

Hal R. Arkes, Ph.D.

Emeritus Professor of Psychology

The Ohio State University

November 29, 2023

Testimony before the Higher Education Committee
of the Ohio House

My name is Hal R. Arkes. I've been a faculty member at both Ohio University and Ohio State University from 1972 until 2011. I've been either the department chair or acting chair four different times in three different departments at these two universities. I was the chair of Ohio University's Education Policy Committee for five years, and I've also been the chair of the Ohio State University Committee on Enrollment and Student Progress. I've also served on the President's Council at OSU. I've had a lot of experience in two of Ohio's largest universities.

I'm here in support of Senate Bill 83. As a researcher I'm going to present more facts than opinions. The first question I want to address is "What is the problem this bill is trying to solve?" There is a two-part answer to this question. The first part is the overwhelming preponderance of liberals versus conservatives among university faculty. According to one survey, in English the liberal to conservative ratio is 88 to 3. In the social sciences it is 75-9. In humanities it is 81 to 9. In political science it is 81-2. These lopsided statistics would be of no concern except that liberals confess to being discriminatory against conservatives. That is the second part of my answer. In 2012 Inbar and Lammers published a pair of studies that asked social and personality psychology faculty if they would discriminate against conservative faculty in hiring decisions, grant reviews, paper reviews, and symposium invitations. In social psychology there is an extremely strong prohibition against discrimination and bigotry. Yet these social and personality psychologists manifested significant discrimination in all four categories! For example, over one in three of these psychologists would

discriminate against conservatives in hiring decisions. This is the number who were willing to confess that they would discriminate. The presumption is that many more are willing to discriminate but are unwilling to confess to this unfairness. Thus the lopsided preponderance of liberal faculty does have an effect on faculty hiring. The very recent *Wall Street Journal* article contained the remarks of faculty members on Ohio State University hiring committees: In evaluating candidates for a faculty member in astrophysics, the policy was, and I quote, “The DEI statement was given equal weight to the research and teaching statements.” In another search the hiring committee gave a zero to a candidate who opined that thought that “racism, classicism, etc. are issues in the academy.” This candidate was rejected for not mentioning these issues might exist outside the academy. Seven months ago OSU finally was pressured into no longer requiring diversity statements. In my examination of hundreds of faculty job applications over my career, I can assure you that one can ascertain the political or racial characteristics of many applicants, and the Inbar and

Lammers study shows that is all you need to ignite the prejudice against conservative candidates. The current situation demonstrably lessens ideological diversity. Thus I suggest that everyone should be in favor of this Bill if they truly support ideological diversity.

Some opponents of Senate Bill 83 have stated that this bill impinges on academic freedom. I think that the current situation is a lot more damaging to academic freedom. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education found in a large survey that 60% of US college students self-censor their political views. Thus we can safely conclude that the current situation is poisonous to the free expression of ideas. This bill prohibits a requirement of a program in the OSU College of Education and Human Ecology that all participants in the program must acknowledge White privilege. In my opinion this political view or any political view should not be required in order to participate in any Ohio university official program. Senate Bill 83 prohibits this type of political litmus test. About a

quarter of Ohio's counties are officially in Appalachia. These counties are overwhelmingly White. For example, my wife grew up in Jackson County, which is 96% White. The median per capita income there is \$25,843. I've lived in Appalachia for 14 years, and I've bicycled around Appalachia for many more years. I think that the White folks in Appalachia would be absolutely astonished to learn that they have enjoyed White privilege, especially since 18% of the folks in Jackson County live below the official poverty line. If they refused to acknowledge their White privilege, they would be barred from the OSU program that required acknowledgement of White privilege. Senate Bill 83 would rectify this situation. What if OSU put a large ad in the newspapers in Appalachian Ohio counties stating that unless people in this county acknowledge their White privilege, they cannot participate in all programs at Ohio State University. I predict that this true statement about Ohio State University will not be well received in these counties.

Biology Professor Rissing in a *Columbus Dispatch* article pointed out “. . . biological insights . . . helped them [students] understand issues of social concern.” He feared that Senate Bill 83 would make his courses boring by prohibiting such a teaching strategy. I respectfully disagree. The Bill prohibits inculcating any social, political or religious point of view. In my opinion, many critics of the Bill are attacking a “straw man” that doesn’t exist. The Bill does not prohibit discussion of social issues. It prohibits indoctrination.

Some critics of the Bill assert that it micro-manages the faculty. After all, this bill requires that faculty members be reviewed annually. Annual reviews already occur in most departments. Unless one is self-employed, an evaluation of one’s performance is nearly a universal feature of being employed anywhere in the United States. This bill allows the university to remediate the deficiencies of faculty members who are performing in an unsatisfactory manner. What can be wrong with that? The bill states that the political or social views

cannot be a basis for a low evaluation. This provides much more protection for academic freedom than is currently the case.

Letters and op-eds in Ohio newspapers contain such fears that Senate Bill 83 is contrary to the elimination of racism, obtaining a more just and equitable society, and promoting peace. These are indeed worthy goals. Does OSU require 132 diversity officials, whose annual pay could fund full tuition for over 1,500 students? Diversity of viewpoint is a worthy goal, too, but discriminating against conservative faculty would seem to limit viewpoint diversity, not foster it. Training in “microaggression” detection at some universities teaches students to feel oppressed if someone asks an innocuous question such as “Where are you from?” This is probably the single most common question asked by freshmen on their first day on campus. I suggest that no freshman would think they were being treated aggressively when asked this question. OSU has multiple courses in microaggression detection. I question

whether such courses could possibly promote world peace, obtaining a more just and equitable society, or the elimination of racism. The goals sound worthy, but the reality of their implementation is far more aggressive than the behaviors they are supposed to address. In my opinion, Senate Bill 83 does much more to promote the goals we all want than does the current situation on Ohio's colleges and universities.

I'd be pleased to answer any questions you might have.