

The Moral Roots of Partisan Division: How Moral Conviction Heightens Affective Polarization

Online Appendix

Results from Primary Analyses

These model coefficients correspond to the results illustrated in Figures 1 to 4 in the main text.

Table 1: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases the Gap in Partisan Affect

	2012 EGSS Data	2016 SSI Data	
	Candidate Gap	Candidate Gap	Party Gap
Propensity to Moralize	0.11** (0.04)	0.17** (0.05)	0.13** (0.04)
Partisan Strength	0.22** (0.04)	0.33** (0.03)	0.41** (0.03)
Ideological Strength	0.14** (0.03)	0.07* (0.03)	0.10** (0.03)
Church Attendance	0.02 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.10** (0.03)
Evangelical	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.05* (0.02)	-0.04 (0.02)
Political Knowledge	0.13** (0.04)	0.07 (0.03)	0.09** (0.03)
White	-0.06* (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.002 (0.02)
Female	-0.02 (0.02)	0.05* (0.02)	0.04* (0.02)
Age	0.16** (0.05)	0.22** (0.05)	0.14** (0.04)
Education	0.04 (0.04)	-0.11* (0.05)	-0.15** (0.04)
(Intercept)	0.07 (0.04)	0.09* (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)
R ²	0.19	0.20	0.32
N	1,253	1,011	1,011

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Models are OLS (weighted OLS for 2012 EGSS). Results from imputed datasets are combined, and standard errors are adjusted to account for imputation uncertainty using Rubin's combination rules (Rubin 1987). ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, two-tailed test.

Table 2: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases the Partisan Divide in Presidential Approval

	Obama Job Approval Rating
Republican	-0.28** (0.04)
Propensity to Moralize	0.12* (0.06)
Partisan Strength	0.04 (0.02)
Ideological Strength	-0.03 (0.03)
Church Attendance	-0.04 (0.04)
Evangelical	-0.05 (0.02)
Political Knowledge	0.11* (0.04)
White	-0.18** (0.03)
Female	0.01 (0.02)
Age	-0.15** (0.05)
Education	0.07 (0.04)
Republican * Propensity to Moralize	-0.22** (0.08)
(Intercept)	0.70** (0.05)
R ²	0.45
N	1,233

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Model is weighted OLS. Results from imputed datasets are combined, and standard errors are adjusted to account for imputation uncertainty using Rubin's combination rules (Rubin 1987).

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, two-tailed test.

Table 3: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases Social Distance from and Hostility toward Opposing Partisans

	Relationship	Social Media			
	Distance	Distance	Anger	Incivility	Antagonism
Propensity to Moralize	0.19** (0.06)	0.17** (0.05)	0.20** (0.05)	0.29** (0.05)	0.19** (0.05)
Partisan Strength	0.29** (0.05)	0.20** (0.04)	0.24** (0.04)	0.15** (0.04)	0.19** (0.03)
Ideological Strength	0.15** (0.04)	0.02 (0.03)	0.14** (0.03)	0.06 (0.04)	-0.003 (0.03)
Church Attendance	-0.06 (0.04)	0.08* (0.03)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	0.15** (0.03)
Evangelical	0.03 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)	0.004 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	0.06* (0.02)
Political Knowledge	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.17** (0.04)	-0.005 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.20** (0.03)
White	0.01 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)	0.05 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)
Female	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.11** (0.02)	-0.05* (0.02)	-0.12** (0.02)	-0.14** (0.02)
Age	-0.26** (0.06)	-0.30** (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)	-0.19** (0.05)	-0.31** (0.05)
Education	0.15* (0.06)	0.16** (0.06)	0.06 (0.06)	0.06 (0.06)	0.13** (0.05)
(Intercept)	-0.01 (0.06)	0.04 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.06)	0.16** (0.05)	0.02 (0.05)
R ²	0.19	0.21	0.17	0.14	0.30
N	1,011	1,011	1,011	1,011	1,011

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Models are OLS. Results from imputed datasets are combined, and standard errors are adjusted to account for imputation uncertainty using Rubin's combination rules (Rubin 1987).

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, two-tailed test.

Overview of Affective Polarization in Everyday Life Scale

This paper includes novel measures of the affective polarization that characterizes relationships among the American public. The following items can be used as separate indicators of social distance from and hostility toward opposing partisans or as one scale of affective polarization in everyday life.

Table 4: Affective Polarization in Everyday Life Scale Properties

	Percentage in Each Response Category						Mean (SD)
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Don't Know	
Relationship Distance I am hesitant to date a Democrat/Republican.	38	12	14	10	16	11	0.37 (0.39)
Social Media Distance I block friends on Facebook and Twitter if they talk positively about the Democrats/ Republicans.	56	11	12	7	9	5	0.24 (0.34)
Anger Just thinking about the Democrats/Republicans makes me angry.	30	15	24	16	14	2	0.42 (0.35)
Incivility Over the course of the election season, I have made fun of Democrats/ Republicans.	31	16	24	14	12	3	0.40 (0.35)
Antagonism I have worn a political T-shirt, or other apparel or merchandise hoping it would upset Democrats/ Republicans.	63	7	11	10	6	3	0.21 (0.32)
Mean (SD)	0.33 (0.36)						
Cronbach's alpha	0.87						
N	1,011						

Note: Due to rounding, response percentages for each item might not add up to 100%. Mean and SD scores exclude "Don't Know" responses.

Table 5: Affective Polarization in Everyday Life Scale Properties Among Democratic Identifiers

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Don't Know
Relationship Distance	35	12	14	11	18	10
Social Media Distance	51	12	13	9	10	4
Anger	28	14	25	17	14	2
Incivility	28	16	25	17	12	2
Antagonism	61	7	12	11	6	3
Mean (SD)	0.35 (0.36)					
Cronbach's alpha	0.88					
N	556					

Note: Entries are percentages. Due to rounding, percentages for an item might not add up to 100%. Mean and SD scores exclude "Don't Know" responses.

Table 6: Affective Polarization in Everyday Life Scale Properties Among Republican Identifiers

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Don't Know
Relationship Distance	42	10	13	8	12	13
Social Media Distance	64	10	11	4	6	6
Anger	31	16	23	13	13	3
Incivility	37	17	23	9	10	4
Antagonism	67	7	10	6	5	5
Mean (SD)	0.28 (0.35)					
Cronbach's alpha	0.86					
N	300					

Note: Entries are percentages. Due to rounding, percentages for an item might not add up to 100%. Mean and SD scores exclude "Don't Know" responses.

Table 7: Comparing Affective Polarization in Everyday Life between Democrats and Republicans

	Mean (SD)	
	Democrats	Republicans
Anger	0.44 (0.35)	0.40 (0.35)
Incivility	0.42 (0.34)	0.34 (0.34)
Relationship Distance	0.40 (0.39)	0.32 (0.37)
Social Media Distance	0.28 (0.35)	0.18 (0.30)
Antagonism	0.23 (0.34)	0.17 (0.30)
Average Distance and Hostility	0.35 (0.30)	0.28 (0.28)

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Items are organized in descending order from the highest to lowest average score. Bolded items reflect significant differences between Democrats and Republicans based on independent samples t-tests ($p < 0.05$).

Results Using Casewise Deletion, Including Independents

We get similar results from analyses using casewise deletion, rather than multiple imputation, to deal with missing data.

Table 8: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases the Gap in Partisan Affect

	2012 EGSS Data	2016 SSI Data	
	Candidate Gap	Candidate Gap	Party Gap
Propensity to Moralize	0.14** (0.04)	0.15** (0.05)	0.12** (0.04)
Partisan Strength	0.20** (0.04)	0.35** (0.03)	0.41** (0.03)
Ideological Strength	0.14** (0.04)	0.07* (0.03)	0.10** (0.03)
Church Attendance	0.02 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.10** (0.03)
Evangelical	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.05* (0.02)	-0.04* (0.02)
Political Knowledge	0.11** (0.04)	0.05 (0.03)	0.09** (0.03)
White	-0.07* (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)
Female	-0.03 (0.02)	0.05* (0.02)	0.04* (0.02)
Age	0.14** (0.05)	0.23** (0.05)	0.15** (0.04)
Education	0.07 (0.04)	-0.09 (0.06)	-0.12* (0.05)
(Intercept)	0.09 (0.05)	0.09* (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)
R²	0.18	0.20	0.31
N	969	941	941

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Models are OLS (weighted OLS for 2012 EGSS).

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, two-tailed test.

Table 9: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases the Partisan Divide in Presidential Approval

	Obama Job Approval Rating
Republican	-0.27** (0.05)
Propensity to Moralize	0.17** (0.06)
Partisan Strength	-0.001 (0.03)
Ideological Strength	-0.06 (0.03)
Church Attendance	-0.04 (0.04)
Evangelical	-0.06* (0.02)
Political Knowledge	0.09 (0.05)
White	-0.19** (0.03)
Female	0.01 (0.02)
Age	-0.15** (0.05)
Education	0.06 (0.04)
Republican * Propensity to Moralize	-0.28** (0.08)
(Intercept)	0.74** (0.06)
R ²	0.48
N	970

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Model is weighted OLS.

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, two-tailed test.

Table 10: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases Social Distance from and Hostility toward Opposing Partisans

	Relationship Distance	Social Media Distance	Anger	Incivility	Antagonism
Propensity to Moralize	0.21** (0.07)	0.18** (0.05)	0.21** (0.06)	0.29** (0.06)	0.18** (0.05)
Partisan Strength	0.28** (0.05)	0.19** (0.04)	0.24** (0.05)	0.14** (0.04)	0.20** (0.04)
Ideological Strength	0.14** (0.04)	0.01 (0.03)	0.12** (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.03)
Church Attendance	-0.04 (0.04)	0.09* (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	0.15** (0.03)
Evangelical	0.04 (0.03)	0.05* (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	0.06** (0.02)
Political Knowledge	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.18** (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.20** (0.03)
White	0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)	0.05 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)
Female	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.12** (0.02)	-0.05 (0.02)	-0.12** (0.02)	-0.14** (0.02)
Age	-0.31** (0.07)	-0.33** (0.05)	0.02 (0.06)	-0.20** (0.06)	-0.34** (0.05)
Education	0.11 (0.07)	0.13* (0.06)	0.04 (0.06)	0.03 (0.06)	0.11* (0.05)
(Intercept)	0.02 (0.07)	0.07 (0.06)	0.002 (0.06)	0.20** (0.06)	0.04 (0.05)
R ²	0.14	0.20	0.11	0.11	0.28
N	735	787	805	804	799

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Models are OLS.

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, two-tailed test.

Results Using Multiple Imputation, Excluding Independents

We get similar results from analyses excluding respondents who identify as pure Independents.

Table 11: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases the Gap in Partisan Affect

	2012 EGSS Data	2016 SSI Data	
	Candidate Gap	Candidate Gap	Party Gap
Propensity to Moralize	0.11** (0.04)	0.16** (0.05)	0.15** (0.05)
Partisan Strength	0.16** (0.03)	0.20** (0.03)	0.27** (0.03)
Ideological Strength	0.13** (0.03)	0.07* (0.03)	0.11** (0.03)
Church Attendance	0.03 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.12** (0.03)
Evangelical	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.06* (0.03)	-0.04 (0.02)
Political Knowledge	0.13** (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	0.08* (0.03)
White	-0.06* (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.001 (0.02)
Female	-0.03 (0.02)	0.04 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)
Age	0.15** (0.05)	0.24** (0.05)	0.15** (0.05)
Education	0.04 (0.04)	-0.10 (0.06)	-0.15** (0.05)
(Intercept)	0.14** (0.04)	0.22** (0.05)	0.17** (0.04)
R ²	0.19	0.13	0.21
N	1,233	856	856

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Models are OLS (weighted OLS for 2012 EGSS). Results from imputed datasets are combined, and standard errors are adjusted to account for imputation uncertainty using Rubin's combination rules (Rubin 1987).

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, two-tailed test.

Note: The Partisan Divide in Presidential Approval Model in the body of the paper already excludes Independents, so it would be redundant to include in this appendix.

Table 12: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases Social Distance from and Hostility toward Opposing Partisans

	Relationship Distance	Social Media Distance	Anger	Incivility	Antagonism
Propensity to Moralize	0.16** (0.06)	0.14** (0.05)	0.18** (0.06)	0.27** (0.05)	0.17** (0.05)
Partisan Strength	0.24** (0.04)	0.17** (0.03)	0.19** (0.03)	0.13** (0.03)	0.15** (0.03)
Ideological Strength	0.13** (0.04)	0.01 (0.03)	0.13** (0.04)	0.04 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)
Church Attendance	-0.06 (0.04)	0.08* (0.03)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)	0.15** (0.03)
Evangelical	0.03 (0.03)	0.05* (0.02)	0.01 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	0.06** (0.02)
Political Knowledge	0.002 (0.04)	-0.16** (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	-0.20** (0.03)
White	0.01 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)	0.04 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)
Female	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.11** (0.02)	-0.05 (0.02)	-0.11** (0.02)	-0.14** (0.02)
Age	-0.28** (0.06)	-0.31** (0.05)	0.04 (0.06)	-0.20** (0.06)	-0.31** (0.05)
Education	0.14* (0.07)	0.16** (0.06)	0.07 (0.06)	0.05 (0.06)	0.14** (0.05)
(Intercept)	0.08 (0.06)	0.09 (0.05)	0.05 (0.05)	0.19** (0.05)	0.07 (0.05)
R ²	0.14	0.20	0.12	0.12	0.28
N	856	856	856	856	856

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Models are OLS. Results from imputed datasets are combined, and standard errors are adjusted to account for imputation uncertainty using Rubin's combination rules (Rubin 1987).

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, two-tailed test.

Analyses with Interaction Terms to Parse Out the Effect of Moralizing

Results from analyses with an interaction term between propensity to moralize and partisan strength provide further evidence that moral conviction distinctly heightens affective polarization. No interaction term is statistically significant in any of the following models, negating the idea that partisan strength moderates the relationship between moralizing politics and affective polarization. Also, the effect of propensity to moralize remains statistically significant at low levels of partisan strength, raising doubts that the moralization of politics measure is simply picking up on unmodeled aspects of partisan identity. While the inclusion of an interaction term increases uncertainty in the estimates due to multicollinearity between the predictors, it only dampens the effect of propensity to moralize in the 2012 candidate model.

Table 13: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases the Gap in Partisan Affect

	2012 EGSS Data		2016 SSI Data	
	Candidate Gap		Candidate Gap	Party Gap
Propensity to Moralize	0.02	0.26**	0.10	
	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.07)	
Partisan Strength	0.16*	0.41**	0.39**	
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)	
Ideological Strength	0.13**	0.07*	0.10**	
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	
Church Attendance	0.02	-0.05	-0.10**	
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	
Evangelical	-0.02	-0.04 ⁺	-0.04 ⁺	
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Political Knowledge	0.13**	0.06 ⁺	0.09**	
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	
White	-0.06*	0.01	-0.002	
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Female	-0.02	0.05*	0.04*	
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Age	0.16**	0.22**	0.14**	
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	
Education	0.04	-0.11*	-0.15**	
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.04)	
Propensity to Moralize *	0.14	-0.14	0.04	
Partisan Strength	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.10)	
(Intercept)	0.11 ⁺	0.03	0.04	
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.05)	
R ²	0.19	0.20	0.32	
N	1,253	1,011	1,011	

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Analyses using multiple imputation, although casewise deletion yields matching results. Models are OLS (weighted OLS for 2012 EGSS). Results from imputed datasets are combined, and standard errors are adjusted to account for imputation uncertainty using Rubin's combination rules (Rubin 1987). ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, ⁺ $p < 0.10$, two-tailed test.

Table 14: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases the Partisan Divide in Presidential Approval

	Obama Job Approval Rating
Republican	-0.28** (0.04)
Propensity to Moralize	0.11 (0.07)
Partisan Strength	0.02 (0.05)
Ideological Strength	-0.03 (0.03)
Church Attendance	-0.04 (0.04)
Evangelical	-0.05+ (0.02)
Political Knowledge	0.11* (0.04)
White	-0.18** (0.03)
Female	0.01 (0.02)
Age	-0.15** (0.05)
Education	0.07+ (0.04)
Republican * Propensity to Moralize	-0.22** (0.08)
Propensity to Moralize * Partisan Strength	0.03 (0.09)
(Intercept)	0.70** (0.06)
R ²	0.45
N	1,233

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Analyses using multiple imputation, although casewise deletion yields matching results. Model is weighted OLS. Results from imputed datasets are combined, and standard errors are adjusted to account for imputation uncertainty using Rubin's combination rules (Rubin 1987).

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.10$, two-tailed test.

Table 15: Propensity to Moralize Politics Increases Social Distance from and Hostility toward Opposing Partisans

	Relationship Distance	Social Media Distance	Anger	Incivility	Antagonism
Propensity to Moralize	0.24 ⁺ (0.14)	0.19 (0.12)	0.22 ⁺ (0.12)	0.29* (0.11)	0.18 ⁺ (0.11)
Partisan Strength	0.34** (0.12)	0.22* (0.10)	0.26** (0.10)	0.15 (0.10)	0.18* (0.09)
Ideological Strength	0.15** (0.04)	0.02 (0.03)	0.14** (0.03)	0.06 (0.04)	-0.003 (0.03)
Religious Attendance	-0.06 (0.04)	0.08* (0.03)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	0.15** (0.03)
Evangelical	0.03 (0.03)	0.05 ⁺ (0.03)	0.005 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	0.06* (0.02)
Political Knowledge	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.17** (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.20** (0.03)
White	0.01 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)	0.05 ⁺ (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)
Female	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.11** (0.02)	-0.05* (0.02)	-0.12** (0.02)	-0.14** (0.02)
Age	-0.26** (0.06)	-0.30** (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)	-0.19** (0.05)	-0.31** (0.05)
Education	0.15* (0.06)	0.16** (0.05)	0.06 (0.06)	0.06 (0.06)	0.13** (0.05)
Propensity to Moralize * Partisan Strength	-0.09 (0.17)	-0.03 (0.15)	-0.03 (0.15)	0.003 (0.14)	0.02 (0.13)
(Intercept)	-0.05 (0.10)	0.03 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.09)	0.16 ⁺ (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)
R ²	0.19	0.22	0.17	0.14	0.30
N	1,011	1,011	1,011	1,011	1,011

Note: All variables coded 0 to 1. Analyses using multiple imputation, although casewise deletion yields matching results. Models are OLS. Results from imputed datasets are combined, and standard errors are adjusted to account for imputation uncertainty using Rubin's combination rules (Rubin 1987).

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, ⁺ $p < 0.10$, two-tailed test.

Table 16: Estimated Marginal Effect of Propensity to Moralize on the Gap in Partisan Affect Given Specific Values of Partisan Strength

	2012 Candidate Gap	2016 Candidate Gap	2016 Party Gap
Independent	0.02 (0.10)	0.26** (0.09)	0.10 (0.07)
Partisan Leaner	0.07 (0.06)	0.22** (0.06)	0.12* (0.05)
Weak Partisan	0.11** (0.04)	0.17** (0.05)	0.13** (0.04)
Strong Partisan	0.16** (0.06)	0.12* (0.06)	0.14** (0.05)

Note: Full model results listed in Table 13.

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.10$, two-tailed test.

Table 17: Estimated Marginal Effect of Propensity to Moralize on Presidential Approval Given Specific Values of Partisan Strength

	Presidential Approval Among Democrats	Presidential Approval Among Republicans
Independent	–	–
Partisan Leaner	0.11 (0.07)	-0.11 (0.07)
Weak Partisan	0.12* (0.06)	-0.10+ (0.05)
Strong Partisan	0.14* (0.07)	-0.08 (0.06)

Note: Full model results listed in Table 14.

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.10$, two-tailed test.

Table 18: Estimated Marginal Effect of Propensity to Moralize on Social Distance and Hostility Given Specific Values of Partisan Strength

	Relationship	Social Media			
	Distance	Distance	Anger	Incivility	Antagonism
Independent	0.24 ⁺ (0.14)	0.19 (0.12)	0.22 ⁺ (0.12)	0.29* (0.11)	0.18 ⁺ (0.11)
Partisan Leaner	0.21* (0.09)	0.18* (0.08)	0.21** (0.08)	0.29** (0.08)	0.18** (0.07)
Weak Partisan	0.19** (0.06)	0.17** (0.05)	0.20** (0.05)	0.29** (0.05)	0.19** (0.04)
Strong Partisan	0.16* (0.07)	0.16* (0.06)	0.19** (0.07)	0.29** (0.07)	0.20** (0.06)

Note: Full model results listed in Table 15.

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.10$, two-tailed test.

Question Wordings from 2016 SSI Sample

Partisan Affect

Operationalized by calculating the difference between respondents' ratings of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump or the Democratic and Republican parties. Coded 0 (no difference in partisan affect) to 1 (most biased partisan affect).

- We'd like to get your feelings toward some of the political leaders and groups who are in the news these days. We'll show the name of a person or group and we'd like you to rate that person or group using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person or group. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorable toward the person or group and that you don't care too much for that person or group. You would rate the person or group at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person or group.
 - Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, Republican Party, Democratic Party

Relationship Distance: Coded 0 (never) to 1 (always).

- Please indicate how frequently you encounter or have encountered the following thoughts, feelings, or situations.
 - I am hesitant to date a [Democrat/Republican].
 - * Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always, Don't know (coded as missing)

Social Media Distance: Coded 0 (never) to 1 (always).

- Please indicate how frequently you encounter or have encountered the following thoughts, feelings, or situations.
 - I block friends on Facebook and Twitter if they talk positively about the [Democrats/Republicans].
 - * Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always, Don't know (coded as missing)

Anger: Coded 0 (never) to 1 (always).

- Please indicate how frequently you encounter or have encountered the following thoughts, feelings, or situations.
 - Just thinking about the [Democrats/Republicans] makes me angry.
 - * Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always, Don't know (coded as missing)

Incivility: Coded 0 (never) to 1 (always).

- Please indicate how frequently you encounter or have encountered the following thoughts, feelings, or situations.

- Over the course of the election season, I have made fun of [Democrats/Republicans].
 - * Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always, Don't know (coded as missing)

Antagonism: Coded 0 (never) to 1 (always).

- Please indicate how frequently you encounter or have encountered the following thoughts, feelings, or situations.
 - I have worn a political T-shirt, or other apparel or merchandise hoping it would upset [Democrats/Republicans].
 - * Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always, Don't know (coded as missing)

Assignment of Opposing Partisans for Independents in the Previous Items

Independents who selected Republican Party or Democratic Party on the following item were assigned the opposing party's supporters for the previous social distance and hostility measures. Independents who selected another option were defined as missing.

- Which political party would you absolutely NOT vote for?
 - The Republican Party, The Democratic Party, Other, I would vote for any party, Don't know

Propensity to Moralize

Operationalized by averaging responses to the two moral conviction items for each issue, then averaging those issue conviction scores to get one measure of propensity to moralize. Coded 0 (lowest propensity to moralize) to 1 (highest propensity to moralize).

- To what extent is your opinion about each of the following issues a reflection of your core moral beliefs and convictions?
 - Same-sex marriage, Abortion, The environment, The minimum wage, Immigration, Gun control, Health care, Physician-assisted suicide, Equal pay for women, Free trade agreements, The budget deficit
 - * Not at all, Slightly, Moderately, Much, Very much
- To what extent is your opinion about each of the following issues connected to your fundamental beliefs about right and wrong?
 - Same-sex marriage, Abortion, The environment, The minimum wage, Immigration, Gun control, Health care, Physician-assisted suicide, Equal pay for women, Free trade agreements, The budget deficit
 - * Not at all, Slightly, Moderately, Much, Very much

Partisan Strength

Operationalized by folding the party identification measure, based on the following questions, at its midpoint. Coded 0 (independent) to 1 (strong partisan).

- Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?
 - Democrat, Republican, Independent, Other, Don't know
- Would you call yourself a STRONG [Democrat/Republican], or a NOT VERY STRONG [Democrat/Republican]? (asked of those who selected "Democrat" or "Republican")
 - Strong, Not very strong
- Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party? (asked of those who selected "Independent," "Other," or "Don't know")
 - Closer to the Democratic Party, Closer to the Republican Party, Neither

Ideological Strength

Operationalized by folding the ideology measure, based on the following question, at its midpoint. Coded 0 (moderate) to 1 (strong ideologue).

- We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. In general, where would you place yourself on this scale?
 - Extremely Liberal, Liberal, Slightly Liberal, Moderate/ Middle of the Road, Slightly Conservative, Conservative, Extremely Conservative

Church Attendance: Coded 0 (never) to 1 (more than once a week)

- People practice their religion in different ways, and some people are not religious. How often do you attend religious services?
 - Never, Once a year or less, A few times a year, Once or twice a month, Once a week, More than once a week

Evangelical: Coded 0 (not born again) or 1 (born again).

- Do you consider yourself to be "born again"?
 - Yes, No, Don't know (coded as missing)

Political Knowledge

Operationalized by summing correct answers to the following questions. Coded 0 (all wrong) to 1 (all correct).

- Who was Mitt Romney’s running mate (his vice-presidential candidate) in 2012?
 - Chris Christie, Paul Ryan, Rand Paul, Scott Walker, I’m not sure (coded as wrong)
- Who is the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court right now?
 - Anthony Kennedy, Antonin Scalia, John Roberts, Larry Thompson, I’m not sure (coded as wrong)
- On which of the following does the U.S. federal government spend the least money?
 - Foreign aid, Medicare, National defense, Social Security, I’m not sure (coded as wrong)
- What job does Nancy Pelosi hold right now?
 - Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Governor of California, House Majority Leader, House Minority Leader, I’m not sure (coded as wrong)

Race: Coded 0 (non-white) or 1 (white).

- What is your race?
 - White, Black, Asian, Native American, Other
- Are you Hispanic?
 - Yes, No, Don’t know

Gender: Coded 0 (non-female) or 1 (female).

- I identify my gender as:
 - Male, Female, Trans, None of the above. I identify myself as _____, Prefer not to disclose (coded as missing)

Age: Coded 0 (youngest) to 1 (oldest).

- What is your age (in years)?
 - Numeric answer

Education: Coded 0 (no high school) to 1 (Ph.D).

- What is the highest degree you have completed?
 - No high school, Some high school, High school diploma/GED, Some college, Associate degree, Bachelor of Arts/Science, Master of Arts/Science, J.D./M.D., Ph.D.

Question Wordings from 2012 EGSS Sample

See http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/2010_2012EGSS/2010_2012EGSS.htm for all question wordings in the EGSS sample. All variables coded 0 to 1.