

8-1-2013

The Liberal Professor? An Analysis of the Beliefs of Teacher Educators

Andrew Kemp
Georgia Regents University

C. Steven Page
Georgia Regents University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jcre>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kemp, Andrew and Page, C. Steven (2013) "The Liberal Professor? An Analysis of the Beliefs of Teacher Educators," *Journal of Contemporary Research in Education*: Vol. 2 : No. 1 , Article 6.
Available at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jcre/vol2/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Education, School of at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Contemporary Research in Education* by an authorized editor of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

Andrew Kemp
C. Steven Page

Georgia Regents University

Abstract

There is much discussion in public discourse about the liberal leanings of faculty in higher education. The researchers in this study investigated the validity of this assumption. Using data collected from faculty from colleges of education throughout the country, the belief systems of this group were analyzed. What was discovered was that faculty in colleges of education are not liberal. In fact, the opposite is true. Discussion about the implications of these findings leads to an analysis of current policies and practices.

Introduction

There is a common perception among many Americans that universities are composed of mostly liberal professors who are attempting to indoctrinate the youth of the world into becoming radical agents of change. This perception is found in the popular media, the news and is discussed with regard to education by many different parties. However, is this true? Does it apply to all faculty? The purpose of this paper was to look at the beliefs of a specific population of higher education faculty—faculty in colleges of education. If the characterization of liberal faculty is true, this particular subgroup would have more influence over the views of college students because of their direct influence in the school systems. Therefore, are our future educators being indoctrinated into liberal ideologies.

Background

From the time of Dewey at the University of Chicago to the protests at Berkeley in the 1960's, conservatives have labeled those in higher education as liberal and at times a detriment to the so-called American way of life. Robert Friedrich (2009) reminds us "... Nixon told Henry Kissinger, 'The professors are the enemy. The professors are the enemy. Write that on the blackboard one hundred times and never

forget it'" (from "Nixon's the One," 2008). This attack by conservative politicians continues to present day. As Rick Santorum stated, "There are good, decent men and women who go out and work hard every day and put their skills to tests that aren't taught by some liberal college professor trying to indoctrinate them. Oh, I understand why he wants you to go to college. He wants to remake you in his image" (Yglesias, 2012, para. 2).

After the media continued to replay this sound bite, Santorum attempted to explain his way out of the situation, but it was evident that Santorum felt higher education is full of professors who are liberal and want to indoctrinate youth. One can even find a web video advertisement on the Fox Nation titled "Wake Up Students! Liberal Professors and Liberal Policies Are Ruining America". In the description of the web ad it states: "If you're tired of the left-wing media attacking conservatives, being made fun of for supporting American values, and Hollywood celebrating the hippy culture of the 1960s, blame higher education" (Coyle, 2012, para. 3).

It is not just the politicians and mainstream media who feel academia is filled with liberal professors. David Horowitz, one time radical turned conservative, proposed the "Academic Bill of Rights (ABOR)." In

response to ABOR, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) stated: "...nearly two dozen state legislatures have considered legislative proposals challenged the fundamental concept that higher education in the United States is and should be free of government control or interference. No state has approved the so-called Academic Bill of Rights, which would involve the state and/or federal government in oversight of curricula and teaching, and faculty hiring and promotion in both public and private institutions of higher education" (AAUP, 2010, para. 3). Horowitz also completed a now famous work, *The Professors: The 101 most dangerous academics in America*. According to Saitta (2006), "The book's dust jacket promises to expose not only 'radical academics', but also the 'ex-terrorists, racists, murderers, sexual deviants, anti-Semites, and al-Qaeda supporters who infect the American system of higher education'" (p. 2). This work includes many professors who have a long standing influence on education and educational thought such as: bell hooks; Stanley Aronowitz, Bill Ayers; and Priya Parmar. While this work has been attacked for its scholarship and validity, it is a constant reminder of the extreme right attacks on academia.

However, just as there are some in academia that are on the extreme fringes of the Left there are also people who are on the extreme fringes of the Right. After reviewing a study conducted by Gross and Fosse Kevin MacDonald, a professor in the Department of Psychology at California State University - Long Beach, came to the conclusion:

The result of this revolution is the American university as we see it now. Conservatives need not apply. And heterosexual White males should be prepared to exhibit effusive demonstrations of guilt and sympathy with their oppressed co-workers — and expect to be passed over for high-profile administrative positions in favor of the many aggrieved ethnic and sexual minorities who now

dominate the university, particularly in the liberal arts and humanities. These are the areas that define who we are. Quite simply, the results of the revolution of the multicultural left have been a disaster for the traditional people and culture of Europe and all its offshoots (MacDonald, 2012, p. 31).

Also, there are organizations that have been identified as being tied to the Left or Right in the view of role of professors in academia. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is considered by many to be liberal and the National Association of Scholars (NAS) is considered to be conservative. The membership of AAUP is approximately 47,000 while the NAS membership is 5,700.

Many have researched the idea of whether professors are liberal and if they are then why do they hold liberal beliefs as opposed to conservative. According to Gross and Foss (2012): "In particular, we found that professors are more liberal than other Americans because a higher proportion have advanced educational credentials, exhibit a disparity between their levels of education and income, have distinctive religious profiles, and express greater tolerance for controversial ideas" (p. 165).

Of course, in applying labels like liberal and conservative, individuals do develop an alliance with a particular political party. Saitta (2006), citing Rothman, Lichter and Nevitte 2005, Lindholm et al. 2002, noted that in more than one recent study of the political affiliations of the professoriate, faculty member in the humanities and social sciences are overwhelmingly Democrats or self-identified themselves as left. Saitta concluded that conservatives believe that these political beliefs intrude on teaching and scholarship and reduce education to indoctrination.

The major misconception is that professors attempt to indoctrinate their students into following a certain ideological thought. While there have been some overly publicized

events of professors going beyond academic freedom and forcing an ideology on students the truth is that the overwhelming majority of professors do not do this.

In a review of *Closed Minds? Politics and Ideology in American Universities* (Smith, B.L.R., Mayer, J.D., & Fritschler, A.L., 2008) Robin Wilson (2008) stated. “The overwhelming majority of professors do call themselves liberal, the authors say, but that doesn't mean their classrooms are dominated by their political views. The survey found that 95 percent of professors believe they are ‘honest brokers’ among competing views. Sixty-one percent said politics seldom comes up in their classrooms, and only 28 percent said they let students know how they feel about political issues in general” (para. 4).

With this in mind, one of the long-held beliefs about academia is students need to be exposed to ideas, philosophies, and ideologies that are different than their own. While being exposed to different ideas and philosophies might cause students to shift their thinking it also enables them to be able to defend their long-held beliefs.

This intersection of differing beliefs is not only for philosophy, humanities and political science courses. The field of education is often a field where competing philosophies and beliefs become evident. In educational theory, belief systems range from educationally conservative to liberal to radical. In order for students to be well rounded in educational beliefs and policy it is important that students understand the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of educational movements.

Methodology

As noted previously, the purpose of this study was to investigate the ideological beliefs of faculty in Colleges of Education around the United States. There is a common conception that university faculty are liberal. This study was conceived to test this popular notion. In order to accomplish this, an instrument, based on the work of Gutek’s (2004), *Philosophical and Ideological Voices in Education*, was

constructed to help define belief systems. The instrument, designed by Author and Author (2013), utilized the basic educational philosophies of essentialism, perennialism, progressivism, and postmodernism/social reconstructionism to create a survey that addressed the fundamental tenets of each educational belief system. The specific number of questions can be found in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Breakdown of statements

Educational Philosophy	Number of Statements
Essentialism	5
Perennialism	6
Progressivism	6
Social Reconstructionism	6

The statements were all worded in the affirmative with responses given on a 6-point Likert scale with 1 being “Strongly Disagree” and 6 being “Strongly Agree.” A sample statement reads, “Promoting future economic success is one of the main reasons that we have public schools.” In addition, there were two additional statements not specifically related to ideology:

- The purpose of education is to expose the conditions of domination present in society.
- Standardized testing is a viable means of judging the quality of an education.

Additionally, there were a variety of demographic items including:

- Region (based on U.S. Census data)
- University Size (based on AAUP categories, ie., Doctoral...)

- University Type (Public/Private/Private for Profit)
- Rank
- Subject(s) Taught
- Teaching Responsibility (Doctoral, Master's, Undergrad, etc.)
- Age (By Range)
- Gender
- Race

Validity and Reliability

The instrument was created by two curriculum theorists (Author & Author, In Press) using, as noted above, Gutek (2008) as a model.

While there are many sources of information about education belief systems, this was deemed a good choice because of the stature of Gutek.

In addition, the instrument was vetted by an additional curriculum theorist for the variety of topics and by two outside readers for clarity, singularity and diversity. This evaluation of the instrument allowed for basic content validity and safeguarded the quality of the statements. In order to ensure that the instrument had validity beyond content validity, will also be addressed through convergent validity and discriminant validity. In order to show both of these forms of validity, a series of correlations were conducted to show the relationships between similar subjects. These different relationships are found in Table 1 (see appendix). An argument could be made that a confirmatory factor analysis would be an appropriate analytical procedure to validity. However, because the instrument was not designed to confirm any particular construct, a confirmatory factor analysis would not be suitable.

Based on the correlation matrix, it is easy to see the relationships between the variables. For instance, there is a strong correlation between patriotism and beliefs about the American dream. In addition, the perennialist ideals of cultural replication and traditional content are closely aligned with the other conservative issues. Finally, the more radical items from the instrument (social equality and domination) are also closely related. All of these suggest there is convergent validity to the instrument. Conversely, these

variables have either no relationship, a small relationship, or an inverse relationship with their philosophically opposites. The perennialist, economic, and socially patriotic items are different from the more radical items. This suggests that there is discriminant validity due to the fact that there is little or no relationship.

This was the fifth use of this instrument. This survey had good internal consistency, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .855. This is above the preferred .8 as suggested by Pallant (2007).

Respondents

In order to ensure that there was a diverse sample of faculty for this study, respondents were chosen using the U.S. News and World Report list of top colleges and universities. A random sample of 100 of the top 200 National Universities and a random sample of 100 of the top 200 Liberal Arts Colleges were selected. In addition, 43 other institutions (based on convenience and contacts) were also added for a total of 243 universities. A total of 5,008 surveys were sent out over the course of fourteen days (due to mail server limitations). A link was sent to the selected faculty members with instructions explaining the study, reliability statistics, and a statement explaining that by completing the survey, consent for use was being granted.

Email address were manually found for each university and compiled into a master list. One hundred forty-two were returned for one of the following reasons: (1) bad email address, (2) sent to spam, (3) faculty member on sabbatical leave. In addition, seven faculty refused to answer the survey for a variety of reasons like questioning survey research, disagreement with the content of the survey and/or no interest. There were a total of 752 respondents for a 15% response rate. In a meta-analysis of survey response rates Nulty (2008), summarized that under the most stringent conditions (defined as a 3% sampling error and a 95% confidence level—common measurements) the results

should be 25% for a population of 2000. In this case, the total number of respondents was 5008. Therefore, an argument could be made that the 150% in respondents would reduce the response rate to the 15% found in this study. What is more important is if the respondents are representative of the group. As noted previously, this was sent to the top 100 national universities, the top 100 liberal arts colleges and 43 other random universities. There was equal representation for all regions and university types. There were thirty-four respondents that answered “other” or “prefer not to answer”. There were twenty respondents that declined altogether to answer this item.

Finally, a determination was made that one of the initial demographic variables had to be manipulated in order for this analysis to take place. For the purpose of this study, race was defined as either Caucasian or minority. The reason for this distinction was that, in general, faculty in colleges of education are predominantly Caucasian. As Hodgkinson (2002) explains, “... the teaching force is actually becoming increasingly White, due mainly to the striking decline in Black, Hispanic, and Asian enrollments in teacher education programs since 1990, with a proportionate increase in minority business majors” (p.104). Therefore, a determination was made to split race into two categories in order to make statistical analysis possible.

Results

Referencing the data collected, the initial analysis was simply a look at the descriptive statistics to determine the general beliefs of College of Education faculty. As seen in Table 2 (see appendix), the questions that have the highest means have little to do with liberalism (as portrayed by the media). In fact, the only statement related to liberalism deals with social equality, and with NCLB professing to make all students on grade level by 2014, that particular statement is deeply imbedded in current educational thinking and practice (not that everyone agrees). In addition, ideas related to critical theory and radical ideology are found in the bottom half of the list. Statements regarding

cultural domination and being critical of social norms are found below the mean suggesting that the respondents disagreed with the statement.

In order to further support the notion that faculty in Colleges of Education are miscast as liberal and radical, a factor analysis was conducted. The 25 items on the Purpose of Public Education survey were subjected to the principal components analysis (PCA) using SPSS Version 20. Before running the factor analysis, an analysis of the correlation matrix was conducted to determine if the data was suitable this type of data reduction. The examination of the correlation matrix revealed that there were many coefficients of .3 or higher suggesting the data was appropriate for factor analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .878, exceeding the recommended value of .6 suggested by (Pallant, 2007) citing Kaiser (1970, 1974). Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (Pallant citing Bartlett, 2007) reached statistical significance, which supports the factorability of the correlation matrix.

Typically, all factors would be addressed in a factor analysis on an individual basis. However, for the purposes of this study, the factors were addressed for their content related to liberalism. It was found that while there were five distinct factors extracted with eigenvalues exceeding one. However, the two most significant factors, which are later labeled as the American Dream and the Conservative Agenda explained almost 41% of the variance, and the next two explain only 11% of the variance totally almost 52% of the overall variance. It wasn’t until the fifth factor was extracted that a liberal bias was discovered. This first liberal factor only accounts for about 4.6% of the variance. The pattern matrix can be found in Table 3 (see appendix).

A quick look at the pattern matrix reveals that the first two factors are overwhelming conservative. From here forward, the first is factor will be referred to as the American Dream (25% of the variance). A brief investigation of the statements that make up this factor suggest that the primary factor is not inherently liberal. In fact, it is quite the

opposite. The components of the factor suggest a focus on what could be construed as the American Dream. The American Dream is a construct that has developed over time that focuses on hard work, creating your own destiny, and personal choice. More specifically, one of the statements specifically asked if promoting the American Dream was a purpose of education. Overall, this first factor is almost the quintessential definition of the traditional view of the American Dream.

There were several statements that stated students were not impacted by their environment and their traditional role in society is not a determining factor in their future success. These all point to the traditional belief in the American Dream. This falls in line with a very conservative view of education in which children are taught that anything is possible and if they focus on school and their education they can achieve success. This view of the purpose of education also suggests that students' home life and socioeconomic status is not a determining factor in the success they can attain.

The factor that loaded as the second most influential is being called the Conservative Agenda (approximately 15% of the variance). The focus of this factor is on issues such as promoting "American" cultural values, developing morality, fostering patriotism, and helping students fit into society. The Conservative Agenda factor suggests that a major purpose of public education is to replicate the status quo represented by white, male, Christians. This is shown through the parts of the factor related to teaching traditional content and replicating cultural values of the majority. Additionally, many people in this country believe that it is the purpose of education to teach children to be proud of their country and this can be seen in a majority of schools that recite the pledge of attendance each day. Especially after 9/11, many in society felt that it was the school's role to promote a favorable view of America. During the late 1990's, Character Education became a focus in many schools and there were programs developed that aided teachers in teaching "character words". Many of these "character words" dealt with

morals and values. It was, and still is, apparent the importance placed on these words by them appearing on the signs in front of schools as "Character Word of the Week".

The third factor, "Future Focus (6% of the variance)," focuses on a only a few, but quite diverse issues. Primarily, though, the emphasis is on economic prosperity and getting ahead for the future. The four components of this factor include education for economic success, going to college or getting a job, the American Dream (again) and standardized testing as a viable means of determining the quality of a student. While the first three are relatively easy to fuse together, the fourth is a bit more troublesome. However, being that the foundation of standardized testing is concentrated on the common core standards that every student is expected to master to be successful post K-12 education. According to corestandards.org (2012), the common core standards, "...reflect[] the knowledge and skills that our young people need for success in college and careers" (para. 2). So, it is obvious that a major belief system of education faculty deals directly with future educational and economic success.

The fourth factor, which accounts for 5% of the variance, is being titled the "Productive Citizen." This factor is composed of issues regarding the ideal citizen. These include issues such as being responsible, using multiple sources of information to make decisions, actively constructing knowledge, having the basic skills necessary for life, being responsible and being a productive citizen. Taken as a whole, these views about the purpose of public education suggest that a productive citizen is active in life and uses information to his/her benefit. The final component of this factor, "*Completing a teacher preparation program is essential to becoming a successful teacher,*" aligns with the rest of the components in the focus on thoughtful preparation. Overall, this factor, while not specifically conservative, doesn't delve into liberal ideology either. An argument could be made that it is a subsidiary component of the "Future Focus" factor in that it is a means of preparing for the future through complete academic preparation.

The final factor, the “Liberal Agenda,” only accounts for about 4.9% of the overall variance. As noted in to the pattern matrix, the liberal statements in the instrument are all found in this factor. It is interesting to note that this is a small part of the overall picture.

Discussion

As we have shown in regards to the philosophical beliefs about the purpose of education professors of education are conservative in their views. This is not in line with the political rhetoric and mainstream media reports about university professors being liberal and attempting to bestow liberal ideas on their students. Professors in Colleges of Education, according to our data, are miscast as liberal and radical and actually hold conservative views about the purpose of education. Perhaps part of this is due to the overwhelming control that No Child Left Behind and the standards movement have over public education. While there are bastions of liberalism discussed in educational circles, and perhaps dominate private conversations, the reality of the current educational system is based on standards, conservative legislation and a belief that America is falling behind.

However, a quick look at this history of curriculum reveals that curriculum is, in fact, cyclical. Glatthorn, Goschee, and Whitehead (2009) successfully summarize the history of curriculum and suggest that education changes regularly, shifting from conservative educational practice to more liberal approaches. Currently, public education is in a conservative cycle which might account for the conservative leanings of college of education faculty.

As mentioned earlier, there are extreme examples of liberal and conservative professors and it appears that those extremes are the publicized examples and not the norm.

Implications

The results of this survey are extremely disconcerting because it suggests that those who are responsible for teaching teachers actually believe that education in the U.S. are reinforcing

the status quo. While it is obvious that this is the focus of education at this point, the overwhelming view that this is the purpose of public education is troubling. These beliefs might cause someone to question “who’s morals” and “who’s culture” are important. It might cause someone to question the value of a liberal arts education versus an educational about economic advancement. It might cause someone to believe that the purpose of education is cultural replication and conformity instead of critical and creative thinking. Since we are a multicultural society and we have a vast number of different cultures that make up the fabric of the U.S. it is hard to promote one culture over another even if this has been done for centuries. It is also difficult to reconcile the results driven views of education with the more aesthetic and critical views of citizenship.

While it many will argued that students should be taught to be proud of their country and to support it both at home and abroad, it is troublesome that some feel this is a goal of education. In promoting patriotism in the classroom there is an assumption that the domestic and foreign policies of the U.S. are correct. There is a difference in patriotism and jingoism but at what point does the former stop and the latter begin? Also, if the goal of education is to promote patriotism then you are also killing critical thinking skills because students are being taught the U.S. is correct and if we question then we are patriotic. This is a slippery slope that those involved in education must be aware of and it would seem that in order not to slide down this path, we should not attempt to be on the slope at all. Another factor that was considered to be conservative is that the goal of education should be to help students “fit into society”. This view, again, reinforces the status quo without bringing into consideration the critique of society with fosters growth and change. This ability to fit into society was identified this as conservative because it implies that students need to be able to adapt to their surroundings and become a part of the larger society.

This is disheartening because if education should be about fitting in then the

Civil Rights Movement would not have occurred, we would not have the technology that we do today, and the Occupy Movement would never have happened. If education should be about helping students fit into society then we should be creating Stepford Wives. This is not to suggest that everyone should live on the fringes like “doomsdayers” or backpack across Europe to find themselves but we should let our students know it is OK to be different.

Finally, while the American Dream is alive and well in the United States, perhaps the antiquated definition of the American Dream is out of place. With the quickly changing makeup of the nuclear family, the expansion of career opportunities, the nebulous definition of wealth, the shift in demographics and the growth of both social media and social capital, perhaps the American Dream as it is traditionally viewed is no more. With technology, science, media, and society creating the need for creative, innovative and critical thinkers, it is conceivable that the view that the “American” culture, the traditional curriculum, and the need to conform to the hypothetical melting pot is outdated and useless. Maybe it is time for that next cycle to begin to reflect the necessities of contemporary society.

References

- AAUP. (2010). *Academic bill of rights & intellectual diversity: Government oversight of teaching and learning*. Retrieved from <http://aaup.org/AAUP/GR/Archives/camp/ABOR>.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative (2012). Common standards. Retrieved from <http://commonstandards.org>.
- Coyle, P. X. (2012). Wake up students! Liberal professors and liberal policies are ruining America. Retrieved from <http://nation.foxnews.com/liberal-professors/2012/06/07/wake-students-liberal-professors-and-liberal-policies-are-ruining-america>
- Friedrich, R. (2009). *Liberal education and liberal politics. Phi Beta Kappa Oration*. Retrieved from <http://www.fandm.edu/pbk/orations/liberal-education-and-liberal-politics>.
- Glatthorn, A.A., Boschee, F., & Whitehead, B.M. (2009). *Curriculum leadership: Strategies for development and implementation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gross, N. & Fosse, E. (2012). Why are professors liberal? *Theory and Society*, 41(2). 127-168.
- Gutek, G. (2003). *Philosophical and ideological voices in education*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hodgkinson, H. (2002). Demographics of teacher education: An overview. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 102-106.
- MacDonald, K. (2012). *Why are professors liberals?* Unpublished Manuscript. Retrieved from <http://www.kevinmacdonald.net/Professors.pdf>
- Nulty, D.D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301-314.
- Page, C.S. & Kemp, A.T. (2013). Reality checks: The (de)evolution of teacher attitudes. *The Educational Forum*, 77(2), 122-137.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Saitta, D. (2006). Higher education and the dangerous professor: Challenges for anthropology. *Anthropology Today*, 22(4), 1-3.
- Smith, B.L.R., Mayer, J.D., & Fritschler, A.L. (2008). *Closed minds: Politics and ideology in American universities*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press.

Wilson, R. (2008). *Professors found the keep political views quiet, but students detect them*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Professors-Found-to-Keep/1254> .

Yglasias, M. (2012). *How the culture war undermines American prosperity*. Retrieved from http://www.slate.com/blogs/moneybox/2012/02/27/how_the_culture_war_undermines_american_prosperity.html .

Andrew Kemp is an Assistant Professor of Teacher Education at Georgia Regents University. His research interests include place-based education, teacher perceptions of education, and increasing the relevance of education to students, teachers, and teacher education faculty. **Dr. Kemp** can be reached at akemp4@gru.edu.

C. Steven Page is an Associate Professor of Teacher Education at Georgia Regents University. His research interests include curriculum theory, the influence of corporations and non-profits on education, and postmodern theories of education. **Dr. Page** can be reached at cpage1@gru.edu.

Appendix

Table 1: Convergent and Discriminant Validity Correlation Matrix

		Promoting future economic success is one of the main reasons that we have public education.	Getting a job and/or going to college is one main reason for public education.	One main purpose of public education is to promote the American Dream.	Fostering patriotism is a primary purpose of public education.	Promoting the continuance of the cultural values of the United States is one of the main reasons for having a public education system.	A primary purpose of public education is to teach the content that is traditionally taught in schools.	One main purpose of public education is to promote social equality in society.	A main reason for public education is to expose the conditions of domination present in society.
Economic Success	Pearson Correlation	1	.629**	.455**	.361**	.360**	.289**	.067	-.143**
Getting a job/college	Pearson Correlation	**	1	.356**	.257**	.249**	.348**	.155**	-.092*
American Dream	Pearson Correlation	.455**	.356**	1	.470**	.549**	.288**	.030	-.102**
Patriotism	Pearson Correlation	.361**	.257**	.470**	1	.569**	.381**	-.108**	-.118**
Continuing Cultural Values	Pearson Correlation	.360**	.249**	.549**	.569**	1	.357**	-.027	-.075*
Traditional Content	Pearson Correlation	.289**	.348**	.288**	.381**	.357**	1	-.046	-.084*
Social Equality	Pearson Correlation	.067	.155**	.030	-.108**	-.027	-.046	1	.398**
Expose Domination	Pearson Correlation	-.143**	-.092*	-.102**	-.118**	-.075*	-.084*	.398**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
One main purpose of public education is to develop well-rounded individuals.	744	5.30	.810
Being able to use multiple sources of information to make decisions is a main goal of public education.	743	5.26	.924
The active construction of knowledge is a primary purpose of public education.	740	5.19	1.041
One primary purpose of public education is to help students develop the basic skills necessary to be successful in life.	739	5.18	.878
One main purpose of public education is to promote social equality in society.	742	5.14	1.029
One main purpose of public education is to promote the well-being of all individuals.	741	5.06	1.040
A main purpose of public education is to create productive citizens.	740	4.89	1.058
One main purpose for public education is to instill in students that their choices are not determined by their environment.	741	4.73	1.135
Cultivating in students an awareness for creating their own destiny is a primary purpose of public education.	740	4.71	1.040
Developing responsibility is a primary reason for public education.	740	4.71	1.060
Being able to work with others is one of the main purposes of public education.	739	4.71	1.007
One primary reason for public education is to foster the uniqueness of each individual student.	743	4.67	1.131
Getting a job and/or going to college is one main reason for public education.	744	4.56	1.197
Completing a teacher preparation program is essential to becoming a successful teacher.	742	4.54	1.428
A primary purpose of public education is to teach that a person's traditional role in society is not a determining factor in future success.	731	4.47	1.197
Promoting future economic success is one of the main reasons that we have public education.	740	4.36	1.205

Being critical of social norms is a primary purpose of public education.	738	3.89	1.339
Developing morality is a prime purpose of public education.	736	3.88	1.283
One main purpose of public education is to promote the American Dream.	737	3.87	1.316
Promoting the continuance of the cultural values of the United States is one of the main reasons for having a public education system.	741	3.86	1.327
A main reason for public education is to expose the conditions of domination present in society.	738	3.70	1.420
A primary purpose of public education is to teach the content that is traditionally taught in schools.	736	3.65	1.395
One of the main reasons for public education is to help teach students to fit into society.	738	3.48	1.290
Fostering patriotism is a primary purpose of public education.	738	3.21	1.352
Standardized testing is a viable means of determining the quality of a student.	739	2.26	1.297
Valid N (listwise)	684		

Table 3: Pattern Matrix

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Promoting future economic success is one of the main reasons that we have public education.			-.738		
One main purpose of public education is to develop well-rounded individuals.					
One main purpose of public education is to promote social equality in society.					.654
Getting a job and/or going to college is one main reason for public education.			-.829		
One main purpose for public education is to instill in students that their choices are not determined by their environment.	.846				

Being able to work with others is one of the main purposes of public education.	.412		
One main purpose of public education is to promote the American Dream.	.529	-.406	
Promoting the continuance of the cultural values of the United States is one of the main reasons for having a public education system.		.630	
Being critical of social norms is a primary purpose of public education.			.853
One of the main reasons for public education is to help teach students to fit into society.		.752	
Cultivating in students an awareness for creating their own destiny is a primary purpose of public education.	.597		
One primary reason for public education is to foster the uniqueness of each individual student.	.469		
The active construction of knowledge is a primary purpose of public education.		-.563	
Being able to use multiple sources of information to make decisions is a main goal of public education.		-.596	
One main purpose of public education is to promote the well-being of all individuals.		-.485	.415
One primary purpose of public education is to help students develop the basic skills necessary to be successful in life.		-.689	
Developing morality is a prime purpose of public education.		.669	
Fostering patriotism is a primary purpose of public education.		.731	
A main purpose of public education is to create productive citizens.		-.501	
A primary purpose of public education is to teach that a person's traditional role in society is not a determining factor in future success.	.649		

Developing responsibility is a primary reason for public education.		-.446
A primary purpose of public education is to teach the content that is traditionally taught in schools.	.488	
A main reason for public education is to expose the conditions of domination present in society.		.869
Standardized testing is a viable means of determining the quality of a student.	-.415	
Completing a teacher preparation program is essential to becoming a successful teacher.		-.448

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 24 iterations.