

Online Appendix for THE POLITICAL DYNAMICS OF PARTISAN POLARIZATION

Eric R. Schmidt (corresponding author), Edward G. Carmines, Paul M. Sniderman

Coding Procedures and Question Wording

This appendix documents the variables we use in our analyses, along with specific variable codes (from the ANES cumulative file, the 1988 and 2020 ANES cross-sections, and the 2016 CCES and 2020 CES Common Content) that readers can use to replicate our analyses.

Weights

Unless otherwise specified, analyses using the ANES cumulative file use VCF0009z to weight results.

To analyze the ANES 1988 cross-section for Tables 1-3, we weight the data using the number of eligible respondents in the household (V880091), consistent with the recommendation in the codebook. To analyze the ANES 2020 cross-section for Tables 1-3, we use weights V200010a (pre-election) or V200010b (post-election), depending on whether the model includes variables assessed only on the post-election module.

To assess voter-validated turnout in the presidential primaries using the CCES/CES, we use `commonweight_vv` (2016 CCES) and `vvweight` (2020 CES); to assess voter-validated turnout in the general election, we use `commonweight_vv_post` (2016 CCES) and `vvweight_post` (2020 CES).

Matching Status (Figures 4 and 8)

To code respondents' matching status using the ANES Cumulative File, we looked at their partisanship (VCF0301), ideological self-identification (VCF0803), and placement of both the Democratic (VCF0503) and Republican (VCF0504) parties on the seven-point, liberal-conservative spectrum.

Question wording and coding procedures were as follows:

- **Partisanship** was a branching question: "Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, or independent, or what?" Respondents that answered "Republican" or "Democrat" were asked "Would you call yourself a strong [Republican/Democrat] or a not very strong [Republican/Democrat]?" Respondents that did not identify with one of the two parties initially were asked "Do you usually think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?" Respondents were coded as *Republican* or *Democratic* identifiers if they indicated they were strong partisans, weak partisans, or that they leaned toward one of the two parties.
- **Ideological self-identification:** With slight differences in question wording across the years, the item reads: "We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?" Respondents were coded as *conservatives* if they indicated they were "slightly conservative," "conservative," or "extremely conservative"; and *liberals* if they indicated they were "slightly liberal," "liberal," or "extremely liberal" on the seven-point scale. Respondents that said "don't know" or "haven't thought much about this" were coded at the midpoint of the seven-point scale. We coded respondents as *sharing their party's ideological orientation* if they were self-identified conservative Republicans or liberal Democrats.
- **Party placement:** "Where would you place the Republican Party on this scale?"; "Where would you place the Democratic Party on this scale?" Respondents were coded as *knowing the parties'*

policy reputations if they placed the Democratic Party to the left of the Republican Party on the seven-point scales.

Matched partisans, then, were respondents that shared their party's ideological orientation **and** knew the parties' policy reputations.

Partially matched partisans either (1) shared their party's ideological orientation but did **not** know the parties' policy reputations or (2) knew the parties' party reputations but did **not** share their party's ideological orientation.

Unmatched partisans did not know the party's policy reputations **and** did not share their party's ideological orientation. However, between 1972-1996, the ANES did not consistently ask respondents to place the parties on the liberal-conservative spectrum if they had not been willing to place themselves on the same spectrum. To avoid discarding hundreds of cases in these years, we code respondents as *unmatched partisans* if they were not shown the party placement questions because they "hadn't thought much about this" when asked their own ideological orientation.

Attitudes about Spending on Federal Programs (Figure 6)

The results in Figure 6 were drawn from three questions about government spending on social welfare programs: childcare (VCF0887), dealing with crime (VCF0888), and Social Security (VCF9049). Respondents indicated whether they believed funding should be (1) increased, (2) decreased, or (3) kept about the same. The figure shows the proportions of respondents that said they either wanted to *increase or keep about the same* spending on the program-in-question, rather than saying "don't know," that they supported a decrease in spending, or volunteering that they would cut the program entirely. The question wording ran as follows:

- **Childcare:** "Should federal spending on child care be increased, decreased, or kept about the same?" This measure was available in 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2008, 2012, and 2016; before 2012, the "decreased" option read "decreased or cut out entirely."
- **Dealing with crime:** "Should federal spending on dealing with crime be increased, decreased, or kept about the same?" This measure was available in 1984, 1992, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016, and 2020; before 2012, the "decreased" option read "decreased or cut out entirely."
- **Social Security:** "Should federal spending on Social Security be increased, decreased, or stay the same?" This measure was available in each midterm and general-election ANES cross-section from 1984-2020, with the exceptions of 1998 and 2008.

Alternate Measures of Political Sophistication (Figure 5)

The results in Figure 5 were based on several measures of respondents' political sophistication, all drawn from the ANES Cumulative File:

- *Political knowledge.* Measures of general political knowledge vary from year to year; to have a consistent measure across as many years as possible, we looked at whether respondents correctly identified the offices held by the Chief Justice of the United States (VCF9262), Vice President (VCF9261), and Speaker of the House (VCF9260), as well as the party that controlled the U.S. House of Representatives before the most recent election (VCF0729). Rescaled from 0-1, *Political knowledge* represents the proportion of responses (out of four) that the respondent answered correctly. Measured this way, distinct *Political knowledge* averages were available in 1992, 1996, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016, and 2020.

- For the items asking about political figures, the question read: “Now we have a set of questions concerning various public figures. We want to see how much information about them gets out to the public from television, newspapers, and the like. [Name presented]. What job or political office does he now hold?”
 - The item about control of the U.S. House read “Do you happen to know which party had the most members in the House of Representatives in Washington before the election this/last month?”
- *Low-level activism.* The figure shows the proportion of campaign-related activities in which the respondent reportedly engaged in the most recent election cycle (VCF0723). The maximum number was five. With slight differences in question wording depending on year, questions used to build the measure included:
 - “During the campaign, did you talk to any people and try to show them why they should vote for one of the parties or candidates?” (VCF0717)
 - “Did you go to any political meetings, rallies, dinners, or things like that in support of a particular candidate?” (VCF0718)
 - “Did you do any other work for one of the parties or candidates?” (VCF0719)
 - “Did you wear a campaign button, put a campaign sticker on your car, or place a sign in your window or in front of your house?” (VCF0720)
 - “Did you give money to a political party during this election year?” **or** “Did you give money to an individual candidate running for public office” (VCF0721; coded as “yes” if the respondent gave money to one or both)
- *Interest in public affairs.* The figure shows the proportion of respondents that answered that that they follow public affairs “most of the time”; other response options included “some of the time,” “only now and then,” and “hardly at all.” The full question wording reads:
 - “Some people seem to follow what’s going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there’s an election going on or not. Others aren’t that interested. Would you say you follow what’s going on in government and public affairs most of the time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?” (VCF0313). This form of the question was asked in each presidential and midterm-election year until 2008; responses were analyzed using the survey weight for FTF interviews only (VCF0009x).
- *Interest in the elections.* The figure shows the proportion of respondents that said they were “very much interested” in the outcome of the upcoming elections: “Some people don’t pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you, would you say that you have been/were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in the political campaigns this year?” (VCF0310).
- *Interviewer rating of respondent’s political knowledge.* This variable is based on a five-point index (0 = very low; 1 = fairly low; 2 = average; 3 = fairly high; 4 = very high), rescaled between 0-1. Note that we use the interviewer rating of the respondents’ political knowledge on the *pre*-election module (VCF0050a). Because this measure was only assessed in face-to-face interviews, average ratings were computed using the survey weight for FTF responses only (VCF0009x).
- *Educational attainment.* The figure shows the proportion of respondents with a four-year degree or higher (VCF0110).

Attitudes on Size and Scope of Government (Figures 7 and 9)

The results in Figures 7 and 9 were drawn from three seven-point scales, on government services and spending (VCF0839), government guaranteed jobs (VCF0809), and government health insurance (VCF0806). Question wording, with minor changes depending on cross-section, were as follows:

- **Government services and spending:** “Some people think that the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending. Other people feel that it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about this?” Scale runs from 1 (“government should provide many fewer services”) to 7 (“government should provide many more services”); respondents that answered “haven’t thought much about this” were coded at the midpoint. **The variable was reverse-coded so that higher values indicated support for less government spending.** This measure was available for each ANES midterm or general-election module (with the exception of 2002) from 1982-2020.
 - To calculate **party cohesion on government services and spending**, respondents were coded as “liberal” if they placed themselves at points 5, 6, or 7 on the initial seven-point scale; and “conservative” if they placed themselves at points 1, 2, or 3.
- **Government guaranteed jobs:** “Some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his/their own. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about this?” Scale runs from 1 (“government should see to a job and good standard of living”) to 7 (“government should let each person get ahead on their own”); respondents that answered “haven’t thought much about this” were coded at the midpoint. This measure was available in each ANES midterm or general-election module (with the exception of 2002) from 1972-2020.
 - To calculate **party cohesion on government guaranteed jobs**, respondents were coded as “liberal” if they placed themselves at points 1, 2, or 3 on the initial seven-point scale; and “conservative” if they placed themselves at points 5, 6, or 7.
- **Government health insurance:** “There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital costs. Some feel there should be a government insurance plan which would cover all medical and hospital expenses for everyone. Others feel that medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and through private insurance like Blue Cross or other company paid plans. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about this?” Scale runs from 1 (“government insurance plan”) to 7 (“private insurance plan”); respondents that answered “haven’t thought much about this” were coded at the midpoint. This measure was available in 1972, 1974, 1976, 1978, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016, and 2020.
 - To calculate **party cohesion on government health insurance**, respondents were coded as “liberal” if they placed themselves at points 1, 2, or 3 on the initial seven-point scale; and “conservative” if they placed themselves at points 5, 6, or 7.

Whites’ Attitudes on Racial Policies (Figures 10 and 11)

The results in Figures 10-11 were based on items about affirmative action in hiring, government aid to Blacks, and racial resentment. We restrict the sample to respondents coded as “White, non-Hispanic” in the ANES Cumulative File (VCF0105a). Question wording ran as follows:

- **Affirmative action in hiring/promotion (VCF0867a):** “Some people say that because of past discrimination blacks should be given preferences in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it gives blacks advantages they haven’t earned. What about your opinion – are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks?” Follow-ups asked “Do you favor/oppose preference in hiring and promotion strongly or not strongly?” Rescaled between 0-1, responses were coded so that higher

scores indicated opposition to affirmative action (0 = favor strongly; 1 = favor not strongly; 2 = oppose not strongly; 3 = oppose strongly). “Don’t know” responses were dropped.

- To calculate **party cohesion on affirmative action**, “oppose not strongly” and “oppose strongly” were coded as “conservative” responses; “favor not strongly” and “favor strongly” were coded as “liberal” responses.
- **Government aid to Blacks** (VCF0830, with slight changes in question wording depending on year): “Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about it?” Scale runs from 1 (“Government should help blacks”) to 7 (“Blacks should help themselves”); respondents that answered “haven’t thought much about this” were coded at the midpoint. This item was available for all midterm and general-election ANES cross-sections (with the exception of 2002) from 1972-2020.
 - To calculate **party cohesion on government aid to Blacks**, respondents were coded as “liberal” if they placed themselves at points 1, 2, or 3 on the initial seven-point scale; and “conservative” if they placed themselves at points 5, 6, or 7.
- **Racial resentment** was an additive index of four Likert-scale items:
 - **“Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class”** (VCF9039). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger disagreement (0 = agree strongly; 1 = agree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = disagree somewhat; 4 = disagree strongly); “don’t know” responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - To calculate **party cohesion** on this item, respondents were coded as “conservative” if they answered “disagree somewhat” or “disagree strongly”; and “liberal” if they answered “agree somewhat” or “agree strongly”
 - **“Irish, Italians, Jewish, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors”** (VCF9040). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger agreement (0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = agree somewhat; 4 = agree strongly); “don’t know” responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - To calculate **party cohesion** on this item, respondents were coded as “conservative” if they answered “agree somewhat” or “agree strongly”; and “liberal” if they answered “disagree somewhat” or “disagree strongly”
 - **“It’s really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites”** (VCF9041). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger agreement (0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = agree somewhat; 4 = agree strongly); “don’t know” responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - To calculate **party cohesion** on this item, respondents were coded as “conservative” if they answered “agree somewhat” or “agree strongly”; and “liberal” if they answered “disagree somewhat” or “disagree strongly”
 - **“Over the past few years blacks have gotten less than they deserve”** (VCF9042). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger disagreement (0 = agree strongly; 1 = agree

somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = disagree somewhat; 4 = disagree strongly); “don’t know” responses were coded at the midpoint.

- To calculate party cohesion on this item, respondents were coded as “conservative” if they answered “disagree somewhat” or “disagree strongly”; and “liberal” if they answered “agree somewhat” or “agree strongly”

Attitudes Toward Civil Rights for Gays and Lesbians (Figure 12)

The results in Figure 12 are based on three items, tapping support for adoption by same-sex couples (VCF0878), attitudes about anti-discrimination laws affecting gay people (VCF0876a), and attitudes about gays in the military (VCF0877a). Question wording was as follows:

- **Adoption by same-sex couples:** “Do you think gay or lesbian couples, in other words, homosexual couples, should be legally permitted to adopt children?” The figure displays the proportion of respondents that said “yes,” rather than “no” or “don’t know.” This question was asked in 1992, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, and 2020.
- **Anti-discrimination laws:** “Do you favor or oppose laws to protect gays and lesbians against job discrimination?” Follow-up asked “Do you favor/oppose such laws strongly or not strongly?” Responses were coded so that higher scores indicated stronger support for anti-discrimination laws (0 = oppose strongly; 1 = oppose not strongly; 2 = favor not strongly; 3 = favor strongly); respondents that said “don’t know” were dropped. This question was asked in 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016, and 2020.
- **Gays in the military:** “Do you think homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the United States Armed Forces or don’t you think so?” Follow-up asked “Do you feel strongly or not strongly that homosexuals should/should not be allowed to serve in the United States Armed Forces?” Responses were coded so that higher scores indicated stronger support (0 = feel strongly should not be allowed; 1 = feel not strongly should not be allowed; 2 = feel not strongly should be allowed; 3 = feel strongly should be allowed); respondents that said “don’t know” were dropped. This question was asked in 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2012.

Attitudes on Cultural Issues (Figures 13 and 14)

The results in Figures 13-14 are based on items about abortion (VCF0838), gun control (VCF9238), and moral traditionalism (VCF0851-VCF0854). Question wording, with slight variations depending on year, were as follows:

- **Abortion:** “There has been some discussion of abortion in recent years. Which one of the opinions on this page best agrees with your view? You can just tell me the number of the opinion you choose.” Responses were coded so that higher scores indicated support for more restrictions on abortion (0 = “By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice”; 1 = “The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman’s life, but only after the need for the abortion has been clearly established”; 2 = “The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest, or when the woman’s life is in danger”; 3 = “By law, abortion should never be permitted.”) This question was asked in each ANES cross-section from 1980-2020, with the exception of 2002.
 - To calculate **party cohesion on abortion**, respondents were coded as “liberal” if they said that “By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice” or that “The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman’s life, but only after the need for the abortion has been

clearly established.” Respondents were coded as “conservative” if they said that “The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest, or when the woman’s life is in danger” or that “By law, abortion should never be permitted.”

- **Gun control:** “Do you think the federal government should make it more difficult for people to buy a gun than it is now, make it easier for people to buy a gun, or keep these rules about the same as they are now?” The graph shows the proportion of respondents that said “more difficult,” rather than “keep these rules the same,” “make it easier,” or “don’t know.” This question was asked in 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016, and 2020.
 - To calculate **party cohesion on gun control**, respondents were coded as “conservative” if they answered that they wanted to “keep the rules about the same” or “make it easier” to buy a gun, and “liberal” if they wanted to make it “more difficult” to buy a gun.
- **Moral traditionalism** was an additive index of four Likert-scale items. The graph only shows average moral traditionalism scores for years when all four measures were available (1986, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, and 2016).
 - **“The newer lifestyles are contributing to the breakdown of our society”** (VCF0851) Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger agreement (0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = agree somewhat; 4 = agree strongly); “don’t know” responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - To calculate **party cohesion** on this item, respondents were coded as “conservative” if they answered “agree somewhat” or “agree strongly”; and “liberal” if they answered “disagree somewhat” or “disagree strongly.”
 - **“The world is always changing and we should adjust our view of moral behavior to those changes”** (VCF0852) Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger disagreement (0 = agree strongly; 1 = agree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = disagree somewhat; 4 = disagree strongly); “don’t know” responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - To calculate **party cohesion** on this item, respondents were coded as “conservative” if they answered “disagree somewhat” or “disagree strongly”; and “liberal” if they answered “agree somewhat” or “agree strongly”
 - **“This country would have many fewer problems if there were more emphasis on traditional family ties”** (VCF0853). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger agreement (0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = agree somewhat; 4 = agree strongly); “don’t know” responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - To calculate **party cohesion** on this item, respondents were coded as “conservative” if they answered “agree somewhat” or “agree strongly”; and “liberal” if they answered “disagree somewhat” or “disagree strongly”
 -
 - **“We should be more tolerant of people who choose to live according to their own moral standards, even if these are very different from our own”** (VCF0854). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger disagreement (0 = agree strongly; 1 = agree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = disagree somewhat; 4 = disagree strongly); “don’t know” responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - To calculate party cohesion on this item, respondents were coded as “conservative” if they answered “disagree somewhat” or “disagree strongly”; and “liberal” if they answered “agree somewhat” or “agree strongly”
 -

Effects of Affective Polarization on Domain-Specific Attitudes, Conditional on Matching (Tables 1-3)

Tables 1-3 use data from the 1988 and 2020 cross-sections of the ANES. We attempted to standardize measurement as much as possible. Note that all variables were rescaled between 0-1. Question wording and variable codes were as follows:

- For use in our multivariate regression analysis, **matching** took on three values (0 = unmatched; 0.5 = partially matched; 1 = matched.) To code matching status, the procedure was identical to that described at the beginning of this appendix. *Matched partisans* are self-identified conservative Republicans or liberal Democrats that know the parties' policy reputations; *partially matched partisans* either identify with their party's ideology (i.e. conservative Republicans or liberal Democrats) **or** know the parties' policy reputations, but not both; *unmatched partisans* neither identify with their party's ideological reputations nor know the parties' policy reputations. In 1988, respondents did not see the party placement questions if they answered that they "hadn't thought much about this" when asked their own ideological orientation; these respondents were classified as *unmatched partisans*.
 - **Republican party ID** reflected respondents that identified as strong Republicans, weak Republicans, or Republican "leaners"; **Democratic party ID** reflected respondents that identified as strong Democrats, weak Democrats, or Democratic "leaners." Measures of party ID were based on the traditional, seven-point scale (1988: V880274; 2020: V202231x).
 - **Conservative ideological orientation** reflected respondents that identified as "slightly conservative," "conservative," or "extremely conservative"; **liberal ideological orientation** reflected respondents that identified as "slightly liberal," "liberal," or "extremely liberal." Measures of ideological orientation were based on the traditional seven-point scale (1988: V880228; 2020: V201200).
 - **Knowledge of the parties' policy reputations** was based on respondents' placement of the Republican (1988: V880234; 2020: V201207) and Democratic (1988: V880235; 2020: V201206) parties on the liberal-conservative spectrum. Respondents were coded as knowing the parties' policy reputations if they placed the Republican Party to the right of the Democratic Party on the seven-point scale.
- To measure **partisan affective polarization**, we subtracted respondents' feeling thermometer rating of the Democratic Party (1988: V880164; 2020: V201156) from their feeling thermometer rating of the Republican Party (1988: V880165; 2020: V201157). Both thermometer ratings could run from 0-100. Rescaled between 0-1, the resulting measure takes on scores above 0.5 for respondents that rated the Republican Party more favorably than the Democratic Party, and scores below 0.5 for respondents that rated the Democratic Party more favorably than the Republican Party. Question wording read:
 - "We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. How would you rate [*The Democratic Party, The Republican Party*]?"

- **Social welfare conservatism** was an additive index of respondents' attitudes about government guaranteed jobs (1988: V880323; 2020: V201255), government health insurance (1988: V880318; 2020: V201252), and government services and spending (1988: V880302; 2020: V201246). Question wording for each item was consistent with the wording provided in the ANES Cumulative File (see notes on Figures 7 and 9 above).
- **Moral traditionalism** was an additive index (rescaled between 0-1) using all available items from the moral traditionalism index. In 1988, all four items were available; in 2020, only two items were available. Item wording, with variable codes, was as follows:
 - **"The newer lifestyles are contributing to the breakdown of our society"** (1988: V880954; 2020: *measure not available*). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger agreement (0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = agree somewhat; 4 = agree strongly); "don't know" responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - **"The world is always changing and we should adjust our view of moral behavior to those changes"** (1988: V880951; 2020: V202264). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger disagreement (0 = agree strongly; 1 = agree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = disagree somewhat; 4 = disagree strongly); "don't know" responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - **"This country would have many fewer problems if there were more emphasis on traditional family ties"** (1988: V880953; 2020: V202265). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger agreement (0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = agree somewhat; 4 = agree strongly); "don't know" responses were coded at the midpoint.
 - **"We should be more tolerant of people who choose to live according to their own moral standards, even if these are very different from our own"** (1988: V880952; 2020: *measure not available*). Coded so that higher scores indicate stronger disagreement (0 = agree strongly; 1 = agree somewhat; 2 = neither agree nor disagree; 3 = disagree somewhat; 4 = disagree strongly); "don't know" responses were coded at the midpoint.
- **Racial conservatism** was an additive index of respondents' beliefs about government aid to Blacks (1988: V880332; 2020: V201258) and race-based affirmative action in hiring (1988: V880857; 2020: V202252x). Question wording for each item was consistent with the wording provided in the ANES Cumulative File; coding procedures followed those used for Figures 10-11. Results in Table 3 were based on models including only non-Hispanic whites (1988: V880412, V880539, V880540; 2020: V201549x).
- **Educational attainment** (1988: V880522; 2020: V201511x) was a six-point scale (0 = less than high school degree; 1 = high school degree or equivalent; 2 = some college; 3 = two-year degree; 4 = four-year degree; 5 = post-graduate degree).
- **Political knowledge** was measured using items on the pre-election wave of each cross-section. For 1988, the measure reflects the number of correct answers to two questions, asking which party had the most members in the U.S. Senate (1988: V880879) and U.S. House (1988: V880878) before the election. For 2020, the measure reflects the number of correct answers to four questions, asking which party had the most members in the U.S. Senate (2020: V201647) and U.S. House (2020: V201646) before the election; the number of years of a U.S. senator's term in office (2020: V201644); and the federal program (correct answer was "foreign aid") on which the federal government spends the least (V201645). For both 1988 and 2020, respondents were treated as missing data if they did not answer any of the political knowledge questions; otherwise, skipped responses were coded as incorrect answers.

- **Low-level activism** was measured as the number of campaign-related activities in which the respondent engaged. For both 1988 and 2020, respondents were treated as missing data if they did not answer any of the questions about campaign-related activities; otherwise, respondents that declined to answer one or more questions were coded as not having engaged in the relevant campaign-related activities.
 - “During the campaign, did you talk to any people and try to show them why they should vote for or against one of the parties or candidates?” (1988: V880825; 2020: V202009)
 - “Did you go to any political meetings, rallies, dinners, or things like that in support of a particular candidate?” (1988: V880827; 2020: V202014) **or** “Did you participate in any online political meetings, rallies, speeches, fundraisers, or things like that in support of a particular candidate?” (1988: *measure not available*; 2020: V202013).
 - “Did you do any other work for one of the parties or candidates?” (1988: V880828; 2020: V202016)
 - “Did you wear a campaign button, put a campaign sticker on your car, or place a sign in your window or in front of your house?” (1988: V880826; 2020: V202015)
 - “Did you give money to a political party during this election year?” (1988: V880832; 2020: V202019) **or** “Did you give money to an individual candidate running for public office?” (1988: V880030; 2020: V202017) **or** “Did you give any money to any other group that supported or opposed candidates?” (1988: V880834; 2020: V202021)
- **Interest in politics.** Respondents’ political interest was an additive index, placing equal weight on two questions:
 - **1988:**
 - “Some people seem to follow what’s going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there’s an election going on or not. Others aren’t that interested. Would you say you follow what’s going on in government and public affairs most of the time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?” (V880812; 0 = hardly at all; 1 = only now and then; 2 = some of the time; 3 = most of the time)
 - “Some people don’t pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you have been very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in the political campaigns so far this year?” (V880564; 0 = not much interested; 1 = somewhat interested; 2 = very much interested).
 - **2020:**
 - “How often do you pay attention to what’s going on in politics?” (V201005; 0 = never; 1 = some of the time; 2 = about half the time; 3 = most of the time; 4 = always).
 - “Some people don’t pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you have been very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in the political campaigns this year?” (V201006; 0 = not much interested; 1 = somewhat interested; 2 = very much interested).

Partisan Identifiers’ Issue Constraint, by Matching Status (Figure 15)

Figure 15 was built using coded data from the ANES Cumulative File.

- **Proportion taking party’s position on both government jobs and government aid to Blacks.** The sample used to compute this summary statistic was limited to non-Hispanic white respondents (VCF0105a). Republicans were coded as taking the conservative position on both

issues if they placed themselves at 5, 6, or 7 on the seven-point scales for government guaranteed jobs (VCF0809) and government aid to Blacks (VCF0830); Democrats were coded as taking the liberal position on abortion if they placed themselves at 1, 2, or 3 on both seven-point scales.

- **Proportion taking party's position on both abortion and government aid to Blacks.** The sample used to compute this summary statistic was limited to non-Hispanic white respondents (VCF0105a). Republicans were coded as taking the conservative position on both issues if they placed themselves at 5, 6, or 7 on the government aid to Blacks scale (VCF0830) and answered the abortion question (VCF0838) by saying either that "By law, abortion should never be permitted" or "The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest, or when the woman's life is in danger." Democrats were coded as taking the liberal position on both issues if they placed themselves at 1, 2, or 3 on the government aid to Blacks scale, and answered the abortion question by saying that "By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice" or "The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the need for the abortion has been clearly established."
- **Proportion taking party's position on both government jobs and abortion.** Republicans were coded as taking the conservative position on both issues if they placed themselves at 5, 6, or 7 on the government jobs scale (VCF0809) and answered the abortion question (VCF0838) by saying either that "By law, abortion should never be permitted" or "The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest, or when the woman's life is in danger." Democrats were coded as taking the liberal position on both issues if they placed themselves at 1, 2, or 3 on the government jobs scale, and answered the abortion question by saying that "By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice" or "The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the need for the abortion has been clearly established."

Matched Partisans in 1984 and 2020 (Figure 16)

Figure 16, comparing matched partisans in 1984 and 2020, was built using coded data from the ANES Cumulative File. **Ideological self-identification** was based on the standard seven-point scale (VCF0803); question wording for attitudes on **government guaranteed jobs** (VCF0809), **abortion** (VCF0838), and **government aid to Blacks** (VCF0830) is provided elsewhere in this appendix. We report attitudes on government aid to Blacks for non-Hispanic white respondents only (VCF0105a).

Matching and Self-Reported Voter Turnout, 1972-2020 (Tables 4-5)

Tables 4-5 use data from the ANES Cumulative File, showing rates of matching among partisan identifiers that self-reported voting in the presidential primaries and general election. Procedures for coding matched partisans are provided in the supplemental information for Figures 4 and 8. Respondents' self-reported participation in the presidential primaries or caucuses corresponds to variable VCF9265; respondents' self-reported participation in the general election, VCF0703. Note that data on primary turnout was not available for presidential election years 1984, 1996, 2000, or 2004.

Matching and Validated Voter Turnout, 2016-2020 (Table 6)

Table 6 uses data from the 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) and 2020 Congressional Election Study (CES), using the Common Content in both years. Voter-validated turnout in the presidential primaries was only computed for respondents in states that held *primaries* rather than caucuses. In 2016, we excluded respondents from Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Maine,

Minnesota, North Dakota, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming. In 2020, we excluded respondents from Alaska, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, North Dakota, Nevada, and Wyoming.

- To code **matching status**, the procedure was substantively identical to that used for the ANES cumulative file. *Matched partisans* were self-identified conservative Republicans or liberal Democrats that knew the parties' policy reputations; *partially matched partisans* either identified with their party's ideology (i.e. conservative Republicans or liberal Democrats) **or** knew the parties' policy reputations; *unmatched partisans* neither identified with their party's ideology nor knew the parties' policy reputations.
 - **Republican party ID** reflected respondents that identified as strong Republicans, weak Republicans, or Republican "leaners"; **Democratic party ID** reflected respondents that identified as strong Democrats, weak Democrats, or Democratic "leaners." Measures of party ID were based on the traditional, seven-point scale (2016: pid7; 2020: pid7).
 - Respondents' ideological orientation was measured using a dynamic grid, with instructions reading "How would you rate the following individuals or groups?" The grid began with "Yourself" (2016: CC16_340a; 2020: CC20_340a); response options were on a seven-point scale from "very liberal" to "very conservative." **Conservative ideological orientation** reflected respondents that identified as "somewhat conservative," "conservative," or "very conservative"; **liberal ideological orientation** reflected respondents that identified as "very liberal," "liberal," or "somewhat liberal."
 - **Knowledge of the parties' policy reputations** was based on respondents' placement of the Republican (2016: CC16_340g; 2020: CC20_340f) and Democratic (2016: CC16_340h; 2020: CC20_340e) parties on the same scale. Respondents were coded as knowing the parties' policy reputations if they placed the Republican Party to the right of the Democratic Party on the seven-point scale.
- **Participation in the presidential primaries** was based on voter-validated data. Respondents were coded as having participated in the presidential primaries if they were matched to their state's voting record for the presidential primaries (2016: CL_E2016PPVM; 2020: CL_2020ppvm); respondents were coded as non-voters if they were not matched to their state's voting record. Note that Table 6 simply looks at whether respondents voted in the presidential primaries, rather than the primary (if applicable) of their chosen party.
- **Voting in the general election** was also based on voter-validated data. Respondents were coded as having voted in the general election if they were matched to their state's voting record (2016: CL_E2016GVM; 2020: CL_2020gvm); respondents were coded as non-voters if they were not matched to their state's voting record for the general election.

DATASETS REFERENCED

American National Election Studies. (2018). ANES 1988 time series study full release [dataset and documentation]. October 2, 2018 version. www.electionstudies.org

American National Election Studies. (2022). ANES cumulative data file full release [dataset and documentation]. September 16, 2022 version. www.electionstudies.org.

American National Election Studies. (2022). ANES 2020 time series study full release [dataset and documentation]. February 10, 2022 version. www.electionstudies.org.

Ansolabehere, S. & Schaffner, B.F. (2017). CCES common content, 2016.

<https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/GDF6Z0>, Harvard Dataverse, V4, UNF:6:WhtR8dNtMzReHC295hA4cg==
[fileUNF]

Schaffner, B.F., Ansolabehere, S., & Luks, S. (2021). Cooperative election study common content, 2020.
<https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/E9N6PH>, Harvard Dataverse, V4, UNF:6:zWLoanzs2F3awt+875kWBg==
[fileUNF]