STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2010

Freedom And Comfort In Academically-related Political Discussions Among Economics And Political Science Faculty In A State Unive

John Hilston
University of Central Florida

Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

FREEDOM AND COMFORT IN ACADEMICALLY-RELATED POLITICAL
DISCUSSIONS AMONG ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY IN
A STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

by

JOHN HILSTON
B.S. Grove City College, 1996
M.A. Cleveland State University, 1998

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Research, Technology, and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2010

Major Professor: Rosa Cintrón

ABSTRACT

This investigation explored whether there was a relationship between comfort in discussing political views and faculty members' political party preferences. The questions of whether political comfort differed based on gender, religious affiliation, academic discipline, and/or institutional affiliation were also explored.

Both economics and political science faculty did not report comfort in discussing political views in the context of departmental committee service. Economics faculty either did not report on their colleagues' political views or they disagreed with their colleagues' political views. Political science faculty either did not report on their colleagues' political views or they agreed with their colleagues' political views. Also, this investigation found minimal ethnic and political diversity among the respondents.

With love and gratitude

this work is dedicated to my family,

for their love, support,

and faith in my ability to accomplish this goal.

I love you Dana, Alexa, Jimmy, Peter, and Elmo!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

my brother-in-law, Jason, my nephews, Peyton and Landon, and my brother, Chuck, for their love, support, and encouragement to pursue and reach this goal. I would be remiss if I did not mention my loving maternal grandparents, Jerome and Esther Flanigan, my loving paternal grandparents, Raymond and Elizabeth Hilston, my brother-in-law, Darryl Strack, his wife, Kathy, and my nephew, Conner. I have so many other awesome friends and family members--too numerous to name here (unfortunately). You know who you are, and you are in my heart! A final thank you goes to my lifelong friends, Gary Delano, Tom Guerra, Pat Herring, and Jon Stemple.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS

Introduction

At the time of the present study, most faculty members defined their jobs as the

complex combination of teaching, research, and service.

> As late as 1869, Charles W. Eliot, on assuming the Harvard presidency, had
> asserted that "the prime business of American professors. . . must be regular and
> assiduous class teaching". . . but thirty years later, on the eve of his retirement,
> was moved to declare that the appointment and promotion of professors at his
> institution depended as much on their "success as investigators" as on their
> teaching prowess. Reflected in this altered expectation was the arrival in the
> interim of the American research university. . . .(Metzger, 1987, p. 135)

Teaching, research, and service gradually became part of the mission of Harvard and

many other universities. "In the last quarter of the nineteenth century. . . residents and

professors grafted together the two ideals of research and teaching into an innovative

structure called the university-college" (Cuban, 1999, p. 14). This movement roughly

paralleled changes in writing instruction.

> Before the 1870s, writing was taught as ancillary to speaking, and that, as a result,
> formal writing instruction was essentially training in handwriting. . . two new
> ideals of academic life, research and utilitarian service, shaped writing instruction
> into its modern forms. (Russell, 1991)

> Teaching, research, and service have been included in most mission statements.

One such research mission, that of the University of Central Florida, provided a broad

definition of research:

> Basic and applied research, as well as creative activity, are integral parts of a
> quality education. UCF faculty members are scholar-teachers. As such, they
> create new knowledge, new points of view, and new means of expression in a
> broad range of academic, professional, and socially significant areas. Their

creativity fosters innovation as they convey their results, methods, values, and expressions to students, colleagues, and the public. (UCF Graduate Catalog, 2009)

The origin of research missions in universities dates back to the 19th century:

the emerging nineteenth-century [German] academic system organized both teaching and research around individual professorial chairs which, in theory at least, were to be given only to scholars of great distinction. . . without much interference from university bodies or government. (Mommsen, 1987, p. 65)

The "limited interference" aspect arises from the German traditions of

"Lernfreiheit" and "Lehrfreiheit." American universities adopted parts of the Lernfreiheit

tradition. Lernfreiheit has been defined as "the freedom to teach. . . the absence of

administrative presence in the learning situation" (Hamilton, 2002, p. 65). That said,

"during the post-Civil War development of the modern university in the United States. . .

the [American] professoriate chose not to accept the complementary German university

tradition of Lehrfreiheit, the freedom to learn" (Hamilton, p. 65). Under the

"Lehrfreiheit" tradition, university students in Germany retained significant control over

their programs of study.

In the United States, academic freedom has come to be defined as follows:

Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results. . . are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment. (American Association of University Professors, 1940)

Faculty at many institutions in the United States have been responsible for creating "new

knowledge, new points of view, and new means of expression" (UCF Graduate Catalog,

2009). A balanced examination of competing ideas should be an essential part of any

faculty role, especially for faculty at colleges that strive to broaden "the range of scientific and cultural topics on which students can exercise discernment, logic, and balanced judgment" (Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 1994, pp. 3-4).

Faculty members regularly encounter competing perspectives.

> The clash of competing ideas is an important catalyst, not only for the expansion of knowledge but also in students' development of independent critical judgment. Recognizing this dynamic, many well-intentioned observers underline the importance of "teaching all sides of the debate" in college classrooms. Teaching the debates is important but by no means sufficient. It is also essential that faculty help students learn--through their college studies--to engage differences of opinion, evaluate evidence, and form their own grounded judgments about the relative value of competing perspectives. (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006)

For instance, political scientists have debated the relative merits of direct democracies and republics. Management theorists have argued about when and where to effectively use a "free-reign" management style. Educators have discussed the pros and cons of school vouchers, and economists have often disagreed about economic inequality and the general health of the economy.

The competition among ideas is relevant for faculty and students. If only selected or limited ideas are addressed, knowledge will remain incomplete. It is possible that time limitations and student grade standing might be determinants of whether certain discussions or segments of information are included in a class. It is also possible that parts of the subject matter, due to various constraints, might be treated in a sufficiently superficial manner so as to ignore fundamental conflicts.

However, if a professor did not teach students about school vouchers because he heard a more senior colleague speak vehemently against the idea, students would not

benefit from the knowledge available. If a researcher found evidence that contradicted the conventional wisdom of a particular discipline but was afraid to publish it, the literature would be weaker rather than stronger. Furthermore, the situation in which faculty may feel uncomfortable espousing certain academically germaine stands on issues can be further compromised by the very structure and dynamics of the department. In an academic department, a "determined minority may have an impact far out of proportion to its numbers. A department is basically a small work group, and its members will often yield to the sentiments of a minority to avoid internal division" (Hamilton & Hargens, 1993, p. 621). Even when division is avoided, conflict may still be present. "Conflict in intergroup relations is often ideological" (Tucker, p. 200). "Serious conflict is often accompanied by feelings of fear, anxiety, or anger. . . " (Tucker, 1984, p. 218).

This ideological conflict may include a competition between political views. Different from a completely free exchange of ideas without consequence, this political ideological conflict takes place within a structure characterized by unequal power relationships. The structure of faculty governance gives senior faculty significant control over evaluation and retention of junior faculty. Some believe that "the tenure system acts against academic freedom" (McCart, 1991, p. 240).

> The belief underlying these viewpoints is that either the administration will make working conditions so uncomfortable he or she will conform or resign, or that faculty will not undertake controversial projects because doing so will harm their chances for tenure and promotion. (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996, p. 27)

An important connection is established here between constrained expression in an academic role and the limitation it places on academic freedom. Comfort is identified as a possible measuring stick.

Tierney and Bensimon (1996)contended that those engaged in "controversial projects" will be made to feel uncomfortable. It is within this very discomfort that we find the roots of the threats to academic freedom. Given that openness to competing ideas requires an environment that comfortably fosters diversity of thought, the question then becomes, "Do academics embrace a broad spectrum of ideological positions?". Most of the efforts to respond to this question focus broadly on political party affiliation and self-identified political positions.

A study conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1989found that professors in the United States were more liberal in their ideological orientations than the general population (Carnegie Foundation, 1989). As recently as 2001, the results of a Brookings Institution survey of professional associations indicated that self-identified Democrats exceeded self-identified Republicans by ratios of 4:1 in economics and history, 5:1 in political science, and 47:1 in sociology (Brookings, 2001). A 2004-2005 UCLA survey found that 51.3% of American faculty members self-identified as far left or liberal, while 19.5% self-identified as far right or conservative. The remaining 29.2% self-identified as middle of the road (The Chronicle Almanac, 2008, p. 26).

Hamilton and Hargens (1993) stated that "the incidence of leftism has been considerably exaggerated" (p. 603). Ladd and Lipset (1975) have written that monolithic

5

liberalism is limited and only tends to occur at either elite institutions, such as Harvard or

University of California-Berkeley, or within certain disciplines, e.g., the social sciences.

Hamilton and Hargens, in discussing a 1969 Carnegie Foundation study, reported

> . . . a clear, but modest, relationship between quality of institution and the frequency of both liberal and leftist identifications. By 1984 that pattern was substantially changed. . . the high quality liberal arts colleges showed a striking opposite pattern with both liberal and leftist sentiments increasing over the fifteen years. This put them at "the top of the list" of combined liberal-left sentiment, well ahead of the prestigious research universities. (pp. 620-621)

While their interpretations were different, both researchers (Ladd, 1975; Hamilton, 1993)

cited data from the Carnegie surveys (1969, 1989). There is, clearly, a need for more

adequate information on the subject.

Up to the present, most studies of faculty political perspective have been focused

on measuring faculty members' political orientations and party affiliation. This concern

with academic freedom and the manner in which it might be impacted by the holding of

non-hegemonic ideas requires that we consider whether individuals within the academy

have or have not felt discomfort attributable to differences in ideology. This study was

conducted to explore the comfort among faculty members in a state university system in

discussing academically-related political views.

<u>Need for the Study</u>

While several researchers have conducted research addressing faculty members'

political views (Klein & Stern, 2005; Rothman, Lichter, & Nevitte, 2005a), this was the

first study to address faculty members' perceptions of their comfort in discussing political

6

views with colleagues. For the purpose of this investigation, the level of ease of faculty

members in these discussions was termed "political comfort." One of the key

assumptions that the researcher made in this study was that political comfort would

enhance academic freedom.

Former U.S. Secretary of Education William J. Bennett (1986) expressed the

following perspective on this topic:

> For if you cannot hold or express or argue for an unorthodox view at a university without risk of penalty, either explicit penalty or social disdain, the university will collapse like a deck of cards, falling of its own weight. If we cannot protect the basic principle of academic freedom, then we cannot even begin to hope that our colleges and universities will evolve into a recognizable imitation of what they claim to be. (p. 21)

Young (1997) echoed this view, and added a warning about treating this important

freedom responsibly:

> The faculty must be able to accomplish their functions without discrimination or the fear of reprisal from forces that might be inside the institution but external to their work. . . Freedom and responsibility synergize each other, and the society that understands the potency in their relationship is better served by it. When all of society's heretics are quieted, the academy is no longer free. (pp. 49-50)

It becomes apparent from even a perfunctory reading and comparison of the writings of

Bennett and Young that they have disagreed on many issues. What is shown with these

quotations is that the ideal of stronger academic freedom tends to unite individuals with

otherwise varying world views.

Statement of the Problem

In 1969, 83.9% of a combined sample of 2-year and 4-year baccalaureate faculty members agreed that "faculty are free to express relevant ideas in class;" by 1998, that number had dropped to 62.9% (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 497). There has not been a clear explanation for why this perception of freedom dropped so much.

One possible explanation can be found in the literature related to marginalization. Organizations and associations tend to marginalize non-hegemonic thought.

> While employees' use of place as a discursive resource to contest the hegemony of the SMT was, at least in part, effective, it was also intensely problematic for them. . . What is more, they said, senior staff were reluctant to visit other parts of the college, leading those working at other sites to feel marginalized and alienated. . . (Brown & Humphreys, 2006, pp. 243-244)

This literature describes unequal power relationships among faculty and the marginalization of those that deviate from an accepted norm. While the AAUP (1940) holds that, "Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results. . . are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject. . .," very limited protection is afforded those in subordinate positions. This study explored whether the constraints imposed by the governance model of higher education limited the expression of political views associated with academic disciplines necessary for academic freedom.

Hauptli (2005) discussed the comfort that can be found in academic freedom, even by those who seek to constrain it:

> Those who would restrict academic freedom should find comfort in the very academic freedom they would fight. If the views which they would restrict are

wrong, then the very academic freedom they rebel against will serve to expose such error.

Klein and Stern (2005) concluded, "Our results support the view that the social-sciences and humanities faculty are pretty much a one-party system. . . . Quite possibly, the academic environment, even in economics, keeps the minority voices muffled and fearful" (p. 14). Klein and Stern did not specify how or why one's political perspective would make one "muffled and fearful" in academic matters. Herein lies a reason for exploring the concept of political comfort.

In summary, a comprehensive review of the literature has indicated that a vast majority of professors identify with liberal viewpoints. Given this ideological imbalance, are conservative academics comfortable discussing and sharing their views? For that matter, are liberal faculty comfortable expressing their views? These questions merited investigation.

Theoretical Framework--Political Comfort

The theoretical framework for this research is one that exists at the convergence of various conceptual understandings. Whereas the literature on academic freedom provided the general context of the study, the researcher sought to explore the degree to which faculty were comfortable in expressing academically-related political views. As those views are constrained, we can consider theories of marginalization as part of the framework. Alternatively, the literature on comfort will provide the conceptual tools for

9

understanding those situations in which faculty perceive expression to be unconstrained. For the purpose of this study, the theoretical framework was based on comfort.

Paterson and Zderad (1988) believed that comfort was an "umbrella under which. . . growth, health, freedom, and openness--could be sheltered" (p. 107). However, there are numerous interpretations of comfort ranging from notions of consolation to satisfaction to freedom from anxiety. It is precisely this latter interpretation that this study will use. This parallels the idea of "freedom from stress" that Bruner (1996) described as "the 'resource' required for a mind to operate effectively" (pp. 8-9).

In this study, comfort was defined according to Kolcaba (2003), who posited that "Comfort is the immediate experience of being strengthened by having needs for relief, ease, and transcendence met. . ." (p. 14). Kolcaba's Comfort Theory has generally been applied to the practice of nursing. This investigation was focused specifically on Kolcaba's sociocultural comfort context. Sociocultural comfort pertains "to interpersonal. . . and societal relationships including. . . education and support" (Kolcaba, p. 15).

The premise of the present study was that faculty members will function best when they are not anxious or, alternatively stated, when they perceive comfort. For the purpose of this investigation, the researcher merged this element of academic freedom with Kolcaba's theory on comfort to create a new variable of interest, political comfort. Within this study, political comfort referred to a faculty member's perception of an absence of anxiety while engaging in academically-related political discussions with colleagues.

<u>Assumptions</u>

It was assumed that faculty members' perceptions of comfort are an important determinant of whether they will fully participate in an academic discussion with colleagues that involves an exchange of competing political viewpoints. This interaction is essential if there is to be a free "marketplace of ideas." Boswell, Cannon & Miller expressed the need for multiple views as follows:

> The individual must learn to view the world through many different sets of eyes or perceptions. The individual's myopic view must be expanded to see the world from the different disciplines, individual, and community views rather than just one aspect" (Boswell, Cannon, & Miller, 2005, p. 6).

The benefit to the mind of sharing and exploring new ideas was further illustrated in the report of one doctoral student by Young (2007):

> One woman, a Ph.D. student in the social sciences at a Midwestern university, told me recently that when she started reading conservative, libertarian, or otherwise heretical blogs, 'It was a whole perspective I had never been exposed to before in anything other than caricature.' When that's the norm, the harm is less to dissenters than to the life of the mind. It's not good for any group of people to spend a lot of time listening only to like-minded others.

Free trade in ideas can be beneficial for all, and true academic freedom is necessary for this exchange to take place.

It was assumed, in this study, that when comfort is perceived, marginalization is not perceived. It was also assumed that political comfort is closely related to academic freedom. The underlying assumption was that true academic freedom only exists where political comfort is perceived.

Research Questions

The following research questions were explored:

1. Is there a relationship between political comfort and faculty members' political party preferences?

2. Does political comfort differ based on gender or religious affiliation?

3. Does political comfort differ based on academic discipline - specifically economics and political science?

4. Does political comfort differ based on institutional affiliation--specifically University of Florida, The Florida State University, and University of South Florida?

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to Florida Public Colleges and Universities that were classified as "Research I" under the 1994 Carnegie Classification System. Only faculty members in economics and political science were surveyed as to their perceptions of political comfort. States and institutions of higher learning have their own unique demographic characteristics. Therefore, the ability to generalize beyond the results of the current study was limited.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter has been organized to provide a review of the literature and related research. Included is a brief history of the professoriate. Attention is also devoted to faculty marginalization, academic freedom, tenure, the tenure process, political freedom of expression, and the marketplace of ideas. Comfort theory and the political comfort of the American professoriate are explored. A body of research that addresses faculty politics, i.e., an overview of faculty politics studies and a review of the research and various findings of faculty politics researchers, are also reviewed.

A Brief History of the Professoriate

The concept of the professoriate will be explored by reviewing its origin and briefly examining its development. This will assist readers in understanding the professoriate as it existed at the time of the proposed study. Over time, there have been a number of changes in the composition and training of the professoriate.

Eastern education had its beginnings in ancient times where it was governed by a strong authority which varied from one country to another. Whether the educational system was guided by the traditions of China, the caste system of India, the state of Persia, or the theology of Judaism, the main purpose was to train people to take their place in society (Painter, 1999). In Ancient Egypt, the priests were designated as the representatives of learning and the intellectual leaders of the people, and they were the

13

only ones who served in that role (Painter). Philosophers and teachers such as Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle played important roles in the history of Greek education. Plato called education "the business of the state" (Painter, p. 61). Greek society was dominated by these well-known male philosophers.

The monasteries of the Middle Ages were the places where knowledge was stored and preserved. The church thought of education as a part of its main operation, and most instruction was based in theology (Painter, 1999). The cathedral of Paris became a university which focused on theology. It was considered by many to be the most important center of learning in Europe (Painter).

Numerous universities were created in Germany in the 15th century based on the expanding interest in science. In the 16th century, the Reformation led to an explosion of interest in culture and higher learning. Still, the monarchical system dominated much of Europe, and the professoriate continued to be a fraternity composed largely of white Christian males while being exclusionary to most others (Painter, 1999).

In the United States, Harvard College was founded in 1636. Many other New England and Eastern colleges soon followed, and they retained many of the traditions of their European counterparts. Oberlin College, founded in 1833 in Ohio, had a unique goal: to provide equal education to everyone, even those of differing races, creeds, and genders. The Presbyterian-influenced college was the beginning of a more inclusive educational system in the U.S. that was strengthened by legal intervention and lobbying for public support (Goodchild & Wechsler, 1989). The Morrill Land-Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890 provided land that was to be used for the construction of colleges. This showed

how important the U.S. federal government believed higher education was to the development of the nation (Goodchild & Wechsler).

A number of court decisions and legislative acts, as well as significant cultural and societal changes, have increased the number of women, minorities, and individuals with disabilities who qualified and have been hired into the U.S. professoriate. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 provided opportunities to those who previously had limited access to the labor market. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 set up the EEOC (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission). The EEOC aimed to prevent discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and/or national origin (United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2004). Though diversity within academe has increased, blacks have continued to make up a very small percentage of most university faculties (Metzger, 1987).

More recently, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) addressed a different kind of discrimination in the workplace. Originally passed in 1990, the ADA was updated as the Americans with Disabilities Amendments Act and signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2008. It stated in part that a disabled person who, "with or without accommodations," can perform a job in an adequate manner should not be prevented from seeking or obtaining that job (Barton, 2009).

In 1980, 68% of U.S. college and university faculty members were white males, 23% were white females, 6% were minority males, and 3% were minority females (Aguirre, 2000). Throughout much of history, the professoriate has remained largely a fraternity of white males, and the professoriate has often been exclusionary to others

(Painter, 1999). By 2007, some shifts in these numbers were evident: 44.7% of U.S.

college and university faculty members were white males, 32.1% were white females,

9.5% were minority males, 7.5% were minority females, .9% were race/ethnicity

unknown males, .7% were race/ethnicity unknown females, 3.0% were nonresident alien

males, and 1.5% were nonresident alien females (U.S. Department of Education, 2008b).

While there have been multiple policy and structural interventions, these have not

changed some of the fundamental attitudes and behaviors of the professoriate. For

instance, there has been a tendency to marginalize non-hegemonic thought. A study of

three distinct cohorts of workers in a recently merged U.K.-based College of Further

Education examined how each cohort understood their group and their organization's

identities.

> While employees' use of place as a discursive resource to contest the hegemony
> of the [senior management team] was, at least in part, effective, it was also
> intensely problematic for them. . . What is more, they said, senior staff were
> reluctant to visit other parts of the college, leading those working at other sites to
> feel marginalized and alienated. . . (Brown & Humphreys, 2006, pp. 243-244)

Those that deviate from an accepted norm--including the political norm--may find

themselves marginalized. The premise of the present study was that faculty members

function best when they perceive comfort.

Marginalization of Faculty and Climate

A history of marginalization exists in higher education. Throughout much of

history, the professoriate has remained largely a fraternity of white males and has often

been exclusionary of others (Painter, 1999). There have been a number of cases of

16

marginalization of females and ethnic/racial minorities. It will be demonstrated in this review of the literature that any deviation from the norm can lead to marginalization. For instance, organizations and associations have had a tendency to marginalize non-hegemonic thought.

Newly hired professors have said that policies to address issues of fair treatment could be valuable, but that they were not really sure the policies were being followed (Smith, 2007). Specifically, faculty of color have faced a number of issues in the academy. Baez (1998) stated that "the tenure process is stressful for all faculty members, and most faculty members would probably report hostility from colleagues and other negative experiences at their institutions" (p. 1). Some faculty of color identified "white liberals" who were unfair to minorities because they did not "meet their expectations" (Baez, p. 10). Baez also noted that one African-American full professor stated that some racism was present in the academic community, but that many of the people involved were "making a mountain out of a molehill" (p. 9).

One of the most important issues for faculty of color was the notion of being perceived as less qualified due to affirmative action hiring. The minority community has been sensitive to this issue and considered it as an unfavorable stigma (Baez, 1998). Some minority faculty members perceived racism in instances where their research was considered less valuable if it "challenged established theories of race, or if it was not published in mainstream journals" (Baez, pp. 12-13). An Asian-American faculty member expressed concern that faculty members who "fight back" might destroy their chances to achieve tenure (Baez, p. 22).

17

Female faculty members have also faced a number of issues in the academy. Those who have advocated policies that are family-friendly claim that the academic community has a lot of work to do to provide adequate support for faculty members who are raising families. However, faculty members who do not have children have expressed the belief that it is unfair to provide extra benefits to those who have children (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004).

O'Connor and Yanus (2009) reported that, "Despite significant progress for the representation of women in government, this study confirms that the climate for women in political science and politics remains cool" (p. 115). Investigations in other fields have echoed this "chilly climate" concern. In a study that focused on women in science and engineering fields, Callister (2006) wrote:

> There is a strong direct effect of department climate on outcomes suggesting that department climate is an important factor for universities to consider when attempting to improve faculty job satisfaction and intentions to quit. The second important finding of this study is that while gender influences job satisfaction and intention to quit (female faculty members report significantly lower levels of job satisfaction and higher intentions to quit), this relationship is completely mediated by department climate. This indicates that female faculty members are not inherently unsatisfied or unhappy with their jobs, but rather that it is likely that they value department climate, such that when they experience negative department climates they are more likely to experience lower job satisfaction and consider going elsewhere. . .Extrapolating from this, the evidence suggests that female faculty members may be more aware of and place more value on the quality of interactions that take place within departments. (pp. 373-374)

It is conceivable that a negative climate could foster other negative perceptions on the part of faculty members.

Aguirre (2000) stated that, "women faculty perceive the academic workplace as using gender as a status characteristic for allocating resources and opportunity" (p. 42).

Also, women and minority faculty members have indicated that they must be congenial and cooperative in order to be accepted (Aguirre, p. 57). It has been suggested by some that minority faculty try to prove "that they are equal to White faculty," and that they do so by becoming overachievers (Aguirre, p. 72).

Individuals who have different racial or cultural backgrounds from the majority in an organization can experience marginalization (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009). Though marginalization of females and ethnic/racial minorities has been recognized as occurring, anyone who does not fit the prevailing model of faculty is at risk of being marginalized in the academy. Baez (1998) has indicated that all White colleagues and, most specifically, White males are seen as the "intentional or unintentional oppressors" (p. 9). Some of the literature reviewed recognized the possibility of such problems for Christian academics. One Christian academic, Copan (2003) wrote:

> Western academics like to cite John Stuart Mill's book *On Liberty* in favor of individual rights, but they often fall prey to the very error Mill condemns: the tyranny of opinion that makes "eccentricity a reproach". Today a tyranny of opinion makes the eccentricity of Christianity a reproach. We should all – with mutual respect and civility and despite our disagreements – stand together against it. (p. 8)

Organizations and associations have tended to marginalize non-hegemonic thought.

There has also been a potential for marginalization of faculty members based on political-ideological perspective. Conservatives and liberals have occasionally differed in their views of faculty members. The conservative image describes the academy as a "vehicle for faculty to alter values in society" while the liberal humanist sees faculty as

involved in the introduction of "ideas into society that result in constructive social change" (Aguirre, 2000, p. 22). If political-ideological perspective becomes a consideration in the allocation of resources and opportunities, academic freedom can be weakened rather than strengthened.

<div align="center">Academic Freedom</div>

In the United States, academic freedom has come to be defined as follows:

> Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results. . . are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment. (American Association of University Professors, 1940)

Currently, ". . .individuals increasingly rely on segmented and differential definitions [of academic freedom] that reflect on their institutional, disciplinary, and individual viewpoints" (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996, p. 26).

A key assumption of the present study was that true academic freedom only exists where political comfort is perceived. Since curriculum development includes an evaluation of "the worth of, and priorities among, different types of knowledge. . ." (Lucas, 1996, p. 124), it was posited that politically comfortable participation in the curriculum development process is an essential part of a faculty member's academic freedom.

Furedy (1997) expressed concern about the state of academic freedom.

> . . . [W]here avoidance of a "chilly climate" is the paramount consideration, there is no real academic freedom. It is subjectively assessed comfort that determines what can be said not only by faculty, but also by student members of the academic community. (p. 333)

In contrast to the present investigation, Furedy approached comfort as a negative factor. He equated comfort with the avoidance of discomfort on the part of some.

Colleges and universities, and even societies, have been challenged to maintain a difficult balance between full freedom of expression and the mitigation of climates that are chilly for some individuals and groups. The premise of the present study was that faculty members function best when they are not afraid--when they perceive comfort.

Hanson (2007) issued the following scathing indictment of the academy: "Hypocrisy runs rampant: many of those assuring students that America is hopelessly oppressive do so on an atoll of guaranteed lifelong employment, summers off, high salaries, and few audits of their own job performance". However, some in the academy have disagreed with Hanson's assessment. One of the main justifications for continuing the practice of granting tenure to educators has been that cited by Finkin (1996) who believed tenure was ". . . a means to guarantee academic freedom".

<p align="center">Tenure</p>

In this study, the researcher examined whether tenure improves the political comfort of college faculty members. The decision on tenure has been a momentous one for individuals and institutions. It

> determines whether the candidate will or will not retain his or her job, and it settles whether the institution will or will not have an employee for a term that

<p align="center">21</p>

will end only when the employee decides to leave or retire (or dies). (Weingartner, 1996, p. 92)

"The AAUP took as its initial major task the protection of academic freedom in higher education. It was involved from the start with efforts to secure formally protected 'job rights', perceived in academe as tenure" (Ladd & Lipset, 1975, pp. 245-246). Contained in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure was the following:

> After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies. (AAUP, 1940)

Typically, faculty members have been evaluated and tenure decisions have been made on the basis of teaching, research, and service. A primary activity in teaching has been classroom instruction. Many factors determine effective classroom instruction, and colleges and universities have typically looked for these factors when evaluating teaching. Knowledge of and expertise in the subject matter has been critical. Presentation, communication, and organization skills have also been important. Less frequently evaluated measures include: "willingness to evaluate and improve one's own teaching; ability to communicate enthusiasm for the discipline; innovation, experimentation, and creativity in teaching; ability to establish and communicate course goals and requirements; and demonstration of personal and professional growth in teaching" (Chait, 2002, p. 50). Most institutions have also evaluated advising as a teaching activity. Roughly half have considered curriculum development. Around one-fourth have also evaluated development of new instructional techniques and supervision of research.

"For most institutions (98%), documentation of research activities involves publications in scholarly journals, books, technical reports, grant applications, inventions, patents, original artwork, and presentations of papers at national conferences" (Chait, 2002, p. 51). Some institutions have extended their definitions of research to include creative work and public performances (to cover arts and music studies), grant writing and directing, postdoctoral fellowships and academic awards, and textbook and pedagogical publications. At a large public research university, "Unquestionably the most important area of evaluation involves research and scholarship" (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996, p. 30).

Most institutions have defined service as "contributions to the general welfare of the university; public service, extension, or outreach; and professional and administrative activities" (Chait, 2002, p. 52). The most common form (100% of institutions) has been university service (Chait, p. 52). Typically, this has translated to serving on committees. Some institutions have extended their definitions of service to include service to the community using expertise (consulting), service to students (advising student organizations), and even service as a volunteer (civic activities). Service has typically been evaluated on the basis of leadership quality, time on task, and effort expended. Less common criteria include "contribution to the effective operation of the institution and favorable attention generated for the institution" (Chait, p. 53).

One commonly cited problem with the tenure process occurs when tenure evaluators use unstated factors or unclear criteria in arriving at decisions. The problem has not been with moving beyond the traditional 'teaching, research, service' triumvirate

of evaluation criteria. Rather, the problem has arisen when tenure denials are issued based on unpublished criteria. This can lead to lawsuits by unsuccessful candidates claiming "unfairness and impropriety" (AAUP, n.d., p.5).

Some institutions, such as St. Louis University, have adopted collegiality clauses. St. Louis defined collegiality as "working cooperatively and professionally with others" (Chait, 2002, p. 108). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has not supported the use of collegiality clauses as tenure criteria on the basis that they create "gray areas" open to individual interpretation. A number of universities such as Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) have experimented with having faculty members outside the university review course materials and syllabi. Others like the University of North Carolina-Charlotte (UNCC) have established peer review programs and included "collecting data on the value given to peer visits to classrooms in these review processes" (Chait, p. 109). While there is merit in collegiality and peer review programs, it is possible that these kinds of programs could have an impact on one's perception of political comfort. As one example, a professor might opt to avoid a controversial topic such as school vouchers because he had heard the peer who was slated to observe his class speak vehemently against the idea.

The concept of academic tenure has provoked many different views from different individuals. Immerwahr (1999) found, in a 1999 survey, that 95% of corporate executives agreed that "tenure sometimes protects incompetent faculty" (p. 22). While this view may not matter to some, it is important because, in many cases, corporate executives often double as college trustees. And trustees have recently exhibited "a more

general activism" (Chait, 2002, p. 15). Of interest is that in the same survey, 74% of tenured professors held similar beliefs. Still, only "23% of faculty (versus 83% of business executives) believed that phasing out tenure would improve higher education" (Immerwahr, p. 22). The impact of tenure on political comfort was examined in this study.

<div align="center">The Tenure Process</div>

A typical tenure process at a research university would be described in the following manner. After completing an advanced degree, the successful candidate for a tenure-track faculty position will be selected from a highly qualified field of candidates in a nation-wide search. New tenure-track faculty members then face a five to seven year probationary period during which their professional activities (teaching, research, and professional service) are regularly reviewed by faculty members, chairpersons, and deans. At the end of the probationary period, applicants for tenure must submit to a comprehensive review of both their performance to-date and of their promise as continuing faculty members (Hauptli, 1996).

Specific criticisms of the tenure process include: "ambiguous and often contradictory criteria; conflicts between institutional rhetoric and realities of reward structures; clouded and clandestine review procedures; and unmitigated stress in the face of unreasonable expectations" (Chait, 2002, p. 17). Some have contended that "Minority faculty may also be more susceptible to taking on extra service burdens. . . ." (Tierney &

Bensimon, 1996, p. 117). The opportunity cost of this extra service is time not spent on research activities.

Critics of tenure say that, ". . . tenure neither protects nor advances the concept for which it was intended--academic freedom" (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996, p. 143).

> The tenure system itself negatively affects faculty leadership in the early years. Tenure track faculty may exercise leadership before they are awarded tenure, but they do so at great peril. They are often afraid to discuss their work, and they have to create partnerships with senior faculty in order to evade resistance and create protection. (Kezar, Lester, Carducci, Gallant, & McGavin, 2007, pp. 14-16)

It is conceivable that some researchers will avoid promising but controversial research in order to avoid being marginalized.

Political Freedom of Expression

Epistemology has been defined as "the branch of philosophy that deals with questions concerning the nature, scope, and sources of knowledge" (DeRose, 2005). "Good scholarship in science (or, for that matter, in any intellectual endeavour) requires that personal conflicts between disputants be transcended by the conflict of ideas, so that the fundamental aim of the discussion can be epistemic rather than political" (Furedy, 1997, p. 299). Furedy elaborated as he explained that "political" can have multiple meanings:

> a foe of the conflict-of-ideas principle. . . was the fear of offending one's peers. This caution was promulgated by the North American scientific granting system that provides funds almost exclusively on the basis of reviews by peers. . . More recently, a new threat to the conflict-of-ideas approach has arisen, and again that threat has been strongest in North America. I refer to political correctness (PC). . . Sensitivity to whether assertions create discomfort for certain people or groups has become a primary criterion for approval of grants to the point that there is a

26

proscription against the mere consideration of certain data (e.g., the observed statistical group difference in performance of IQ tests in North America between blacks and whites, let alone specific interpretations, i.e., those that stress genetic influences). (p. 299)

When political freedom of expression is limited, so is the ability to pursue new sources of knowledge. **"For example, in North Africa, a professor of public health** discovered that his country's infant mortality rate was higher than government figures indicated. He lost his job and was imprisoned" (Fuchs, 1969). The pursuit of truth is stifled and political comfort is reduced here because others, due to fear of imprisonment, will likely withhold information and statements that conflict with the governing authority even if that governing authority is promulgating false or misleading information. The stifling of the pursuit of truth by governing authorities is nothing new:

> The reference is to Galileo's *sotto voce* (and probably apocryphal) assertion of the heliocentric theory. Under threat of torture, Galileo publicly denied the theory, but said under his breath "And yet it [the earth] moves." The significance of Galileo's whispered retort is that it represents the value of disinterestedness--that what should govern inquiry is the search for truth. In other words, no matter what an authority may say, even if that authority has power over life and death, it has no power over truth. (Furedy, 1997, p. 299)

Freedom to pursue truth is clearly important, and it may even necessitate a clash of diverse ideas. However, Hanson articulated a concern about relativism in the academy. He explained that some courses:

> . . . are by design deductive. The student is expected to arrive at the instructor's own preconceived conclusions. The courses are also captives of the present--hostages of the contemporary media and popular culture from which they draw their information and earn their relevance.
>
> The theme of all such therapeutic curricula is relativism. There are no eternal truths, only passing assertions that gain credence through power and authority. Once students understand how gender, race, and class distinctions are

27

used to oppress others, they are then free to ignore absolute "truth," since it is only a reflection of one's own privilege. (Hanson, 2007)

Velasquez, Andre, Shanks, and Meyer (1992) expressed a general concern with ethical relativism:

Also, it is argued, it may be the case that some moral beliefs are culturally relative whereas others are not. Certain practices, such as customs regarding dress and decency, may depend on local custom whereas other practices, such as slavery, torture, or political repression, may be governed by universal moral standards and judged wrong despite the many other differences that exist among cultures. Simply because some practices are relative does not mean that all practices are relative.

In theory, the goal of the academy has been to pursue new sources of knowledge and truth. While some academics may take solace in "truth" that matches their preconceived notions, the potential for the following exists: "There is no single, absolute truth, says the moral relativist, but many truths; in fact, there are as many truths as there are individuals with separate definitions as to what is the truth" (Kengor, 2008).

A practical problem with multiple "truths" lies in the following: In an academic department, a "determined minority may have an impact far out of proportion to its numbers. A department is basically a small work group, and its members will often yield to the sentiments of a minority to avoid internal division" (Hamilton & Hargens, 1993, p. 621). If "truth" is determined in an academic setting by a "determined minority", it is posited that political comfort in that academic setting is damaged.

Also, if "truth" is determined by a "determined minority", it may or may not be absolute truth. Lewis (2001) had this to say about the pursuit of absolute truth: "If you look for truth, you may find comfort in the end: If you look for comfort you will not get

either comfort or truth--only soft soap and wishful thinking to begin with and, in the end, despair" (p. 32).

<u>Overview of Faculty Politics Studies</u>

It is important to note that some research issues have been salient for a period of time followed by a period of dormancy. While this phenomenon is difficult to quantify, it is fairly easy to explain. Topics of interest in any discipline are subject to periods of both saliency and dormancy.

Politics is dynamic. As such, the definitions of what constitutes Democrat and Republican are dynamic. For instance,

> In the aftermath of the American Civil War the former Confederate states maintained a cohesive voting pattern nearly a century. It became known as "The Solid South" and was counted in the Democratic column for years. But as times, and party platforms, changed southern politics did too. Now for several decades the South has been solidly in the Republican camp. (Moyers, 2008)

One of the earlier studies of college faculty politics was sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. **"**In 1969, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education sponsored a series of large scale, parallel national surveys of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and administrators" (Ladd & Lipset, 1975, p. 3). Ladd and Lipset analyzed data from these surveys along with that gathered in a 1972 survey of their own. They "attend[ed] to general characteristics of the 'academic mind', to the way professors conceptualize political life, and the relationship of their perspectives to broad currents within the intellectual stratum" (p. 5). They also "explore(d) sources of divisions within the professoriate" and "attend(ed) to some

29

specific issues which reflect both the underlying dimensions of conflict in faculty politics and the rapidly shifting context in which academic politics is acted out" (p. 6). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in its 1989 study, sought information about the following categories: "the goals of collegiate education; academic standards; attitudes about student life; teaching, research, and service; status of the profession; views of the institution; participation in decision-making; general observations" (Carnegie Foundation, 1989, p. xix).

Hamilton and Hargens (1993) "examined evidence on the political orientations of professors" (p. 603). They used data from several of the large Carnegie studies in their analyses. More recently, Klein and Stern (2005) measured the voting behavior of humanists and social scientists. They were fairly critical of the academy albeit not in a political, ideological manner.

Rothman, Lichter, and Nevitte (2005a) released a study on the politics and professional advancement of college faculty. They posed several questions:

> First, do full-time faculty in four year colleges and graduate institutions have differentially liberal or left of center political views and Democratic Party preferences? Second, is there any evidence indicating that these liberal orientations are self-reinforcing? Do faculty who do not share the prevailing mindset find professional advancement more difficult? (Rothman, Lichter, & Nevitte, 2005a, p. 3)

The Rothman et al. (2005a) study raised some serious questions about the academy and received some criticism. One of the responses came from a group of University of Pittsburgh professors. "Hide the Republicans, the Christians, and the Women: A Response to 'Politics and Professional Advancement among College

30

Faculty'" was published later in 2005 in the same online social science journal where the

Rothman study initially appeared. Their main criticism of Rothman et al. was that other

researchers were "unable to subject our alternative hypothesis to empirical assessment (or

even to replicate the initial results of Rothman, Lichter and Nevitte) since they have

refused to make their data available to the scientific community" (Ames, Barker,

Bonneau, & Carman, 2005, p. 1).

Zipp and Fenwick (2006) set out to learn more about faculty and discover if the

majority had liberal leanings. Their goals for the study were to answer two questions:

"(1) Have faculty become increasingly liberal? and (2) Are these liberal faculty pushing

their agendas on their students?" (p. 305).

According to Gross and Simmons (2007), two sociologists whose results were

released in September, 2007, conservatives have comprised a small minority within the

American professoriate. "The study, arguably the best-designed survey of American

faculty beliefs since the early 1970s, found that only 9.2 percent of college instructors are

conservatives, and that only 20.4 percent voted for George W. Bush in 2004" (Glenn,

2007).

Methodology Used in Faculty Politics Studies

The faculty study on which Ladd and Lipset drew

. . . most heavily, employed a questionnaire that was mailed to approximately
100,000 full-time college and university professors located at 303 schools around
the country. The questionnaire solicited more than 300 items of information from
each respondent, including social background, professional activities and
achievements, and opinions on a broad range of political issues and controversies,

31

from those largely restricted to the campus to matters of national and international affairs. (Ladd & Lipset, 1975, pp. 3-4)

A total of 60,000 faculty members in more than 300 institutions responded to the 1969 Carnegie survey (Ladd & Lipset, 1975). Variations of political orientation associated with different academic disciplines, age, and religion were also described and analyzed.

The Carnegie Foundation survey (1989) "gathered information from more than 5,000 faculty members at all types of higher learning institutions" (p. xix). Hamilton and Hargens (1993) used "data from the 1969, 1975, and 1984 Carnegie surveys of faculty at U.S. colleges and universities" (p. 603).

Klein and Stern (2005) surveyed U.S. members in the following six nation-wide social science and humanities associations:

> . . . American Anthropology Association, American Economics Association, American Historical Association, American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy, American Political Science Association, American Sociological Association. . . . All six associations are non-partisan; the main benefits of membership are reduced fees to academic conferences and journal subscriptions" (Klein & Stern, pp. 4-5).

This discipline-specific approach to data collection contrasted with the broad-based Carnegie surveys.

Like the Carnegie surveys, the data analyzed in the Rothman study came from a broad-based survey. "We tested the first hypothesis through cross-tabulation of political self descriptions, party affiliations, and social and political attitudes reported by a randomly-based national sample of American college faculty surveyed in 1999" (Rothman et al., 2005a, p. 3). Specifically, data were gathered in the 1999 North American Academic Study Survey (NAASS) of students, faculty and administrators at

32

colleges and universities in the United States and Canada. The questionnaire included a wide range of items. Specifically, questions sought information regarding demographics; attitudes toward social, political, and academic issues; and (for faculty) academic background, activities, and accomplishments (Rothman et al.).

It is important to clarify that the focus of the analysis in the Rothman et al., (2005a) study was college and university faculty in the United States. The United States sample included 1643 faculty members from 183 universities and colleges.

> The sample of institutions was stratified by institution type according to the Carnegie classifications of doctoral, comprehensive, and liberal arts schools. The data set contains responses from 81 doctoral, 59 comprehensive, and 43 liberal arts institutions. Within each stratum, institutions were randomly selected from the universe of qualified institutions, with probability of selection proportional to size of faculty and student body combined. Full-time faculty members were then randomly chosen from each institution in numbers proportionate to its size. The response rate among the American faculty was 72%. (Rothman et al., pp. 3-4)

Criticisms of the work of Rothman et al. (2005a) by the Ames group centered on the research design and methodology of the Rothman study. "First, RLN are unclear as to whether they are measuring 'professional success', 'professional advancement', or 'quality of institutional affiliation'. We believe that these terms connote rather distinct concepts, but RLN treat them as one and the same" (Ames et al., 2005, p. 5). Whether these concepts are one and the same or distinct probably depends on the individual academic. There are certainly many who have perceived professional success in the academic field as being affiliated with a prestigious institution. It is likely that those individuals would consider a move from a lower-tier institution to a higher tier institution

to be professional advancement. To be fair, however, there are others who would be less

concerned about institutional reputation.

> Second, it is unclear whether RLN's measure compares academic institutions
> within tiers or merely across tiers. If discrimination is really occurring, we would
> expect to find the negative relationship between faculty conservatism and
> institutional prestige both within and across tiers. However, if this relationship
> can only be observed across tiers, it is more likely to be a function of self
> selection, given that institutions differ more across tiers than within tiers in terms
> of mission, emphasis, and scholarly approach. (Ames et al., p. 6)

One of the main criticisms of the Klein and Stern (2005) study was that it focused

too heavily on social science faculty at elite institutions. Therefore, Zipp and Fenwick

(2006) sought a more "representative" sample of institutions and disciplines, including

two-year colleges and fields like business and science. The authors assembled data on

professors' political orientations from the 1989 and 1997 National Surveys of Faculty

conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Zipp &

Fenwick).

The Gross and Simmons (2007) survey drew responses from 1,417 full-time

instructors at 927 colleges of all types. Gross and Simmons designed their sample to give

weight to the 20 fields with the most undergraduate majors.

Findings of Faculty Politics Studies

According to Ladd and Lipset (1975), "Evidence that the dominant mood on the

American campus is liberal to left and hence predisposed to favor politics dedicated to

egalitarian social changes is clear and decisive. . . ." (pp. 25-26). In the Carnegie

Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching survey (1989), it was found that American

34

professors were more liberal in their ideological orientations than the general population

(Carnegie Foundation, 1989). In yet another study, Hamilton and Hargens (1993), stated

that "the incidence of leftism has been considerably exaggerated" (p. 603).

Ladd and Lipset (1975) have written that monolithic liberalism is limited and only

tends to occur at either elite institutions, such as Harvard and University of California -

Berkeley, or within certain disciplines, e.g., the social sciences. Hamilton and Hargens, in

discussing a 1969 Carnegie Foundation study, reported

> . . . a clear, but modest, relationship between quality of institution and the
> frequency of both liberal and leftist identifications. By 1984 that pattern was
> substantially changed. . . .The high quality liberal arts colleges showed a striking
> opposite pattern with both liberal and leftist sentiments increasing over the fifteen
> years. This put them at "the top of the list" of combined liberal-left sentiment,
> well ahead of the prestigious research universities. (pp. 620-621)

Klein and Stern (2005) surveyed 5,486 members of the above-mentioned six

national academic associations. Respondents were asked for their voting histories as well

as their views on several policy issues. A total of 1,678 (31%) completed the

questionnaire. Across the humanities and social sciences, the authors estimated that self-

identified Democrats outnumbered self-identified Republicans (7:1). In economics, the

ratio was 3:1, and in anthropology, it was 30:1. "Our results support the view that the

social-sciences and humanities faculty are pretty much a one-party system. . . . Quite

possibly, the academic environment, even in economics, keeps the minority voices

muffled and fearful" (Klein & Stern, p. 14). Klein and Stern did not fully explain what

they meant by "muffled and fearful."

35

In the Rothman study, it is also important to consider the survey instrument. The NAASS instrument included three separate measures of political identification: (a) ideological self-designation on a left-right scale, (b) political party preference, and (c) a set of items on social and political attitudes (Rothman et al., 2005a).

As shown in Table 1, several facts are apparent. The U.S. public has been somewhat conservative, and there was very little change in that leaning between 1999 and 2004. Also, as a group, professors have been much more liberal than the U.S. public. No investigation or explanation was found in the review of faculty politics literature for the increase in the liberal/conservative gap between 1984 and 1999.

Table 1
Ideological Self-description of College Professors and General Public

Ideology*	Professors		U. S. Public	
	Carnegie 1984	NAASS 1999	Harris 1999	Harris 2004
Left/Liberal	39%	72%	18%	18%
Right/Conservative	34%	15%	37%	33%

Note. *Categories exclude "n = middle-of-the-road," "n = independent," and "n = other." Reproduced with permission (Appendix A) from "Politics and Professional Advancement Among College Faculty," by S. Rothman, S.R. Lichter, and N. Nevitte, (2005), *The Forum*, 3(1), p. 2. Copyright 2005 by Berkley Electronic Press

Table 2 (Rothman et al., 2005a) categorizes the survey responses by discipline. Only two disciplines, business and nursing, yielded numbers remotely approaching a liberal/conservative balance. However, every discipline area surveyed had more self-identified liberals than self-identified conservatives. Of interest is that sociology did not show any Republican responses among the 61 sociologists surveyed.

Table 2

Political Identification of College Professors by Field (%)

Descriptor	Liberal* %	Conservative* %	Democrat+ %	Republican+ %	N
Field of Study					
All Faculty	72	15	50	11	1643
Social Sciences	75	9	55	7	289
Humanities	81	9	62	6	449
Other	67	20	43	15	905
Selected Departments					
English Literature	88	3	69	2	87
Performing Arts	84	16	63	2	31
Psychology	84	8	63	7	68
Fine Arts	83	8	55	4	36
Theology/Religion	83	5	49	16	26
Political Science	81	2	58	8	67
Philosophy	80	5	62	11	26
History	77	10	70	4	62
Sociology	77	9	59	0	61
Biology	75	17	56	13	59
Communications	75	14	47	11	66
Music	74	8	56	6	53
Computer Science	74	26	43	21	44
Mathematics	69	17	43	15	49
Physics	66	11	48	5	37
Linguistics	65	11	64	2	53
Chemistry	64	29	41	25	52
Education	61	29	55	7	88
Economics	55	39	36	17	44
Nursing	53	47	32	26	32
Engineering	51	19	34	13	90
Business	49	39	26	26	101

Note. *Categories exclude middle-of-the-road; +excludes third parties and independents.

Table 3 (Rothman et al., 2005a, p. 7) displays the results of a survey of college professors on a variety of "hot-button" social, moral, and economic issues. With such vast majorities of professors identifying with the liberal viewpoints, a question arises as to whether conservative viewpoints can receive balanced coverage.

Table 3
Responses of College Professors to Attitude Items

Items	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't Know
Homosexual lifestyle as acceptable as heterosexual	44%	23%	17%	14%	2%
Women's right to have abortion	67%	17%	7%	7%	1%
Accept extramarital cohabitation	50%	25%	12%	11%	1%
Government should guarantee employment	25%	41%	23%	11%	0%
Government should reduce income gap	38%	34%	17%	10%	0%
Protect environment despite higher prices, fewer jobs	48%	40%	9%	2%	1%

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Reproduced with permission (Appendix A) from "Politics and Professional Advancement Among College Faculty," by S. Rothman, S.R. Lichter, and N. Nevitte, (2005), *The Forum*, 3(1), p. 7. Copyright 2005 by Berkley Electronic Press.

The Rothman survey data:

> confirm the first hypothesis, which posits a predominance of liberal to left faculty on American college campuses. But is there any merit to the claim that homogeneity makes it more difficult for conservatives to enter and advance in the profession? That proposition is more difficult to test systematically. In addition to the finding that conservatives are underrepresented in college faculties, it is necessary to show that conservative academics are hindered in their career advancement, and that this disadvantage is not simply due to a lack of merit on their part. (Rothman et al., 2005a, p. 8)

Rothman's (2005a) second hypothesis was explored using multiple regression

analysis that examined the independent effect of faculty social and political ideology on

professional success when other variables as academic achievement were controlled.

Table 4 presents the variables associated with the quality of school in which faculty

teach. In Model I, political ideology was an independent variable. In Model II, party

identification was an independent variable.

Listed are the regression coefficients that resulted from a multiple regression

analysis. In both models, academic achievement was determined to be the most powerful

predictor of the quality of a professor's institutional affiliation, which served as the

dependent variable in both models. Political ideology in Model I and party identification

in Model II were the second most powerful predictors. Institutional quality data were

based on the U.S. News & World Report rankings of colleges and universities.

> The second hypothesis is confirmed when socio-political orientation is
> operationalized in terms of ideological attitudes or party identification, although
> not as left-right self-designation. These results show that individual scholarly
> achievement is by far the most important factor in predicting the quality of a
> professor's institutional affiliation. But being a Republican or conservative
> significantly reduces the predicted quality of the college or university where he or
> she teaches, after taking scholarly achievement into account. In addition, the
> regressions uncovered some relationships that clearly warrant further research,
> principally the role of gender and religiosity in academic advancement. (Rothman
> et al., 2005a, p.12)

Any deviation from the norms of the academy can lead to marginalization. Organizations

and associations also have displayed a tendency to marginalize non-hegemonic thought.

Table 4

Variables Associated with Quality of School in Which Faculty Teach (N = 1562)

Variables	Model I Coefficients		Model II Coefficients	
	Unstandardized	Standardized	Unstandardized	Standardized
Ideology index	.084***	.086		
Republican			-2.547**	-.073
Independent			-.982	-.042
Female	-1.743**	-.069	-1.692**	-.067
Black	1.706	.026	1.405	.021
Asian	1.333	.025	1.246	.024
Gay or lesbian	1.296	.025	1.375	.026
Married	.710	.028	.601	.023
Practicing Jewish	1.041	.019	1.058	.020
Practicing Christian	-1.402*	-.063	-1.788***	-.081
Faculty achievement index	.433***	.388	.436***	.391
Constant	46.959***		55.913***	
Adjusted R squared	.197		.196	

Note. *Significant at the .05 level; **significant at the .01 level; ***significant at the .001 level. Historically Black colleges were excluded from this analysis. Reproduced with permission (Appendix A) from "Politics and Professional Advancement Among College Faculty," by S. Rothman, S.R. Lichter, and N. Nevitte, (2005), *The Forum*, 3(1), p. 11. Copyright 2005 by Berkley Electronic Press.

The notion of whether comfort differs based on gender and/or religiosity was also

investigated in the present study.

Ames et al. (2005) were critics of the Rothman study. They theorized that the

reason for the lack of conservatives in the academy was "self-selection".

> In lieu of discrimination, [Ames et al.] posit self-selection as the reason political
> liberals are more likely than conservatives to teach at highly rated schools. They
> present three instances of potential self-selection. First, conservatives might
> "*prefer* to work in smaller, more rural areas" (their emphasis) with more
> compatible ideological climates. Second, they might choose to stay in the South
> and Midwest, regions from where conservatives are differentially drawn, but
> where fewer elite universities are located than, say, the Northeast.
> More provocatively, they argue that many conservatives may deliberately
> avoid top-tier universities because they object to the scientific method. (Rothman,
> Lichter, & Nevitte, 2005b, p. 3)

40

However, Rothman et al. found that ideology and party affiliation were statistically significant predictors of institutional quality when South and Midwest region variables were included in regression models, though the region variables made no independent contribution. Also, Ames et al. noted that many liberal arts colleges "of the highest quality" are located in small communities (p. 2). Rothman et al. responded in the following manner to the Ames et al. criticism of conservatives' approach to the scientific method: ". . .within the academy the most prominent attacks on scientific method, as [Ames et al.] describe it, come not from the Christian right but from the ideological left, in the forms of postmodernism, deconstructionism, and some variants of radical feminism" (p. 5).

Zipp and Fenwick (2006) found that professors were more likely to identify themselves as left of center than as right of center. However, on a five-point scale of political orientation, professors made an overall move toward the middle between 1989 and 1997. They concluded that, "Despite little evidence for an overwhelmingly liberal faculty pushing its values on campus, the clamor continues to ring out. . . . Much of this outcry surely is based more on partisan politics than on dispassionate scholarly inquiry" (Zipp & Fenwick, p. 307).

Table 5 displays the political orientation of American professors as viewed by Gross & Simmons (2007). This indicates the dearth of self-identified conservative professors in many fields. Gross and Simmons also found "faculty members leaned sharply to the left on issues of gender, sexuality, and foreign policy"(Glenn, 2007). For

instance, three-quarters agreed that abortion should be legal "if a woman wants it for any

reason" (Gross & Simmons, p. 47).

Table 5
The Political Orientation of American Professors

Field	Liberal	Moderate	Conservative
Physical/biological sciences	45.2%	47.0%	7.8%
Social sciences	58.2%	36.9%	4.9%
Humanities	52.2%	44.3%	3.6%
Computer science/engineering	10.7%	78.0%	11.3%
Health sciences	20.5%	59.0%	20.5%
Business	21.3%	54.3%	24.5%
Other	53.4%	35.9%	10.7%

Note. Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding. Adapted with authors' permission from *The social and political views of American professors* by N. Gross and S. Simmons, (2007), p. 28. Retrieved December 19, 2007.

"Not all of Gross and Simmons' numbers matched the left-liberal profile" (Glenn,

2007). Among those who expressed an opinion, only 50.7% supported affirmative action

in college admissions, and 60% agreed with the statement that "the government should do

more to help needy Americans, even if it means going deeper into debt" (Gross &

Simmons, p. 43).

> That was similar to the general population's belief. In a national survey conducted in 2007 by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 54% of Americans agreed with the same statement. On another item, however, faculty members appeared significantly more conservative than the general public. Slightly less than half of faculty members agreed that "Business corporations make too much profit" compared with 67% of Americans. (Glenn)

> Liberal-arts colleges have had the highest concentrations of left-of-center faculty

members. Only 3.9% of instructors at liberal-arts colleges have referred to themselves as

conservatives. Community colleges have had the smallest proportion of self-identified

42

liberals (37.1%) and the highest proportion of self-identified conservatives--19% (Glenn, 2007). According to Gross and Simmons (2007), "Elite, Ph.D.-granting institutions" (p. 29) were in a middle ground with 10.2% of faculty members identifying themselves as conservative. Glenn noted the contrast: "That pattern contrasts with the well-known studies conducted in the early 1970s by Everett Carll Ladd Jr. and Seymour Martin Lipset, which found that conservatives were rarest at the most elite institutions."

Faculty members have generally supported the idea of political openness on campuses. Gross and Simmons (2007) asked whether "the goal of diversity should include fostering diversity of political views among faculty members" (p. 69). A total of 68.8% agreed. Glenn (2007) noted that one participant in a symposium thought the percentage to be disturbingly low and wondered about the other 31%. When asked whether "professors are as curious and open-minded today as they have ever been, 79.9% of the total sample responded affirmatively, but 46.3% of self-identified conservative respondents disagreed (Gross & Simmons, p. 69).

<center>Commentary on Faculty Politics Studies</center>

In the foreword to Ladd and Lipset's 1975 work, Clark Kerr, Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and former President of the University of California, wrote "The authors find the dominant orientation of professors to be liberal, and they trace the causes of the orientation to the nature of intellectual activities that involve questioning of the status quo and a critical attitude toward conventional wisdom" (Ladd & Lipset, 1975, p. xi; Lipset, 1982, p. 144).

<center>43</center>

The late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a New York Democrat, expressed the

view that, during the 1960s:

> social scientists gained 'quite extraordinary access to power' which they
> employed for intellectually partisan objectives, 'to promote social change in
> directions they deemed necessary and desirable.' He sees the social scientist as
> suffering from a kind of split personality, on the one hand as a scholar genuinely
> committed to an objective pursuit of truth, but at the same time as a 'passionate
> partisan of social justice and social change to bring it about. (Ladd & Lipset,
> 1975, p. 98)

There have been several studies since the 1970s that indicate left-liberal politics in

the United States professoriate. A study by Klein and Stern (2005) has been called the

"'most careful' of these studies by *The Nation*, which was nonetheless wary of the study's

claims" (Gravois, 2007). Critics have cited the low response rate as diminishing the

usefulness of the findings. Also, Klein and Stern did not specify how or why one's

personal voting record would make one "muffled and fearful" in many academic matters.

> Rothman et al. (2005a) believed

> that ideology accounts for differences in professional standing. It is entirely
> possible that other unmeasured factors may account for those variations. That
> said, the results are consistent with the hypothesis that political conservatism
> confers a disadvantage in the competition for professional advancement. These
> results suggest that conservative complaints of the presence and effects of liberal
> homogeneity in academia deserve to be taken seriously, despite their self-
> interested quality and the anecdotal nature of the evidence previously presented.
> (p. 13)

Rosemary G. Feal, executive director of the Modern Language Association, said

that the implication that liberal faculty members were keeping conservative scholars out

was ". . .'rubbish', and said that anyone who has been on dozens of search committees, as

she has, knows that. 'It boggles my mind the degree to which this is rubbish' " (Jaschik, 2005).

Milov (2005) reported on the responses to the Rothman et al. study by two Harvard professors: One education professor, Reuben, indicated that:

> she was skeptical of the argument that discrimination is to blame for the weak conservative voice on campus. 'I would have assumed that there is a high degree of self-selection rather than discrimination,' Reuben said. Reuben also said that she believed the abundance of liberals in academia could be due to the fact that as people become more educated, they tend to become more liberal". (Milov, 2005)

Another Harvard faculty member, Kenan Professor of Government Harvey C. Mansfield was not surprised at Rothman's findings.

> 'Conservatives have a hard time in academia,' Mansfield said. 'Just look at my department. There are fifty professors, and two or three are Republicans. How is that possible?' Mansfield. . . said he rejects the 'liberals are smarter' hypothesis. 'That is ridiculous,' Mansfield said. 'All that would mean is that fewer conservatives go to graduate school, because there are no [academic] jobs for them.' Mansfield offered another hypothesis for the bluish tint to the ivory tower. 'Multiculturalism crowds out conservatives,' Mansfield said. "They think they've done their duty by promoting women and minorities. Once they're done doing that, they have nothing left for conservatives.' (Milov, 2005)

Ames et al (2005) discussed the idea that conservatives may prefer to live in certain communities (rural) and regions (the South and Midwest) where there are fewer top-tier colleges and universities.

Just as Zipp and Fenwick have been critical of Klein and Stern, Klein and Stern offer the following critique of the Zipp and Fenwick (2006) study: "Unlike voting behavior, self-reported political orientation is slippery and relative. . . Why bother factoring in the politics of chemists? The humanities and social sciences are where politics is most relevant--and most lopsided" (Gravois, 2007).

Glenn (2007) reported on the response of Lawrence Summers, former president of Harvard University, to the new study. Summers praised the sophistication of the study but viewed the results differently than did Gross and Simmons.

> 'The data in this paper surprised me in the opposite direction that it surprised the authors,' said Mr. Summers, who is now a university professor at Harvard. 'It made me think that there is even less ideological diversity in the American university than I had imagined.' In his remarks, Mr. Summers concentrated on a subset of the data concerning elite, Ph.D.-granting universities. In humanities and social-science departments at those institutions, he pointed out, not a single instructor reported voting for President Bush in 2004.

In the August, 3, 2006 edition of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, columnist Debra J. Saunders wrote,

> Imagine, if you would, that slightly more than half of the public voted Democratic in the last presidential election, yet some 80 percent of higher education's social scientists voted Republican. In that universe, you would expect the left to demand changes in university hiring practices so that academia would nurture greater diversity so as to better represent the American community. Then step back into the real world, where academia has become a solid bastion of the Left. . . I call that a near monopoly marketplace of ideas. (Saunders, 2006)

<u>Marketplace of Ideas</u>

Economics provides an explanation of why idea competition is important. The "marketplace of ideas" is an analogy to the economic concept of a free market (Lisheron, 2003). This concept holds that the truth, or the best policy, arises out of the competition of diverse ideas in free, transparent public discourse. This concept has also been used by educators in higher education who have linked the concept to academic freedom (Lisheron, 2003).

The concept of the 'marketplace of ideas' has often been attributed to Justice

Oliver Wendell Holmes' dissenting opinion in *Abrams v. U S* , 250 U.S. 616 (1919).

While Justice Holmes (1919) implied the idea in his dissenting opinion, he never used the

term:

> Persecution for the expression of opinions seems to me perfectly logical. If you
> have no doubt of your premises or your power and want a certain result with all
> your heart you naturally express your wishes in law and sweep away all
> opposition. . . But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting
> faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations
> of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade
> in ideas. . . that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself
> accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon
> which their wishes safely can be carried out. That at any rate is the theory of our
> Constitution. (Abrams v. U S)

The term "marketplace of ideas" was used in the 1967 Supreme Court decision

Keyishian v. Board of Regents, where the Court stated, "The classroom is peculiarly the

"marketplace of ideas." The nation's future depends upon leaders trained through wide

exposure to that robust exchange of ideas which discovers truth "out of a multitude of

tongues, [rather] than through any kind of authoritative selection." (Keyishian v. Board of

Regents, 385 U.S. 589, 605-606 [1967]).

Even though 1967, in the Keyishian case, was the first time "marketplace of

ideas" was mentioned by name, the concept of the classroom as a marketplace of ideas

was not born in the 20th century. In the modern era, Thomas Jefferson provided his own

explanation of the marketplace of ideas. Making reference to the University of Virginia,

Jefferson said, "This institution will be based upon the illimitable freedom of the human

mind. For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate any error so long as reason is left free to combat it" (Jefferson, 1905, p. 320).

Since the marketplace has been a critical area of study in economics, it is appropriate to consider some economic ideas. The opposite of competition is monopoly. In microeconomics, monopolies and near-monopolies have tended to have minimal incentive to innovate and improve. Competition has provided this incentive. Herein lies a benefit of having vigorous competition in the marketplace of ideas. When the marketplace of ideas has had broad and diverse competition, there has been greater incentive for participants in that marketplace of ideas to effectively innovate.

Comfort Theory

This study sought to explore the degree to which faculty were comfortable in expressing academically-related political views. As those views were constrained, the theories of marginalization could also be considered. Alternatively, the literature on comfort provided the conceptual tools for understanding those situations in which faculty perceived expression to be unconstrained.

Comfort has been defined as "consolation in time of trouble or worry. . . feeling of relief or encouragement" (Merriam-Webster online, 2007). Paterson and Zderad (1988) believed that comfort was an "umbrella under which. . . growth, health, freedom, and openness--could be sheltered" (p. 107). Though worry is not entirely synonymous with fear, the words certainly can be linked. The definition of "anxious" appears to provide this link. Those who are anxious are "characterized by extreme uneasiness of

mind or brooding fear about some contingency**:** worried" (Merriam-Webster online, 2007). These emotions are not without impact. "Your emotions affect your brain's ability to learn, think, and remember. Self-doubt, fear, etc., prevent your brain from learning, thinking, and remembering" (Smilkstein, 2003, p. 11).

The premise of the present study was that faculty members would function best when they were not afraid-- when they perceive comfort. ". . . educationally interesting theories of mind contain specifications. . . about the 'resources' required for a mind to operate effectively. These include. . . freedom from stress or from excessive uniformity" (Bruner, 1996, pp. 8-9). Des Jardin (2001) presented a different point of view in his statement that "Fear of retaliation may negatively affect political involvement".

In this study, comfort was defined according to Kolcaba (2003) who posited that "Comfort is the immediate experience of being strengthened by having needs for relief, ease, and transcendence met in four contexts (physical, psycho-spiritual, sociocultural, and environmental)" (p. 14). Kolcaba's Comfort Theory has generally been applied to the practice of nursing. The physical context pertains "to bodily sensations, homeostatic mechanisms, immune function, etc." (Kolcaba, p. 15). The psychospiritual context pertains "to internal awareness of self, including esteem, identity, sexuality, meaning in one's life, and one's understood relationship to a higher order or being" (Kolcaba, p. 15). The environmental context pertains "to the external background of human experience (temperature, light, sound, odor, color, furniture, landscape, etc.)" (Kolcaba, p. 15). Application of the physical, psychospiritual, and environmental contexts of Kolcaba's theory has typically been made within the practice of nursing.

The application of a nursing theory to a higher education situation presented a challenge. However, Kolcaba's (2003) sociocultural comfort context does pertain "to interpersonal. . . and societal relationships including. . . education and support" (Kolcaba, p. 15). The premise of the present study was that faculty members will function best when they are not anxious or, alternatively stated, when they perceive comfort. For the purpose of this investigation, the researcher has merged this element of academic freedom with Kolcaba's theory on comfort to create a new variable of interest, political comfort. Within this study, political comfort referred to a faculty member's perception of an absence of anxiety while engaging in academically-related political discussions with colleagues. Therefore, the researcher was able to move forward with the application of the sociocultural context of Kolcaba's Comfort Theory to this investigation of political comfort.

<u>Political Comfort in the Academy</u>

Throughout American history, peoples' perceptions of political comfort have been dynamic. There have been a myriad of circumstances at work in this regard. For instance, "anti-war protests by students have interrupted speeches by proponents of current national policies. Some protestors have sought to silence--rather than debate--positions with which they do not agree" (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006). Historic events and movements, elections and politics, business and economic conditions could all possibly have an impact on one's perception of political comfort.

50

These, along with other external and internal factors, provide the context in which higher

education institutions and faculty have operated over time.

Shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, a Red Scare took hold in the

United States.

> A nationwide fear of communists, socialists, anarchists, and other dissidents
> suddenly grabbed the American psyche in 1919 following a series of anarchist
> bombings. . . During this time, colleges were deemed to be hotbeds of
> Bolshevism, and professors were labeled as radicals. The hunt reached down to
> public secondary schools where many teachers were fired for current or prior
> membership in even the most mildly of leftist organizations. (Burnett, n.d.)

Some issues and movements, such as this described Red Scare, go dormant as quickly as

they arise. However, history has been known to repeat itself.

Another Red Scare was spearheaded by Wisconsin Senator Joseph McCarthy in

the 1950s. "When the Red Scare began to target academia in the 1950s, several university

professors were among those who fought powerful figures and accusations for their

political independence--and their jobs" (Adamy, 1997). Following is the recollection of a

University of Michigan faculty member in the 1950s:

> Not long before the student protests of the 1960s gave the University its liberal
> reputation, the Ann Arbor campus was not a bastion of free speech. [Chandler]
> Davis, an instructor at the University in 1953, remembers when the national wave
> of McCarthyism began to affect students and faculty. 'On occasion, the
> University would refuse to give permission to let speakers speak on campus
> because they were too radical,' Davis said, recalling that in 1950, leftist speaker
> Herbert Phillips spoke in a local book store because the University would not give
> him permission to speak on campus. (Adamy, 1997)

Halberstam (2000) alluded to the irony of circumstances when "the forces of free speech.

. . align behind people who are odious and pitted against people who are in some ways

more politically sympathetic" (p. xi).

The Red Scares certainly impacted the perception of political comfort. The culture in a particular discipline also has the potential to impact whether a faculty member fully participates in an academic discussion.

> In the 1950s and 1960s, the Department of Political Science at Yale University was staffed by intellectual luminaries including Robert Dahl, Charles Lindblom, Harold Lasswell, and Karl Deutch to name but a few, and not surprisingly it was regarded as one of the best in the nation. Although its leading academics wrote on diverse topics such as political theory, opinion polling and administrative science, they were all identified with the theory of pluralism which had evolved at Yale. . . (Merelman, 2003)

Since the department culture had coalesced around the theory of pluralism, it is entirely possible that dissent would have been uncomfortable. In an academic department, a "determined minority may have an impact far out of proportion to its numbers. A department is basically a small work group, and its members will often yield to the sentiments of a minority to avoid internal division" (Hamilton & Hargens, 1993, p. 621).

The events of the turbulent 1960s also impacted the perception of political comfort. Despite his lopsided loss in the U.S. presidential election of 1964, many consider the late Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater to be the founder of modern conservatism. "When Barry Goldwater spoke to the American Political Science Association two months before the 1964 election, he almost didn't have an audience. . . ever since then, academics have chosen to ignore Goldwater and what he represented" (Miller, 2002, p. 1).

Miller (2002), a national political reporter for the *National Review*, attempted to explain why Goldwater and conservatism were ignored by many academics.

This is partly because so few historians are themselves conservative. Many despise conservatism. Just as most biologists don't want to specialize in slime molds, hardly any modern historians want to spend their careers examining a subject they find so distasteful. (p.1)

Another perspective is offered as Historian Douglas Brinkley:

". . . warns that traditional liberals have 'too quickly dismissed conservative thought as if it were a kind of pathology.' In fact, 'the clamor at the gate' from populists and fundamentalists is not just the sound of a hostile wrath. It is also a simple plea for admission" (Boyer, 1998).

Richard Hofstadter, a Columbia University professor and two-time Pulitzer Prize winner, was probably the most influential political historian of his day. Miller (2002) indicated that Hofstadter "viewed conservatives as quite literally, unhinged" (p. 2). Miller's review of Hofstadter also included the following:

His most famous essay about the Right, from a 1963 lecture, was called "The Paranoid Style in American Politics." (It reached a wide audience when Harper's published it immediately prior to the 1964 election.) It diagnosed conservatives as suffering from a severe case of political paranoia, marked by "heated exaggeration, suspiciousness, and conspiratorial fantasy." (Among other things, it seems, they opposed the New Deal.). . . Yet Hofstadter was not content merely to dismiss conservatives as demented. Instead, he placed them within an American tradition of irrational hatred that (he said) previously had manifested itself as anti-Masonism and anti-Catholicism. (Miller, 2002, p. 2)

One question to consider: how did the academy move from the Red Scares to liberal dominance? According to Victor Davis Hanson, Professor Emeritus (of Classics) at California State University, Fresno: "Colleges lost their way in the 1960s. . . . Students now get a 'therapeutic curriculum' instead of learning hard facts and inductive inquiry. The result: we can't answer the questions of our time" (Hanson, 2007). Hanson attempted to explain the transition to a "therapeutic curriculum":

53

Sometime in the 1960s--perhaps due to frustration over the Vietnam War, perhaps as a manifestation of the cultural transformations of the age—the university jettisoned the classical approach and adopted the therapeutic. . . So if, for a mere four years, the university could educate students to counter. . . sinister forces, the nation itself could be changed for the better. Colleges could serve as a counterweight to the insidious prejudices embedded in the core of America. (Hanson, 2007)

Ladd and Lipset (1975) had a different perspective on the conflict in academe in the 1960s:

It was, at the least, disconcerting for academics who had thought of themselves as left and progressive to be attacked as hypocrites by the student left and by some of their colleagues who variously led and followed the students in the call for a new "idea of the university". The net effect of the intense politicization of academe in the 1960s. . . served to further fragment the professoriate. . . ." (p. 214)

They appeared to lament the 1960s campus turbulence, and seemed to advance the view that the conflict of the 1960s in academe was about more than just national politics.

It is interesting to note that this traditional vs. progressive curricular debate has persisted for generations. In the mid-1980s, President Derek Bok of Harvard University wrote the following: ". . . since 1900. . . all of the fundamental issues have remained the same. . . . No permanent victories are ever won, nor are serious arguments ever conclusively defeated" (Cuban, 1999, p.86).

An AAUP survey highlighted a gap between the way conservatives and liberals have viewed higher education.

People who described themselves as liberal were more likely to say they had 'a lot of confidence' in colleges and universities. More than half of them said they had a lot of confidence, while less than a third of conservatives felt the same way. A question about whether people considered being a professor 'very prestigious' found a similar gap. Little surprise, then, that 49 percent of Republicans said

political bias was a problem in colleges, compared with just 27 percent of Democrats. (Smallwood, 2006)

The data in most of the studies have supported the possible veracity of the conclusion of

Rothman et al. (2005a):

> Our results are consistent with the hypothesis that political conservatism confers a disadvantage in the competition for professional advancement. These results suggest that conservative complaints of the presence and effects of liberal homogeneity in academia deserve to be taken seriously. . . (p. 13).

> There have also been a number of student complaints. For example,

> While lecturing on James Joyce's rejection of the church, a professor drew two mountains with a valley between them on the chalkboard, explaining that Joyce's church believed one mountain was man and the other mountain was God. Next he drew a cross in the valley, touching both peaks - a visual metaphor (one student) knew from childhood - and explained that this was Christ on the cross connecting man to God. Then the professor broke into peals of mocking laughter. The rest of the class joined in. "My heart stopped," says the student. "If this were any other religion, the professor wouldn't get away with his remarks - it would be politically incorrect. But in the Bay Area, it is OK to laugh at Christianity and its God". (Weingarten, 2005)

Some of the literature reviewed alluded to the possibility of comfort problems for

Christian academics. The notion of whether political comfort differs based on religious

affiliation was investigated in this study.

One of the most vocal proponents of academic reform has been author and activist

David Horowitz. Pipes (2005) referenced a statement by Horowitz: "Universities are a

left wing monolith these days. A conservative professor, or a Republican or evangelical

Christian professor, is as rare as a unicorn." Horowitz has long advanced an "academic

bill of rights" which stated:

> No faculty shall be hired or fired or denied promotion or tenure on the basis of his or her political or religious beliefs. . . Exposing students to the spectrum of

55

significant scholarly viewpoints on the subjects examined in their courses is a
major responsibility of faculty. Faculty will not use their courses for the purpose
of political, ideological, religious or anti-religious indoctrination. (Academic Bill
of Rights, n. d.)

Critics have charged that consideration of this type of legislation amounts to an attempt

by conservative politicians to intimidate liberal professors.

Another approach to reform has been advanced by Stephen H. Balch, president of

the National Association of Scholars. Balch's Property Rights approach "includes

procedural expedients that preserve minority influence--for example, proportional voting

on curriculum and hiring decisions through which dissenters can determine a fractional

share of the outcomes" (Balch, 2004, p. 5). Balch also suggested that:

Formally recognizing the value of intellectual pluralism in adversarial fields, and
deliberately multiplying the institutional sites wherein it can flourish, may be the
best remaining course. The most direct way of doing that would be to allow
distinct schools of thought within adversarial fields to organize themselves in a
state of partial independence from their rivals, with some significant control over
hiring and tenure decisions affecting their members. (p. 5)

He offered this caution about a Property Rights approach:

The principal danger would be the development of an ideological quota system,
with political groups seeking their piece of the academic action through crude
political struggle. Unfortunately, at many colleges and universities such a system
already exists, albeit with participation limited to a very restricted range of
parties. . . It would also help immensely if senior administrators began again to
make clear that the university's mission was serving the cause of truth, not the
activist vindication of external movements, interests, and claims. (Balch, pp. 5-6)

For some, according to Metzger (1987), change "brought a new freedom, a new

vitality, a new social relevance to the academy; for others, it represented the debasement

of academic standards. . . the creation of intellectual chaos in the name of educational

reform" (p. 127). Metzger was not describing a current conflict or, for that matter, a

debate about the changes of the 1960s academy. He was referring to the post-Civil War academy in the United States.

Summary

Those who do not fit the prevailing model of faculty, including conforming to political ideology expectations, are at risk of being marginalized in the academy. Organizations and associations do tend to marginalize non-hegemonic thought. If political-ideological perspective is a consideration in the allocation of resources and opportunity, then academic freedom and political comfort will be weaker rather than stronger.

Most of the current studies on faculty political identification have employed quantitative methodologies. Views and commentary have been presented from those who believe (a) that the political imbalance in the academy is due to self-selection and (b) that the political imbalance in the academy is a serious issue. Most researchers have found at least some liberal tilt in the politics of college faculty, e.g., Klein & Stern (2005), Rothman, Lichter, & Nevitte (2005a).

It is difficult at best to predict how society and the academy will evolve and how these changes will impact political views and/or comfort. Because of these difficulties, the researcher refrained from forecasting future trends in this investigation. There have not been any research studies in which it has been attempted to predict future trends in college faculty political views and/or comfort.

It appears that the significant knowledge gap in this line of inquiry can be reduced

to a single word: Why? Why does this liberal tilt exist? It may be that more liberals than

conservatives have chosen academic careers. This reason is known as self-selection.

Balch (2004) concluded:

> Our universities would be wise to make the cause of intellectual diversity their
> own. Pledged to virtually every other kind of diversity, they must not neglect the
> one type that--when appropriately conceived and pursued--goes to the very
> heart of their mission. (p. 6)

Or, Klein and Stern (2005) may have been correct in their explanation, "Our

results support the view that the social-sciences and humanities faculty are pretty much a

one-party system. . . . Quite possibly, the academic environment, even in economics,

keeps the minority voices muffled and fearful" (p. 14). Klein and Stern did not specify

how or why one's personal voting record would make one "muffled and fearful" in many

academic matters. Herein rested the reason for exploring the concept of political comfort.

Chapter 3 contains a discussion of the methods and procedures used in the collection of

data for the present study.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this study, it was assumed that a balanced examination of competing ideas is a
necessary part of the pursuit of truth. A comprehensive review of the literature indicated
that the majority of professors have typically identified with liberal viewpoints. Given
this ideological imbalance, there is a question as to the comfort level of academics in
discussing and sharing their views. It is this primary question that was investigated in this
study.

Research Questions

The following research questions were explored:

1. Is there a relationship between political comfort and faculty members'
    political party preferences?

2. Does political comfort differ based on gender or religious affiliation?

3. Does political comfort differ based on academic discipline--specifically
    economics and political science?

4. Does political comfort differ based on institutional affiliation--specifically
    University of Florida, The Florida State University, and University of South
    Florida?

Dependent and Independent Variables

In this study, comfort in discussing political views was the dependent variable. Gender, party affiliation, subject matter, and religious self-identification were independent variables.

Population

This study was limited to Florida Public Colleges and Universities that were classified as "Research I" under the 1994 Carnegie Classification System. Research I universities offer:

> a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive at least $15.5-million a year in federal support" (Carnegie, 1994).

Florida Research I universities included the University of Florida, Florida State University, and the University of South Florida (Carnegie, 1994).

The University of Florida (UF) is located in Gainesville, Florida. UF offers "First-professional, Doctor's, Master's, Bachelor's, Associate's" degrees, and the total enrollment is 51,474 (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). As of 2004, library holdings included 4,288,118 units of print material and 71,336 serials (U.S. Department of Education). In 2008, UF employed 12,277 people. This total included 3,087 faculty members, and 841 were tenure-track assistant professors (UF Factbook, 2008).

The Florida State University (FSU) is located in Tallahassee, Florida. FSU offers "First-professional, Doctor's, Master's, Bachelor's, Associate's" degrees, and the total

enrollment is 38,682 (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). As of 2004, Library holdings

included 3,483,573 units of print material and 62,093 serials (U.S. Department of

Education). In 2008, FSU employed 6,129 people (FSU Factbook, 2008). Included in this

employment number were 2,150 faculty members, of whom 319 were tenure-track

assistant professors (FSU Institutional Research, 2008).

The University of South Florida (USF) is located in Tampa, Florida. USF offers

"First-professional, Doctor's, Master's, Bachelor's, Associate's" degrees, and the total

enrollment is 46,189 (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). As of 2004, Library holdings

included 2,209,358 units of print material and 42,049 serials (U.S. Department of

Education). In 2008, USF employed 13,207 people, of whom 1,944 were faculty

members (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, n.d.). Included in the faculty were 343 tenure-

track assistant professors (USF Office of Decision Support, 2008).

The perceptions of economics and political science faculty members within the

three Research I universities were investigated in this study. The University of Florida

(UF) has described its economics program in the following manner:

> First, economics majors acquire general business skills that are useful for many
> different jobs. The preparation is less specific than other business-related majors,
> but this gives students the flexibility to select from a variety of careers, which
> include finance, insurance, management, and marketing. This general business
> background is ideal for students who wish to pursue advanced training in business
> through an MBA program. Second, economics also has become increasingly
> important in legal analysis. Thus, economics is a popular major for pre-law
> students because of the rigor of economic analysis. (UF Economics Department,
> n.d.)

UF's Economics Department is located in the Warrington College of Business

Administration. The department employs 18 full-time economics faculty members. Of the

18, there are two tenure-track assistant professors (one male and one female). (UF

Economics Department, n.d.). As of Fall 2008, UF's economics department served 653

students (UF Factbook).

The University of Florida (UF) Political Science Department's mission is:

to educate students who have political interests and concerns into politically
literate citizens capable of understanding their own governments and political
processes, other governments, and the interactions among governments. The
Undergraduate major is not intended solely a pre-professional program to train
either attorneys or political scientists, nor one designed simply to produce 'good
citizens'. It is intended to develop students' frames of reference and their critical
and analytical skills to understand better their political world. (UF Political
Science Department, n.d.)

UF's Political Science Department is located in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The department employs 37 full-time political science faculty members, 11 of whom are

tenure-track assistant professors. Among the tenure-track assistant professors, there are

five males and six females (UF Political Science Department, n. d.). As of Fall 2008,

UF's Political Science Department served 1,274 students (UF Factbook).

Florida State University (FSU) described its economics program as

providing training in and practice with an analytical approach to thinking and
problem solving that gives you a unique advantage in any career you choose.
Indeed, we think economics gives you an advantage even in your daily activities
and enables you to make better choices, better decisions, and avoid some of the
pitfalls that arise from illogical and incomplete thinking. (FSU Economics
Department, n. d.)

FSU's economics department is located in the College of Social Sciences and Public

Policy (FSU Economics Department, n. d.). The department employs 30 full-time

economics faculty members, 12 of whom are tenure-track assistant professors. Among

the tenure-track assistant professors, there are eight males and four females (FSU

Institutional Research, 2008). As of Fall 2008, FSU's economics department served 498

students (FSU Institutional Research).

Florida State University (FSU) has described its political science program in the

following manner:

> The major in political science offers a solid undergraduate education in the liberal
> arts and sciences. Such study prepares the graduate for a variety of careers by
> emphasizing the acquisition of skills in communication and analysis; and by
> encouraging independent thought, tolerance, and informed interest in current
> affairs. It is also an excellent preparation for graduate study in political science,
> law or the other social sciences. (FSU Political Science Department, n. d.)

FSU's political science department is located in the College of Social Sciences and

Public Policy (FSU Political Science Department, n.d.). The department employs 27 full-

time political science faculty members, 10 of whom are tenure-track assistant professors.

Among the tenure-track assistant professors, there are 8 men and 2 women (FSU

Institutional Research, 2008). As of Fall 2008, FSU's political science department serves

1,301 students (FSU Institutional Research).

The University of South Florida (USF) has described its economics program in

the following manner: "Economics offers a clear, logical way of thinking about

complicated business problems and contemporary social issues such as unemployment,

inflation, pollution, and crime" (USF Economics Department, n.d.). USF's economics

department is located in the College of Business Administration. The department

employs 16 full-time economics faculty members, three of whom are tenure-track

assistant professors. Among the tenure-track assistant professors, there are two males and

one female (USF Economics Department, n.d.). As of Fall 2008, USF's economics

department served 71 students (USF Infocenter, 2008).

The University of South Florida (USF) has described its political science program

as:

> providing students with a detailed study of the institutions and processes of
> American Government, foundations in Political Theory, as well as an examination
> of the international system and foreign political systems through the study of
> International Relations and Comparative Politics. (USF Government and
> International Affairs Department, n.d.)

At USF, political science is studied in the Government and International Affairs

Department of the College of Arts and Sciences. The department employs 27 full-time

political science faculty members, seven of whom are tenure-track assistant professors.

Among the tenure-track assistant professors, there are five males and two females (USF

Government and International Affairs Department, n.d.). As of Fall 2008, USF's

Government and International Affairs Department served 1,140 students (USF

Infocenter).

<u>Study Methodology</u>

A researcher-developed online survey (Appendix B) was used to gather data in

this quantitative study. Using the survey, data were collected via SurveyMonkey, whose

service has been described as a "Powerful Survey Designer. . . Using just your web

browser, create your survey with our intuitive survey editor. Select from over a dozen

types of questions (multiple choice, rating scales, drop-down menus, and more. . .)."

(SurveyMonkey, n. d.).

There are both advantages and disadvantages to conducting online surveys. Advantages include cost-savings, ease of editing/analysis, faster transmission time, easy use of preletters, higher response rates, more candid responses, and potentially quicker response time with a wider magnitude of coverage (Colorado State University, n.d.). Some of the disadvantages related to online surveys include potential problems related to (a) demographic limitations related to the sample, (b) lower levels of confidentiality, layout and presentation issues, (c) the need for more instruction and orientation to the computer online system in order for respondents to complete the questionnaire, (d) technical problems with hardware and software, and (e) response rates that tend to be higher during the first few days (Colorado State University, n. d.). Shannon, Johnson, Searcy, and Lott (2002) offered the following view regarding online surveys:

> . . . The majority of these professionals' responses (n=32, 91.5%) described specific types of groups that have access to technology. Specific samples identified included listservs, professional memberships, alumni groups, "in house" employee groups, and University professors. The remaining three respondents simply indicated that samples had to be small and clearly defined.

The researcher in this study concluded that the benefits of an online survey outweighed the potential pitfalls for the research. The population surveyed in this study was a fairly small (N = 155) group of university professors.

<div align="center">Data Collection</div>

A link to the survey was e-mailed to full-time economics and political science faculty members categorized asassistant, associate, and full professors at the University of Florida, Florida State University, and the University of South Florida. Participants

received a brief explanatory email message that contained a link to the survey (Appendix C). Faculty email addresses were initially accessed by visiting the three institutions' departmental websites. Before the surveys were sent, telephone calls were made to the economics and political science department chairs at the three institutions to verify that all full-time faculty members were correctly listed on the departmental website.

Surveys were e-mailed to faculty members with the titles of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. "Most newly-minted PhDs are hired as assistant professors, promoted to associate upon achieving tenure. . . " (University of California-Berkeley, n. d.).

Instrumentation

Because political comfort is a new concept, a tested survey instrument did not exist. Therefore, a survey instrument designed by the researcher, and based on the literature reviewed, was used. The survey instrument contained 24 items designed to elicit the views of respondents.

Many of the questions used a Likert-type scale to ascertain the extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with a particular statement. "A Likert scale measures the extent to which a person agrees or disagrees with the question. The most common scale is 1 to 5. Often the scale will be 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = not sure, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree" (University of Northern Iowa, n.d.). "Not sure" was removed as a potential response to the political comfort research questions.

Section 1 of the survey began with several questions regarding the participant's position at the university. Research Question 3, "Does political comfort differ based on academic discipline--specifically economics and political science?" was explored by asking respondents to reveal their subject matter expertise of either economics or political science (Section 1, item 1). Since surveys were emailed to faculty members with the titles of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, the next item (Section 1, item 2) asked about the participant's academic rank. Participants were then asked to reveal their years of teaching experience at the college level (Section 1, item 3).

The next question asked participants about their tenure status (Section 1, item 4). Those faculty members who have been awarded tenure were directed to move to section 2. Non-tenured participants were asked in section 1 - item 5 to state the number of years remaining on their "tenure clock". A typical "tenure probationary period in their unit. . .7 years" (University of Florida, 2007, p. 3).

In Section 2, several questions were posed in regard to politics and religion. Since party platforms have changed over time, several issue questions were asked in order to better describe Democrat and Republican respondents. A similar approach was taken by Klein and Stern (2005). Though they asked many more issue questions than were posed in this survey, they did inquire about the following issues: "Government ownership of industrial enterprises. . . . Government production of schooling (k through 12). . . . Redistributive policies (transfer and aid programs and tax progressivity). . . ." (Klein & Stern, 2005, p. 9).

This survey included items addressing the role of government (Section 2, item 1), school vouchers (Section 2, item 2), and income inequality (Section 2, item 3). Democrats have generally favored an expanded role for government. The official platform of the Democratic National Committee in 2008 stated, ". . . the government should ensure that health insurance is affordable. . . " (The 2008 Democratic National Platform, 2008, p. 10). Democrats have generally opposed school vouchers. "Most Democrats have traditionally opposed vouchers as a threat to the stability of public schools" (Strauss & Turque, 2008). Also, Democrats have often favored income redistribution as a means of addressing income inequalities. The 2008 Democratic Platform stated, "We will provide access to home visits to low-income expectant first-time mothers" (The 2008 Democratic National Platform, p. 49).

In contrast, Republicans have generally favored limited government. Their 2008 platform stated, "Republicans oppose. . . a government-run universal health care system" (Republican Platform, 2008, p. 37). Republicans have also generally supported school vouchers. The 2008 platform stated, "We support choice in education for all families, especially those with children trapped in dangerous and failing schools, whether through charter schools, vouchers or tax credits for attending faith-based or other non-public schools, or the option of home schooling" (Republican Platform, p. 44). Republicans have tended to be "gleeful at the prospect of running against what they call 'an income redistribution scheme' " (Lambro, 2007). Section 2, item 4, "Given only these choices, I would be most likely to vote for candidates from the following party" offered respondents two choices: Democrat and Republican.

Three items were used to explore Research Question 2, "Does political comfort differ based on gender or religious affiliation?" Survey participants were asked to reveal their gender (Section 4, item 1). Participants were also asked to self-identify their religious affiliation and how often they attended religious activities (Section 2, items 5 and 6).

> The religious life of Florida follows that of the rest of the USA. The State is predominantly Christian with Roman Catholics and Baptists each making around one-third of the total. The other religions of the world such as Judaism and Islam are also represented. (World InfoZone, 2009)

In regard to the United States population as a whole, 25.1% self-identified as Catholic, 15.8% self-identified as Baptist, 35.1% self-identified as Christian (other than Catholic and Baptist), 1.2% self-identified as Jewish, .6% self-identified as Muslim, 7.2% self-identified as other, and 15% self-identified as not religious (Kosmin & Keysar, 2009, p. 5). These religion and gender questions were explored because Rothman, Lichter, and Nevitte (2005a) found that their "regressions uncovered some relationships that clearly warrant further research, principally the role of gender and religiosity in academic advancement" (p. 12).

Section 3 included eight questions that were used to gather data related to Research Question 1 which asked "Is there a relationship between political comfort in discussing political views and faculty members' political party preferences?" Most faculty members defined their work as a complex combination of teaching, research and service. Respondents were asked if "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my teaching (Section 3, item 1), research

(Section 3, item 3), (university) service (Section 3, items 5 and 6), and informally (Section 3, item 7)." Respondents were also asked whether they were comfortable discussing their political views in the classroom (Section 3, item 2) and whether they were comfortable discussing their political views in academic publications (Section 3, item 4).

Respondents were queried as to whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues (Section 3, item 8). This survey item merely sought to explore the following scenario: In an academic department, a "determined minority may have an impact far out of proportion to its numbers. A department is basically a small work group, and its members will often yield to the sentiments of a minority to avoid internal division" (Hamilton & Hargens, 1993, p. 621). This item was included to test for differences in comfort based on the extent to which participants perceived their political views to be similar to those of their colleagues.

Since Research Question 4 explored differences in political comfort based on institutional affiliation, respondents were requested to reveal institutional affiliation--specifically, University of Florida, The Florida State University, and University of South Florida (Section 4, item 2). Several demographic questions were included on the survey in order to better describe the population. Participants were asked to reveal their age (Section 4, item 3) and race (Section 4, item 4). The race "category includes blacks, whites, persons of Latino or Asian origin or descent, and indigenous Americans (Eskimos, Native Hawaiians, Native Americans)" (HR Guide, 1999).

As part of the development of the survey instrument, a pilot study was conducted. The instrument was reviewed by a panel of current and former colleagues of the researcher. The instrument was determined to meet the needs of the study after several modifications were considered.

One participant, a political libertarian, suggested a space to self-identify as a libertarian. Some consideration was given to asking about political parties other than Democrat and Republican, but "there is a precedence of focusing on D to R in both the Lipset tradition of scholarship and in the voter registration work referenced earlier" (Klein & Stern, 2005, p. 8).

Another participant suggested the elimination of the "neither agree nor disagree" choice. The researcher accepted this suggestion, in part. Respondents were "forced" to definitively answer, or to skip, the political comfort questions, because definitive responses to these questions are essential for the effective development of the study's dependent variable. The "neither agree nor disagree" or "not sure" response will only be removed, however, when posing the political comfort research questions. The researcher believed that a "not sure" response may be useful in the other items where it appears.

Methodological Challenges and Advantages

Each U.S. state and each institution of higher learning has its own unique demographics. As such, it was impossible to generalize these results to other situations. Despite this limiting factor, Florida is very demographically diverse and "as the 2000

71

(U.S. presidential) election showed, Florida is now an important swing state" (Zogby, 2004). In other words, Florida has become, in many ways, a bellwether for the United States as a whole.

A major methodological challenge of this line of inquiry is that the data points are human-generated and based on perceptions. Because times and perceptions change, data need to be regularly re-generated. Whereas perception surveys present challenges, they also present opportunities. "Persons from diverse backgrounds enjoyed answering questions about their own comfort. They related to each question because each was meaningful to their daily experiences" (Kolcaba, 2003, p. 76). Cultural differences arising from differences in national origin and/or ethnicity may or may not impact whether a faculty member fully participates in an academic discussion. This study of culture was beyond the scope of this investigation.

Another possible challenge was survey instrument clarity. Flesch Reading Ease for the survey instrument was 34.7. The Flesch Reading Ease measure "rates text on a 100-point scale; the higher the score, the easier it is to understand the document. For most standard documents, aim for a score of approximately 60 to 70" (Microsoft Word, 2003). Clearly a doctoral dissertation is not a "standard document." The Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level is 10.9. The clarity of the survey instrument was confirmed by the participants in the pilot study.

Still another challenge existed. It was important to address the question, "What are the 'threats to validity'? For one, it's possible that there isn't sufficient statistical power to detect a relationship even if it exists" (Trochim, 2006). To negate this concern,

it was important that the statistics be used properly. Pearson chi-square statistics were

considered because

> Likert scale questions have a range of answers that is discrete, not continuous.
> The chi-square statistic is designed for use in a multinomial experiment, where
> the outcomes are counts that fall into categories. The chi-square statistic
> determines whether observed counts in cells are different from expected counts. . .
> . Rather than doing a t-test, we can run a chi-square statistic. Since the chi-square
> statistic assumes a discrete distribution rather than a normal distribution, the
> results will be statistically valid and can be used as scientific proof. (University of
> Northern Iowa, n. d.)

Ultimately, Fisher's Exact test, an adaptation of the chi-square test for independence,

was used because the structure of the data yielded fewer than 80% of the cells with

expected cell counts greater than five--a critical assumption for the Chi-Square test for

tables beyond 2x2. Fisher's Exact test only generates a probability value, so there are no

test statistics associated with it as in most other inferential procedures.

Reliability was another factor that merited investigation. Therefore, Cronbach's

alpha was calculated. Cronbach's alpha is a measure of reliability which is used when

measures have items that are not scored simply as right or wrong such as attitude scales

(Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). This commonly used reliability coefficient is an

indicator of internal consistency. Aiken (1996) reported that perception instruments often

have coefficients of reliability below .60; some reach .70; very few reach a level of .80,

with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient above .90 having been found to be rare. Cronbach's

alpha for this instrument was .71.

Response Rates

Another methodological challenge was thepotential for low response rates. Because politics and political comfort are charged issues, some may prefer to avoid participating in these kinds of surveys. To improve the response potential, the researcher followed an example from Schaefer and Dillman (1998):

> In a survey of university faculty, an electronic mail survey that used no paper or stamps, but did use individually addressed e-mails and a pre-notice. . .achieved a 58% response rate. This response rate was the same as that obtained by a four-contact paper mail strategy.

The text of the pre-notice letter is included in Appendix B (Dillman, 2000, p. 157).

The first contact was a *pre-notice e-mail* (see Appendix C), which was sent to all population members on January 15, 2010. The second contact, also made via e-mail, was the *request for participation mailing* (see Appendix C). This message was sent on January 20, 2010, five days after the pre-notice e-mail and discussed the study and the benefits of participation. It also included the hyperlink to the questionnaire. Two weeks after the competency questionnaire mailing, on February 3, 2010, all population members received a *questionnaire reminder* (see Appendix C) via e-mail. This contact was intended to reinforce the importance of the study and the recipient's response and contained the questionnaire hyperlink. Almost two weeks later, on February 16, 2010, the researcher sent the *final contact* (see Appendix C). This contact was sent via e-mail, stating the upcoming deadline and giving the questionnaire link. All population members received a total of four contacts. From the first contact until the response deadline, the data collection process took almost 30 days.

Confidentiality, Anonymity, and Problem Resolution

All responses were anonymous, and there was no identifying information associated with any response. "SurveyMonkey" did not maintain the Internet Protocol addresses of the participants. To ensure privacy, all responses were encrypted.

There were negligible risks involved with participation. Participants were informed that submission of the survey indicated voluntary participation in the study. Participants were also informed that they did not need to respond to any questions that they did not wish to answer. Email addresses of the research advisor and researcher, as well as the U.S. Mail address of the University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board, were provided in the event that participants had questions or concerns about the study.

Analysis of the Data

Descriptive statistics and Fisher's Exact test were computed to examine the relationship among variables. Analysis of the data was organized around the four research questions which guided the study.

Since party platforms have changed over time, several issue questions were asked in order to better describe Democrat and Republican respondents. Data obtained about respondents' perceptions of the role of government, school vouchers, and income inequality (Section 2, items 1-3) were used in arriving at these descriptions. Descriptive statistics were calculated, and data were reported in tabular form with supportive

narrative statements. Descriptive statistics were also calculated and presented in tabular form for item 4 in Section 2 as to respondents' political preferences.

Responses to items in Section 3 of the survey provided the data to answer Research Question 1 as to whether there was a relationship between political comfort in discussing political views and faculty members' political party preferences. Fisher's Exact test was computed to determine whether a significant relationship existed between comfort and political party preference. Descriptive statistics were calculated and data were reported in tabular form for the political comfort items related to teaching (Section 3, item 1), research (Section 3, item 3), and service (Section 3, items 5 and 6). Descriptive statistics were also analyzed for item 8 in Section 3 as to whether respondents' political views were generally similar to those of their colleagues.

For Research Question 2, which inquired as to whether political comfort differed based on gender (Section 4, item 1) or religious affiliation (Section 2, item 5), Fisher's Exact test was calculated to determine whether a significant relationship existed between comfort and gender. Fisher's Exact test was also calculated to determine whether a significant relationship existed between comfort and religious self-identification. Descriptive statistics were calculated and data were reported in table form for gender and religious self-identification.

For Research Question 3, as to differences in political comfort based on academic discipline, specifically economics and political science, Fisher's Exact test was calculated to determine whether a significant relationship existed between comfort and academic

discipline. Descriptive statistics were calculated and data were reported in tabular form for these academic discipline questions.

Fisher's Exact test was also calculated in order to answer Research Question 4 as to whether political comfort differed based on institutional affiliation, specifically University of Florida, Florida State University, and University of South Florida. Descriptive statistics were calculated using data from survey item 2 in Section 4, and data were reported in tabular form for this institutional affiliation question.

Demographic information was used to better describe the population. Descriptive statistics were calculated for demographic variables related to respondents' age (Section 4, item 3) and race (Section 4, item 4). The results of the analysis were displayed in tabular form and discussed in accompanying narratives.

Authorization

The proposal and instrumentation for the research study was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Central Florida for approval. The research was approved as being Exempt Human Research (see Appendix D).

Originality

The initial Turnitin.com similarity index for this investigation was 40%. However, 4% was subtracted from the initial score when the List of References was excluded. Another 23% was subtracted from the initial score when quoted material and citations were excluded. When matches with generic statements were removed, a 4%-6%

actual similarity score range was established. This range was well below the 10%

maximum score allowed by the research advisor.

Summary

This research utilized a survey instrument developed as part of this study. The

researcher sought to understand whether there is any truth to the following statement:

> . . . colleges are now hostile environments for economic and cultural
> conservatives. Only a comparatively narrow spectrum of views is really welcome
> on campus. If-you stray from the liberal consensus you will soon find yourself
> without allies, without tenure, and eventually without a position. (Zinsmeister,
> 2002, p. 18)

Specifically, the clear focus of this investigation was to define the concept of political

comfort and study its impact as a stand-alone dependent variable.

The population surveyed was a fairly small (N = 155) group of university

professors. The analyses of the data for the four research questions are presented in

Chapter 4. Conclusions drawn from the data analysis and resulting recommendations are

contained in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

A comprehensive review of the literature has indicated that a vast majority of
university professors have identified with liberal viewpoints. Given this ideological
imbalance, are conservative academics comfortable discussing and sharing their views?
For that matter, are liberal faculty comfortable expressing their views? These questions
merited investigation.

This chapter presents the research findings organized by the four research
questions which guided the study. The institutional and personal demographic
characteristics of respondents are also displayed and discussed.

Description of the Population

The data for this study were collected during January and February of 2010.
Participation in the survey was voluntary, and responses were considered to reflect
respondents' perceptions of political comfort. A total of 68 (43.9%) useable surveys were
returned from an original population of 155 professors of economics and political science
at The Florida State University (FSU), University of Florida (UF), and University of
South Florida (USF).

Table 6 presents demographic data for survey respondents. Response percentages
for demographic variables were calculated using the actual number of responses for each
item. The number of male respondents (n = 53 or 81.5%) exceeded the number of female

79

respondents (n = 12 or 18.5%). This disparity between male and female respondents differed from that of the surveyed population. Male professors constituted 64.4% of the surveyed population whereas female professors constituted 35.6%. This indicates a higher response rate from the males who were surveyed.

The number of political science faculty responses (n = 40 or 64.5%) exceeded the number of economics faculty responses (n = 22 or 35.5%). This disparity between political science and economics respondents differed from that of the surveyed population. Political science professors constituted 58.7% of the surveyed population whereas economics professors constituted 41.3%. This indicates a higher response rate from the political science professors who were surveyed.

The majority of respondents (76.7%) were older than 35 years of age. A total of 17 (28.3%) of the respondents were 36 to 45, but only five (8.3%) were 46 to 55 years of age. A total of 19 (31.7%) of the respondents were 56-65, and only five (8.3%) were older than 65 years of age. Only 14 respondents (23.3%) were 35 years of age or younger.

The majority of respondents (n = 38 or 59.4%) were tenured faculty members. A total of 26 (40.6%) of the respondents were not tenured.

Table 6

Institutional Demographics

Descriptors	University of Florida		Florida State University		University of South Florida	
Gender	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Female	7	29.2	5	17.9	0	0.0
Male	17	70.8	23	82.1	13	100.0
Total (*N*=65)	24	100.0	28	100.0	13	100.0
Department						
Economics	7	29.2	12	48.0	3	23.1
Political Science	17	70.8	13	52.0	10	76.9
Total (*N*=62)	24	100.0	25	100.0	13	100.0
Age						
35 and Younger	4	17.4	10	38.5	0	0.0
36-45	8	34.8	5	19.2	4	36.4
46-55	1	4.3	3	11.5	1	9.1
56-65	9	39.1	7	26.9	3	27.3
65 and Older	1	4.3	1	3.8	3	27.3
Total (*N*=60)	23	99.9	26	99.9	11	100.1
Tenure Awarded						
No	10	41.7	12	42.9	4	33.3
Yes	14	58.3	16	57.1	8	66.7
Total (*N*=64)	24	100.0	28	100.0	12	100.0

Note. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table 7 presents information related to the ethnicity and religion of the respondents. Respondents were professors of economics and political science at The Florida State University (FSU), University of Florida (UF), and University of South Florida (USF). Data were not disaggregated by institution in order to better protect the anonymity of respondents.

Table 7

Repondents' Religious and Ethnic Demographics (N=67)

Descriptors	Frequency	Percentage
Religious Preference		
Christian (Catholic)	11	16.4
Christian (Baptist)	3	4.5
Christian (Other)	16	23.9
Judaism	5	7.5
Islam	0	0.0
Other	3	4.5
Not Religious	29	43.3
Total	67	100.1
Ethnicity		
Black	3	4.7
White	57	89.1
Hispanic	0	0.0
Asian	1	1.6
Native American	0	0.0
Other	3	4.7
Total	64	100.1

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

With regard to religion, 29 (43.3%) of the survey respondents indicated they were

not religious. Respondents indicating they were Christian (Other) totaled 16 (23.9%),

Christian (Catholic) respondents totaled 11 (16.4%), Jewish respondents totaled five

(7.5%), Christian (Baptist) respondents totaled three (4.5%), and respondents from other

religions totaled three (4.5%). None of the respondents indicated they were Muslim.

With regard to ethnicity, 57 (89.1%) of the survey respondents indicated they

were white. There were three (4.7%) Black respondents and one (1.6%) Asian

respondent. All other minorities totaled three (4.7%). No respondents indicated they were Hispanic or Native American.

<div align="center">Description of the Political Parties</div>

Because party platforms have changed over time, several issue questions were asked in order to better describe Democrat and Republican respondents. Data were obtained regarding respondents' views on the role of government (Section 2, item 1), school vouchers (Section 2, item 2), and income inequality (Section 2, item 3). Overall, 52 (81.3%) respondents indicated a political preference for Democrats whereas 12 (18.7%) indicated a preference for Republicans. Table 8 displays respondents' views by political affiliation.

Among the Democrats, 28 (54.9%) strongly agreed or agreed that "Government should be more involved in the economy." Twenty (39.2%) neither agreed nor disagreed, and 3 (5.9%) disagreed or strongly disagreed. A total of 23 Democrats (44.2%) neither agreed nor disagreed regarding the statement "School voucher programs should be expanded." Nineteen (36.5%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 10 (19.2%) agreed or strongly agreed. Also, a total of 29 Democrats (56.9%) agreed or strongly agreed regarding the statement "Economic inequality should be solved through income redistribution in the United States." A total of 14 (36.5%) neither agreed nor disagreed, and eight (15.7%) disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 8

Respondents' Views by Political Affiliation (N=64)

Respondents' Views	Democrat		Republican	
	n	%	n	%
Government should be more involved in the economy.				
Strongly Disagree	1	2.0	7	58.3
Disagree	2	3.9	4	33.3
Neither Agree nor Disagree	20	39.2	0	0.0
Agree	18	35.3	1	8.3
Strongly Agree	10	19.6	0	0.0
Total	51	100.0	12	100.0
School vouchers should be expanded.				
Strongly Disagree	9	17.3	0	0.0
Disagree	10	19.2	0	0.0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	23	44.2	0	0.0
Agree	9	17.3	3	25.0
Strongly Agree	1	1.9	9	75.0
Total	52	99.9	12	100.0
Economic inequality should be solved through income redistribution in the United States.				
Strongly Disagree	1	2.0	6	50.0
Disagree	7	13.7	2	16.7
Neither Agree nor Disagree	14	27.5	2	16.7
Agree	24	47.1	2	16.7
Strongly Agree	5	9.8	0	0.0
Total	51	100.1	12	100.1

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Among the Republicans, 11 (91.6%) strongly disagreed or disagreed that

"Government should be more involved in the economy;" and only one (8.3%) agreed.

None of the Republican respondents strongly agreed or neither agreed nor disagreed on

this item. All 12 Republicans (100%) agreed or strongly agreed regarding the statement "School Voucher programs should be expanded." Also, a total of eight Republicans (66.7%) disagreed or strongly disagreed regarding the statement "Economic inequality should be solved through income redistribution in the United States" Of the remaining four respondents, two (16.7%) agreed and two neither agreed nor disagreed. None of the Republican respondents strongly agreed with this statement.

Research Question 1

Is there a relationship between political comfort and faculty members' political party preferences?

The relationships between each of the political comfort variables in Section 3 of the survey were compared to the political affiliation of the respondents using Fisher's Exact test. This adaptation of the chi-square test for independence was used because the structure of the data yielded fewer than 80% of the cells with expected cell counts greater than five. This is a critical assumption for the Chi-Square test for tables beyond 2 x 2. Fisher's Exact test only generates a probability value. Unlike most other inferential procedures, there are no test statistics associated with it. The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 9. Of the eight variables for which data were analyzed, only "My political views are similar to those of my colleagues" was significantly related to political preference ($p < .01$).

Table 9

Fisher's Exact Test Between Political Comfort and Political Preference

Variables	P
Comfort with teaching context	.99
Discussing political views in class	.09
Discussing political views in research	.99
Discussing political views in publications	.73
Discussing political views in departmental committees	.79
Discussing political views in university-wide committees	.63
Discussing political views with colleagues	.16
Political views are similar to colleagues	.01**

Note. * $p < .05$ **$p < .01$

Among the Democrats, 28 (53.9%) neither agreed nor disagreed in response to the

statement "My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues." A total of

19 (36.5%) agreed or strongly agreed whereas five (9.6%) disagreed or strongly

disagreed. Among the Republicans, nine (75%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the

statement "My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues." A total of

two Republicans (16.7%) neither agreed nor disagreed, and only 1 (8.3%) agreed with the

statement. None of the Republican respondents strongly agreed with the statement. These

results are illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10

Respondents' Similarity of Views by Political Preference

Respondents' Views	Democrat		Republican	
	n	%	n	%
My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues.				
Strongly Disagree	1	1.9	5	41.7
Disagree	4	7.7	4	33.3
Neither Agree nor Disagree	28	53.9	2	16.7
Agree	18	34.6	1	8.3
Strongly Agree	1	1.9	0	0.0
Total	50	100.0	12	100.0

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Research Question 2

Does political comfort differ based on gender or religious affiliation?

The relationships between each of the political comfort variables in Section 3 of the survey were compared to gender using Fisher's Exact test. In the consideration of the eight variables as they related to gender, "Discussing political views in class" ($p < .01$) and "Political views are similar to colleagues" ($p = .03$) were found to be significant. Table 11 displays the results of the analysis of the relationship between political comfort and gender.

Table 11

Fisher's Exact Test Between Political Comfort and Gender

Variables	P
Comfort with teaching context	.19
Discussing political views in class	.01**
Discussing political views in research	.40
Discussing political views in publications	.75
Discussing political views in departmental committees	.85
Discussing political views in university-wide committees	.23
Discussing political views with colleagues	.11
Political views are similar to colleagues*	.03*

Note. * $p < .05$ **p $<.01$

Among the females, 10 (83.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the

statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views in the classroom".

A total of two (16.7%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Among the males,

47 (88.7%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "I am or would be

comfortable discussing my political views in the classroom. A total of six (11.3%) agreed

or strongly agreed with the statement. These results are illustrated in Table 12.

Table 12

Respondents' Classroom Comfort in Discussing Political Views by Gender (*N* = 65)

Respondents' Views	Female		Male	
	n	%	n	%
I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views in the classroom.				
Strongly Disagree	9	75.0	17	32.1
Disagree	1	8.3	30	56.6
Neither Agree nor Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agree	1	8.3	4	7.6
Strongly Agree	1	8.3	2	3.8
Total	12	100.0	53	100.1

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Among the females, eight (66.7%) agreed with the statement "My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues". Four (33.3%) chose "Neither Agree nor Disagree" regarding the statement. None of the female respondents strongly agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the statement. Among the males, 25 (47.2%) chose "Neither Agree nor Disagree" in response to the statement "My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues". A total of 16 (30.2%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 12 (22.6%) agreed or strongly agreed. These results are illustrated in Table 13.

89

Table 13

Respondents' Similarity of Political Views by Gender ($N = 65$)

Respondents' Views	Democrat		Republican	
	n	%	n	%
My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues.				
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	6	11.3
Disagree	0	0.0	10	18.9
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	33.3	25	47.2
Agree	8	66.7	11	20.8
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	1	1.9
Total	12	100.0	53	100.1

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

In the analysis of religious affiliation, the two religion variables were collapsed into a single variable to improve the validity of the test. The three Christian subpopulations were combined into one group, all the non-Christian religions were combined into a second, and the Not Religious category was left as a third. Table 14 displays the results of the analysis using the Fisher's Exact test between political comfort and the combined religion variable. None of the variables were significantly related.

For religious attendance, the weekly responses were combined into one group, the monthly responses were combined into a second, and the responses of Rarely/Never and Only on Holidays were combined into a third. Table 15 displays the results of the analysis between the political comfort variables and religious attendance and indicates that none of the variables were significantly related to religious attendance.

Table 14

Fisher's Exact Test Between Political Comfort and Religion

Variable	P
Comfort with teaching context	.51
Discussing political views in class	.54
Discussing political views in research	.93
Discussing political views in publications	.32
Discussing political views in departmental committees	.46
Discussing political views in university-wide committees	.98
Discussing political views with colleagues	.70
Political views are similar to colleagues	.42

Note: * $p < .05$ **$p < .01$

Table 15

Fisher's Exact Test Between Political Comfort and Religious Attendance

Variable	P
Comfort with teaching context	.23
Discussing political views in class	.40
Discussing political views in research	.69
Discussing political views in publications	.27
Discussing political views in departmental committees	.13
Discussing political views in university-wide committees	.84
Discussing political views with colleagues	.21
Political views are similar to colleagues	.12

Note. * $p < .05$ **p $< .01$

Does political comfort differ based on academic discipline--specifically economics and political science?

The relationships between each of the comfort variables in Section 3 of the survey were measured against academic department using Fisher's Exact test. Of the eight variables, the following four were significant: "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my teaching" ($p = .02$), "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on departmental committees" ($p = .01$), "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on university-wide committees" ($p < .01$), and "My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues" ($p < .01$). Table 16 displays the results of the analysis of the relationship between political comfort and academic discipline.

Table 16
Fisher's Exact Test Between Political Comfort and Academic Discipline

Variables	P
Comfort with teaching context	.02*
Discussing political views in Class	.63
Discussing political views in research	.80
Discussing political views in publications	.81
Discussing political views in departmental committees	.01*
Discussing political views in university-wide committees	.01**
Discussing political views with colleagues	.47
Political views are similar to colleagues	.01**

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Among the economics faculty, 17 (70.9%) agreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my teaching". A total of seven economics faculty members (29.1%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Among the political science faculty, 22 (55%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my teaching." A total of 18 (45%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Economics faculty respondents, more than political science respondents, reported that they would be comfortable in discussing their political views with their colleagues in the context of their teaching. These results are presented in Table 17.

Table 17 *Comfort in Discussing Political Views in Context of Teaching by Departmental Affiliation* ($N = 64$)

Respondents' Views	Economics		Political Science	
	n	%	n	%
I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my teaching				
Strongly Disagree	1	4.2	9	22.5
Disagree	6	25.0	13	32.5
Neither Agree nor Disagree				
Agree	16	66.7	12	30.0
Strongly Agree	1	4.2	6	15.0
Total	24	100.1	40	100.0

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Among the economics faculty, 14 (58.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with

93

colleagues in the context of my service on departmental committees." A total of 10

economics faculty members (41.7%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Among the political science faculty, 28 (71.8%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the

statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues

in the context of my service on departmental committees." A total of 11 (28.2%) agreed

or strongly agreed with the statement. Overall, neither economics or political science

faculty reported comfort in discussing political views in the context of departmental

committee service. Political science faculty members, however, more frequently

disagreed that they were or would be comfortable discussing their political views with

colleagues in the context of service on departmental committees than did economics

faculty. These results are shown in Table 18.

Table 18
Comfort in Discussing Political Views in Context of Departmental Committee Service by Departmental Affiliation (*N* = 63)

Respondents' Views	Economics		Political Science	
	n	%	n	%
I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on departmental committees				
Strongly Disagree	2	8.3	16	41.0
Disagree	12	50.0	12	30.8
Neither Agree nor Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agree	9	37.5	7	18.0
Strongly Agree	1	4.2	4	10.3
Total	24	100.0	39	100.1

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Among the economics faculty, 12 (50%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on university-wide committees." A total of 12 (50%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Among the political science faculty, 32 (82.1%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on university-wide committees." Seven faculty members (17.9%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Whereas economics faculty were evenly divided in regard to their comfort in discussing political views with colleagues in the context of their service on university-wide committees, political science faculty disagreed strongly with the comfort question in this context. These results are displayed in Table 19.

Table 19

Comfort in Discussing Political Views in Context of University-wide Committee Service by Departmental Affiliation ($N = 63$)

Respondents' Views	Economics		Political Science	
	n	%	n	%
I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on university-wide committees				
Strongly Disagree	2	8.3	17	43.6
Disagree	10	41.7	15	38.5
Neither Agree nor Disagree				
Agree	11	45.8	4	10.3
Strongly Agree	1	4.2	3	7.7
Total	24	100.0	39	100.1

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

95

Among the economics faculty, 11 (45.8%) chose "Neither Agree nor Disagree" regarding the statement "My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues." A total of 10 (41.7%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement and three (12.5%) agreed with the statement. None of the economics faculty strongly agreed with the statement. Among the political science faculty, 17 (42.5%) chose "Neither Agree nor Disagree" regarding the statement "My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues." A total of 17 (42.5%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, and six (15%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Republican respondents reported more frequently that their political views were not similar to those of their colleagues than did the Democrat respondents. These results are illustrated in Table 20.

Table 20
Respondents' Similarity of Political Views by Departmental Affiliation (N = 64)

Respondents' Views	Economics		Political Science	
	n	%	n	%
My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues				
Strongly Disagree	1	4.2	5	12.5
Disagree	9	37.5	1	2.5
Neither Agree nor Disagree	11	45.8	17	42.5
Agree	3	12.5	16	40.0
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	1	2.5
Total	24	100.0	40	100.0

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Research Question 4

Does political comfort differ based on institutional affiliation--specifically
University of Florida, Florida State University, and University of South Florida?

The relationships between each of the political comfort variables in Section 3 of

the survey were compared by institution using Fisher's Exact test. For each of the eight

variable combinations, crosstab tables were generated to support the *p*-values from

Fisher's Exact test. Of the eight variables, "I am or would be comfortable discussing my

political views with colleagues informally" ($p = .01$) was significant. Table 21 displays

the results of the analysis of the relationship between comfort and institutional affiliation.

Table 21
Fisher's Exact Test Between Political Comfort and Institution

Variable	*P*
Comfort with teaching context	.51
Discussing political views in class	.08
Discussing political views in research	.18
Discussing political views in publications	.58
Discussing political views in departmental committees	.81
Discussing political views in university-wide committees	.49
Discussing political views with colleagues	.01*
Political views are similar to colleagues	.35

Note: * $p < .05$ **$p < .01$

Among the University of Florida (UF) faculty members, 23 (95.9%) agreed or

strongly agreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political

views with colleagues informally." Only one (4.1%) disagreed with the statement. None

of the UF faculty members strongly disagreed with the statement.

Among the Florida State University (FSU) faculty members, 26 (92.9%) agreed

or strongly agreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my

political views with colleagues informally." Two (7.1%) disagreed with the statement.

None of the FSU faculty members strongly disagreed with the statement.

Among the University of South Florida (USF) faculty members, nine (69.3%)

agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing

my political views with colleagues informally." Four faculty members (30.8%) disagreed.

None of the USF faculty members strongly disagreed with the statement. These results

are illustrated in Table 22.

Table 22
Comfort in Discussing Political Views with Colleagues by Institution (*N* = 65)

Respondents Views	University of Florida		Florida State University		University of South Florida	
	N	%	n	%	N	%
I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues informally						
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	1	4.2	2	7.1	4	30.8
Neither Agree nor Disagree						
Agree	10	41.7	20	71.4	7	53.9
Strongly Agree	13	54.2	6	21.4	2	15.4
Total	24	100.1	28	99.9	13	100.1

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Ancillary Analyses Based on Tenure Variable

Though the tenure variable had been included only as a demographic variable in the study, an additional Fisher's Exact test was performed to determine any relationships between the political comfort variables in Section 3 of the survey and respondents' tenure status. Table 23 displays the results of the analysis. Of the eight variables, only "My political views are similar to those of my colleagues" ($p = .02$), was significant. In other words, tenure did not necessarily promote increased political comfort.

Table 23
Fisher's Exact Test Between Political Comfort and Tenure Status

Variable	P
Comfort with teaching context	.84
Discussing political views in class	.94
Discussing political views in research	.98
Discussing political views in publications	.49
Discussing political views in departmental committees	.22
Discussing political views in university-wide committees	.56
Discussing political views with colleagues	.62
Political views are similar to colleagues	.02*

Note. * $p < .05$ **$p < .01$

Table 24 presents the analysis of data related to the similarity of views between tenured and non-tenured faculty. Among the non-tenured faculty, 13 (50%) neither agreed nor disagreed regarding the statement. A total of 11 (42.3%) agreed and two (7.7%) strongly disagreed with the statement.

In regard to the views of tenured faculty, none disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 18 (45%) neither agreed nor disagreed that their political views were similar to those of their colleagues. A total of 13 (32.5%) tenured faculty members disagreed or strongly disagreed, and nine (22.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that their political views were similar to those of their colleagues.

Table 24

Respondents' Similarity of Political Views by Tenure Status ($N = 66$)

Respondents' Views	Nontenured		Tenured	
	N	%	n	%
My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues.				
Strongly Disagree	2	7.7	3	7.5
Disagree	0	0.0	10	25.0
Neither Agree nor Disagree	13	50.0	18	45.0
Agree	11	42.3	8	20.0
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	1	2.5
Total	26	100.0	40	100.0

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter has been organized to include a summary and discussion of findings

related to each research question. Implications for future research as well as

recommendations are presented. A conclusion then completes the chapter.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

Research Question 1

Is there a relationship between political comfort and faculty members' political
party preferences?

The relationships between each of the political comfort variables in section 3 of

the survey were compared to the political affiliation of the respondents using Fisher's

Exact test. Of the eight variables, only "My political views are similar to those of my

colleagues" was significantly related to political preference ($p < .01$).

Democrats outnumber Republicans by more than 4:1 among the survey

respondents. Therefore, it was not surprising that Republican respondents reported more

frequently that they differed with their colleagues' political views than did the Democrat

respondents.

However, it was difficult to draw any firm conclusions regarding the perceptions

of Republican respondents because there were so few Republican respondents.

Politically, 81.3% of respondents indicated a preference for Democrats whereas 18.7%

indicated a preference for Republicans. Among non-tenured faculty members, this disparity increased. A total of 88.5% of non-tenured respondents indicated a preference for Democrats whereas 11.5% indicated a preference for Republicans.

Research Question 2

Does political comfort differ based on gender or religious affiliation?

The relationships between each of the political comfort variables in section 3 of the survey were compared to gender, religious beliefs, and frequency of attending religious services using Fisher's Exact test. Of the eight variables, "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views in the classroom" ($p < .01$) and "My political views are similar to those of my colleagues" ($p = .03$) were significantly related to gender. None of the variables were significantly related to either religion-oriented variable.

Across all respondents, male and female, 86.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views in the classroom". This was not surprising as the definition of academic freedom includes the following principle: "Teachers. . . should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject" (American Association of University Professors, 1940).

Male faculty members were more reserved in assessing the similarity of their political views to those of their colleagues than were females. In other words, there were more "Neither Agree nor Disagree" responses to the statement "My political views are

generally similar to those of my colleagues" among the males than there were among the females. This may or may not indicate more political discussion among females than among males.

The males were also more divided regarding whether they agreed with their colleagues' views than were the females. This finding makes sense considering the differences in male/female faculty political identification. A total of 78% of male faculty respondents indicated a preference for Democrats, whereas 22% of male faculty respondents indicated a preference for Republicans. Also, a total of 91.7% of female faculty respondents indicated a preference for Democrats, but only 8.3% of female faculty respondents indicated a preference for Republicans.

Research Question 3

Does political comfort differ based on academic discipline--specifically economics and political science?

The relationship between each of the political comfort variables in section 3 of the survey was measured considering academic department using Fisher's Exact test. Of the eight variables, "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my teaching" ($p = .02$), "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on departmental committees" ($p = .01$), "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on university-wide

103

committees" ($p < .01$), and "My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues" ($p < .01$) were significant.

Economics faculty respondents reported more willingness to discuss political views in the context of teaching than did political science faculty respondents. This may or may not be due to differences in the culture of the disciplines.

Neither economics nor political science faculty reported comfort in discussing political views in the context of departmental committee service. Political science faculty members more frequently disagreed with the political comfort question as it applied in the departmental committee service context than did economics faculty. Comparatively speaking, even though both economics and political science faculty did not report comfort in discussing political views in the context of departmental committee service, political science faculty reported less comfort in this context than did economics faculty. Some departmental committee service may have nothing to do with politics. When politics is salient, it may or may not be the case that some faculty members are uncomfortable expressing themselves due to perceptions of an environment that might be hostile to their views.

Also, whereas economics faculty were evenly split on discussing political views in the university-wide committee context, political science faculty disagreed strongly with the comfort question in this context. The literature did not create any expectations related to this context. It is certainly possible that these narrow dissertation research questions do not capture some of the complexity of workplace relationships. It is also

possible that some individuals may not--as a personal preference--engage in political speech outside of very familiar social settings.

Economics faculty either did not report on their colleagues' political views or they disagreed with their colleagues' political views. Political science faculty either did not report on their colleagues' political views or they agreed with their colleagues' political views. This finding makes sense considering the differences in economics/political science faculty political identification. A total of 68% of economics faculty respondents indicated a preference for Democrats whereas 32% of economics faculty respondents indicated a preference for Republicans. A total of 90.5% of political science faculty respondents indicated a preference for Democrats whereas only 9.5% political science faculty respondents indicated a preference for Republicans.

Research Question 4

Does political comfort differ based on institutional affiliation--specifically University of Florida, The Florida State University, and University of South Florida?

The relationship among the universities was explored for each of the political comfort variables in section 3 of the survey using Fisher's Exact test. Of the eight variables, only "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues informally" ($p = .01$) was significant. Large majorities of faculty members at all three institutions reported comfort in discussing political views informally with colleagues. The percentages were similar at the University of Florida (95.9%) and The Florida State University (92.9%), and somewhat smaller at the University of South

Florida (69.3%). Based on the literature reviewed, these numbers were surprising. One possible explanation for the smaller comfort percentage among the University of South Florida respondents – relative to University of Florida and The Florida State University respondents--is the brief research tradition of the University of South Florida, as compared with the longer research tradition at University of Florida and The Florida State University. It is possible that a longer tradition of research at a university goes hand-in-hand with an increased perception of academic freedom and, therefore, political comfort. However, given the exploratory nature of the study, the small sample size, and the unique variable of interest, the conclusions that might be drawn here are very limited.

In discussing this finding, it is interesting to note that at the University of Florida, 86.4% of respondents indicated a preference for Democrats, and only 13.6% of respondents indicated a preference for Republicans. At The Florida State University, 78.6% of respondents indicated a preference for Democrats, and 21.4% of respondents indicated a preference for Republicans. At University of South Florida, 75% of respondents indicated a preference for Democrats, whereas only 25% of respondents indicated a preference for Republicans. Given the relative lack of diversity in the respondents in terms of political preference, one might question whether less diversity of political views could contribute to greater comfort in discussing those views.

Significant Findings of the Study

The findings of this study yielded some interesting data points related to the professors who responded to the survey. Only 23.3% of respondents were 35 years of age or younger, and only 3.2% were younger than 30 years of age. With regard to religion, 43.3% of the survey respondents indicated they were not religious. The next highest self-identified religion was Christian (Other) with a total of 23.9% of responses. None of the respondents indicated they were Muslim. With regard to ethnicity, 89.1% of the survey respondents indicated they were white. Respondents indicating they were black totaled 4.7%, Asian respondents totaled 1.6%, and all other minorities totaled 4.7%. None of the respondents indicated they were Hispanic or Native American. Whereas these demographic data are surprising, it would be difficult at best to accurately estimate or predict--based on names and information on a university website--the demographic makeup of a population of faculty members prior to conducting a formal study.

Politically, 81.3% of respondents indicated a preference for Democrats whereas 18.7% indicated a preference for Republicans. Among non-tenured faculty members, this disparity increased. A total of 88.5% of non-tenured respondents indicated a preference for Democrats, whereas 11.5% indicated a preference for Republicans. These findings are similar to previous faculty politics studies.

To better describe "Republican" and "Democrat" party preference, respondents were asked several issue questions. The vast majority of Republican respondents (91.6%) strongly disagreed or disagreed that "Government should be more involved in the economy." All Republican respondents (100%) agreed or strongly agreed regarding the

107

statement "School Voucher programs should be expanded." Also, most Republican respondents (66.7%) disagreed or strongly disagreed regarding the statement "Economic inequality should be solved through income redistribution in the United States." The majority of respondents were aligned with the 2008 Republican national party platform.

The Democrat respondents were more heterogeneous in their responses to issue questions. A majority of Democrat respondents (54.9%) strongly agreed or agreed that "Government should be more involved in the economy," but 39.2% of Democrat respondents chose "Neither Agree nor Disagree." A total of 44.2% of Democrat respondents chose "Neither Agree nor Disagree" regarding "School voucher programs should be expanded," but 36.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 19.2% agreed or strongly agreed. The Democrat Party has generally opposed school vouchers.

Also, a majority of Democrats (56.9%) agreed or strongly agreed regarding the statement "Economic inequality should be solved through income redistribution in the United States." A total of 36.5% of Democrat respondents, however, chose "Neither Agree nor Disagree" and 15.7% of Democrat respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Research Question 1 sought information regarding whether there was a relationship between political comfort and faculty members' political party preferences. Of the eight political comfort variables, only "My political views are similar to those of my colleagues" was significantly related to political preference ($p < .01$). Republican respondents reported more frequently that their political views differed from those of their colleagues than did the Democrat respondents. However, it is difficult to draw any

firm conclusions regarding the perceptions of Republican respondents because there were so few Republican respondents.

Research Question 2 sought information regarding whether political comfort differed based on gender or religious affiliation. Of the eight variables, "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views in the classroom" ($p < .01$) and "My political views are similar to those of my colleagues" ($p = .03$) were significantly related to gender. Across all male and female respondents, 86.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views in the classroom." Male faculty members, though more reserved in assessing the similarity of their political views to those of their colleagues than females, were more divided regarding whether they agreed with their colleagues' views than were females. None of the variables were significantly related to either religion-oriented variable.

Research Question 3 sought information regarding whether political comfort differed based on academic discipline--specifically economics and political science. It is important to review here that of the eight variables, four were significant: "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my teaching" ($p = .02$), "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on departmental committees" ($p = .01$), "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on university-wide committees" ($p < .01$), and "My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues" ($p < .01$).

Economics faculty respondents reported more willingness to discuss political

views in the context of teaching than did political science faculty respondents. Both

economics and political science faculty did not report comfort in discussing political

views in the context of departmental committee service. A higher percentage of political

science faculty members disagreed with the political comfort question in the

departmental committee service context than did economics faculty.

Though economics faculty were evenly divided in regard to discussing political

views in the university-wide committee context, political science faculty disagreed

strongly with the comfort question in this context. The literature does not point to a

reason for this disparity. Economics faculty either did not report on their colleagues'

political views or they disagreed with their colleagues' political views. Political science

faculty either did not report on their colleagues' political views or they agreed with their

colleagues' political views.

Research Question 4 sought information regarding whether political comfort

differed based on institutional affiliation--specifically University of Florida (UF), The

Florida State University (FSU), and University of South Florida (USF). Of the eight

variables, only "I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with

colleagues informally" ($p = .01$) was significant. Large majorities of faculty members at

all three institutions reported comfort in discussing political views informally with

colleagues. The proportion was similar at UF (95.9%) and FSU (92.9%), and was a bit

less at USF (69.3%).

Implications for Future Research

The findings of this investigation indicate that Democrats outnumber Republicans 4:1 among the survey respondents. Further research could examine why there are so many more Democrats than Republicans among college faculty members. The ratio of Democrats to Republicans could be examined among those admitted to graduate study. This could then be compared to the Democrat to Republican ratio among doctoral recipients seeking academic jobs.

It is difficult to predict how society and the academy will evolve and how these changes will impact political views and/or comfort. Because of these difficulties, the researcher refrained from speculating on the future in terms of trends. No researchers have attempted to predict trends in the political views and/or comfort of college faculty. Because this is the first study to investigate political comfort, data from the general population and other professions do not exist. Therefore, at this point, these findings stand alone and cannot be compared with political comfort in other settings.

The researcher has attempted in this study to develop and test a survey instrument that would assess university faculty members' comfort in academic discussions related to politics. For the purpose of this investigation, the level of ease of faculty members in these discussions was termed "political comfort." One of the key assumptions that the researcher made in this study was that political comfort would enhance academic freedom.

Further study could be initiated related to the measurement of academic freedom. An "Academic Freedom of the Colleges" index could be built by aggregating the comfort

measures. For that matter, the instrument developed for this study might be used to examine political comfort in other sectors of higher education such as community colleges, proprietary colleges, and private liberal arts colleges. It would also be interesting to see if the results were similar based on a statewide or even a national population of public research universities.

Some evidence in this study indicated that tenure did not necessarily promote increased political comfort. Exploration of the relationships between tenure and academic freedom, and tenure and political comfort might yield some interesting results.

Several qualitative studies could also be undertaken. With regard to religion, 43.3% of the survey respondents indicated they were not religious. In regard to the United States population as a whole, 15% self-identified as not religious (Kosmin & Keysar, 2009). A qualitative study would provide religious and not religious respondents more opportunity to expand on the impact of their world views on their professional lives. Another qualitative study might describe some of the political comforts (or discomforts) of faculty members with an emphasis on communication. It is possible that one might be "muffled and fearful" in academic matters due to poor communication or misunderstandings.

Still other areas of research could be initiated related to students, their perceptions regarding the politics of their professors, the pressure to conform with professors' political views, and the positive and negatives associated with pressure to conform. Quantitative and qualitative studies could also be undertaken to examine whether and how political views might impact teaching. Though peer review has its critics, subject

matter experts could examine course materials, syllabi, and textbooks for evidence of bias that could impact students.

Conclusion

This study represents the first investigation of faculty members' political comfort. In this investigation the researcher explored the relationship, if any, between comfort in discussing political views with colleagues and faculty members' political party preferences. The questions of whether political comfort differed based on gender, religious affiliation, and/or institutional affiliation were also explored.

The theoretical framework for this research was one that existed at the convergence of various conceptual understandings. Though the literature on academic freedom provided the general context of the study, the researcher sought to explore the degree to which faculty were comfortable in expressing academically-related political views. As those views were constrained, theories of marginalization were considered as part of the framework. Additionally, the literature on comfort provided the conceptual tools for understanding those situations in which faculty perceived expression to be unconstrained. For the purpose of this study, the theoretical framework was based on comfort.

Minimal ethnic and political diversity was found among the respondents in the present study. With regard to ethnicity, a large majority (89.1%) of the survey respondents were white. Black, Asian and all other minorities equaled approximately 10% of respondents, and no Hispanic or Native Americans were identified. In regard to

political preference, 81.3% of respondents indicated a preference for Democrats and only 18.7% indicated a preference for Republicans. It was difficult to draw any firm conclusions regarding the perceptions of Republican respondents because there were so few Republican respondents.

Male faculty members, though more reserved in assessing the similarity of their political views to those of their colleagues than females, were more divided regarding whether they agreed with their colleagues' views than were females. None of the variables were significantly related to either religion-oriented variable.

Economics faculty respondents reported more willingness to discuss political views in the context of teaching than did political science faculty respondents. Both economics and political science faculty did not report comfort in discussing political views in the context of departmental committee service. A higher percentage of political science faculty members disagreed with the political comfort question in the departmental committee service context than did economics faculty.

Though economics faculty were evenly divided in regard to discussing political views in the university-wide committee context, political science faculty disagreed strongly with the comfort question in this context. The literature does not point to a reason for this disparity. Economics faculty either did not report on their colleagues' political views or they disagreed with their colleagues' political views. Political science faculty either did not report on their colleagues' political views or they agreed with their colleagues' political views. Large majorities of faculty members at all three institutions reported comfort in discussing political views informally with colleagues.

114

Given the exploratory nature of the study, the small sample size, and the unique variable of interest, the conclusions that might be drawn from this investigation are limited. An important question remains though: Why is inclusiveness and diversity preached by many in the academy whereas some aspects and areas of the academy remain decidedly non-diverse? Whereas legislative remedies have been proposed, those tend to be fraught with unintended consequences. The best solutions to the academy's challenges will probably come from within the academy. Therefore, further study is certainly needed and warranted. Investigation can and should be done related to academic freedom, tenure, and political comfort.

APPENDIX A
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE/ADAPT TABULAR DISPLAYS

--- On **Mon, 8/24/09, Neil Gross *<neilgross@mac.com>*** wrote:

From: Neil Gross <neilgross@mac.com>
Subject: Re: Permission...
To: "John HILSTON" <jhilston82@bellsouth.net>
Date: Monday, August 24, 2009, 3:00 PM

no problem...

On 24-Aug-09, at 12:00 PM, John HILSTON wrote:

I'd appreciate permission to use a table from the following study:

Gross, N. & Simmons, S. (2007). The social and political views of American
professors. Retrieved December 19, 2007 from
http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~ngross/lounsbery_9-25.pdf

I'm working on a dissertation at University of Central Florida in Orlando, FL.

Let me know if you need any other info.

Thanks much,

john Hilston

Neil Gross
Editor, *Sociological Theory*, a journal of the American Sociological Association
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
University of British Columbia
6303 NW Marine Drive
Vancouver BC V6T 1Z1
Office: (604) 827-5511
Cell: (604) 312-4062
neilgross@mac.com

From: Avi Warner [mailto:awarner@bepress.com]
Sent: Monday, November 02, 2009 1:32 PM
To: Hilston, John
Subject: Re: Permission...

Dear John Hilston,

Thank you for writing. The permission you have requested would be fine. Please consider this email to use the tables in your dissertation.

Thank you,

Avi

Avi Warner
Editorial Project Manager
Berkeley Electronic Press
Phone: (510) 665-1200 Ext. 153
awarner@bepress.com
www.bepress.com/journals

bepress: 10 years of accelerating and enhancing the flow of scholarly ideas

On Sun, Nov 1, 2009 at 1:09 PM, Hilston, John <hilstonj@brevardcc.edu> wrote:
I'd appreciate permission to use Tables 1-4 (pgs 4, 6, 7, and 11) from the following study:

Rothman, S., Lichter, S.R., & Nevitte, N. (2005). Politics and professional advancement among college faculty. The Forum, 3(1), Article 2. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://www.bepress.com/forum/<http://www.bepress.com/forum/>

I'm working on a dissertation at University of Central Florida in Orlando, FL.

Thanks much,

john hilston

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. We'd like to start with a few questions about your position at the University:

1. What is your subject matter expertise?

☐ Economics   ☐ Political Science

2. What is your academic rank?

☐ Assistant Professor   ☐ Associate Professor   ☐ Professor

3. I have been teaching at the college level for _____ years.

[   ]

4. I have been awarded tenure at my institution.

☐ No   ☐ Yes

5. I will be considered for tenure in _____ years.

[   ]

Next

2. Now we will ask some questions related to politics and religion:

Please select the choices that most closely reflect your views.

1. Government should be more involved in the economy.

◻ Strongly Disagree ◻ Disagree ◻ Neither Agree nor Disagree ◻ Agree ◻ Strongly Agree

2. School Voucher programs should be expanded.

◻ Strongly Disagree ◻ Disagree ◻ Neither Agree nor Disagree ◻ Agree ◻ Strongly Agree

3. Economic inequality should be solved through income redistribution in the United States.

◻ Strongly Disagree ◻ Disagree ◻ Neither Agree nor Disagree ◻ Agree ◻ Strongly Agree

4. Given only these choices, I would be most likely to vote for candidates from the following party:

◻ Democrat ◻ Republican

5. The religion I most closely identify with is:

◻ Christian (Catholic) ◻ Christian (Baptist) ◻ Christian (other than Catholic or Baptist) ◻ Judaism ◻ Islam ◻ Other ◻ I am not religious

6. How often do you attend religious activities?

◻ More than once per week ◻ Once per week ◻ 2-3 times per month ◻ Once per month ◻ Only on major holidays ◻ Rarely/never

Prev   Next

121

3. Now we will ask some questions regarding your perceptions of comfort in the academic setting:

Please select the choices that most closely reflect your views.

1. I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my teaching.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

2. I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views in the classroom.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

3. I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my research.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

4. I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views in academic publications.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

5. I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on departmental committees.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

6. I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views with colleagues in the context of my service on university-wide committees.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

7. I am or would be comfortable discussing my political views informally with colleagues.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

8. My political views are generally similar to those of my colleagues.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Neither Agree nor Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

4. We will now finish with a few demographic questions:

1. What is your gender?

☐ Female   ☐ Male

2. I am employed by:

☐ University of Florida   ☐ Florida State University   ☐ University of South Florida

3. My age is:

[   ]

4. My race is _____.

☐ Black   ☐ Caucasian (White)   ☐ Hispanic   ☐ Asian   ☐ Native American   ☐ Other

5. Comments and/or Feedback

[   ]

[Prev]   [Done]

Faculty Views Questionnaire

Thank you for completing our survey!

Done

APPENDIX C
REQUESTS FOR SURVEY PARTICIPATION

Pre-request for Participation in UCF Survey

Dear faculty member,

A few days from now you will receive an email request to fill out a brief online questionnaire for my doctoral research that will address the notion of political comfort among college faculty members.

I am writing in advance because we have found many people like to know ahead of time that they will be contacted. Completing this survey should take no more than 10 minutes of your time.

Thank you for your time and consideration. It's only with the generous help of people like you that this research can be successful.

Sincerely,

John Hilston
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida
(407) 617-3549

Request for Participation in UCF Survey

Dear faculty member,

Please participate in an online survey that John Hilston, a University of Central Florida doctoral candidate, is using to collect data for his dissertation. The survey examines political comfort among college faculty members. Completing this survey should take no more than 10 minutes of your time. By clicking the link below and submitting the survey, you are consenting to voluntarily participate in the study. If the link does not work, please copy and paste it into the address line of your browser.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=mObILVm2h3LAz3Q1F7CSCg_3d_3d

Your responses will be anonymous and there will be no identifying information associated with them. To ensure privacy, all responses will be encrypted. We are using a host provider that does not maintain the Internet addresses of respondents. There are negligible risks involved with participation. If you decide to take part in the study, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer; simply skip to the next question.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact John Hilston at jhilston82@bellsouth.net or Dr. Rosa Cintrón at rcintron@mail.ucf.edu. Thank you in advance for participating in this survey. Your time and help are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

John Hilston
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida
(407) 617-3549

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research project, you can contact: UCF IRB - Office of Research & Commercialization; 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501; Orlando, FL 32826-3246.

Second Request for Participation in UCF Survey

From: Hilston, John
Sent: Wed 2/3/2010 12:12 PM
To: jhilston82@aol.com
Subject: Dissertation Survey...

Dear Professor:

Two weeks ago, you received an email requesting your participation in a survey
regarding the political comfort of college faculty.

If you have already responded, thank you so much for sharing your views. I am
especially grateful for your participation since it is only through the participation of
higher education professionals like yourself that this study is possible.

If you have not yet completed the survey, please do so by clicking on this link (or copy
and pasting the link into your web browser):

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=mObILVm2h3LAz3Q1F7CSCg_3d_3d

It will take less than 10 minutes of your time to complete the survey. If you are
experiencing difficulty,
please contact me via email at hilstonj@brevardcc.edu or jhilston82@aol.com.

Sincerely,

John Hilston
Associate Professor of Economics
Brevard Community College - Palm Bay
(321) 433 - 5327

Final Request for Participation in UCF Survey

From: Hilston, John
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2010 2:31 PM
To: 'jhilston82@aol.com'
Cc: 'Rosa Cintron-Delgado'
Subject: Last Chance...

Dear Professor:

Over the past several weeks, I have sent several emails inviting you to participate in a research study being conducted as part of my doctoral dissertation. The purpose of the study is to examine the political comfort of college faculty. If you have already responded, thank you so much for sharing your views.

The study will end soon. This is the last attempt I will make to encourage your participation. You may complete the survey by clicking this link to submit your responses electronically (or copy and pasting the link into your web browser):

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=mObILVm2h3LAz3Q1F7CSCg_3d_3d

The study population is quite small. Therefore, your response is critical to producing valid results.

All responses to the questions are confidential. In fact, responses are encrypted for maximum security. If you feel you have been contacted by mistake or that you are not qualified to respond to the survey, I understand.

Thank you again for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

John Hilston
Associate Professor of Economics
Brevard Community College - Palm Bay
(321) 433 - 5327

APPENDIX D
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) APPROVAL

Approval of Exempt Human Research

University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
          FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **John Hilston**

Date: **January 12, 2010**

Dear Researcher:

On 1/12/2010, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	Exempt Determination
Project Title:	FREEDOM OF POLITICAL EXPRESSION AMONG ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY IN FLORIDA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY
Investigator:	John Hilston
IRB Number:	SBE-10-06658
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Joseph Bielitzki, DVM, UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 01/12/2010 01:50:38 PM EST

IRB Coordinator

Page 1 of 1

REFERENCES

Abrams v. U S , 250 U.S. 616 (1919).

Academic Bill of Rights. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from http://www.studentsforacademic
    freedom.org/abor.html

Adamy, J. (1997, April 11). Reds among the maize and blue. *The Michigan Daily Online*.
    Retrieved December 3, 2007, from http://www.pub.umich.edu/daily/1997/apr/04-
    11-97/news/news14.html

Aguirre, Jr., A. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace*. San
    Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Aiken, L.R. (1996). *Personality assessment methods and practices*. Toronto, Canada:
    Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.

American Association of University Professors. (n.d.). *Good practice in tenure
    evaluation*. Retrieved October 17, 2009 from
    http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2000/ND/NB/teneval.htm

American Association of University Professors. (1970). *1940 Statement of principles on
    academic freedom and tenure with 1970 interpretive comments*. Retrieved June 7,
    2009 from http://www.higher-ed.org/resources/AAUP_1940stat.htm

Ames, B., Barker, D.C., Bonneau, C.W., & Carman, C.J. (2005). Hide the republicans,
    the christians, and the women: A response to 'Politics and professional
    advancement among college faculty'. *The Forum*, *3*(2), Article 7. Retrieved July
    28, 2006 from http://www.bepress.com/forum/

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C. & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education (5th
    ed.).* Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2006, January 6). *Academic
    freedom and educational responsibility: AAC&U board of directors' statement*.
    Retrieved June 7, 2009 from
    http://www.aacu.org/About/statements/academic_freedom.cfm

Balch, S. H. (2004, April 23). The antidote to academic orthodoxy. *Chronicle of Higher
    Education*, p. B7.

Baez, B. (1998). Negotiating and resisting racism: How faculty of color construct promotion and tenure. Retrieved February 10, 2010 from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/17/91/4e.pdf

Bartels, L.M. (2002). Beyond the running tally: Partisan bias in political perceptions. *Political Behavior, 24*(2), 117-150.

Barton, B. (2009). Dreams deferred: Disability definitions, data, models, and perspectives. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, *36*(4), 13-24.

Bastedo, M.N. (2005). Curriculum in higher education. In Altbach, P.G., Berdahl, R.O., & Gumport, P.J. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century.* (pp. 462-481). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bennett, W.J. (1986, October) Address by William J. Bennett, United States secretary of education. Harvard University. Cambridge, MA.

Boswell, C., Cannon, S., & Miller, J. (2005). Nurses' political involvement: Responsibility versus privilege. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 21*(1), 5-8.

Boyer, A.D. (1998, April 19). Review of *Liberalism and its discontents*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved April 7, 2008 from http://www.nytimes.com/books/98/04/19/bib/980419.rv101054.html.

Brookings Institution. (2001). *National survey on government endeavors*. Princeton Survey Research Associates.

Brown, A.D. & Humphreys, M. (2006, March). Organizational identity and place: a discursive exploration of hegemony and resistance. *Journal of Management Studies*, *43*(2), 231-257.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burnett, P. (n.d.). The red scare. Retrieved November 27, 2007 from http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/SaccoV/redscare.html.

Callister, R.R. (2006). The impact of gender and department climate on job satisfaction and intentions to quit for faculty in science and engineering fields. *Journal of Technology Transfer, 31*, 367-375.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). *The condition of the professoriate: Attitudes and trends*.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1994). Classifications.
     Retrieved August 4, 2009 from
     http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=63&search_flag
     =true&ref=783&start=783&BASIC2005=15&class_displaycount=10000&class_s
     tart=1

Chait, R.P. (Ed.). (2002). *The questions of tenure*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
     Press.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (n.d.) University of South Florida – Employer Profile.
     Retrieved October 4, 2009 from http://chronicle.com/employer/University-of-
     South-Florida/61/

Colorado State University. (n.d.) Strengths and weaknesses of electronic surveys.
     Retrieved October 7, 2009 from
     http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/research/survey/com3c1.cfm

Copan, P. (2003). Christophobia: Confronting the problem of religious discrimination on
     campus. *Christian Research Journal, 26*(1), 42-50.

Cuban, L. (1999). *How scholars trumped teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

DeRose, K. (2005, November 23). What Is epistemology? A brief introduction to the
     topic. Retrieved June 7, 2009 from http://pantheon.yale.edu/~kd47/What-Is-
     Epistemology.htm

Des Jardin, K. E. (2001). Political involvement in nursing--politics, ethics, and strategic
     action. Retrieved July 31, 2009 from http://www.aorn.org/AORNJournal/

Diggs, G.A., Garrison-Wade, D.F., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009). Smiling faces and
     colored spaces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the
     academy. *Urban Review*, *41*, 312-333.

Dillman, D.A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method (2nd ed.).*
     New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Ehrlich, T. & Colby, A. (2004, Summer). Political bias in undergraduate education.
     Liberal Education.

Finkin, M. (Ed.). (1996). *The case for tenure*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Florida State University Economics Department. (n.d.) Program (overview). Retrieved
August 4, 2009 from http://www.coss.fsu.edu/economics/undergraduate

Florida State University Factbook. (2008). Employee demographics. Retrieved October
4, 2009 from http://www.ir.fsu.edu/reports.cfm?ID=sf_factbook

Florida State University – Institutional Research. (2008). Enrollment headcount.
Retrieved October 4, 2009 from http://www.ir.fsu.edu/student/headcount.htm

Florida State University – Institutional Research. (2008). Faculty headcount. Retrieved
October 4, 2009 from
http://www.ir.fsu.edu/Faculty_Headcount/facultyheadcount.htm

Florida State University Political Science Department. (n.d.) Program (overview).
Retrieved October 6, 2009 from http://polisci.fsu.edu/undergraduate/index.htm

Fuchs, R.E. (1969). Academic freedom—Its basic philosophy, function and history. In L.
Joughin (Ed.), *Academic freedom and tenure: A handbook of the American
association of university professors.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Furedy, J.J. (1997). Academic freedom versus the velvet totalitarian culture of comfort.
Interchange, *28*(4), 331-350.

Furedy, J.J. (October-December 1997). Political correctness and the culture of comfort.
Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science, *32*(4), 299-302.

Glenn, D. (2007, October 19). Few conservatives but many centrists teach in academe.
Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved December 19, 2007 from
http://chronicle.com/article/Few-Conservatives-but-Many/26294/

Goodchild, L.F.& Wechsler, H.S. (1989). *The history of higher education*. Needham
Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Gravois, J. (2007, January 26). The battle over studies of faculty bias. *Chronicle of
Higher Education*. Retrieved December 18, 2007 from
http://chronicle.com/article/The-Battle-Over-Studies-of/28824

Gross, N. & Simmons, S. (2006, May 22). Americans' views of political bias in the
academy and academic freedom. AAUP. Retrieved April 13, 2007 from
http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/newsroom/prarchives/2006/Panel+to+Discuss+Publi
c+Perception+of+Higher+Education.htm

Gross, N. & Simmons, S. (2007). The social and political views of American professors. Retrieved December 19, 2007 from http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~ngross/lounsbery_9-25.pdf

Halberstam, D. (2000). Foreword. In P.J. Hollingsworth (Ed.), *Unfettered expression* (pp. vii-xv). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hamilton, N.W. (2002). *Academic ethics*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.

Hamilton, R.F. & Hargens, L.L. (1993). The politics of the professors: Self-identifications, 1969-1984. *Social Forces 71*(3), 603-627.

Hanson, V.D. (July/August, 2007). Blissfully uneducated. *The American*. Retrieved December 7, 2007 from http://www.american.com/archive/2007/july-august-magazine-contents/blissfully-uneducated

Hauptli, B.W. (1996). An unfounded critique of Florida's tenure system. Retrieved December 10, 2009 from http://www.fiu.edu/~hauptli/AnUnfoundedCritiqueofFlorida'sTenureSystem.htm#4

Hauptli, B.W. (2005). Education, indoctrination, and academic freedom. Retrieved December 4, 2009 from http://www.fiu.edu/~hauptli/Education,Indoctrination,andAcademicFreedom.html

Hofstadter, R. & Metzger, W.P. (1955). *The development of academic freedom in the U.S.* New York: Columbia University Press.

HR Guide to the Internet. (1999). EEO: Protected classes. Retrieved October 19, 2009 from http://www.hr-guide.com/data/G714.htm

Immerwahr, J. (1999). *Public attitudes on higher education*. Retrieved June 7, 2004 from http://www.highereducation.org/reports/pubatt/

Jaschik, S. (2005, March 30). Leaning to the left. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved July 25, 2006 from http:/insidehighered.com/news/2005/03/30/politics

Jefferson, T., Lipscomb, A.A., & Bergh, A.E. (1905). *The writings of Thomas Jefferson*. Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association of the United States.

Kengor, P. (2008, January 22). The twisted relativism of abortion. Retrieved June 9, 2009 from http://www.visandvals.org/The_Twisted_Relativism_of_Abortion.php

Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 385 U.S. 589, 605-606 [1967].

Kezar, A., Lester, J., Carducci, R., Gallant, T.B.& McGavin, M.C. (Fall, 2007). Where are the faculty leaders? *Liberal Education*, 14-21.

Klein, D. & Stern, C. (2005). Political diversity in six disciplines. *Academic Questions 18*(1), 40-52.

Kolcaba, K. (2003). *Comfort theory and practice*. New York: Springer Publishing.

Kosmin, B.A. & Keysar, A. (2009, March). American religious identification survey. Retrieved December 15, 2009 from http://livinginliminality.files.wordpress.com/2009/03/aris_report_2008.pdf

Ladd, E.C. & Lipset, S.M. (1975). *The divided academy*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lambro, D. (2007, November 8). Republicans can run against Rangel. RealClearPolitics.com. Retrieved September 19, 2008 from http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/11/rangel_tax_bill_jitters.html

Lipset, S.M. (1982). The academic mind at the top: The political behavior and values of faculty elites. *Public Opinion Quarterly 46*, 143-168.

Lisheron, M. (2003, July 6). UT seeks to profit from its marketplace of ideas. *The Austin American Statesman*. Retrieved October 1, 2007 from http://www.otc.utexas.edu/News/UTSeeksToProfit.jsp

Lewis, C.S. (2001). *Mere Christianity*. New York: Harper One.

Lucas, C.J. (1996). *Crisis in the academy*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

McCart, C.L. (1991). Using a cultural lens to explore faculty perceptions of academic freedom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

Merelman, R.L. (2003). *Pluralism at Yale: The culture of political science in America*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary. Comfort. Retrieved June 2, 2009 from http://www.merriam-webster.com/

Metzger, W.P. (1987). The academic profession in the United States. In B.R. Clark (Ed.), *The academic profession* (pp. 123-208). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Microsoft. (2003). Microsoft Word (2003 Version) [Computer software]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft.

Mill, J.S. (1859). *On liberty*. London: John W. Parker and Son.

Miller, J.J. (2002, January 28). Getting the right right: Liberals (and others) write conservative history. *National Review*. Retrieved April 8, 2008 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1282/is_/ai_81775381

Milov, S.E.F. (2005, April 7). Study finds academia may favor liberals. *The Harvard Crimson*. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://www.thecrimson.com/article.aspx?ref=506877

Mommsen, W.J. (1987). The academic profession in the federal republic of Germany. In B.R. Clark (Ed.), *The Academic Profession* (pp. 60-92). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Moyers, B. (2008, August 29). The solid south? Retrieved June 9, 2009 from http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/08292008/profile3.html

Mutz, D. & Martin, P. (March, 2001). Facilitating communication across lines of political difference: The role of mass media. *The American Political Science Review, 95*(1), 97-114.

O'Connor, K. & Yanus, A.B. (2009). The chilly climate continues: Defrosting the gender divide in political science and politics. *Journal of Political Science Education 5*, 108-118.

Painter, F.V.N. (1999). *A history of education*. Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press.

Paterson, J. & Zderad, L. (1976). *Humanistic nursing*. New York: Wiley Biomedical.

Phillips, K.A. (2000). The use of humor and effective leadership styles by elementary principals in central Florida (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(07), 2545.

Pipes, D. (2005, April 12). Conservative professors hard to find. *New York Sun*. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from http://www.danielpipes.org/article/2526

138

Republican Platform. 2008. Retrieved September 19, 2008 from
http://www.gop.com/2008Platform/

Rothman, S., Lichter, S.R., & Nevitte, N. (2005a). Politics and professional advancement
among college faculty. *The Forum, 3*(1), Article 2. Retrieved July 28, 2006 from
http://www.bepress.com/forum/

Rothman, S., Lichter, S.R., & Nevitte, N. (2005b). Fundamentals and fundamentalists: A
reply to Ames et al. *The Forum, 3*(2), Article 8. Retrieved February 12, 2010 from
http://www.bepress.com/forum/

Russell, D.R. (1991). *Writing in the academic disciplines, 1870-1990: A curricular
history*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Saunders, D.J. (2006, August, 3). Don't think outside the college box. *San Francisco
Chronicle*. Retrieved August 7, 2006 from http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-
bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2006/08/03/EDGOBIQ0961.DTL

Schaefer, D., & Dillman, D.A. (1998). Development of a standard email methodology:
Results of an experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly 62*, 378-397.

Schuster, J.A. & Finkelstein, M.J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of
academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University
Press.

Shannon, D.M., Johnson, T.E., Searcy, S., A. Lott (2002). Using electronic surveys:
advice from survey professionals. *Practical assessment, research & evaluation*,
8(1). Retrieved October 7, 2009 from http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=1

Smallwood, S. (2006, June 16). Poll finds the public opposes government interference in
academe--but some people remain concerned about radical professors. *Chronicle
of Higher Education.* Retrieved December 16, 2007 from
http://chronicle.com/article/Poll-Finds-the-Public-Opposes/4336

Smilkstein, R. (2003). *We're born to learn: Using the brain's natural learning process to
create today's curriculum*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Smith, L. (2007, August 17). Junior professors question job policies. *Chronicle of higher
education*. Retrieved February 10, 2010 from
http://chronicle.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu

State University System of Florida Facts and Figures. Retrieved June 8, 2007 from
http://www.flbog.org/factbook/quickfacts.asp#faculty

Strauss, V. & Turque, B. (2008, June 9). Fate of D.C. voucher program darkens. *The Washington Post,* p. B01.

SurveyMonkey. (n.d.) The simple way to create surveys. Retrieved October 8, 2009 from http://www.surveymonkey.com/Default.aspx

The Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. (2003). Conflicted views of affirmative action. Retrieved June 2, 2010 from http://people-press.org/report/184/conflicted-views-of-affirmative-action

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2004, June 24). Celebrating the 40th anniversary of title vii. Retrieved January 25, 2010 from http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/history/40th/panel/firstprinciples.html

The 2008 Democratic National Platform. August 25, 2008. Retrieved September 19, 2008 from http://www.dnc.org/a/party/platform.html

Tierney, W.G. & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Trochim, W.M.K. (2006). Introduction to validity. Retrieved October 9, 2009 from http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/introval.php

Tucker, A. (1984). *Chairing the academic department*. New York: Macmillan.

United States Department of Education – Institute of Education Sciences. (2008). Full-time instructional faculty in degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2003, fall 2005, and fall 2007. Retrieved December 10, 2009 from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d08/tables/dt08_249.asp

United States Department of Education – Institute of Education Sciences. (2008b). Characteristics and Enrollment. Retrieved October 2, 2009 from http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/index.asp?search=1&State=FL&city=&zipcode=&miles=&itemname=University+of+Florida&sortby=name&School=1&PrivSchool=1&College=1&Library=1&CS=DDB9C07E

University of California, Berkeley Career Center. (n.d.) PhDs--the transition from graduate student to assistant professor. Retrieved October 31, 2008 from http://career.berkeley.edu/PhDs/PhDtransition.stm

University of California at Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute. (2005). The American college teacher: National norms for the 2004-2005 HERI faculty survey. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved December 11, 2008 from http://chronicle.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/weekly/almanac/2008/nation/0102601.htm

University of Central Florida Graduate Catalog. (2009-2010).

University of Florida Economics Department. (n.d.) Economics as a major. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from http://www.cba.ufl.edu/eco/docs/udg_economics_as_a_major.pdf

University of Florida Economics Department. (n.d.) Faculty directory. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from http://www.cba.ufl.edu/eco/faculty/peoplelist.asp

University of Florida Factbook. (2008). Final headcount enrollment by major. Retrieved October 4, 2009 from http://www.ir.ufl.edu/factbook/enroll.htm

University of Florida Factbook. (2008). Staffing patterns. Retrieved October 4, 2009 from http://www.ir.ufl.edu/factbook/staff_pattern.htm

University of Florida Political Science Department. (n.d.) Faculty listing. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from http://www.polisci.ufl.edu/people/facalpha.shtml

University of Florida Political Science Department. (n.d.) Mission. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from http://www.polisci.ufl.edu/undergrad/index.shtml

University of Florida Tenure and Promotion Committee. (2007). Operating code. Retrieved October 19, 2009 from http://www.hhp.ufl.edu/find/forfacstaff/forms/CHHP-Tenure-&-Promotion-Committee-Operating-Code-final.pdf

University of Northern Iowa. (n.d.) SPSS techniques series: statistics on Likert scale surveys. Retrieved October 7, 2009 from http://www.uni.edu/its/us/document/stats/spss2.html

University of South Florida Economics Department. (n.d.) Faculty. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from http://coba.usf.edu/departments/economics/faculty/index.html

University of South Florida Economics Department. (n.d.) Program of study. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from http://coba.usf.edu/departments/economics/programs/index.html

University of South Florida – Infocenter. (2008). Student headcount. Retrieved October 4, 2009 from http://usfweb3.usf.edu/infocenter/?report_category=STU

University of South Florida – Office of Decision Support. (2008). American association of university professors-faculty compensation survey 2008-09. Retrieved October 4, 2009 from http://www.ods.usf.edu/DSS/Resources/docs/AAUP/AAUP-Survey-2009.pdf

University of South Florida Government and International Affairs Department. (n.d.) Faculty. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from http://gia.usf.edu/faculty/

University of South Florida Government and International Affairs Department. (n.d.) Program overview. Retrieved August 4, 2009 from http://gia.usf.edu/ps/ughome/

Velasquez, M., Andre, C., Shanks, T. & Meyer, M.J. (1992). Ethical relativism. *Issues in Ethics 7*(1), 2-5.

Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2004). Academic motherhood: Managing complex roles in research universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, *27*(2), 233-257.

Weber, J. & Cintrón, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Issues in higher education: Enduring enigmas in American colleges and universities*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Weingarten, T. (2005). Campus christians: not always at ease. *Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved August 2, 2006 from http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/0125/p12s02-legn.html

Weingartner, R.W. (1996). *Fitting Form to Function: A Primer on the Organization of Academic Institutions*. American Council on Education/Oryx Press Series on Higher Education.

Western Association of Colleges and Schools. (1994, February 23). Statement on diversity. Retrieved August 31, 2009 from http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/wasc/docs/pdf/WASC_statement_on_diversity.pdf

World InfoZone. (2009). Florida USA information. Retrieved November 30, 2009 from http://worldinfozone.com/country.php?country=Florida

Young, C. (2007, April). The impact of academic bias: Professors do lean to the left-but are students listening? *Reason Magazine*. Retrieved April 12, 2007 from http://www.reason.com/news/show/119231.html

Young, R.B. (1997). *No neutral ground: Standing by the values we prize in higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zinsmeister, K. (2002, September). The shame of America's one-party campuses. *The American Enterprise, 13*(6), 18-25.

Zipp, J.F. & Fenwick, R. (2006). Is the academy a liberal hegemony? *Public Opinion Quarterly, 70*(3), 304-326.

Zogby, J. (2004). The split electorate. eJournalUSA. Retrieved April 13, 2007 from http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itdhr/1004/ijde/zogby.htm