

The Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors

By F. S. DEIBLER

Professor of Economics, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

THE American Association of University Professors was organized in January, 1915. The motive for forming the organization was the feeling that there was a distinct need for an association of college and university teachers through which their professional interests might find expression. Most college and university teachers were members of the learned societies in their respective fields, but it was felt that these bodies did not adequately meet the needs. In the first place, in these associations, time and energy was devoted solely to the discussion of scientific topics and the extension of scientific knowledge along specialized lines. In the second place, the large number of these scientific bodies prevented any group consideration of the professional interests of college and university teachers. There was no body that could express these interests comparable with the American Bar Association for the lawyers or the American Medical Society for the physicians of the country. The American Association of University Professors was formed to fill this need, and to "enhance the security and dignify the scholar's calling throughout our country."

Membership was limited at first to teachers or research students who had had ten years' experience in teaching or investigation in connection with some college or university of recognized standing. The condition for membership was changed at the annual meeting in 1920 so that three years' experience is now required. The evidence that the Association is filling a need may be seen in the continued growth in mem-

bership, which now numbers 4,046, representing 183 institutions.

ORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEES

During its first year of existence the new Association began the study of two closely related subjects, that have continued to occupy a large amount of the time and energy of the organization—namely, the questions of academic freedom and tenure, and the relation of the faculty to the administrative and governing bodies of colleges and universities. The question of academic freedom and tenure was taken up at once. In fact, some preliminary thought had been given to this issue by a joint committee of nine, appointed in December, 1913, and representing the American Economic Association, the American Sociological Society and the American Political Science Association. At the first meeting (January, 1915) of the American Association of University Professors it was decided to take up the problem of academic freedom and the President of the Association was authorized to appoint a committee of fifteen, which should include, so far as the members were eligible, this joint committee of nine. The committee of fifteen became Committee "A"—the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

This Committee was immediately faced with the consideration of a number of specific cases of alleged infringement of academic freedom. Eleven cases were laid before it the first year. Because of their significance it was decided to make special inquiries into five of these cases. Four of the other cases were brought

to the attention of the specific scientific association, to which the individual affected belonged. In the five cases investigated, the Committee decided to appoint special committees of inquiry and to advise with these as to questions of principles and on methods of procedure, a practice that has continued to govern the investigations conducted under the permanent committee on this subject (Committee A). This left the parent committee free to consider the whole problem of academic freedom and formulate a report thereon. The report was submitted by the Committee and was accepted and approved at the annual meeting in December, 1915. This report constitutes the declaration of principles of the Association on the subjects of academic freedom and academic tenure. In investigating specific cases, the subcommittees making the inquiry have been instructed to consider the facts in the light of the principles contained therein. Because of the importance attached to these principles by the Association, an extended abstract of this report will be given here.

WHAT IS "ACADEMIC FREEDOM"?

"The term 'academic freedom,' " says the report, "has traditionally had two applications—to the freedom of the teacher and to that of the student, *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*. It needs scarcely be pointed out that the freedom which is the subject of this report is that of the teacher. Academic freedom in this sense comprises three elements: freedom of inquiry and research; freedom of teaching within the university or college; and freedom of extramural utterance and action. The first of these is almost everywhere so safeguarded that the dangers of its infringement are slight. It may therefore be disregarded in this report. The

second and third phases of academic freedom are closely related, and are often not distinguished. The third, however, has an importance of its own, since of late it has perhaps more frequently been the occasion of difficulties and controversies than has the question of freedom of intra-academic teaching.

"All five of the cases which have recently been investigated by committees of this Association have involved, at least as one factor, the right of university teachers to express their opinions freely outside the university or to engage in political activities in their capacity as citizens. The general principles which have to do with freedom of teaching in both these senses seem to the Committee to be in great part, though not wholly, the same. In this report, therefore, we shall consider the matter primarily with reference to freedom of teaching within the university, and shall assume that what is said thereon is also applicable to the freedom of speech of university teachers outside their institutions, subject to certain qualifications and supplementary considerations which will be pointed out in the course of the report.

"An adequate discussion of academic freedom must necessarily consider three matters:

(1) The scope and basis of the power exercised by those bodies having ultimate legal authority in academic affairs.

(2) The nature of the academic calling:

(3) The function of the academic institution or university."

THE POWER OF THE TRUSTEES

On the subject of academic authority, the report recognizes the trustees as the "ultimate repositories of power," but raises the question of the responsibilities which this power imposes

upon the trustees as it affects the question of academic freedom. On this latter point the report differentiates between two types of institutions, (a) proprietary institutions, and (b) those in the nature of a public institution. In connection with the first type, the report recognizes the responsibilities imposed upon the trustees, if an institution is founded to promote a particular religious, political or economic doctrine. In such institutions the trustees have a "right to subordinate everything to that end." Such institutions "do not, at least as regards one particular subject, accept the principles of freedom of inquiry, of opinion and of teaching; their purpose is not to advance knowledge by the unrestricted research and unfettered discussion of impartial investigators, but rather to subsidize the promotion of the opinions held by persons, usually not of the scholar's calling, who provide the funds for their maintenance." The Committee holds that "genuine boldness and thoroughness of inquiry, and freedom of speech, are scarcely reconcilable with the prescribed inculcation of a particular opinion upon a controverted question."

Concerning the second type of institutions, the report holds that the duty of the trustees is plain. They are trustees for the public and therefore can not assume the proprietary attitude and privilege if they are appealing to the general public for support. Trustees of such universities or colleges have no moral right to bind the reason or conscience of any professor. "It follows that any university which lays restrictions upon the intellectual freedom of its professors proclaims itself a proprietary institution, and should be so described when it makes a general appeal for funds."¹

¹ In his annual report President Butler of Columbia makes the following statement con-

NATURE OF THE ACADEMIC CALLING

On the nature of the academic calling, the report has this to say:

"If education is the cornerstone of the structure of society and if progress in scientific knowledge is essential to civilization, few things can be more important than to enhance the dignity of the scholar's profession with a view to attracting into its ranks men of the highest ability, of sound learning, and of strong and independent character. This is the more essential because the pecuniary emoluments of the profession are not, and doubtless never will be, equal to those open to the more successful members of other professions. It is not, in our opinion, desirable that men should be drawn into this profession by the magnitude of the economic rewards which it offers; but it is for this reason the more needful that men of high gifts and character should be drawn into it by the assurance of an honorable and secure position, and of freedom to perform honestly and according to their own consciences, the distinctive and important function which the nature of the profession lays upon them.

"That function is to deal at first hand, after prolonged and specialized technical training, with the sources of knowledge; and to impart the results of their own and of their fellow-specialists' investigations and reflections, both to students and to the

cerning the attempt to control the educational policies of universities. He says, "Under no circumstances should, or can, any self respecting university accept a gift upon conditions which fix or hamper its complete freedom in the control of its own educational policies and activities. To accept a gift on condition that a certain doctrine or theory be taught or be not taught, . . . is to surrender a university's freedom and to strike a blow at what should be its characteristic independence. Indeed, any donor who would venture to attempt to bind a university

general public, without fear or favor. The proper discharge of this function requires (among other things) that the university teachers shall be exempt from any pecuniary motive or inducement to hold, or to express, any conclusion which is not the genuine and uncolored product of his own study or that of fellow specialists. Indeed, the proper fulfilment of the work of the professorate requires that our universities shall be so free that no fair-minded person shall find any excuse for even a suspicion that the utterances of university teachers are shaped or restricted by the judgment, not of professional scholars, but of inexpert and possibly not wholly disinterested persons outside of their ranks. The lay public is under no compulsion to accept or to act upon the opinions of the scientific expert whom, through the universities, it employs. But it is highly needful in the interests of society at large, that what purports to be conclusions of men trained for, and dedicated to, the quest for truth, shall in fact be the conclusions of such men, and not echoes of the opinions of the lay public, or of the individuals who endow or manage universities."

FUNCTION OF THE ACADEMIC INSTITUTION

On the function of the academic institution, the report sets forth the following:

"The importance of academic free-

either as to the form or the content of its teachings or as to its administrative policies, would be a dangerous person. Unless the public can have full faith in the intellectual and moral integrity of its universities and complete confidence that they direct and are responsible for their own policies, there can be no proper and helpful relationship between the universities and the public. A university may accept a gift to extend and improve its teaching of history, but it may not accept a gift to put a fixed and definite

dom is most clearly perceived in the light of the purposes for which universities exist. These are three in number:

A. To promote inquiry and advance the sum of human knowledge.

B. To provide general instruction to the students.

C. To develop experts for various branches of the public service.

"Let us consider each of these. In the earlier stages of a nation's intellectual development, the chief concern of educational institutions is to train the growing generation and to diffuse the already accepted knowledge. It is only slowly that there comes to be provided in the highest institutions of learning the opportunity for the gradual wresting from nature of her intimate secrets. The modern university is becoming more and more the home of scientific research. There are three fields of human inquiry in which the race is only at the beginning: natural science, social science and philosophy and religion, dealing with the relations of man to outer nature, to his fellow men, and to the ultimate realities and values. In natural science, all that we have learned but serves to make us realize more deeply how much more remains to be discovered. In social science, in its largest sense, which is concerned with the relations of men in society and with the condi-

interpretation good for all time, upon the facts of history. A university may accept a gift to increase the salaries of its professors, but it may not accept a gift for such purpose on condition that the salaries of professors shall never exceed a stated maximum, or that some professors shall be restricted as others are not in their personal, literary or scientific activities. No university is so poor that it can afford to accept a gift which restricts its independence, and no university is so rich that it would not be impoverished by an addition to its resources which tied the hands of its governing boards." (Annual Report, 1919, pp. 7, 8.)

tions of social order and well being, we have learned only an adumbration of the laws which govern these vastly complex phenomena. Finally, in the spiritual life, and in the interpretation of the general meaning and ends of human existence and its relation to the universe, we are still far from a comprehension of the final truths, and from a universal agreement among all sincere and earnest men. In all these domains of knowledge, the first condition of progress is complete and unlimited freedom to pursue inquiry and publish its results. Such freedom is the breath in the nostrils of all scientific activity.

“The second function—which for a long time was the only function—of the American college or university is to provide instruction for students. It is scarcely open to question, that freedom of utterance is as important to the teacher as it is to the investigator. No man can be a successful teacher unless he enjoys the respect of his students, and their confidence in his intellectual integrity. It is clear, however, that this confidence will be impaired if there is suspicion on the part of the students that the teacher is not expressing himself fully or frankly, or that the college and university teachers in general are a repressed and intimidated class who dare not speak with that candor and courage, which youth always demands of those whom it is to esteem. The average student is a discerning observer, who soon takes the measure of his instructor. It is not only the character of the instruction, but also the character of the instructor that counts; and if the student has reason to believe that the instructor is not true to himself, the virtue of the instruction as an educative force is incalculably diminished. There must be in the mind of the teacher no mental reservation.

He must give the student the best of what he has and what he is.

“The third function of the modern university is to develop experts for the use of the community. For if there is one thing that distinguishes the more recent development of democracy, it is the recognition by legislators of the inherent complexities of economic, social, and political life and the difficulty of solving problems of technical adjustment without technical knowledge. The recognition of this fact has led to a continually greater demand for the aid of experts in these subjects, to advise both legislators and administrators. The training of such experts has, accordingly, in recent years, become an important part of the work of the universities; and in almost every one of our higher institutions of learning the professors of the economic, social and political sciences have been drafted to an increasing extent into more or less unofficial participation in the public service. It is obvious that here again the scholar must be absolutely free not only to pursue his investigations, but to declare the results of his researches, no matter where they may lead him or to what extent they may come into conflict with accepted opinion. To be of use to the legislator or administrator, he must enjoy their complete confidence in the disinterestedness of his conclusions.

“It is clear, then, that the university cannot perform its threefold function without accepting and enforcing to the fullest extent the principle of academic freedom. The responsibility of the university as a whole is to the community at large, and any restriction upon the freedom of the instructor is bound to react injuriously upon the efficiency and morale of the institution, and therefore ultimately upon the interest of the community.”

CORRELATIVE OBLIGATIONS OF
THE SCHOLAR

The report recognizes that rights impose duties and that academic freedom for the teacher entails correlative obligations. On this subject the report declares as follows:

"The claim to freedom of teaching is made in the interest of the integrity and of the progress of scientific inquiry; it is, therefore, only those who carry on their work in the temper of the scientific inquirer who may justly assert this claim. The liberty of the scholar within the university to set forth his conclusions, be they what they may, is conditioned by their being conclusions gained by a scholar's method and held in a scholar's spirit; that is to say, they must be the fruits of competent and patient and sincere inquiry, and they should be set forth with dignity, courtesy, and temperateness of language. The university teacher, in giving instruction upon controversial matters, while he is under no obligation to hide his own opinion under a mountain of equivocal verbiage, should, if he is fit for his position, be a person of a fair and judicial mind; he should, in dealing with such subjects, set forth justly, without suppression or inuendo, the divergent opinions of other investigators; he should cause his students to become familiar with the best published expressions of the great historic types of doctrine upon the questions at issue; and he should above all, remember that his business is not to provide his students with ready-made conclusions, but to train them to think for themselves, and to provide them access to those materials which they need if they are to think intelligently."

The report holds that the power to determine departures from the scientific spirit and method should be

vested in the academic profession. "Intervention by any other bodies can never be exempt from the suspicion that it is dictated by other motives than zeal for the integrity of the science." However disagreeable the task, the Committee held that the obligation to rid the profession "of the incompetent and the unworthy and to prevent the freedom which it claims in the name of science from being used as a shelter for inefficiency, for superficiality or for uncritical and intemperate partisanship" must be assumed by the profession. A special obligation rests upon the teacher of immature students. In such cases scientific truth should be presented with discretion and with consideration for the students' preconceptions and traditions, and with due regard to character-building. The teacher should not take unfair advantages of the students' immaturity to indoctrinate him with the teacher's own opinions before the student has had an opportunity to examine other opinions or develop sufficient judgment to formulate independent opinions of his own. The teacher should strive to stimulate an intellectual interest and develop the habit of patient and methodical consideration of both sides of every controverted question. On the question of "class-room utterances," the Committee holds that these should be regarded as "privileged communications," since they are often designed to provoke opposition or arouse debate. Such utterances should not be made the basis of passing judgment on the positions held by the teacher.

EXTRA-MURAL UTTERANCES

In respect to extra-mural utterances, the report holds that academic teachers are under "peculiar obligations to avoid hasty or unverified or exaggerated

statements and to refrain from intemperate or sensational modes of expression." But, subject to these restraints, it is not, in the opinion of the Committee, desirable that scholars should be debarred from giving expression to their judgment upon controversial questions, or that their freedom of speech, outside the university, should be limited to questions falling within their own specialty.² The Committee quotes with favor, a statement from a non-academic body that, "it is neither possible nor desirable to deprive a college professor of the political rights vouchsafed to every citizen."

In concluding its report, the Committee said:

"It is, it will be seen, in no sense the contention of this Committee that academic freedom implies that individual teachers should be exempt from all restraints as to the matter or manner of their utterances, either within or without the university. Such restraints as are necessary should in the main, your Committee holds, be self-imposed, or enforced by the public opinion of the profession. But there may, undoubtedly, arise occasional cases in which the aberrations of individuals may require to be checked by definite disciplinary action. What this report chiefly maintains is that such action cannot with safety be taken by bodies not composed of

members of the academic profession. Lay governing boards are competent to judge concerning charges of habitual neglect of assigned duties on the part of individual teachers, and concerning charges of grave moral delinquency. But in matters of opinion, and of the utterance of opinion, such boards cannot intervene without destroying, to the extent of their intervention, the essential nature of a university—without converting it from a place dedicated to openness of mind, in which the conclusions expressed are the tested conclusions of trained scholars, into a place barred against the access of new light, and precommitted to the opinions or prejudices of men who have not been set apart or expressly trained for the scholar's duties.

"It is, in short, not the absolute freedom of utterance of the individual scholar, but the absolute freedom of thought, of inquiry, of discussion and of teaching, of the academic profession, that is asserted by this declaration of principles. It is conceivable that our profession may prove unworthy of its high calling, and unfit to exercise the responsibilities that belong to it. But it will scarcely be said as yet to have given evidence of such unfitness. And the existence of this Association, as it seems to your committee, must be construed

² President Lowell has this to say on this point: "In spite, however, of the risk of injury to the institution, the objections to restraint upon what professors may say as citizens seems to me far greater than the harm done by leaving them free. In the first place, to impose upon the teacher in a university restrictions to which the members of other professions, lawyers, physicians, engineers, and so forth, are not subjected, would produce a sense of irritation and humiliation. In accepting a chair under such conditions a man would surrender a part of his liberty; what he might say would be submitted to the censorship of a board of trustees, and he would

cease to be a free citizen. . . . It is not a question of academic freedom, but of personal liberty from restraint, yet it touches the dignity of the academic career. . . . There is another (objection), not less weighty from that (standpoint) of the institution itself. If a university or college censors what its professors may say, if it restrains them from uttering something that it does not approve, it thereby assumes responsibility for that which it permits them to say. This is logical and inevitable, but it is a responsibility which an institution of learning would be very unwise in assuming." (Quoted in February-March 1918 *Bulletin of American Association of University Professors*, pp. 12-15.)

as a pledge, not only that the profession will earnestly guard those liberties without which it can not rightly render its distinctive and indispensable service to society, but also that it will with equal earnestness seek to maintain such standards of professional character, and of scientific integrity and competency, as shall make it a fit instrument for that service."

ENFORCEMENT OF PRINCIPLES OF TENURE

Four measures were proposed by the Committee as necessary steps in putting the principles of its report into operation:

1. *Action by Faculty Committees on Reappointments.* It was held that official action relating to reappointments and refusals of reappointments should be taken only with the advice and consent of some board or committee representative of the faculty.

2. *Definition of Tenure of Office.* In every institution there should be an unequivocal understanding as to the term of each appointment; and the tenure of professorships, and associate professorships, and of all positions above the grade of instructor, after ten years of service should be permanent. In state universities, incapable of making binding contracts for more than a limited period, the governing boards should announce their policy with respect to the presumption of reappointment in the several classes of positions and such announcements should be regarded as morally binding. No university teacher of any rank should, except in cases of grave moral delinquency, receive notice of dismissal or refusal of reappointment, later than three months before the close of any academic year, and in the case of teachers above the grade of instructor, one year's notice should be given.

3. *Formulation of Grounds for Dismissal.* In every institution the grounds which will be regarded as justifying the dismissal of members of the faculty should be formulated with reasonable definiteness; and in case of institutions which impose upon their faculties doctrinal standards of a sectarian or partisan character, these standards should be clearly defined and the body or individual having authority to interpret them in case of controversy, should be designated.

4. *Judicial Hearings Before Dismissal.* Every university or college teacher should be entitled, before dismissal³ or demotion, to have the charges against him stated in writing in specific terms and to have a fair trial on those charges before a special or permanent committee chosen by the faculty senate or council, or by the faculty at large. At such trial the teacher accused should have full opportunity to present evidence, and, if the charge is one of professional incompetency, a formal report upon his work should first be made in writing by the teachers of his own department and cognate departments in the university, and, if the teacher concerned so desires, by a committee of his fellow specialists from other institutions, appointed by some competent authority.

In all of the cases that have been investigated by the Association the specific facts found have been considered in the light of the principles set forth in this report. The practical proposals have likewise become the method approved by the Association for dealing with dismissal cases. The Association has striven to give these principles as wide publicity as possible through the discussions that have centered around the specific cases investigated.

³ This does not refer to refusals to reappoint at the expiration of definite terms of office.

THE FACULTY IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

The problem of putting these principles into effect is closely associated with the position taken by the Association upon the second question mentioned above, namely, the place and function of the faculty in university government. The report of Committee T, submitted at the annual meeting in 1920, may be said to set up a standard to be attained on this subject. On this problem there is by no means the same unanimity of opinion nor has the Association put itself on record in favor of a particular position, as has been done on the question of academic freedom and tenure. Committee T was appointed in 1917 and its report⁴ contains not only the recommendations of the Committee but also the present practice in the leading institutions of the country. For the purposes of this article the specific recommendations of the Committee are of importance.

I. *Boards of Trustees and Faculties.* The Committee held that the faculty should be represented in some manner at regular or stated meetings of the board of trustees for the purpose of discussing general educational policies. The majority of the Committee favored a conference committee for this purpose rather than faculty members regularly elected to membership on the board of trustees.

II. *The President and the Faculty.* The President should be the educational leader and its chief administrative officer both with regard to the functions of the trustees and those of the faculty. Since the Committee held that the president should be more of an educational leader than an administrative expert, it was of the opinion that he should be chosen "for broad scholarship, insight into educa-

tional needs and problems and power of leadership, no less than for administrative skill." In the selection of the president, the Committee held that he should be nominated by a joint committee composed of trustees and faculty.

III. *Deans and the Faculty.* The Committee recognized the wide diversity of practice in the functions performed by deans. In the smaller institutions, he is chiefly a disciplinary officer; in institutions divided into schools for administrative purposes, he becomes the administrative head of the school or college. Recognizing the wide diversity of practice, the Committee laid down certain considerations on the functions of, and manner of choosing, deans as a basis for discussion rather than a proposal for acceptance. The significance of these propositions is the light they throw on the developing opinion among faculty members in regard to the form of organization of colleges and universities.

The propositions laid down by the Committee are as follows: The dean should be the chief administrative officer of the faculty of which he is a member. He should formulate and present to the faculty policies for its consideration. This duty does not imply any abridgment of the right of any member of the faculty to present any matter to the faculty. He should be responsible for the enforcement of admission requirements, for oversight of the work of students and be the ordinary medium of communication for all official business with the administrative and governing bodies. This latter proposition is not intended to abridge the right of the faculty in choosing representatives for special conferences with the trustees.

On the question of selection of deans the Committee proposed that a dean

⁴ *Bulletin*, March, 1920.

should be chosen by concurring action, in some form, of the faculty over which he shall preside, the president and the trustees. At the annual meeting in December the Association approved the proposition that a faculty should participate in some form in the selection of its administrative officers, including the president of the institution.

The relative merits of definite and indefinite tenure of the dean is considered in the report, but the Committee concludes that this question can be wisely decided only after a joint determination by the president, trustees and faculties what the duties and functions of a dean are.

IV. *The Faculty and Budget Making.* Here also wise procedure will differ in institutions of different size and kind. The procedure in a state university must differ somewhat from that in a privately endowed institution. But as a fundamental principle the Committee without exception was of the opinion that in all cases the faculty should have a recognized voice in the preparation of the annual budget. In larger colleges or universities this end can be best achieved through a budget committee elected by the faculty. The Committee held that some such plan "would tend to allay the discontent which so frequently arises from inequities in the distribution of the salary budget."

V. *The Faculty.* The faculty should be the legislative body for all matters concerning the educational policy of the university. In institutions consisting of more than one school there should be either a general faculty or an elected body representing all the faculties, for the determination of the educational policy of the university as a whole. Each faculty should determine its own voting membership, its rules of procedure, elect all standing

committees and determine their functions, and should participate, through appropriate committees, in the selection of full professors and executive officers of departments.

Among the standing committees of the general faculty should be a judicial committee of a small number of members, one or more to be elected annually by the faculty. In the event of the proposed dismissal of a member of the instructing staff, on indefinite tenure, the member in question should have the right to full investigation by the judicial committee of the grounds alleged for the proposed action. Failure to sustain the charges before the committee should stop dismissal. The judicial committee should report its findings to the president and the board of trustees.

An investigation was made by Committee A and a report submitted to the annual meeting in Pittsburgh on the extent to which the principles of the Association have been adopted by the various institutions of the country. The information was collected by means of a questionnaire sent to the president or secretary of the local branch of the Association in those institutions which had organized a local group. Replies were received from fifty-four of the fifty-nine branches to which the inquiry was sent. The results of the investigation are of interest and may be summarized as follows:

REPORTS ON ADOPTION OF PRINCIPLES

In fourteen of the fifty-four institutions reporting, the general faculty exercises, either as a matter of definite rules or as a common administrative practice, some authority over the selection and promotion of the instructional staff or the development of the budget, thus exercising an influence

over the broader educational policies that depend upon the distribution of available funds. In this list appear some of the largest and best known universities and colleges of the country.

But of more direct significance for the present purpose is the presence of faculty influence in dismissal cases. In thirteen of the fifty-four institutions, definite machinery has been set up for dealing with dismissal cases. In some instances the plans have been developed since the organization of the Association and, in one institution, as the direct result of an investigation conducted by the Association. Here again, we find some of the well-known colleges and universities. But in addition to the institutions that have set up a definite procedure for dealing with dismissal cases, it was found that this subject had received attention in twenty-one of the other institutions reporting. In other words, only twenty of the fifty-four institutions reporting admitted that the question of academic freedom and tenure had received no recent consideration by the faculty.

The report reaches the following conclusions:

(1) "There has developed a considerable faculty influence in the control of appointments and dismissals in the institutions studied. Among these are both large and small institutions; both state and endowed institutions. It would seem from the replies that there has been less attention in state than in endowed institutions. Certainly the most completely organized plans for exercising faculty influence in protecting professional standards of academic freedom and tenure appear in the endowed institutions. The problem is more difficult to deal with in a state university on account of the legal relations, and this may explain the difference found.

(2) "The declarations of this Association are gradually becoming recognized as reasonable standards to be attained. An examination of the statutory provisions that have been adopted in recent years will clearly reveal internal evidence of familiarity with the principles of this Association. . . . It would seem, then, that gradually and with no blare of trumpets, the Association has been a potent influence in formulating an opinion in respect to the proper professional standing of the instructional staff of our colleges and universities; in determining what protection is necessary to promote research and the promulgation of truth; what procedure in terminating contractual relations is in keeping with the vital interest of the teacher or research student, and the dignity of the institution."

The evidence shows that the Association is performing an important function in developing a wise public opinion on questions of academic freedom and tenure and in formulating principles and practices in keeping with the dignity of the academic profession.⁵ While these two subjects mentioned in this article have occupied the major part of the energies of the Association to date, they do not exhaust the interests of the membership. These were the immediate questions to receive attention but the influence of the Association has been and will no doubt be, extended to other questions of vital concern to the profession as these may arise and become urgent.

⁵ At the recent annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges, it was voted to "suggest to the American Council of Education either the appointment of a joint commission on academic freedom and academic tenure from its constituent bodies, or the securing of an appointment of such a commission by each of such bodies, with a view of having concerted action and a statement of principles at the earliest possible time."

ERRATUM

MacDonald, John and Jessica Saunders. 2012. Are Immigrant Youth Less Violent? Specifying the Reasons and Mechanisms. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 641: 125–47.

Table 1 and Table 4 of the above article were printed with errors. In Table 1, under “Control Variable” the row labeled “Non-Latino (Y)” should have appeared as “Latino (Y)”. In Table 4, the last row labeled “Immigrant” should have been removed.

The correct tables appear below:

TABLE 1
Sample Descriptive Statistics of Key Measures

| | Nonimmigrant Household (n = 301) | Immigrant Household (n = 422) | Difference |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|
| Dependent variables | | | |
| Youth violent victimization (Y) (η) | 6.3% | 7.5% | |
| Steal something by force | 8.0% | 4.9% | |
| Threatened with a gun, knife, or club | 3.8% | 5.4% | |
| Hit so badly that he/she needed bandages or a doctor | 1.5% | 2.5% | |
| Attacked by a group of youth | 5.7% | 8.2% | |
| Witnessed group assault | 12.6% | 16.9% | |
| Independent variables | | | |
| Deviant attitudes and beliefs (Y) | 1.91 (.47) | 2.11 (.50) | ° |
| School and family bonds (Y) | 8.38 (1.01) | 8.24(1.12) | ° |
| Collective efficacy (P) | 2.96 (.48) | 2.71 (.44) | ° |
| Neighborhood disorder (P) | 1.45 (.41) | 2.03 (.65) | ° |
| Control variables | | | |
| Male (Y) | 57.3% | 51.9% | ° |
| Age (Y) | 15.35 (1.45) | 15.36 (1.42) | |
| Latino (Y) | 16.5% | 85.3% | ° |
| Household SES (P) | 3.96 (1.40) | 2.41 (1.25) | ° |

NOTE: P = parent survey; Y = youth survey.

°p < .001.

TABLE 4
 Doubly Robust (DR) Comparison of Immigrant
 and Nonimmigrant Household Status on Youth Violence

| | Immigrant Weighted | Nonimmigrant Weighted | Effect Size | DR Estimate (<i>z</i> -Value) |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| Immigrant | — | — | — | -.03 (-2.09) |
| Non-Latino | .48 | .52 | -.04 | |
| Age | 4.37 | 4.39 | -.005 | |
| Gender | .54 | .59 | -.05 | |
| SES | 3.15 | 3.28 | -.04 | |
| Deviant attitudes | 2.00 | 1.96 | .03 | |
| School and family bonds | 8.29 | 8.43 | -.06 | |
| Disorder | 1.75 | 1.65 | .08 | |
| Collective efficacy | 2.81 | 2.87 | -.06 | |

NOTE: *n* = 3,040 items, 608 individuals.