Supplemental Materials

1. 21 Day Senate Random Sample

My first robustness check is based on how many partisan tweets Senators sent during 21 random days amid Kavanaugh's confirmation fight. My argument is that I should not observe the same partisan intensity patterns among Judiciary Committee members and men and women on other partisan issues. To test this claim, I developed a coding scheme that categorizes tweets unrelated to Kavanuagh as partisan. Generally speaking, I classified a tweet as partisan if it 1) supports the politician's party (and its members) or opposes the other party and 2) creates a partisan frame for the reader. When coding tweets, I consider nine contexts that produce a partisan post. Below, I list these categorization rules and examples of partisan and 'not partisan' tweets from the data I coded. Note, the examples included with the coding rules are not exhaustive and that this coding scheme was not applied to the Kavanaugh-specific tweets.

1. Explicitly using party labels.
    - Democrat, D's, Dems, Republicans, R's, Repubs, GOP.
2. Mentioning the president, administration or prominent presidential appointees.
    - @realdonaldtrump, Trump, @POTUS, Pence, the president, @PressSec, KellyAnne Conway, Scott Pruitt.
3. Mentioning party leaders or partisan groups.
    - Mitch McConnell, Paul Ryan, Nancy Pelosi, Chuck Schumer, @SenateDems, @NRSC.
4. Partisan issues related to good governance, scandals, or corruption.

- Mueller's Russia investigation into Trump campaign and 2016 election interference, Republican investigation into FBI bias against Trump, Hillary Clinton'se-mails.

5. Partisan issues related to congressional procedure or a party's handling of an issue.
    - Conduct of House Intelligence Committee, disputes over congressional subpoenas.
6. Discussing policy issues using partisan monikers.
    - Obamacare, #TrumpBudget, #GOPTaxScam.
7. Retweeting a partisan or party leader's account.
    - @realdonaldtrump, @NancyPelosi, @HouseGOP, @OversightDems. @BarackObama.
8. Explicitly attacking a member of the other party.
    - Posts directly attack a member of the other party by name or by including their Twitter ID in the tweet.
9. Campaign tweets that encourage voters to support a candidate, including vote, donation, and volunteering appeals, endorsements, and attacks on their opponent.
    - Include posts that ask followers to vote for candidate (including hashtags such as #VoteJB), appeals to help the campaign (including asking people to phone bank, canvas, post yard signs, or volunteer more generally), endorsements from newspapers or interest groups, or contribution requests (including buying campaign merchandise).

Three examples of partisan and non-partisan tweets are:

Partisan

Congress must pass debt relief for Puerto Rico to ease the financial burden of hurricane recovery. We already failed them once when 2,975 Americans lost their lives. This is the first

step toward righting the wrongs of President Trump and helping Puerto Rico finally recover. -Sent by Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY) on 9/2/2018

Six months after it passed, corporations continue to use the #GOPTaxCut to enrich wealthy shareholders instead of giving workers a much-deserved raise. -Sent by Diane Feinstein (DCA) on 7/12/2018

From cutting taxes to fighting illegal immigration, @realDonaldTrump's agenda has been about putting America First and I'm committed to working with him to #MAGA! I'm proud to have our President's endorsement! #TeamCindy #Cindy2018 -Sent by Cindy-Hyde Smith (R-MS) on 8/28/2018

Not Partisan

Understandably, our agricultural producers are also worried about this trade war. The damage from the trade war extends to other sectors of our economy, like our manufacturers and energy suppliers, as well. -Sent by Heidi Heitkamp (D-ND) on 9/11/2018

Glad that @NOAA has opened an investigation after dozens of dolphins have washed up dead on our beaches in a single month. Instead of giving polluters a pass, we should be protecting our water and the environment we all rely on. -BN -Sent by Bill Nelson (D-FL) on 9/7/2018

#LWCF has support from Republicans and Democrats, in the Senate and in the House. Americans support the program and want it to continue. Yet for some reason, the Senate still refuses to take up this issue. -Sent by Richard Burr (R-NC) on 8/22/18

Results

My theory predicts that Judiciary Committee members should not act more partisan on other issues during this same period and that the same Kavanaugh-specific gender dynamics did not spillover into other partisan fights. To test these claims, I specified the same models as those in Table 3, but used the 21 day random sample tweets that are unrelated to the Supreme Court confirmation as my data. As before, the models in Table 4 are estimated with robust standard errors clustered by Senator.

Table 4: 21 Day Random Sample of Senate Partisan Intensity

	Binary model	% Model	Count Model
Seat Safety x Reelection	-0.025	0.008	-0.011
	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.021)
Reelection	0.481**	0.446**	0.646***
	(0.240)	(0.201)	(0.213)
Seat Safety	0.003	-0.000	0.002
	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.014)
Judiciary Committee	-0.405**	-0.507**	-0.279
	(0.175)	(0.205)	(0.252)
Pre-9/14			
Republican Woman	-0.228	0.370	0.294
	(0.407)	(0.488)	(0.444)
Democratic Man	0.620***	0.902***	0.883***
	(0.212)	(0.209)	(0.222)
Democratic Woman	0.206	-0.487	-0.193
	(0.466)	(0.530)	(0.483)
Post-9/14			
Republican Man	-0.094	-0.211	-0.242
	(0.156)	(0.219)	(0.176)
Republican Woman	0.759**	-0.129	-0.010
	(0.387)	(0.264)	(0.272)
Democratic Man	-0.053	0.142	0.253
	(0.246)	(0.279)	(0.296)
Democratic Woman	-0.599	0.227	-0.152
	(0.514)	(0.359)	(0.383)
Control Variables			
Ideological Extremity	1.297**	0.346	-0.036
	(0.513)	(0.548)	(0.628)
Party Leader	0.143	0.283	0.347
	(0.430)	(0.212)	(0.264)
Former Representative	-0.198	-0.101	-0.098
	(0.140)	(0.150)	(0.178)
Years Served	0.010	0.002	0.004
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.012)
Age	-0.006	0.002	0.000
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.009)
Total Tweets -	0.000**	0.000***	0.000***
115th Congress	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Constant	-0.354	-3.215***	-5.396***
	(0.627)	(0.581)	(0.647)
N	2079	2079	2079
Pseudo R^2	0.04	0.08	0.12

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Note: The unit is the Senator-Day. Model 1 is a logistic regression and the DV is 1 if Senator sent a partisan tweet about Brett Kavanaugh that day and 0 otherwise. Model 2 is a fractional logistic regression and the DV is the percentage of partisan tweets a Senator sent about Brett Kavanaugh that day. Model 3 is a negative binomial count models with an exposure term that is the maximum number of tweets sent by a Senator that day. All three models are estimated with robust standard errors clustered by Senator.

These results support my argument. The models show that Senate Judiciary Committee members were not more partisan on other issues that arose during Kavanaugh's nomination. Additionally, men and women's partisan intensity did not shift on other topics after September 14th. Not surprisingly, Senators running for reelection sent more partisan tweets in the final months leading up to Election Day.

House Members' Partisan Intensity

I also consider a second robustness check, whether the gender dynamics that occurred in the Senate also played out in the House. My theory suggests that I should observe similar shifts in tweeting patterns among men and women after September 14th. This would indicate that personal characteristics, even when they fall outside a politician's specific jurisdiction, can still spur or limit partisan intensity. To test this possibility, I coded partisan Kavanaugh tweets sent by House members during his nomination and I specify the same models as above.[1]

Table 5's results partially support my expectation that personal characteristics can affect a legislator's partisan intensity even when the issue is not in their jurisdiction. As expected, Democratic women's partisan intensity increased after September 14th. However, while the coefficients are in the expected direction, Republican women's partisan intensity did not significantly decrease. This is due to House Republican women largely abstaining from discussing this nomination in the first place. The probability a female Republican representative sent a partisan tweet about Kavanaugh before September 14th on a given day was 0.02. After September 14th, this probability slightly decreased, but not enough to produce a statistically significant difference. Like Senators, men's partisan intensity increased, but more modestly than Democratic women's.

Table 5: House Members' Kavanaugh Tweeting Activity

	Binary Model	% Model	Count Model
Seat Safety x Reelection	0.019	-0.001	0.022
	(0.022)	(0.013)	(0.022)
Reelection	-0.118	0.105	-0.118
	(0.425)	(0.263)	(0.427)
Seat Safety	-0.002	0.016	-0.003
	(0.022)	(0.013)	(0.022)
Judiciary Committee	0.390***	0.366***	0.377**
	(0.127)	(0.125)	(0.173)
	(0.425)	(0.263)	(0.427)
Pre-9/14			
Republican Woman	-0.118	-0.220	-0.181
	(0.195)	(0.240)	(0.236)
Democratic Man	1.163***	0.716***	1.191***
	(0.171)	(0.137)	(0.210)
Democratic Woman	0.389	0.351	0.451
	(0.245)	(0.268)	(0.283)
Post-9/14			
Republican Man	0.573***	0.645***	0.897***
	(0.134)	(0.120)	(0.141)
Republican Woman	-0.557	-0.546	-0.825*
	(0.506)	(0.455)	(0.446)
Democratic Man	0.878***	0.782***	0.701***
	(0.164)	(0.148)	(0.167)
Democratic Woman	0.905*	0.967**	1.213***
	(0.526)	(0.473)	(0.466)
Control Variables			
Ideological Extremity	2.841***	1.827***	2.846***
	(0.444)	(0.382)	(0.469)
Party Leader	0.573*	0.014	0.494*
	(0.296)	(0.214)	(0.255)
Years Served	-0.005	-0.003	-0.009
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Age	0.011*	0.013**	0.014**
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
tweets115th	0.000***	-0.000	0.000***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Constant	-5.944***	-6.159***	-9.892***
	(0.564)	(0.441)	(0.549)
N	23379	23379	23379
Pseudo R^2	0.18	0.11	0.13

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Note: The unit is the Representative-Day. Model 1 is a logistic regression and the DV is 1 if representative sent a partisan tweet about Brett Kavanaugh that day and 0 otherwise. Model 2 is a fractional logistic regression and the DV is the percentage of partisan tweets a representative sent about Brett Kavanaugh that day. Model 3 is a negative binomial count models with an exposure term that is the maximum number of tweets sent by a representative that day. All three models are estimated with robust standard errors clustered by representative.

[1] Due to House members removing their Twitter pages after losing reelection or resigning from office, I only have data from 424 representatives.