

Operant Subjectivity

The International Journal of Q Methodology

The Constitution in the Public Mind: New Perspectives

Larry R. Baas
James Paul Old
Valparaiso University

James C. Rhoads
Westminster College

Abstract: Scholars have long held that the Constitution occupies a sacred and reverent place in the public mind. Recent research tracking respondents across a 45-year period reports that almost all of these persons either continued to hold a mythical view of the Constitution or switched to this viewpoint later in life. These results are important and tell us how a group of mature individuals (their average age was 66) currently view the Constitution and how these views changed across time, but they don't address what the Constitution might mean to young adults today who have grown up in a much different political environment. The current study, using the same Q sample as that in the longitudinal studies referred to, provides answers to that question, and examines the beliefs about the Constitution of a cohort of younger adults. The results indicate a good deal of similarity to the results of previous research, but some noteworthy differences.

Keywords: Longitudinal studies, public perspectives of the U.S. Constitution, symbolic meaning

Introduction

Conventional wisdom asserts that the U.S. Constitution occupies a reverent, sacred, and security-providing place in the mind of the American public (Klein, 1995). For example, Max Lerner (1937) claimed the Constitution is a symbol "of an ancient sureness and comforting stability" (p. 1291). Similarly, Arthur Miller (1965) remarked that "Americans are a nation of Constitution worshippers, with the Supreme Court acting as a high priest administering to the faithful. The Constitution seems to be or is considered the rock upon which the nation was built. The Justices have the task of exegesis of the Sacred text" (p. 154). *Time* magazine concluded that "(t)he Constitution has the aura of the sacred about it. It occupies a shrine up in the higher stretches of American reverence. A citizen imagines sunshot clouds, the founders hovering in the air like saints in religious art" (July 6, 1987). And Mary Anne Franks (2019) noted that "(e)ven in an era of intense political polarization, Americans seem to be of one mind with regard to the

Contact author: Larry.Baas@valpo.edu

© 2022 The International Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity ©2022 The Authors

Constitution. It is venerated by individuals across the political and cultural spectrum: The U.S. Republicans and Democrats, politicians and pundits, billionaires and blue-collar workers” (p. 35).

In a democracy it has long been recognized that shared values and the attribution of positive affect to a system’s key symbols are critical to the preservation of a stable and well-functioning system. If the assertions cited previously about popular constructions of the Constitution are accurate, the Constitution should be more than capable of performing the characteristic functions that have been attributed to important symbols and thus helping to maintain a democratic society. Specifically, these would include helping to maintain stability, facilitating compliance with policies, fostering the legitimacy of both policies and the activity of other institutions, inducing the loyalty of the citizenry, providing a general unifying experience, as well as providing individuals with hope and security (Edelman, 1974; Lasswell, 1960, 1965; Merelman, 1966; Cobb & Elder, 1973; Zink & Dawes, 2016). It is, therefore, critical to determine if the conventional wisdom which asserts that a sacred, reverent, and mythical view of the Constitution exists is in fact correct. If reverence for key symbols contributes to democratic stability, then it is even more crucial today given the reported decline in support for most other political and nonpolitical institutions (Raine & Perrin, 2019).

Other Research

Despite these alleged sacred and reverent attributions to the Constitution and their potential consequences, research on what the Constitution as a symbol means is largely nonexistent. As historian Michael Kammen notes (2006, p. xvii) : “Even though our libraries are filled with books and journals telling us what the specialists think, we do not have a single study that traces what the Constitution has meant to the rest of the populace.” With relatively rare exceptions, Kammen’s statement about the absence of research on what the Constitution means to the American public continues to be the case. In examining previous research related to this subject, when scholars write about public perspectives on the Constitution most tend to just accept conventional wisdom’s mythical view of the Constitution as a given rather than examine its accuracy (Franks, 2019). In examining other previous research related to this topic, it is important to distinguish between research that examines what the Constitution as a symbol means to members of the public – the intent here – and research that focuses on knowledge and awareness of the document, agreement with its various parts, attitudes towards various decisions about it by the US Supreme Court, and related matters. Looking at the symbolic meaning turns the focus to examining the extent to which people have beliefs about the entire document that parallel the mythical and reverent views suggested by people like Max Lerner. The focus is on the subjective narratives people have in their mind about the Constitution. This is much different than asking persons about their knowledge and awareness of the Constitution. This latter focus avoids deeper probes into the mind of the public, similar to what Lerner had in mind, and which is the focus of this research.

For example, a substantial body of research predates even Lerner’s work in gauging attitudes about the Constitution. One of Louis Thurstone’s (1931) early efforts to create and demonstrate the value of scales was a scale he developed to measure attitudes toward the Constitution. The focus was on attitudes and information about the origin of the Constitution, the structure of the Constitution, and the functioning of the Constitution. There was nothing included about the symbolic meaning of the Constitution. Likewise, for years studies have examined the extent of agreement with various parts of the document (Stouffer, 1955; Prothro & Grigg, 1960; Davis et al., 2022) with discouraging

results. Similarly, numerous studies that inquire about knowledge of the Constitution conclude public knowledge is somewhere between little and nonexistent (“Americans Are Poorly Informed,” 2017). In other studies, research uses simplistic measures of public sentiment about the Constitution. For example, in one study researchers asked, “(o)n a scale from 1-10 how do you approve of the Constitution (Stephanopoulos & Versteeg, 2016). Or studies ask whether the Constitution should be interpreted in terms of original meaning or what it means in current times (Bialik, 2018).

There is a much greater body of research on the public’s perspective on the Constitution’s handmaiden — the U.S. Supreme Court and its decisions (Tanenhaus & Murphy, 1968; Marshall, 1989, 2022). Much of the research is about either support for the Supreme Court (Jones, 2022), which has declined substantially, or support for particular decisions, like the recent abortion decision (“Positive views of Supreme Court,” 2022). This literature regarding the Supreme Court, like that on the Constitution, is a far cry from research on the subjective understanding of the Constitution. This is not meant as a criticism of these studies, but rather points out the concerns expressed have been quite different from those addressed in this paper. As a result, Kammen’s assertion about the lack of research on the meaning of the Constitution to the mass public remains accurate. The purpose here is to continue to rectify this absence of research on the symbolic meaning of the Constitution in the public mind.

An effort was made in the 1970s to address the lack of attention to the symbolic meaning of the Constitution. After generating a concourse of several hundred statements, 60 were selected for a Q sort (Stephenson, 1953; Brown, 1980; McKeown & Thomas, 2013) that was eventually distributed to over several hundred persons (Baas, 1976, 1980). This 1970s-era study generated three factors and demonstrated that the “conventional wisdom” describing the sacred and reverent position of the Constitution was quite accurate among a very large segment of those interviewed. At the same time, two other factors, with fewer adherents, also emerged. A brief description of these factors follows.

Factor 1: Conventional Wisdom. This factor is the most endorsed narrative and reflects what most scholars anticipated would emerge as the prevailing view of the Constitution. These persons have a high regard for the Constitution and founding fathers; to them it is considered a “masterpiece,” “an incredible document,” “almost perfect,” and something “which should always be kept sacred.” The Founding Fathers are considered “giants in the sky” and above the “politics” of everyday life. The Constitution is also a great protector of us and our fundamental rights. It guides us through difficult times, provides answers to fundamental questions, and is something to which we can turn when we have problems. At the same time, to persons on this factor the Constitution has some problems which revolve primarily around the view that the Constitution has been ignored or too loosely interpreted and that some persons have interpreted it to suit their own needs.

Factor 2: The Negative Perspective. This factor reflects a negative and depriving view of the Constitution. It consists almost exclusively of younger persons who generally identify as liberal. The Constitution may have had some value, but now it is essentially weak, powerless, ineffective, depriving, and has failed us. Therefore, it should be completely revised. Likewise, it is a deterrent to change, is something used to control the population, has allowed the government to become too powerful, and has sanctioned the existence of a depriving class structure through which an oligarchic elite has been allowed to control.

Factor 3: The Realist Perspective. This perspective is best described as "realist," after the legal realist school of thought. To these persons, the Constitution is interpreted by humans and as society changes so will the Constitution. As a result, the Constitution can lead to both indulgent and depriving results. Yet, these persons believe that the Constitution performs valuable functions and should be preserved. It neither protects all nor guarantees that everyone will receive justice, but it does enable most to get their due, facilitates a more objective decision-making process, and contains a set of worthy goals and ideals that are worth striving to accomplish. It also provides a yardstick whereby the propriety of current actions can be evaluated. In this sense, the Constitution is the social conscience of the nation and without it, or a similar institution, chaos would result.

There was no plan for the original study to be longitudinal, but 10 years later curiosity got the best of us. We decided to go back and try to find as many of the original respondents as possible and see how their views might have changed. So, in the mid-1980s we searched for the addresses of as many of the persons from the original study as possible and mailed out the same Q sort. We received responses from 71 persons. (Baas, 1987). We did the same thing again with a shortened version of the Q sort (discussed later) in the spring of 2020 (Baas, et al., 2022) and received responses from 17 persons who had completed the Q sort at all three times over the 45-year period. There were some differences over time. However, essentially the same three factors emerged. That the same three factors emerged each time suggests there is a relatively consistent set of cognitive categories (factors) among these respondents which they use to evaluate the document.

The results of this longitudinal research suggest the continuing potency of the sacred and reverent viewpoint among these respondents. The 17 respondents were in their early 20s during the first study in the mid-1970s. In 2020, 45 years later, the cohort averaged 66 years old. Of the 17, eight held a mythical viewpoint in all three studies. Another seven individuals started out with a perspective other than the mythical one, but over their lifetimes switched to the more mythical view of the Constitution. One individual stayed the same across time and another switched from an extremely favorable view of the Constitution (factor 1) to a negative view (factor 2). The previous studies' findings demonstrate both what happens to the perspectives on the Constitution across the lifetimes of a small group of people and the current status of the Constitution in the minds of a mature cohort. The studies shed little light on what the Constitution might mean to a completely different group. For example, how might the Constitution be viewed by young adults who have grown up in a much different political environment and to whom Watergate, the Viet Nam War, and the Civil Rights Movement are ancient history, and who have come to maturity in an era of Donald Trump and polarization? Is the sacred and reverent view still alive among this younger group? Do they still apply the same cognitive categories (factors) in their evaluation of the Constitution? These are the questions the current study will address.

To examine this, the Constitution Q sort used in the third wave (Baas, et al., 2022) of the study discussed above was administered in early 2020 right after the first impeachment trial of Trump. Recall that this version of the Q sample was shortened. The 2020 study was done by mail because it was conducted in the middle of the pandemic and past experience (the 1980s study) indicated it was cumbersome for persons to do the 60-item version by mail. This was especially the case because the mean age of the possible respondents in 2020 was 83. We did experiment with the original 60-item Q sort but found it difficult for some elderly respondents to do, particularly by mail.

To accommodate this, the Q sort used in the original study was reduced from 60 items to 24 items. The original Q sort was constructed based on a factorial design that classified statements in four separate groups as either depriving or indulgent with respect to welfare or deference values. Initially, 15 statements were selected for each of the four categories in the original factorial design. In the shortened version, six statements were selected from each of the same categories, resulting in a 24-item Q sort. Efforts were made to find statements within each of the categories with which the initial perspectives on the Constitution both agreed and disagreed, ensuring respondents had an opportunity to express themselves adequately.

When comparisons were made to the rankings of each respondent across the three initial studies there was a problem because in the first two studies the 60-item Q sample was used and in the third study the 24-item Q sample was used. This was managed by abstracting the 24 items in the shortened Q sample from the 60-item Q used in studies 1 and 2 for each person. These Q sorts for each person were used for comparative purposes across the three studies. As an assessment of this process, a correlation of the ranking with the 60-item Q sample in study 1 (the original study) and study 2 (the one done in the mid-1980s) was done for each respondent. Another correlation was done for each respondent for study 1 and study 2 using the abbreviated 24-item Q sample, and the results indicated the correlations for each respondent were virtually identical to the ones using the 64-item Q sort.

The 24-item Q sample used in the 2020 study was administered to 112 people, most of whom were students attending either Valparaiso University in Valparaiso, Indiana, or Westminster College in New Wilmington, Pennsylvania, and were students currently enrolled in classes taught by the authors. The resulting Q sorts were correlated and factor analyzed using Centroid factor analysis and judgmental rotation. Four factors resulted from this analysis. Copies of the Q sort, the factor scores, factor loadings, and background characteristics of respondents are listed in the Appendix.

Results

Correlations

To provide some initial perspective on how the data in the current study compare to the data from the original study done in the 1970s, the resulting factor scores from the original study and the factor scores from the current study were correlated. This correlation of the factor scores is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Correlations Between Current Study and the Original Study

Original Current	Original Factor 1	Original Factor 2	Original Factor 3
Current Factor 1	.83	-.62	.20
Current Factor 2	.11	.45	-.10
Current Factor 3	.54	-.07	-.20
Current Factor 4	.04	.36	-.42

Correlations .39 and above significant $p < .05$.52 and above significant $p < .01$.

As indicated, the first factor in the current study correlated with the first factor from the original study at .83 ($p < .01$) indicating the two perspectives are remarkably similar and nearly identical. The second factor in the current study correlated to some extent (.45 $p < .05$) with the negative perspective of factor 2 in the original study. Factor 3 in the current study correlated (.54 $p < .01$) with factor 1 in the original study and therefore seems to be somewhat of a variant of the mythical perspective. Factor 4 does not seem similar to any of the factors from the original study except that it is negatively correlated (-.42 $p < .05$) with factor 3 (the realist perspective) from the original study indicating a rejection of this perspective. Thus in addition to the existence of four factors in the current study, there seemed to be other differences including a bipolar factor, an entirely new perspective, and a variant of the mythical perspective.

Interpretation of Factors

Factor 1. Factor 1 is the perspective having the most persons with significant loadings. It also is bipolar, indicating a group of people at the negative end of the factor with almost the opposite view of the Constitution. There were 51 respondents who loaded positively on the factor at a statistically significant level of at least $p < .05$. Of those, 34 identify as male and 16 as female. Politically, 36 identified as Republican, 30 labeled themselves conservative, and 29 planned to vote for Trump. Six labeled themselves Democrats, six considered themselves liberal, and 11 planned to vote for a Democrat for president in 2020 with Bernie Sanders (4) and Tulsi Gabbard (3) receiving the most support. Additionally, seven considered themselves Independent, 13 moderate, and 10 had not decided for whom they would vote. While there was some diversity in terms of demographics, male, conservative Republicans, who planned to vote for Donald Trump were the largest group.

Respondents at the positive end of factor 1 expressed respect for authority and order. For example, they believe the Constitution is so fundamental in our country that no one has the “right to go against [it] no matter how much power they have. If we let a person get away with breaching rules, then we’re showing signs of letting our foundations crumble” (8 +5). [*The first number is the statement number followed by the factor score.*] The concern about “crumbling foundations” is continued in their fear of disorder and chaos. To them “(t)he Constitution stands between order and chaos, between organized government and anarchy, between ruthless power and helplessness. Without it people defend their rights by strength alone; they protect their property by power alone; they save their lives by the sword” (17 +5). Thus without the Constitution, we apparently would descend into a virtual Hobbesian state of nature where survival would depend, not upon the law, but brute force. Apparently, the views of Max Lerner from over 80 years ago still hold for persons sharing the factor 1 perspective. As Lerner (1937) noted, “(e)very tribe needs its totem and its fetish, and the Constitution is ours. Every tribe clings to something [they] believe to possess supernatural powers, as an instrument for controlling unknown forces in a hostile universe” (1294).

The view of the Constitution as an entity that provides protection and security for the nation extends to the provision of security and stability in their day-to-day lives. Factor 1 asserts that “the Constitution is a living and essential piece of our lives as Americans and still operates to guide us through difficult and tumultuous days” (11 +3). Likewise, “(w)hen we have problems we almost always can turn to the Constitution and get some kind of an answer” (12 +2). And while a bit less supported by this perspective, yet still part of their overall narrative on the Constitution, factor 1 states that “if ever the Constitution were proven inadequate to cover all contingencies, I’d be shaken” (18 +1).

Not surprisingly, given the view of the Constitution as a protector and provider of security and order, factor 1 exhibits a reverence for the document that reaches a point of almost religious fervor. Not only does the Constitution mean “justice in its highest form” (20 +4), it is not “flawed” (15 -5), represents a “a symbol of power” (23 -5, 21 -2), and does not need “wholesale revamping” (24 -4), but is a “masterpiece. It applies to today as well as 200 years ago” (16 +4). Tied into this view of the Constitution is the exaltation of the Founders to God-like figures. When respondents who load positively on factor 1 think of the Constitution and “how complicated it seems [they] really admire the founders and wonder if our congressman, senators, lawyers, etc., could create anything comparable to it if they were put 200 years back in time” (16 +4). Similarly, they “think our Constitution represents the ideal aspirations of great men in a new country” (1 +3).

While the Constitution appears to be a near-perfect document in their eyes, they express some concerns related to current situations in the country. For example, they agree that “...recent events have undermined [their] confidence and faith in the government which it created” (6 +2) and “it seems that we have gone away from the basic truths in this document” because “(t)he interpretations of judges and other individuals have changed the basic truths to suit only a few people and not the whole nation” (10 +1). While they express some concern, it is important to emphasize that they do not believe that the Constitution has failed, but that the “government” and “the interpretations of judges and others” have failed.

At the negative end of factor 1 are eight persons with significant negative loadings, only one of whom is a conservative Republican who would vote for Trump, while the remainder are mostly Democrat, liberal leaning individuals supporting a Democratic candidate, primarily Sanders. Consistent with the different background characteristics, these respondents reflect the polar opposite view of the Constitution. Certainly, the Constitution is not idealized, nor are the founders, but the Constitution is “flawed” having been “pieced together at a time of necessity, a time when the common people were deemed too ignorant to run their own affairs” (15 -5). Similarly, “(t)he Constitution is not the panacea for a specific nation for all time, alterations may be needed. I don’t think this means amendments, but wholesale revamping. Many of the sections are outmoded or unclear” (24 -4). The problem to them is that “so many interpretations of the doctrine exist [that this] should be reason enough to question its reliability” (5 -3). And in the final analysis, “(t)he Constitution is just the legal format that may be interpreted according to one’s finances” (9 -4). So, in contrast to the viewpoint of those on the opposite end of factor 1, there are significant problems with the Constitution, and it is not the potent, positive symbol as constructed by those on the positive end.

The polarization that affects so many of the issues in politics today apparently extends to the Constitution as well. This degree of polarization as demonstrated by the bipolarity in factor 1 did not exist in previous studies. While factor 1 positive gives an indication of the continuing legitimacy of the Constitution, there seems to be the emergence of a group much more likely to deny the legitimacy of the Constitution.

Factor 2. Twenty-one persons significantly loaded on factor 2. Only two of them were Republican, Trump supporters. It is largely a liberal (13) group of Democrats (15) who planned to vote for Democratic candidates (13), including five for Sanders, three for Pete Buttigieg, and five for other candidates. There were 13 who identified as female, seven who identified as male, and one no response. Their backgrounds are similar to those on the negative end of factor 1, with the exception that this factor includes a greater number of females.

Factor 2 provides a different perspective than factor 1, which is indicated by the two factors' correlation of $-.06$. Immediately apparent when the factor scores for factor 1 and 2 are compared is the difference in the tendency to idealize the Constitution. Factor 2 rejects the notion that "(t)he Constitution is a masterpiece. It applies to today as well as 200 years ago. When I think of how complicated it seems I really admire the founders and wonder if our congressman, senators, lawyers, etc., could create anything comparable to it if they were put 200 years back in time" (16 +4 -4). [*This represents the statement number followed by the factor scores of factor 1 and then factor 2.*] And while factor 1 is adamantly opposed to anyone going against the Constitution for fear "of letting our foundations crumble," factor 2 rejects such a stringent requirement (8 +5 -3). They also disagree on the protective qualities the Constitution provides. Factor 2 does not see the Constitution as some type of inanimate object without which we would be relegated to saving our property and life "by the sword" (17 +5 -1). Nor does factor 2 share the belief that "(w)hen we have problems we almost always can turn to the Constitution and get some kind of an answer" (12 +2 -2), or that the Constitution means "justice in its highest form" (20 +4 -1). Nor do they "believe the Constitution is a living and essential piece of our lives as Americans and still operates to guide us through difficult and tumultuous days" (11 +3 0).

Factors 1 and 2 do, however, share the viewpoint that "recent events have undermined [their] confidence and faith in the government which [the Constitution] created" (6 +2 +3). The two perspectives differ, however, on the causes of recent problems with the Constitution and what to do about this. Factor 2 argues that at least part of the problem is with the Constitution itself and that it should be radically altered. According to factor 2, "(t)he Constitution is flawed. It was pieced together at a time of necessity, a time when the common people were deemed too ignorant to run their own affairs" (21 -2 +5). [*This represents the statement number followed by the factor scores of factor 1 and then factor 2.*] The problems with the document, it asserts, have gotten worse, and while "(t)he Constitution has worked throughout the history of our country, [they] do not believe it is strong enough to provide the U. S. with the kind of government we need to take care of us in future world politics" (15 +4 -5). And further, they note that "(w)ith the recent development of impeachment and what this country has evolved to, I think it's time we begin to question its validity seriously and take steps to get this nation back on its feet" (22 +4 -2).

Clearly, factor 2 represents a relatively negative view of the Constitution as indicated by a correlation with factor 2 in the original study — the negative perspective — of $.45$ ($p < .05$). For example, as indicated, it does not see the document as a "masterpiece" (16 -4) — or an instrument for protecting against chaos and disorder (17 -1), nor does the Constitution provide individual security (18 -5), or answers to all our pressing issues (12 -2). The problem is that it has failed us in many situations that have become increasingly more obvious. As a result, the Constitution needs "wholesale" revamping (24 +1). Interestingly, despite this negative viewpoint, factor 2 still believes the Constitution does represent "the ideal aspirations of great men in a new country," and that while "we haven't been able to live up to it or by it all the time . . . that just leaves us something to strive for" (1 +3). It appears the key goal, "objective," or standard by which those on factor 2 seek to evaluate the Constitution is one of equality. According to them "(w)hen people can treat others as equals and mean it, then and only then would I say that the Constitution is doing the job it was meant to do" (4 +5). That point obviously has not been met in the eyes of factor 2.

While factor 1 negative and factor 2 in this study both reflect critical narratives on the Constitution, factor 1 negative holds a more pessimistic view of the Constitution than both factor 2 in this study and factor 2 in the original study. For example, the biggest difference between factor 1 negative and factor 2 in this study is that factor 1 negative does not view the Constitution as the ideal aspirations of great men in a new country (1 -3 +3) [*This represents the statement number followed by the factor scores for factor 1 negative and factor 2 in this study.*] Nor does it see the Constitution as a “great document” (6 -2 +3). Rather, the focus is on the fact that the Constitution is simply the legal format that may be interpreted according to one’s finances (9 +4 -4). At the same time, interestingly, despite the overall hostility to the Constitution, the negative factor 1 individuals are more likely to express the view that the document does protect them and would be “shaken” if the Constitution were incapable of covering all contingencies, and in the final analysis they do need it to avoid being completely walked upon (18 -1 -5, 23 +5 -5).

Factor 3. Factor 3 includes 11 respondents with significant loadings ($p < .05$). Factor 3 correlated with factor 1 at .31, factor 2 at .21, and factor 4 at -.03 . It also correlated at .54 ($p < .01$) with factor 1 in the original study. Overall, the backgrounds of persons on factor 3 are a mixed bag. Five identified as Independents, four as Democrats, and two as Republicans. Three labeled themselves moderate, five conservative, and three liberal. Two individuals indicated a preference for Trump; six support Democratic candidates, with four of them for Sanders, one for Andrew Yang, one for Joe Biden, and three had not made up their mind. In an interesting twist, two of the conservatives indicated they would vote for Sanders. Of the 11, four identified as female and seven as male.

Factor 3 mimics, albeit to a much lesser extent, the factor 1 in this study’s grandiose view of the Constitution. This association is suggested in part by the correlation between the two factors at .31. Factor 3’s semi-grandiose viewpoint is tempered considerably, and appears somewhat conflicted, however, by a realization that there are problems with the Constitution that leads them to the realization that changes to the Constitution are necessary. The statement given the highest ranking by this factor demonstrates this apparent ambivalence as they still agree that the Constitution “is a very great document, although the recent events have undermined my confidence and faith in the government which it created. It is still the single most important document” (6 +5). Factor 3 also goes so far as to conclude that some sections are outmoded or unclear and there needs to be some “wholesale revamping” of the document (24 +4), which is substantially different from the factor 1 perspective. Similarly, they also accept some of the blame for weaknesses in the Constitution noting that “our Constitution represents the ideal aspirations of great men in a new country. I know we haven’t been able to live up to it or by it all the time, but that just leaves us something to strive for” (1 +5). Despite this expression of a need for change, factor 3 still describes the Constitution as a “masterpiece,” (16 +2), believes that it protects us against chaos and disorder (17 +2), and that it is a “living and essential part of our lives and guides us through difficult and tumultuous times” (11 +3). And like factor 1, factor 3 does not believe that “anyone has the right to go against the Constitution no matter how much power they have” (8 +4). The apparently ambivalent and somewhat conflicted view of Factor 3 appears to be the result of a continued admiration for the Constitution but a recognition that if it is to maintain its status as “the most important document,” it needs some change and updating. The Constitution, as “the ideal aspirations of great men in a new country” (1 +5) needs some help to maintain that status.

What the Constitution does appear to do for them is, to some degree, stand “between order and chaos, between organized government and anarchy, between ruthless power and helplessness” (17 +2). In other words, it is somewhat of a protective and stabilizing force in society. Similarly, allowing individuals to go against the Constitution will contribute to the crumbling of our foundations (8 +4), again, indicating a concern for political stability. And at a more symbolic level, “the Constitution represents the ideal aspirations of great men in a new country” (1 +5). It is to them, therefore, a repository of the ideals and goals for which our country was created, and we need to do all we can to preserve the document that contains these goals. The conclusion appears to be that making specific amendments and changes to the document will preserve the ideals and maintain the Constitution’s stabilizing force.

As indicated, factor 3 is a variant of the mythical narrative contained in the original factor 1. There are, however, some differences that distinguish the two. The largest difference revolves around their attitude toward changing the Constitution. Factor 3 in this study does not question the validity of the Constitution (22 –3 0) but it does note that the Constitution does need substantial changes (24 +4 –5). [*The first number is the statement number followed by the factor scores for factor 3 and factor 1 from the original study.*] They also vary somewhat on the overall role the Constitution performs in the system. Factor 3 views the Constitution as more of a restraint on their activities and sees the Constitution as “always looming above” them putting “limitations” on them. “We were “born free” with endless possibilities but the Constitution tells us what we can or cannot do” (7 +3 0). On the other hand, the original factor 1 is more likely to emphasize that the Constitution is “the cornerstone of the U.S. Government.” And that “this past year reflects its power and stronghold on the people and politics. It leads and directs the people (19 –2 +2). The original Factor 1 is also more likely to say that “the Constitution means justice in its highest form. (20 -5 +1). Finally, the two factors disagree about the role of equality in an overall evaluation of the Constitution. “When man can treat his fellow man as an equal and mean it, then and only then would I say that the Constitution is doing the job it was meant to do” (4 –3 +1).

Factor 4. Ten persons had significant, positive loadings on factor 4, and one had a significant negative loading. Comparing factor 4 to the other factors in the current study, factor 4 correlated -.09 with factor 1, .26 with factor 2, and .01 with factor 3. Factor 4 is a unique perspective that did not appear in previous studies. Recall in Table 1 that factor 4 only correlated negatively at -.42 ($p < .05$) with the original factor 3, indicating at least some rejection of the “realist perspective” reflected in the original factor 3. Thus, among this younger cohort a new and different perspective on the Constitution is revealed. It also adds to the diversity of responses forthcoming from this group when the Constitution as symbol is invoked.

Factor 4 was primarily a liberal Democratic group with a variety of different presidential preferences. Overall, there were six liberals, one conservative, one moderate, and two no responses. Similarly, there were six Democrats, one Republican, one Independent, and two no responses. There was one Trump supporter, three Sanders supporters, one Buttiegieg, one Biden, two none or other, and one “anybody but Trump.” Seven on factor 4 identified as female, and four identified as male. The lone person on the negative end of this factor was a moderate, Independent who expressed no preference for his presidential vote.

Several things stood out when the factor scores for factor 4 were examined. First is the absence of any glowing statements about the Constitution. While they do provide some positive support for the Constitution and do not “think anyone has the right to go against

the Constitution no matter how much power they have" (8 +5), the dominant theme is the absence of the attribution of an omnipotent quality to the Constitution. For example, factor 4 does not see the Constitution as a great or an important document (6 -3), nor do they view it as "the cornerstone of the U.S. Government," nor something that "leads and directs the people" (19 -3). It is neither a "masterpiece" (16 -2), nor does it reflect the "ideal aspirations of great men in a new country" (1 -1). Likewise, they do not lend much support to the idea that the Constitution is the great protector against chaos and disorder (17 0).

The source of this lack of adoration for the Constitution appears related to what they see as the multiple and inconsistent interpretations given to the Constitution. As factor 4 notes, "(t)he fact that so many interpretations of the doctrine exist should be reason enough to question its reliability. There are so many arguments for and against the Constitution that it makes it pretty difficult to make a decision" (5 +5). Expressing a similar concern about the multiple interpretations of the document, they argue "(i)t seems that we have gone away from the basic truths in this document. The interpretations of judges and other individuals have changed the basic truths to suit only a few people and not the whole nation. We need it to cover all people. We need our rights again" (10 +4). They also see a drifting away from the "basic truths" in the document as a result of the recent problems with "impeachment and what this country has evolved to. . . ." As a result they "think it's time we begin to question its validity seriously and take steps to get this nation back on its feet" (22 +3).

It appears factor 4 resents the politicization of the Constitution. While not specifically referred to in the statements, they see the politicization in the class bias that exists in the Constitution. According to factor 4, this is not entirely new and has been a fundamental problem with the Constitution since its creation. As they note, "(t)he Constitution is flawed. It was pieced together at a time of necessity, a time when the common people were deemed too ignorant to run their own affairs" (15 +2). This class bias, however, has accelerated more recently in part because of the variety of interpretations that have been given to the document as well as recent events like impeachment. The variety of interpretations have not benefitted all equally and have primarily favored "only a few people" (10 +4). The problem is that the poor are already disadvantaged and more likely to be unaware of what is happening "which prevents the lower class from getting any protection from the Constitution" (13 +3). What needs to be done is to reassert the basic notions of equality that do exist in the Constitution. As they say, only "(w)hen people can treat others as equals and mean it, then and only then would I say that the Constitution is doing the job it was meant to do" (4 +4).

Factor 4 adds an additional viewpoint to the previously uncovered perspectives on the symbolic meaning of the Constitution. Previous research using the same group of respondents over time had consistently generated the same three factors. While the factors revealed in this study resemble to some degree the previous factors, factor 4 provides a new take on the document. This factor generated by the younger cohort adds a somewhat secular and political view of the document.

Discussion and Conclusions

The primary purpose of this study has been to assess the symbolic meaning of the Constitution in the minds of the American public and particularly to see how a much younger cohort constructs the Constitution compared to participants in previous research. What is clear from the data presented here is that the grandiose, reverent, and sacred view of the Constitution suggested by scholars years ago exists and continues to

persist among many of these younger adults. The fact that almost half of the persons in the current study have significant loadings on factor 1 the sacred and reverent perspective – suggests the continued importance of the Constitution as a potent symbol in the minds of these individuals. Similarly, the fact that factor 1 from the original study in the 1970s and factor 1 in the current study — which was done on a different, younger cohort and over 40 years after the initial study — correlated at .83, indicates the persistence of this particular viewpoint.

The existence of factor 3 in this study provides support for both the continued existence of a more mythical view of the constitution, but also suggests that this group of younger adults have somewhat different takes on the Constitution. Factor 3 mirrors, to some degree, factor 1's sacred and reverent view of the Constitution, but persons on this factor also see that the document is not perfect and needs significant change.

The polarization in factor 1 presents a more substantial deviation from previous research and a potential problem for the Constitution's role as an important symbol. The problem is exacerbated considerably by the greater association of conservative, Republican Trump supporters with the sacred and reverent view, and a group of more liberal, Democratic Sanders supporters who view the Constitution in almost completely opposite terms. This degree of polarization, while quite common on many issues today, was not detected in previous studies on the Constitution. This certainly raises some questions about the continued ability of the Constitution to play a central role for all people in providing security, fostering stability, and lending legitimacy to other institutions. Previous research, however, did reveal that younger, liberal persons who had negative views of the Constitution as young adults adopted the sacred and reverent perspective as they matured and became more integrated into the community (Baas, et al., 2022). At the same time, it is important to note that those participants in previous research who at first held negative views of the Constitution were not coming from an initial bipolar position that was in direct opposition to the Constitution's mythic viewpoint, rather they initially had a negative orientation that was independent (or orthogonal) to the sacred and reverent perspective. The journey for those on the negative end of factor 1 in the current study likely will be a much more difficult voyage, particularly because their viewpoint tends to be intricately related to ideology, partisanship, and candidate orientation, a very difficult combination to overcome.

Another indication that the symbolic status of the Constitution may be weakening is the existence of factor 2, another youthful, liberal, Democratic group with, albeit, a less negative evaluation than those on the negative end of factor 1, yet still a hostile view of the Constitution. Once again with maturity and further integration into American society, these individuals may adopt the sacred and reverent view of the Constitution, and their journey may be a bit less difficult than for those persons on the negative end of factor 1. Still, this viewpoint is also tied into ideological, partisan, and candidate orientation. As for right now, this perspective reflects a part of a more fragmented overall view of the Constitution among these respondents than seen in previous research.

To some extent, the sharper division along partisan and ideological lines on factor 1, factor 2, and even on factor 4, should not come as a surprise. There is ample data indicating how the public has become divided along party lines, even on issues like attitudes toward the Supreme Court. For example, recent data by the Pew Research Center ("Positive views of Supreme Court," 2022) indicates that while overall 62% of the public approve of the Supreme Court, that figure drops to 49% for Democrats and rises to 75% for Republicans. This 26% spread is the largest reported in over two decades. Keeping in mind that approval ratings are no real substitute for measures of

legitimacy (Gibson, et al., 2003) such as those used here, and there is reason to keep evaluations of the Supreme Court and Constitution separate, these results on the Supreme Court are consistent with patterns uncovered here on the Constitution.

One more note on partisanship. Republicans appear to rally around the Constitution and most are loaded on the positive end of factor 1. This should not be too surprising given their tendency to support traditional values and authority (Tucker et al., 2019). At the same time, a large contingent of Democrats is associated with the negative end of factor 1 and the negative viewpoint of factor 2, and a smaller group on factor 4. Most of the Democrats that are spread out across several perspectives also express voting tendencies over a broad range of candidates other than Sanders. The Democrats here may be reflecting to some degree the variety of different candidates who were still in the presidential primaries when this study was undertaken. This is to say nothing of divisions within the party over a variety of issues and the role of identity politics. Whatever the reason, the emergence of factor 4, a new and distinct perspective on the Constitution, indicates an expanded repertoire of emotional responses forthcoming from this cohort when the Constitution is invoked than in previous studies. Factor 4's only link with previous research is a rejection of the more rational, realist perspective of factor 3 in the original study. The existence of a fourth factor also modifies the tendency of previous research to include only three factors, or cognitive categories. Along with the bipolarity in factor 1, when the Constitution is invoked among this younger cohort a wider variety of emotional responses occur than seen in past studies.

In addition, it is worth noting the lack of emergence among this younger cohort of the rational, realist perspective of factor 3 in the original study. In fact, if anything, factor 4 is a rejection of that particular perspective as indicated by the significant negative correlation between the two viewpoints. It already has been suggested that the current widespread polarization in today's world may have affected and contributed to the polarization of views of the Constitution. Likewise, it is possible that the anti-science, anti-rational milieu that exists today may also be reflected in the absence of the rational-realist perspective among this cohort.

The results of this study present a somewhat favorable but also mixed picture of the Constitution's ability to perform basic symbolic functions that would contribute to a well-ordered democratic society. On the one hand, most respondents subscribe either to a mythical perspective on the Constitution or are not overly hostile to the document and do find some value in it. On the other hand, the antagonistic perspectives of those on the negative end of factor 1 and those on factor 2 present a particular problem to the legitimacy conferring ability of the document. Likewise, and perhaps of more importance, the existence of a greater number of perspectives/factors emerging from the data in this study than in previous studies also present some obstacles to a unifying response to the document. At the same time, symbols may not need overtly positive responses to be functional and may need just enough potency to create a quiescent effect (Edelman, 1985).

What the future might hold is not clear. If the pattern of previous research provides the map, it would be expected that with maturity and social integration that the myth holders would remain as such and others will convert to that viewpoint, with the likely exception of a few. At the same time, some of the viewpoints here seem at least in part to be linked with ideological, partisan, and candidate orientations which may make them harder to change. Similarly, it is difficult to predict what is going to happen in this era of polarization and opposition to science, and how these may continue to affect the meaning of symbols like the Constitution. These are issues to be addressed by future research.

Finally, as noted in the Introduction, there was no plan for the original study to be longitudinal. Nonetheless, we believe that the studies presented here illustrate Q methodology's potential as a tool for charting intergenerational stability and change in political views.

References

- Americans are poorly informed about basic Constitutional provisions (2017, September 12). [The Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania](#).
- Baas, L. R. (1976). *The Constitution in the public mind*. Dissertation. Kent State University.
- Baas, L. R. (1979). The Constitution as symbol: The interpersonal sources of meaning of a secondary symbol. *American Journal of Political Science*, 23(1), 101.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2110774>
- Baas, L. R. (1980). The Constitution as symbol. *American Politics Quarterly*, 8(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X8000800206>
- Baas, L. R. (1984). The primary sources of meaning of a secondary symbol: The case of the Constitution and Ms. Murphy. *Political Psychology*, 5(4), 687.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3791237>
- Baas, L. R. (1987). The Constitution as symbol: Change or stability after 10 years: A preliminary report. Delivered at the 1987 annual conference of the American Political Science Association, September 3.
- Baas, L. R. (1997). The interpersonal sources of the development of political images: An intensive, longitudinal perspective. *Operant Subjectivity*, 20, 117-42.
<https://ojs.library.okstate.edu/osu/index.php/osub/article/view/8981>
- Baas, L. R. (2021). Reflections on longitudinal analysis with Q: The case of the Constitution and the public mind. Delivered at the 36th Annual Meeting of the International Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity, via zoom. 2021.
- Baas, L. R., Old, J. P., & Rhoads, J. C. (2022). The Constitution in the public mind: Change and stability. In J. C. Rhoads, D. B. Thomas, & S. E., Ramlo (Eds.), *Cultivating Q methodology: Essays honoring Steven R. Brown* (pp. 314-343). International Society for the scientific Study of Subjectivity.
- Bialik, K. (2018, May 11). Growing share of Americans say Supreme Court should base its rulings on what Constitution means today. *Pew Research Center*. Majority now say Supreme Court should interpret Constitution for today. Pew Research Center.
<https://pewrsr.ch/2I8tjWA>
- Brown, S. R. (1980). *Political subjectivity: applications of Q Methodology in political science*. Yale University Press.
- Cobb, R. W., & Elder, C. D. (1973). The political uses of symbolism. *American Politics Quarterly*, 1(3), 305-338.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673x7300100302>
- Davis, N. T., Kirby, G., & Gaddie, K. (2022). *Democracy's meanings: How the public understands democracy and why It matters*. University of Michigan Press.
- Edelman, M. (1974). The political language of the helping professions. *Politics & Society*, 4(3), 295-310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003232927400400301>
- Edelman, M. (1985). *The symbolic uses of politics*. (2nd ed.). University of Illinois Press.
- Franks, M. A. (2019). *The cult of the Constitution*. Stanford University Press.
- Gibson, J. L., Caldeira, G. A., & Spence, L. K. (2003). Measuring attitudes toward the United States Supreme Court. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(2), 354-364.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5907.00025>

- Jones, J. M. (2022, June 23). Confidence in U.S. Supreme Court sinks to historic low. *Gallup Poll*. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/394103/confidence-supreme-court-sinks-historic-low.aspx>
- Kammen, M. (2006). *A machine that would go of itself: The Constitution in American culture*. Vintage.
- Klein, M. (1995). Mythologizing the U.S. Constitution. *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 78(1), 169-187. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41178693>
- Lasswell, H. D. (1960). *Power and personality*. The Viking Press.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1965). *World politics and personal insecurity*. The Free Press.
- Lerner, M. (1937). Constitution and court as symbols. *The Yale Law Journal*, 46(8), 1290-1319 <https://doi.org/10.2307/792156>
- Marshall, T. R. (1989). *Public opinion and the Supreme Court*. Unwin Hyman.
- Marshall, T. R. (2022). *American public opinion and the modern Supreme Court, 1930-2020: A representative institution*, Lexington Books.
- McKeown, B. F., & Thomas, D. B. (2013). *Q Methodology. Quantitative applications in the social sciences*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Merelman, R. M. (1966). Learning and legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 60(3), 548-561. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1952970>
- Miller, A. S. (1965). Some pervasive myths about the U.S. Supreme Court. *St Louis University Law Journal*, 19, 153-189.
- Positive views of Supreme Court decline sharply following abortion ruling. (2022, September 1). <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2022/09/01/positive-views-of-supreme-court-decline-sharply-following-abortion-ruling>
- Prothro, J. W., & Grigg, C. M. (1960). Fundamental principles of democracy: Bases of agreement and disagreement. *The Journal of Politics*, 22(2), 276-294. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2127359>
- Rainie, L & Perrin A. (2019). Key findings about Americans' declining trust in government and each other. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/22/key-findings-about-americans-declining-trust-in-government-and-each-other>
- Stephenson, W. (1953). *The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Stephanopoulos, N., & Versteeg, Mila. (2016). The contours of Constitutional approval. *Washington University Law Review*, 94, 1-13. https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol94/iss1/6
- Stouffer, S. A. (1955). *Communism, conformity and liberties*. Routledge.
- Tanenhous, J., & Murphy, W. F. (1981). Patters of public support for the Supreme Court: A panel study. *Journal of Politics*, 43 (1), 24-39. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2130235>
- Thurstone, L. L. (1931). The measurement of social attitudes. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 26(3), 249-269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0070363>
- Tucker, P. D., & Torres, M., Sinclair, B., Smith, S. (2019). Pathways to Trump: Republican voters in 2016. *Electoral Studies*, 61,102035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2019.03.011>
- Zink, J. R., & Dawes, C. T. (2016). The dead hand of the past? Toward an understanding of "constitutional veneration." *Political Behavior*, 38(3), 535-560. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-015-9325-5>

Appendix 1: Statements and Factor Scores *

Statements	Factors			
	1	2	3	4
1. I think our Constitution represents the ideal aspirations of great men in a new country. I know we haven't been able to live up to it or by it all the time, but that just leaves us something to strive for.	3	3	5	-1
2. The Constitution is merely the will of the strongest for the time being, and therefore has no fixity, but shifts from generation to generation.	-1	1	-2	0
3. The Constitution does not mean that right and legal actions will be taken at any given time. It only enables most to get their just rewards.	0	0	0	-4
4. When man can treat his fellow man as an equal and mean it, then and only then would I say that the Constitution is doing the job it was meant to do.	0	5	-3	4
5. The fact that so many interpretations of the doctrine exist should be reason enough to question its reliability. There are so many arguments for and against the Constitution that it makes it pretty difficult to make a decision.	-3	-2	0	5
6. To me it is a very great document, although the recent events have undermined my confidence and faith in the government which it created. It is still the single most important document.	2	3	5	-3
7. To me the Constitution is something that I never see or experience, but is always looming above me. It puts limitations on us. We were "born free" with endless possibilities but the Constitution tells us what we can or cannot do.	-1	-3	3	-5
8. I don't think anyone has the right to go against the Constitution no matter how much power they have. If we let a person get away with breaching rules, then we're showing signs of letting our foundations crumble.	5	-3	4	5
9. The Constitution is just the legal format that may be interpreted according one's finances.	-4	-4	-5	0
10. It seems that we have gone away from the basic truths in this document. The interpretations of judges and other individuals have changed the basic truths to suit only a few people and not the whole nation. We need it to cover all people. We need our rights again.	1	0	1	4
11. I believe the Constitution is a living and essential piece of our lives as Americans and still operates to guide us through difficult and tumultuous days.	3	0	3	2
12. The Constitution means a lot to me because it is such a big part of our country. When we have problems we almost always can turn to the Constitution and get some kind of an answer.	2	-2	0	-2

13. The Constitution presupposes that individuals are aware of what the document means which prevents the lower class from getting any protection from the Constitution.	-3	2	-1	3
14. The Constitution reflects the social conscience of the nation.	0	2	-4	-5
15. The Constitution is flawed. It was pieced together at a time of necessity, a time when the common people were deemed too ignorant to run their own affairs.	-5	4	0	2
16. The Constitution is a masterpiece. It applies to today as well as 200 years ago. When I think of how complicated it seems I ready admire the founders and wonder if our congressman, senators, lawyers, etc., could create anything comparable to it if they were put 200 years back in time.	4	-4	2	-2
17. The Constitution stands between order and chaos, between organized government and anarchy, between ruthless power and helplessness. Without it man defends his rights by strength alone; man protects his property by power alone; man saves his life "by the sword."	5	-1	2	0
18. I think if ever the Constitution were proven inadequate to cover all contingencies, I'd be shaken.	1	-5	-2	-4
19. The Constitution seems to be the cornerstone of the U.S. Government. This past year reflects its power and stronghold on the people and politics. It leads and directs the people.	0	0	-2	-3
20. The Constitution means justice in its highest form.	4	-1	-5	1
21. The Constitution has worked though out the history of our country, but I do not believe it is strong enough to provide the U. S. with the kind of government we need to take care of us in future world politics.	-2	5	1	1
22. With the recent development of impeachment and what this country has evolved to, I think it's time we begin to question is validity seriously and takes steps to get this nation back on its feet.	-2	4	-3	3
23. The Constitution is not a symbol of power. It is a symbol of weakness. Unfortunately we do need it to avoid being completely walked upon.	5	-5	-4	-1
24. The Constitution is not the panacea for a specific nation for all time, alterations may be needed. I don't think this means amendments, but wholesale revamping. Many of the sections are outmoded or unclear.	-4	1	4	0

*Factor scores refer to the ranking given that statement by that particular factor. Scores run from +5 to -5 just like the Q sort ranking.

Appendix 2: Factor Loadings and Background Characteristics*

#	Sex	Age	Major	Party	Ideology	Vote	I	II	III	IV
1	M	20	Electrical Engineer	Republican	Moderate	Trump	92	24	02	-07
2	M	21	Computer Science	Independent	Conservative	**	91	-05	04	10
3	M	21	Criminology	Republican	Conservative	Trump	88	-17	09	13
4	F	22	Mechanical Engineering	Republican	Conservative		88	02	06	22
5	M	21	Finance	Republican	Conservative	Trump	86	-06	-07	-17
6	M	20	Political Science	Republican	Conservative	Trump	86	-25	29	-19
7	M	19	Atmospheric Science	Republican	Conservative	Trump	83	-20	17	05
8	M	18	Political Science	Republican	Conservative	Trump	82	20	-04	-05
9	M	22	Mathematics	Republican	Moderate	Trump	82	14	02	-12
10	M	18	Physics	Republican	Conservative		81	03	-07	12
11	M	19	Computer Science	Independent	Conservative	Gabbard	79	-04	13	18
12	M	20	Communication	Republican	Moderate	Buttegieg	78	20	-31	-34
13	M	20	Meteorology	Republican	Conservative	Trump	77	-09	02	-29
14	F	20	Political Science	Republican	Moderate		77	-08	06	-28
15	M	54		Republican	Conservative	Trump	77	-25	47	01
16	M	21	Actuarial	Republican	Moderate	Trump	76	06	-15	44
17	F	51		Democrat	Liberal	?	76	0	31	23
18	M	19	Economics/Finance	Republican	Conservative	Trump	75	-04	09	-04
19	M	18	Business	Republican	Conservative	Trump	75	29	-41	-05
20	M	19	Political Science	Republican	Conservative	Trump	74	00	34	19
21	M	20	Biology		Conservative	Trump	73	-19	08	-01
22	M	20	Computer Engineering	Republican	Conservative	Trump	70	35	-28	06
23	M	18	Engineering	Republican	Moderate	Trump	70	17	30	-08
24	F	20	Political Science	Independent	Moderate	Gabbard	70	01	32	12
25	F	50	Education B.S.	Republican	Conservative	Trump	70	-25	27	-41
26	M	21	Psychology	Republican	Conservative	Trump	69	-02	27	06
27	M	18	Electrical Engineer	Republican	Moderate	Trump	66	16	-11	24
28	M	24	International Relations	Independent	Conservative	Yang/Trump	66	20	10	02
29	F	19	Marketing	Republican	Conservative	Trump	64	11	-07	-23
30	M	21	Statistics	Independent	Moderate	Bloomberg	64	18	29	18
31	M	19	Finance	Republican	Conservative	Trump	63	01	-15	-32
32	F	19	Biology	Republican	Conservative	Warren	63	07	13	29
33	M	21	International Relations	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	61	12	27	27
34	M	21	Political Science	Republican	Conservative	Trump	59	10	30	-14
35	M	20	Music	Republican	Conservative	Trump	58	56	-01	25
36							57	38	-10	-10
37	F	22	Mechanical Engineering	Republican	Moderate		56	-06	-20	-30
38	M	21	Computer Science	Democrat	Liberal	Bloomberg	56	14	-07	-42
39	F	20	Biology/Chemistry	Republican	Conservative	Trump	55	-24	34	-27
40	F	52		Republican	Conservative	?	55	18	54	03
41	M	22	Mechanical Engineering	Independent	Moderate		54	-07	-17	07
42	F	22	Sports Management	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	53	28	4	19
43	M	20	Psychology	Republican	Conservative	Trump	52	-26	09	-05
44	F	22	Marketing	Republican	Conservative		51	44	04	39

45	F	19	Data Science	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	50	36	15	21
46	M	26	Graduated	Independent	Conservative	Other	49	-04	42	32
47	M	19	Health Science	Republican	Conservative	Trump	46	15	45	20
48	F	20	International Relations	Republican	Moderate		46	21	-32	12
49	F	19	Communication	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	44	40	23	-09
50	F	18	Marketing	Republican	Moderate	Trump	43	05	44	-05
51	M	19	Education	Republican	Conservative	Trump	40	-11	09	-02
52	F	22	Business/Engineering	Republican	Conservative		38	02	-17	-35
53	M	20	Meteorology	Republican	Conservative	Trump	-42	26	23	-02
54	F	18	Digital Media	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-55	26	14	39
55	F	19	Nursing	Independent	Moderate	Warren	-55	25	39	21
56	M	22	Computer Science	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-59	04	-10	57
57	M	19	Physics	Democrat	Liberal	Buttigieg	-61	31	11	57
58	M	19	Political Science	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-66	35	-09	45
59	M	20	Computer	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-68	42	-14	-06
60	M	22	Political Science	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-87	14	-07	24
61	M	20	Computer	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-18	68	-06	07
62	F	21	Exercise	Republican	Moderate	Trump	24	67	12	-06
63	F	19	Sociology	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-15	67	-04	33
64	F	20	Communication	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-09	63	15	-18
65	M	22	Mathematics	Democrat	Moderate	Sanders	09	61	34	02
66	F	18	Biology	Democrat	Liberal	Klobachar	20	60	-18	34
67	F	19	Engineering	Democrat	Liberal		13	60	20	-09
68	M	21	Mechanical Engineering	Independent	Moderate	Obama	10	60	-14	04
69	F	20	English/Communication	Democrat	Liberal		36	59	10	15
70	F	19	Theatre/Music	Independent	Moderate		02	55	-11	08
71	M	20	Computer Engineering	Independent	Moderate		-13	53	-05	07
72	F	22	Biology	Democrat	Liberal	Warren	09	52	09	52
73	M	22	Finance	Republican	Conservative	Trump	04	49	-14	05
74	M	19	Political Science	Democrat	Liberal	Steyer	15	48	12	-05
75	F	21	Engineering	Democrat	liberal	Buttegieg	-30	46	-04	04
76	F	21	Data Science	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-30	45	37	44
77	M	18	Meteorology	Independent	Moderate	Biden	29	44	-09	18
78	F	20	Criminology/Psychology	Democrat	Liberal		13	44	35	39
79	F	19	International Relations	Democrat	Liberal	Buttegieg	-14	44	42	03
80	F	21	International Relations	Democrat	Liberal	Buttegieg	13	40	-07	01
81		19	Chemistry	Independent	liberal		11	40	-04	44
82	M	22	Accounting	Democrat	Moderate		04	37	-06	36
83	M	20	Sociology	Independent	Moderate	Sanders	-24	36	07	34
84	M	20	Engineering	Independent	Conservative		11	31	66	-05
85	F	20	Geography	Independent	Moderate		20	13	62	-44
86	M	28	American Studies	Independent	Conservative	Sanders	14	-13	62	22
87	M	22	Chemistry	Republican	Conservative	Trump	34	16	61	-15
88	M	21	Engineering	Republican	Conservative	Trump	29	06	59	03
89	M	22	Political Science	Independent	Conservative	Sanders	23	06	59	-14
90	M	19	Political Science	Democrat	Liberal	Yang	22	36	54	47
91	F	20	Political Science	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	23	-20	45	40
92	F	22	Civil Engineering	Independent	Moderate		18	36	44	-61

93	M	19	Political Science	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	31	08	43	22
94	F	21	Sports management	Democrat	Moderate	Biden	06	34	41	04
95	F	21	International Relations	Independent	Moderate		19	-03	38	17
96	M	19	Political Science	Republican	Conservative	Trump	0	15	35	-05
97	F	20		Independent	Moderate	Gabbard	-04	-05	-45	12
98	M	22	Computer Engineer	Independent	Liberal	Sanders	07	26	05	74
99	F	21	Greek and Roman	Democrat	Liberal	Buttigieg	-16	38	07	68
100	F	49	Biology	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-18	53	19	63
101	F	19	International Relations	Democrat	Liberal	No Trump	-18	26	23	59
102							18	35	08	55
103	F	20	Political Science	Democrat	Liberal	Biden	22	34	24	53
104		21		Democrat	Independent	No Trump	-04	13	14	50
105	F	21	Political Science	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	-38	38	-17	47
106	F	21	Sports Management		Conservative	Trump	18	27	36	42
107	F	21	Political Science	Republican	Moderate	Old	21	-07	-13	40
108	M	22	Biology	Democrat	Liberal	Buttigieg	-13	14	10	36
109	M	21	Civil Engineering	Independent	Moderate		-02	37	29	-47
110	F	47	English	Democrat	Moderate		06	28	01	21
111	M	20	Economics	Democrat	Liberal	Warren	-26	-20	29	05
112	M	22	Political Science	Democrat	Liberal	Sanders	23	29	-20	3

*Factor loadings exceeding .40 are significant $p < .05$.

** Blank spaces indicate nonresponses to those questions.