Perceptions of the Kavanaugh Controversy

Shania R. Kennedy

Westminster College

Perceptions of the Kavanaugh Controversy

This study seeks to evaluate the impact that misogyny and sexism have on Americans' interpretations and the media's coverage of political controversies involving gender, namely the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to the US Supreme Court by President Donald Trump in 2018. The concept of misogyny is defined as the extent to which individuals possess a prejudice against women; the concept of sexism is defined as the extent to which individuals possess prejudices based on sex or gender.

This topic area is important because perceptions of misogyny in politics have significant relevance following the Trump election in the United States. As can be seen in the Kavanaugh nomination, questions about the role of misogyny in political appointments are also critical.

Thus far, Q-sort methodology has not been extensively used to study attitudes toward sexism, especially within the context of controversies like the Kavanaugh nomination. My research seeks to add to the growing dialogue surrounding the relationship between politics and misogyny in the United States, a relationship that further scholarship could examine in other parts of the world.

Literature Review

Attempts to study sexism to date have most often been made in the field of social psychology; these studies have provided researchers with data relating to sexist thought patterns and behaviors among individuals and within groups. For my study, this data provided insight into how sexism manifests itself in particular contexts and how different individuals may exhibit or lack sexist characteristics based on a multitude of factors. Although it was not within the scope

of this project to look at sexism extensively, this data could be used in future research to expand upon mine and others' findings.

In "The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism," Glick and Fiske (1996) sought to: "(a) reveal the multidimensional nature of sexism, (b) offer a theoretical and empirical analysis of the sources and nature of men's ambivalence toward women, (c) compare our conception of ambivalent sexism with other theories of ambivalence (including ambivalent racism), and (d) provide a validated measure of ambivalent sexism." Their theory of sexism, ambivalent sexism, is characterized by ambivalence toward women, rather than hostility or benevolence. In developing this theory, Glick and Fiske also developed a corresponding method for measuring ambivalent sexism, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI).

The ASI taps into two opposite orientations toward women: "sexist antipathy or *Hostile Sexism* (HS) and a subjectively positive (for sexist men) orientation toward women, *Benevolent Sexism* (BS)." Glick and Fiske's research found that overall ASI scores predicted ambivalent attitudes toward women. The HS was correlated with negative attitudes about and toward women, and the BS (for nonstudent participants) correlated with positive attitudes toward women.

In their 1996 article, Glick and Fiske point out that sexism is typically conceptualized as a hostile attitude toward women, which does not take into account the positive feelings about women that often accompanies sexist antipathy: "*Hostile sexism* needs little explanation; by it we mean those aspects of sexism that fit Allport's (1954) classic definition of prejudice. We define *benevolent sexism* as a set of interrelated attitudes toward women that are sexist in terms of

viewing women stereotypically and in restricted roles but that are subjectively positive in feeling tone (for the perceiver) and also tend to elicit behaviors typically categorized as prosocial (e.g., helping) or intimacy-seeking (e.g., self-disclosure)." Ambivalent sexism, however, encompasses both hostile and benevolent sexism to create a multidimensional framework for understanding sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996; 1997; 1999; 2001).

The ASI is key to tapping into these nuanced attitudes toward women, which allows researchers to conduct more extensive, well-rounded studies on sexism. The authors have also created an Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory, which measures attitudes toward men (Glick & Fiske, 1999). Other measures that have been used to study sexism, along with the ASI, include the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS), the Modern Sexism Scale (MS) (Swim, 1997), and the Neosexism Scale (Masser, 1999).

In the article "Mobilizing Sexism: The Interaction of Emotion and Gender Attitudes in the 2016 US Presidential Election" the researchers sought to examine what role sexism played in the 2016 Trump victory. Conventional wisdom posited that authoritarianism, fueled by citizens' fears of economic and cultural change, was the main driver of Trump support in the months leading up to the 2016 election. This article argues that anger, rather than fear, mobilized particular groups in support for Donald Trump.

Also, the article found that sexism was a powerful predictor of vote choice in the 2016 election, even after controlling for factors like authoritarianism and partisanship; the article's analysis of the American National Election Studies (ANES) data from 2004, 2008, and 2012 indicates that sexism didn't play a significant role in the previous few elections, but was found to have played a large and significant role in the 2016 election. Sexism's influence on the 2016

presidential election has been notable in multiple studies (Rothwell, Hodson, & Prusaczyk, 2019; Setzler & Yanus, 2018). Knuckey's (2019) research yielded similar results, finding that sexism was exceeded only by partisanship. Research by Tien (2017), Greenberg (2016), and (Cassese & Barnes, 2018) shows, interestingly, that Trump was somewhat successful among a particular subgroup of women, despite his sexist comments-- white women without college degrees.

This research does indicate that voters apply powerful gender stereotypes to evaluations of female political candidates, regardless of what their general attitudes are about women. Voters often perceive women as being more caring and compassionate than men, and women are at a disadvantage when "masculine" qualities, like strength, are relevant. These stereotypes may lead some voters to perceive that women are also less competent than men; voter evaluations of female candidates are more dependent on information relating to candidate competence and compassion than evaluations of male candidates. These factors may very well have fueled anti-Clinton sentiment in the months and weeks preceding the election, while also mobilizing sexist voters to the polls.

Finally, the researchers examined that catalyzing effect of fear and anger on voter turnout. They found that "Fear sharply reduced sexism's impact on support for Trump relative to those who experienced anger. Further, anger powerfully mobilized sexists, a group that would normally be likely to stay home. These results illuminate the role that emotional undercurrents play in catalyzing group-based predispositions into politics" (Valentino, 2018).

Even before the recent controversies surrounding sexual harassment and assault, researchers sought to examine whether or not sexism could be a factor leading to sexual aggression. Begany and Milburn's (2002) study, entitled "Psychological Predictors of Sexual

Harassment: Authoritarianism, Hostile Sexism, and Rape Myths," hypothesized that authoritarianism would be predictive of sexual harassment, after previous research had indicated that authoritarianism had been found to be predictive of both physically and sexually aggressive behaviors. They found that authoritarianism was significantly correlated with Glick and Fiske's (1997) hostile and benevolent sexism theories, and with rape myth acceptance. Their results indicated that authoritarianism was a predictor of the likelihood of sexual harassment.

Rape myth acceptance also has a role to play in sexual assault perpetuation and perception. Chapleau, Oswald, and Russell's (2007) study found that ambivalent sexism, whether it is toward women or toward men, perpetuates rape myth acceptance; rape culture present in newspapers was found to be correlated with higher rates of rape and lower rates of pursuit through local criminal justice systems (Baum, Cohen, & Zhukov, 2018).

Sexism was also found to influence perceptions of rape scenarios and rates of victim blame; Abrams, Viki, Masser, and Bohner (2003) conducted four studies to examine these relationships. In the first two studies, participants higher in benevolent sexism blamed the victim significantly more than did their hostile sexist counterparts after reading an acquaintance rape scenario. However, in the second study, participants higher in hostile sexism showed significantly greater propensity to commit acquaintance rape, but not stranger rape. The third and fourth studies showed that the effects of both types of sexism were brought about by different perceptions of the victims in each scenario. These studies indicate that "benevolent sexism and hostile sexism underpin different assumptions about women that generate sexist reactions toward rape victims." Research by Yamawaki (2007) and Masser, Lee, and McKimmie (2010) supports these findings.

Methods

This project utilizes Q-methodology, a set of procedures and techniques to study human subjectivity. First, a *Q-sample* is created from a *concourse of communication*, or issue area. For this project, the Q-sample was created from the concourse surrounding the Kavanaugh nomination controversy.

Once the Q-sample is created, participants for the research are selected, which make up the P-set. The P-set for this project was made up of 20 Westminster College undergraduate students. After the P-set is selected, participants complete a *Q-sort*; the Q-sort allows participants to express their viewpoints by rank-ordering the Q-sample statements according to a particular *condition of instruction*, typically most agree to most disagree.

The Q-sample was made up of statements surrounding the Kavanaugh nomination controversy, and the participants were asked to rank the 24 statements on a scale of -3 to 3, with -3 representing the participant's most disagreed with statements and 3 representing the participant's most agreed with statements.

After all participants complete the Q-sort, the researcher is tasked with *factor analysis*. This analysis consists of intercorrelating the Q-sorts as variables and factor analyzing the resulting correlation matrix. Factors emerge from this correlation, and participants' levels of agreement or disagreement with the array of statements in each factor are indicated by *factor loadings*. After factor loadings are determined, *factor scores* are calculated for each Q-sample statement for each of the factors; this process determines what the different viewpoints are that are present in the wider concourse or issue area.

Finally, the results of the factor analysis are used by the researcher for *factor interpretation*, a process through which core meanings are extracted from the patterns and viewpoints found in the data. To determine core meanings, the researcher looks does not focus on the placement of individual Q-sample statements; rather, the researcher is tasked with scrutinizing the patterns of meaning present in the larger contextual structure given by a particular factor array (McKeown & Thomas, 2013, p. 5-6). The factor analysis for this project was completed using the program PQMethod, and both the analysis and interpretation will be discussed below.

Results

The analysis revealed two factors that were present in the participants' responses. Out of the 20 participants in the P-set, 13 participants were grouped into Factor 1, 5 were grouped into Factor 2, and 2 did not have significant loadings for either factor (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: Factor Matrix with an "X" Indicating a Defining Sort

Q-Sort	Sex	Political Party	Political Ideology	Factor 1 Loadings	Factor 2 Loadings
1	F	Democratic	Liberal	0.7979X	-0.4058
2	F	Democratic	Very Liberal	0.8664X	-0.2168
3	F	Democratic	Moderate	0.6295X	-0.0764
4	F	Democratic	Liberal	0.8471X	-0.2841
5	F	Democratic	Moderate	0.8473X	-0.2189
6	F	Democratic	Liberal	0.7969X	-0.3139
7	F	Democratic	Very Liberal	0.0882	0.4421

8	F	Democratic	Very Liberal	0.8375X	-0.4047
9	M	Democratic	Liberal	0.4688	-0.3740
10	M	Democratic	Very Liberal	0.7884X	-0.3645
11	F	Democratic	Very Liberal	0.7635X	-0.5049
12	M	Democratic	Liberal	0.5795X	0.1018
13	M	Republican	Conservative	-0.3308	0.7649X
14	M	Republican	Very Conservative	0.0246	0.7129X
15	M	Republican	Conservative	-0.3681	0.7018X
16	M	Republican	Conservative	-0.4128	0.7402X
17	M	Republican	Conservative	-0.3277	0.8199X
18	M	Other	Moderate	0.7875X	-0.0726
19	F	Other	Moderate	0.8301X	-0.2759
20	M	Other	Liberal	0.7507X	-0.0123
% expl.Var.				44	21

After analyzing the correlations between factor scores, it was determined that Factors 1

and 2 are highly intercorrelated in a negative direction (Table 2). Composite reliability scores for

each factor were 0.981 and 0.952, respectively, indicating that, if this Q-sort was given again,

participants are very likely to respond in similar ways as they did here (Table 3). The

characteristics of each factor were analyzed and interpreted based on factor loadings,

participants' political affiliation and voting history, and demographic information.

Factor 1

Factor 1 consisted of 4 males and 9 females. Ten of the participants identified with the Democratic Party, while the remaining three responded that they identified with neither the Democrats nor the Republicans. Of those ten who identified with the Democratic Party, four identified as "very liberal;" four others identified as "liberal;" the remaining five identified as "moderate." All but two of the participants reported supporting Hillary Clinton in the 2016 election; the two who did not reported that they did not or could not vote in the election.

The statements in which Factor 1 had the highest agreement were "Watching Ford's experience, it's no wonder that many sexual assault survivors hide their past and spend their lives suffering and pained silence" (Z = 1.558) and "Sexual assault allegations aside, no man who willingly lies under oath repeatedly should even be considered as a Supreme Court justice. Our government has lost its way and we should be ashamed" (Z = 1.515).

The statements in which Factor 1 had the highest disagreement were "Judge Kavanaugh was treated unfairly and is a man of highest integrity" (Z = -1.682) and "Judge Kavanaugh in the end proved himself the most reliable, factual, and transparent witness" (Z = -1.532) (Table 4).

Factor 2

Factor 2 consisted of all males. All five participants reported identifying with the Republican Party. Of these five, four identified as "conservative," and the remaining participant identified as "very conservative." Candidate support among these participants was similarly split; four of the participants reported that they supported Donald Trump in the 2016 election, while the fifth reported supporting none of the major candidates.

The statements in which Factor 2 had the highest agreement were "The burden of proof is not on Judge Kavanaugh to prove he didn't do it. He cannot prove a negative. In the United States of America, you are presumed innocent until proven guilty. But, apparently not in the United States Senate" ($Z = 2.100$) and "I am confident that Judge Kavanaugh will be a fair-minded and honest addition to the Supreme Court" ($Z = 1.213$).

The statements in which Factor 2 had the highest disagreement were "Dr. Ford is what a true patriot actually looks like. She is willing to risk everything for the good of the country. She showed real courage" ($Z = -1.714$) and "The message that Kavanaugh's confirmation gives to women who have been sexually assaulted, abused or harassed is fundamentally that you are not to be believed, that American society does not believe you. Unless there is a neutral third party witness, to corroborate, and there is very, very rarely, if ever, such a person" ($Z = -1.671$) (Table 5).

Differences and Similarities Between the Factors

The statements with the highest arrays of difference between the factors were "The message that Kavanaugh's confirmation gives to women who have been sexually assaulted, abused or harassed is fundamentally that you are not to be believed, that American society does not believe you. Unless there is a neutral third party witness, to corroborate, and there is very, very rarely, if ever, such a person" (Z-score difference = 3.140) and "Dr. Ford is what a true patriot actually looks like. She is willing to risk everything for the good of the country. She showed real courage" (Z-score difference = 2.406) (Table 6).

The consensus statements-- those that do not distinguish between any pair of factors-- were "The FBI should have investigated Dr. Ford's charges as they did in the 1991 Clarence

Thomas confirmation hearings, when Anita Hill made her charges. But the FBI did not" (Factor 1 Z-score = 0.73; Factor 2 Z-score = 0.47); "It's a very, very sad day for all Americans, because the process we witnessed is a sham" (F1 Z-score = 0.20; F2 Z-score = -0.09); "Truth has been the greatest casualty. There has not been a fair process for Dr. Ford nor Judge Kavanaugh, nor for the American public. It was political theater" (F1 Z-score = 0.12; F2 Z-score = 0.23); and "While Dr. Ford and Judge Kavanaugh both conducted themselves well, neither is 100% believable, and Americans should be angered by the deterioration of the confirmation process" (F1 Z-score = -0.30; F2 Z-score = -0.03) (Table 7).

Participants Who Loaded on Neither Factor

As previously discussed, two of the original 20 participants, one male and one female, did not have significant loadings on either Factor 1 or Factor 2. Both participants reported identifying with the Democratic Party; one identified as "very liberal," while the other identified as "liberal." Both reported supporting Hillary Clinton in the 2016 presidential election.

Discussion

This study aimed to examine perceptions of the Kavanaugh nomination controversy and then describe the characteristics of those perceptions. The results of the Q-sort indicated that there were two factors: Factor 1, in which the majority of the participants who loaded on the factor reported that they identified with the Democratic Party and supported Hillary Clinton in the election, and Factor 2, in which all of the participants who loaded on the factor identified with the Republican Party, and all but one reported supporting Donald Trump in the 2016 election.

Factor 1, outside of its partisan dimensions, displays high levels of sympathy toward Ford and victims of sexual assault overall, as evidenced by strong agreement with statements 5, 12, 2, and 18, and disagreement with statements 6 and 20 (see Table 8 for a complete list of Q-sample statements). Similarly, participants who loaded on Factor 1 view Ford as credible, as evidenced by agreement with statements 2 and 24, and strong disagreement with statement 20.

Factor 1 also indicates that participants did not seem to believe that Ford's accusations were leveled for personal gain or being used for political purposes, as as evidenced by agreement with statement 15, and disagreement with statements 21 and 14. Likewise, participants showed that they had concerns regarding the thoroughness of the investigation and that the hearings were being used as political theater, as evidenced by agreement with statements 3, 8, 13, 4, and 7.

Participants who loaded on Factor 1 also expressed doubts about Kavanaugh's moral character and credibility, as evidenced by agreement with statement 22, and disagreement with statements 11, 9, 17, and 1. Another characteristic of Factor 1 that may be related to these concerns about Kavanaugh is that participants did not believe that the controversy just reinforced people's prior views or that many observers were split 80-20, as evidenced by disagreement with statement 16.

Overall, Factor 1 seems to be characterized by a willingness to believe Ford and other victims, lack of trust in Kavanaugh, and a belief that the hearings and processes involved therein were not a ploy devised by Congressional Democrats; participants responses seem to indicate that, had there not been limitations on the time and scope of the hearings, justice could have been properly carried out.

Factor 2 displays lower levels of sympathy toward Ford and other victims of sexual assault, as evidenced by disagreement with statements 5, 18, and 12; Ford is not viewed as a hero, as evidenced by strong disagreement with statement 24. Participants who loaded on this factor showed concerns with the credibility of Ford's accusations and their implications, as evidenced by agreement with statements 9, 16, 23, 6, and 20, and disagreement with statements 11 and 2.

Participants who loaded on Factor 2 also indicated significant concerns about Ford benefitting from coming forward, as evidenced by strong disagreement with statement 15; likewise, participants were also concerned about Democratic involvement, as as evidenced by agreement with statements 21 and 14. Interestingly, when presented with another context that deals with women benefiting from particular circumstances, participants who loaded on Factor 2 do not indicate that they believe that white women who support Trump put their proximity to power over their own interests, as evidenced by disagreement with 10.

Concerns about the process were also raised in Factor 2, as evidenced by agreement with statements 3 and 7; however, the process was not regarded as a "sham" (statement 4), and there is some indication that participants believe that truth was sacrificed, but not, apparently as a result of the speed or limitations of the investigation, as evidenced by disagreement with statements 8 and 13.

Unlike Factor 1, Factor 2 displays high opinions of Kavanaugh's ability and character, as evidenced by agreement with statements 19 and 1; however, like Factor 1, there are also some doubts about his reliability as a witness, as evidenced by disagreement with statement 17 and agreement with statement 22.

Overall, Factor 2 displays mistrust in Ford, trust in Kavanaugh's ability, but not his credibility, and heightened suspicions about the whole process and everyone involved; there is an indication that participants believe that truth was sacrificed in the hearings, and that Democrats were involved in leveraging the hearings for political gain. Further research could examine the lack of sympathy for Ford in Factor 2 to determine if sexism plays a significant role.

Conclusion

The results indicated two types of perceptions on the Kavanaugh nomination controversy, though it is possible that there are other types of perceptions present in the population as a whole. Both types indicated some doubts about Kavanugh's credibility, and that there were some sacrifices as a result of the hearings and process: participants who loaded on Factor 1 indicated concerns about Kavanaugh being considered for the nomination even though he had lied under oath in the past, and participants who loaded on Factor 2 lamented that truth had been sacrificed.

The findings of this study are noteworthy in that they contribute to the growing body of literature surrounding Trump, his political appointments, and their impacts on the American public. This research also contributes to the proliferation of Q-methodology, a method to measure human subjectivity, that has not been widely applied thus far to questions of Trump's political appointments. This project further provides opportunities for future research to be done regarding sexism's role in perceptions of the Trump presidency and his political appointments, as it was not within the scope of this study to examine these in-depth.

References

Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003, January). Perceptions of stranger and

    acquaintance rape: the role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape

    proclivity. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12518974

Baum, M., Cohen, D., & Zhukov, Y. (2018). Does rape culture predict rape? evidence from u.s.

    newspapers, 2000–2013. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science, 13*(3), 263-289.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/100.00016124

Begany, J. J., & Milburn, M. A. (2002). Psychological predictors of sexual harassment:

    authoritarianism, hostile sexism, and rape myths. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*(2),

    119-126. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.119

Cassese, E.C. & Barnes, T.D. (2019). Reconciling sexism and women's support for republican

    candidates: a look at gender, class, and whiteness in the 2012 and 2016 presidential races.

    Political Behavior, 41(3), 677-700. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-018-9468-2

Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2007). How ambivalent sexism toward

    women and men support rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles*, *57*(1-2), 131-136.

    https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11199-007-9196-2

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and

    benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512.

    doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist

    attitudes toward women. *Psychology of women quarterly*, *21*(1), 119-135.

    https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1997-07907-008

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory: Differentiating hostile and

   benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23*, 519–536.

   https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379.x

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as

   complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American psychologist*, *56*(2),

   109-118.

   https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Peter_Glick/publication/12053318_An_Ambivalent

   _Alliance_Hostile_and_Benevolent_Sexism_as_Complementary_Justifications_for_Gen

   der_Inequality/links/00b4952e699935d24e000000.pdf

Greenberg, J. (2016, November 4). Trump wrongly claims tremendous support from women.

   Retrieved from

   https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2016/nov/04/donald-trump/trump-wr

   ongly-claims-tremendous-support-women/

Knuckey, J. 2019. ““I Just Don't Think She Has a Presidential Look”: Sexism and Vote Choice

   in the 2016 Election.” *Social Science Quarterly*, *100*(1), 342-358.

   https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/ssqu.12547

Masser, B., & Abrams, D. (1999). Contemporary sexism: the relationships among hostility,

   benevolence, and neosexism. *Psychology of women quarterly*, *23*(3), 503-517.

   https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00378.x

Masser, B., Lee, K., & McKimmie, B. M. (2010). Bad woman, bad victim? Disentangling the

   effects of victim stereotypicality, gender stereotypicality and benevolent sexism on

acquaintance rape victim blame. *Sex Roles*, *62*(7-8), 494-504.

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11199-009-9648-y

McKeown, B., & Thomas, D. B. (2013). *Q Methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

Publications, Inc.

Rothwell, V., Hodson, G., & Prusaczyk, E. (2019). Why pillory hillary? Testing the endemic

sexism hypothesis regarding the 2016 u.s. election. *Personality and Individual*

Differences, 138, 106-108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.09.034

Setzler, M., & Yanus, A. 2018. "Why did women vote for donald trump?" *PS: Political Science*

& Politics, 51(3), 523-527. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096518000355

Swim, J. K., & Cohen, L. L. (1997). Overt, covert, and subtle sexism: A comparison between the

attitudes toward women and modern sexism scales. *Psychology of women quarterly*,

21(1), 103-118. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00103.x

Tien, C. 2017. The racial gap in voting among women: White women, racial resentment, and

support for trump." *New Political Science, 39*(4), 651-669.

https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2017.1378296

Valentino, N., Wayne, C., & Oceno, M. (2018). Mobilizing sexism: The interaction of emotion

and gender attitudes in the 2016 u.s. presidential election. *Public Opinion Quarterly*,

82(1), 799-821. https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfy003

Yamawaki, N. (2007). Rape perception and the function of ambivalent sexism and gender-role

traditionality. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*(4), 406-423.

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17369444

Appendix

Table 2: Correlations Between Factor Scores

```
                1        2

    1      1.0000  -0.6044

    2     -0.6044   1.000
```

Table 3: Factor Characteristics

```
                               Factors

                            1         2
No. of Defining Variables   13        5
Average Rel. Coef.        0.800     0.800
Composite Reliability     0.981     0.952
S.E. of Factor Z-Scores       0.137     0.218
```

Table 4: Factor Scores-- For Factor 1

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
5	5. Watching Ford's experience, it's no wonder that many sexu	5	1.558
22	22. Sexual assault allegations aside, no man who willingly l	22	1.515
12	12. The message that Kavanaugh's confirmation gives to women	12	1.468
18	18. I've been really troubled by the expense offered by too	18	0.944
2	Ford's testimony was extremely raw, and extremely credibl	2	0.756
3	The FBI should have investigated Dr. Ford's testimony lik	3	0.727
24	24. Ford is what a true patriot actually looks like. She is	24	0.692
8	8. The hearing was rushed. Ford's allegations were not suffi	8	0.610
15	15. Ford had absolutely nothing to gain by bringing these ch	15	0.571
13	13. It was absurd that there was a hearing prior to there b	13	0.533
10	10. There is a longstanding problem that a majority of white	10	0.375
4	4. It's a very, very sad day for all Americans because the p	4	0.199
7	7. Truth has been the greatest casualty. There has not been	7	0.119
16	16. The hearings were a credibility contest, a Rorshach test	16	-0.134
11	11. While Ford and Kavanaugh both conducted themselves well,	11	-0.299
6	6. It is true that Ford was an empathetic witness in recount	6	-0.437
9	9. The burden of proof is not on Kavanaugh to prove he didn'	9	-0.486
21	21. Democrats calling for a 'full' FBI investigation of Ford	21	-0.508
23	23. If somebody can be brought down by accusations like the	23	-0.866

19	19. I am confident that Kavanaugh will be a fair-minded and		19	-1.141
20	20. I did not believe that Ford was telling the truth about	20		-1.492
14	14. The accusations were a calculated and orchestrated polit		14	-1.493
17	17. Kavanaugh in the end proved himself the most reliable, f		17	-1.532
1	1. Kavanaugh was treated unfairly and is a man of highest in	1		-1.682

Table 5: Factor Scores-- For Factor 2

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES	
9	9. The burden of proof is not on Kavanaugh to prove he didn'	9	2.100	
19	19. I am confident that Kavanaugh will be a fair-minded and	19	1.213	
16	16. The hearings were a credibility contest, a Rorshach test	16	1.149	
23	23. If somebody can be brought down by accusations like the	23	1.092	
21	21. Democrats calling for a 'full' FBI investigation of Ford		21	0.840
6	6. It is true that Ford was an empathetic witness in recount		6	0.805
20	20. I did not believe that Ford was telling the truth about	20	0.762	
14	14. The accusations were a calculated and orchestrated polit	14	0.553	
1	1. Kavanaugh was treated unfairly and is a man of highest in	1	0.501	
3	3. The FBI should have investigated Dr. Ford's testimony lik	3	0.466	
7	7. Truth has been the greatest casualty. There has not been		7	0.230
22	22. Sexual assault allegations aside, no man who willingly l	22	0.110	
11	11. While Ford and Kavanaugh both conducted themselves well,	11	-0.031	
4	4. It's a very, very sad day for all Americans because the p		4	-0.095
17	17. Kavanaugh in the end proved himself the most reliable, f	17	-0.329	
8	8. The hearing was rushed. Ford's allegations were not suffi	8	-0.438	
13	13. It was absurd that there was a hearing prior to there b	13	-0.585	
5	5. Watching Ford's experience, it's no wonder that many sexu	5	-0.657	
18	18. I've been really troubled by the expense offered by too		18	-0.743
2	2. Ford's testimony was extremely raw, and extremely credibl	2	-0.941	
15	15. Ford had absolutely nothing to gain by bringing these ch	15	-1.029	
10	10. There is a longstanding problem that the majority of white	10	-1.588	
12	12. The message that Kavanaugh's confirmation gives to women	12	-1.671	
24	24. Ford is what a true patriot actually looks like. She is	24	-1.714	

Table 6: Descending Array of Differences Between Factors 1 and 2

No. Statement	No.	Type 1	Type 2	Difference No.
12 12. The message that Kavanaugh's confirmation	12	1.468	-1.671	3.140
24 24. Ford is what a true patriot actually looks like.	24	0.692	-1.714	2.406
5 5. Watching Ford's experience, it's no wonder that	5	1.558	-0.657	2.215
10 10. There is a longstanding problem that a majori	10	0.375	-1.588	1.963
2 2. Ford's testimony was extremely raw, and extrem	2	0.756	-0.941	1.698
18 18. I've been really troubled by the expense offer	18	0.944	-0.743	1.687
15 15. Ford had absolutely nothing to gain by bringi	15	0.571	-1.029	1.600
22 22. Sexual assault allegations aside, no man who	22	1.515	0.110	1.405
13 13. It was absurd that there was a hearing prior to	13	0.533	-0.585	1.118
8 8. The hearing was rushed. Ford's allegations were	8	0.610	-0.438	1.049
4 4. It's a very, very sad day for all Americans becau	4	0.199	-0.095	0.294
3 3. The FBI should have investigated Dr. Ford's tes	3	0.727	0.466	0.261
7 7. Truth has been the greatest casualty. There has	7	0.119	0.230	-0.111
11 11. While Ford and Kavanaugh both conducted t	11	-0.299	-0.031	-0.268
17 17. Kavanaugh in the end proved himself the most	17	-1.532	-0.329	-1.203
6 6. It is true that Ford was an empathetic witness in	6	-0.437	0.805	-1.242
16 16. The hearings were a credibility contest, a Ro	16	-0.134	1.149	-1.283
21 21. Democrats calling for a 'full' FBI investigation	21	-0.508	0.840	-1.348
23 23. If somebody can be brought down by accusati	23	-0.866	1.092	-1.958
14 14. The accusations were a calculated and orchest	14	-1.493	0.553	-2.046
1 1. Kavanaugh was treated unfairly and is a man of	1	-1.682	0.501	-2.183

Table 7: Consensus Statements-- Those That Do Not Distinguish Between ANY Pair of Factors.

All Listed Statements are Non-Significant at P>.01, and Those Flagged With an * are also Non-Significant at P>.05.

		Factor 1		Factor 2	
No.	Statement	Q-SV	Z-SCORE	Q-SV	Z-SCORE
3*	3. The FBI should have investigated Dr. Ford's testimony lik	1	0.73	0	0.47
4*	4. It's a very, very sad day for all Americans because the p	0	0.20	0	-0.09
7*	7. Truth has been the greatest casualty. There has not been	0	0.12	0	0.23
11*	11. While Ford and Kavanaugh both conducted themselves well,	0	-0.30	0	-0.03

Table 8: List of Q-Sample Statements Including Z-Scores for Both Factors

1. Judge Kavanaugh was treated unfairly and is a man of highest integrity. (F1= -1.68, F2= +0.50)

2. Dr. Ford's testimony was extremely emotional, extremely raw, and extremely credible.

Her testimony was a disaster for Republicans and Judge Kavanaugh's supporters. (F1= +0.76, F2= -0.94)

3. The FBI should have investigated Dr. Ford's charges as they did in the 1991 Clarence Thomas confirmation hearings, when Anita Hill made her charges. But the FBI did not. (F1= +0.73, F2= +0.47)

4. It's a very, very sad day for all Americans, because the process we witnessed is a sham. (F1= +0.20, F2= -0.09)

5. Watching Dr. Ford's experience, it's no wonder that many sexual assault survivors hide their past and spend their lives suffering in pained silence. (F1= +1.56, F2= -0.66)

6. It is true that Dr. Ford was an empathetic witness in recounting what she seems to believe happened. However, raising the allegations 30 years later confirms only that she believes her own allegations as they concerned Judge Kavanaugh are valid. (F1= -0.44, F2= +0.81)

7. Truth has been the greatest casualty. There has not been a fair process for Dr. Ford nor for Judge Kavanaugh, nor for the American public. It was political theater. (F1= +0.12, F2= +0.23)

8. The hearing was rushed. Dr. Ford's allegations were not sufficiently investigated, despite a rushed FBI report. (F1= +0.61, F2= -0.44)

9. The burden of proof is not on Judge Kavanaugh to prove he didn't do it. He cannot prove a negative. In the United States of America, you are presumed innocent until proven guilty. But, apparently not in the United States Senate. (F1= -0.49, F2= +2.10)

10. There is a longstanding problem that a majority of white women voted for Donald Trump and supported Judge Kavanaugh-- they put their proximity to power over their own interests. (F1= +0.38, F2= -1.59)

11. While Dr. Ford and Judge Kavanaugh both conducted themselves well, neither is 100% believable, and Americans should be angered by the deterioration of the confirmation process. (F1= -0.30, F2= -0.03)

12. The message that Kavanaugh's confirmation gives to women who have been sexually assaulted, abused or harassed is fundamentally that you are not to be believed, that

American society does not believe you. Unless there is a neutral third party witness, to corroborate, and there is very, very rarely, if ever, such a person. (F1= +1.47, F2= -1.67)

13. It was absurd that there was a hearing prior to there being an investigation into Dr Ford's accusations. And when an investigation was permitted, it was limited in time and scope. They did not appear to want the truth, it was an exercise of brute power. It was a dark day for American justice. (F1= +0.53, F2= -0.58)

14. The accusations were a calculated and orchestrated political hit against Kavanaugh by people seeking revenge because Hillary Clinton lost the election. (F1= -1.49, F2= +0.55)

15. Dr. Ford had absolutely nothing to gain by bringing these facts to the Senate Judiciary Committee. (F1= +0.57, F2= -1.03)

16. The hearings were a credibility contest, a Rorschach test, and as such, served mostly to reinforce people's prior views. But no impartial observer could emerge from the hearings with total certainty that one of the parties was representing the perfectly-true course of events. If you aren't split at least 80-20, then you're probably looking at this wrong. (F1= -0.13, F2= +1.15)

17. Judge Kavanaugh in the end himself proved the most reliable, factual, and transparent witness. (F1= -1.53, F2= -0.33)

18. I've been really troubled by the excuse offered by too many, that this was a high school incident, and boys will be boys. To me, that's just far too low a standard for the conduct of boys and men in our country. (F1= +0.94, F2= -0.74)

19. I am confident that Judge Kavanaugh will be a fair-minded and honest addition to the Supreme Court. (F1= -1.14, F2= +1.21)

20. I did not believe Dr. Ford was telling the truth about Judge Kavanaugh. She likely had a political agenda. (F1= -1.49, F2= +0.76)

21. Democrats calling for a "full" FBI investigation of Dr. Ford's charges were simply a tactic to delay Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation by the Senate. (F1= -0.51, F2= +0.84)

22. Sexual assault allegations aside, no man who willingly lies under oath repeatedly, should even be considered as a Supreme Court Justice. Our government has lost its way and we should be ashamed. (F1= +1.52, F2= +0.11)

23. If somebody can be brought down by accusations like the ones leveled against Judge Kavanaugh, then you, me, every man certainly should be worried. (F1= -0.87, F2= +1.09)

24. Dr. Ford is what a true patriot actually looks like. She is willing to risk everything for the good of her country. She showed real courage. (F1= +0.69, F2= -1.71)