

**Professors' Politics and their Appeal as Instructors**  
**Jason Giersch, University of North Carolina at Charlotte**

**ONLINE APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A.**

**Responses by self-identified Democrats, Independents, and Republicans in sample.** Note that students not identifying with Democrats or Republicans were between the two on each measure.

<b>How serious or not will each of the following be for the United States in the future if nothing is done to address it?</b>	<b>Percent responding “very serious”</b>		
	<b>Democrats</b>	<b>Independents</b>	<b>Republicans</b>
Climate change	76	55	22
The environment	77	61	29
Terrorism	47	50	73
Corruption in the government	70	58	54
unemployment	52	40	37
immigration	35	33	52
	<b>Percent responding “agree” or “strongly agree”</b>		
Some groups of people in this country are given unfair advantages to get ahead in society.	78	55	40
There are equal opportunities to be successful for children born into low-income, middle-income, and high-income families.	5	13	25
The United States is a meritocracy, where people get ahead by their performance rather than their position.	7	19	32
How likely do you think that children born in families in the United States who have an income below the poverty line can become part of the wealthy class when they are adults?	12	19	28
<b>How much of the time do you think you can trust the following to do what is right?</b> (At the time, Republicans held the presidency, both houses of Congress, and both houses of the state legislature.)	<b>Percent responding “most of the time” or “just about always”</b>		
	<b>Democrats</b>	<b>Independents</b>	<b>Republicans</b>
The national government in Washington	23	32	52
The state government in [BLINDED]	37	45	60

**APPENDIX B.**

**Role of Expertise Impression.** In Model 1 of the table below, students who felt the teacher had more expertise were more interested in taking a class with them. In Model 2, students' impression of the professor's expertise is the dependent variable and is unrelated to the professor's ideology, when controlling for other factors. Values presented are odds ratios.

	<b>DV=interest in taking class with professor Model 1</b>	<b>DV=impression of professor's expertise Model 2</b>
<b>Impression of expertise</b>	2.078*** (.359)	
<b>Liberal Professor</b>	.684+ (.150)	1.358 (.334)
<b>Conservative Professor</b>	.468** (.105)	1.202 (.292)
<b>Ideology (conservative)</b>	.895* (.048)	.926 (.055)
<b>Political Science Major</b>	1.426 (.343)	.836 (.219)
<b>News consumption</b>	1.108* (.047)	1.106* (.050)
<b>Female</b>	1.104 (.212)	1.183 (.254)
<b>Log Likelihood</b>	-561.764	-316.549
<b>n</b>	416	416

## **APPENDIX C.**

### **Robustness Checks**

Data collection included alternative measures of the dependent variable. Items asking for interest in the course or interest in a different course with the instructor produced very similar results, save the difference shown in Models 4 and 5 of Table 3. Participant ideology served as an alternative measure for the political affiliation independent variable. Again, results did not change in meaningful ways.