

**THE RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND SCALABILITY OF INDICATORS OF
GENDER ROLE BELIEFS AND FEMINISM IN THE
1992 AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY:
A REPORT TO THE ANES BOARD OF OVERSEERS**

Sue Tolleson-Rinehart, Douglas R. Davenport, Terry L. Gilmour,
M.V. (Trey) Hood III, William R. Moore, and Kurt Shirkey

Texas Tech University

May 1994

**NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES
TECHNICAL REPORT # 52**

**The Reliability, Validity, and Scalability of Indicators of
Gender Role Beliefs and Feminism in the
1992 American National Election Study:
A Report to the ANES Board of Overseers**

Sue Tolleson-Rinehart, Douglas R. Davenport, Terry L. Gilmour,
M.V. (Trey) Hood III, William R. Moore, and Kurt Shirkey

Texas Tech University

May 1994

**THE RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND SCALABILITY OF INDICATORS OF
GENDER ROLE BELIEFS AND FEMINISM IN THE
1992 AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY:
A REPORT TO THE ANES BOARD OF OVERSEERS**

"Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is in the home. Where would you place yourself on this [seven point] scale, or haven't you thought much about this?" (V3801 in the 1992 American National Election Study. Responses run from 1, women and men should have an equal role, to 7, women's place is in the home. The variable has been reverse-coded in this analysis, to make 7 equal to the most egalitarian response. "Haven't thought much" responses are given a unique missing data code, and are also treated as missing data here.)

This question has been asked in every survey since 1972, and it is the only consistently used question, other than a feeling thermometer on the Women's Liberation Movement (asked from 1972 to 1988) or Women's Movement (asked in 1992; the omission of "liberation" raises its own set of questions) in the last 20 years. Scholars have worried for some time that the question suffers from social desirability pressure on responses, and that in any case it cannot capture many nuances of either feminism or beliefs about men's and women's roles. But its use for 20 years has given us longitudinal analytical opportunities to study attitudes toward gender roles provided nowhere else in the election studies.

"Old equal roles," as the question will be known in these pages, has been examined exhaustively (Knoche Fulenwider 1980; Sapiro 1983; Tolleson Rinehart 1992), because of scholars' steadily growing interest in the relation between beliefs about feminism and gender roles and political beliefs and behavior (for general discussions see Carroll 1988; Norris 1994). Sapiro and Conover (1993: 3) observed the need for more detailed survey analysis in

order better to understand the role of gender in structuring electoral behavior. Recently, scholars, journalists and the attentive public have pondered whether gender role beliefs and feminism not only create electoral "gender gaps" but will ultimately affect public policy agendas and public leadership (see the essays in Cook, Thomas and Wilcox, 1994). More, and more intricate, indicators of these beliefs have been urgently needed.

In 1991, the ANES Pilot Study included new indicators of feminism and beliefs about men's and women's roles, in addition to some recent ones that have been used in the last few surveys, after they were proposed by scholars led by Virginia Sapiro and Pamela Johnston Conover (Conover and Sapiro 1992) to the ANES Board of Overseers. Conover's and Sapiro's analysis (1992) of the behavior of new indicators in the 1991 Pilot Study justified inclusion of most of the new indicators in the 1992 American National Election Study.

The essential next step is an analysis of the behavior, the reliability, and the validity of the new indicators, and then to explore some analytic approaches that can more fully express the dimensions of meaning represented by the new data. We take that next step here. We begin by examining the continuing validity and reliability of "old equal roles" by scrutinizing its covariance with the other new and old indicators. Next, we examine the scalability (and the reliability and validity) of all indicators of feminism and gender role beliefs, and assess the different *domains* and *dimensions* represented by responses: do indicators tap beliefs about feminism, feminist and gender consciousness, beliefs about gender roles, all, or none of these things? Are the different dimensions related to one another, nestling under one overarching gender dimension? We also examine the indicators' autonomy, or relative independence from other ideological and political orientations and demographic factors.

Finally, we recommend to the Board that "old equal roles" and eleven other items be retained in the 1994 and future surveys, but suggest that two items can be dropped, and we urge scholars to employ the indicators in multiple item scales. (Please note that we do not evaluate "intensity"

measures accompanying the "consider oneself a feminist" and assessment of influence items, on the assumption that if the "parent" variables themselves are valid and reliable, then the following "how strongly...?" variables are also sound). We refer readers, first of all, to Figure 1 for the complete list of feminism and gender role indicators.

Figure 1 about here

I. The simple performance of "old equal roles" and other indicators

The American public is converging toward a simple declaration of men's and women's equality, as Tables 1 and 2 make clear. With a mean score of 5.75 out of 7, and 53.4% of 1992 respondents taking the most egalitarian position, one might wonder how extensive any debates about the equality of the sexes could be. There has been a roughly 50% increase in egalitarian responses since "old equal roles" was first asked in 1972, and it is this presumed reduction of variance in the measure that prompted the development of new items for the 1991 Pilot Study.

Tables 1 and 2 about here

But is the convergence enough to cause us to jettison "old equal roles"? Is it irremediably tarred with the brush of social desirability? How does it covary with other old and new items? We would argue that "old equal roles" continues to retain both face and substantive validity if researchers regard it as a measure of simple, liberal feminist egalitarianism only. The new indicators can and should relieve "old equal roles" of carrying virtually the entire burden of our interest in feminist and gender role beliefs. And if "old equal roles," the other old indicators, and the new indicators all covary reasonably well, in sensible and theoretically grounded ways, then that constitutes an argument for preserving the whole battery of items, and for paying closer attention to the different, if related, dimensions represented by feminist, gender conscious, and gender role beliefs.

Table 3 about here

In Table 3 we see clearly that, barring the extremely high margins of error at the most traditional, or inegalitarian pole of "old equal roles"

caused by few respondents choosing this option, all but two of the indicators covary with it in expected ways. The exceptions are the two "empirical" assessments of men's and women's influence in government and business and in the family, and we shall have more to say about these indicators below. Otherwise, while "old equal roles" seems surely to be the "easiest" of the feminism and gender role questions to answer, it is nonetheless appropriately associated with virtually all of the other indicators. Initially, then, and especially because of its historic value, we would conclude that "old equal roles" merits retention. Almost all of the other indicators also seem to be performing sensibly. Thus we can turn to a consideration of the dimensionality of the items. This theoretical concern also directs our quantitative examination of the variables' validity.

II. The use of items as composite or multiple indicators

As Conover and Sapiro (1992) explained in their report of the performance of the new indicators in the 1991 Pilot Study, and as we briefly addressed above, extant research has made clear that orientations toward feminism and gender role beliefs for both sexes, and questions of gender identification and gender consciousness for women, are complex and nuanced matters. Indeed, concern that "old equal roles" and one feeling thermometer rating of the Women's Movement were hardly adequate to tap all these dimensions prompted Conover and Sapiro, as well as other scholars, to propose new items for the 1991 Pilot Study. Our analysis of the 1992 ANES, as Conover and Sapiro also found for the 1991 Pilot study, supports the use of a battery of items, rather than a single indicator, to capture the intricacies of these orientations. Given measurement challenges in survey research, the use of multiple indicators has always been the recommended strategy for analysis of complex concepts (see, for instance, McIver and Carmines 1981 and Sullivan and Feldman 1979), and that reasoning could not be more appropriate than in the fascinating case of beliefs about gender roles and their relationship to political beliefs (see Sapiro and Conover 1993, Somma and Tolleson-Rinehart

1993, and Tolleson-Rinehart and Somma 1994 for analytical applications of scales constructed from the new items in the 1992 survey).

Moreover, the bent of most of the literature on gender politics has been toward explaining the emergence of feminism, or pro-egalitarian gender consciousness. Scholars have shown comparatively little interest in the origins of *antifeminist* orientations (but see, for example, Luker 1984 and Klatch 1987 on conservative or antifeminist women, and Tolleson Rinehart 1992 for an attempt to analyze the whole range from traditional, antifeminist to "feminist" gender consciousness). While greater interest in feminist orientations, rather than their antipodes, is a completely reasonable outgrowth of recent political phenomena as well as scholars' own normative interests, we increasingly understand that knowledge about the entire constellation of attitudes -- from antifeminist to feminist -- is important to our understanding of mass political behavior. Scalar composites of the items will aid us here as well, by allowing us more clearly to see that entire constellation.

Theoretical and methodological justifications for multiple item composites of all feminism and gender role indicators also, of course, invite us to reconsider the validity and reliability of the items. Their correlation to one another and their scalability are effective tests of their validity and, as the beginning point of their longitudinal use, their reliability. As we see in Tables 4 and 5, all of the items **EXCEPT THE EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENTS OF INFLUENCE (V6007 AND V6010)** are satisfactorily related to one another. Even "old equal roles," about which there has been so much doubt, is clearly tapping a straightforward dimension of liberal egalitarianism. Table 5 demonstrates that twelve of the fourteen items meaningfully contribute to a single overarching dimension (Cronbach's alpha .502) and, if the two empirical assessments of influence are removed, the remaining items are even more obviously associated *in the minds of both men and women* (Cronbach's alpha .610 for men, .649 for women). Tables 4 and 5 suggest that most of the old and new

items reflect the same or proximate cognitive dimensions, but that the empirical assessments of influence are related only to one another.

Tables 4 and 5 about here

Factor analyses of all items (principle components analysis with varimax rotation) reinforce these conclusions: the empirical assessment variables load alone on a single weak factor, forcing all other items into one of two remaining factors, one apparently covering feminist identification and awareness, and the other representing simple normative egalitarian beliefs (see Table 6). But if the weak empirical assessment measures are omitted, the remaining items redistribute themselves into three theoretically satisfying dimensions (see Table 7). The first factor is clearly a measure of *feminist identity* and, for women alone, *gender consciousness* -- closeness to women loads on this factor for women but not for men (analyses by sex not shown). The second factor reflects awareness of and attentiveness to *women's* position in society -- we think fondly of it as the "angry" factor but it should be thought of as general attentiveness. The third factor is a straightforward indicator of *normative egalitarianism*.

Tables 6 and 7 about here

We urge interested scholars to consider the theoretical harmony that the factors make obvious as another indication of our remaining twelve items' validity. First, all twelve items "scale" in an overarching dimension. Second, within the overarching dimension are three related but distinct dimensions, ranging from "easy" -- simple normative egalitarianism, the third factor -- to progressively "harder" positions -- from "anger" or attentiveness, the second factor, to genuine politicized consciousness, the first factor. The items, then, sort themselves out as scholars of gender politics would expect them to, but also behave as we would generally expect for any cognitive organizations (Carmines and Stimson 1989; Sniderman, Brody and Tetlock 1991).

III. Are feminism and gender role items merely determined by ideology or sociodemographic status?

After extensive examination of the interrelationship among the items, a remaining test of their reliability and validity is their relative independence from other political orientations, and their ability to distribute themselves across the population, rather than being held hostage to a particular demographic level. Such testing of each item would burden readers of this document, and we have taken advantage of the items' scalability to test composites (although we would recommend that users of the 1992 ANES reassure themselves that no single item diverges from the general behavior of the composites). We have created four scales: BIGFEM is a simple additive composite of dummied versions of all indicators except the empirical assessments of influence. FEMID, ANGRY, and NORMEAL are factor score-weighted scales composed of standardized (but not dummied, except for the group closeness measures) versions of indicators loading on the three factors discussed above. Figure 2 shows the creation of all four scales.

Figure 2 about here

Traditional behavioral research has suggested that there is considerable variation among individuals in their development of attitudinal constraint. Scholars have often attempted to explain these variations by focusing on the relationships between political attitudes and a number of ideological factors. The most commonly used sources of ideological constraint in the American case have been liberal-conservative self-placement and partisanship. The most frequently explored demographic factors have been race, education, income and age (as a stand-in for political socialization and maturation). Some have argued that feminist attitudes, in particular, are epiphenomena of relative affluence, higher education, liberal ideology and Democratic partisanship. If these demographic and ideological factors truly determine attitudes toward feminism and gender roles, then they should explain a significant portion of the variance in the responses to the new and old measures in the 1992 survey.

Also, if variance in our four scales appears to be restricted to specific subgroups of the population, then their reliability and validity as broad measures of the different dimensions can be seriously challenged.

To test the null hypothesis that feminist attitudes and gender role beliefs are not dependent upon ideological or sociodemographic position, seven independent variables were regressed on the four scales for the whole sample, and separately for men and women. Five independent variables are the sociodemographic indicators discussed above, and the remaining two are the seven point scales of liberal-conservative self-placement and partisanship.

Tables 8 through 11 here

Although a number of the independent variables do have statistically significant effects on the four scales, no clear pattern of association emerges and no one, or group, of the independent variables has what could be called determinative force on the shaping of feminist attitudes or gender role beliefs. More importantly, the combined explanatory power of these seven independent variables across all twelve of the regression equations is quite low, with an average adjusted 17% of variance explained, and a high adjusted R^2 of only .27 (for explanations of men's feminist identity; see Table 9). Demographic and ideological variables do a particularly poor job of explaining the variance in the ANGRY and NORMEGAL scales (adjusted R^2 s of .09 and .13, respectively, for the whole sample), and can generally explain even less variance in women's attitudes than in men's. Taken together, these results suggest that the feminism and gender role items are not the creatures of other ideological orientations, although they may be related to them; nor are they determined by socioeconomic status. They clearly seem to represent independent cognitive frameworks.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

1. "Old equal roles" (V3801) should be retained with its original wording. It remains our only means for longitudinal analysis, as it is the only consistent indicator used since 1972. The analysis in the foregoing pages makes clear that, despite reduced variance in the measure over time, this

measure validly represents simple, normative, liberal egalitarian beliefs, and it scales well with the two new normative assessments, V6008 and V6011, as well as making a contribution to a twelve-item scale. We would, however, recommend continuing the practice of separating "old equal roles" from the other items in the question order of the survey instrument.

2. V6007 and V6010, the empirical assessments of influence, can be dropped.

While we understand and applaud Conover's and Sapiro's (1992) argument for the need to consider potential differences between normative and "real" judgements about how much equality there is or should be in society and the family, in 1992 these measures appear to be related to nothing but themselves; nor do they display sufficient variance.

3. The remaining twelve indicators all appear to be valid and reliable indicators of different dimensions of attitudes toward gender roles and feminism, and should be retained. We also recommend that scholars use these indicators in multiple item scales. The value of a battery of items, rather than one or two, to longitudinal studies (with 1992, the putative "Year of the Woman" as their beginning point) is difficult to overestimate.

Selected References

- Carmines, Edward G. and James A. Stimson. 1989. Race and the Transformation of American Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carroll, Susan J. 1988. "Women's Autonomy and the Gender Gap." In The Politics of the Gender Gap, ed. Carol Mueller. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Conover, Pamela Johnston and Virginia Sapiro. 1992. "Gender Consciousness and Gender Politics in the 1991 Pilot Study: A Report to the ANES Board of Overseers." Ann Arbor: Center for Political Studies.
- Cook, Elizabeth Adell, Sue Thomas and Clyde Wilcox. 1994. The Year of the Woman: Myths and Realities. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Klatch, Rebecca. 1987. Women of the New Right. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Knoche Fulenwider, Claire. 1980. Feminism in American Politics: A Study of Ideological Influence. New York: Praeger.
- Luker, Kristin. 1984. Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McIver, John P. and Edward G. Carmines. 1981. Unidimensional Scaling. Sage University Papers Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-024. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Miller, Warren E., Donald R. Kinder and Steven J. Rosenstone, Principal Investigators. 1993. American National Election Study, 1992: Pre- and Post-Election Survey [ICPSR 6067]. Ann Arbor: Center for Political Studies, the University of Michigan.
- Norris, Pippa. 1994. "Gender-Related Influences on Voting Behaviour and Public Opinion." Paper presented to the Conference on Research on Women and American Politics: Agenda Setting for the 21st Century. Center for the American Woman and Politics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, 22-24 April.
- Sapiro, Virginia. 1983. The Political Integration of Women. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Sapiro, Virginia and Pamela Johnston Conover. 1993. "Gender in the 1992 Electorate." Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Washington, D.C.
- Sniderman, Paul M., Richard A. Brody and Phillip E. Tetlock. 1991. Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Somma, Mark and Sue Tolleson-Rinehart. 1993. "Tracking the Elusive Green Women: Environmentalism and Feminism as Schematically Connected Attitudinal Structures in the United States and Europe." Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. Atlanta.
- Sullivan, John L. and Stanley Feldman. 1979. Multiple Indicators: An Introduction. Sage University Papers Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-15. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Tolleson Rinehart, Sue. 1992. Gender Consciousness and Politics. New York and London: Routledge.

Tolleson-Rinehart, Sue and Mark Somma. 1994. "From Thought to Action: 'Ecofeminist' Attitudes as Sources of Political Mobilization." Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago.

Figure 1.

List of variable numbers, variable content, and recoding information for feminism and gender role indicators, 1992

Variable number	Variable content	Recoding information
V3801	"Old equal roles"	reverse coded; 1=7...7=1
V5317	Feminists FT ^a	unaltered in initial analyses; divided by 100 for inclusion in scales
V5324	Women's Movement FT	unaltered in initial analyses; divided by 100 for inclusion in scales
V6001	Attn to women in news	reverse coded, 1=4...4=1 in initial analyses; dummied (4=1)(ELSE=0) for later scale creation
V6002	Think of self as feminist?	unaltered in initial analyses; dummied (3=1)(ELSE=0) for scales
V6004	Individ effort/work togeth	unaltered in initial analyses; dummied (2=1)(ELSE=0) for scales
V6005	Pride in accompls of women	reverse coded, 1=4...4=1 in initial analyses; dummied (4=1)(ELSE=0) for scales
V6006	Anger at women's treatment	reverse coded, 1=4...4=1 in initial analyses; dummied (4=1)(ELSE=0) for scales
V6007	Empirical infl, govt/bus	unaltered
V6008	Normative infl, govt/bus	unaltered in initial analyses; dummied (2,3=1)(ELSE=0) for scales
V6010	Empirical infl, govt/bus	unaltered
V6011	Normative infl, govt/bus	unaltered in initial analyses; dummied (2,3=1)(ELSE=0) for scales
V6207	Group closeness, feminists	dummied (1=1)(ELSE=0)
V6213	Group closeness, women	dummied (1=1)(ELSE=0)

^aFT = Feeling Thermometer, here and throughout

Table 1.

The distribution of responses to "old equal roles" in 1992

	position on equal roles						
	women in home			women = men			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
% of respondents in each category	3.8	2.7	4.7	13.9	7.3	14.2	53.4
N = 2365; Mean = 5.745; SD = 1.705							

Table 2.

Proportion of egalitarian responses to "old equal roles",
1972 - 1992

year of study	% combined three egalitarian responses
1972	48.9
1976	54.6
1980	62.1
1984	59.6
1988	68.7
1992	74.9

SOURCE: American National Election Studies, 1972, 1976, 1980, 1984, 1988,
1992

Table 3. The covariance of "Old equal roles" with other indicators

positions on...	position on equal roles						
	women 1	in home 2	3	4	women = men 5	6	7
<hr/>							
<hr/>							
A. Pay attn to women in news							
not at all	7.1	10.3	4.1	4.7	2.6	2.6	4.0
some	22.6	15.5	27.6	21.3	24.5	18.6	12.4
a little	41.7	60.3	48.0	53.4	56.3	55.4	44.3
a lot	28.6	13.8	20.4	20.6	16.6	23.5	39.2
N=2136; $\chi^2 = 114.988$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = .144$							
B. Think of self as feminist?							
no	60.8	84.2	78.7	81.3	80.7	78.2	63.3
don't use term	11.4	1.8	3.2	8.8	5.3	4.2	7.7
yes	27.8	14.0	18.1	9.9	14.0	17.5	19.0
N=2092; $\chi^2 = 86.007$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = .112$							
C. Individual effort or women work together							
individual effort	26.6	50.9	47.9	49.0	47.0	48.5	37.8
work together	73.4	49.1	52.1	51.0	53.0	51.5	62.2
N=2085; $\chi^2 = 31.301$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = .075$							
D. Pride in accmpls. of women							
almost never	14.5	10.3	8.2	11.6	5.3	8.8	6.8
occasionally	25.3	34.5	38.8	31.1	25.8	27.4	20.2
some of the time	41.0	39.7	36.7	40.6	45.7	47.9	43.7
very often	19.3	15.5	16.3	16.7	23.2	16.0	29.3
N=2131; $\chi^2 = 74.911$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = .123$							
E. Anger at women's treatment							
almost never	17.3	19.0	11.5	13.9	11.2	9.4	7.5
occasionally	25.9	29.3	39.6	30.2	30.9	33.4	24.4
some of the time	34.6	32.8	37.5	43.1	38.8	46.4	41.4
very often	22.2	19.0	11.5	12.9	19.1	10.7	26.8
N=2130; $\chi^2 = 88.293$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = .125$							

Table 3, contd. The covariance of "Old equal roles" with other indicators

positions on...	position on equal roles						
	women in home			women = men			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

F. Empirical assessment of influence, govt/bus

men have more	71.1	77.2	73.5	80.8	78.1	83.5	86.5
sexes are equal	19.3	19.3	22.4	17.1	19.2	14.6	11.7
women have more	9.6	3.5	4.1	2.1	2.6	1.9	1.8

N=2132; $\chi^2 = 43.806$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = -.065$

G. Normative assessment of influence, govt/bus

men have more	39.8	42.9	33.0	23.8	18.0	6.9	5.1
sexes are equal	59.0	55.4	66.0	75.9	80.7	92.1	92.8
women have more	1.2	1.8	1.0	0.3	1.3	1.0	2.1

N=2112; $\chi^2 = 248.217$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = .166$

H. Empirical assessment of influence in families

men have more	36.6	36.2	40.6	41.4	47.0	44.3	46.5
sexes are equal	39.0	48.3	39.6	45.2	39.1	40.7	38.0
women have more	24.4	15.5	19.8	13.4	13.9	15.0	15.4

N=2112; $\chi^2 = 14.795$, $p = ns$; $\tau_c = -.039$

I. Normative assessment of influence in families

men have more	39.0	31.0	22.6	15.5	15.3	8.2	5.3
sexes are equal	53.7	63.8	73.1	82.1	83.3	89.8	91.8
women have more	7.3	5.2	4.3	2.4	1.3	2.0	2.9

N=2114; $\chi^2 = 169.716$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = .108$

J. Group Closeness...

...to feminists	7.4	1.8	2.2	2.6	5.8	9.8	18.0
-----------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

N=1951; $\chi^2 = 78.493$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = .132$

...to women (includes men)	30.9	34.5	23.3	29.0	34.1	36.6	46.4
-------------------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

N=1951; $\chi^2 = 48.341$, $p < .001$; $\tau_c = .158$

Table 3, contd. The covariance of "Old equal roles" with other indicators

positions on...	position on equal roles						
	women	in home			women = men		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K. Breakdowns of feeling thermometers (mean scores) by equal roles category							
Feminists	40.30	42.74	44.18	44.87	49.65	52.82	58.69
	N=2004; F = 25.733, p < .001						
Women's Movement	61.62	48.57	49.73	51.60	56.43	60.04	68.24
	N=2087; F = 38.947, p < .001						

Table 4. Bivariate correlation matrix (Pearson's r) of all indicators

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	V3801	V5317	V5324	V6001	V6002	V6004	V6005	V6006	V6007	V6008	V6010	V6011	V6207	V6213
with...														
1. old eq roles														
2. feminist FT	.249													
3. women's mvmt FT	.267	.669												
4. women in news	.149	.275	.302											
5. feminist?	.134	.378	.380	.319										
6. work together	.057	.287	.330	.125	.191									
7. pride	.117	.240	.276	.389	.239	.120								
8. angry	.130	.264	.300	.366	.225	.176	.400							
9. emp infl b/p	-.122	-.037	-.032	-.100	-.056	.006	-.098	-.101						
10. norm infl b/p	.301	.214	.277	.156	.129	.060	.100	.129	.000					
11. emp infl fam	-.046	-.032	-.035	-.055	-.046	-.016	-.002	-.076	.136	-.034				
12. norm infl fam	.217	.172	.179	.031	.078	.046	.072	.043	.003	.295	.119			
13. close to fems	.180	.332	.312	.264	.471	.124	.163	.188	-.070	.122	-.040	.092		
14. close to women	.144	.196	.264	.248	.239	.123	.208	.182	-.058	.134	-.046	.064	.313	

Table 5.

Reliability and scalability of all items

Corrected Item-to-total (scale) correlations...			
	With empirical assessments All	Without empirical assessments Men only	Without empirical assessments Women only
old equal roles	.287	.221	.296
feminist FT	.686	.490	.552
women's mvmnt FT	.698	.513	.590
women in news	.338	.419	.472
feminist?	.426	.373	.414
work together	.339	.192	.248
pride	.302	.387	.377
angry	.325	.387	.408
normative assessment, b/p	.282	.327	.287
normative assessment, fam	.202	.192	.192
close to feminists	.375	.418	.480
close to women	.269	.280	.330
empirical assessment, b/p	.047		
empirical assessment, fam	.040		
Cronbach's Alpha	.502	.610	.649
N of cases	1695	708	907

Table 6.

Factor analysis of all items

old equal roles	.1463	.6657	-.2220
feminists feeling thermometer	.6871	.2961	.1593
women's mvmt feeling thermometer	.7125	.3283	.1327
attn to women in the news	.5771	.0120	-.3557
consider oneself a feminist?	.6717	.0400	.0033
women should work together	.4989	-.0440	.2894
pride in women's accomplishments	.5179	.0013	-.3416
angry at women's treatment	.5334	.0058	-.3543
normative assessment/business, politics	.1302	.7175	-.0554
normative assessment/family	.0326	.6989	.1726
close to feminists (as group)	.5843	.1061	-.0364
close to women (as group)	.4568	.0958	-.1607
empirical assessment/business, politics	-.0066	-.1009	.6550
empirical assessment/family	-.0275	.0491	.5171
Eigenvalue	3.55	1.40	1.19
Percent of variance explained	25.3	10.0	8.5

Table 7.

Factor analysis omitting empirical assessment measures^a

	Factor 1 "FemID"	Factor 2 "Angry"	Factor 3 "NormEgal"
old equal roles	.1408	.1245	.6447
feminist FT	.7201	.1477	.2799
women's mvmnt FT	.7058	.2099	.3216
women in news	.2245	.7135	.0589
feminist?	.6637	.2484	.0070
work together	.5798	-.0144	-.0469
pride	.0877	.7768	.0682
angry	.1581	.7190	.0658
norm assessment, bus/pol	.0704	.1235	.7385
norm assessment, fam	.0401	-.0525	.7101
close to feminists	.6183	.1878	.0540
close to women	.3542	.3308	.0830
Eigenvalue	3.54	1.36	1.11
% Variance explained	29.5	11.4	9.2
Cronbach's Alpha	.493	.627	.236

^aAfter removing the empirical assessment indicators and conducting a new factor analysis, items contributing to each factor (coefficients in boldface type) were analyzed for reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha underneath each factor is the resulting reliability coefficient for those items.

Figure 2.

Scale creations^a

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{BIGFEM} &= \text{V3801D} + \text{V6001D} + \text{V6002D} + \text{V6004D} + \text{V6005D} + \text{V6006D} + \text{V6008D} \\
 &\quad + \text{V6011D} + \text{V6207D} + \text{V6213D} + \text{V5317R} + \text{V5324R} \\
 \text{FEMID} &= .6637((\text{V6002} - 2.04)/1.673) + .5798((\text{V6004} - 1.588)/.492) \\
 &\quad + .6183((\text{V6207D} - .118)/.322) + .7201((\text{V5317R} - .535)/.222) \\
 &\quad + .7058((\text{V5324R} - .621)/.224) \\
 \text{ANGRY} &= .7135((\text{V6001} - 3.043)/.810) + .7768((\text{V6005} - 2.821)/.886) \\
 &\quad + .7190((\text{V6006} - 2.728)/.902) \\
 \text{NORMEGAL} &= .6447((\text{V3801} - 5.745)/1.705) + .7385((\text{V6008} - 1.887)/.365) \\
 &\quad + .7101((\text{V6011} - 1.921)/.360)
 \end{aligned}$$

^a"V3801D," etc., indicates that the variable has been dummied. "V5317R" etc., indicates a feeling thermometer divided by 100, to yield a recoded variable ranging from 0 to 1. In the latter case, dividing by 100 accomplished the purposes of, first, standardizing the minimum and maximum values of all variables while, second, preserving the largest amount of information and, third, avoiding the problem of deciding where to establish the cutpoint necessary to make a feeling thermometer into a dummy. Readers should refer to Figure 1 for reminders of specific recoding information.

Table 8.

Regression of most frequently analyzed demographic and ideological indicators on all feminism and gender role indicators (BIGFEM)

	All	Men only	Women only
Partisanship (0=Dem; 6=Rep)	-.181*	-.177*	-.167*
Age	-.004	.016*	-.006
Race (1=white; 0=nonwhite)	-.587*	-.723	-.427
Respondent's income	.013	-.032	.033
Education in years	.135*	.112*	.177*
Ideological self-placement	.415*	.425*	.389*
Family income	-.032	.003	-.045
R ²	.242	.231	.200
adjusted R ²	.237	.222	.190
N of cases	1218	599	619

Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients.

* p (from T test) < .001

Table 9.

Regression of most frequently analyzed demographic and ideological indicators on feminist identity indicators (FEMID)

	All	Men only	Women only
Partisanship (0=Dem; 6=Rep)	-.253*	-.265*	-.231*
Age	.005	.018*	-.005
Race (1=white; 0=nonwhite)	-.582	-.585	-.523
Respondent's income	.006	-.014	.007
Education in years	.076	.042	.139
Ideological self-placement	.493*	.491*	.492*
Family income	-.032	.003	-.048
R ²	.238	.278	.202
adjusted R ²	.233	.269	.193
N of cases	1218	599	619

Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients.

* p (from T test) < .001

Table 10.

Regression of most frequently analyzed demographic and ideological indicators on awareness of women's position indicators (ANGRY)

	All	Men only	Women only
Partisanship (0=Dem; 6=Rep)	-.094*	-.071	-.107
Age	.012*	.024*	.003
Race (1=white; 0=nonwhite)	-.476*	-.647	-.273
Respondent's income	-.004	-.044	.010
Education in years	.123*	.147*	.010
Ideological self-placement	.129*	.129	.132
Family income	-.005	.032	-.019
R ²	.094	.112	.077
adjusted R ²	.088	.101	.067
N of cases	1218	599	619

Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients.

* p (from T test) < .001

Table 11.

Regression of most frequently analyzed demographic and ideological indicators on normative egalitarianism indicators (NORMEGAL)

	All	Men only	Women only
Partisanship (0=Dem; 6=Rep)	-.081*	-.086	-.075
Age	-.008*	.004	-.010*
Race (1=white; 0=nonwhite)	.356	.459	.274
Respondent's income	.011	-.004	.018
Education in years	.074*	.074	.077
Ideological self-placement	.222*	.244*	.200*
Family income	-.013	.003	-.017
R ²	.131	.112	.148
adjusted R ²	.125	.101	.138
N of cases	1218	599	619

Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients.

* p (from T test) < .001