

The academic dialectic: Political positional views of professors in different fields of academic study

James E. Guffey, Ph.D.
National University, La Jolla, California

James G. Larson, J.D.
National University, La Jolla, California

Chandrika Kelso, J.D., Ph.D.
National University, La Jolla, California

ABSTRACT

The authors attempted to measure the political position/political affiliation of US university professors of criminal justice administration and criminology versus professors in other selected disciplines (social sciences, psychology, math/computer science, engineering, business administration, and the “hard sciences”). Our study was conducted in the presidential election year 2020. The study was designed to determine whether political affiliation of the selected disciplines had changed since studies conducted by Gross (2013), Lazarsfeld & Thielens’ (1958) and Ladd and Lipset’s (1975). The authors identified 18 dependent variable statements that could be considered either conservative leaning or liberal leaning, and the surveyed faculty were asked to respond to each of these 18 statements on a Likert Scale of 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3-no opinion, 2-disagree, and 1-strongly disagree. All responding faculty were also asked to identify their political affiliation as Democrat, Republican, Independent, Libertarian, and Other. Our study reveals the results of this survey as Chi-Square data.

Keywords: U.S. University Professors, Political Position, Political Survey, Chi-Square Data

Copyright statement: Authors retain the copyright to the manuscripts published in AABRI journals. Please see the AABRI Copyright Policy at <http://www.aabri.com/copyright.html>

INTRODUCTION

This study is the second one extrapolated from survey data conducted in 2019-2020 of the political leaning of professors of criminal justice administration, criminology and other selected disciplines not related to criminal justice administration and criminology. The other selected disciplines selected for this previous study were the social sciences, engineering, business administration, math/computer science, psychology and the physical sciences. The responses for the other selected disciplines were extremely small except for the social sciences. Our initial study titled, “Political Position and Political Opinions of U.S. University and College Professors in Selected Disciplines” showed that professors of criminal justice administration compared to professors of criminology are significantly more Republican leaning and that professors of criminology are more Democratic and Independent leaning. The authors encourage the readers of this research to read the findings in our previous research to get a perspective on our extant research.

This study presents aggregate data for all faculty responses to our 18 political statements for all 213 faculty respondents. Therefore, the authors are presenting the data from all faculty respondents regarding their political position on the 18 political statements. As previously identified, most of the responses to our survey came from a combination of criminal justice administration faculty (83) and criminology faculty (72) which is 73% of all faculty responses. Social Science faculty (26) comprised the third most responses—12%. The 18 political statements and 10 demographic questions are given in Appendix A.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Neil L. Gross (2013) presents the most detailed study of the liberalism of US university and college professors in the 21st Century. In his book, “Why Are Professors Liberal and Why Should Conservatives Care?”, he presents his case that university professors are significantly more liberal than the US population at large. Gross and Solon Simmons (2006) teamed to produce the Politics of American Professoriate (PAP) Survey. They surveyed 1416 university professors to determine their political affiliation, and their opinions on specific controversial political issues. Their study was a follow-up study of Lazarsfeld & Thielens’ (1958) and Ladd and Lipset’s (1975) studies of the political position of US University and College Professors.

Gross’s survey revealed that US university faculty were significantly skewed toward being Democrats or Independent-leaning Democrats versus Republicans.

Survey research shows that 51% of professors are Democrats, as compared to 35% of the voting-age American public. Among Independents, who compose a third of the faculty, those leaning Democratic out-number those leaning Republican by more than 2 to 1. That leaves the Republican Party only a 14% solid share of the professorial population, meaning the professoriate is less than half as Republican as the country as a whole (2013, p. 6-7).

Gross’s data is very similar to Lazarsfeld and Thielens’ (1958) and Ladd and Lipset’s (1975) data. Lazarsfeld and Thielens’ data centered exclusively on social scientist professors. Only 16% surveyed said they were Republicans. Forty-seven percent identified as Democrats, and of those who voted in the 1952 presidential election, 65% voted for Democrat Adlai Stevenson; whereas, in the US as a whole, Stevenson received 44% of the vote. Ladd and Lipset (1975), unlike Lazarsfeld and Thielens, surveyed professors in all disciplines. They reported that

the professoriate as a whole was more liberal and Democratic than the rest of the US. About 46% of professors in their survey identified themselves as left or liberal, 27% as moderates, and 28% conservative. In contrast, only 20% of the American public was left or liberal in the early 1970s. They also determined that social science professors were the most liberal; whereas, professors of medicine, business, engineering and agriculture were more conservative (Gross, p. 29).

There are many other studies that have documented the political disparity of Democratic versus Republican political leaning of university and college professors (see Sunstein, 2018; Jaschik, 2017; Whitsitt and Williams, 2019; Brow, 2017; Ream, 2014; Cargas, 2018; Bialstok, 2015; Wills, Brewster & Nowak, 2019; and Shields & Dunn, 2017). With this much coverage of this issue, there is some degree of concern among academicians that there is a reason to be alarmed that academe has been hijacked by the liberal left. In general, universities have abandoned the idea of tolerance and have taken a firm stance of being intolerant when it comes to conservative views.

Shields (2018) reported that the Carnegie Foundation survey of 1999 found that a mere 12% of professors were conservatives compared to 27% in 1969. Abrams (2019) used data from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). He determined that the ratio of liberal to conservative professors had increased about 350% since 1964. Jaschik (2017) determined that faculty members were more likely to categorize themselves as moderate (46.1%) than liberal (44.1%). Conservatives trailed at 9.2%.

Perhaps more alarming than these numbers is the exposure of conservative students to liberal agendas in the classroom.

SO WHAT!: SHOULD THIS BE A CONCERN?

It appears that university and college faculty, as a whole, lean toward a liberal orientation. Should this be a concern? If society were to believe that university faculty are indoctrinating their students to a liberal point of view, then yes, America should be concerned. For the most part, however, university faculty are not “brainwashing” their students to a liberal or even radical point of view. Research shows that professors in the social science disciplines share their political beliefs in the classroom more frequently than professors from non-social sciences disciplines. Other research indicates that undergraduate students who are politically conservative are not persuaded by liberal positions expressed by their faculty. However, students who progress through their Bachelor’s, Master’s and Ph.D. degrees--without having worked in an “eight-to-five” occupation--seem to join, agree with or accept the views and beliefs of their liberal professor mentors even if these students were moderates prior to joining academe. Most US universities require a period of pedagogical scrutiny before being granted tenure, which may explain the self-preservation leanings of some non-tenured professors in search of tenure.

There are a few brave tenured faculty who are willing to stand on their academic freedom to criticize their colleges for not allowing divergent views. Professor Samuel Abrams, a tenured professor at Sarah Lawrence College, boldly wrote an op-ed in the *New York Times* in which he criticized the College for embracing programs with names like “Stay Healthy, Stay Woke,” “Microaggressions,” and “Understanding White Privilege” without offering opposing viewpoints. His office door was vandalized, the college president accused him of attacking members of the college community, and a student group demanded his position at the college be put up for tenure review by none other than a panel of students and at least 3 faculty of color

(Flaherty, 2019). The authors believe this sort of egregious usurpation of academic freedom is an outlier in academe, but solidifies the position of this paper that conservatives should be concerned. It also explains why tenured and non-tenured faculty join in lock-step with their liberal fellow faculty members even if they were moderate or conservative politically before becoming a faculty member.

Fosse, Gross, and Ma (2014) sought to determine if there is bias against applicants for graduate studies in the leading American universities' departments of sociology, political science, economics, history, and English. Using subterfuge, they sent two emails to the faculty members in charge of graduate admissions: The control email made no mention of politics for one fake student; the other mentioned that the candidate had worked in either the McCain or Obama campaigns for president. They concluded that there were traces but no statistically or substantively significant evidence of bias (p. 20).

METHODOLOGY

This study is based on data from a survey deployed by the authors. The survey is attached as Appendix A and has 18 opinion questions and 10 demographic questions. The survey was uploaded via Survey Monkey with a URL that the potential respondents could use to access the survey. The authors developed the survey in 2019 using questions that were politically controversial at that time going into the 2020 presidential election period. The eighteen opinion questions ask the respondents to answer on a Likert scale of 1-5 with 1 being strongly disagree, 2 being disagree, 3 being no opinion, 4 being agree and 5 being strongly agree. The 10 demographic questions asked the respondents to respond to mostly nominal data categories such as age (ratio data), race, political affiliation, professorial rank, years of experience in higher education (ratio data), size of college or university, etc.

The authors obtained email addresses of possible professorial respondents by randomly selecting universities and colleges throughout the US through their websites. The random selection was based on the university or college's location geographically in an attempt to get a balance of universities and colleges throughout the 50 US states. In addition, when selecting a university or college, a specific discipline was targeted at this university or college so that the various disciplines identified for scrutiny as identified above in the Introduction were equally distributed. For example, Virginia Tech University was selected, and their engineering department was selected and a random selection of the faculty within the engineering department was sent the email requesting the faculty members to respond to the survey. All of the Historically Black Colleges/Universities were included. A total of 75 universities and colleges were surveyed for this study. Over 3,000 emails were sent to faculty at these universities and colleges asking for them to participate in the survey. The authors received 213 responses. In the following section, Findings and Results, the authors have presented the results of the 213 faculty responses comparing the nominal independent variables of political affiliation as defined as Democrat, Republican, Independent, Libertarian, and Other to the ordinal 18 dependent variables as will be identified in the following tables. The data from the Survey Monkey survey was entered into SPSS using the Analyze Chi-Square feature which is the most appropriate for nominal and ordinal data.

RESULTS

The following are the results/data from the survey for the 18 ordinal dependent variables, measured on a Likert Scale of 1-5 with 1=Strongly Disagree and 5=Strongly Agree, when correlated to the nominal categories of Democrat, Republican, Independent, Libertarian and Other Faculty. The Methodology Section identifies the author's method of gathering the data for this study. The results are presented in Tables 1-18 each representing one of the dependent variables queried. Each table gives an interpretation of the Chi-Square data, because Chi-Square values do not show the direction of significance as does, for example, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient of +1 = a perfect direct correlation and -1 = a perfect indirect correlation. The survey is displayed as Appendix A, and shows the definitions of each of the 18 dependent variables.

Table 1: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation for DV: Second Amendment

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	33.383	33.588	28.833	3.250	5.286
df	4	2	4	2	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.197	.259

Interpretation:

Significant disagreement at $p=.000$ for both Democrat and Independent faculty for support for the Second Amendment

Significant agreement at $p=.000$ for Republican faculty for support for the Second Amendment.

No significance for Libertarian and Other faculty.

Table 2: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation for DV: Social Programs

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	48.927	11.588	31.676	1.000	7.714
df	3	4	4	3	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.021	.000	.801	.052

Interpretation:

Significant agreement at $p=.000$ for both Democratic and Independent faculty for governments spending more on social programs and prison rehabilitation. Other faculty at $p=.052$ almost support spending more on social programs and prison rehabilitation.

Republican faculty disagree at $p=.021$ that more public funds should be spent on social programs and prison rehabilitation.

Libertarian faculty results not significant.

Table 3: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation for DV: Middle Class Too Much Fed and State Taxes

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertaria n	Other
Chi-Square	29.463	19.882	23.568	6.250	1.429
df	4	3	4	2	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.044	.699

Interpretation:

There was significant agreement, $p=.000$, among Democratic, Independent and Republican faculty that the American middle class is paying too much in federal and state taxes. There was also agreement of the Libertarian faculty at $p=.044$.

Other faculty not significant

Table 4: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation DV: Affirmative Action

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	39.220	5.706	38.278	3.000	6.000
df	4	4	4	3	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.222	.000	.392	.199

Interpretation:

There was strong agreement for Affirmative Action for both Democratic and Independent faculty at $p=.000$. Republican faculty Asymp. Sig. was $p=.222$ and not significant. Data for Libertarian and Other Faculty not significant.

Table 5: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation of DV: Concealed Weapon in Classroom

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	48.568	30.412	11.405	6.000	6.615
df	4	4	4	3	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.022	.112	.158

Interpretation:

Democratic faculty were strongly against, $p=.000$, allowing faculty to have a concealed weapon in the classroom.

Republican faculty were strongly in favor, $p=.000$, of allowing faculty to have a concealed weapon in the classroom.

Independent faculty were against, $p=.022$.

Libertarian and Other Faculty data was insignificant.

Table 6: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation of DV: DACA

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	107.878	11.588	26.110	2.000	1.000
df	4	4	4	4	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.021	.000	.736	.607

Interpretation:

Democratic faculty were very strongly in favor of DACA, Chi-Square value 107.878 $p=.000$.

Republican faculty were not in favor of DACA, $p=.021$.

Independent faculty were strongly in favor of DACA, $p=.000$.

Libertarian and Other faculty responses showed no significance.

Table 7: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation of DV: Military Style Weapons

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	18.732	21.059	9.534	1.000	6.000
df	4	3	4	3	4
Asymp. Sig.	.001	.000	.049	.801	.199

Interpretation:

Democratic faculty disagree, $p=.001$, that police departments should have military-style weapons.

Republican faculty strongly agree, $p=.000$, that police departments should have military-style weapons.

Independent faculty borderline agree, $p=.049$, that police departments should have military-style weapons.

Results for Libertarian and Other faculty are not significant.

Table 8: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation of DV: Student Debt

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	29.098	21.059	24.649	3.000	3.143
df	4	3	4	3	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.392	.534

Interpretation:

Both the Democratic and Republican faculty strongly agree, $p=.000$, that the student dept of 1.5 trillion should be paid by the federal government even if it means higher taxes on the wealthy and middle class.

Independent faculty strongly disagree, $p=.000$, that the federal government should pay the 1.5 trillion student dept.

The data for both the Libertarian and Other faculty is not significant.

Table 9: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation of DV: Support for Border Wall

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	104.341	17.061	30.051	1.750	5.286
df	4	3	4	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.001	.000	.417	.071

Interpretation:

Democratic, Republican, and Independent faculty strongly disagree; $p=.000$, $p=.001$ that they support a Border Wall with on the U.S.-Mexican border.

Libertarian and Other faculty responses were not significant.

Table 10—Chi-Square Value and Interpretation of DV: Police Hampered by Legislation in “Shoot/Don’t Shoot” Situations

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	39.220	5.706	38.278	3.000	6.000
df	4	4	4	3	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.222	.000	.392	.199

Interpretation:

Both the Democrat and Independent professors strongly disagreed that police are hampered by state and federal legislation in shoot/don’t shoot situations.

Results for Republican, Libertarian, and Other faculty are insignificant.

Table 11: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation of DV: Police Officers are Prone to Use Excessive Force on Non-White Suspects

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	83.073	17.765	21.946	1.750	5.429
df	5	4	4	2	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.001	.000	.417	.143

Interpretation:

Democratic and Independent faculty significantly agree, $p=.000$, that police officers use excessive force on non-White suspects versus White suspects.

Republican faculty significantly disagree, $p=.001$, that police officers use excessive force on non-White suspects versus White suspects.

Data for Libertarian and Other faculty are insignificant.

Table 12—Chi-Square Values and Interpretation of DV: Law Enforcement Officers in all 50 States and Federal Government Treat Minority Suspects Equally as White Suspects insofar as Reasonable Suspicion to Detain and Probable Cause to Arrest.

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	83.073	17.765	21.946	1.750	5.429
df	5	4	4	2	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.001	.000	.417	.143

Interpretation:

Democratic Professors significantly disagree. Republican Professors significantly agree Independent Professors significantly disagree. Libertarian and Other Professors’ data are insignificant.

Table 13: Chi-Square Value and Interpretation of DV: Professors Should on Occasion Interject Their Political Beliefs in Lectures

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	23.244	18.647	23.096	.250	8.286
df	4	4	4	2	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.001	.000	.882	.040

Interpretation:

Democratic, Republican, Independent and Other faculty strongly disagree or disagree (p=.000, p=.000, p=.001, and p=.040) that faculty should, on occasion, interject their political beliefs in class.

Data for Libertarian faculty is insignificant.

Table 14—Chi-Square Value and Interpretation of DV: University Supports Desire to Interject Political Opinion

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	53.732	11.882	24.806	3.000	8.286
df	4	4	4	3	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.018	.000	.392	.040

Interpretation:

This question had by far the most “no opinion” choices for all five of the faculty categories. This is probably because most, if not all, of the universities and colleges do not have a policy regarding expression of political opinion in class. Nevertheless, the data showed that Democratic, Republican, Independent and Other faculty ($p=.000$, $p=.018$, $p=.000$, and $p=.040$) strongly disagreed or disagreed that their universities supported expressing political position in class.

Libertarian faculty data was insignificant.

Table 15—Chi-Square Value and Interpretation for DV: Support the Death Penalty for First Degree Convictions

Dependent Variable: Support the Death Penalty for First Degree Convictions

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	80.732	20.412	7.216	.000	4.571
df	5	4	4	3	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.125	1.000	.334

Interpretation:

The Democratic faculty were strongly against the death penalty ($p=.000$); however, the Republican faculty were strongly in favor of the death penalty ($p=.000$). The data did not rise to significance for Independent, Libertarian, and Other faculty.

Table 16—Chi-Square Value and Interpretation for DV: College/University Prefers Full-time Faculty Who are Liberal vs. Conservative

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	39.707	11.588	15.917	2.000	4.000
df	4	4	4	4	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.021	.003	.736	.135

Interpretation:

Democratic Faculty strongly disagreed ($p=.000$) as did the Independent faculty ($p=.003$). Republican faculty agreed ($p=.021$). Both the Libertarian and Other faculty data was insignificant.

Note: For all five of the faculty categories, there were a significant number of No Opinion responses.

Table 17—Chi-Square Values and Interpretation of DV: Support Student Campus Protests Against Wrongful Governmental Actions

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Libertarian	Other
Chi-Square	44.864	10.000	10.730	2.000	2.429
df	4	3	4	1	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.019	.030	.157	.657

Interpretation:

Chi Square data reveal that Democratic Faculty are strongly supportive of student campus protest; whereas, Republican faculty are not supportive of student campus protests.

Independent Faculty are also supportive of student campus protests but not to the extent of Democratic Faculty. Libertarian and Other faculty data are insignificant.

Table 18—Chi-Square Values and Interpretation of DV: Support Students Who Tear Down Monuments

Political Party	Democrat	Rep	Independent	Other
Chi-Square	27.580	43.059	50.459	
df	4	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.788

Interpretation:

On the question, “support for students who tear down monuments either on or off campuses,” there was rare agreement among Democratic, Republican, and Independent faculty and the agreement was strongly against this behavior in all three cases. In fact, the Independent faculty exceeded the Republican faculty in strongly disagreeing with this behavior. Libertarian data was all Significantly Disagree and is not measured in Chi-Square.

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

How can these results be interpreted? Professors who indicate as being Republican support more of the 18 dependent variables that are clearly Republican supported positions, and the professors who indicate as being Democrat or Independent support more of the 18 dependent variables that are clearly Democratic supported positions. One exception is the unified non-support of students who tear down monuments. The data for faculty identifying as Libertarian or Other were most often insignificant.

Recommendations

In our study, faculty who aligned with the Democrat or Independent parties (73.46%) significantly outnumbered Republican (16.11%), and Libertarian plus Other (10.43%). This aligns with the previously cited studies (Gross, 2013; Ladd & Lipset, 1975; Lazarsfeld & Thielens, 1958). Time and many studies have shown that U.S. university faculty have been and continue to be predominately Democratic or Independent, and a significant proportion of these Democratic and Independent leaning faculty are liberal, ultra-liberal, or progressive. Should this be a concern to Americans in general? The authors believe the emphatic answer is yes. Even though liberal-leaning faculty may not interject their political beliefs in lectures, it is inevitable that their liberal-leaning beliefs will emerge in assignments and grading. For example, in a Sociology 101 course that has the students write an essay on social justice, a

police officer or correctional officer takes and supports with articles a stance that social justice is as just as it can be in a capitalist nation like the US, but receives a poor grade based on what the liberal-leaning professor expected to read and used as his/her grading criteria.

Even though academia believes this does not occur, it most certainly does. Experienced faculty--such as me and my co-authors--know this does occur. The three of us are Republican-leaning faculty. Nevertheless, we would never down-grade a student based on a liberal or progressive position in a written assignment. Our university, National University, insists that all courses incorporate grading rubrics which emphasize critical thinking, excellent writing skills, library research, and an open-minded approach to all assignments versus political leaning.

Universities and colleges will be able to move toward a more politically balanced faculty only when they hire a more balanced faculty. The way to do this in criminal justice administration and criminology programs is to hire more faculty who identify as Republican. The authors are not suggesting that a hiring announcement ask an applicant's political affiliation; this is most certainly illegal. Rather placing emphasis on the applicant's work experience can generally accomplish the objective of the balance needed at least in academic programs of criminal justice and criminology. This was proven in our first study, Political Position and Political Opinions of U.S. University and College Professors in Selected Disciplines.



REFERENCES

- Bialystok, L. (2015, January 15). Politics without “brainwashing:” A philosophical defense of social justice education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(3), 413-444.
- Brow, M.V. (2017, May-August). Why there are no conservative professors and why do conservatives care: Implications for Christian scholarship. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 26(2), 211-222.
- Brow, M.V. (2017). Perceptions of intellectual diversity among religious/conservative undergraduate seniors at highly selective US universities: Is the university a liberal hegemony? *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 26(3), 251-270.
- Cargas, S. (2018, March 1). Social justice education in honors: Political but non-partisan. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, 33-38.
- Fosse, E., Gross, N., & Ma, J. (2014). Political bias in higher education: A field experiment. *Professors and Their Politics*, 109-134. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gross, N. (2013). *Why are professors liberal and why do conservatives care?* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Jaschik, S. (2017, February 17). Professors and politics: What the research says. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved on December 6, 2019, from insidehighered.com/news/2017/02/27/research-confirms-professors-lean-left-questions-assumptions-about-what-means.
- Kearns, M. (2018, November 6). Viewpoint diversity dies at Sarah Lawrence college. *National Review*. Retrieved on April 16, 2020 from, nationalreview.com/2018/11/college-professor-targeted-over-op-ed-viewpoint-diversity/
- Ladd, E.C., & Lipset, S.M. (1975). *The divided academy: Professors and politics*. New York, N.Y: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F., & Thielens, W. (1958). *The academic mind: Social scientists in a time of crisis*. Glencoe, Il.: Free Press.
- Ream, T.C. (2014, January). Why are professors liberal and why do conservatives care (briefly noted). *First Things: A Monthly Journal of Religious and Public Life*, 239, 67.
- Shields, J.A (Fall, 2019). The disappearing conservative professor. *National Affairs*, 41, 1-12. Retrieved on December 26, 2019, from <https://nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/the-disappearing-conservative-professor>
- Shields, J.A., & Dunn, J.M. (2017, February). Passing on the right: Conservative professors in the progressive university. *Society*, 54(1), 89.
- Sunstein, C.R. (2018, September 17). The problem of all those liberal professors. *Technology and Issues*. Retrieved on December 6, 2019, from <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2018-09-17/collegeshavewaytoomanyliberals>, p. 1-16.
- Wills, J.B., Brewster, Z.W., & Nowak, G.R. (2019, March). Student’s religion and perception of professors: Some empirical lessons for sociologists. *American Sociologists*, 50(1), 136-153.
- Wills, J.B., Brewster, Z.W., & Nowak, G.R. (2018, July 25). Students’ religiosity and perceptions of professor bias: Some empirical lessons for sociologists. *American Sociology* 50, 136-153. Retrieved from EBSCO data base, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-018-9388-y>

APPENDIX A:**Survey Monkey Survey of Political Leaning of Faculty in Designated Academic Disciplines**

I believe in the 2nd Amendment right to bear arms.

I believe all governments--local, state, and federal--should spend more funds on social programs such as welfare, affordable housing, and prison rehabilitation.

I believe the American middle class is paying too much in federal and state taxes.

I support affirmative action programs that assist underprivileged students in getting access to their choices of colleges and universities.

I believe college and university professors should have the option to have a concealed firearm in class, if he/she has received and passed the firearms training necessary to carry a concealed weapon.

I support the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Program and do not want to see it repealed.

I believe the police in the U.S. should have military-style weapons available (such as armored vehicles, high-powered automatic weapons, drones, etc.) in the event of an overwhelming crisis such as a domestic terrorist attack.

I believe that student debt, calculated to be 1.5 trillion dollars as of July 2019, should be paid by the federal government, even if it means higher taxes on the wealthy and middle-class Americans.

I support a border wall between the U.S. and Mexico.

I believe policing in the U.S. has been hampered by state legislation which has placed an undue burden on police officers in "shoot/don't shoot" situations.

I believe most police officers are prone to use excessive force on non-White suspects versus White suspects.

I believe that law enforcement officers in all 50 states and the federal government generally treat minority suspects equally as White suspects insofar as reasonable suspicion to detain and probable cause to arrest.

I believe that college and university professors should, on occasion, interject their political beliefs and opinions in their lectures.

My college/university supports my desire to occasionally interject my opinion in lectures on controversial political topics that are contemporary, even if the topic does not pertain to my discipline.

I support the death penalty for First Degree Murder convictions.

My university prefers full-time faculty whose political leaning is liberal versus conservative.

I support student campus protest against governmental actions they see as wrongful (immigration policies, right-wing marches, unequal distribution of wealth) even if it amounts to civil disobedience (such as blocking sidewalks, entrances to classrooms, taking over campus buildings, or the Occupy Movement of 2011-2012).

I support students who see what they perceive as injustice, such as civil war monuments on campus or in the town or city surrounding, and take action of their own to tear down these monuments.

