

## **Burn after Reading**

### *Research-Related Trauma, Burnout, and Resilience in Right-Wing Studies*

MEREDITH L. PRUDEN

Kennesaw State University

Last year, in preparation for my academic discipline's biggest international conference, the International Communication Association (ICA), I purchased a T-shirt from the ICA web store with the words "FCUK INDIVIDUAL RESILIENCE" emblazoned across the front alongside a newly redesigned association logo. The shirt was inspired by the 2021 article "Academic Caregivers on Organizational and Community Resilience in Academia (Fuck Individual Resilience)," by Sun Joo (Grace) Ahn, Emily T. Cripe, Brooke Foucault Welles, Shannon C. McGregor, Katy E. Pearce, Nikki Usher, and Jessica Vitak. The article draws on Patrice M. Buzzanell's resilience scholarship to make a series of recommendations for moving away from individualized approaches and toward "organizational and community resilience" (Ahn et al. 2021, 301). While the article focuses on a lack of institutional support for academics with additional caregiving responsibilities (e.g., parents who care for children or those who care for aging parents), the authors also recognize that the recommendations they make will ultimately "help *everyone* in academia" (301, original emphasis). In an era when ever more disciplines and subjects are politicized and, following from that, ever more university students, staff, faculty members, and administrators find themselves in the proverbial hot seat for the content of their scholarship, it is clear *everyone* needs the help that community and organizational approaches to resilience could provide. Perhaps nowhere is this truer than in right-wing, extremism, or far-right studies and adjacent disciplines.<sup>1</sup> But a recent investigation of Canadian universities found that only one of the responding media relations offices had any resources available for the increasing risk of harassment related to public-facing scholarship (Ketchum 2020). It is not unreasonable to assume this is similarly the case elsewhere.

---

1 While an imperfect term, "far right" is used as an umbrella term encompassing the illiberal, extremist, and antidemocratic right for the remainder of this essay.

The T-shirt is also a fundraiser with proceeds earmarked to provide free childcare for student ICA attendees with kids—certainly, a cause well worth the \$25 price tag and an excellent example of community resilience. But, more than that, the message—of both the article and the T-shirt—deeply resonated with me. I wore the shirt proudly on the first day of the conference with jeans, a blazer, my N95 mask, and sensible flats for trekking all over the expansive Parisian conference center, and it proved a reliable and often compelling conversation starter. After reading the article, wearing the T-shirt, and having conversations about the shirt with colleagues and friends conducting research on the right wing and far right, I began to make connections between this community resilience experience and another topic I have been tinkering with for the better part of the past two years—research-related trauma (RRT), that is, trauma related to studying harmful content. Since that time, my perspective on RRT has more fully developed. This essay is an early attempt to flesh out my thinking on organizational and community resilience and how scholars of the far right and beyond might begin to tackle the mental, emotional, and physical risks of conducting research on harmful content and groups as well as such associated manifestations of RRT as burnout.

Research-related trauma has been conceptualized by political scientists Cyanne E. Loyle and Alicia Simoni (2017, 141) as “the psychological harm that emerges from exposure to death or violence while engaging in research.” While this body of scholarship is still in its relative infancy by academic standards, it first emerged as a response to concerns around the trauma caused by conducting fieldwork in conflict zones or working with people who have experienced pervasive death and violence. Because this research area has historically been geared toward these populations, as well as survivors of sexual violence, many of the recommendations to improve conditions for those experiencing RRT have tended to echo the highly individualized personal care strategies Ahn et al. implicitly rail against (e.g., therapy, peer support, exercise, ample sleep, practicing mindfulness, taking breaks, maintaining meaningful connections, etc.).<sup>2</sup>

Early work in this vein has also tended to overlook other forms of RRT—namely, harassment-related research trauma (HRRT) and symbolic research-related trauma (SRRT). Along with scholars studying newly politicized topics, researchers of the far right are likely to experience organized harassment campaigns and spend long hours analyzing potentially traumatic content. Kathleen Blee (2007, 121) has written of HRRT that “it is not uncommon for extreme rightest groups to actively intimidate potential researchers with explicit or implicit threats of violence.” I have personal and professional relationships with (mostly female and LGBTQ) scholars of the far right

---

2 To be clear, there is nothing inherently wrong with these practices. I have practiced all of them at one time or another in the course of my research on supremacism, violent extremist communication, far-right media and politics, mis- and disinformation, and conspiracism; however, they all put the burden of detraumatization on the person who has been traumatized in the first place. In other words, they are individual band-aids on a gaping structural wound.

who have been threatened with lawsuits for public scholarship, received rape and death threats, been doxxed, and more. You probably do too, and you should find some wood to knock on if you do not. Repeated, long-term exposure to symbolic forms of violence (e.g., racist, sexist, or anti-LGBTQ media narratives and online discourses) while conducting research can also lead to another kind of trauma—SRRT. I can personally attest, for example, that immersing yourself in harmful content can leave you feeling irritable and exhausted on even the best days. (I once had to take a week “off” after reading and analyzing thousands of pages of white supremacist content.) Thomas Colley and Martin Moore (2022) have highlighted mental health concerns related to sustained researcher exposure to harmful content. Similarly, in recent interviews for a forthcoming study of early career researchers and harmful online content, my coauthors and I found that most of our participants had experienced some form of RRT and its mental or physical manifestations. Importantly, the risk of RRT for researchers of the far right—whether it stems from fieldwork, harassment, or repeated exposure to symbolic violence—is more pronounced for graduate students, precariously employed staff, and scholars researching harmful groups and content when they are related to those scholars’ intersectional identity (e.g., a trans woman studying anti-trans hate groups or a Black woman studying white nationalism).

Of course, we scholars who conduct research on the far right, disinformation, hate speech, conspiracism, supremacism, extremism, radicalization, and other similar topics (as well as the ever-increasing list of “newly” politicized topics like vaccination) did in many cases choose to build our research agendas around these subjects. I, for example, transitioned from a specific focus on male supremacism to the far right more broadly due to personal and professional concerns about a lack of intersectional scholarship in the discipline. Some readers may be thinking that we have no one to blame but ourselves if we experience RRT while exploring, analyzing, or critiquing our chosen research area, so why bother building, rethinking, or restructuring organizational and community resilience. But such thinking downplays very real internal academic imperatives and external political landscapes that shape how we carry out our work.

Internally, there are several cross-cutting factors that can contribute to difficulties with changing one’s research agenda. First, graduate students regularly conduct research on behalf of their advisors rather than choose a specific research area for themselves.<sup>3</sup> In these cases, students will most likely graduate with a body of work that best positions them for academic or alternative-academic (alt-ac) jobs that require maintaining this research agenda. In the case of far-right studies, this may mean alt-ac jobs in areas such as deradicalization or countering violent extremism (CVE) since academic roles with a far-right emphasis are somewhat limited outside of a few dedicated centers—increasingly

---

3 These students likely selected their graduate programs and advisors because they were interested in similar topics, but this is not always the case. At many institutions, advisor-advisee matches are simply made by the administration.

so in the current political climate. This is a detriment for knowledge production in our field. Second, the academic job market tends to reward applicants from “prestige” programs who have high numbers of publications or funded grants around a clear and cohesive research agenda. For critical scholars of the far right who are uninterested in taking money from government agencies—like Department of Justice funding for CVE—this also limits academic opportunities, particularly in less precarious positions such as tenure-track jobs. Third, the informal mandates to “publish or perish” and build a public profile often mean researchers have spent years focusing on one highly specialized research area that may have a few related branches.<sup>4</sup> I, for example, focus on supremacism, harmful online content, far-right media and politics, and associated disinformation and conspiracism, all from an intersectional feminist perspective rooted in political communication. To change that now, after seven years, would be akin to a full-scale reset of my academic career. Finally, many scholars studying the far right conduct their research because they hope to help fix the problem. They may be well aware of the inherent risks associated with this work, but in hoping to make the world a better, safer place, they actively work at not allowing these dangers to scare them away from their mission, including when support is required to reduce these harms.<sup>5</sup>

Even if from an internal perspective it were easy or desirable to change one’s research area away from far-right studies, the external political landscape has changed drastically in recent years. There are many tenured faculty who have been studying these topics for decades and are now potentially blindsided when they experience HRRT at the hands of students, colleagues, administrators, “grassroots activists,” and even government officials and online trolls.<sup>6</sup> Student evaluations of instructors can reflect racial and gender biases.<sup>7</sup> Friends and colleagues have noted student evaluations that now “armchair quarterback” their areas of research expertise and/or accuse them of ideological favoritism. I personally get at least one evaluation almost every semester that describes my visual communication class (a critical field often deployed in far-right studies to interrogate memes, symbols, etc.) as “too liberal” because the textbook unpacks the asymmetrical power dynamics of visibility and the persuasive capacity of looking, which these students seem to perceive as progressive “wokeism.”

But it is not just students who have begun targeting those who research harmful content. Some colleagues and administrators, too, voice concerns about these lines

---

4 Importantly, building a public profile (increasingly prized by academic institutions) also increases the likelihood of HRRT.

5 See, for instance, works on the importance of public scholarship around social injustice (Billard 2019) and communication studies broadly (Billard and Waisbord 2024).

6 I do not mean to imply that RRT—in all its variations—is a new phenomenon. However, the uptick in right-wing and far-right media outlets, as well as the speed with which related rhetoric and harassment can circulate online, has exacerbated the issue.

7 On bias in student evaluations, see note 14.

of scholarship because right-wing grievances about left-wing indoctrination do not magically disappear when you step across the campus border. Prior to joining my current institution, while still on the job market, I received some anecdotal remarks about my research agenda being too contentious in the current political climate. While this can be a hurdle most anywhere, it is more likely to be considered an issue in locations, such as the US South, where attacks on higher education have become par for the political course. Additionally, the appeal of neo-reactionary philosophy—traditionalist, antimodernist, “postliberal”—while fringe, is growing in academic spaces, as is founding right-wing centers and installing right-wing leadership at colleges and universities.<sup>8</sup> Conservative activist organizations, like the Leadership Institute, have been pushing academia as a leftist “evil empire” for decades, while organizations like Turning Point USA (TPUSA) curate its Professor Watchlist and help students file lawsuits against colleges and universities.<sup>9</sup> Even at the highest echelons of power, the “liberal elite” narrative in academia is present—former US education secretary Betsy DeVos infamously and erroneously bemoaned leftist indoctrination of students on college campuses at the 2017 Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC).<sup>10</sup> These trends parallel growing attacks on trans rights and women’s reproductive health, and associated political violence, beyond academia. The rhetoric is not only factually inaccurate but also inflames online trolls (who regularly respond by targeting and harassing journalists, activists, and researchers) and fuels conservative politicians’ efforts to quell academic freedom and whitewash course content.<sup>11</sup>

University of Tennessee professor Robert L. Williams wrote almost twenty years ago that “a conservative sociopolitical culture poses [a threat] to academic freedom in state colleges and universities” (2006, 5). More recently, the *American Conservative* cheered the “end of academic ‘freedom’” as a “conservative achievement,” suggesting

---

8 An example of the allure of antimodernist postliberalism is Deneen (2018). The North Carolina Board of Trustees, early in 2023, passed a resolution (bypassing shared governance in these matters) to launch a School of Civic Life and Leadership at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill designed as “an effort to remedy” a lack of “right-of-center views,” as described by the board chairman on *Fox and Friends* (Quinn 2023). Also, Florida’s governor, Ron DeSantis, waged a hostile takeover at New College of Florida and an all-out assault on liberal arts education in the state, vowing to transform the college into a “bastion of conservatism” (Mazzei 2023).

9 Early results from my own research on TPUSA’s Professor Watchlist indicate BIPOC and non-gender-conforming scholars conducting research on social justice issues are overrepresented relative to their presence in the academy.

10 This came as little surprise considering DeVos is likely connected (financially and personally) with the conservative website The College Fix. For her ties to The College Fix, see Fain and Seltzer (2017). For an overview of DeVos’s CPAC speech, see Jaschik (2017). On lawsuits by TPUSA, see Boothe (2017).

11 “Grassroots activists” are also trying to effect change in these areas at the K–12 level, turning up at school board meetings to discuss curriculum and harassing library workers over attempted book bans largely related to so-called culture war topics.

“tenure is on life support, and so are academic freedom of speech and inquiry as we have known them since at least the mid-twentieth century” (Ahmari 2023). These threats to academic freedom disproportionately impact scholars researching the far right and related social justice topics. Republican US congressperson Jim Jordan of Ohio, for example, recently weaponized Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to harass researchers studying politicized topics such as disinformation (Bernstein 2023). Florida, Georgia, and Texas, among other states, have either banned or are investigating the funding of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) initiatives.<sup>12</sup> Arkansas senator Tom Cotton introduced in 2021 the Stop CRT Act to federally defund institutions teaching critical race theory (CRT). Since then almost every state has seen efforts to ban the teaching of CRT or “divisive concepts.” Following the ban of gender studies programs in Hungary in 2018 (Kent and Tapfumaneyi 2018), some US states have also attempted to follow suit, despite reports that interest in the discipline is increasing.<sup>13</sup> Already in these places, faculty are left with unpleasant decisions to make—change their research agenda (as we have already established, not an easy task), seek employment elsewhere in a saturated and competitive job market, quit or retire, or stay to fight. We might also characterize these assaults on academic freedom as sources of RRT.

At the end of the day, whether you are an overworked academic caregiver (such as those on which Ahn et al. focus), conduct research on the far right in a state where your work is under attack, have been targeted for FOIA requests by the likes of Jim Jordan, or spend your days conducting far-right research that may lead to RRT, the symptoms of trauma are overwhelmingly similar. Colley and Moore (2020, 22) describe feelings of “despondency, numbness, intimidation, and isolation.” Loyle and Simoni (2017, 142) list many “intense or unpredictable feelings,” “changes to thoughts or behavior patterns,” “strained personal relationships,” and “stress-related physical symptoms,” including anxiety, nervousness, impatience, feeling overwhelmed, trouble eating and sleeping, difficulty concentrating, feelings of isolation, increased levels of conflict, withdrawal, headaches, nausea, and ultimately, burnout.

---

12 A recent report reviewed “the apparent pattern of politically, racially, and ideologically motivated attacks on public higher education in Florida” and found that the “hostile takeover” of the New College of Florida is viewed as a “test case.” Administrators are either acquiescing to the attacks or are complicit in them; the bills passed in Florida represent “a systematic effort to dictate and enforce conformity with a narrow and reactionary political and ideological agenda”; and self-censorship and fear are running rampant in this context. See AAUP (2023).

13 In the United States, states, including Florida and Wyoming, have attempted (in some cases successfully) to defund gender studies programs despite a 2023 report called “Protecting Our Futures: Challenges and Strategies for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies,” which pointed to increasing student interest (Alonso 2024). This may be linked to broader efforts to defund these programs by groups such as the conservative National Association of Scholars, which manages the website [www.mindingthecampus.org](http://www.mindingthecampus.org).

The Mayo Clinic (2023) describes work-related burnout or “job burnout” as “a special type of work-related stress—a state of physical or emotional exhaustion that also involves a sense of reduced accomplishment and loss of personal identity.” The organization also describes causes, risk factors, and symptoms of job burnout. Among the common causes of job burnout are a “lack of control,” “unclear job expectations,” “dysfunctional workplace dynamics,” “extremes of activity,” “lack of social support,” and “work-life imbalance.” In the academy, we experience all of these to varying degrees.

For scholars of the far right specifically, these demoralizing features of our higher education system butt up against pressures related to our research, and create compounding stressors that can hasten burnout from RRT, HRRT and SRRT. External actors such as local and federal politicians increasingly wield disproportionate pressure that threatens academic freedom and limits perceived control over our day-to-day professional lives. We may, for example, be implicitly or explicitly encouraged to avoid certain topics deemed not “germane” to our teaching. We may worry about our ability to publicize research about the far right without becoming targets of organized harassment campaigns or weaponized FOIA requests. We may experience a lingering sense of uncertainty or dread that politically inspired budget cuts will see our faculty lines disappear, or suffer anxiety around whether our research agendas will be deemed “tenure worthy” beyond our department. We may even have trouble publishing our research in journals beyond “niche” area studies either because that work displays normative commitments rooted in our desire to make the world better and safer or, alternatively, because it fails to align with more general disciplinary norms.

A perceived lack of control also can arise from unclear top-down mandates pertaining to job expectations. Undertaking leadership work at academia-adjacent organizations like the Global Network on Extremism and Technology (GNET), the Global Internet Forum to Counter Extremism (GIFCT), the Institute for Research on Male Supremacism (IRMS), and other similar nonprofits or think tanks may be highly relevant to our research agendas but frowned upon in lieu of department, college, institutional, or more general disciplinary service. Ratings of teaching excellence can be marred by evaluations from students who base their opinions on our gender or race, or on preconceived notions of our political leanings based on our research agendas, which are easily found online. This is further heightened for BIPOC, non-gender-conforming, and women scholars who already tend to receive comparatively worse—and identity-based—evaluations.<sup>14</sup> Also, publishing outside of academic journals (e.g.,

---

14 Studies on gender bias in teaching evaluations have been conducted for years with mixed results. However, several recent qualitative studies find support for bias related to a failure to “do gender” correctly (Adams et al. 2021; Gelber et al. 2022). See also Colleen (2022). Similarly, scholars have noted not only that women tend to experience bias in student evaluations but also that people of color do (Chávez and Mitchell 2020). While there is comparatively less research on how political views may impact student evaluations, at least one study indicates that students’ perceptions of an instructor’s politics may impact their evaluation (Kelly-Woessner and Woessner 2006). Additional research is needed related to politics and student evaluations in the contemporary climate.

op-eds, whitepapers, reports, etc.) or producing “creative” content (e.g., podcasts and documentaries) about our areas of focus may not count toward tenure and promotion.

Unfortunately, a lack of control and unclear job expectations—especially when combined with high-stakes research areas like far-right studies—can also quickly lead to dysfunctional work environments. While this dysfunction may or may not be discernible in our home departments or institutions, the interdisciplinary nature of our field can lead to gatekeeping and infighting, some of which has resulted in high-profile, and very public, arguments or meltdowns. Similarly, the academy’s baked-in extremes of activity and work-life imbalance are intensified in the case of far-right studies due to a lack of the formalized social support necessary to (at least partially) ameliorate RRT, HRRT, SRRT, and burnout. If there are no secure institutional mechanisms for support, how do we communicate with one another? Where do we fit this communication into our already jam-packed schedules? In the end, many far-right scholars may be left to suffer alone and in silence. My first experience with sustained harassment, for example, was interpersonal. A former colleague from my magazine days took issue with my research agenda, which he found online, and spent months creating new and ever more explicit fake email addresses to spam me with hate mail. Because this occurred during my first year on the tenure track, I felt I had precious little time to seek support about the situation from my peers despite having built an informal support network since graduate school. In the end, tears were cried, curses were shouted into the ether, and the HRRT I experienced was left unresolved and festering.

Unsurprisingly, the Mayo Clinic’s (2023) recommendations to address job burnout echo the forms of individual resilience previously described. Experiencing extreme stress? Do some yoga and *relax*. Feeling irritable? Get some *exercise* to improve your mood. Having trouble sleeping? Well, just get more *sleep*. Concentration on the fritz? Practice *mindfulness*. Feeling sad or disillusioned? Why not try seeking *social support* from friends, family, and colleagues. But, as Ahn et al. (2021, 303) note, “Structural change is critical to remove structural barriers.” Whether we are talking about caregiving during a crisis, RRT, or job burnout, we must rethink how we combat ongoing attacks on academic freedom and human rights, as well as how we can reprioritize efforts away from individualized recommendations and toward structural solutions and change using organizational and community resilience. At last year’s ICA conference in May 2023, my collaborators (including Drs. T. J. Billard, Rae Jereza, Ayse Lokmanoglu, and Nanditha Narayanamoorthy) and I convened a Blue Sky workshop on RRT aiming toward “the defanging of higher ed.”<sup>15</sup> The group identified four main areas for institutional and community support and resilience. While these suggestions would benefit everyone working in higher education, they hold particular promise for those

---

15 Other groups have also discussed these matters, including a recently formed working group on risky research organized by Alice Marwick, who has also conducted related research, at the Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR) and elsewhere.

conducting research related to the far right who are at higher risk of legal, physical, and mental health ramifications related to their work and are subject to additional monetary costs around personal safety and security.<sup>16</sup>

1. **Legal.** Colleges and universities can offer legal aid to employees who are being threatened with lawsuits stemming from public scholarship about their research areas, as well as representation when those threats turn into legal action. They can also provide training and welcome transparent and collaborative conversations with faculty about FOIA requests, including how they handle research in progress and redacting personal information. Legal counsel can take the time to learn more about faculty research agendas, particularly those who work in politicized areas like the far right and are more likely to be targeted for harassment. Finally, larger associations affiliated with higher education (e.g., the American Association of University Professors) can work together to establish or expand pro bono legal assistance for researchers facing harassment, FOIA weaponization, and lawsuits.
2. **Financial.** Shoring up or maintaining personal security costs money that many students, early career scholars, and precariously employed faculty simply do not have. The cost of purchasing services (like DeleteMe and Privacy Pro) and technology (like VPNs), among other things, adds up. Colleges and universities could launch small grants for researchers studying harmful and politicized topics to purchase the things they most need to keep them as safe as possible in the course of their work. Similarly, academic associations, publishers, and other similar organizations that rely on academic labor for their success can establish similar funds and target them toward those most in need of financial aid. From a community perspective, the “FCUK INDIVIDUAL RESLIENCE” T-shirt fundraiser provides an excellent example of how association divisions with many members doing difficult research can think creatively about resilience.
3. **Mental Health.** Colleges and universities can employ mental health professionals with expertise in RRT and make those services available free of charge to employees and students who may experience RRT in the course of their work. Alternatively, they could provide health insurance for employees and students with specific provisions for this type of mental health support. They could also establish peer support networks through campus centers for excellence in teaching and learning and/or mental health offices for researchers working on harmful or politicized subjects. One participant at our Blue Sky session also suggested exploring ways for researcher safety, including mental

---

16 I do not mean to imply, in the following list, that none of these suggestions are currently in practice at institutions of higher education and/or related organizations. However, if and where they are, they remain outliers in the broader academic ecosystem when they could be models for improvement.

health, to be tied to funding mechanisms (e.g., through federal grant makers like the National Science Foundation or the National Institutes of Health in the United States). Another recommended trying to expand the phrase “in the field” to include online research for health insurance coverage purposes.

4. **Awareness.** In order to convince our institutions that legal, financial, and mental health resources are necessary for the proper functioning of our professional roles, we must first raise awareness of the problems. We will not, for example, garner support for pseudonymous publishing practices or for the removal of classroom and office locations or phone numbers and emails from public-facing websites without an awareness that researchers of the far right are at risk of harassment and physical violence. RRT is still an understudied subject area, harassment of researchers is still largely swept under the rug, and the few recommendations and resources that do exist are still largely individualized. It takes a village, as they say, to do this work and community building is the foundation. Locking arms to advocate for these support structures is not too much to ask of our colleges and universities since engaging with our chosen research areas and interlocutors is a function of our employment. But to do so, we will need to begin by raising awareness of the problem and building community resilience.

Until such time as we have a fully fleshed-out organizational resilience infrastructure at our institutions and in academia-adjacent spaces, I invite anyone interested in connecting with me and my ICA Blue Sky collaborators to reach out and get plugged into the repository that emerged from the session. There is always power in numbers.

## References

- AAUP. 2023. *Preliminary Report of the Special Committee on Academic Freedom and Florida*. American Association of University Professors, Reports and Publications, May 24, 2023. <https://www.aaup.org/report/preliminary-report-special-committee-academic-freedom-and-florida>.
- Adams, Sophie, Sheree Bekker, Yanan Fan, Tess Gordon, Laura J. Shepherd, Eve Slavich, and David Waters. 2021. “Gender Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching: ‘Punish[ing] Those Who Fail to Do Gender Right.’” *Higher Education* 83: 787–807. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00704-9>.
- Ahmari, Sohrab. 2023. “The Right Should Cheer the End of Academic ‘Freedom.’” *American Conservative*, March 14, 2023. <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/the-right-should-celebrate-the-end-of-academic-freedom/>.
- Ahn, Sun Joo, Emily T. Cripe, Brooke Foucault Welles, Shannon C. McGregor, Katy E. Pearce, Nikki Usher, and Jessica Vitak. 2021. “Academic Caregivers on Organizational and Community Resilience in Academia (Fuck Individual Resilience).” *Communication, Culture & Critique* 14 (2): 301–5.

- Alonso, Johanna. 2024. "Student Interest in Gender Studies on the Rise, Despite Political Hostility." *Inside Higher Ed*, April 5, 2024. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/students/academics/2024/04/05/more-students-take-gender-studies-even-it-comes-under-attack>.
- Bernstein, Andrea. 2023. "Republican Rep. Jim Jordan Issues Sweeping Information Requests to Universities Researching Disinformation." *ProPublica*, March 22, 2023. <https://www.propublica.org/article/jim-jordan-information-requests-universities-disinformation>.
- Billard, T. J. 2019. "Out of the Tower and into the Field: Fieldwork as Public Scholarship in the Face of Social Injustice." *International Journal of Communication* 13: 3512–28. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/12581/2733>.
- Billard, T. J., and S. Waisbord. 2024. "The Promethean Imperative: An Introduction to Public Scholarship in Communication Studies." In *Public Scholarship in Communication Studies*, edited by T. J. Billard and S. Waisbord, 1–22. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Blee, Kathleen M. 2007. "Ethnographies of the Far Right." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 36 (2): 119–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241606298815>.
- Boothe, Daniel. 2017. "Turning Point USA Sues Another College after Settling with GVSU." *WGVU News*, July 7, 2017. <https://www.wgvunews.org/news/2017-07-07/turning-point-usa-sues-another-college-after-settling-with-gvsu>.
- Chávez, Kerry, and Kristina M. W. Mitchell. 2020. "Exploring Bias in Student Evaluations: Gender, Race, and Ethnicity." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (2): 270–74. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096519001744>.
- Colley, Thomas, and Martin Moore. 2022. "The Challenges of Studying 4chan and the Alt-Right: 'Come On In the Water's Fine.'" *New Media & Society* 24 (1): 5–30.
- Deneen, Patrick. 2018. *Why Liberalism Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fain, Paul, and Rick Seltzer. 2017. "Family Ties." *Inside Higher Ed*, February 6, 2017. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/02/07/betsy-devoss-connection-college-fix-conservative-higher-education-news-site>.
- Flaherty, Colleen. 2022. "Ratings and Gender Bias over Time." *Inside Higher Ed*, October 30, 2022. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/10/31/ratings-and-bias-against-women-over-time>.
- Gelber, Katharine, Katie Brennan, David Duriesmith, and Ellyse Fenton. 2022. "Gendered Mundanities: Gender Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching in Political Science." *Australian Journal of Political Science* 57 (2): 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10361146.2022.2043241>.
- Jaschik, Scott. 2017. "DeVos vs. the Faculty." *Inside Higher Ed*, February 23, 2017. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/02/24/education-secretary-criticizes-professors-telling-students-what-think>.
- Kent, Lauren, and Samantha Tapfumaneyi. 2018. "Hungary's PM Bans Gender Study at Colleges Saying 'People Are Born either Male or Female.'" *CNN*, October 19, 2018.

- <https://www.cnn.com/2018/10/19/europe/hungary-bans-gender-study-at-colleges-trnd/index.html>.
- Ketchum, Alex. 2020. "Report on the State of Resources Provided to Support Scholars Against Harassment, Trolling, and Doxxing While Doing Public Media Work." *Medium*, July 14, 2020. <https://medium.com/@alexandraketchum/report-on-the-state-of-resources-provided-to-support-scholars-against-harassment-trolling-and-401bed8cfbf1>.
- Loyle, Cyanne E., and Alicia Simoni. 2017. "Researching under Fire: Political Science and Researcher Trauma." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (1): 141–45.
- Mayo Clinic. 2023. "Job Burnout: How to Spot It and Take Action." Mayo Clinic, November 30, 2023. <https://www.mayoclinic.org/healthy-lifestyle/adult-health/in-depth/burnout/art-20046642>.
- Mazzei, Patricia. 2023. "Sports Are In, Gender Studies Are Out at College Targeted by DeSantis." *New York Times*, September 22, 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/09/22/us/new-college-florida-desantis.html>.
- Quinn, Ryan. 2023. "UNC 'Civic Life' Center Progressing, Over Faculty Objections." *Inside Higher Ed*, May 31, 2023. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/faculty-issues/shared-governance/2023/05/31/unc-civic-life-center-progressing-over-faculty>.
- Williams, Robert L. 2006. "Academic Freedom in Higher Education within a Conservative Sociopolitical Culture." *Innovative Higher Education* 31 (1): 5–25. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10755-006-9005-9>.