class. These are the individuals who look at society issues and propose suggestions or solutions to improve things for the majority (see CODESRIA 1990). Being an African intellectual entail resisting the dominance and constraints of tradition, not just by virtue of being born in Africa (Sono 1994). Likewise, to be classified as an African intellectual, one must subscribe to the notion of Pan-Africanism. That is, one cannot be classified an African intellectual and be against Pan-Africanism.

Each generation of intellectuals, according to Fanon (1961), must find their purpose, carry it out, or betray it. According to Fagunwa (2011), the current neocolonial and neoliberal society is one in which intellectuals are still yet to fulfill their crucial responsibility. Meaning, the dominating neoliberal methodologies and epistemologies along with an unfinished business of decolonization (*native bourgeoisie individualistic lifestyle*) in Africa have precluded to a reasonable extent, the existence of African intellectuals who have an important roles and responsibilities in their societies (Wessels 1994, p. 96). This exemplifies the socioeconomic scenario we are currently in in Africa, where even academics and researchers are at conflict with one another and are unsure of what is best for Africa. Thus, under these difficult social

structures in Africa, it is necessary to remind and encourage African intellectuals of their roles and responsibilities.

### ***1.1.7 The current dilemma on Academic freedom and Social Responsibility***

It is very important to important to note that both in South Africa and the entire continent of Africa, we are facing different structures that have different responsibilities and moral standards because of past circumstances such as colonialism and apartheid in South Africa. For this, both historically marginalized, and historically non-marginalized academics must understand freedom, responsibility and moral conduct. For example, it can be unethical for academics, both those who have faced oppression and those who have not, to demand academic freedom for promoting injustice in the society. That would go against what the CODESRIA (1990) held true academic freedom to be. If one harms the academic community's moral code or detach his/her freedom from other basic freedoms, one cannot expect their academic freedom to be unharmed.

The debate in Africa on whether African universities violate the academic freedom of African academics and if they are aware of the responsibility that comes with such freedom is well-served by the 2020 debate on academic freedom in South Africa. The debate was driven by the study of Nicole Natrass (2020) titled “Why are Black South African Students Less Likely to Consider Studying Biological Sciences”. The insight of this debate can be found on the *South African Journal of Science*. Natrass (2020a) wanted to know why, in comparison to other races, Black students are less likely to study biological sciences in university.

She then concluded as follows: -

“Black South African students are less likely to consider studying biological sciences than other students, and that this stance was linked primarily with career aspirations (supporting conservation but not wanting a career in it), and these were associated with materialist values and attitudes to local wildlife” (Natrass 2020: 2).

This study revealed the culture under which the social science of South Africa operates. The historical constructions of the colonizers and the inequality between African scholars or students in Higher education. This study, corresponded with the assertion by Mafeje (1994) that in any society, people (*intellectuals according to Mafeje*) are not equal. There are those said to be possessing higher intelligence than other in connection to the matters of their surroundings.

In addition, as stated by Mzilikazi, le Roux and van Vuuren (2020), the study by Natrass (2020), fits perfectly into the historical narrative making Black people as incapable of thinking beyond their immediate circumstances. This shows inequality because, some people are seen as more superior and more intelligent than others. Basically, the study judged materialistic values and career aspirations based on skin colour, seeing Black students as less careless to the nature (*not caring to animals*) and not affording. Thus, the study of Natrass (2020) was racist as also stated by Ross (2020), Mzilikazi, le Roux and van Vuuren (2020) and Nongxa (2020). In this way, this study as stated by Glennon et. al, (2020) was not a properly and scientifically conducted. Natrass (2020) merely used her academic freedom to shield her bad science (Adesina 2020) and did not acknowledge her duty to act ethically and responsible.

## **1.2 Problem statement**

According to the CODESRIA Kampala Declaration (1990), freedom and responsibility go hand in hand. African academics are therefore allowed to express their academic freedom, but only in an ethical and responsible manner. African academics, however, have lately concentrated solely on their entitlement to academic freedom without acknowledging conditions of such freedom in Africa. In Africa, academic freedom without a sense of social responsibility has no place in the continent's development plan. Academic freedom is not superior to other freedoms violated in African societies, as stated in CODESRIA (1990). Such freedom also has no great importance for the entire society, unless it is used to correspond to the issues faced by the society.

This then drives to the need of more research on academic freedom and responsibility of African intellectuals. The research that covers both academic freedom and responsibility of African intellectuals. Such research could alert and educate African academics and intellectuals on the true meaning of Academic freedom in Africa. The freedom that is not enjoyed as an elitism and individual freedom, but the freedom that corresponds with African social realities. In essence, the freedom that is attached with the responsibility.

In this way, the problem with this study centers on how African intellectuals and academics in Africa perceive and use their academic freedom, and how that affects the Africa's intentions for social sciences development.

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to provide more details on academic freedom in Africa by presenting the responsibility and role of African intellectuals in Africa. It revisits the

CODESRIA (1990) debate, which contains important details about the scope of academic freedom in Africa and the responsibility of African intellectuals.

### **1.3 Significance of this study**

This study touches on the 2020 academic freedom debate in South Africa. Thus, it provides an important contribution to the body of knowledge on academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa. Hence, this study researches an area needing further research, the role and responsibility of African intellectuals. Making a good understanding of academic freedom in Africa. The theories such as the constructivism are vital in studies that relate to how individuals understand concepts. In this way, this theory and its underlying presumptions contribute significantly into the African social sciences field by providing useful information on how one come to know and how is that affected by the culture under which an individual interacts. The relationship between total freedom and the rise of conflict is also adequately explained by the social responsibility theory.

Future researchers on the same subject will find the study's findings to be very useful. It will be useful since it addresses nearly all aspects of academic freedom, including how it is understood, its definition in isolation with reference to Africa, its history, its status in Africa, and the continent's history. Such knowledge is extremely beneficial not just to the discussion of academic freedom but also to the understanding of social sciences in Africa and African history. Therefore, this study provides African intellectuals and future researchers with the foundation and literature to draw on when they are conducting social sciences studies, especially those relating to African history, African social sciences and academic freedom.

Considering the ongoing conflicts over the misunderstanding of academic freedom in Africa. The study that serves as a reminder of the social conditions in Africa as well as the role and responsibility of African intellectuals is extremely important. Such research can help to change intellectuals' future behavior toward other individuals or intellectuals and remind the intellectuals of their social roles and responsibilities.

### **1.4 Questions of this Study**

As was said in the preceding discussion, social sciences in Africa are in an extremely conflict-prone position, therefore it is important to understand how academic freedom in research relates to the responsibility and role of African intellectuals. With this in mind, the focus of this study was on the various encounters that African intellectuals had with colonialism and

post-colonialism. Since Africans intellectuals have gone through the different experiences, not everyone can understand academic freedom in the same sense. Thus, it is essential to think about both academic freedoms, the role, and the responsibility when conducting research.

This study examined the condition of African social sciences and the insights of various African intellectuals on academic freedom and social responsibility. Therefore, this study follows these questions: -

1. Why is it important for intellectuals to know their roles and responsibilities when conducting social research?
2. What exactly is the role and responsibility of African intellectuals?
3. In the context of ongoing debates on academic and intellectual freedom in South Africa, what can we learn from the CODESRIA debate on this issue?

## **1.5 Objectives of this Study**

- The main objective of this research is to revisit the CODESRIA debate on academic and intellectual freedom in Africa and what lessons could be learnt from it.
- Based on the insights of this debate, the study aims to understand the role and responsibility of African intellectuals.

## **1.6 Theoretical Framework**

There are various theoretical frameworks from which the topic of academic freedom can be examined. Among these theories are liberalism theory, socio-cultural theory, general theory, special theory, and others. But the social constructivism theory and the social responsibility theory were the ones that this study decided to use. In chapter 2, the theoretical framework chapter, the roots and ideas of the social responsibility theory and social constructivism theory are presented in detail.

This research uses the social constructivism theory to explain how knowledge, truth, and reality are created or evolved. This enables academic freedom to be viewed in context of its evolution and the way African intellectuals today interpret it. Knowing this helps to explain why African intellectuals constantly construct, reconstruct, and understand academic freedom in diverse ways. The social responsibility theory is then applied to explain the connection between

freedom and responsibility. Such information offers a hint as to the connection between academic freedom and the social responsibility of African intellectuals. It makes reference to the reasons why freedom and responsibility go hand in hand as well as the consequences of breaking that connection. Thus, by offering a theory-driven approach to this study, these theories provide a framework and support for the rationale of this study.

## **1.7 Research Motivation**

This study opted for academic freedom and social responsibility. In Africa, it is necessary to conduct research on social responsibility and academic freedom. Because the social sciences of Africa, as described in the background of this chapter, have the most shaky and bad foundations upon which African intellectuals conduct their research. As a Black person, and not coming from an elite family, I subscribe to the notion of Pan-Africanism, and therefore, I believe that academic freedom must ponder to the ethos and agenda of Pan-Africanism (*brotherhood and collaboration*). Since African intellectuals interact on these social sciences, it is crucial for them to keep in mind the history and state of these social sciences. The conditions under which academic freedom must be exercised and the justifications for which one intellectual's academic freedom may be considered to have been violated would then become much clearer. Moreover, the argument over academic freedom in Africa is sometimes painful and sensitive since sometimes it touches on the realities or experiences of some of the historically marginalized individuals, as was demonstrated in South Africa in 2020. If African intellectuals and academics loses sight of their mission and the university's mission, academic freedom then comes to be problematic in African social sciences.

## **1.8 Data collection Methods**

This study is explanatory research. This type of research, according to Bentouhami, Casas, and Weyler (2021), is the initial study that identifies the detailed nature of the issue that has to be solved. This study uses this research approach to understand the scope and nature of the ongoing debate on academic freedom in South Africa. An unstructured approach is used in this study so that all components of the research process can be flexible. This approach, as shown by Patibandla et al. (2015), is one that does not pre-plan specific questions or have a predetermined pattern before the data collection procedure.

Moreover, this is a qualitative study. As said by Maxwell (2008), a qualitative study is one in which the data is presented in words rather than numbers (statistically). Having said that, this

study makes use of words (narration), descriptions, and a reasoning stance. This study differs from quantitative studies in that it uses words to understand the phenomenon rather than statistics, whereas qualitative studies use statistics (see Maxwell 2008). By applying this method, this study is distinguished by its goal to explain the social interaction aspect. Therefore, the point is to get a deep insight into questions such as “by whom”, “how”, “why”, and/or “for what reasons”. As for this viewpoint, this study's conclusions and data analysis are presented entirely in accordance with this qualitative research design, which leads in a verbal or word rather than a numerical presentation of the results.

The data for this study is not constrained to a specific time period, but it is primarily sourced from CODESRIA 1990 literature and later literature on the same subject. I am also an important instrument for data collection on this thesis because the position I take determines what I view as ethical and responsible. Moreover, this study is entirely a desktop study, thus the fieldwork or interviews are not included. This desktop study, like all others, is built on secondary information from existing studies on the subject of academic freedom and similar topics (literature search). Therefore, a literature search is used to collect the appropriate literature from earlier studies, such as journal articles from scholarly publications, CODESRIA conference papers, and books in both electronic and print format. The online literature used in this study is searched using academic-electronic databases notably Google Scholar, Sage Online Journals, Science Direct, Sabinet Reference, and Springer Link.

## **1.9 Data Analysis**

The collected data is analyzed using interpretive paradigm and thematic analysis method. An interpretive paradigm is the data analysis approach used to explain social constructions, different viewpoints, or subjective reality in research. As said by Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis is a technique for analyzing qualitative data that involves looking through a data set to find, evaluate, and report similarities. In interpretive paradigm, the researcher shapes the research's generalizations or findings by bringing their own look to the examination of the phenomena that they see, based on their own experiences (Putnam & Banghart 2017).

The interpretive paradigm and thematic paradigm are used in this study to understand the development and meaning of concepts underlying this study. These involve a considerable number of relevant secondary qualitative data used in this study. The advantage of the interpretive paradigm is that it “draws on numerous definitions, concepts, methods and grand

narratives or theories to explain social phenomena and human behavior” (Sarimana, 2011: 28). The thematic analysis approach would then search for patterns in the data obtained from literature review, such as commonalities and differences.

### **1.10 Limitations of this Study**

The first limitation of this study is the unreliability of data. Like any desktop studies using information from the secondary sources, the data contained on this study may be outdated. Secondly, this study had no control of participants since it is desktop research. Thus, the data contained in this study is based on the research conducted by prior researchers. Therefore, this study could not control the research participants and methods used by the prior researchers whom their conclusions are included in this study. Moreover, there is a limited useful data being attained by this study. However, the available data was searched carefully analyzed and included in this study. This is to say, this study looked for the most literature that was similar to other literature on the same issue and excluded all of the literature that was, for the most part, not comparable.

### **1.11 Structure of this study**

This thesis is lengthy in terms of words and not in terms of chapters. Thus, there are just six chapters in this study. These chapters are as follows: -

**Chapter one: *Introduction***- The chapter that is now being viewed is chapter one. This chapter provided the background and the context of the study so that the reader may grasp enough knowledge on how and when the research problem started in a historical perspective. This chapter followed by presenting the problem statement, the significance of the study, the questions to be uncovered by this study, the objectives, the motivation of the study, the research methods as well as the limitations of this study.

**Chapter two: *Theoretical Framework***- This chapter provides a theoretical basis to make this study more understandable. Thus, the Social Responsibility Theory and the Constructivism Theory, (Social Constructivism Model) are the two theories applied in this chapter. To make a clear understanding on academic freedom and offer a starting point for the Social Responsibility Theory and Social Constructivism Theory this chapter presents the Special Theory and General Theory of Academic Freedom and their critique. It then goes into further detail on the historical context and premise of both constructivism and social responsibility

theory and stating how they apply to this study. On the final remarks, the Social Responsibility Theory and Social Constructivism delivers their purpose on this study.

**Chapter Three: *The History and Context of Academic Freedom***- This chapter presents the historical overview of academic freedom. The idea is that, for academic freedom to be analysed and understood, such understanding must come from the origins and development of academic freedom. The roots of the university are presented at first because academic freedom emerged and developed within the university. Thus, with no university, academic freedom would not exist. The discussion of the roots of the university goes to include the transformation of the university from Medieval Cathedral university into the Modern Scientific university. Then the emergence and constant development of academic freedom is discussed to include academic freedom from the Middle Ages into the contemporary university.

**Chapter Four: *Academic Freedom in the African Context***- This chapter presents the studies consulted during the process of this study. These studies are presented, analyzed and criticized when appropriate. The chapter begins with the transition into democracy by African countries and the space for academic freedom in Africa, followed by African universities, the conditions of learning in postcolonial Africa, The 1990 CODESRIA debate: the perspective on academic freedom, the mission of the university and intellectuals: their responsibility to the society, the new threats to academic freedom: the neoliberal principles, the Kampala Declaration (1990), its flaws and strengths, academic freedom and social responsibility of African Intellectuals, the 2020 debate on academic freedom in South Africa and the research gap covered by this study.

**Chapter Five: *The Role and Responsibility of African intellectuals***- This chapter provides the answers to the queries that structure this study. It starts off by showing how important it is for African intellectuals to understand their roles and responsibilities when conducting academic research in the social sciences in Africa. Then, it shows precisely the responsibilities and roles of African intellectuals as mentioned in CODESRIA (1990) and other related literature. Finally, the chapter discusses the lessons from the CODESRIA summit in 1990 in view of the ongoing debate over academic freedom in South Africa.

**Chapter Six: *Conclusion***- this is the final chapter of this study containing the summary and overview of the study. Much of the crucial data covered in each chapter of this study is summarized in this chapter. The results of this investigation are also presented in this chapter,

together with the theory and referenced literature that were used to collect and analyze the data. The summary, significance and limitations of this study are covered on this chapter.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter served as the study's opening and the outset of the study's discussion. Thus, this chapter first offered a background and context for the study, showing its rationale and direction of the study. Afterwards, it offered a problem statement, explained the importance of the study, its research questions, objectives, and motivation, as well as its limitations and its structure. In this chapter, it was stated that, the goal of this study is to revisit the CODESRIA (1990) debate to understand the role and responsibility of African intellectuals. The theoretical framework, which will continue from this chapter and play an important role in this study, will be covered in the following chapter.

## **CHAPTER TWO: Theoretical Framework**

### **Introduction**

There are two goals of this chapter, the first is to understand the root causes of the current conflict on academic freedom in South Africa, and the link between freedom and responsibility from a theoretical perspective. The second is to understand how African academics understand and come to understand academic freedom. Such helps to build a solid knowledge on how academic freedom in African societies comes to be understood and exercised by different academics on different ways and why there has always been a conflict on academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa.

The Special Theory as well as the General Theory are presented in commencement of this chapter. This is done to see how other scholars had previously understood academic freedom. That then serves as an entrance for the Social Constructivism Theory and the Social Responsibility Theory. Thus, this chapter is divided into different subheadings. The first subheadings provide detailed information on how conflict develops and how shared views are formed in a society. The second one covers the conceptualization of academic freedom, that is where the Special Theory and the General Theory and their critiques appear. The basis and implications of the Social Constructivism Theory and the Social Responsibility Theory on this study are presented in the fourth and fifth subheadings.

### **2.1 The Commonly Accepted “*Social Ideas*” and the Rise of Conflict in the Society**

It is the interaction and the history of individuals interacting in each society that makes the meanings of every phenomenon (Braun 2010). For instance, commonly accepted ideas and rules are created by the society for the society (see Fosnot 2013). Which means, it is either a person joins and accepts the rules created by the society or just leaves and behaves in a contrasting way. As defined by Tonnies and Loomis (2002), a society is a group of individuals who live together in a certain territory. Moreover, according to Redfield (1947) and Luhmann (2013), these individuals are bound to a common law or common set of political power since they live together, and they are mindful of having a unique identity from other groups nearby.

People who live in a society are characterized mainly by a shared interest and may have a unique culture and traditions (Tonnies and Loomis 2002). As stated by CODESRIA (1990),

societies like these, the societies that are defined by differences cannot build a better and stable environment. For them to do so, they need to cooperate and accept one another, with no regards of identity or geographical characteristics. That is to say, when a group of people interact or connect, they come to have the responsibility towards one other and for themselves. The responsibility that protects the freedom of both individuals. Then irresponsibility from one individual would break the interaction between them and create conflict.

Each country in Africa has a lot to tell on its experiences and the inequality persisting. South Africa is a multi-ethnic society, meaning it consists of different races. The races which have different experiences in the country. However, as being a multi-ethnic society, South Africa falls under a political or civil society. The political or civil society, refers to the group people living together (Frangipane 2015) with a defined institution of governance (Kistner 2014). This is to say, South Africa and the other African countries as whole have the rules and laws they operate under. The laws that prohibit the domination of one person over another. These laws are socially constructed for the benefit and future of African countries. Thus, they must be acknowledged by the citizens. In addition, as said by Brau (2010), the constructed ideas are the ones making the society positive interaction in a society possible. It is the individuals in a society that must accept the constructed ideas and make sense of them (Baru 2010). At the same time, it is the behaviour of an individual that points the direction to either wellbeing or conflict in the society.

African societies are the very conflict-prone societies because of both the internal and external conflicts. Furthermore, when it comes to social stability and development, the experiences of African nations make it exceedingly challenging. Decolonization itself is a fallacy in Africa, as also stated by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013). This thus demonstrates the sociocultural context that African societies live with. In other words, colonialism's and Apartheid's legacies shape how African societies interact. Because, as indicated by Booker (2001), both colonialism and apartheid left the former oppressed stranded and to handle their problems.

As shown by CODESRIA (1990), academic freedom in Africa arrived into a very problematic and wrecked Africa that requires social justice. The development in other words, where all individuals interacting within Africa would see each other as equals. The Kampala Declaration (1990) remains the powerful weapon for African intellectuals to abide and reference to when interacting in academic community. This is because, the Kampala Declaration (1990) relates both the freedom and responsibility of African intellectuals.

Africans must embrace a common vision of how to interact peacefully and on an equal footing, working together under the same set of principles. This entails, African academics must enjoy their freedom responsibly. Because, Africa is a society that has many grievances, as stated by Booker (2001). Thus, this requires African academics to see their academic freedom in relation to their neighbours, or those they relate with in African academia.

## **2.2 Conceptualizing Academic freedom**

As said by Pincoffs (1975), when a professor or student claims their right to academic freedom, they are typically believed to be implying their unrestricted freedom to seek the truth. Thus, it is generally accepted that one's academic freedom has been violated when someone interferes with that freedom. However, it is challenging to tell the victim from the perpetrator. As a reason, it can be difficult to identify the specifics that support or refute a charge of academic freedom violation.

This brings up the necessity for a theory, a theory that can explain what true academic freedom entails. It is advantageous to begin with other theories that have been put forth by other scholars in order to understand their premises before moving on to the social responsibility theory and the constructivism theory. The social constructivism theory and the social responsibility theory, the two theories used in this study, might benefit from such presumptions. As a result, the Special Theory and General Theory must first be understood in order to fully understand academic freedom using the social responsibility theory and the social constructivism theory.

### **2.2.1 The Special Theory of Academic Freedom**

This theory, according to Borhan (2019) and Baloyi (1998), stems from the traditional interpretations of academic freedom by "Lehrfreiheit" and "Lernfreiheit." As said by Pincoffs (1975), this theory does not connect academic freedom with basic human rights. The special theory thereby says that human rights of academics or scholars have nothing to do with their right to teach, conduct research, or publish. Academic freedom is merely the freedom that is created and assigned to them in a university context with the intention of achieving the university mission (Pincoffs 1975). According to Borhan (2019) and Mamdani (2007), the mission of the university is to create and disseminate the knowledge. The special theory then sees academic freedom as the specific freedom given to academics or students inside the academic community to pursue academic interests. This specific freedom only applies inside the context of the university and not beyond (Borhan 2019). In other words, the rights possessed

by the academics or students as the members of the free society does not relate to the rights they possess as academia community members.

The special theory's view of academic freedom as said by Andreescu (2010) and Borhan (2019), is the freedom for academics to teach students, to do research and publish their findings with no restriction. Likewise, for the students, academic freedom implies to their right to pursue or taught any course of study of their interest without limitations or prohibitions (Pincoffs 1975; Andreescu 2010; Borhan 2019). However, this freedom is only available to students and professors as fellow members of the academic community and for the good of that institution and the society. In other words, academic freedom only belongs to members of the academic community because of their membership and not because of their citizen status.

### **2.2.2 The General Theory of Academic Freedom**

The general theory of academic freedom, as said by Borhan (2009) and Aldossari and Ashwaq Mohammed (2021), is rooted in the traditional understanding of civil liberties. In other words, the civil liberties are considered in the basic view of academic freedom by this theory. Thus, for the general theory, academics and students possess the same freedom to express themselves in their positions as academic community members as they do in their positions as individual persons in a free civilized or democratic society. In short, as said by Baloyi (1998) this theory "equates academic freedom to civil liberty or civil freedom" (Baloyi 1998: 57). The freedom of expression, the freedom of enquiry, the freedom of publication and the freedom of association (see Borhan 2009; Aldossari and Ashwaq Mohammed 2021). Under this theory, intellectual freedom ought to be beneficial for society. Simply put, as said by Borhan (2019) this theory provides students or academics this very same rights as any other individual in society, both within and outside of the university.

For this theory, students and academics must be permitted to enjoy the same freedoms as they do as private individuals and must not be punished by either the university or the other group in the society (Borhan 2019; Reichman 2019). Following the view of this theory, the state as it does not interfere in the freedoms of the society members, it must do the same to the freedom of intellectuals. But academics have a strict guideline of using their freedom. That is to say, professors must not misuse his own freedom to violate the academic rights of the students in the classroom for the advantage of his personal agenda. Same applies to the student, the student must not as much as the professor, unless he is given the permission by the professor to do so,

because the professor is entitled to be the head in the classroom (Borhan 2019). Which means, they are free only in the campus to proclaim their personal agendas, but not in the classroom. If they fail to remain under this regulation, they are entitled to the lawful sanctions by the university because they failed to meet the requirements of the university, and are possible to ruin or interfere on the mission of the university (Seale, 1972; Borhan 2019; Nelson 2010).

Under the general theory, academic freedom is understood as the freedom that academic community members can exercise both inside and outside of the academic community. Thus, the freedoms that members of the academic community enjoy are related to the rights that community members in democratic societies enjoy (Borhan 2019; Reichman 2019; Nelson 2010; Aldossari and Ashwaq Mohammed 2021).

The general theory and the special theory are then distinguished by how they view academic freedom. To put it simply, the general theory sees academic freedom as the right possessed by students and academics, both as academic members and society members. Which means, they are granted their freedom acknowledging the freedoms they possess as society members. The special theory on the other hand, sees academic freedom of students as the freedom they possess as only academic members and not as the society members. Which means the special theory sees academic freedom as only existing inside the university walls and not outside. However, both theories are similar in that, they both place the right to free expression and free enquiry at the core of the concept of academic freedom.

### **2.2.3 Special Theory and General Theory: Their Critique**

Starting with the Special Theory, this theory lacks the component of human rights, the freedom of speech and the freedom of expression. Academic freedom fundamentally originates from the human rights. With no human rights at hand, academic freedom would be meaningless. The General Theory, on the other hand, believes that the right to academic freedom is connected to the fundamental freedom that every citizen of a free society has. This does not, however, address the fundamental understanding of academic freedom in a non-libertarian or unfree society. Thus, it does not give enough details on what counts as the violation of academic freedom in an unfree society. Finally, both of these two theories, the Special Theory and the General Theory, does not acknowledge how society is evolving and how this might affect how academic freedom is understood in each society. This means that these theories do not recognize how intellectuals interpret academic freedom and how they come to interpret it.

Thus, this makes these theories ineffective in explaining the changing nature of academic freedom in Africa.

As a result, through the weaknesses discussed above, the Constructivism theory and Social Responsibility Theory gets an entrance to this study by providing an in-depth knowledge of the freedom that relates to responsibility as well as the social constructions that result in the constant shift in understanding of academic freedom in Africa by African academics. Thus, instead of the Special Theory and General Theory, the Social Responsibility Theory and Constructivism Theory would be more useful in helping to understand the present debate over academic freedom in Africa.

### **2.3 The Social Constructivism Theory and its Applicability to this Study**

Constructivism Theory is a learning theory or philosophy that explains how individuals (people) come to have the knowledge that they do. In simple terms, this theory is all about acquiring knowledge; it outlines both "knowing" and "coming to know" (see Fosnot 2013; Huitt & Hummel 2003). This theory was developed to understand how children, adolescents, and adults learn and develop cognitively. The premise of this theory is that, knowledge that people have is not merely acquired but constructed (Berk, 2010). Under this theory, knowledge is an intersubjective interpretation, as stated by Brau (2020). People learn by taking the knowledge taught to them and then constructing an interpretation based on their experiences, beliefs, and cultural background (Brau 2020). Thus, this theory sees learning as an active process in which human being functions as a constructor of knowledge.

Jean Piaget is credited as the founder of constructivism. Piaget wanted to understand children's intellectual development. His theory then offered other scholars and the public at large with a clearer picture on how children learn. Then, as a result of his insight, other theorists modified this theory and added to it (see Nja, Ndifon & Cornelius-Ukpep 2019). As for this reason, constructivism theory first emerged in around 1880 as a cognitive constructivism. After that, social constructivism, whose founder was Semyonovich Vygotsky, followed and modified cognitive constructivism around 1896 (Huitt & Hummel 2003; Brau 2020).

Social constructivism amended cognitive constructivism because it did not consider society's influence on how people learn and know. Under cognitive constructivism, each person builds their knowledge through a unique or individual process (Berk 2010). The question then came up, as shown by Berk (2010) and Fosnot (2013), that if a person creates his own knowledge

through a personal process, then why do a group of people frequently have the same perspective on a given idea, situation, or event? Therefore, social cognitive constructivism had to be added to the cognitive constructivism's foundation and highlight how interactions between individuals also contribute to the creation of knowledge.

As stated by Driscoll (2000) social constructivism has these following key principles: -

- Human learning is built on the basis of the learner's prior or already existing knowledge
- Human beings are not born as empty vessels waiting to be loaded with information; rather, they are born with problems and a desire to understand them (to learn).
- Every knowledge is socially constructed; hence learning is a social activity that we all engage in as a group through interpersonal interaction.
- Every person has a specific and personal point of view based on their prior knowledge or beliefs.
- Learning exists in human mind

In essence, the social aspects of learning are the primary emphasis of the social constructivism model's central scope. Under this theory, a person's ability to grow cognitively is present from birth and later influenced by the experiences and interactions within the society. That is to say, the fundamental abilities of an individual to grow cognitively are eventually developed through interaction with others when the individual is introduced to society and develops. Thus, that is when he commences his path of learning. This leads to the central tenet of this theory, which holds that social interaction is the greatest way to learn (Brau 2020). In other words, a person's knowledge is influenced by the culture or the individuals he interacts with. As shown by Fosnot (2013), this subsequently influences an individual's learning and thinking. Indicating that an individual is easily adaptable to subjective interpretations when exposed to a new environment.

Considering the principle that each person has a unique perspective of view as shown by Driscoll's (2000). This premise implies that, it is in our nature as humans to be able to learn and think critically. For instance, even if we were put in a group and taught the same lesson, we would each apply our own, unique interpretation and analysis of the content. As a result, we will all perceive the lesson differently, and that is what distinguishes our knowledge from others. However, even though the interpretation might be unique, it will still be based on data from social interaction as stated by Fosnot (2013).

The principle that the learning exist in a human mind is linked to the idea that knowledge is always within a human mind and does not necessarily need to correspond to reality. As a result, a person would spend their entire life trying to create their own unique mental picture of world using their judgements of that world. They would continually create new meanings to reflect what they were learning from each event. More importantly, based on this theory, history and culture have a major influence on intellectual development. For instance, if the child is raised in a culture and educational environment which encourages flashcards, they would employ similar strategies of repetition to enhance their memory. The information that will be built in the learner's mind depends on their past experiences and the cultures of individuals with whom they interact. That would then be nurtured by him and develop into a mental culture.

Although this theory is a learning and education theory, as stated by Fosnot (2013), Brau (2020), and Berk (2010), its premises are highly helpful to the goals of this study. This study greatly benefits from the assumptions made by this theory, especially in terms of how experiences and interactions with society shape knowledge for an individual. The conceptualization of academic freedom by African academics is one of the most important components of this study. Thus, it would be simpler to understand how African academics' interactions and their experiences within those interactions connect to how they perceive academic freedom when applied this theory's viewpoint. Then it would be simpler to relate to the current conceptualization of academic freedom by African academics.

### **2.3.1 The Society, Interaction and Construction of Ideas**

Any form of social or political activity, as said by Snyder (1988), is a social construct; it is up to the individuals whether they choose to remain or depart from it. This indicates that we develop ideas and meanings as a result of our interactions with others in a society. Thereafter, it is our choice to keep them or leave them. John Locke in book *The Works of John Locke* of 1794 argued that, while an individual is alone, he can use their natural right to freedom, but as soon as he come into contact with other people, he either give up his freedom or limit it in order to respect the freedom of the others. The contract as stated by Hancock (1999) is the agreement (rules) between two or more parties on their relationship and safeguarding their properties. This contract exists through human interaction rather than an objective fact (Campbell 2000).

Money and countries are two examples of social constructions. The countries would not have existed without human interaction, as said by Hancock (1999) and Pettit (2001). This means that a country exists and is thought to exist because people think it does. Thus, according to

Hancock (1999), for humans to understand the existence of a country, they must first agree that such a thing as a country exists, and then they must also agree on what a country is. There would be no countries if that agreement did not even exist. The money is another illustration for social construction. That is to say, if we were to consider objective reality, we might argue that the money is real. After all, we are able to feel the coins or the paper. That, however, requires individuals to agree on what the paper or the coins stand for and can be used for. If not, coins are would simply be seen as metal objects and paper money as merely a paper. This is what the social construct is according to the Social Constructivism Theory. Because, when a person interacts with others, they come to an understanding of what something is and what it should be in order for it to be considered to be what it is.

Based on the social constructivism theory, social meanings result from interactions between individuals, their society and culture. Knowledge therefore develops through social interaction and the expansion of personal understanding (see Fosnot 2013; Brau 2020). This shows that there is always a chance to learn something new or broaden one's knowledge during conversations with two or more people. The knowledge that is acquired, however, is subject to change and does not stay constant. This is a result of how people interact, the nature of the society or individuals they interact with. Indicating that culture influences the development of new ideas in every interaction. People will therefore continue to learn since, as Fosnot (2013) stated, learning is an active or continuing phenomenon.

The social construction and its premises provide much information on how academic freedom comes to be understood and practiced. Academic freedom is a Human right based on the assertion by Rajagopal (2003), Beiter (2006) and Appiagyei-Atua (2016). A human right is not something that you can point at and say, 'There it is,' as mentioned by Snyder (1988) and Gregg (2011). In the same way, a person can only recognize such a right as a result of his interactions with other individuals. As said by Pettit (2001), a person alone in the desert, for instance, would not really need rights. For him, the concept would have no meaning (Pettit 2001). However, once he starts interacting with people or when a new person is put next to him, they will both understand how to work together. The only way to reach this is for them to mutually acknowledge their rights and set up rules to safeguard them. This is because, as Gregg (2011) has observed, when there are two or more people present, they start to believe that they are entitled to certain rights. For instance, one would believe and claim that he cannot be killed, held as a slave, or have his property taken from him. Then, each person would have a choice

between upholding the social contract or breaking it, depending on how each understands their human rights.

Academic freedom was developed and conceptualized in the Middle Ages by the intellectuals to safeguard scholars (*both academics and students*) in the university and defend their freedom, as said by Alemu (2018) and Baloyi (1998). It was designed to support and safeguard the rights of scholars in the university (Baloyi 1998; Alemu 2018). It supports them by ensuring that academics are aware of their freedom and may exercise it fearlessly. Likewise, it safeguards their freedom from a third entity, such as the Government (society as it was in the Middle Ages) or the university itself (Baloyi, 1998). But since academics connect with one another, their freedom ends up being paired with responsibility (see Pettit 2001). Everyone has a responsibility to respect the rights of others when exercising or enjoying their own. Thus, the notion of academic freedom depends on who, where, and how they exercise it. That is, whomever exercises it is responsible for not hurting anyone with whom he comes into contact. It basically comes down to, ‘you have a freedom,’ ‘I have a responsibility to not infringe on it,’ and vice versa.

An academic or scholar must interact with other scholars in the academic community in order to understand academic freedom. Academic freedom would not be needed if an academic or scholar was alone in the university. He would not recognize the term at all. Because no one could possibly violate his freedom. Because he is alone, he thus has no freedom and no responsibility. Moreover, based on social constructivism theory, academic freedom is constructed in this way.

In addition, the construction and interpretation of academic freedom is highly depended on the culture of the society upon it was created. For instance, the democratic states would not have the same view of academic freedom as the autocratic states. Experiences, and interactions between intellectuals likewise plays a bigger role on how academic freedom is understood, based on how Brau (2020) and Fosnot (2013), elaborates the evolution of knowledge. This means that African scholars only understand academic freedom through the lens of society, their interactions, and their experiences. Because, as stated by Fosnot (2013), Brau (2020), and Berk (2010) knowledge is a product of active (continuous) human construction. In other words, Academic freedom is socially constructed by intellectuals in the university. This is because, without interaction, there would be no meaning of concepts as stated by Fosnot (2013). Thus, it takes an intellectual to either obey or leave this social construction. This comes to relate to

the statement by Mpetsheni (2019) on *Ubuntu* philosophy, for one to ensure a better existence, s/he must be mindful of everyone around him. That is, refraining from harming them and expecting the same in return.

How an individual academic or scholar understands academic freedom is attached or connected to how he interprets it. Because as stated by Fosnot (2013) and Vinney (2019), people are different in ways in which they perceive meanings. Individuals' prior knowledge is what would enable them to understand what academic freedom means. From the view of the Kampala Declaration (1990) academic freedom is linked with responsibility. However, this now does not mean the same on academics in presence of neoliberal principles. The way that scholars or academics view academic freedom has transformed because of neoliberal policies (see Ogachi 2011; Akala 2021). This tells us that, the neoliberal culture brought a new culture to how academic freedom is perceived by African scholars. Making African scholars to see it different from the common good freedom into individual good freedom. This then becomes the biggest reason in the university's transformation from an academic to a political environment. Because there is no shared purpose by African scholars.

In summary, an academic's perspective of academic freedom is influenced by his or her historical background, interactions with others, and experiences. Consequently, how intellectuals understand and exercise their academic freedom is influenced by the society they are brought in as well as their relationships and experiences there. Then, as a result, such determines one's behavior and knowledge construction. The formation of good and healthy concepts is influenced by positive experiences and a healthy society. However, negative experiences and a negative society are likely to result in poorly constructed/understood concepts (Fosnot 2013). The difference in interpretation of academic freedom would then be caused by personal judgment. Because learning is an active process that relies on a person's thoughts rather than reality, the social culture and changes that the society experiences would alter each person's perspective of the world (see Driscoll 2000; Fosnot 2013; Brau 2020). An individual's mind is adaptable to societal change as stated by Brau (2020), therefore new knowledge and understanding is produced every day, in every condition.

Given that the CODESRIA (1990) linked academic freedom with responsibility, an academic is bound to choose between two options. The option of accepting academic freedom with the condition that they do not hurt others or of viewing their freedom as simply their own personal freedom. Everyone has expectations, which is the unfortunate thing about individual freedom

without boundaries and responsibility. Because not all actions carried out freely and without responsibility would be appreciated by everyone in society.

The social constructivism theory is useful in this study because it enables us to understand how African scholars acquire knowledge about academic freedom, how they understand it, why African scholars have different perspectives on it, and why understandings of academic freedom have changed significantly from CODESRIA (1990) to the modern neoliberal era.

## **2.4 The Social Responsibility Theory and its Applicability to the Study**

Chaffe (2017) classifies social responsibility theory as a media or press theory. Hence, Chaffe (2017) and Davis (1967) defined Social Responsibility Theory as a common good concept asserting that, individuals or organizations within the media society have the responsibility to act in the best interest of their surroundings and society. So, as stated by Pachamama (2019), this implies that journalists/ members of the press have a freedom and responsibility that are intertwined and must never be detached. The press or media is defined by Manzar et al. (2021) as a news industry of mass communication with a goal of dissemination of information to the society through print media, broadcast news, and the internet.

This theory's origins can be found in the West in the 1940s, but Siebert, Peterson, and Schramm formally developed it in 1956 with the appearance of their book, "Four Theories of the Media." Later, this theory was expanded upon and popularized in the 20th century by numerous scholars. As said by Chaffe (2017), this theory emerged to fill the gap posed by the libertarian theory, which dominated the media prior to the social responsibility theory. The gap that the social responsibility theory sought to fill was that throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, libertarian thought gave the media complete or absolute freedom, which led journalists to publish whatever they preferred without necessarily serving the public interest (see Chaffe 2017; Pachamama 2019; Bhattacharyya 2019). Thus, this theory developed in response of directing them, serving to both safeguard the press's freedom and direct individuals on how to exercise such freedom without touching on the freedoms of others. The conduct and behavior of journalists in the media society are primarily the focus of social responsibility theory (see Chaffe 2017).

The foundation of social responsibility theory, according to Siebert et al. (1956) and Nordenstreng (2000), is based on the following presumptions: -

- Freedom entails responsibilities, and the press, which is granted such freedom by the government, is required to fulfil certain important functions in mass communication in the society.
- If the press refuses to take responsibility, another body must ensure that the fundamental tasks of mass communication are completed.
- The media must adhere to a set of ethical norms in accordance with democratic values.

Following these core presumptions, this theory was developed to present such a vision to the media (see Siebert et al. 1956; Chafee 2017).

In essence the premise of the social responsibility theory is that, freedom includes responsibility. Thus, even while journalists can work as they choose in the media, they still have a responsibility to uphold the values of the society in which the media is operating (see Davis 1967; Van Buran 2000; Chafee 2017). In other words, as shown by Chaffe (2017), the social responsibility theory is on the view that while individuals working in the media must keep in mind and enjoy their freedom, particularly the freedom to do their work, they must also consider the consequences of their freedom on other individuals. This means that social responsibility is a common or public oriented approach, as opposed to libertarian theory, which is individual centered, in that social responsibility theory grants an individual freedom in recognition of the common interest. This is because this theory promotes cooperation or interaction and common goals rather than competition and self-serving gain (see Chafee 2017).

As shown by Uzuegbunam (2015), libertarian theory differs significantly from social responsibility theory in the way that libertarian theory is individualistic while the social responsibility is cooperative theory. The second difference between these two theories is how they view freedom of expression. While the social responsibility theory sees freedom of speech as a moral rather than an absolute right, the libertarian theory sees it as a natural and independent right. Moreover, their viewpoints on human nature are very opposed. Under the libertarian theory, man is purely a moral and intellectual being who is compelled to search for the truth on his own desire and without interference. In opposition, the social responsibility theory holds that people are naturally competitive and selfish beings who can cause harm to others. Because of this, based on the social responsibility theory, social responsibility is essential.

As shown by Chaffe (2017) and Uzuegbunam (2015), this idea is originally the theory of the media and not a theory of academic freedom. It can, however, be applied to the current debate

on academic freedom in South Africa. Given the underlying presumptions of this theory and its focus on media's freedom and responsibility, it serves as an important tool for analyzing the trends and nature of the ongoing conflict over academic freedom in South Africa. Applying this theory assists in showing the roots of the conflict and its driving forces. This theory would also show the link between conflict, freedom and responsibility.

#### **2.4.1 Responsibility and Freedom: The Emergence of Conflict**

The university and the media/press function in society in the same way, not for their own interests but for the interests of society (Mjr and Turoma 2020). As said by Mamdani (2007), universities serve the public interest since they are the center of society's survival because they produce and disseminate information through research, which is essential for society to address its problems. Similarly, the media is also connected with society as it is the source of information on social events (Schramm 2006). Thus, in order to prevent interference with the wellbeing of people within the society, there must be a positive interaction between the university or the media and the society.

Furthermore, the journalists and scholars or intellectuals, are similar in that they both seek knowledge to freely understand and report a certain phenomenon. Keeping in mind that, while they have the right to do so, both individuals are operates on the society, specifically the media society or the academic society (Kramer et al., 2016). According to Kramer et at. (2016) both the media and the academia include society in their search, writing, reporting, or publishing of results, most importantly for the society that will read and analyze their work. In many circumstances, the media or academia reflects society's image (Kramer et al., 2016; De Castro 2020). This means that each person or entity must be mindful of both their freedom and their responsibilities. This part focuses on how the root causes of conflict on academic freedom in South Africa.

As said by Chaffe (2017), Patterson, Painter, and Wilkins (2018), and Schramm (2006), the social responsibility theory in the media describes the freedom of the press as the ability to engage in media activities without restraints but with significant responsibilities that come with such freedom. Chaffe (2017) continues by saying that freedom comes with responsibility. In other words, when engaging in their activities within society, journalists or the media could not only exercise their freedom but also their duties, which are the bases of such freedom. For social responsibility theory as stated by Ineji (n.d.), the activities and consequences of the media must be fundamentally compatible with the social and cultural basis of the society in

which it operates. This is because an activity or conversation of mass media would be incomplete without mentioning media society (Ineji n.d.; Schramm 2006; Morgan 2020). Because there would be no media if society did not exist, Schramm (2006) claims that the two are mutually linked components. As said by Morgan (2020) and Schramm (2006), the media must respect society in this way by not inciting fear or other negative emotion on the society.

Based on the social responsibility theory, if the media do not take social responsibility into account, the government or another body will censor them (Morgan 2020; Mussell, 2016). Social unrest or conflict in the media society is caused by journalists who disobey the laws and regulations set in place to regulate their behaviour (Morgan 2020; Chaffe 2017; Mussell 2016). In other words, when journalists or the media refuse to acknowledge both their freedom and their responsibilities, conflict is likely to occur in the media society. Meaning that, when they only consider their freedom and neglect to think about the consequences of their actions on society. The journalists would be judged to be irresponsible when their media activity results in manipulation, transmission of biased information, stereotyping, and domination against the population whose activity is based on (Mussell 2016). That would then lead to harmful consequences on media culture, such as mental, physical, and emotional issues, as shown by Haas and Steiner (2001).

As stated in the Kampala Declaration (1990), African academics possess both the freedom and responsibility. In that they have freedom to pursue a research or academic interests but they need to do so with ethics and responsible manner. Which means, the freedom must be balanced with the responsibility. African academics therefore have both freedom and responsibility within the academic community. The right to pursue their studies as they see fit, as well as the responsibility to keep their studies professional, ethical and driven by integrity. Thus, as stated by the CODESRIA (1990), only a scientific study is considered is accepted, not an unscientific study. Therefore, academic freedom cannot be isolated from social responsibility and cannot be used to encourage harassment of other intellectuals (Kampala Declaration 1990; Adesina 2020).

Drawing from the social responsibility theory, there is conflict in the media when journalists fail to carry out their responsibilities. And probably when their actions had a negative effect on other members of the community (see Chaffe 2017; Mussell 2016). Therefore, if media professionals exercise both their freedom and responsibility, there will not be any problem. Hence, the conflict will only arise when one person fails to respect another's right to

freedom. The offended would react, and the reaction would typically be unfriendly (Chaffe 2017). For the social responsibility theory, if a journalist who violated another person's freedom is not brought to justice, it is likely that other members of the media community will take the same route (Middleton 2009; Chaffe 2017). The media industry will then have an individual-driven and conflict-driven culture where journalists only care about their freedom and not their responsibilities as Mussell (2016) mentions.

The conflict over academic freedom in South Africa in 2020 resulted from the freedom that is not attached with the responsibility by Nicole Nattrass (2020). In essence, it was a study driven by academic freedom but lacking the duty to act ethically and responsible (see Adesina 2020). The Blacks responded because they were offended by the study, as the social responsibility theory says in the media, that the offended responds (Chaffe 2017). Drawing from the constructivism theory, they responded because they related the study to their lived experiences. Therefore, the Black people made and understood the meaning of Nattrass (2020) study using the experience of long discrimination of Black people.

Based on the social constructivism theory, it is clear that there is a strong link between a person's intellect (way of understanding) and the society in which he was raised. That is, understanding academic freedom depends on one's cognition, which is shaped by the society in which he or she lives. Black South Africans in 2020 understood Nattrass's (2020) study based on their experiences and position on the continent. Then the conflict arises when people do not understand their academic freedom in same way. Nattrass (2020) understood academic freedom solely as a freedom, whereas the Black community or others who were upset understood it as a freedom connected to responsibility.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter discussed the theoretical foundations of the study, which helped to understand its context. This chapter's opening covered the summary of the South African 2020 debate over academic freedom. After that, the concept of academic freedom was viewed, using the special theory and general theory as a starting point for the social responsibility theory and constructivism (social constructivism model) theory. The theory of constructivism examined how an idea is developed and how knowledge is acquired. That was done in order to understand how African scholars came to know about academic freedom. It continued by explaining how the current debate over academic freedom in South Africa came about. The history of academic freedom will subsequently be covered in the chapter that follows this one.

# CHAPTER THREE: The History and Context of Academic Freedom

## Introduction

The history of academic freedom goes back a very long way (see Baloyi 2004; Bilgrami & Cole 2015; Ndereyimana 2021). It is crucial to consider the roots of academic freedom in order to fully understand what academic freedom truly is and why it is constantly debated in Africa.

To reach this aim, this chapter is divided into different subchapters. In the first subchapter, academic freedom is defined in terms of how it has been interpreted throughout history, from its inception in the Middle Ages to how it is currently understood in Africa. The second subchapter goes on to expand on the history and background of the university since academic freedom is constructed in the university setting. The history of academic freedom itself, from its early stages to the present-day, is then covered in the last subchapters.

### 3.1 Understanding Academic Freedom from Past to Present

It is true to say, as mentioned by Majava (2020), that not everyone in the world understands academic freedom in the same sense. The concept of academic freedom varies based on the society or person (Arko-Cobbah 2010; Majava 2020; Fish 2021). This is why academic freedom is a challenging concept to simply define, as stated by various scholars including Lucas (2010), Arko-Cobbah (2010), Yankah (2010), and Ndereyimana (2021). It may seem obvious to define academic freedom as an individual person, but it is very difficult to define it in a commonly accepted sense. That goes to say, the definition of academic freedom depends of who is defining it and under what reasons or circumstances. As a result, the definition of academic freedom connects to the political and social context as stated by Arko-Cobbah (2010) and Mama and Imam (1994).

According to Baloyi (1998), academic freedom in the Middle Ages was associated with the opinions or beliefs of *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lehrfreiheit* the German Scholars. From the ideas of *Lehrfreiheit*, the phrase "academic freedom meant the freedom of academics to teach and share their opinions without the hindrance from the society" (Baloyi 1998: 47). In other words, this was an exclusive privilege given to academics to conduct their intellectual interests free from interference from the state or society.

However, having academic freedom did not serve as the license for the academics to disregard the university's objective or their role in society (Alemu 2008; Alemu 2019). In this way, *Lehrfreiheit's* and *Lehrfreiheit* vision of academic freedom, the freedom of the scholar to teach and learn, was broadened by the academic society to include the responsibility of those who possess or exercise it. As in the democratic country where there is a freedom of speech, not everything spoken by an individual is permitted, one is jailed for harassing one another as the Act 17 of 2011 *The Protection from Harassment Act* in democratic South Africa says. This was similar of how academic freedom was conceived during the Middle Ages.

In Africa, academic freedom is defined based on the social conditions of Africa and structures existing in social sciences research field (see CODESRIA 1990). The view of academic freedom in Africa is rests both on freedom and responsibility of those enjoying such freedom. That is, it refers to the freedom granted to all members of the African academia, whether individually or collectively, to actively pursue, develop, and transmit knowledge through research, documentation, discussion, or lecturing. But such freedom is not an absolute freedom since it requires African intellectuals to accept their responsibilities in African academia (see CODESRIA 1990; Zeleza 2003; The Kampala Declaration 1990). This comes to say, academic freedom in Africa refers to both their freedom and their responsibility in academia. That is, as stated by Adesina (2020), academic freedom includes the responsibility to act ethical.

## **3.2 The Origin of the University**

To understand academic freedom, the university and its roots must be addressed because that is where academic freedom stems. Without the University, there could be no academic freedom. Thus, Academic freedom cannot be discussed without touching on the university, just as syllabus cannot be discussed if there is no schooling. This is because the school is the primary place where scholars engage in academic activities and where academic freedom emerges. In addition, the Early Universities helped to shape the development of academic freedom, which dates all the way back to the Middle Ages (Baloyi 2004; Alemu 2018; Wilson 2014). To know academic freedom, one must first know the transformations that it has gone through.

### **3.2.1 Medieval Universities: The Bologna University**

The roots of the university can be found in the Middle Ages as stated by Baloyi (1998), Wilson (2014) and Alemu (2018). The term *university* originates from the Latin name *universitas*

*magistrorum et scholarium*, meaning community of teachers and scholars (Heald 1975). Universities in the Middle East as stated by Dlamini (1996) emerged as the result of the turning point in the history of Europe. In other words, during the Renaissance that marked the need for cultural and ecclesiastical renewal. The second reason for the emergence of the university was the industrialization that took place in Middle Ages, marking the change from agrarian to industrialized society (Dlamini 1996).

Moreover, according to Dlamini (1996) and Baloyi (1998), during the Middle Ages, the university was more like an organization or a place for studying specific skills. In Bologna University, the law was the main priority (How did universities develop - DailyHistory.org, 2022; Baloyi 1998; Heald 1975). As stated by Wilson (2014), training students for more advanced abilities within a given field was prioritized in order to serve and advance such skills at higher professional levels during these Medieval Universities (Wilson 2014).

The universities in the Middle Ages had no constitutional basis because they were built according to norms rather than by the constitution (Bowen 1975; Baloyi 1998). Meaning, these universities had no formal or defined constitution, university charter, and rules governing operations within the university environment. Consequently, as said by Baloyi (1998) and Wilson (2014), both the teachers and students were not offered any legal protection by any laws that applied to the academic. The students in Bologna University for instance, were not allowed to form organizations. At the same time, they were not allowed to choose their representative. It was the Bologna society that chose the president for Bologna University students (Bowen 1975). Academics at the same time were not allowed to be engaged in political movements. As stated by Baloyi (1998) and Wilson (2014), the Bologna society feared that, if they give academics and students such choices, they would subvert or replace the authority and mission of the Bologna University. Thus, weakening both city's policies and ability to influence the university operation and governance (Wilson 2014; Baloyi 1998).

Moreover, during the Middle Ages, the most of the curriculum was provided by cathedral schools, and the primary focus of that education was religious, with an emphasis on themes like religious theology, morals, and archaeology (Baloyi 1998). The church had a monopoly on power in the university during the Middle Ages (Fuchs 1963). Because the Medieval institution was founded and financed by the medieval church. Clearly, since it was the church who governed the university and its operation, the faculty was then mostly composed of the clerics (priests). In addition, as Baloyi (1998) stated, the curriculum was not awarded in any

specific order. The grades and course material for the different study years were not assigned in a consistent manner for the subjects or the courses as said by Baloyi (1998) and Alemu (2008).

Moreover, during the Middle Ages, in the universities there were no specialists for change and compilation of curriculum. It was individual teachers or those in power in the society who performed such duties and determined how students' results should be judged (Bowen 1975; Wieruszowski 1966; Baloyi 1998). As stated by Alemu (2008), it was the priests in their 30s to 40s, those having professional experience and financial resources who made up the majority of the student body at the Middle Ages institutions. Thus, as Alemu (2008) and Baloyi (1998) states, the curriculum subjects of the students were dictated by these clerics. They had the option of selecting the subjects they wanted to learn as well as the financial commitment they wanted to make to having those subjects taught to them. However, at Bologna University, professors or academics were in control of selecting the curriculum and who would be enrolled as a student (Baloyi 2004).

### **3.2.2 Evolution of Ancient to Modern Universities**

Compared to modern universities, the early universities were very different. They served as institutions for monastic and religious learning, governed by the church and with no constitution or charter governing the processes within the university. As indicated by Wieruszowski (1966), Baloyi (1998), Wilson (2014) and Alemu (2018), the modern universities owe their existence from the monastic and religious institutions. In this way, the modern universities are a direct result of the old institutions. The medieval and modern universities only differ slightly from one another. The transformation in the university's management and curriculum is obviously one of them. Instead of being guided by religion or rituals, modern universities are primarily led by a modern curriculum that covers a wide range of academic disciplines. Second, unlike medieval universities, modern universities have constitutions that permit the existence of student organizations like the widely recognized Students' Representative Council (SRC).

The foundation and development of the modern universities occurred between the late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era (Wieruszowski 1966). Following in the footsteps of the medieval universities and taking into consideration social developments, the need for new, progressive universities was essential. The number of modern universities was seen in Europe, in which there were possibly 143 universities by the 18th century (Baloyi 1998). This excludes

other types of higher education institutions, such as academies, that did not identify themselves as universities. These institutions began to grow and add faculties with specialized fields of study. As many of these fields of study involved the translation of ancient literature in combination to an attention on the discipline, they were considered as being tied to a humanistic perspective as stated by Wieruszowski (1966).

However, although the modern universities were established in different regions. These institutions followed a variety of transformational patterns that differed from nation to nation and region to region as said by Alemu (2018). Each nation with each university had developed its own curriculum based on the quality and content of their instruction (Baloyi, 1998). As social structure evolved throughout the society, trained doctors, attorneys, clerics, schoolmasters, and administrative professionals were needed to carry out particular societal functions. To fulfil this goal as stated by Alemu (2018), cathedral schools had to give a wide education that was not solely religious. Thus, a number of cathedral schools were chosen as experimental projects, and new courses, such as medicine, law, and art, were added to the curriculum (Alemu 2018; Baloyi 1998). Then, the students who were keen in such fields were registered, and then the chosen cathedral schools were named as higher learning institutions, the "*stadium generale*," a Medieval term that is now referred as the "university" (Baloyi 1998: 27).

Having said that, not all countries and their universities experienced this shift equally. Yet, there are certain similar patterns as said by Alemu (2018). Universities have evolved and broadened their role and goal over time, shifting from the straightforward transmission of book learning to searching, producing, and applying knowledge, in particular because of the pursuit of education (Alemu 2018; Martin and Etzkowitz 2000). The Modern University now operates in a different way than it did decades ago. Universities were primarily focused on teaching theology and religion before and during the Middle Ages, and teachers had to stick only to this agenda. In other words, they were only assigned to educate students about religion or theology (Martin and Etzkowitz 2000; Baloyi 1998). As a result, students were taught at the medieval university to become priests and to maintain only the societal values.

The organization and operation of earlier institutions, whose primary academic concentration was on religion, have now been modified by modern universities as said by Altbach and Salmi (2011). Modern universities now provide a variety of subjects and course materials. The faculties of each institution differ from one another. For instance, the faculties of commerce,

education, humanities, law, pharmacy, and sciences that are present and distinct to each other at Rhodes University. For the Rhodes University Academic Community, each of these faculties provides a unique and significant curriculum.

The early modified universities were highly influenced by Aristotle's view of learning and the sciences as said by Martin and Etzkowitz (2000). But intellectuals started experimenting with innovative approaches to learning and research. Disciplines started to separate away from a strong humanistic influence. As a result, the humanities and sciences developed differently inside an educational system. In the 18th century, universities also began to establish research journals, allowing intellectuals to publish and disseminate their results to other intellectuals. German universities were the first to develop and promote research. Thus, the idea of academic freedom grew in Germany as a way for universities to promote debate, scientific research, and knowledge within universities (see Wieruszowski 1966; Baloyi 1998; Wilson 2014). This change has led to the evolution of fields like physics and chemistry as well as the social sciences like sociology and economics (see Altbach and Salmi 2011; Wieruszowski 1966). Thus, the modern university is currently characterized as an organized system of higher education and training, with faculty for the arts, humanities, and sciences alongside more specialized ones for agriculture, engineering, science, and technology (Alemu 2018).

The university had a responsibility to the community from the beginning (see Alemu 2018; Altbach and Salmi 2011). The university was not founded to fulfil its own purposes; rather, it had to benefit the community in which it functions. This implies that since intellectuals operate inside the university and society, they too had a responsibility to carry out that mission (see Alemu 2018). As shown by Baloyi (1998), the university had a responsibility to society that is of the extreme significance. According to Alemu (2018) this is so because the university stands for both a community of scholars and higher education learning. This points that the university's purpose is to serve society, and that purpose is to improve society productively and positively (see Murove and Chitando 2018; Hagan 1994). The management and operation of Middle Ages universities had to adapt to the social changes, changing not only their mission but also their character to make room for the intellectuals operating there. In this form of change, academic freedom was also demanded (see Baloyi 1998; Alemu 2018). Along with academic freedom, intellectuals' social responsibility gradually came to the forefront in light of the issues and surroundings in higher education.

### **3.3 The History of Academic Freedom, its Origins**

The history of academic freedom is very long as stated by Alemu (2018) and Baloyi (1998). Academic freedom is currently primarily understood and analysed as intellectuals' quest for and defence of intellectual autonomy in the face of pressure by administrative and political bodies both inside and outside of universities (see Fish 2021). Whereas, this does not provide a clear picture on how this quest and defence of intellectual autonomy came about. The Academic freedom has been restricted in a number of ways, not merely by administrative or political bodies not only in Africa, but throughout the world (Mamdani 1992).

The quest for academic freedom dates back almost to Greek Socrates' time as stated Williams (2016). As said by Williams (2016) and Wade (1971), Socrates was the first person to rebel against the medieval style of education by refusing to praise the Athens gods. Socrates questioned the Greek curriculum, that included worshipping of the gods. He did that to awaken Athens' intellectuals and confront their lack of reasoning (Wade 1971; Williams 2016). Thereafter, Socrates was murdered then around 399 B.C. He was murdered because the community (the worshippers of the gods he opposed) thought his ideas were corrupting Athens' youth (see Wade 1971; Williams 2016; Ndereyimana 2021). Likewise, the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century, scandals relating to academic freedom proves that academic freedom has always been debated for a long time. For instance, the case of professor Galileo who was imprisoned from the 1564 to 1642 for sharing information with learners that the institution had prohibited (see Hoye 1997).

During and before the Middle Ages, the university did not include the research in its curriculum as said by Baloyi (1998). The university had just to teach and share the subject content. The research was not allowed because, the society felt that new knowledge would be discovered (see Alemu 2018; Baloyi 1998). The task of the university at that time according to Baloyi (1998) “was not to discover new knowledge, but merely to train lawyers, school teachers, clerics and other personnel who were to fill the ranks of administration of the church, State and schools” (Baloyi 1998; 48). For this reason, the need for research began to be considered with the intention of developing new knowledge. The development of new knowledge necessitated university autonomy, freedom of expression, freedom of research, freedom of teaching by the faculty, and freedom of student learning without intervention from society (Baloyi 1998).

The teachers and students who felt their freedoms were being violated by the university protested to defend their freedom to academic freedom (Baloyi 1998). An illustration comes from Bologna University, where, as stated by Alemu (2018) and Baloyi

(1998), students protested against society by not attending the classes. Academics protested over their limited freedom to teach in the classroom in Germany as well, calling for the inclusion of research (Baloyi 2004; Alemu 2018; Fuchs 1963).

According to Fuchs (1963), the origin of academic freedom in the Middle Ages has three foundations. These foundations are as follows: -

- The philosophy of intellectual freedom, which has its origins in Greece and reappeared in Europe, particularly under the effect of the Renaissance, to reach maturity in the Age of Reason;
- The concept of university autonomy, which originated in European universities.
- Finally, the freedoms granted by the federal constitution's Bill of Rights, as interpreted by the courts.

According to Fuchs (1963) and Dlamini (1996), the framework for how academic freedom was and is currently conceived and understood comes from these three foundations. As states by Fuchs (1963) and, Raaflaub, Ober and Wallace (2007) and Alemu (2008), Greece was the first society to implement free speech and the first to experience democracy. Individuals' right to free speech in matters pertaining to the development of the institution also required the university to have the autonomy to administer and control its own affairs. For academia to function properly, these specific freedoms had to be approved by the constitutions. Then, academic freedom became visible (see Alemu 2008; Raaflaub, Ober and Wallace 2007).

Based on the literature by Fuchs (1963), Baloyi (1998), Alemu (2008), censorship has existed for a very long time. There was both self-censorship and censorship directed towards the other-by-other actor. Like the academics who were also obligated to practice self-censorship throughout the Middle Ages, universities were a society of self-censored institutions. Both professors, researchers, and students were subject to this type of censorship (see Fuchs 1963). Scholars had a responsibility to restrain themselves from crossing boundaries set by their institutions of higher learning or society (Wilson 2014). So, in this way, responsibility was emphasized more than the freedom.

Considering that the church was in charge of the university, the priests who handled the institution's management and operations during the Middle Ages enjoyed much freedom compared to the ordinary intellectuals (Fuchs 1963; Baloyi 1998). Students and teachers as well had a little bit of freedom, but not enough freedom. Students had the freedom to pick their

courses during the Middle Ages, particularly at Bologna University (see Baloyi 1998). As said by Appiagyei-Atua (2019), Hofstadter and Geiger (2017), teachers had the freedom to choose the curriculum and resources for each discipline. In this way, in Bologna University academic freedom was given in relation to the positions of the scholars. Given that the Bologna University students were stable financially, academic freedom for them meant having the freedom to choose the courses they wanted to take, the teachers who would teach them, the amount of money the teachers would be paid, as well as who would be allowed to enrol as a student. Academic freedom for teachers meant the freedom to choose the discipline's curriculum and course materials as well as the freedom to examine their students (see Baloyi 1998).

However, considering the constraints placed on them, these freedoms were unsatisfactory for both students and teachers. With this said, the city of Bologna exercised legal control over the university by establishing laws and standards that governed its administration and operation (Baloyi 1998). The freedom of both students and teachers was more severely constrained by the regulations that the society imposed. According to Bilgrami and Cole (2015), the regulations imposed by the society and the medieval curriculum maintained the main boundaries of university life throughout the Middle Ages. Therefore, genuine academic freedom was not exercised and not professed at the same time. The teacher was not permitted to depart from the university's prescribed curriculum (Baloyi 1998; Alemu 2018; Middle & Cole 2015).

The dispute within the academic community was triggered by social constraints imposed by the society in the university community, thus, creating a space for the need of academic freedom that was alleged to have been violated (Baloyi 1998). The regulations made by medieval society legislators clashed with the expectations of the students, leading in student protests. Since it was the politics that influenced the appointment of staff, as the universities grew, there was a demand for individuals' freedom within the University by scholars in response to censorship and administration of the university. This led into the ideas of the right to academic freedom (Dea, 2008). Thus, scholar's protests against the rules and regulations imposed by medieval society on university administration and functioning led to the realization and imagination of academic freedom. This tradition of intellectual protests against oppression did not just stop at Bologna University; it also spread to other regions of the world, depending on the circumstances of each and every civilization (see Baloyi 1998; Alemu 2018).

Furthermore, the democracy offers a strong foundation for each person's rights and responsibilities as stated by Alemu (2008). In this way, the degree and effectiveness of democracy dictates the extent and possibility of human rights. That is to say, only democratic nations can provide this kind of freedom. Authoritarian governments are unable to do so because they lack the basic foundation for human rights. This is to say, academic freedom and strong democracy are closely related, each supporting the other and strengthening the other as evident from Alemu (2018). To put it another way, academic freedom depends heavily on a strong democracy, and a strong democracy is one in which individuals enjoy adequate freedom, including the freedom of expression, association, and ideas (Fuchs 1963; Hawi 2010).

According to Ndereyimana (2021), German universities because of their strong democracy are the main contributors to the academic freedom after the attempts made at Bologna University by intellectuals. The rise of humanism in the 14th to 15th century as Baloyi (1998) and Dlamini (1996) argues undermined the Medieval style of life in academia and society. People in Germany wanted the change in the operation of the university. In this way, academic freedom emerged as the result of the creation of the University of Berlin which, as stated by Dlamini (1996) resulted from the defeat of the Prussians by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1806.

As stated by Alemu (2008), German philosophy and practice, as well as the growth of non-sectarian American universities, matured and gained significant international attention. The idea of academic freedom was impacted by this time period. Due to the growth of ideological conflicts, particularly those related to economic theory, faculty started to feel the need for protection against trustees and administrators who tried to terminate academics whose beliefs they deem inappropriate (Fuchs 1963; Ndereyimana 2021). The need for specific structural changes in German universities resulted in the emergence of academic freedom in this way. The democratic system gave intellectuals the opportunity to imagine academic freedom as the type of freedom they felt was not given to them.

Academic freedom was first acknowledged, developed and institutionalized in Germany, Heidelberg University (see Fuchs 1963). This was because, the Germany had the better democracy, allowing for the human rights. Thus, academic freedom resulted from the basic human rights, such as the freedom of opinion, the freedom of expression and assembly as well as the freedom of association (Hawi 2010; Fuchs 1963; Baloyi 1998). On this basis, the quest for academic freedom in Heidelberg University was seen as an important aspect of the fight for

human rights (Hawi, 2010; Fuchs 1963). Because academia is where academics seek out the truth, formulate it for students to understand, and then teach students how to do the same.

Academic freedom derived from the German notion of *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*, meaning the freedom of scholars to teach and learn with no restrictions by the university or society (Baloyi 1998; Bohall 2005; Kilase 2013). Such freedom only solely applied to academics and students in the university, not to the wider population outside the university. Moreover, academic freedom solely applied to activities conducted within higher education institutions walls and not to the outside (Fuchs 1963; Baloyi 1998; Kilase 2013). Nevertheless, this freedom did not imply irresponsibility from academics or scholars. Academic freedom and social responsibility in relation to the academic community were granted to scholars, giving them both freedom and responsibility. For instance, an academic would not use such freedom to participate in non-academic activities. Likewise, the students had a freedom to learn, but they had to remain silent when the teacher teaches during the classroom (Kilase 2013; Baloyi 1998).

In summary, academic freedom come a long way back. It dates from the Greek times of Socrates, but its development and institutionalization dates back to the German University on the ideas of *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*. Then, academic freedom spread throughout the world in democratic countries as stated by Hawi (2010). But the democratic countries upon which academic freedom spread did not conceptualize the concept the same way. Thus, because of the social transformations, academic freedom evolved time to time to mean different meanings to different people, societies and situations. The term came to be popular under the book by Robert Seale (1972), titled *The Two Concepts of Academic Freedom*.

### **3.4 Academic Freedom in Africa**

Academic freedom in Africa is philosophically and literally closely linked to the colonial history of the continent, notably to several forms of nationalism from whose names African states earned liberation (Habib 2008). Formerly colonized African states were authoritarian regimes, which restricted the colonized academic's and intellectuals' freedom (see Wilson 2014; Habib 2008). The little room for intellectual freedom was somehow racially motivated. Due to the colonial framework on which the African institutions were built, the institutions that the former colonizers of Africa left behind generated serious issues on that continent. As a result, African academics or scholars had a little room for both academic and intellectual freedom in a university setting (see Dlamini 2021; Murove and Mazibuko 2008; Wilson 2014).

During colonial times, academic freedom was not a crucial concept to consider because most basic rights also were completely ignored (Wilson 2014). The university was established in a hierarchical manner, with the underprivileged and privileged individuals (scholars). Therefore, intellectual freedom received little to no respect, particularly in relation to the colonized. Academic freedom was either absent or racially motivated (see Ndereyimana 2021; Murove and Chitando 2018; Kay 1971; Wilson 2014).

In the earlier days of African independence, Kwame Nkrumah was the first to connect academic freedom with social responsibility. He did it within a nationalist and anti-imperialist framework that the emigrating colonialists did not support. Since the institution is responsible to furthering the interests of society, academic freedom does not strictly imply irresponsibility to scholars (cited from Mama 2003; Mkandawire 1999). The state was considered as the major representation of both the national interest and the public interest at the period. In the meantime, the state was viewed as the major threat to academic freedom in Africa (see Zeleza 2006; Mama 2003).

African institutions campaigned for social reform and progress during the struggle for independence. One of the objectives and requirements for African academia's development was the promotion and protection of academic freedom (see Mamdani and Diouf 1994; Mkandawire 1999). African intellectuals during the decolonization process as stated in CODESRIA (1990), wanted a developed curriculum that would match with their expectations and align with the development agenda of the continent. Because, colonial government brought the curriculum that did not match the expectations of African intellectuals and the development agenda. Rather, it taught them to defy their own traditions (Mazrui 1994).

Academic and intellectual freedom in Africa took its prominence during the harsh treatment of African intellectuals and scholars from early 1960s to the late 1980s. Therefore, academic freedom in Africa by the time appeared to help to stop the harassment and torture of African intellectuals and scholars (see CODESRIA 1990; Adesina 2020). Intellectuals and scholars were harassed because, the decolonization in Africa was not a complete process (see Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013). It was an incomplete process because, the colonial structures of Africa were left unchanged. The African leaders as well did not change those structures during decolonization (see Ki-Zerbo 1994; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013). Which is why the CODESRIA had to set the meeting in Kampala 1990 to address such issues. In this way, academic freedom in Africa came to be popular during the decolonization process and post-colonialism.

The social context in Africa needed to transform to allow for academic freedom to survive and flourish (see Hagan 1994; Mama and Imam 1994). As a result, the CODESRIA considered academic freedom to be strongly tied to societal objectives. Because academic freedom empowers researchers to search for and disseminate information that is essential for society. That is, academic freedom in Africa was tied to the interests of the community or society. This implies that the society would only support academic freedom if doing so would aid the society to overcome its difficulties (CODESRIA 1990). The poverty, the human rights abuse in Africa and other challenges faced by African societies. This means that, as previously understood by *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit* in German Universities, academic freedom in the face of Africa opposed the unique and individual freedom of academics and students that served to work only on academic oriented agendas. The academic freedom in Africa included the goal of the university and the society development agenda. Meaning that African scholars has both the freedom in academia and responsibility in the society.

However, in Africa, academic freedom remains a very contested concept. The view of academic freedom in face of the arrival of neoliberal principles and in sight of the CODESRIA (1990) is drastically different. Academic freedom in lenses of the CODESRIA (1990), as stated above, relates both to the freedom of African scholars to conduct the research and their responsibility to the society. But in face of neoliberal principles, it means the opposite. It only relates to the freedom of academics and the university to pursue their own interests. Having the profit making for both academics and the university as the main interests fostered by the neoliberal principles (see Akala 2021; Ogachi 2011). This comes to cover the 2020 debate on academic freedom in South Africa. Where the insights rests both on academic freedom of African scholars and their social responsibilities.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter covered the historical background of academic freedom. For that, this chapter had a number of parts, each with a specific function. The first part covered academic freedom in general. The second part then examined the history of the university as it was said during the chapter that it was difficult to trace the origins of academic freedom without also looking at the history of the university where academic freedom appeared and evolved. The Bologna University served as the ancient university this chapter focused on, with the universities being stated to have emerged in the Middle Ages. The third part provided an illustration of how universities have changed over time. The social evolution of the modern university from the

Medieval university was then illustrated in this part using comparisons to the medieval universities. That was done to provide information about how academic freedom began. The final part then covered academic freedom's historical roots and its conceptual development.

## **CHAPTER FOUR: Academic Freedom in the African Context**

### **Introduction**

The review of academic freedom in Africa for the mission of this study needs to touch all aspects related to the subject of academic freedom in Africa. In this approach, it is simpler to understand academic freedom and the issues surrounding it from all sides. Therefore, this research examined a variety of academic freedom-related literature. This includes the literature on colonialism and transition to democracy in Africa, the CODESRIA (1990) debate on academic freedom, the role and mission of the university and intellectuals, the Kampala Declaration (1990) its weaknesses and its strengths and also academic freedom and social responsibility of African intellectuals.

The goal of this Chapter is to provide summary and critique on the literature that was reviewed for this research. The body of literature on which the judgments and interpretations in this study are grounded. As said by von Brocke et al. (2009), the literature review provides a reader with a more detailed understanding of the topic under investigation and allows the researcher a chance to question the presumptions underlying the opinions of other researchers. Which is why it is called a literature review instead of a literature report because the researcher reviews and criticizes the relevant literature to offer new insights or judgments.

This literature was searched through using Google Scholar. Moreover, this literature review follows a thematic format, reviewing previous works' content to identify connections, trends, and author repetitions. The purpose of this literature was to understand the emergence and scope of academic freedom in Africa, the connection between academic freedom and social responsibility of African intellectuals, and the underlying reasons for conflicts on academic freedom in Africa.

This literature review is divided into sections. The first section examines the research on the relationship between academic freedom and democracy. The second discusses the CODESRIA academic freedom debate of 1990. The next section is a literature assessment on the university's goal, and the final section comes with a review of academic freedom and social responsibility.

### **4.1 Transition into Democracy by African Countries and the Space for Academic Freedom in Africa**

The approach to understanding academic freedom in Africa is frequently lengthy and challenging. An in-depth examination of the emergence and current condition of academic freedom in Africa is necessary because it is a new concept in African continent (Ndereyimana, 2021). Therefore, this literature search involved the colonialism and democratization in Africa. During the process, this research found throughout its review of the literature that academic freedom and democracy are connected. Furthermore, it was seen that, compared to authoritarian states, truly democratic states are less likely to experience problems with academic freedom. This was revised since the study aimed to determine whether democratic reforms in Africa were necessary, as was stated at the CODESRIA meeting on academic freedom in 1990. If yes, the study wanted to understand why Africa still continue to have conflicts on academic freedom in presence of democratic stated. As said by CODESRIA (1990), for academic freedom to survive in Africa, the continent's social structures must be established to support it. This study sought to identify the concise relationship between academic freedom and democracy.

Kratou and Laakso (2020) to understand the academic freedom in Africa, they reviewed both colonialism and the democratization in Africa. In their analysis, Kratou and Laakso (2020) argued that, there is a close relationship between academic freedom and a good democracy. Alemu (2008) in same way, on his study of the origins of academic freedom, argued that there is really a good connection between academic freedom and the good democracy. According to Alemu (2018), it was the democratic principles that brought the idea of academic freedom. As a result, the analysis of Kratou and Laakso (2020) saw academic freedom as an essential ingredient of democracy and vice versa.

The conclusion by Kratou and Laakso (2020) was that, the problem that gives the rise in constant conflicts on academic freedom in Africa is the lack of democratization in Africa. as the result, Kratou and Laakso (2020) argued that, democratization has not been effective in many countries in Africa. However, it is insufficient to evaluate academic freedom in Africa using the authors' conclusion. The assumptions are particularly short for someone who seeks to understand academic freedom in the context of democracy because, as noted by Lucas, conflicts over academic freedom exist even in Western nations, which are generally regarded as having better democracies (2010). Once more, this research lacked a clear idea of the human being and his capacity to perceive things differently from others. That is to say, not everyone

has the same intellectual scope, even in democracies. There will always be people who act in ways that are contradictory.

Moreover, Sultana (2018) noted that accountability on decision-making in any democratic country requires freedom of expression, public access to knowledge and the freedom to generate evidence-based knowledge. To see the connection between democracy and academic freedom, Sultana (2018), used a thematic method which allowed him to compare and analyse information from different angles. According to Sultana (2018), this was to see what other people have said on the same theme, so that he could find the similarities, patterns and relationships. As a result, the conclusion was that there is a relationship between knowledge production (education) and the democracy (Saltana (2018)). Both Sultana (2018) and Kratou and Laakso (2020) on their writings said that, higher education standards are one of the basic conditions for sustaining a democracy. In same way, academic freedom is essential for the creation and survival of the democracy as stated by Sultan (2018).

Furthermore, according to Cole (2017) academic freedom, that is free enquiry, free speech and free dissemination of ideas is at the core of the values of both the society and the university. Because these values are the determinants of the democracy in both the university and the society (Cole 2017). Which means, if the university lacks academic freedom or limits academic freedom of intellectuals would be said to be not a democratic enough institution. According to Sultan (2018) and Cole (2017), the freedom of speech, freedom of enquiry and freedom of dissemination of ideas is a key indicator of the existence of a liberal democracy. Because as said by Cole (2017), the existence of these factors would allow one to measure whether the individual rights and free expression really exist in a society.

This study saw Africa as the best continent to investigate and confirm the relationship between academic freedom and democracy that Kratou and Laakso (2020), Sultana (2018), Cole (2017) and Thomas (2010) talked about. For this study Africa comes to be best because virtually the whole continent was affected by colonialism and had to go through democratic transition from colonialist authoritarianism. Bratton and van de Walle (1997) presented the most important systematic attempt to understand the democratic transition in Africa between 1989 to 1994. These authors wanted to know why democratization succeeds from other African countries but fail to other African countries. On the findings using their Afrobarometer surveys concluded that, many countries are still showing heterogeneity in the African experience. Meaning that, African counties are still diverse in character and content because of their experiences. Which

is why some African countries are still failing to undergo democratization. The Ghana for instance as stated by Mozaffar (1997), Omotola and Onuoha (2018), in its experience with the military regime has succeeded in its democratic transition. Zimbabwe still remains not fully transitioned from authoritarian into democracy in spite of its multi-party system (see Mozaffar 1997; Omotola and Onuoha 2018).

Other literature from many sources, the one from Ake (2000) and Mkandawire (2010) for instance, have associated the inability for African countries to change into fully democratic countries as linked with lack of economic development, most importantly income inequality and also the dependency of African countries from the Western aid, the IMF and WB. The assumption by Mkandawire (2010) and Ake (2000) is better and convincing. This is because the WB and IMF are undeniably present and heavily influential in academic matters as stated by Ogachi (2011) and Akala (2021). These authors also make a convincing case for economic inequality. Inequality of wealth contributes to social unrest in society. The result of that would therefore probably be the tension and violence mentioned by (Dlamini 1996).

Moreover, the societies of Africa as stated by Burchard (2015) are shaped by the violence. The violence then interferes with the elections as seen in Zimbabwe on the political violence of Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front (ZANU–PF) towards other opposition parties in Zimbabwe. Therefore, the severity of political rivalry and the ongoing fight for democracy in Africa are expressed by these restrictions on democracy. As a result, the political unrest in Zimbabwe has, as stated by Moyo (2009) and Laakso (2020), had a detrimental effect on academic freedom and constrained the space for open inquiry. Therefore, Zimbabwe and its ZANU-PF provides a good knowledge on the relationship between academic freedom and democracy. It is evident that, Zimbabwe compared to other countries has a very complicated and challenging academic freedom. Because as stated by Moyo (2009) and Laakso (2020), ZANU-policies PF's have a significant negative impact on how the University of Zimbabwe operates.

Since it was measured that the threat to academic freedom comes mostly from countries like Zimbabwe that are not entirely democratic. Studying the democratic country in Africa was necessary. According to Cole (2017) South Africa is one of the better countries when it comes to democracy, intellectual freedom and academic freedom of scholars in higher education. Because South Africa has a democratic system that allows for effective communication and free expression of South African intellectuals and scholars. Cole (2017) therefore claims that

South Africa has better environment that support academic freedom. The most crucial information on the classification of threats to academic freedom is provided by the conceptions presented by Moyo (2009) and Laakso (2020) on countries that are not fully democratic and by Cole (2017) on countries that are more democratic. According to Laakso (2020) and Moyo (2009)'s analysis of Zimbabwe and academic freedom, authoritarianism in Africa poses a threat to academic freedom, which is a claim expressed in CODESRIA (1990). The views about democratic countries like South Africa, as highlighted by Cole (2017), provided the insight on the necessity of the democratization that was seen in CODESRIA (1990). Cole (2017) did not, however, fully address the potential challenges to academic freedom in liberal democracies. Cole's (2017) research assumes as if democratic countries have no difficulties on academic freedom. But the research by Cole (2017) made a clear relationship between democracy and academic freedom.

Along this Diouf (1994) once mentioned that the political transition of Africa had highlighted the importance of academic freedom (Diouf 1994; 335). Thus, academic freedom is a fundamental norm in democratic countries. As stated by Kratou and Laakso (2020), the significance of academic freedom does not only benefit the faculty or students but the whole society. Which is why it is crucial to be defended (Karran 2009).

Looking at the case of Africa on the transition into democracy, it is clear that academic freedom is really a problematic issue in Africa. As indicated by Kratou and Laakso (2020), democracy does not come out of the blue. It demands scholars and intellectuals to think and subject themselves to criticisms by other scholars or intellectuals. For the university to take part, itself, the university and its intellectuals must be free. According to Mkandawire (1999), the development of social sciences in Africa is the portion of liberation for African states, but it is stretched to the intellectual domain. That is, the quest for democratization in Africa included the decolonization and democratization of social sciences in Africa. According to Mkandawire (1999), African intellectuals wanted an independent and newly liberated environment whereby they can reflect on Africa's social sciences development. But as stated by No (2013), not all African countries went the same process of decolonization. Some countries were able to create favourable conditions for academic freedom, while others did not (see No 2013). It is for this reason that academic freedom is contested in Africa.

## **4.2 African Universities, the Conditions of Learning in Postcolonial Africa**

On the circumstances in African universities, El Baz (2015), Nyoka (2020), and Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013) made valid points. Such writings aided in understanding the decolonization fallacy put forth by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013) and the potential for imbalance in African universities. This also served to generalize the statements made in reference to the 2020 discussion in South Africa on academic freedom after seeing the proven inequalities and continuing colonialism or incomplete decolonization.

According to El Baz (2015), Africa has a long history of being marginalized, notably in terms of ideas. The demand for academic freedom in Africa is a form of decolonization or independence struggle (El Baz 2015; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013). Similarly, as stated by Ogachi (2011) and Mamdani and Diouf (1994), the intellectual community's struggle for academic freedom is linked to Africa's quest for human rights and democracy. El Baz (2015) then argued that, the conceptual meaning of academic freedom at universities is complicated by drastic changes in academic sphere and inequalities in African societies defined by race, gender, language, nationality, and so on (El Baz 2015). The points by these authors gave good start for understanding the 2020 debate in South Africa. The historical inequality in South Africa is the one that defines the understanding of academic freedom in higher institution.

In the same way, Swartz, et al. (2017), likewise, on their study on the inequalities in higher education in Africa, argued in the current university environment in Africa students have continued experienced racial divisions on campus. This includes differences in how academics treat students depending on race, racial stereotypes, and how to access resources, as well as student housing distribution and fee payment. In addition, Black students felt inferior and unwelcome in academic settings. Additionally, according to Mbovula (2017), the Fees Must Fall and Rhodes Must Fall Movement in South Africa in 2015 exposed the difficulties that South African universities are presently dealing with. Along this, according to Nyoka (2019), the Fees Must Fall campaign was not only about freeing education but also about decolonizing it. The students wanted a curriculum that matched their lived experiences through African intellectuals' writings, as Eurocentric education did not meet their needs (Nyoka, 2019).

### **4.3 The 1990 CODESRIA debate: The Perspective on Academic Freedom**

As stated by a number of scholars, including Mafeje (1994), Mazrui (1994), and Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2017), colonialism did nothing but damage African nations by forcing Africans to learn western culture rather than the required skills for their own development. According to

Mafeje (1994), academic freedom in Africa could only be interpreted as bourgeois democracy, which has no significance in Africa. In this way, the colonial bourgeoisie was replaced by the native bourgeoisie during the decolonization of Africa. During independence as stated by Mamdani (2005) African scholars wanted to decolonize Africa. However, as mentioned by Mafeje (1994), African nations inherited the problematic social context that the colonizer had left behind when they gained independence. During decolonization, African natives inherited an undemocratic social environment (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2017). As a result, there must be a connection between the social issues and the academic freedom issue in Africa. The problems with academic freedom in this way is linked with the colonial heritage and legacy (Mafeje 1994).

The CODESRIA 1990 debate on academic freedom was characterized by three broad strands. The first strand was on the view that academic freedom is not the freedom enjoyed by the entire society. For instance, according to Ake (1994), academic freedom only relates and is limited to the middle class in the society. In other words, academic freedom, according to Ake (1994) is only limited for intellectuals, or those who own and control the means of knowledge production. So, the first strand in CODESRIA (1990) was on the view that, before African intellectuals and academics speak of academic and intellectual freedom, they ought to relate it to the broader socio-economic and political issues because African societies have no democratic foundations (see Diouf and Mamdani, 1994).

The second strand was similar to the first strand in that, it also saw academic freedom as a “*bourgeois freedom*” the freedom only enjoyed by those who possess higher positions in the society. But this strand was different to the first one in that it saw the connection between academic freedom and social structures. Likewise, as stated by Mamdani (1994), this strand believed that academic freedom helps in building social and power relations on the society. Thus, this strand saw a need for academic freedom to be uplifted. The third strand is that the foregoing strands were not only “populist”, but also assume that there is a trade-off between academic freedom and other freedoms (see Diouf and Mamdani, 1994; Mkandawire, 1999).

The viewpoints towards academic freedom on the CODESRIA (1990) were not the same. The perspectives on the term were different. For Ake (1994) academic freedom meant the ability to pursue and communicate knowledge as well as the ability to judge what is worthy of knowledge. Therefore, Ake (1994) found academic freedom to have nothing related to the society and its challenges. However, on the other hand Mama and Imam (1994) saw academic

freedom as a conditional freedom, defined by the social ties and political economy of academic sphere in the larger society. According to Hagan (1994), academic freedom is defined by the societal conditions in which persons who demand academic freedom live. Along this view, Hagan (1994), Ake (1994) and Mama and Imam (1994) saw that, the societal conditions in Africa are very hostile for academic freedom. And that, as stated by Mama and Imam (1994) and Hagan (1994), the conditions must first be drastically changed to accommodate academic freedom.

The CODESRIA (1990) found out that, academic freedom would not survive in Africa if the social conditions of Africa remain unchanged. Therefore, it was seen that African countries must first build democratic or developed structures that would serve to develop and maintain academic freedom. As stated by Ki-Zerbo (1994) and Mama and Imam (1994), This could only be accomplished by maximizing the power of unions and professional networks, as well as forging organic ties with progressive civil society groups. That African institutions must gain self-confidence to express political and ethical principles, and that they must cooperate with other liberal forces in society to do so (Iman and Mama, 1990). However, Ake (1994) saw this as not possible in Africa. Because of the societal conditions primarily defined by dependency and inequality in Africa. Thus, for Ake (1994), academic freedom could not be achieved for a common good. Rather, those who enjoy it would use it for their own interest.

However, according to Mamdani and Diouf (1994) academic freedom was not only the matter of concern. Thus, as seen by Ake (1994), academic freedom had to be addressed before all other freedoms violated by the society have been addressed. Because it does not sit on top of other freedoms. In this way, according to Mamdani and Diouf (1994), it was the duty of intellectuals to engage and accept both their freedom and their responsibility. Likewise, intellectuals had to connect their intellectual struggle with the social struggle of Africa (Mkandawire 1999; Mafeje 1994). It was for this way that the struggle for academic freedom was associated for the social development struggle in Africa. In this way, Hagan (1994) believed that, academic freedom must be linked with the social conditions in which an intellectual reside.

The threats to academic freedom were believed to have come both outside and inside African countries. This is what Mazrui (1994), saw as a dual tyranny. According to him, academic freedom was engaged at dual tyranny, meaning there is both the domestic and Eurocentric tyranny. Domestic tyranny is what he refers to as political tyranny, which occurs when

governments are tempted by power. Second, the tyranny of Eurocentrism, which occupies and controls Africa's academic environment. According to Mazrui (1994), this had to be confronted along with other development agenda set forward by African intellectuals. Because academic freedom itself is dis-Africanization into a Eurocentric view.

In short, the CODESRIA (1990) saw that, academic freedom to be meaningful it must be connected with the problems of the society. That is, intellectuals must take social responsibility in addition to their academic freedom (Hagan 1994; Ki-Zerbo 1994; Mama and Imam 1994). But for that to happen as said by Ki-Zerbo (1994), the patterns in the administration of the university must be examined. That is, there must be a formation of intellectual communities, there must be the quest for democracy, and the selection of unified tactics for implementation. Thereby, in order for an intellectual to assert their rights, they must have a real existence as a group and actively participate in the ongoing power balance as a group. That is, to create frameworks that will eliminate the gaps that have characterized intellectual identity divisions (Ki-Zerbo, 1990). And lastly, Academic freedom should not be used for personal gain, but rather for the good of society as a whole, and intellectuals should be aware of the effects of their activities on others (Ake 1994; Mama and Imam 1994; Ki-Zerbo 1994).

#### **4.4 The mission of the university and intellectuals: Their responsibility to the society**

Understanding the purpose of universities, intellectuals and scholars is important for understanding academic freedom and social responsibility. To understand the responsibility and academic freedom, Higgins (2006) saw a need to first identify the purpose of the university. The purpose of the university is to express the truth and expose lies, according to Higgins (2006). In this way, according to Higgins (2006), the university and intellectuals are to expose whatever lies or truths. The question Higgins (2006) asked is, if intellectuals and the university are forced to self-censor themselves, how will they achieve their purpose? Rapoport (2010) claimed that, the institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to merely further the interests of either individual teacher of the institution. Seabi (2011) also on his study claimed that, if a university does not pay attention to and work to address the problems that society faces, it has no purpose.

Higgins' (2006) assertion is not entirely reasonable. This is because while intellectuals and universities must have freedom, that does not mean that their freedom cannot be subject to

restrictions. People's responsibilities to one another become more significant the more they interact. The people who live in a group have the possibility of harming one another since they are not the same as the people who live alone, whereas the person living alone has no one to harm. Higgins (2006) does not acknowledge the interaction of intellectuals within universities or the connection between higher education and society. Along these lines, Florida (1999) emphasized that maintaining the privacy of sensitive or confidential information is a part and necessity of the university's and intellectual's mission and role. The universities and intellectuals thus serve not just their own interests but also the interests of society as a whole because it is the results of their activities that are important to society.

According to Baloyi (1998) the university in its old ages had two functions, to teach and to perform the research. Likewise, Alemu (2008) in his study agreed that the mission of the university from the early ages was just to give skills to the faculty and students. Which means, the Medieval universities were not responsible for the society. However, Murove and Chitando (2018) found that, the university operates within the society. That is, it is responsible for the direction of its society. According to Murove and Chitando (2018) the knowledge produced in the society has a direct impact on the society. Thus, it determined the direction and character of that society. Along this line, Compagnucci and Spigarelli (2020) found out that, the university as it operates within the society its objective of teaching and researching changes to include the Third Mission (TM). The TM is “a contribution to the society” (Compagnucci and Spigarelli, 2020: 1). According to Compagnucci and Spigarelli, (2020) the dynamics of knowledge production are changing, as the way in which societies are regarding expectations and values. In this way, as seen by Bortagaray (2009), the university can be understood as being at a crossroads in teaching, research and the third mission.

Moreover, according to Mamdani (2009) the university has a mission of generating and sharing the knowledge to the society through research. Mamdani (2009) in this way labelled the university as the heart of the society. In line with this, Akala (2020) contends that, the university the key contributor of knowledge for the society. The knowledge the society carries or has comes from the knowledge generated by the university and its academics (Akala 2020).

The mission of the university and the role of intellectuals is the same. According to Ake (1994) the faculty follows the direction of the university. Because, academics are the employees of the university. Therefore, the university uses academics to reach its mission which is to produce and share the knowledge to the society. However, according to Murove and Chitando (2018),

intellectuals are not the puppets of the university. Intellectuals according to these authors have the freedom and their own missions. Moreover, according to Murove and Chitando (2018), intellectuals sacrifice their freedom to follow the orders from the university. Because at the end of the day, it is the university that pays for their bill and that they are the members of a given society. Having being the members of the society, their activities have an impact in their societies which they are citizens.

Based on the mission of the university and the consideration of the society where the university and academics operate, it comes evident that both are obliged by the society to work as the responsible and ethical members. Along this, according to Hagan (1994) argues as follows: -

“It is the society that bears the cost of sustaining academic work and using the products of universities, those who control society and its resources also assert that society has a right to control, or, at least, participate in the control of the activities of academics” (Hagan 1994: 39).

According to Murove and Chitando (2018) this assertion by Hagan (1994), implies that, academics are expected to undertake their academic activities as responsible members of a particular society because at the end of the day it is the society that pays the bill. Therefore, both the university and intellectuals are the knowledge producers, producing the knowledge in consideration of the society. They produce this knowledge under strict conditions implemented by the society. In this way, both academics, intellectuals and the university must limit their freedom to accommodate the needs of the society. Not only because of the society as stated by Edmore (2019) but for their sake as well. Because, as stated by Edmore, when one does not respect the freedom of the other, the other person will take the same route as well.

#### **4.5 The New Threats to Academic Freedom: The Neoliberal Principles**

Throughout the literature review, it was evident that, African universities do not experience the same threats to academic freedom as before. Likewise, as stated by Minerva (2014) and Akala (2021) Africa now have new issues in relation to academic freedom. The CODESRIA (1990) and the Africa Watch Report (1990) associated the threats to academic freedom with the religious and political aspects. According to Minerva (2014), today in democratic countries, these threats are less intrusive, but there are new challenges underrated which pose a threat to academic freedom. Akala (2021) and Ogachi (2011) shown the neoliberal principles as the

main threat to academic freedom currently. Because, as they stated, the neoliberal principles lead to the reconceptualization of academic freedom by both the African universities and by African academics.

This literature review, wanted to know or understand the impact of the new threats to academic freedom. In relation to the 2020 debate on academic freedom in South Africa, the neoliberal principles give as the clue on how academic freedom is understood currently by African academics. As stated by Akala (2021) and Ogachi (2011), academic freedom has been individualized by the university and by intellectuals. Which means, academic freedom has been used for personal gains instead for the public interest (see Ogachi 2011; Akala 2021).

#### **4.6 The Kampala Declaration (1990), its Flaws and Strengths**

The analysis of the Kampala Declaration (1990) was crucial to understanding why there is a growing debate in Africa about academic freedom and social responsibility in its presence. For that purpose, the literature of Ihonvbere (1993) proved effective. As viewed by Ihonvbere (1993), this declaration is generally available in the West or on other continents, but it is less well recognized and communicated in Africa. Moreover, He argues that this declaration does not address the realities that oppressive governments in Africa are supported and aided, and that there are no clearly defined sanctions for individuals who openly, knowingly, and consistently break the declaration's rules (Ihonvbere 1993).

These assertions by Ihonvbere (1993) are clearly accurate. Because African institutions do not make sure that the Kampala Declaration (1990) is recognized from the beginning when African academics engage in their academic activities, it is obvious that most African scholars in African social sciences research are unfamiliar of it. Secondly, the Kampala Declaration (1990) really does not address the realities in African social sciences. It does not address the oppressiveness in higher institutions being supported by the Western countries. On the other hand, it does exclude students as stated by Appiagyei-Atua (2019). Notwithstanding all of these problems, it is still a crucial declaration that should be kept in mind in Africa. Because the Kampala Declaration's (1990) assumptions provide a sound and positive path forward for how to address the ongoing injustices in Africa. It does this by connecting intellectual freedom in Africa with social responsibility.

The Kampala Declaration (1990), Article 21 emphasizes that no intellectual should harass, oppress, or dominate one another in the academic community, and that disparities should be handled in a sense of justice, non-discrimination, and democracy. This document encourages intellectuals to respect the perspectives of others and to defend their freedoms without infringing on the rights of others. Individuals must do scientific and ethical research that adheres to the norms and standards according to the Kampala Declaration (1990).

#### **4.7 Academic freedom and Social Responsibility of African Intellectuals, the 2020 Debate on Academic Freedom in South Africa**

It was necessary to read the literature on the past and current position of academic freedom to understand the 2020 debate in South Africa. These works of literature help to better understand the deep meaning of academic freedom in Africa from the past as well as what it ought to mean in the present. This literature reviewed recent writing on academic freedom and social responsibility in order to accomplish that.

According to Amina Mama (2006), the African scholarly community was founded on a historical recognition of the importance of regionally aware and skilled intelligentsia in order to create a distinctive regional approach to academic freedom. In this sense, Mama (2006) saw that the Kampala Declaration was necessary in order to create an African viewpoint that would address the extremely difficult circumstances that African academics face. According to CODESRIA (1990), academic freedom and the problems that African countries face on a daily basis require equal attention. Academic freedom must be used in this way to address the social issues that African societies face on a daily basis (Mamdani and Diouf 1994).

Several authors who commented on the 2020 debate viewed Natrass' (2020a) study as being racist toward Black students and, as a result, unethical. The study was defined by the authors Adesina (2020), Dziwa (2020), Nongxa (2020), Mzilikazi, le Roux, and Jansen van Vuuren (2020) as having no sense of ethics or responsibility. Natrass (2020b) argued in her defense that her work had been interpreted and understood incorrectly.

She then viewed her research as an ethical study and constructed it using the body of previous literature. She argued that obtaining ethical approval was a necessary for the data gathering before she started her investigation. Then Natrass (2020b) made the case that her study should

not be evaluated as a racist study but rather as an explanatory, logical study that is supported by a large body of scholarly literature.

In support of Natrass (2020), Esso and Long (2020) claimed that universities are "places of discomfort, testing boundaries, posing uncomfortable questions, and challenging received truths," as highlighted by a prominent South African scholar (Esso and Long 2020, p.1). Additionally, they contended that it is only normal for some scholars to sometimes take offense at questions posed by other scholars. In similar vein, Chachage (2008) argued that academic and intellectual freedom evolved from the basic human right freedoms. The freedom of speech and sharing ideas. For him, these are basic and essential rights to any society. That is, without academic freedom or intellectual freedom, scholars and intellectuals cannot fulfil their mission and critical function to the society. For Chachage (2008) scholars need academic freedom to communicate their findings as they are, even if they contradict widely held ideas. The freedom without responsibility, however, stands in contrast to Africa's development priorities, perceived in CODESRIA (1990). In other words, it increases the existing inequality in African nations. A genuine intellectual enjoys academic freedom that comes with responsibilities.

Following CODESRIA (1990) and Adesina (2020), academic freedom must be applied to infer superiority and bias towards one another (see Mamdani and Diouf 1994; Adesina 2020). In this approach, the Kampala Declaration (1990) (the outcome of the CODESRIA 1990 meeting), as also stated by Mama (2006), focused on confirming the connection between academic freedom and greater societal freedom. That is, as stated by Adesina (2020), African intellectuals have both the freedom that needs their equal attention. Likewise, as Mama (2006) stated, intellectuals are only entitled for their academic freedom as much as the struggle for academic freedom is coupled with the social responsibility towards those struggles.

The study by Aarrevaara (2010), Butler (2017), Murove and Chitando (2018) and Adesina (2020) gives a very meaningful information on academic freedom. According to Aarrevaara (2010), academic freedom comes with responsibility and is essential for the sustainability of the institution. In a similar vein, Butler (2017) contended that while academic freedom and freedom of thought or expression are undoubtedly connected, they are not the same thing. According to Butler (2017), a person can exercise freedom by expressing a viewpoint that is within their legal right to do so while walking down the street or in public. However, people who operate within the norms of academic freedom and who are already part of an institution carry a particular responsibility that goes along with their freedom (*academic freedom*). Along

this way, the responsibility is to do the research in an ethical and responsible manner, as shown in the Kampala Declaration (1990). Likewise, Murove and Chitando (2018) made a good point on academic freedom and social responsibility. They argued that, the university and academics are part of society, and their work may have a harmful or beneficial consequence on that society. As a by-product, they must remain committed to their social responsibilities. Individual social responsibility, according to Murove and Chitando (2018), is responsibility connected to current society's realities. As viewed from the literature by Adesina (2020), academic freedom must be accompanied by the social responsibility. That is, African academic freedom includes the responsibility of academics to act ethically responsibly (Adesina 2020).

#### **4.8 Research Gap**

The literature given above provides extensive information on the history of authoritarian colonialism in Africa, the relationship between academic freedom and democracy, and the path by which African nations became democratic. With this understanding, one can begin to see why academic freedom is still under threat in many post-colonial African nations. The literature on the mission and function of universities also provides in-depth knowledge on the criteria for evaluating academic behavior and conduct. Likewise, the CODESRIA (1990) and the research on academic freedom and social responsibility contribute to laying a foundation and firm viewpoint for African scholars' academic freedom and responsibility. That is, having read the CODESRIA (1990) on academic freedom and the related literature on academic freedom and social responsibility, one is more able to judge whether academic freedom has actually been violated or has just been misinterpreted in Africa.

These studies, however, make no mention of the social constructions in which social constructs like academic freedom and human rights are created. In Africa, people face many and different experiences, both good and bad experiences. That then establishes the context in which widely held beliefs are formed and held in Africa. For instance, in this study, it is seen that academic freedom is a social construct constructed by scholars, the government, and universities to safeguard their rights when they pursue their respective missions of producing and disseminating knowledge. The social responsibility likewise is a social constructed idea to guide intellectuals on exercising their academic freedom. As stated by this study, when individuals interact, they come poses both their personal freedom and the responsibility towards one other.

In Africa, the meaning of academic freedom varies from person to person. People would only understand academic freedom commonly if they had had similar experiences and were raised in a similar culture. Therefore, one African intellectual's actions and opinions are influenced by his background and the culture he was exposed to. This study fills this gap by introducing the social constructivism theory, which then provides sufficient information on how ideas are created and how people perceive and respond to them. Such knowledge would help to shape the reasons for constant debates on academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa.

## **Conclusion**

The studies that were consulted from the beginning of this study were reviewed in this chapter. The ideas put forth by various authors in earlier works on colonialism, decolonization, and post-colonialism in Africa were then presented in this chapter. It also provided the opinions of other intellectuals on the responsibility and mission of both intellectuals and universities. This was intended to facilitate the cases for and evaluate limitations on academic freedom. The CODESRIA (1990) assertions on academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa were also stated in this chapter. The Kampala Declaration's (1990) weaknesses and strengths in African social sciences also were discussed. At the final discussions, consulted studies on neo-liberal principles, academic freedom, and social responsibility of African intellectuals were presented. However, this chapter did more than just summarize the conclusions or claims made by other researchers; it also offered criticism when necessary. Hence, the research gap was stated at the end to indicate the omission that other studies have consistently made.

The next chapter will assist by presenting the necessity or importance for African intellectuals and scholars to be aware of their responsibilities. Furthermore, it will discuss the lessons to be taken from the CODESRIA (1990) debate on academic freedom in connection to the 2020 South African debate on academic freedom. It will also discuss the role and responsibilities of African intellectuals.

# CHAPTER FIVE: The Role and Responsibility of African Intellectuals

## Introduction

It is best for African scholars to understand their academic freedom, their duty, and their responsibility when carrying out academic research. Like this, it is crucial for African intellectuals to understand their responsibilities in this neoliberal Africa. According to Helms and Nixon (2010), academic research and intellectual activity contributes to the development of new knowledge in a particular subject. This indicates that the research or intellectual's conclusions form the foundation of new information created about the certain scenario. In this sense, a qualitative scientific investigation combines professionalism and ethics. That is, as stated by the Kampala Declaration (1990) on its Chapter three, "members of the intellectual community are obliged to discharge their roles and functions with competence, integrity and to the best of their abilities. They should perform their duties in accordance with ethical and highest scientific standards" (Kampala Declaration: Article 19).

This compels African scholars to concentrate on conducting scientific research rather than relying solely on their academic freedom and delivering a poor scientific. Therefore, this chapter emphasizes on how important it is for African intellectuals and scholars to understand their roles and responsibilities in the first section. The role and responsibilities of African intellectuals are presented and discussed in the section that follows the first. In light of the 2020 academic freedom discussion in South Africa, this chapter concludes by presenting the lessons to be learned from CODESRIA's (1990) on academic freedom in Africa.

### 5.1 Why is it Important for Intellectuals to Know their Roles and Responsibilities when Conducting Social Research?

According to Ki-Zerbo (2005), an intellectual is defined in many ways. He then considered the term *intellectual* as an ambiguous and dialectical concept because it must be referred to a specific instance (see Ki-Zerbo 2005). This study, uses this term *intellectual* to reflect an individual operating within the institution to carry out the mission of the university by producing and sharing ethical and scientific knowledge to the wider society. Such individual is the knowledge transmitter and producer in the academic community (see Mamdani and Diouf 1994). In short, the term "intellectual" as used in this study basically refer to academic staff and academic researchers producing and sharing knowledge in the university.

Ethics has been identified as a major source of concern in research by modern academic studies worldwide (Mitcham 2003). The study is judged ethically from the beginning to the end and from its consequences. A study must be ethically done in this way since it involves many people from start to finish and has an impact on a large number of people as well. The purpose and impact of the study are reflected by the role and responsibility of an individual. According to Mitcham (2003), a role is the behaviour and action that is required of someone in a particular position. Thus, the idea of a role as a social position combines both normative and descriptive components. In other words, defining what is required of a researcher also involves prescribing how that researcher should conduct themselves (Mitcham 2003).

The health of human beings' interaction is determined by their behaviour and the nature of their environment (Knowles 1977). In this way, in academic community it is the behaviour of scholarly community members that determines whether their positive or negative interaction. As stated by Jordan and Gray (2015), social responsibility covers the relationship of researchers and their societies in which their research is funded, conducted and applied. Thus, the responsible conduct of research speaks to the professional responsibility of the researcher regarding their practices in their field of conducting research. Personally, researchers have the responsibility to rigorous study design, accurate data collection, secure, backed-up data storage, accurate and comprehensive data analysis and reporting, and responsible and fair allocation of credit of other scholars cited.

Socially, a researcher has a responsibility to limit the negative consequences of the research into wider community. That is, as stated by Jordan and Gray (2015), research should be responsibly organized and practiced. Research ethics then comes to be tool for such purpose. Researchers and the university are both obliged to be responsible in ensuring compliance in research ethics. Both the university and intellectuals are responsible for fulfilling their civic duties, that is, their actions must benefit the whole society. In this way, academic freedom and social responsibility of intellectuals must be balanced in an equilibrium.

The social responsibility is only accomplished and maintained when the freedom is balanced with the responsibility. Having to know and accept the role and responsibility benefits one in many ways. According to Schumann and Dweck (2014), accepting responsibility entails taking charge of the good you have accomplished. As a result, you can develop stronger links or relationships with the people you interact with. One is more likely to connect with people when

they are aware of their responsibilities and their position since they will view themselves as a whole human rather than just one portion of their own.

As stated previously, social science research in Africa is undertaken in a difficult environment that is shaped by both external and internal forces that then pose inequality in Africa (CODESRIA 1990; Mama 2006; Botha 2022; Jansen 2019). Thus, academic studies must be conducted with caution in areas where scholars are held accountable for their work. Likewise, the Kampala Declaration (1990) states clearly that intellectual work must be motivated by the highest ethical and scientific standards, and that intellectuals must carry out their responsibilities and activities with competence, integrity, and to the best of their abilities. This indicates that the study must be scientific and should not raise tensions within the university. Scholars should also be aware of their responsibilities before considering their academic freedom (see Mama and Imam 1994; Adesina 2020; Mzilikazi, le Roux and Jansen van Vuuren, 2020). Gender, race, nationality, ethnicity, religion, language, and other factors all contribute to inequality in African universities. That is, each and every member in any community is classified according to one or more of these qualities. These characteristics lead to marginalization, bias, stereotypes, and other issues, which is where the conflict arises. In a scenario like this, intellectuals must be very clear about their roles and responsibilities, because their work has an impact on society, whether beneficial or harmful. This pushes intellectuals and scholars to avoid using violence or other methods that lead to conflict, instead focusing on their roles and responsibilities in their own societies.

Intellectuals, in essence, create a cohesive and rational picture of the reality as it looks from their standpoint for a class or society. That is, the information offered by the intellectuals or scholars serves as the light for the society in viewing and interpreting issues in its surroundings. According to Suttner (2005), “intellectuals are crucial to the process through which a major new culture, representing the world-view of an emerging class or people, comes into being” (Suttner, 2005: 124). What can be accomplished when one does not know their role and responsibility in their society? It is with this reason that they must be fully aware of their societal responsibilities and call attention to them in an intellectual and ethical manner, considering the potential consequences of their actions. Having to know the role and responsibility shapes the ability to respond to the certain phenomenon. That is, responsibility implies ‘being prepared’ and able to respond to your surroundings. When intellectuals realize their roles and responsibilities, they will be professional in their activities. At the same time,

intellectuals who have a clear understanding of their roles will be able to understand and accept what is expected from them, how and when to behave, and what they must achieve when doing academic work or doing social research.

Furthermore, societies throughout Africa, whether inside or outside the academic setting, have a legal obligation to put in place long-term health and safety measures. In particular, the Kampala Declaration (1990) on academic freedom and social responsibility, which guides African intellectuals into a positive and conducive social sciences community, is a fundamental document in the African social sciences. On this declaration, intellectuals are expected to behave ethically, and their work must be rationally driven by integrity (CODESRIA, 1990). So, how can an intellectual be on the proper path in fulfilling what the social research regulations require if they are unaware of their responsibilities in Africa's social sciences? So, in this way, when intellectuals know and understand their roles and responsibilities as African intellectuals, they can cooperate with each other more effectively. When intellectuals know what they are required to fulfil and when responsibilities are appropriately assigned or monitored so they are not given to the same person over and over, there is much less conflict in the society. In addition, intellectuals will have significantly more regard for their team members if they can see how important they are to the community's ultimate success. Noting that, respectful working conditions are more positive, cooperative, and innovative.

The university is a laboratory and a place of discomfort, where boundaries are tested, difficult questions are asked, and received truths are challenged. As a result, it is unavoidable that some scholars may be offended by other scholar's behaviours (Essop and Long, 2020). This claim appears to imply that the university's goal is to reveal the truth, regardless of who it may be to. But what about Africa's deeply divided and historically shaped societies? In Africa, the legacy of colonialism's oppression still haunts individuals who were oppressed as stated by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013). If the offended come across something that triggers or reminds them of their oppression, they will fight over it, and conflict will follow. The university, academics and intellectuals, in this scenario, would not be serving the role of benefitting society; rather, they would be widening socioeconomic inequalities within societies. In this situation, one's responsibility transforms into one's freedom. Freedom is automatically maintained when intellectuals are responsible. Knowing your responsibilities and roles gives you a clear picture of what you are up to as an intellectual. In this case, in an academic setting, knowing both your

academic freedom and your responsibilities is vitally essential for a healthy balance of one's interests and social interests.

The contribution of African intellectuals in Africa is one of the most essential for the continent's progress. In the creation and development of civilized society, intellectuals play a vital role (Bourdieu 2002). According to the CODESRIA (1990), academic freedom does not only imply to the personal freedom of African intellectuals, but it applies to the problems faced by the society as whole. In other words, the society and academic freedom are connected and helpful to each other since academic freedom enables intellectuals to freely do research that would help both themselves and their societies.

The society on the other hand, assists in nurturing academic freedom through providing democratic system to the intellectual. This is to say, knowing the role and responsibility as an African academic or researcher, provides a sense of purpose. The purpose of a researcher is to reveal the remedies for the challenges faced by the society, not to further destroy it. Avoiding such responsibility as stated by Jordan and Gray (2015) destroys the sense of purpose. Intellectuals must understand their roles in order to fulfil their mission in their societies. A feeling of contribution and connection to something bigger than oneself is the source of purpose. In other words, it is critical to accept responsibility for both your actions and those of society. If intellectuals do not have this understanding, there would be little or no progress in the field of African social sciences study. Knowing your role, according to Bourdieu (2002), defines the activity you are expected to take and fulfil whenever essential.

Intellectuals' purpose stems from a desire to contribute to and be connected to their communities. As a result, it is critical that they understand and accept responsibility when undertaking research. Furthermore, intellectuals' knowledge and accountability would prevail if they knew and understood their responsibilities, resulting in strong partnerships in African social sciences rather than leaving them in terrible conditions. This is in consistent with Majawa (2020), who claims that academic freedom and the integrity of higher education institutions are a complicated matter since there is a conflict of interests between making personal choices and protecting other human rights in teaching and learning process. To avoid problematic conflicts, academic intellectuals must understand, practice, and monitor their roles and responsibilities as intellectuals in Africa (Majawa, 2020).

According to Mama and Imam (1994), freedom stems from responsibility, based on all of the information presented above. One's freedom may mistakenly interfere with the freedom of someone else. It does not sound pretty good to be an academic or scholar who understands his or her freedom but not his or her responsibility. This assertion is supported by what occurred at UCT. CODESRIA (1990) and CODESRIA (2005) call on African people to unite rather than split; it is their responsibility to contribute to the unity of their societies. Only when intellectuals are aware of their roles and responsibilities can this be accomplished.

## **5.2 What Exactly is the Role and Responsibility of African Intellectuals?**

In Africa it is both the internal and external threats that challenges academic freedom and pose a debate more often. The social inequalities which are the legacy of colonialism and apartheid in Africa, as stated previously are among the aspects to be blamed for the ongoing and unending conflicts in social sciences research field in Africa. The authoritarianism of the donor agencies such as the IMF and WB on the other hand, continues on where colonialism left in Africa. As stated by Akala (2021), they serve not the interests of Africa, but they are in a mission of serving their own interests or the interests of their mother countries. That so, the CODESRIA's 1990 promotion of academic freedom did not prevent African intellectuals from acknowledging their social duty (Chachage 2008).

The Kampala Declaration (1990) states that members of the academic community have a duty to address historical and current inequalities in African societies based on gender, class, beliefs, race, nationality, and economic circumstances in similarly to their obligations to perform academic functions and roles. All of this is the product of the creation of a just and democratic environment in African societies (CODESRIA, 1990). Therefore, the university is one of the places for the struggle for democracy, as indicated by Mkandawire (1996). This indicates that the university is a platform for African development as well as a place for pushing boundaries and speaking truth to power. This then is the responsibility of African intellectuals. African intellectuals are the ones to rebuild Africa and develop it.

To pursue renaissance is yet another obligation or responsibility of Africans intellectuals in post-colonial Africa. A Pan-African African renaissance must be fuelled by the consumption of African intellectuals. Renaissance is undoubtedly necessary for addressing the current

neoliberalism and neo-colonialism. In the fight against both neo-colonialism and neo-liberalism, African intellectuals must inspire and lead the African revolution (Nkrumah 1970: 30). In other words, intellectuals in African society have always served as a record of the norms and experiences of their community as well as a voice of vision for their own time. Such obligation must ever be disregarded.

The South African debate in 2020 on academic freedom shown a misunderstanding on the role and responsibility of African intellectuals. It was the globalization that made intellectuals to forget about their role and responsibility in Africa. It is only the freedom that dominates in the minds of African intellectuals, but not their responsibility. African intellectuals with their intellectual freedom must be of service for the continent in the development agenda. As stated by Nesbitt (2019), African intellectuals are the dominant social forces in the production of knowledge. Such knowledge is vital for the development of the country and its people (Nesbitt 2019). Hence, as the CODESRIA (1990) stated, they need to correctly understand the problems faced by Africa and the measures to be taken for the sustainable development. In this way, the task of producing knowledge is not purely on academic task, but it is also on society task.

When producing knowledge that is vital to the development agenda of Africa, African intellectuals enjoys enormous opportunities to provide the continent with the understanding of its society. Accepting responsibility and understanding African society condition when conducting research is the first responsibility of African intellectuals. That is, African intellectuals must work on developing their societies and producing and disseminating knowledge in Africa that relates to being a true-pan Africanism. Pan-Africanism, or brotherhood as stated by Emerson (1962) refers to the belief that individuals of African descent should band together since they share a common interest. This then demands African intellectuals to work collaboratively and not individually. The individualism character posed by the neoliberalism in Africa is completely in opposite of development agenda in Africa. For African intellectuals to fulfil their responsibility, as was stated in CODESRIA (1990), they must use their academic freedom to advance the struggle for equality in Africa and to protect the rights of African citizens.

African academic research must be carried out according to established guidelines and basic tenets by the CODESRIA 1990 and its Kampala Declaration (1990). The CODESRIA (1990) and Mama (2006) both mentioned that national freedom and African development go hand in hand. This is because African development genuinely relates to transforming the continent's

unequal society and deliver justice to those who had previously been marginalized. The development of the university contributes to this liberation because it ensures and defends the intellectual freedom of the academic community through democracy or social justice. However, that does not accurately describe the development in Africa. The development in African academic environment is through recognizing and upholding academic freedom and social responsibility (see CODESRIA 1990). This links to the assertion by Kwame Nkrumah that academic freedom in Africa does not imply irresponsibility. That is, African intellectuals must promote and preserve this sense of culture in Africa to unite and not dismantle African civilization.

Intellectual freedom in Africa entails not just the freedom of the individual intellectual, but also their relationship to other intellectuals' freedoms within the academic community (Chachage 2008; CODESRIA 1990). Likewise, it is not only intellectual or academic freedom violation that must be considered in Africa. The responsibility of African intellectuals too must be considered. African intellectuals have a tendency of departing with their responsibilities and moral norms. The freedom with no responsibility is completely a meaningless freedom in Africa. That is to say, African intellectuals must remind African scholars that, academic freedom must not merely be misused for one's own benefit and as a means to escape taking responsibility, as mentioned in the CODESRIA (1990). Those with privilege to intellectual freedom should link it to the social realities in Africa (Ake 1994; Hagan 1994; Mama and Imam 1994).

Therefore, the work of African intellectuals must benefit society by furthering the social justice, development, and democratization agendas (see Mama 2006). This demands for intellectuals to take a stand in carrying out their responsibility to society in addition to considering their academic freedom. In CODESRIA (1990), the quest for academic freedom was made clear to be valid in as much as it is consistent with popular struggles and filled with social responsibility towards those struggles (see Mama 2006). Through this approach, social, cultural, and religious life outside of academies were included in the freedom of intellectuals (see Mama 2006; CODESRIA 1990). In the Kampala Declaration (1990), both the freedom and the responsibility of African intellectuals are stated and emphasized.

The scientifically transmission of information about the social, political, and economic situation of the continent should be the first step for African intellectuals in the conceptual or theoretical front of the quest for social justice in Africa (see CODESRIA 1990). The nature

and scope of injustices, as well as the core causes of the general majority's dissatisfaction and problems, require special consideration. As the CODESRIA (1990) stated, without the proactive and professional engagement of intellectuals in a democratic and ethical academic community, the struggle for academic freedom that is paired with intellectuals' social responsibility cannot be won. Intellectuals should have a clear awareness of the general public's grievances. An intellectual is judged on his or her competence and moral character. One cannot be considered intellectual if they violate ethical standards through negligence and incompetence.

The university has rules and standards that academics are expected to follow in order to control their behaviour and academic performance. These norms and standards are based on ideals considered fundamental for the university's mission, and they are designed to ensure the integrity of academia in Africa (see Hagan, 1994). This viewpoint is premised on the fact that, in the absence of certain academic rules, some intellectuals would create exceptionally bad and unethical research. The responsibility of African scholars or researchers as stated in CODESRIA (1990) in its Kampala Declaration (1990) is to conduct their academic research for the benefit of the society. They have the freedom to do so, but that freedom must be accompanied by their responsibility to conduct their research in ethical and responsibly manner. Academic freedom must be matched with responsibility in this way, as Mama and Imam (1994) believe that freedom is connected with responsibility. Because of the difficult conditions in which social sciences research is conducted in Africa, intellectual responsibility is extremely important.

Academic freedom in Africa, relates to the responsibility in the society. Hence, according to Ake (1994) and Hagan (1994), people must tie their freedom to the greater interests of society for the benefit of society rather than for their own personal benefit. Intellectuals in Africa have a dual responsibility to uphold their own rights and to support other people's rights struggles (see The Kampala Declaration 1990). This suggests that while protecting scholars' freedom is part of African intellectuals job, it is also their duty to consider how it can affect other group members, demonstrating the necessity of coupling role with responsibility. This is what Imam and Mama (1994) entail by "recognizing the values that inform the job and societal implications, as well as the likely consequences of intellectual's activities" (Mama and Imam 1994: 74). As Mama and Imam (1994) point out, there are social divisions in Africa based on

religion, class, race, and gender, therefore research based entirely on academic freedom rather than responsibility contributes to further injustice, exploitation, and oppression.

Intellectuals' role in African countries is to confront existing structures (CODESRIA 1990). This is accompanied with the responsibility that intellectuals must try to build integrative and multidisciplinary perspectives that are suitable to the social realities and concerns under study. As stated by Hagan (1994), intellectuals must serve as role models for both collective and individual members in order for society to develop. This will necessitate intellectuals refraining from reproducing existing societal divisions (Mama and Imam, 1994). Today's African intellectuals appear to have forgotten their critical role in the academic environment's survival and harmony. This intellectual responsibility is lacking in research such as Natrass's (2020). Because the research of Natrass (2020) was more like of a stereotypic, racist and poorly researched study in general. It is the freedom of an African intellectual to conduct a study of their choice, but it is also their responsibility to keep their research ethically and responsible (see the Kampala Declaration 1990; Adesina 2020). Hence, intellectuals must challenge and modify societal ideas in order to alter and democratize academic institutions' administrative, research, and teaching methods (Mama and Imam 1994; Hagan 1994). As stated by Mama and Imam (1994) this can be achieved when intellectuals unite to broaden the academic space, increase intellectual freedom, and accept social responsibility in their work.

As stated by Ki-Zerbo (1994) in CODESRIA 1990 conference, the role of intellectuals is to bring society together in terms of identity-related social differences. According to Ki-Zerbo (1994), intellectuals could only become fully integrated into society by networking and forming alliances with as many people as possible. In order to foster social cohesion and lessen exploitation, the objective would be to bring together the different groups and work for the advantage of the majority. In doing this, African intellectuals should act as unbiased promoters of libertarian culture and pave the way for democracy. For this reason, they must settle their disputes by peaceful means rather than through conflict (Mamdani and Diouf 1994).

Moreover, it must be understood that, just as it was in the past, the contribution of African intellectuals in Africa is central to social justice, democratization, and progress (CODESRIA 1990). It is essential for intellectuals to recognize how prevailing and functional social conditions are in African society. Without intellectuals setting the pace in using their unique talents and abilities within the authority, capital, and civil society groups as a shared national asset towards social reform, social justice, development, and democratization cannot be

reached in a continent. African intellectuals need to be careful with the information they develop and disseminate given that it is for the society's consumption and use. As it was stated in the CODESRIA (1990), the social responsibility of African intellectuals is the nation building. That is accomplished when intellectuals provide a wealth of scientific and not poor or biased research.

The role of the intellectual, according to Ki-Zerbo (1994), is to ensure that the greatest number of people within the society where intellectual lives have the ability and information to critically and intelligently assess the ongoing process involving them (Mamdani and Diouf 1994). This does not, however, push intellectuals in the direction of stirring conflict. In this instance, intellectuals must concentrate on this duty rather than just being vanguards for their academic freedom, as Ake (1994) points out, that intellectuals often dismiss this. Intellectuals have a critical role to play in making society aware of the issues and realities it faces, as well as providing viable answers. This is because an intellectual is supposed to play a critical part in the flow of ideas by identifying problems and responding with new, functional, and logical alternative solutions (see Ki-Zerbo 1994). With this, there would be no or little attempt by studies whose scholars goes against ethical or professional conduct.

The university is a zone of discomfort where new information and boundaries are tested, as said by Essop and Long (2020). But it is also essential to remember that information affects how society is structured, the ethical line must not be crossed. Instead of ruining society, scholars need to lend a hand in development agenda (see Ake 1994). They must accomplish this through creating information that is in line with moral principles and societal demands. This is because the academic community is required to be responsible to society's demands and to propose new solutions to challenges what society may confront (Hagan 1994; Ake 1994; Baloyi 1998). Therefore, scholars need to keep in mind both their freedom and their responsibilities (see CODESRIA 1990; Mzilikazi et al 2020; Adesina 2020). Their work must reflect both integrity and competence (CODESRIA 1990; The Kampala Declaration on Academic Freedom and Social Responsibility 1990).

The duty of intellectuals is to support and spread principles that society may overlook and not focus on themselves but to the entire society (Ake 1994; Hagan 1994). To put it more simply, integrity, rationality, clarity, and rigor of intellect, as well as an open, inquiring mind and the freedom to think and exchange ideas as Hagan (1994) stated. Academics and universities owe it to themselves to maintain their political activity to a minimum (Hagan 1994: Mama and

Imam 1994). That is to say, both universities and intellectuals must abstain from political and immoral behavior and instead concentrate on providing services to society by fostering unity through competence and integrity.

According to Nwala (1994), the responsibility of an intellectual is to "seek for the truth, teach the truth, and protect the truth." The truth must, however, be a scientifically and professionally searched truth, not the truth to invoke injustice (CODESRIA 1990). That is to say, intellectuals assist in this function at various levels, such as in national development, where intellectuals are responsible for assisting in the discovery and creation of scientific knowledge that contributes to rather than hinders the growth process (see Hagan 1994). Intellectuals are not just producers of information. They are also members of society (Hagan 1994; Murove and Chitando 2018). Intellectuals are expected to not only accomplish their own individual objectives, but also to play an important part in society and contribute to the process of development. In this circumstance, African intellectuals must focus on creating a more balanced and healthier atmosphere (see Ki-Zerbo, 1994). The role of African intellectuals is to transform academic freedom from a means for academics to a benefit for the general public as Ake (1994) stated.

In this context, scholars or researchers must put the needs of society before their own interests when pursuing the truth (Hagan 1994). Therefore, it is necessary for the research of African scholars to positively contribute for the benefit of the community. Such research and its findings must attempt to assist the disadvantaged and oppressed in speaking up for themselves and overcoming their social situations (Ake 1994). This is in direct opposition to the current research behaviour of scholars, whose sense of academic freedom is informed by individualism rather than sociality.

It is the responsibility of intellectuals to create a culture of respect for opposing opinions and positions, as well as to encourage democratic debate and discussion (Kampala Declaration 1990). However, this becomes complicated when scholars overuse their academic freedom by purposefully provoking conflict through spreading biased or racist material about the other group. In this circumstance, intellectual's responsibility is to demonstrate competence, integrity, and respect for other intellectuals. Furthermore, scholars must carry out their responsibilities in accordance with the highest ethical and moral standards (Kampala Declaration, 1990). If scholars do not adhere to ethical principles, their research is no longer scientific, especially if the research results are racist. Such research disregards the intellectual

responsibility outlined in the Kampala Declaration (1990). Academics as stated by the CODESRIA (1990) have a duty to act ethically and responsibly.

Academic freedom implies, that African scholars must not suffer for their own judgments or opinions academically. However, as stated in the Kampala Declaration (1990), it is their responsibility to behave ethically and responsibly within their academic studies. On this, African scholars are required to carry out their academic tasks with competence (Kampala Declaration 1990). They must hold views or conclusions that adhere to professionalism and ethics. They must therefore refrain from infringing on the rights of other members of the academic community by misusing their personal freedom. Freedom of research must not undermine the research's ethical, scientific, or professional norms (Dar es Salaam Declaration 1990; Kampala Declaration 1990).

Along this, the Kampala Declaration (1990) on its Article 19 states that: -

Members of the intellectual community are obliged to discharge their roles and functions with competence, integrity and to the best of their abilities. They should perform their duties in accordance with ethical and highest scientific standards and without being motivated by prejudice (Kampala Declaration 1990).

Vilakazi (1999) makes a strong point about the responsibility of African Intellectuals in addition to the CODESRIA 1990 debates on academic freedom. By establishing a narrative of continuity between the pre-colonial African past and the present, African intellectuals in Africa are responsible for reforming the post-colonial African society (Vilakazi 1999). This means that instead of pulling backward by embracing colonial structures, intellectuals must take charge in creating the new Africa. "African intellectuals are required to undertake a significant and serious procedure of re-educating themselves about the beliefs and traditions of African culture in order to fulfil this type of responsibility" (Vilakazi 1999: 208). This indicates that intellectuals in Africa should build strong relationships instead of engage in acts of harassment or torture against other intellectuals. Academics have a social responsibility, and they are required to fulfil it because they are extensively integrated into society and frequently shaped by it.

### **5.3 In Context of Ongoing Debates on Academic and intellectual Freedom in South Africa: What can we Learn from the CODESRIA Debate on this Issue?**

Academic freedom is a sensitive topic that might cause conflict for those with short temper in South Africa right now. The social interactions between blacks and whites in South Africa were exposed the 2020 debate on academic freedom in South Africa. Intentionally or not, the study by Nicoli Natrass (2020) showed that black people are less capable of thinking and are less likely to love animals than other races. Given the contemporary circumstances, when academic freedom is perceived as personal freedom rather than being connected with responsibilities, the CODESRIA 1990 debate on academic freedom could give use many lessons.

Some people might not know why Africa continues to have problems in higher education while it is democratic. The democratization that CODESRIA (1990) sought has not been achieved totally by African intellectuals. Instead, the Western influence has really introduced the individualism culture in Africa, destroying the unity. In CODESRIA (1990) Mazrui (1994) once argued that, Western countries does not share skills in Africa but they share their culture. It is now their culture that African countries have been dragged out into that creates and maintains the conflicts in Africa. In this way, as CODESRIA (1990) argued, the lesson to be learned by African people is that the university is a struggle for development, democratization and social justice. Academic freedom is essential for the mission of the university and intellectuals, but it is also a tool for development in Africa.

It is evident that intellectuals had not taken a stand for achieving social progress when connecting the CODESRIA (1990) debate to the discussion at hand on academic freedom. Instead, globalization makes intellectuals more likely to prioritize their own interests over those of society. In the CODESRIA (1990) discussion, there is a focus on the intellectuals considering both their academic freedom and their societal responsibilities. One might assume from the current dispute around Natrass' (2020) study that there is still much that African intellectuals need to offer. It has also been noted that social science funding shortages enable the West to interfere in African affairs, which promotes globalization and the development of new forms of policy-making decisions like the neoliberal practices mentioned by Ogachi (2011). Then, as Mkandawire (1999) and Ogachi (1999) have noted, this places African academics at danger and turns them into a political and commercial battlefield.

It is evident to compare that condition to the current situation pertaining to academic freedom and social responsibility from the claims made by Ake (1994) and Hagan (1994) that the society is made up of undemocratic and unequal members. According to Ki-Zerbo (1994), intellectuals did not significantly alter colonial systems after and during liberation. This is accurate when

considering the social dynamics in the academic world nowadays. The role left by previous colonial rulers was quickly filled by African intellectuals during and after the liberation movement. According to Khan (1994) and Ki-Zerbo (1990), intellectuals in Africa did fight for the abolition of the colonialists and the attainment of their rights, but they lacked a clear strategy for obtaining a social vision that is still essential for contemporary society. As Ake (1994) claims, African states are following in the colonial legacy. This leads to the conclusion that colonialism's effects are still felt today. The unequal treatment of other scholars in the academic setting, is evidence of this. In this instance, Ake (1994) was clear in his assertion that academic freedom would not succeed if societal issues were not brought to light and resolved. In fact, the current society is not yet democratic, and this needs to change in order to allow for academic freedom where intellectuals would understand it correctly instead of for their own advantage. Intellectuals as stated by Mamdani (1994) really seemed to ignore the social structures in African academic environment. In that, they neglected the fact that academic freedom would not really shine in Africa. Intellectuals appear to be ignorant of Mama and Imam's (1994) presumption that social responsibility and academic freedom go hand in hand. It is important to consider Hagan's (1994) assertion that societal institutions must change if academic freedom is to flourish. Again, if intellectuals use academic freedom for their own interest, social divisions would continue in Africa.

It is important to understand that intellectuals are responsible for creating the social formations, institutions, and processes that we are connected with. This is made clear by Mamdani (1994), who said that intellectuals' activity involves the idea, organization, and justification of social processes. According to Diouf (1994), intellectuals are those who hold prominent positions in the system for the transfer of knowledge because they possess specialized knowledge or competence. The same intellectuals might play this role for their own gain. According to Mafeje (1994), intellectuals are not all the same, and their identity is determined by how they relate to politics. The social processes and structures of other societies might be seriously affected by these intellectuals' use of their identity divisions. The present situation in South Africa at the moment makes this clear.

It is evident from the CODESRIA 1990 debates on academic freedom that the history and westernization of the African academic community have shaped and divided the continent's intellectuals. According to Mazrui, western education inhibits Africanization and causes intellectuals to become lost in their own selves. One factor to consider is the Fees Must Fall

campaign that was launched in South Africa in 2015. According to Nyoka (2020), the movement not only aimed to make education free but also to decolonize it. The struggle for one's lost identity, as noted by Mafeje (1994), can be connected to this activity. According to Mafeje (1994), the struggle is what gives rise to academic freedom, and in order for the struggle to involve the entire community, intellectuals must link their pursuit of freedom with their duty to the people (see Ake 1994). As stated by Hagan (1994), the structure of the academic society determines the effectiveness of academic freedom, this informs us that the battle as it is in South Africa will continue as long as it is unchanged. This tells us that intellectuals have a role to perform in society, a role that some intellectuals have not acknowledged, because they continue to harass other intellectuals.

The issue of Africa's reliance on First World nations is the other lesson to be learned from the CODESRIA 1990 debates on academic freedom. The lack of economic independence in Africa was discussed by authors like Mittelman (1994), Imam and Mama (1994), as well as Ake (1994). The World Bank and International Monetary Fund remain in power and govern African affairs. This is due to the lack of self-confidence displayed by Africa and the intellectual community's occasionally unfulfilled duties in the development of the continent (see Khan 1994). This is clear from recent research by Ogachi (2011) and Murove and Chitando (2018), which shows that the World Bank and International Monetary Fund continues to play a significant role in the globalization of the African academic community.

The majority of South Africa's programs are funded by foreign donors. What should be studied and shared as legitimate knowledge at African institutions is frequently decided by foreign donors. Any information found to be detrimental to the donor's interests would not be funded. This indicates that, similar to what Ake (1994) had previously said regarding the status of the African academic community and the applicability of academic freedom in Africa. According to Ake (1994), academic freedom would not matter in Africa as long as the academic community is still governed by those who possess the means of knowledge production. The situation across Africa, not only in South Africa, supports Ki-Zerbo's (1994) assertion that academics in Africa are under pressure to submit to manipulation by those in control of the tools of knowledge production. Therefore, these statements confirm to the fact that there is no academic freedom in South Africa, and they also serve as a lesson that must be learned in order to provide the solution. The majority of what African intellectuals know, research, publish, or share comes from outside Africa. Because of this, according to Murove, Chitando (2018) and

Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013), the colonial past continues to be central to Africa's debate on academic freedom. As a result of this knowledge, we can conclude that the struggle for academic freedom in Africa as a whole not just in South Africa remains relevant and is now more important than it ever was. This is because, as Zeleza (2003) notes, there are many more challenges to academic freedom in Africa than there were in the past. Dependence on foreign donors being one of the new challenges to academic freedom in Africa.

In addition to the lessons already mentioned, CODESRIA has a few more to take lessons from the debates on academic freedom that took place in the 1990s. These lessons centre on the necessity of prioritizing and privileging the acknowledgement and representation of the viewpoints, systems of thought, and contextual and epistemological variety that shape production of knowledge both internationally and regionally. The lessons concerning the necessity of broadening our understanding and debate of "open access" to go further than simply giving access to information and research findings through several distribution choices are again other lessons. The other lesson, from CODESRIA debate of 1990 includes the struggle for the true democratization and the battle against inequality. All the axis of inequality must be fought against in the pursuit of academic freedom.

The final and most evident message from the CODESRIA academic freedom discussions in 1990 is that academics or scholars' academic freedom can only be sustained when they take on their social responsibilities. Academic freedom would not help restore social harmony and stability if intellectuals ignore their responsibilities; on the contrary, it will do the reverse and upset the society. For intellectual freedom to flourish and benefit society, intellectuals must fulfil their moral responsibilities (Mama and Imam 1994). Since academic freedom comes with responsibility, it must be used for the benefit of the entire academic community rather than for personal benefit (Ake 1994; Hagan 1994; Mama and Imam 1994). According to Ki-Zerbo, this demonstrates that intellectuals must contribute to society's answers rather than simply watching as it suffers (1994).

## **Conclusion**

This chapter covered three main questions guiding this study. First it addressed the importance of African intellectuals to know their role and responsibility when conducting academic research. This was done to make a clear standing point on the necessity of African intellectuals to know and understand their roles and responsibilities when conducting research. This chapter

went on to address the role and responsibility of African intellectuals. It was stated that, it is not only the freedom that matters in Africa, but the responsibility as well matters. The final part of this chapter then went on to cover the lessons to be learned on the CODESRIA 1990 debate on academic freedom in relation to the 2020 debate on academic freedom in Africa.

## **CHAPTER Six: Conclusion**

### **Introduction**

There were six chapters in this research study. This final chapter of the study serves as its conclusion, with the first chapter served as its introduction. The results in this chapter are based on a thorough study of the literature on the theme of academic freedom and social responsibility of African intellectuals, including the CODESRIA 1990 and more contemporary works. The conclusions were drawn in view of the study's objectives, research questions, and results.

This concluding chapter concludes the research effort by analysing and summarizing how each chapter from this study contributed towards the goal of this study and addressing the research questions.

### **6.1 Overview of the Study**

The study was an analysis and response to a belief that universities do not provide African academics enough academic freedom. Based on this study, for African academics to reasonably claim that African universities have violated their right to academic freedom, they must first understand their academic freedom, its boundaries, and their duty to behave ethically and responsibly when conducting academic research. To do this, this study related to the 2020 debate in South Africa that touched both to academic freedom and the social responsibility of African intellectuals.

This study's primary goal was to revisit the CODESRIA 1990 debate on academic freedom in Africa in effort to clarify the role and responsibility of African intellectuals. The study wanted to clarify how academic freedom should be interpreted and to address the role and responsibility of African intellectuals to the problematic social sciences field as it related to the 2020 academic freedom debate. The claim was that academic freedom entails social responsibility. Therefore, it was stated that when African academics think of their academic freedom as being violated by the university, they must first confirm if their understanding of academic freedom matches the ethical conduct and integrity. The study pointed that, academic freedom in Africa is viewed differently than it was during the CODESRIA meeting on academic freedom in 1990. It was stated that in the CODESRIA 1990, academic freedom referred to an intellectuals' unrestricted, yet responsible, right to pursue their academic interests

(CODESRIA 1990). That was stated to be the academic freedom that is accompanied by a duty to act ethically and responsibly.

The neoliberal ideals that African nations adopted under the Structural Adjustment Programs were said to have had a greater influence on the contemporary understanding of academic freedom. This study supported the argument made by Akala (2021) and Ogachi (2011) that academic freedom in Africa is today used more for personal gain than for the collective good. The university is now making a profit through tuition fees, based on a literature review on neoliberal principles and academic freedom in Africa. The purchasers of the education that the institution sells end up being the students. The academics from Africa also went down the same road and abandoned their moral responsibilities. They just interpreted academic freedom through the neoliberal ideals' individualism. The CODESRIA 1990 made clear that there is a connection between academic freedom and other fundamental rights in society, but they had now lost any understanding of this. Even intellectuals today lack a sense of responsibility for establishing an ethical and responsible behavior that promotes social cohesiveness by generating that society may use to address its problems.

This study then explored the CODESRIA 1990 debate as well as recent literature essential to the ongoing discussion over academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa. In order to perform the literature review, the relevant works on academic freedom in Africa were selected, examined, and integrated. The main and most significant work of literature used in this study was the CODESRIA 1990 debate on academic freedom and the studies on neoliberalism and reconceptualization of academic freedom in Africa. The CODESRIA 1990 was the initial point for this study because it is where the debate and conceptualization of academic freedom linked with social responsibility in Africa first began. The studies on the neoliberal principles were then visited and included in this study because they show the transformation of academic freedom from being for public good into being the individual good. The information contained by the literature on neoliberal principles in Africa was then crucial for understanding the misconception of Academic freedom in Africa. The researchers selected the key information from each of the reviewed literatures, giving each study the same amount of attention.

Moreover, as stated in Chapter 1 on research methods, this study was a desktop and an explanatory, descriptive, and contextual qualitative study utilizing a secondary information. The collection of data was through the literature search on CODESRIA 1990 debate and previous studies on academic freedom and social responsibility. The collected data was then

analysed using an interpretive paradigm and thematic analysis methods. These were applied explain social constructions, different viewpoints and subjective reality by looking through a revised literature and find and evaluate similarities.

This study then used two theories the social responsibility theory and the social constructivism theory. The social constructivism theory was used to explain and analyse how the human cognition. Meaning to understand what one knows and how he comes to know that. This was made for the effort of understanding the interpretation of academic freedom by African intellectuals. The social responsibility theory was on the other hand used to explain the connection between freedom and responsibility. These theories played a good part in generating the interpretations applied in this study. With the social constructivism theory, it was easy to understand why academic freedom is always a debated concept in Africa. Likewise, using the insights of social responsibility theory, it was easy to find the link between academic freedom and social responsibility.

By revisiting the CODESRIA 1990, this study wanted to address the assumption that African universities are violating the academic freedom of African intellectuals or academics. This was done to understand academic freedom, its boundaries, and the necessity of African academics embracing both their academic freedom and social responsibility. This choice was drawn in the context of the circumstances surrounding social science research in Africa and the centrality of academic freedom for the continent's development agenda. Hence, academic freedom was not only viewed in this study as the freedom of academics to pursue their studies but also as an instrument for African development. Because academic freedom and the society are closely related. If the undemocratic foundations in society are not addressed, academic freedom will cease to exist. Academic freedom, moreover, does not apply to everyone in society, it only applies to academics. Academic freedom must therefore be in harmony with and work toward resolving the social realities of society for the society to accept and defend it.

In this manner, the research study's questions were:

4. Why is it important for intellectuals to know their roles and responsibilities when conducting social research?
5. What exactly is the role and responsibility of African intellectuals?
6. In the context of ongoing debates on academic and intellectual freedom in South Africa, what can we learn from the CODESRIA debate on this issue?

After viewing and analysing the literature on academic freedom and social responsibility using the thematic approach, this study was then able to answer these questions.

## **6.2 Review of Chapters and Discussions**

As was seen, this research was divided into six Chapters, with each chapter playing its significant part. This part then presents the summary and contribution of each chapter to this study. The role played by each of these chapters is as follows: -

### **6.2.1 Chapter One**

The primary goal of this chapter was to introduce this study. In doing that, this chapter started by highlighting the assumption that African academics are being denied their academic freedom by the African universities and mentioning the correct or genuine meaning of academic freedom. This chapter then provided a background of this study. The background covered the definition of academic freedom initially. Then to give a deep knowledge on academic freedom in Africa, this chapter provided a history of Africa, citing the colonialism and Apartheid in South Africa. Under this discussion it was stated that the problem of academic freedom in Africa is linked to the colonial legacy of Africa.

This chapter then went on to discuss the conditions of social sciences in Africa. This discussion pointed that the social conditions in Africa has always been from the start shaped by the colonial inheritance. Referring to Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013) it was also discussed that, decolonization in Africa is an unfinished process. Hence, independence in Africa must be understood as the substitution of colonial bourgeoisie by a native bourgeoisie. Where the same path and the operational system of African societies is still in footsteps of the colonial powers. All this was drawn from the literature search including the views of intellectuals in the CODESRIA (1990) meeting, later found in the collection by Mamdani and Diouf (1994), titled "*Academic freedom in Africa*".

The CODESRIA and its failures were then presented in this chapter. The CODESRIA's dependence and its influence by the Western countries (Hoffmann 2019) was also described as another factor that contributes to a long-lasting debates on academic freedom in Africa. The discussion of African intellectuals' perspectives on the difficult neoliberal and neo-colonial Africa followed. An African intellectual, according to the study, is someone who rejects dominance and limitation on tradition, and is not influenced by the decisions of the ruling class, thus, being an intellectual African does not simply necessitate being born in Africa it was stated. Then the study moved to discuss the 2020 debate on academic freedom and the roots of

it. It was stated that, the meeting in Kampala, 1990 was not only motivated by the brutality of African states towards African intellectuals and academics, but it was also to discuss the overall challenges faced by the African countries and possible solutions. On this debate, as stated, this chapter defined academic freedom in relation to the social structures in Africa. That is, academic freedom was linked with social responsibility. Having African academics possessing both their academic freedom and their social responsibility.

As stated on this chapter, it is the economic challenges in Africa that forced African states to opt for Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). The SAPs comprised of the loans provided by the IMF and WB (Ogachi 2011; Akala 2021). Then the WB and IMF or the donor countries forced African countries to adopt neo-liberal principles which were in opposite of African development agenda (Akala 2021). The neoliberal principles as stated in this chapter reconceptualized academic freedom as being for the private or individual good and not for public good. Having the university and academics not accepting and fulfilling their roles in society but working for their own interest. At the end, this chapter returned on the debate in South Africa over academic freedom, stating that academic freedom in Africa must be understood as it was in CODESRIA (1990). That, African academics must use their academic freedom with a sense of responsibility. After providing the abovementioned background, the problem this chapter addressed was African intellectuals' exclusive focus on academic freedom and failure to acknowledge their social responsibilities in Africa.

Then, Chapter 1 had background and context portion, followed by the problem statement, the significance of the study, the questions of the study, objectives of the study, theoretical framework of the study, research motivation, data collection methods, and data analysis methods, finally the limitations and the delimitations of the study as well as the structure of this study. With all this information presented by chapter 1 a reader was able to understand the background and the way forward of this study.

## **6.2.2 Chapter Two**

This chapter followed and took from the first chapter. The aim of this chapter was to clarify or make it easier for this study to be understood through the theory. Hence, theoretical basis for this study was offered in this chapter. The primary theories for this study were the Social Responsibility Theory and the Social Constructivism Theory. It was seen that it is vital to visit other theories of academic freedom that have been used before in order to make a path for the Social Responsibility Theory and the Social Constructivism Theory. Hence, this study started

by introducing and discussing the assumptions of Special Theory and General Theory of academic freedom. Presenting and analysing the special theory and general theory broadened the knowledge on academic freedom from various viewpoints.

The special theory was the first theory to be discussed. This theory was stated that it stems from the traditional interpretations of academic freedom in Medieval Universities by "Lehrfreiheit" and "Lernfreiheit" (Borhan 2019; Baloyi 1998). This theory saw academic freedom as not being linked with the basic human rights. Under the assumption by Pincoffs (1975), it was stated that the freedom of scholars inside the university has nothing to do with their freedom outside the university. Thus, academic freedom according to the special theory referred to the freedom enjoyed by members of academic community inside academic environment and not the freedom they enjoy as the members of a free society (Pincoffs 1975; Borhan 2019).

In addition to the special theory, the general theory was presented. The general theory was stated to be related to the traditional understanding of human rights or civil liberties (Aldossari and Ashwaq Mohammed 2021). The general theory in opposite of the special theory saw academic freedom as entirely linked with the human rights. That is to say, it was indicated that academic freedom evolved from the basic human rights. In this way, members of academic community possess the same freedoms or rights as academic community members and as a member of a democratic society. Meaning, academics or students inside and outside academic community have the individual freedoms. The freedom of expression, the freedom of enquiry, the freedom of publication and the freedom of association are among those rights. Moreover, academic freedom under the general theory referred to the freedom that academic community members can exercise both inside and outside of the academic community. Therefore, the freedoms that members of the academic community enjoy are related to the rights that community members in democratic societies enjoy (Borhan 2019; Reichman 2019; Nelson 2010; Aldossari and Ashwaq Mohammed 2021).

The weakness from both of these theories was the omission of how academic freedom come to be understood. In other way, both these theories generalized the understanding of academic freedom but they did not exactly give a foundation on how academic freedom or the human rights come to be understood by the society members. Also, these theories defined academic freedom only in relation of the democratic countries. They had no explanation of academic freedom in undemocratic societies.

The social constructivism theory and social responsibility theory then came to fill the gaps left by these the special theory and the general theory. The social constructivism theory was stated to be the human cognitive theory that have initially evolved as the cognitive constructivism theory under the writings by Jean Piaget and latter modified by Semyonovich Vygotsky into a social constructivism theory (Fosnot 2013; Huitt & Hummel 2003; Berk, 2010; Nja, Ndifon & Cornelius-Ukpep 2019). The main assumption under the social constructivism theory was that, a person's ability to grow cognitively is present from birth and later influenced by the experiences and interactions within the society. That is to say, the fundamental or natural abilities of an individual to grow cognitively are eventually developed through interaction with others when the individual is introduced to society and develops. Under this theory it was stated that, every political or socially accepted idea is formed through interaction of one person and one another. Most importantly, it was stated that it is the society under which an individual was introduced and nurtured to that influences his behavior towards understanding.

Academic freedom was stated under the social constructivism theory to be the human construction or the socially constructed idea. To support this, this study took the claim by Hancock (1999) and Pettit (2001) that nothing would make sense without human interaction, and that the countries would not have existed without human interaction. Seeing to conform this, the study used the claim by Africa Watch Report (1990), Rajagopal (2003), Beiter (2006) and Appiagyei-Atua (2016) that academic freedom is a human right. Then it was stated that a human right is not something that you can point at and say 'there it is', referencing from Snyder (1988). Thus, a person who is alone as was indicated cannot have both the freedom (right) and responsibility. As was stated by Pettit (2001), a person alone in the desert would not need rights because no one would infringe on them. It is when he come to connect with other individuals that he come to have freedom and responsibility towards other's freedoms. Then understanding of academic freedom was believed from this study to be closely related to one's personal experiences, interactions and the culture of the society one grows up into. Then the assumption made in this study is that, African people because they have different experiences in the continent would not understand academic freedom in same way. Even the CODESRIA's (1990) understanding of academic freedom as having boundaries and being paired with responsibility, could not sit well in all African intellectuals. That is why some African academics continue to assume their freedom as being violated by the universities even if it is not.

The social responsibility theory then came to be addressed in this chapter to relate to academic freedom, social responsibility of African intellectuals and conflict on academic freedom in South Africa in 2020. Chaffe (2017) and Davis (1967) as stated in chapter 2 classified this theory as a common good media theory. This theory as stated, came to transform the individualism posed by the libertarian theory into public or common good. It did this by giving the media both their freedom and reminding them of their social responsibility.

This theory's background and development were outlined, then its strengths and weaknesses were considered. The social responsibility theory was then used to define theoretically academic freedom and social responsibility. This chapter also gave more thorough information on how this theory fits into the ongoing discussion in Africa about academic freedom and social responsibility. This chapter was concluded after providing a general analysis of the ongoing discussion regarding academic freedom and social responsibility using the social responsibility theory (see Chaffe 2017; Pachamama 2019; Bhattacharyya 2019). Then the main assumption under this theory is that the conflict rises when one person does not accept his responsibility towards one another. Therefore, this theory was associated with this study to understand academic freedom conflict and the link between academic freedom and social responsibility.

The results were that the 2020 conflict on academic freedom in Africa is attached to the freedom that applied by Natrass (2020) with no sense of responsibility and ethical conduct. Therefore, the conflict was said to be the result of the freedom disassociated from the responsibility. This was drawn from the social responsibility theory's assumption in the media. That there is conflict in the media when journalists fail to carry out their responsibilities. And probably when their actions had a negative effect on other members of the community (see Chaffe 2017; Mussell 2016). Therefore, if media professionals exercise both their freedom and responsibility, there will not be any problem. Hence, the conflict will only arise when one person fails to respect another's right to freedom.

Finally, it was stated that the knowledge is dependent of the society, the interaction and the experiences. Likewise, the conflict is depended on the freedom linked with the responsibility of the freedom alone not matched with the responsibility. Therefore, the dependent variables are the conflict and the knowledge. The independent variables are the freedom, responsibility, the experiences, the society and interaction. With this theoretical framework presented by

chapter 2, the reader was able to understand this study from a theoretical lenses and able to draw conclusions and guess the way forward of the study.

### **6.2.3 Chapter Three**

This chapter took from Chapter 2. The purpose of this chapter was to study the history of academic freedom and to examine how it has changed through time. Meaning, understanding academic freedom from the interpretations in the past and current interpretations. Understanding the roots of academic freedom necessitated understanding of the roots of the university first. It was indicated that, without the University, there could be no academic freedom.

The university as stated in this chapter emerged in the Middle Ages with the Bologna University being the oldest (Baloyi 1998). The university in Middle Ages, as stated by Dlamini (1996) and Baloyi (1998) emerged as the place for intellectuals to study specific skills having no constitution or norms. The Middle Ages universities were cathedral societies governed by the church and the society. So, whatever taking place in the university was dictated by the clerics or the society. The modern societies then transformed from the Medieval universities following the social developments and the need for new and progressive universities (Baloyi). The transformed universities then brought the light to the democracy in the university because of the renaissances and the views of Socrates (Williams (2016). Thus, these universities sought the need for a change of curriculum and academic freedom in the university. The renaissance was influenced by the democratic principles. It was stated that, there is a link between democracy and academic freedom. Consequently, academic freedom initially developed and evolved from democratic countries with the democratic universities.

Academic freedom on this chapter was then stated to be having its roots in German universities. Because as stated by Ndereyimana (2021), Germany universities had very strong democracy. In this way, academic freedom emerged as the result of the creation of the University of Berlin which, as stated by Dlamini (1996) resulted from the defeat of the Prussians by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1806. In German universities, academic freedom emerged from the ideas of *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*. The freedom of scholars to teach and learn with no restrictions by the university or society (Baloyi 1998; Bohall 2005; Kilase 2013). But such freedom enjoyed by the members of academic community inside the walls of academic community and not outside the walls of academic community. Meaning, academic freedom derived but did not

imply to basic human rights that an academic community member enjoys as a democratic society community member.

It was then stated that in Africa is new and it is linked to the colonial history of the continent. Therefore, when one talks about academic freedom in Africa he normally relates to the colonial legacy of Africa. The CODESRIA (1990) redefined academic freedom in Africa to cover the entire society where the person exercising such freedom operates rather than just the freedom of an intellectual. This chapter played a very good role in not just highlighting the roots of academic freedom, but by also touching on the roots and development of the university. Such knowledge is vital for understanding the ways universities operated in the past and the way they do now. Also, having this information on the emergence and development of academic freedom assisted in understanding academic freedom not only on CODESRIA (1990) lenses, but on its historical lenses.

#### **6.2.4 Chapter Four**

This chapter followed the history of academic freedom in Africa covered by chapter 3. The aim of this chapter was to elaborate on academic freedom in African context. In doing so, it visited the literature on academic freedom and social responsibility of African intellectuals and analysed it, criticised it when was necessary and built a research gap. In this way, this chapter reviewed and criticized the literature visited by this study on academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa. It was stated that the review of academic freedom in Africa for the mission of this study needs to touch all aspects related to the subject of academic freedom in Africa.

The literature review initially reviewed the studies on the transition by African countries from authoritarian governments into democratic societies. As stated, this was reviewed to understand the need for democratization that the CODESRIA (1990) sought. From this review it was evident that, there is really a link between democracy and academic freedom. It was noted that, the universities that denies academic freedom, demonstrates the culture or the system the country where the university as whole operates. Therefore, when there is no academic freedom in the university, the country where such university operates lacks democratic structures (Kratou and Laakso 2020; Cole 2017). Because the freedom of speech, research, association and dissemination of ideas are core determinants of the democracy in both the university and the society.

This chapter went on to review the studies on the conditions of learning in Africa in postcolonial Africa. Reviewing these literatures, this study found out that decolonization in Africa is a fallacy (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013). This study adopted Nyoka's (2019) assertion that the Fees Must Fall Movement in 2015 in South Africa was a struggle to decolonize the curriculum as well as a fight against the financial burden of tuition fees. Also included in this literature the persisting imbalance in African academia was Swartz, et al. (2017).

The CODESRIA (1990) debate on academic freedom was then reviewed on this chapter. One of the points visited by this chapter was the replacement of colonial bourgeoisie by a native bourgeoisie, and no change in African development. The debate on academic freedom, that academic freedom must be linked with the society as whole. The mission of the university and the mission of intellectuals as well was visited by this chapter. Taking from other points raised, it was stated that the mission of the university is to generate and share the knowledge through research (Mamdani 2009). But as it was realized that intellectuals were responsible for making this possible, they came to be viewed as the university's information producers and disseminators into society. The chapter continued to discuss the new threats to academic freedom, the neoliberal principles in particular. It also discussed the Kampala Declaration (1990) and its problems. One of the problems of the Kampala Declaration noted in this study was its extreme availability in the West or on other continents and less in Africa.

The chapter then reviewed the studies on academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa. Taking from other points made by other scholars on academic freedom, among them was Chachage (2008). This author as stated on this study claimed that academic freedom evolved from the basic rights that are vital for every society. Along this Msila (2021) argued that there is no need to limit academic freedom. That is, an academic or scholar must have a complete academic freedom. This study also looked on the 2020 debate over Nattrass (2020) study. Where Esso and Long (2020) claimed that, the university is by nature a place of discomfort to test boundaries and seek the truth, in a way that it is normal for some people to be offended by the truth. The study took on the claim of Adesina (2020) that academic freedom does not entail irresponsibility. That, the Kampala Declaration (1990) gave African intellectuals both the freedom and responsibility that they must accept. This chapter laid out three perspectives of academic freedom in the CODESRIA, 1990 debate. The first one alluded to academic freedom as a bourgeoisie freedom that excludes ordinary people. Secondly, academic freedom as the middle-class entitlement with link to other rights and struggles. Lastly, it defined academic

freedom as the freedom linked to other ordinary freedoms and therefore, inseparable from other struggles.

This chapter did not just present the findings or assumptions made by the scholars in the previous literature used, it also criticized the literature when it was necessary. After the critique and analysis of the literature used, this study provided the gap that other scholars on academic freedom have. Then the research gap was identified and discussed. This chapter assisted the researcher to find the literature that formed the conclusions and the stance taken on this research. Thus, the chapter 5 assisted in providing the vast literature on academic freedom, not only on conceptualization of the term but on all aspects that relate to academic freedom in Africa and ongoing debates on the concept.

### **6.2.5 Chapter Five**

The cornerstone of the whole study was this chapter. The purpose of this chapter was to answer the research questions. The reader can get the actual answers and relevant details of this study in this chapter. The study genuinely adds to the prior literature on this topic by presenting the role and responsibility of African intellectuals in Africa, as was promised that it would do.

Having stated that, this chapter began by providing many details on why it is important for intellectuals and academics to be aware of their roles and responsibilities when conducting social research in Africa. One of the presumptions was that being aware of your responsibility and position indicates a feeling of purpose because when you know what is required of you, you know the actual reason why you are an African intellectual and what is expected of you. And that, having to know the role and responsibility shapes the ability to respond to the certain phenomenon. That is, responsibility implies ‘being prepared’ and able to respond to your surroundings.

The chapter then discussed the responsibility and role of African intellectuals. Among the stated assumptions, was that academic freedom implies, that African academics or scholars must not suffer for their own judgments of or opinions academically. However, as stated in the Kampala Declaration (1990), it is their responsibility to behave ethically and responsibly within their academic studies. Their opinions or judgments must be consistent with professionalism and ethics (Kampala Declaration (1990)).

Lastly, this chapter stated the lessons that can be learned from the CODESRIA debates on academic freedom in Africa in relation to the current debate on academic freedom in South Africa. One of the lessons was that, the social processes and structures of other societies might be seriously affected when intellectuals use their identity divisions in academic community when conducting research. Likewise, it was stated that the 2020 debate situation in South Africa corresponds to the social divisions being made by African intellectuals. The role played by this chapter was to answer the research questions that guided this study. The reader would have a better understanding of the role and responsibility of African intellectuals through this chapter.

### **6.2.6 Chapter Six**

The chapter six of this study is the chapter viewed now. This chapter summarises this study and provides the findings to conclude the study. The role of this chapter is making this study clear by summarizing the most important aspects from this study.

## **6.3 Presentation of the Research Gap**

During the literature review, this study found that many scholars have studied academic freedom and social responsibility of African intellectuals. But it was noted that, many studies on academic freedom in Africa pertains mostly on the violation of academic freedom and not on the responsibility of African intellectuals themselves. On the studies on both academic freedom and social responsibility of African intellectuals, this research found that there is a gap that past researchers had in common. That was the omission of the conceptual analysis on how academic freedom is actually understood and come to be understood in Africa.

To fill this gap, this study came up with the social constructivism theory. The theory that studies the development of human cognition (human leaning) (see Driscoll 2000; Fosnot 2013; Brau 2020; Vinney, 2019). This theory was discussed in detail in chapter 2 of this study. Understanding the social context in Africa and the various experiences of many African intellectuals was the driving force for the selection of this theory. The objective of this study, which drew on the insights provided by this theory, was to understand how a person's social environment affects the concepts or ideas they know or understand. Under this view, each person's experiences, interactions, and individual judgment define the knowledge that is created and maintained by them (Brau 2010; Fosnot 2013). In other words, it was found that an individual's upbringing, including the society, culture, experiences, and interactions, influences how he will interpret and perceive his surroundings.

Academic freedom in this way was perceived as socially constructed idea by intellectuals in the university environment to safeguard their freedom to speech, learning, teaching, research and sharing ideas. Academic freedom was considered to be a social constructed concept because one person, as stated by Gregg (2011), Campbell (2000) and Hancock (1999), could not have meaning of harm or freedom when living alone in the desert. Thus, the freedom to him would be meaningless because there would be no one to threaten him or his property (Gregg 2011). In the university in this way, it was seen that an individual studying alone with no chance of interacting with other human beings would have no need for academic rules, social responsibility and personal freedoms. For him to have a sense of freedom he must come into contact with the other individuals, then he would notice his freedom and have to respect the freedom of the others.

In this way, social construction of ideas was associated with how African academics understand academic freedom. It was stated that, the fully democratic countries and totally authoritarian regimes would have no same understanding of academic freedom. The individuals interacting within those political systems would have different experiences and viewpoints in relation to academic freedom. Because their understanding of academic freedom would be shaped by the society under which they grew up. Then in Africa, it was stated that, African people have different experiences relating to the colonialism and its legacy. The different social structures, culture, experiences and interactions are the foundations under which an African intellectual and academic could interpret academic freedom. In this way, the once marginalized individuals relate to their past experiences on the continent when they speak of academic freedom. Therefore, the definition of academic freedom would vary for those who have been marginalized in the past and those who have never been marginalized. Because of this, it is important to consider culture, history, interactions, and experiences when studying academic freedom, especially in a socially compromised society like Africa.

## **6.4 Summary**

The context of this study and the stance taken, the collection and analysis of data had all been outlined, and the findings of the data obtained had been covered in the portions above. This therefore gives the reader a clear understanding of the research. The study confirmed that, relating to the CODESRIA (1990) conference and its Kampala Declaration (1990), academic freedom has changed from what it is supposed to be. The Kampala Declaration (1990) and this conference's freedom are linked to social responsibility. But nowadays, academic freedom is frequently linked to individuality and irresponsibility. Then African academics fails to

understand this because their minds have been shaped by the neoliberal principles. They then come to assume that their academic freedom has been infringed while they do not understand their role and responsibility in Africa.

It was also confirmed that the 2020 South African debate on academic freedom is connected to the tendency of intellectuals to either not understand or disregard their social responsibility when conducting social sciences academic research. academics only focuses on their academic freedom instead of balancing their freedom with their responsibility. It was evident in this study that each academic or scholar must recognise both the academic freedom as well as social responsibility when conducting research in social sciences. Most of scholars tends to disregard this. One of the results of the study was that, the society in which a person lives and their experiences shape their knowledge and understanding of the ideas and their surroundings. Thus, how academic freedom is interpreted depends on the environment in which a scholar lives and the experiences he has had. Conflict in African academic was said to rise when diverse intellectual's or scholar's interpretations of academic freedom were the result of this. It also appeared the major reason for conflict in African academia, such as the one South Africa is currently experiencing, is misinterpretation of academic freedom and social irresponsibility of African intellectuals.

It was clear that, academics need to know and understand their roles and responsibility in order to operate effectively in social sciences research in Africa. The Kampala Declaration (1990) and social responsibility should be placed ahead whenever an academic start thinking of conducting the research. Practically, this could end the tendency of academics or scholars harassing other scholars, thus ending the debate on academic freedom and social responsibility in Africa. The people who comment on the unethical work of other scholars are the people whose freedom is being infringed by that scholar's work. They come forward to raise their voices against being harassed or dominated by other scholars. Thus, expressing the need for ethical considerations and equality in social sciences.

In this way, this study provided strong evidence that scholar's behaviour is what is causing the current dispute over academic freedom. Scholars who behave well advance and enhance African academia while also benefiting society by teaching it valuable lessons. On the other hand, scholar's inappropriate behaviour is what causes the conflict, which is presently visible in South Africa. scholars cause the current conflict when they disobey the rules outlined in the Kampala Declaration (1990) and violate others' freedoms by harassing others. The outcomes

of this chapter and the overall research indicated that the fundamental issue in African academia, particularly in the social sciences research sector, appears to be African intellectuals' withdrawal from their role and responsibilities.

## **6.5 Implications of the study**

The study's findings have helped in understanding the ongoing debate over academic freedom in Africa, particularly the controversy surrounding a paper by Nattrass (2020). By outlining the roles and responsibilities of African intellectuals in reference to the CODESRIA 1990 debate on academic freedom in Africa, this study has provided findings that point to the best way to proceed for minimizing a discussion and conflict of this nature in the future. The results are consistent with previous research and offer both theoretical and practical implications for everyone involved in the social sciences in general, particularly for social science researchers in Africa. The implications are as follows:

- i. This study has proven that in order for universities and intellectuals to function and achieve their goals, there must be academic freedom in Africa. When their freedom to do so is restricted, they cannot accurately carry out their mandate. But the studies have revealed that it is the same intellectual behaviour that puts their academic freedom at danger and ultimately results in its restriction. A person cannot be referred to as intellectual when they misuse their freedom to upset others. This is owing to the belief that an intellectual is a professional by definition.
- ii. The findings on this study show that academic community is likely to flourish when intellectuals do not take on their roles and responsibilities and do not respect the freedom of others in academic community. With that, it was seen that one who exerts their freedom must be cautious of those close to them and make sure to not impact them negatively.
- iii. Additionally, this study has shown that the African curriculum continues to be implemented within colonial masters' frameworks and that the curriculum itself does not entirely reflect the requirements of Africa, prolonging divisions rather than African unity. Therefore, intellectuals need to understand this and behave properly, it was stated.
- iv. Finally, it was remarked that the university no longer just fulfills its original objective of developing or fostering independent, clear intellectual thought for resolving African problems, but has evolved into a business-focused organization that sells knowledge to

those who can afford it. Therefore, it was believed that this is endangering the transmission of profound African knowledge from one generation to the next in Africa.

## **6.6 Limitations of this study**

There is no set period of time for collecting data for this study. The majority of the literature, however, was reviewed between the period of the 1990 CODESRIA meeting and the present. This study undoubtedly has limitations as it was a desk study without any participants. As a result, the information for this study was acquired from secondary sources and used in its analysis.

One of the limitations of this study is the unreliability of data. This study relied on the data collected through desk research, and obviously that is little bit risky. Some of the data used in this research in this case might be outdated.

Like other studies, this one has a few limitations. This study's biggest limitation is the availability of more accurate data from earlier studies on the same subject. Except for the CODESRIA book "academic freedom in Africa," there is relatively little literature on the roles and responsibilities of African intellectuals. Therefore, it appears that this limitation also contributes to the study's originality.

The premise that this research is a desktop study that relies on secondary data is another one of its limitations. The researcher, of course, may come across the knowledge that is biased, limited, or poorly presented in secondary data. However, this study looked for the most literature that was similar to other literature on the same issue and excluded all of the literature that was, for the most part, not comparable.

## **Conclusion**

In the same way that chapter one served as the beginning to this study, this concluding chapter served as its end. The primary concepts covered in this study's discussion were summarized in this chapter, along with a summary of the study's research findings. This chapter began with giving an overview of the study, summarizing its objectives, methodologies, and procedures for data collection and analysis. The discussion then turned to the study's findings, which were broken down into subheadings to accurately provide a clear picture of the findings. Additionally, this chapter discussed the study's significance, demonstrating how it contributed

to the ongoing and upcoming discussion about academic freedom in Africa. Additionally, the limitations were mentioned, highlighting potential weaknesses in this study.

## Reference List

- Abdullahi, A.A., 2021. Decolonization of Higher Education in South Africa. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*, 20(4), pp.380-401.
- Adeoti, G., 2015. *African Literature and the Future*. Dakar: CODESRIA, Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.
- Adesina, J., 2020. The Anatomy of a Bad Science: Reflections on Natrass' 'commentary'. *South African Journal of Science*, 116(special).
- Akala, B.M.M., 2021. A Critical Reflection on Neoliberalism Policies and Neo-colonialism at African Universities. *Journal of Decolonising Disciplines*, 3.
- Ake, C., 1994. Academic Freedom and Material Base. In: M. Mamdani and M. Diouf, ed., *Academic Freedom in Africa*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.17-25.
- Akerlind, G.S. and Kayrooz, C., 2003. Understanding academic freedom: The views of social scientists. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22(3), pp.327-344.
- Aldossari, Ashwaq Mohammed (2021) *Academic Freedom in Saudi Arabia: a comparative analysis*. PhD thesis, University of Lincoln.
- Alemu, A., 2008. Massification and Teaching Personnel's Conditions of Service at University of Gonder. *Academic Freedom in Ethiopia: Perspectives of Teaching Personnel*, p.441.
- Alemu, S.K., 2018. The Meaning, Idea and History of University/Higher Education in Africa: A Brief Literature Review. In *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education* (Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 210-227). Lehigh University Library and Technology Services. 8A East Packer Avenue, Fairchild Martindale Library Room 514, Bethlehem, PA 18015.
- Allison, M. and Casey, C., n.d. *New media, communication, & society*.
- Allott, N., Knight, C., Smith, N. and Chomsky, N., 2019. *The Responsibility of Intellectuals: Reflections by Noam Chomsky and others after 50 years* (p. 156). UCL Press.
- Altbach, P.G. and Salmi, J. eds., 2011. *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities*. World Bank Publications.
- Altbach, P.G., 2005. Academic freedom: International challenges and African realities. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, pp.17-34.
- Ancl-radc.org.za. 2022. *CODESRIA International Conference Academic freedom and the Social Responsibility of Academics and Researchers in Africa: What are the New Challenges? March 9-11, 2010, Oran (Algeria) | ANCL site*.
- Appiagyei-Atua, K., Beiter, K. and Karran, T., 2016. A Review of Academic Freedom in Africa through the Prism of the UNESCO's 1997 Recommendation. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, 14(1), pp.85-117.
- Appiagyei-Atua,, Kwadwo, Beiter, Klaus and Karran, Terence (2015) *The capture of institutional autonomy by the political elite and its impact on academic freedom in African universities*. Higher Education Review, 47 (3). pp. 47-74. ISSN 0018-1609

- Arikewuyo, M.O., 2013. The Challenge of Academic Freedom in the Nigerian University System. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 4(2), pp.247-259.
- Badat, S., 2010. The challenges of transformation in higher education and training institutions in South Africa. *Development Bank of Southern Africa*, 8(1), pp.1-37.
- Baloyi, C.R., 1998. *The Role of the State in the Establishment of a Culture of Learning and Teaching in South Africa, 1910-2004* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa).
- Bangura, A.K., 2017. The CODESRIA Bulletin: a content analysis. *African Research Review*, 11(1), pp.1-10.
- Bayluk, V., 2016. Freedom, Responsibility and Social Responsibility of Students. *Pedagogical Education in Russia*, (2), pp.7-23.
- Beckett, C., 2013. Can journalism count as an academic research output?. *British Policy and Politics at LSE.*, [online] 4, p.1.
- Benatar, S., 2016. Freedom of Speech, Academic Freedom, and Challenges to Universities in South Africa. *Society*, 53(4), pp.383-390.
- Bentouhami, H., Casas, L. and Weyler, J., 2021. Reporting of “Theoretical Design” in Explanatory Research: A Critical Appraisal of Research on Early Life Exposure to Antibiotics and the Occurrence of Asthma. *Clinical Epidemiology*, 13, p.755.
- Berggren, N. and Bjørnskov, C., 2022. Political institutions and academic freedom: evidence from across the world. *Public Choice*, 190(1), pp.205-228.
- Bertocchi, G. and Dimico, A., 2017. De jure and de facto determinants of power: evidence from Mississippi. *Constitutional Political Economy*, 28(4), pp.321-345.
- Bhattacharyya, S.S., 2019. Development of international corporate social responsibility framework and typology. *Social Responsibility Journal*.
- Bilgrami, A. and Cole, J.R. eds., 2015. *Who's afraid of academic freedom?*. Columbia University Press.
- Bodner, G.M., 1986. Constructivism: A theory of knowledge. *Journal of chemical education*, 63(10), p.873.
- Booker, S. and Minter, W., 2001. Global apartheid. *The Nation*, 9(11).
- Borhan, C., 2009. *Exploring the concepts of academic freedom and institutional autonomy-A case study of the faculty of political science at the University of Suleimaniyah* (Master's thesis, The University of Bergen).
- Bourdieu, P., 2002. The role of intellectuals today. *Theoria*, 49(99), pp.1-6.
- Brau, B., 2020. Constructivism. *The Students' Guide to Learning Design and Research*.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2012. *Thematic analysis*. American Psychological Association.
- Breuilly, J., 1982, *Nationalism and the State, Manchester*: Manchester University Press.
- Bubtana, A., 2005. “Problems and Challenges in Arab and African Countries”. In: *Academic Freedom Conference*. Place de Fontenoy: United Nations Educational, pp.7-50.

- Caffentzis, G., 2005. Academic Freedom & the Crisis of Neoliberalism: Some Cautions. *Review of African Political Economy*, 32(106), pp.599-608.
- Caliendo, S.M. and Kyle, W.C., 1996. Editorial: Establishing the theoretical frame. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 33(3), pp.225-227.
- Castellan, C.M., 2010. Quantitative and qualitative research: A view for clarity. *International journal of education*, 2(2), p.1.
- Chachage, C.S.L., 2006. The university as a site of knowledge: The role of basic research. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, pp.47-67.
- Chafee, E.C., 2017. The Origins of Corporates Social Responsibility. *CGN: Corporate Social Responsibility/Corporate Citizenship (Topic)*, n. pag. (85), p. 353.
- Chigudu, S., 2020. Rhodes Must Fall in Oxford: a critical testimony. *Critical African Studies*, 12(3), pp.302-312.
- CODESRIA. 1990. *The Kampala Declaration on Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility*. Dakar: CODESRIA.
- CODESRIA. 2005. *Outline of a Research Policy for CODESRIA*. Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Coe, P., 2018. (Re)embracing social responsibility theory as a basis for media speech: shifting the normative paradigm for a modern media. *Northern Ireland Legal Quarterly*, 69(4), pp.403-431.
- Collins, C.S. and Stockton, C.M., 2018. The central role of theory in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17(1), p.16
- Compagnucci, L. and Spigarelli, F., 2020. The Third Mission of the university: A systematic literature review on potentials and constraints. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 161, p.120284.
- Davids, N., 2021. Academic freedom and the fallacy of a post-truth era. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 53(11), pp.1183-1193.
- Davis, K., 1967. Understanding the social responsibility puzzle. *Business horizons*, 10(4), pp.45-50.
- Ddungu, L. and Edopu, R.N., 2016. Social responsibility of public and private universities in Uganda. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 8(1), pp.73-90.
- De Castro, L.S.V., 2020. Deweyan Democracy, Neoliberalism, and Action Research. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 39(1), pp.19-36.
- De la Fuente, J.R., 2002. Academic freedom and social responsibility. *Higher Education Policy*, 15(4), pp.337-339.
- Diouf, M. and Mamdani, M., 1994. *Academic freedom in Africa*. CODESRIA, Dakar, SN.

- Dlamini, C.R.M., 1996. *University autonomy and academic freedom in South Africa* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Dlamini, C.R.M., 2002. University autonomy and academic freedom in Africa: ex Africa semper aliquid novi?. *Comparative and International Law Journal of Southern Africa*, 35(1), pp.77-98.
- Dziwa, S., 2020. Academics have a duty to exercise responsible scholarship. *South African Journal of Science*, 116(special).
- Dziwa, Simba. (2020). Academics have a duty to exercise responsible scholarship. *South African Journal of Science*, 116(spe), 1-4. <https://dx.doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2020/8587>
- Editorial. 2016. "Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility, 25 Years after the Adoption of the Kampala Declaration." *CODESRIA Bulletin*, Nos 1 & 2.
- El Baz, Shahida. 2015. Interview about CODESRIA. Interview by Nimi Hoffmann. Audio recording. Dakar.
- Essop, H. and Long, W., 2020. Black – and not offended. *South African Journal of Science*, 116(special).
- Fiore, R. and Nelson, H., 2003. *Recognition, responsibility, and rights*. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Fish, S., 2021. *Versions of Academic Freedom*. 2nd ed. [ebook] Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, pp 10- 20.
- Foreign Office Blogs. 2021. *The Responsibility of the Press*. [online] Available at: <<https://blogs.fcdo.gov.uk/petermillet/2012/02/13/the-responsibility-of-the-press/>> [Accessed 10 October 2021].
- Fosnot, C.T., 2013. *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Fox, R., 2001. Constructivism examined. *Oxford review of education*, 27(1), pp.23-35.
- Fuchs, R.F., 1963. Academic freedom. Its basic philosophy, function, and history. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 28(3), pp.431-446.
- Gabriel Anghel, R., 2008. Changing statuses: freedom of movement, locality and transnationality of irregular Romanian migrants in Milan. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(5), pp.787-802.
- Gabriel, A., 2013. *"The Meaning of Theory."* *Sociological Theory*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, pp.173–199.
- Gerstmann, E. and Streb, M., 2006. *Academic freedom at the dawn of a new century*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Glennon, K.L., White, J., Reynolds, C., Risenga, I., Pillay, N., Archibald, S., Balkwill, K., Byrne, M., Cron, G., Engelbrecht, H. and Fisher, J., 2020. Misinterpretation of why black

students do not pursue studies in the biological sciences. *South African Journal of Science*, 116(SPE), pp.1-3.

Goksu, N., 2014. Point of View to Social Responsibility Understanding from Social Media (Facebook Sample). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 155, pp.283-288.

Gore, O. and Botha, J., 2022. Exploring Inequality in South African Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) through Vignettes.

Gorelick, R.E., 1986. Apartheid and colonialism. *Comp. & Int'l LJS Afr.*, 19, p.70.

Govinder, K., Zondo, N. and Makgoba, M., 2013. A new look at demographic transformation for universities in South Africa. *South African Journal of Science*, 109(11/12), pp.1-11.

Gregg, B., 2011. *Human rights as social construction*. Cambridge University Press.

Haas, T. and Steiner, L., 2001. Public journalism as a journalism of publics. *Journalism*, 2(2), pp.123-147.

Habib, A., Morrow, S. and Bentley, K., 2008. Academic freedom, institutional autonomy and the corporatised university in contemporary South Africa. *Social dynamics*, 34(2), pp.140-155.

Hagan, G., 1994. Academic Freedom and National Responsibility in an African State: Ghana. In: M. Mamdani and M. Diouf, ed., *Academic Freedom in Africa*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.39-48.

Haier, R., 2020. Academic freedom and social responsibility: Finding a balance. *Intelligence*, 82, p.101482.

Hall, M., 2006. Academic freedom and the university: Fifty years of debate. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 20(3), pp.8-16.

Hawi, H., 2010. Reconceptualizing Academic Freedom in the African Context. In: *Academic Freedom and the Social Responsibility of Academics and Researchers in Africa: What are the new challenges?* M. Oran (Algeria): CODESRIA, pp.1-15.

He, K., 2018. Role conceptions, order transition and institutional balancing in the Asia-Pacific: A new theoretical framework. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 72(2), pp.92-109.

Heald, J.E., 1975, April. Universitas Magistrorum et Scholarium. In *National Forum* (Vol. 55, No. 2, p. 9). Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.

Hoffmann, N., 2017. *The knowledge commons, pan-Africanism, and epistemic inequality: A study of CODESRIA*. Doctor of Philosophy (Social Sciences). Rhodes University.

Hoffmann, N., 2019. How to build a strong knowledge common: learning from CODESRIA under structural adjustment.

Holt, B.J., 2020. Identifying and Preventing Threats to Academic Freedom. *International Journal for Infonomics*, 13(2), pp.2005-2012.

Hoque, M.N. and Abdullah, M.F., 2021. THE WORLD'S OLDEST UNIVERSITY AND ITS FINANCING EXPERIENCE: A STUDY ON AL-QARAWIYYIN UNIVERSITY (859-990). *Journal of Nusantara Studies (JONUS)*, 6(1), pp.24-41.

- Hountondji, P., 2009. Knowledge of Africa, Knowledge by Africans: Two Perspectives on African Studies\*. *RCCS Annual Review*, (1).
- Hoye, W.J., 1997. The religious roots of academic freedom. *Theological Studies*, 58(3), pp.409-428.
- Huitt, W. and Hummel, J., 2003. Piaget's theory of cognitive development. *Educational psychology interactive*, 3(2).
- Human Rights Watch, 1991. *Human Rights Watch World Report 1990*. Human Rights Watch.
- Hyden, G., 1991. The Efforts to Restore Intellectual Freedom in Africa. *Issue: A Journal of Opinion*, 20(1), pp.5-14.
- Ibonvbere, J.O., 1993. The state and academic freedom in Africa: how African academics subvert academic freedom. *Journal of Third World Studies*, 10(2), pp.36-73.
- Ihonvbere, J.O., 1996. *Economic crisis, civil society, and democratization: The case of Zambia*. Africa World Press.
- Imam, A., and Mama. A., 1994. The Role of Academics in Limiting and Expanding Academic Freedom. In: M. Mamdani and M. Diouf, ed., *Academic Freedom in Africa*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.72-85.
- Imenda, S., 2014. Is there a conceptual difference between theoretical and conceptual frameworks?. *Journal of social sciences*, 38(2), pp.185-195.
- Ineji, P., Nkanu, E. and Okoi, P., 2020. *SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MEDIA THEORY AND ITS IMPLICATION FOR MEDIA PROFESSIONALISM IN NIGERIA*. Ph.D. Cross River University of Technology.
- Jansen, J.D., 2019. Inequality in education: What is to be done?. In *South African schooling: The enigma of inequality* (pp. 355-371). Springer, Cham.
- Kagisano, K., 2013. *Academic freedom*. 1st ed. Brummeria, Pretoria South Africa: Council on Higher Education (CHE), p.16.
- Kalyowa, A.K. and Sekalegga, L.B., 2018. Decolonizing Higher Music Education in Uganda and the Question of Neoliberalism: The Case of Makerere University. *ISME Commission on Music Policy: Culture, Education, and Media*, p.131.
- Kay, S. and Nystrom, B., 1971. Education and colonialism in Africa: an annotated bibliography. *Comparative education review*, 15(2), pp.240-259.
- Kerlinger, P. and Lein, M.R., 1986. Differences in winter range among age-sex classes of Snowy Owls *Nyctea scandiaca* in North America. *Ornis Scandinavica*, pp.1-7.
- Khan, A., 1994. Algerian Intellectuals: Between Identity and Modernity. In: M. Mamdani and M. Diouf, ed., *Academic Freedom in Africa*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.273-280.
- Kilase, M.E., 2013. Academic Freedom and State Control on Universities: Lessons Learned from Sudan Experiences. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(10), pp.180-186.

- Ki-Zerbo, J., 1994. The Creative Organizational Approaches. In: M. Mamdani and M. Diouf, ed., *Academic Freedom in Africa*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.26-37.
- Kratou, H. and Laakso, L., 2020. Academic Freedom and the Quality of Democracy in Africa. *The Varieties of Democracy Institute, Users Working Paper Series (33)*.
- Kubayanda, J. B., 1990, *The Poet's Africa-Africanness in the Poetry of Nicolas Guillen & Aime Cesaire*, New York: Greenwood Press
- Laakso, L., 2020. Academic mobility as freedom in Africa. *Politikon*, 47(4), pp.442-459.
- Locke, J., 1794. *The Works of John Locke* (Vol. 6). T. Longman, B. Law.
- Loreman, T., Deppeler, J. and Harvey, D., 2011. *Inclusive education*. Crows Nest, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.
- Lucas, T., 2010. Academic Freedom and the Constriction of Democratic Space in Botswana: Reflections from an Academic-cum-Politician. In: *International Conference :Academic Freedom and the Social Responsibility of Academics and Researchers in Africa: What are the new challenges?*. Oran, Algeria: CODESRIA, pp.1-10.
- Maathai, W. 2003. *The Green Belt Movement: Sharing the Approach and Experience*. Lagos: Lantern Books.
- Mabovula, N.N., 2011. The erosion of African communal values: A reappraisal of the African Ubuntu philosophy. *Inkanyiso: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(1), pp.38-47.
- Mafeje, A., 1994. Beyond Academic Freedom: The Struggle for Authenticity in African Social Sciences Discourse. In: M. Mamdani and M. Diouf, ed., *Academic Freedom in Africa*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.60-70.
- Makgetlaneng, S., 2011. The role of African intellectuals of South Africa in the struggle for South African economic liberation or independence: the view of the Zimbabwean state, capital and civil society. *Africa Insight*, 41(1), pp.111-128.
- Mama, A., 2006. Towards academic freedom for Africa in the 21st century. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, pp.1-32.
- Mama, A., 2011. The challenges of feminism: Gender, ethics and responsible academic freedom in African universities. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, 9(1-2), pp.1-23.
- Mama, A., 2011. What does it mean to do feminist research in African contexts?. *Feminist Review*, 98(1\_suppl), pp.e4-e20.
- Mamadou Diouf and Mahmood Mamdani (Eds). *Academic freedom in Africa*. Dakar. CODESRIA. 1994.
- Mamdani, M., 2009. *Scholars in the Marketplace: The Dilemmas of Neo-liberal Reform at Makerere University*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

- Manzar, M.D., Albougami, A., Usman, N. and Mamun, M.A., 2021. Suicide among adolescents and youths during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdowns: A press media reports-based exploratory study. *Journal of child and adolescent psychiatric nursing*, 34(2), pp.139-146.
- Martin, B. and Etzkowitz, H., 2000. The origin and evolution of the university species. *Organisation of mode*, 2.
- Mavunga, G., 2019. # FeesMustFall protests in South Africa: A critical realist analysis of selected newspaper articles. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 7(1), pp.81-99.
- Maxwell, J.A., 2008. *Designing a qualitative study* (Vol. 2, pp. 214-253). The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods.
- Mazrui A.A. & Mazrui, A.M. (1998). *The Tower of Babel. Language and governance in the African experience*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mazrui, A., 1994. The impact of global changes on academic freedom in Africa: A preliminary assessment. In: M. Mamdani and M. Diouf, ed., *Academic Freedom in Africa*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.120-140.
- Middleton, M., 2009. Social responsibility in the media. *Center for International Media Ethics CIME, Oxford University PCMLP*.
- Minerva, F., 2014. New threats to academic freedom. *Bioethics*, 28(4), pp.157-162.
- Mittelman, J., 1994. Academic Freedom, the State and Globalization. In: M. Mamdani and M. Diouf, ed., *Academic Freedom in Africa*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.142-148.
- Mkandawire, T., 1999, 'Social Sciences and Democracy: Debates in Africa', *African Sociological Review*, Vol. 3, No.1, pp. 20-34.
- Mkandawire, T., 2005. *African intellectuals: Rethinking politics, language, gender and development*. Zed Books.
- Mmari, G., 2008. Academic Freedom, Social Responsibility and the State of Academia in Tanzania: Glimpses of Nationalist Academics. *Academic Freedom and the Social Responsibilities of Academics in Tanzania*, p.6.
- Moscardini, A., Strachan, R. and Vlasova, T., 2020. The role of universities in modern society. *Studies in Higher Education*, pp.1-19.
- Moulton, J. and Robinson, G., 2002. Plagiarism. *Encyclopedia of ethics. Garland*. [<http://sophia.smith.edu/~jmoulton/plagiarism.pdf>. Accessed 24 Mar. 22].
- Mozaffar, S., 1997. Democratic transitions in Africa. *Bridgewater Review*, 16(2), pp.7-10.
- Mpetsheni, L. (2019). *Ubuntu-a soteriological ethic for an effaced umntu in a post 1994 South Africa: a black theology of liberation perspective* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).
- Msila, V., 2021. Community Engagement: The Role of Intellectuals.

- Mudimbe, V. Y., 1983, 'African Philosophy as an Ideological Practice: The Case of French-Speaking Africa' *African Studies Review*, Vol. 26. Nos.3\4
- Mudimbe, V.Y., 1988, *The Invention of Africa*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Mulyampiti, T., Kabeba, R. and Kanabahita, C., 2018. *It is a Long Way to the Top*. Increasing Women's Leadership in Ugandan Public Universities. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.14- 20.
- Mungwini, P., 2020. Decolonisation Debates in African Higher Education. In *African Higher Education in the 21st Century* (pp. 106-121). Brill.
- Munusamy, R., 2022. *SA's intellectuals: Who is speaking the truth and exposing the lies?*. [online] Daily Maverick. Available at: <<https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2013-04-02-sas-intellectuals-who-is-speaking-the-truth-and-exposing-the-lies/>> [Accessed 21 January 2022].
- Murove, M. and Chitando, E., 2018. Academic Freedom and the Problems of Patriotism and Social Responsibility in Post-colonial Africa. *Alternation: Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of the Arts and Humanities in Southern Africa*, SP23, pp.326-345.
- Musavengane, R. and Leonard, L., 2019. When race and social equity matters in nature conservation in post-apartheid South Africa. *Conservation & Society*, 17(2), pp.135-146.
- Mussell, H., 2016. The Nature of Social Responsibility: Exploring Emancipatory Ends. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 47(2), pp.222-243.
- Mzilikazi, N., le Roux, A. and Jansen van Vuuren, B., 2020. Bad science cannot be used as a basis of constructive dialogue: Response to Prof Nicoli Natrass commentary. *South African Journal of Science*, 116(special).
- Natrass, N., 2020. Why are black South African students less likely to consider studying biological sciences?. *South African Journal of Science*, 116(5/6).
- Ndereyimana, L., 2021. The History of Academic Freedom in Africa: Issues, Challenges and Perspective. *Advances in Literary Study*, 9(3), pp.154-158.
- Ndimande, B.S., 2013. From Bantu education to the fight for socially just education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 46(1), pp.20-35.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J., 2013. *Coloniality of power in postcolonial Africa*. African Books Collective.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J., 2018. Rhodes must fall. In *Epistemic Freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and Decolonization*. Taylor & Francis.
- Nelkin, D.K., 2011. *Making sense of freedom and responsibility*. OUP Oxford.
- Nephew, J., 2021. Intellectual Freedom: Incorporating Intellectual Freedom into STEM Programs. *Children and Libraries*, 19(1), pp.32-33.
- Nigeria, T., CODESRIA. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(3), pp.347-364.

- Nja, C.O., Ndifon, R.A. and Cornelius-Ukpep, B., 2019. Constructivists' Theory and Science Education Classroom. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 154(4), pp.549-553.
- Nkrumah, K., 1964, *Consciencism*, London: Heineman.
- Nordenstreng, K., 2006. 'Four Theories of the Press' reconsidered. *Researching media, democracy and participation*, p.35.
- Nouria Bricki, J.G., 2017. A Guide to Using Qualitative Research Methodology. *Fieldresearch*. msf.org. [online] Available at: <https://fieldresearch.msf.org/handle/10144/84230>.
- Nyamnjoh, F.B., 2010. Open Access and open knowledge production processes: Lessons from CODESRIA. *The African Journal of Information and Communication*, 2009(10), pp.67-72.
- Nyoka, B., 2019. Archie Mafeje as Revolutionary Sociologist. *Theoria*, 66(158), pp.1-26.
- Nzegwu, N. U. 2006. *Family Matters: Feminist Concepts in African Philosophy of Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- O'Neil, R., 2006. Review of Academic Freedom after September 11. *The Teachers College Record*.
- Ogachi, I.O., 2011. Neo-liberalism and the subversion of academic freedom from within: Money, corporate cultures and 'captured' intellectuals in African public universities. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, 9(1-2), pp.25-47.
- Okoye, A., 2012. Exploring the relationship between corporate social responsibility, law and development in an African context. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 54(5), pp.364-378.
- Oladipo, O., 1995. Reason, identity, and the African quest: The problems of self-definition in African philosophy. *Africa today*, 42(3), pp.26-38.
- Oni, A. and Adegoke, B., 2015. *Teacher education systems in Africa in the digital era*. Dakar, Senegal: CODESRIA, Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.
- Osanloo, A. and Grant, C., 2016. Understanding, selecting, and integrating a theoretical framework in dissertation research: Creating the blueprint for your "house". *Administrative issues journal: connecting education, practice, and research*, 4(2), p.7.
- Osanloo, A. and Grant, C., 2016. Understanding, selecting, and integrating a theoretical framework in dissertation research: Creating the blueprint for your "house". *Administrative issues journal: connecting education, practice, and research*, 4(2), p.7.
- Patibandla, R.L., Kurra, S.S., Prasad, A. and Veeranjanyulu, N., 2015. Unstructured Data: Qualitative Analysis. *J. of Computation In Biosciences And Engineering*, 2(3), pp.1-4.
- Patterson, Philip, Lee Wilkins, and Chad Painter. *Media ethics: Issues and cases*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2018.
- Pettit, P., 2001. *A theory of freedom: from the psychology to the politics of agency*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

PhD Assistance. 2021. *Why is theoretical framework important in research?*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.phdassistance.com/blog/why-is-theoretical-framework-important-in-research/>> [Accessed 10 October 2021].

*Popular Communication*, 2018. CFP: Exploring Fashion as Communication in Popular Communication. 16(4), pp.309-310.

Prah, K.K., 2012. The language of development and the development of language in contemporary Africa. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 3(2), pp.295-313.

Putnam, L.L. and Banghart, S., 2017. Interpretive approaches. *The international encyclopedia of organizational communication*, 117.

Raaflaub, K.A., Ober, J. and Wallace, R., 2007. Origins of democracy in ancient Greece. *In Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. University of California Press.

Radhakrishnan, P., 2008. Academic Freedom from a Human Rights' Perspective: The Indian Case and its Relevance to Africa. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, 6(2-3), pp.183-210.

Rajagopal, B., 2003. Academic freedom as a human right: An internationalist perspective. *Journal of the American Association of University Professors*, pp.25-28.

Ross, F.C., 2020. Response to Commentary: 'Why are black South African students less likely to consider studying biological sciences?' (Prof. N Natrass). *South African Journal of Science*, 116, pp.1-2.

Sacconi, L., 2011. *Corporate social responsibility and corporate governance*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sall, E. and Mangu, A.M.B., 2005. Introduction: The Quest for Academic Freedom Today. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, pp.1-16.

Sall, E. and Mangu, A.M.B., 2005. Introduction: The Quest for Academic Freedom Today. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, pp.1-16.

Sawyer, A., 2004. African universities and the challenge of research capacity development. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, pp.213-242.

Schauster, E., Ferrucci, P. and Neill, M., 2016. Native Advertising Is the New Journalism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 60(12), pp.1408-1424.

Schauster, E.E., Ferrucci, P. and Neill, M.S., 2016. Native advertising is the new journalism: How deception affects social responsibility. *American behavioral scientist*, 60(12), pp.1408-1424.

Scott, C.L. and Ivala, E.N. eds., 2019. *Transformation of higher education institutions in post-apartheid South Africa*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Searle, J.R., 2021. 6. Two Concepts of Academic Freedom. In *The concept of academic freedom* (pp. 86-96). University of Texas Press.

Sesanti, S., 2020. The African Intellectuals' Project. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies - Multi-, Inter- and Transdisciplinarity*, 15(1), pp.1-24.

Shivji, I., 1991. The Jurisprudence of the Dar es Salaam Declaration on Academic Freedom, *Journal of African Law*, 35(1-2), pp. 128-141.

Shivji, I., 1994. The Jurisprudence of the Dar-es-Salaam Declaration on Academic Freedom. In: M. Mamdani and M. Diouf, ed., *Academic Freedom in Africa*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.302-307.

Shraddha Bajracharya, "Social Responsibility Theory," in *Businessstopia*, January 6, 2018, <https://www.businessstopia.net/mass-communication/social-responsibility-theory>

Siebert, F., Peterson, T. and Schramm, W., 1956. *Four theories of the press: The authoritarian, libertarian, social responsibility, and Soviet communist concepts of what the press should be and do* (Vol. 10). University of Illinois Press: Urbana, pp.73-104.

Sifuna, D.N., 2012. Leadership in Kenyan public universities and the challenges of autonomy and academic freedom: An overview of trends since independence. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, 10(1), pp.121-137.

Simala, K., 2010. Pan-Africanism and the Language Question: Re-reading African Cultural and Intellectual History. *African Journal of International Affairs*, 6(1-2).

Sleat, M., 2021. Realism and political normativity. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, pp.1-14.

Speare, M., 2021. Blurring the Lines of Race and Freedom: Mulattoes and Mixed Bloods in English Colonial America. By A. B. Wilkinson. *Journal of Social History*.

Suttner, R., 2005. The character and formation of intellectuals within the ANC-led South African liberation movement. In: T. Mkandawire, ed., *African intellectuals and nationalism*, 1st ed. Dakar: CODESRIA, pp.124-127.

Szadkowski, K. and Krzeski, J., 2021. The common good and academic freedom in Poland. *Higher Education Quarterly*.

The Conversation. 2021. *Academic freedom is sacrosanct. But so is ethical responsibility*. [online] Available at: <<https://theconversation.com/academic-freedom-is-sacrosanct-but-so-is-ethical-responsibility-141616>> [Accessed 15 October 2021].

The Kampala Declaration on Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility (1990)

The Kampala Declaration on Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility., 1990. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Thompson, C., 2020. Debating Academic Freedom. Educational-philosophical Premises and Problems. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, pp. 1-11. DOI: 10.1080/00131857.2020.1773796.

- Ukpokolo, C., 2010. Academic freedom and dual career academic couples: The complexities of being a woman academic in the university space. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, 8(1), pp.49-71.
- Uzuegbunam, C.E., 2015. The Social Responsibility Theory of The Press: A Contemporary Review.
- Van Buren, H.J., 2000. The bindingness of social and psychological contracts: Toward a theory of social responsibility in downsizing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 25(3), pp.205-219.
- Wade, F.C., 1971. In defense of Socrates. *The Review of Metaphysics*, 25(2), pp.311-325.
- Wasonga, T.A. and Makahamadze, T., 2020. Boarding Schools as Colonizing and Oppressive Spaces: Towards Understanding Student Protest and Violence in Kenyan Secondary Schools. *European Journal of Educational Management*, 3(2), pp.25-35.
- Watch, A., 1991. Academic freedom and human rights abuses in Africa. *New York: Africa Watch*.
- Wilkins, L., Painter, C. and Patterson, P., 2021. *Media Ethics: Issues and Cases*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Williams, J., 2016. *Academic freedom in an age of conformity: Confronting the fear of knowledge*. Springer.
- Wilson, J.K., 2014. *A history of academic freedom in America*. Illinois State University.
- Yandell, J., Doecke, B. and Abdi, Z., 2020. Who me? Hailing individuals as subjects: Standardized literacy testing as an instrument of neoliberal ideology. *The sociopolitics of English language testing*, pp.3-22.
- Zajda, J., 2022. Discourses of Gender Inequality in Education. In *Discourses of Globalisation and Education Reforms* (pp. 45-58). Springer, Cham.
- Zavale, N.C. and Langa, P.V., 2018. African Diaspora and the Search for Academic Freedom Safe Havens. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, 16(1/2), pp.1-24.
- Zezeza, P.T., 2003. Academic freedom in the neo-liberal order: Governments, globalization, governance, and gender. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa/Revue de l'enseignement supérieur en Afrique*, pp.149-194.
- Zezeza, T., 1992. African social scientists and the struggle for academic freedom. *Journal of Eastern African Research & Development*, pp.11-32.