

**Do University Statements of Free Expression and Institutional Neutrality Increase Student
Tolerance for Different Points of View?**

John D. Bitzan, PhD
Challey Institute Menard Family Director

Antonio Saravia, PhD
Director at Center for the Study of Economics and Liberty at Mercer University

Andrés Marroquín, PhD
Associate Professor of Economics at Mercer University

October 2026

NDSU

SHEILA AND ROBERT CHALLEY
INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL
INNOVATION AND GROWTH

Introduction

Recent student surveys by the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) and others suggest increasing intolerance for different points of view on campus. FIRE's 2026 annual survey of college campuses about free expression finds a majority of students unwilling to allow controversial speakers on campus, a majority believing it is at least rarely acceptable to shout down a speaker or block other students from attending a speech, and one-third believing it is at least rarely acceptable to use violence to prevent a campus speech.ⁱ Other surveys find large percentages of students being in favor of dropping readings or class discussion topics that make students feel uncomfortable, reporting professors for saying things that students find offensive or for making statements students disagree with, and reporting other students who say something deemed offensive.ⁱⁱ

In an attempt to improve campus climates surrounding free speech, 120 higher education institutions have adopted or endorsed a version of The Chicago Statement.ⁱⁱⁱ The Chicago Statement, which was adopted by the University of Chicago in 2014, articulates “the University’s overarching commitment to free, robust, and uninhibited debate and deliberation among all members of the University’s community.”^{iv}

Similarly, a number of universities have adopted statements of institutional neutrality, modeled after the University of Chicago’s 1967 Kalven Report.^v Adopting institutional neutrality commits a university not to comment on social or political issues, arising “out of respect for free inquiry and the obligation to cherish a diversity of viewpoints.”^{vi}

While adoption of the Chicago Statement and the Kalven Report are meant to serve as signals to the university community about expected behavior of faculty, staff, and students, the effectiveness of these statements in influencing student behavior has not been tested. This study

uses five years of annual survey data of student attitudes toward free expression to evaluate the effectiveness of adoption of the Chicago Statement and Kalven Report on student tolerance for different points of view. Specifically, the study uses survey responses from the 2021-2025 versions of the American College Student Freedom, Progress, and Flourishing Survey to assess the impacts of university adoptions of statements of free expression and institutional neutrality on student attitudes toward dropping readings or class discussions that make students uncomfortable, withdrawing controversial speaker invitations, and reporting professors/students who say something deemed offensive.

What is meant by tolerance and how might it be affected by these statements?

Gibson (2006) defines political tolerance as the willingness to extend civil liberties to individuals or groups whose ideas one disagrees with or dislikes. Having reviewed fifty years of research on the subject, Gibson (2006) identifies four different determinants of political tolerance: education, democratic values, perceived threat, and social and institutional context. Our paper assesses this last determinant in the context of academia. We explore whether the adoption of statements supporting free expression and/or institutional neutrality, which shapes the campus institutional context, is associated with greater student tolerance for opposing viewpoints.

Gibson and Gouws (2001) have argued that tolerance is, indeed, context dependent. Working with a sample of South African citizens during the country's democratic transition, these authors conducted a survey experiment which allowed them to isolate the effects of different institutional and political contexts while holding the respondent's underlying political attitudes constant. Their findings suggest that institutions and political contexts can influence

how citizens evaluate the civil liberties of unpopular groups, although these effects are often mediated by perceived threat.

This theme is also present in the organizational institutionalism literature. Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powell (1983), for example, argue that formal policies and organizational commitments influence behavior not only through enforcement, but also through the signaling of expected norms of conduct. Similarly, North (1990) argues that institutions influence behavior, not only by constraining actions but also by shaping expectations regarding appropriate conduct. Ciadini, Reno, and Kallgren (1990) also make the point that the institution can communicate the behaviors that are legitimate and appropriate.

Research specifically focused on statements supporting free expression and/or institutional neutrality suggest their roles as institutional signals that communicates universities' expectations regarding viewpoint diversity. Marcoci and Oprea (2024) identify both selection and educational mechanisms connecting campus speech policies with tolerance and open-mindedness. Policies may attract individuals already committed to these values, but they may also socialize students by encouraging practices and peer norms that support engagement with disagreement.

Institutional neutrality may operate through a related mechanism by creating rules that enable free inquiry, without fear of penalty. Ginsburg (2024) compares university adoption of a statement of institutional neutrality to nations adopting a constitution, noting the statement's signaling of a commitment to principles that are not open to question. He argues that when a university makes statements on political or social issues, it suppresses internal debate; specifically discouraging inquiry by students or faculty, discouraging entry to the university by

those who disagree, and creating backlash against the university. Similarly, Whittington (2024) and Zambrano (2024) suggest that when universities issue statements on political or social matters, it can create harm to the university in a variety of ways, such as restricting freedom of speech and academic freedom on campus, harming the university's reputation, and creating demands for more position-taking by the university.

The literature studying student tolerance on college campuses is considerably more limited. Using a survey of social science students at Goethe University Frankfurt, Revers and Traummuller (2020) study whether university students tolerate controversial viewpoints. They find that depending on the issue, between one-third and one-half of students support restricting offensive speech, left-leaning students are less tolerant, and campus norms appear to influence the willingness to express unpopular opinions. Extending this line of inquiry and using a sample from 55 American universities, Traummuller (2023) also finds that campus tolerance norms affect students' willingness to speak and that institutional context matters even after accounting for ideology and demographics. Grady and Lewis (2024) find that perceived political discrimination is associated with greater self-censorship among university students. None of these studies, however, examines whether formal institutional commitments to free expression or institutional neutrality influence these attitudes.

Eren (2026) notes the lack of empirical evidence related to the impacts of institutional neutrality on campus climates surrounding free expression. In aiming to provide some evidence on the impacts of institutional neutrality on campus speech climate, the study surveys tenure-track faculty at R1 universities. Erin (2026) finds that as a result of R1 universities that do not have institutional neutrality statements taking positions on social and political issues, about a third of professors report self-censoring over job security concerns and 44 percent report being

less likely to engage professionally with an issue if their view does not align with the university. The study does not assess the impact on students, however.

The existing literature shows that institutional context influences political tolerance. We also know that demographics, ideology and campus norms affect student tolerance. Little evidence exists, however, on whether formal institutional commitments shape students' attitudes toward opposing viewpoints. By linking national survey data on student attitudes with university adoption of free-expression and/or institutional neutrality statements, we provide one of the first empirical tests of whether formal institutional commitments influence tolerance in higher education.

Empirical Approach and Results

This study uses student responses from the American College Student Freedom, Progress, and Flourishing Survey (2021-2025) to assess the impacts of university adoptions of statements of free expression and institutional neutrality, as well as the impacts of university speech policies, on student attitudes toward censoring speech. The American College Student Freedom, Progress, and Flourishing Survey is an annual survey conducted by the Challey Institute for Global Innovation and Growth in collaboration with College Pulse. The survey is a representative survey of undergraduate college and university students in all 50 states, drawn from a panel of over 850,000 verified students representing more than 1,500 different colleges and universities. It includes data on gender, race, political leaning, and the university or college attended. These data are matched with FIRE's list of universities that have adopted versions of the Chicago Statement^{vii}, universities that have adopted official positions of institutional neutrality^{viii}, and speech policy ratings from FIRE's annual Spotlight on Speech Codes.^{ix}

Table 1 provides variable definitions and descriptive statistics. As the table shows, in the five years of the student survey, 64 percent of students were female, 43 percent white, and 76 percent attended a public university. Students leaned slightly more toward the Democratic Party than toward the Republican Party. 35 percent of the students attended a university where a statement of free expression had been adopted at least one year prior to the survey, and 5.5 percent attended a university where a statement of institutional neutrality had been adopted at least one year prior to the survey. Most students attended universities rated as yellow in terms of speech policies at 67 percent, while roughly equal percentages attended universities rated as green or red.

To measure student attitudes toward free speech, we use student answers to five questions relating to censoring the speech of others. 34 percent stated that controversial speaker invitations should be withdrawn, 38 percent were in favor of dropping readings and 29 percent in favor of dropping class discussions that make students uncomfortable, and 74 percent and 60 percent in favor of reporting professors and other students who say something deemed offensive. These questions are also combined into an intolerance scale ranging from 0 to 5, where the number represents the number of these actions the student is in favor of. The average student was in favor of 2.3 of these actions over the 5-year period.

Table 1: Variable Definitions and Descriptive Statistics				
Variable	Mean	Standard Dev.	Min.	Max.

Male (1=male, 0=not)	0.29240	0.45490	0.00000	1.00000
Female (1=female, 0=not)	0.64116	0.47969	0.00000	1.00000
Other (nonbinary or prefer not to say) (1=other, 0=not)	0.06202	0.24120	0.00000	1.00000
White (1=white, 0=not)	0.43218	0.49541	0.00000	1.00000
Political Leaning (1= Strong Democrat, 7=Strong Republican)	3.09696	1.75711	1.00000	7.00000
Public University (1=public, 0=not)	0.76243	0.42562	0.00000	1.00000
If many students disagree with someone invited to speak on campus, should the invitation be withdrawn? (1=yes, 0=no)	0.33937	0.47353	0.00000	1.00000
If a required reading for a college class includes content that makes students uncomfortable, should the reading be dropped? (1=yes, 0=no)	0.37680	0.48462	0.00000	1.00000
If a topic being discussed in a college class makes students uncomfortable, should the class stop discussing? (1=yes, 0=no)	0.28550	0.45168	0.00000	1.00000
If a professor says something that students find offensive, should the professor be reported to the univ.? (1=yes, 0=no)	0.73633	0.44066	0.00000	1.00000
If a student says something other students find offensive, should that student be reported to the univ.? (1=yes, 0=no)	0.59945	0.49004	0.00000	1.00000
Intolerance (combined sum of the previous five questions (0=tol., 5=intol.))	2.33743	1.50986	0.00000	5.00000
Chicago - University adopted free expression statement at least 1 year prior to student survey? (1=yes, 0=no)	0.34890	0.47665	0.00000	1.00000
Kalven - University adopted institutional neutrality at least 1 year prior to student survey? (1=yes, 0=no)	0.05566	0.22929	0.00000	1.00000
Green – University’s speech code is rated as green 1 year prior to student survey (1=yes, 0=no)	0.16588	0.37200	0.00000	1.00000
Yellow– University’s speech code is rated as yellow 1 year prior to student survey (1=yes, 0=no)	0.67348	0.46897	0.00000	1.00000
Red– University’s speech code is rated as red 1 year prior to student survey (1=yes, 0=no)	0.16064	0.36722	0.00000	1.00000
Year	2023.26	1.29783	2021	2025
7,240 observations				

We model intolerance as follows:

Intolerance =

f(Female, Other, White, Political Leaning, Public, Chicago, Kalven, Red, Yellow)

where male and green dummy variables are left out to avoid perfect collinearity.

This is modeled as a binomial logit model, where each student is deemed to have five choices to make: (1) in favor of disinviting speaker or not, (2) in favor of dropping a class reading or not, (3) in favor of dropping a class discussion or not, (4) in favor of reporting a professor or not, and (5) in favor of reporting other students or not. The count variable (Intolerance) is the number of times an individual student is in favor of any of these five things.

The count variable (Y_i) is assumed to follow a binomial distribution:

$$Y_i \sim \text{Binomial}(5, p_i)$$

Where p_i is the probability that a student is in favor of a particular intolerant action.

The regression is modeled as the log-odds of any particular intolerant action as follows:

$$\ln\left(\frac{p_i}{1 - p_i}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Female}_i + \beta_2 \text{Other}_i + \beta_3 \text{White}_i + \beta_4 \text{Political Leaning}_i + \beta_5 \text{Public}_i \\ + \beta_6 \text{Chicago}_i + \beta_7 \text{Kalven}_i + \beta_8 \text{Yellow}_i + \beta_9 \text{Red}_i + \varepsilon$$

Table 2 shows the estimation results of four different models: one including a dummy for the Chicago Statement, one including a dummy for Kalven, one with both of them, and one that includes both of them and dummies for speech policy ratings.^{xxi} As the table shows, all models present consistent and statistically significant results relating demographics to intolerance.

Table 2: Binomial Logit Estimation of Intolerance				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Intercept	0.0809* (0.0457)	0.0874* (0.0453)	0.0905** (0.458)	-0.0499 (0.0637)
Female	0.4769*** (0.0320)	0.4755*** (0.0320)	0.4762*** (0.0320)	0.4771*** (0.0320)
Other	0.4056*** (0.0620)	0.3984*** (0.0620)	0.3991*** (0.0620)	0.3947*** (0.0620)
White	-0.2461*** (0.0288)	-0.2513*** (0.0287)	-0.2503*** (0.0288)	-0.2485*** (0.0288)
Political Leaning	-0.1595*** (0.0084)	-0.1595*** (0.0084)	-0.1596*** (0.0084)	-0.1596*** (0.0084)
Public	0.0908*** (0.0334)	0.0844** (0.0333)	0.0857** (0.0334)	0.1303*** (0.0374)
Chicago	-0.0549* (0.0298)		-0.0154 (0.0309)	0.0056 (0.0317)
Kalven		-0.3108*** (0.0624)	-0.3021*** (0.0648)	-0.2860*** (0.0651)
Yellow				0.1017** (0.0405)
Red				0.1787*** (0.0559)
Scale	1.3128	1.3114	1.3115	1.3109
AIC	26,412	26,375	26,376	26,362
***significant at the 1% level **significant at the 5% level *significant at the 10% level # of observations = 7,240				

Female students and students who identify as other are much more likely to be in favor of any particular intolerant action in comparison to male students. White students are less likely to be in favor of any intolerant action, and those leaning more Republican are also less likely to be in favor of any intolerant action. Students at public universities are more likely to be in favor of intolerant actions than those at other universities. Whether the student is at a university that has adopted a statement of free expression (Chicago) has a statistically significant and negative impact on the log odds of being in favor of intolerant actions, but only when controls for institutional neutrality and speech policies are not included. An institutional neutrality statement at a university consistently has a negative and statistically significant impact on the log odds of being in favor of intolerant actions, while students at universities with speech policies rated yellow or red are significantly more likely to be in favor of intolerant actions than those attending universities with speech policies rated as green.

Because the dependent variable is the log odds of being in favor of a particular intolerant action, the marginal change in probability of being in favor of an intolerant action from a one-unit change in an independent variable is calculated as follows (in this case, it is the change in probability of being in favor of an intolerant action for female relative to male):

$$\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial Female} = p_i (1 - p_i) \beta_1$$

These marginal effects are calculated for every student and then averaged to obtain the average marginal effects in Table 3 (using Model 4 from Table 2). In addition, by multiplying these average marginal effects by five, we obtain the change in the expected number of intolerant actions (out of 5 possible) from one-unit changes in independent variables.

Table 3: Average Marginal Effects		
	Change in probability of being in favor of an intolerant action	Change in the number of expected intolerant actions student is in favor of
Female	0.1141	0.5703
Other	0.0944	0.4718
White	-0.0594	-0.2971
Political Leaning	-0.0382	-0.1908
Public	0.0312	0.1558
Chicago	0.0013	0.0067
Kalven	-0.0684	-0.3419
Yellow	0.0243	0.1216
Red	0.0427	0.2136

As the table shows, school adoption of a statement of institutional neutrality is associated with a reduction in the expected number of intolerant actions a student will be in favor of by .34. Similarly, university adoption of speech policies that put it in the green category is associated with reductions in the expected number of intolerant actions a student will be in favor of by .12 and .21 in comparison to having speech policies in the yellow or red categories.

Discussion

The results suggest that the signal conveyed by universities adopting statements of free expression, and especially statements of institutional neutrality, may be effective in influencing student attitudes toward free speech. By stating the university's intent to expose students to all different points of view and not to endorse particular positions on social and political issues, these statements attempt to convey expectations of the university community regarding tolerance of speech that some might find disagreeable.

However, the results also suggest that statements of institutional neutrality may be more effective than free expression statements in influencing student attitudes. Students at universities

that have adopted institutional neutrality statements are significantly less likely to be in favor of intolerant actions in all specifications, while the effects of being at a university where a statement of free expression has been adopted become insignificant once the effect of institutional neutrality statements is considered. Although it is possible that these results reflect institutional neutrality statements attracting students who are more open to different points of view, rather than influencing their tolerance for different points of view, it seems unlikely given the recency of most of these statements; of the 49 universities that have adopted institutional neutrality, only 7 did so before 2024.

The results also suggest that changing university policies addressing free speech issues may influence student attitudes toward free expression. Student attitudes align with FIRE's speech policy ratings in the way one would expect; when a university adopts policies more supportive of free expression (Green Speech Code Rating), students are less likely to be in favor of intolerant actions. This may suggest another pathway for statements of free expression and institutional neutrality to influence student attitudes. To the extent that adopting such statements creates momentum toward university policy changes that are more supportive of free expression, they may reduce student intolerance through this indirect route.

Robustness Tests

One critique of the method used to estimate the impacts of statements of free expression, institutional neutrality, and speech policies on student tolerance is that we're only examining impacts on a combination of favorability toward 5 possible intolerant actions. To test whether the findings are a function of the way the dependent variable was created, we estimate individual logit models for favorability toward each of the individual intolerant actions.

Table 4 shows estimation results of five separate logit models, where the dependent variables are log-odds of answering yes to each of the following questions: (1) should a speaker be disinvited if many students disagree with their views? (2) should a reading be dropped if it makes students feel uncomfortable? (3) should a class discussion topic be dropped if it makes students feel uncomfortable, (4) should a professor be reported if they say something deemed offensive, (5) should other students be reported if they something other students deem offensive? As the table shows, the estimations support the general findings of the binomial logit model. In every estimation, female students, those reporting gender as other, and those who lean democratic are statistically significantly more likely to be in favor of the illiberal action. Non-white students and those at public universities are significantly more likely to be in favor of illiberal action in four of the five estimations. Importantly, for all estimations except favorability of reporting a professor, students at universities adopting an institutional neutrality statement are statistically significantly less likely to be in favor of taking illiberal actions.

As two additional robustness checks, we regress the illiberal scale (0 to 5) against the same covariates using OLS and using Poisson regression. All parameter estimates have the same signs and significance as in the binomial logit (see Appendix Table A1).

Table 4: Logit Estimation of Specific Intolerant Attitudes					
	Withdraw Speaker Invitation	Drop Reading that Makes Students Unconf	Drop Disc. Topic that Makes Students Unconf	Report Professor	Report Other Students
Intercept	-0.2847** (0.1172)	-0.6283*** (0.1124)	-1.1594*** (0.1211)	1.3597*** (0.1238)	0.6093*** (0.1113)
Female	0.3502*** (0.0593)	0.5332*** (0.0573)	0.2846*** (0.0608)	0.8793*** (0.0594)	0.6588*** (0.0551)
Other	0.3875*** (0.1109)	0.5025*** (0.1080)	0.3289*** (0.1143)	0.5965*** (0.1220)	0.3687*** (0.1085)
White	-0.4264*** (0.0527)	-0.3108*** (0.0505)	-0.4555*** (0.0546)	-0.0506 (0.0575)	-0.1603*** (0.0510)
Political Leaning	-0.2319*** (0.0161)	-0.0802*** (0.0146)	-0.0326** (0.0156)	-0.3065*** (0.0161)	-0.2633*** (0.0147)
Public	0.0340 (0.0668)	0.1438** (0.0656)	0.2855*** (0.0712)	0.1258* (0.0755)	0.1676*** (0.0666)
Chicago	0.0240 (0.0574)	-0.0464 (0.0553)	-0.0028 (0.0591)	0.0122 (0.0634)	0.0467 (0.0563)
Kalven	-0.3749*** (0.1234)	-0.4828*** (0.1202)	-0.4016*** (0.1305)	-0.1203 (0.1258)	-0.2898*** (0.1122)
Yellow	0.2458*** (0.0758)	0.0462 (0.0711)	0.1247* (0.0766)	0.0566 (0.0794)	0.1207* (0.0710)
Red	0.2685*** (0.1026)	0.1192 (0.0978)	0.2348** (0.1048)	0.0908 (0.1105)	0.3148*** (0.0992)
AIC	8,877	9,402	8,544	7,669	9,174
***significant at the 1% level **significant at the 5% level *significant at the 10% level # of observations = 7,240					

Conclusion

This study supports the idea that institutional context matters for student tolerance on university campuses. It provides the first empirical evidence of a relationship between institutional statements aimed at free expression and student tolerance of different points of view. Using five years of survey data from college students attending 4-year universities, we examine whether students at universities that have adopted statements of free expression and institutional neutrality have different attitudes about censoring speakers, professors, and other students than those at universities that have not adopted such statements.

We find a robust, negative relationship between adoption of an institutional neutrality statement and student intolerance. When estimating the likelihood of students being in favor of five different intolerant actions through a binomial choice model, we find a significant negative association with university adoption of an institutional neutrality statement for all models. In estimating logit models for attitudes toward each individual intolerant action, we find a significant negative relationship with institutional neutrality statements in four of the five models. Specifically, students at universities adopting an institutional neutrality statement are significantly less likely to be in favor of withdrawing controversial speaker invitations, dropping readings that make students feel uncomfortable, dropping discussion topics that make students feel uncomfortable, and reporting other students who say something deemed offensive. They are also less likely to be in favor of reporting professors who say something deemed offensive, although the relationship is not statistically significant.

The effects of a statement of free expression, like the Chicago statement, are less robust. In the binomial choice model of student attitudes toward intolerant actions, a free expression statement is significantly negatively associated with intolerance, but only when not controlling

for institutional neutrality statements. The statement of free expression is not significantly related to favorability toward intolerant actions in any of the individual logit models.

Interesting, our results also show that students at universities with stricter speech policies are less tolerant of different points of view. All of our estimations show that students at universities where speech policies are deemed more restrictive by FIRE are more likely to be in favor of intolerant actions, with most of these relationships being statistically significant.

These results suggest that university adoption of statements of institutional neutrality, like those modeled after the Kalven Report, may be effective in influencing student attitudes toward free speech. By making a commitment not to take positions on social and political issues, institutional neutrality statements are meant to signal the university's intent to create an environment that is open to debate, rather than closing debate by declaring one side of the debate to be correct. Our findings are consistent with that signal being effective in reducing student intolerance toward controversial or unpopular views.

In addition, the strong positive association between restrictive speech policies and intolerance suggests an additional potential route where statements of free speech and institutional neutrality may influence free expression. To the extent that adopting statements of free expression and institutional neutrality create momentum toward changing university policies to be more supportive of free speech, they may have an additional indirect influence in improving the climate of free expression on campus.

An important qualifier, of course, is that the results provide evidence of an association. While the results show a strong correlation between institutional neutrality statements and student tolerance, the relationship is not necessarily causal.

References

- Bitzan, John D. "American College Student Freedom, Progress, and Flourishing Survey," Challey Institute for Global Innovation and Growth, North Dakota State University, 2021-2025. <https://www.ndsu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/2025-American-College-Student-Freedom-Progress-and-Flourishing-Survey.pdf>
- DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48(2): 147–160.
- Eren, Colleen P. 2026. "Chilling Effects? The Impact of Political-Statement Making on Faculty at R1 Universities." *Journal of Open Inquiry in the Behavioral Sciences* 5(3): 1-26.
- Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression. 2026. "Adoptions of an Official Position of Institutional Neutrality." <https://www.fire.org/research-learn/adoptions-official-position-institutional-neutrality>
- Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression. 2026. "Chicago Statement: University and Faculty Body Support." <https://www.fire.org/research-learn/chicago-statement-university-and-faculty-body-support>
- Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression. "Spotlight on Speech Codes," 2020-2024. <https://www.fire.org/research-learn/spotlight-speech-codes-2024>
- Gibson, James L. 2006. "Enigmas of Intolerance: Fifty Years after Stouffer's *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties*." *Perspectives on Politics* 4(1): 21–34.
- Gibson, James L., and Amanda Gouws. 2001. "Making Tolerance Judgments: The Effects of Context, Local and National." *The Journal of Politics* 63(4): 1067-1090. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-3816.00101>
- Ginsburg, Tom. 2024. "A Constitutional Perspective on Institutional Neutrality," Public Law and Legal Theory research Paper No. 845, University of Chicago Law School. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4577076
- Grady, A.R., Lewis, J.A. Perceptions of academic discrimination mediate the relationship between political minority status and self-censorship among US college students. *Discover Psychology* 4, 191 (2024).
- Marcoci, A. & Oprea, A. (2024). Freedom of speech on campus, *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Volume 74, Issue 4, October 2024, Pages 1251–1273.
- Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83(2): 340–363.

- North, Douglass C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Revers, Matthias, and Richard Traunmüller. 2020. "Is Free Speech in Danger on University Campus? Some Preliminary Evidence from a Most Likely Case." *KZfSS Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 72(3): 471-497.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11577-020-00713-z>
- Stevens, Sean T., "2026 College Free Speech Rankings: What is the State of Free Speech on America's College Campuses?" The Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, 2025.
<https://www.fire.org/sites/default/files/2025/09/2026%20College%20Free%20Speech%20Rankings%20Report.pdf>
- Traunmüller, Richard. 2023. *Testing the "Campus Cancel Culture" Hypothesis*. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4392840>
- Whittington, Keith E. 2024. "On Institutional Neutrality and the Purpose of a University," SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4801896
- Zambrano, Diego A. 2024. "The Costs and Benefits of University Position-Taking," SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4821928

Table A1: OLS and Poisson Estimation of Intolerance		
	OLS	Poisson
Intercept	2.4428*** (0.0757)	-0.7338*** (0.0345)
Female	0.5695*** (0.0378)	0.2606*** (0.0179)
Other	0.4681*** (0.0744)	0.2228*** (0.0330)
White	-0.2967*** (0.0343)	-0.1307*** (0.0154)
Political Leaning	-0.1901*** (0.0098)	-0.0867*** (0.0046)
Public	0.1561*** (0.0446)	0.0657*** (0.0197)
Chicago	0.0066 (0.0377)	0.0036 (0.0167)
Kalven	-0.3390*** (0.0764)	-0.1556*** (0.0362)
Yellow	0.1201** (0.0480)	0.0538** (0.0219)
Red	0.2125*** (0.0664)	0.0927*** (0.0297)
Scale (Pearson Adjusted Scale Errors for Poisson)		0.9683
R ² or AIC	0.1069	87,709

-
- ⁱ Stevens, S.T., “2026 College Free Speech Rankings: What is the State of Free Speech on America’s College Campuses?” The Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, 2025.
<https://www.fire.org/sites/default/files/2025/09/2026%20College%20Free%20Speech%20Rankings%20Report.pdf>
- ⁱⁱ Bitzan, J.D. “2025 American College Student Freedom, Progress, and Flourishing Survey,” Challey Institute for Global Innovation and Growth, North Dakota State University, 2025.
<https://www.ndsu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/2025-American-College-Student-Freedom-Progress-and-Flourishing-Survey.pdf>
- ⁱⁱⁱ <https://www.fire.org/research-learn/chicago-statement-university-and-faculty-body-support>
- ^{iv} <https://www.fire.org/sites/default/files/2024/06/Report%20of%20the%20Committee%20on%20Freedom%20of%20Expression%20-%20Chicago%20Statement%20-%20202015.pdf>
- ^v <https://www.fire.org/sites/default/files/2020/07/20104433/KalvenReport.pdf>
- ^{vi} Ibid.
- ^{vii} <https://www.fire.org/research-learn/chicago-statement-university-and-faculty-body-support>
- ^{viii} <https://www.fire.org/research-learn/adoptions-official-position-institutional-neutrality>
- ^{ix} <https://www.fire.org/research-learn/spotlight-speech-codes-2024>
- ^x Because the Pearson chi-square statistic divided by its residual degrees of freedom was between 1.7189 and 1.723 in all models, indicating overdispersion, we use Pearson scale-adjusted standard errors.
- ^{xi} We also estimated model 4 with time fixed effects as a robustness check. The sign and significance of all variables remained unchanged, though the magnitude of the institutional neutrality variable dropped to -0.1764. However, we report the model without time fixed effects, as the universities represented in the sample change substantially for different years. Thus, the time fixed effects likely capture differences in the universities represented (and their policies) more than capturing time effects.