

AFFECTIVE POLARIZATION: DOES POLITICAL AFFILIATION
AFFECT AN APPLICANT'S HIREABILITY?

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies and Research

Angelo State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

by

JACOB FRANCISCO MIRANDA

May 2019

Major: Industrial/Organizational Psychology

AFFECTIVE POLARIZATION: DOES POLITICAL AFFILIATION

AFFECT AN APPLICANT'S HIREABILITY?

by

JACOB FRANCISCO MIRANDA

APPROVED:

Dr. Cheryl Stenmark

Dr. Crystal Kreitler

Dr. Kyle van Ittersum

Dr. Susana Badiola

March 1st, 2019

APPROVED:

Dr. Don R. Topliff

Provost, VPAA, and Interim Dean, College of Graduate Studies and Research

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

If I have an opportunity to thank the people who have helped me get to this point in my life, I will take advantage of it.

First and foremost I would like to express my love and gratitude towards my younger siblings; Jonathon and Jasmine, my grandmother and grandfather, and my mother. In addition, to my social network in California: Francisco, James, Vanessa, Mel, and Andrew; love ya. Their check ins have kept me sane and motivated when I felt exhausted.

I just have to thank the two I/O faculty members here at Angelo State University, Dr. Cheryl Stenmark and Dr. Kyle van Ittersum. I would especially thank Cheryl for her patience when I would be stressed, her flexibility, and her overall kindness to those around her. I appreciate the collaborative, learning environment Kyle set, and I am glad I got to work as his Teaching Assistant.

I would also like to thank the ASU faculty members who have given me all the research opportunity that I could ask for: Dr. Crystal Kreitler, Dr. Steven Brewer, Dr. Drew Curtis, and Dr. Tay Hack. They allowed me to explore my interests with pain and memory, personality, deception within the clinical field, and stigma on the intersection of atheism and LGBT identities. I would like to highlight Dr. Kreitler for accepting me as a mentee from Day 0 when I arrived at Angelo State. Everyone here has affirmed how passionate I am about research and want to teach Psychology.

Lastly, a special thank you to my cohort for creating a friendly, eccentric dynamic that cannot be forgotten: Spencer, Robbie, Angela, Donielle, Katie, Kendall, Kory, Robert, Sarah. I wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

Best, Jacob

ABSTRACT

The present study seeks to examine the role that political affective polarization (A.P.) may play in an employment setting: specifically perceptions of a job candidate, hiring decisions, and expectations for that potential new employee. Participants were randomly assigned to read one of three comparable resumes: one signaling Democrat partisanship, a second signaling Republican partisanship, and a third neutral resume that did not signal any partisanship. Participants were asked about their perceptions of the job applicant and the standards they would set if the fabricated job applicant were hired. A statistically significant relationship was found between A.P. and the performance standards set for the job applicant. The theoretical and practical implications of this result are discussed. In addition, the present study highlights the need to study A.P. outside of voting behaviors, and instead, look at other domains of life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LITERATURE REVIEW	1
Introduction	1
Social Distance.....	1
Social Distance and Politics.....	2
Affective Polarization	3
IMPORTANCE OF STUDYING AFFECTIVE POLARIZATION	6
RESEARCH METHODS	8
Participants	8
Procedure	8
Instruments.....	9
RESULTS	11
Correlations.....	11
MANOVA.....	12
DISCUSSION	14
Theoretical and Practical Implications.....	14
Limitations	15
Future Directions	16
Conclusion	18

REFERENCES	19
APPENDICES	22
Appendix A.....	22
Appendix B.....	23
Appendix C.....	24
Appendix D.....	25

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Humans naturally label and categorize ideas, people, and things that they encounter. This process even applies to the labeling and categorization of themselves and others. People classify themselves and others based on a number of constructs, including gender, age, religious beliefs, race, and ethnicity. Such classifications have real-world implications for how people perceive one another. Humans naturally use this perceptual information to determine which groups of people they are members of and which groups of people they are not (Bogardus, 1925; Bogardus, 1947; Karakayali, 2009). In other words, people use these categories in order to determine their own “in-groups” and “out-groups”. The social psychological construct of social distance can inform how people make such determinations. The present study seeks to examine the role that these social constructs may play in an employment setting: making decisions about hiring a new employee and expectations for that new employee.

Social Distance

Karakayali (2009) describes Social Distance (S.D.) as the perceived social distance between different groups in society. Researchers have studied how these groups can be formed based on similarities in social class, ethnicity, race, or gender. It has been proposed that S.D. is multidimensional and can be categorized into interactive, normative, and affective dimensions. Interactive S.D. defines the distance between “us” and “them” based on the frequency and the intensity of interactions. For example, a social tie with a neighbor would be stronger when there are more frequent conversations at greater length. Normative

S.D. refers to distinguishing “us” and “them” through knowledge and expression of in-group norms that an “outsider” would not know. For example, Japanese people may distinguish themselves from ‘outsiders’ based on specific norm-dictated behaviors around Shinto shrines. An outsider may not be privy to the specific movements or chants related to honoring the dead. Last, S.D. can be conceptualized by focusing on affectivity, which involves how one feels about their in-group in comparison to members of an out-group and is based on the idea that, “...those who are socially close to us are those we feel close to, and vice versa” (Karakayali, 2009, p. 540).

Social Distance and Politics

In the United States, most Americans identify as members of one of two major political groups: Republicans or Democrats. There has not been much research examining social distance between political groups until recently. Political scientists have been concerned with the question of whether members of these two groups are becoming more divided or polarized (Fleisher & Bond, 2001; Hetherington, 2002; McCarty, Poole, & Rosenthal, 2001). Political polarization has traditionally been defined in terms of the degree to which partisans’ (supporters of a political party) policy preferences have moved either conservatively/liberally (Iyengar, Lelkes, Levendusky, Malhotra, & Westwood, 2018).

In other words, the more citizens of a country differ on policies enacted by their government representatives, the more “political polarization” exists. Iyengar, Sood, and Lelkes (2012) took a psychological approach to political polarization that incorporates the concept of affective social distance. Thus, recently, instead of focusing on growing policy divides to determine if there is a growing level of political polarization, researchers have been focusing on this new construct: affective polarization.

Affective Polarization

Affective polarization (A.P.) can be defined as the extent to which partisans (individuals who support a political party) view the opposition with negative feelings (Iyengar, Sood, & Lelkes, 2012). Specifically, researchers examining A.P. have explored the extent to which individuals perceive the opposing party's members, party leaders, and presidential candidates negatively (Iyengar, Sood, & Lelkes, 2012; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Webster & Abramowitz, 2017). Political scientists have demonstrated that those who identify on either end of the political spectrum have shown a trend of increased dislike of the opposite party (Iyengar, Lelkes, Levendusky, Malhotra, & Westwood, 2018). Specifically, there is a growing perception of negative traits of individual rank and file, ordinary, members of that opposite party, not just leaders of the other party (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015). Iyengar et al.'s (2012) initial research suggested that this partisan affect is not consistent with policy preferences. Negative affect occurs simply as a result of identifying another person with the opposing party, even if individuals actually agree on many policy issues. Indeed, Iyengar and Westwood (2015) built upon this initial research by examining multiple categories of inter-group differences. They found that when compared to race, gender, and income, differences in partisanship resulted in the most A.P., on both explicit and implicit measures.

Iyengar and Westwood (2015) examined A.P. within the two main political parties in the United States: Republicans and Democrats. They argued that although many citizens identify as "centrist," there is indeed a perception of a political "out-group." In addition, when examining only participants with a strong, salient political identity, Republicans demonstrated significantly higher A.P. than Democrats. The authors concluded that

individuals could inappropriately invalidate the correct actions of another due to A.P. against the party the other identifies with. Conversely, individuals may overlook mistakes made by someone who shares the same partisan identity.

Mason (2015) also provided support for looking at political polarization in affective terms rather than simply a difference on issue preference. She proposed two mechanisms that drive affective polarization: the salience of an individual's political identity, which she labels "strength", and the degree of alignment between an individual's partisan identity with their ideological identity. Mason found that those with a strong political identity and those with more political alignment show more bias, anger, and activism against those who identify with the opposition. In addition, she found that even when issue positions were held constant, social polarization still occurred independently. It was argued that due to the psychological and emotional attachment of this identity, there does not have to be a logical component to reactions toward others who claim an opposing identity. This research provides further support that simply identifying with the opposition can cause polarization.

Garrett, Gvirsman, Johnson, Tsftati, New, and Dal (2014) expanded upon the Iyengar et al. (2012) study by exploring the extent to which A.P. is influenced by political information that either confirmed pre-existing beliefs or challenged them. They also wanted to find out if the effects found were uniquely "American," and thus looked at a drastically different nation, Israel. It was found that individuals engage in a selective approach; they seek out information sources that support their political beliefs and tolerate news that supports the opposition. They found that when individuals are exposed to only pro-attitudinal information, there is an increase in A.P. They also found that when individuals receive both pro- and counter-attitudinal information, A.P. also increases because individuals look at the

opposition's news in order to critique it. The results were found in both America and Israel, showing near identical trends, despite the numerous cultural differences of the two nations.

McLaughlin (2016) also investigated the role of media in regards to political polarization. He investigated whether the perception of conflict between Democrats and Republicans mediates the media's effect on political polarization. He found that when the news emphasizes the conflict between the two parties, this increases an individual's perception of the conflict. This perception then leads to the individual's political identity becoming more salient. He found that this stronger political identification leads to both increased issue polarization and A.P..

Rogowski and Sutherland (2016) further complicates the concept of A.P. as being distinct from issue polarization. Instead of looking at A.P. as distinct from the traditional issue polarization, they suggest that the two concepts are potentially not as distinct as originally suggested. They found that increased differences in policy issues led to a larger increase in A.P.. They also found that A.P. regarding ideological differences is mitigated if the individual is provided with personal information about another who identifies with the opposing party. Additionally, Webster and Abramowitz (2017) built upon Rogowski and Sutherland's work and found that simply knowing the candidate's political party is enough to provide a negative evaluation of the opponent, even if one does not know where their party's candidate stands on the issues. Webster and Abramowitz (2017) suggested a rational basis to a voter's negative affect of the opposition. They argue that increasing A.P. reflects a growing issue-based divide in the American population. They found that social welfare issues, in particular, were a strong predictor of A.P..

IMPORTANCE OF STUDYING AFFECTIVE POLARIZATION

There is limited research on A.P.. Most of that research is found within the political science realm, and it is focused on voter behavior. Only recently has research begun to investigate A.P. as it relates to non-political environments. For example, Nicholson, Coe, Emory, and Song (2016) have found that political in/out party status can affect perceptions of attractiveness, such that faces that are identified as members of the opposing political party are rated less attractive. McConnel, Margalit, Malhotra, and Levendusky (2017) have found that individuals will make decisions that place them at an economic disadvantage in order to avoid supporting individuals of the opposing party. Specifically, participants were offered money, but only if they gave permission for researchers to donate to the participants' opposing political party an equal amount. Many participants refused to take the money, a personal financial benefit, so that money would not be donated to the opposing party.

Future research should continue to examine how A.P. influences behavior outside of Washington and the voting booth. If individuals are willing to make disadvantageous economic decisions in a lab setting, perhaps these detrimental decisions be generalized to other settings. For example, the dynamics of A.P. in the workplace would be an important context for study. Will individuals hire the most qualified candidates who will bring the most return on investment, or dismiss them due to perceived partisanship? If this is the case, are there methods to reduce this type of behavior? By studying political polarization from a psychological perspective, researchers can provide a fresh perspective on a concept that influences everyone. Although many may not like the idea of talking about politics, now more than any other time in the United States' history, it is necessary to acknowledge and study the elephant in the room. Only by understanding what influences and divides people,

can people overcome that division. Thus, the present study seeks to examine the role that affective polarization may play in an employment setting: specifically perceptions of a job candidate, hiring decisions, and expectations for that new employee.

RESEARCH METHODS

Participants

The participants were undergraduate students that were enrolled in a psychology course and that were recruited from the psychology experimental online database (Sona system). In addition, participants were recruited on a voluntary basis using the social media website Facebook to post a link to the online survey. Two-hundred and nine participants (151 females, 55 males, 3 did not report; average age = 20.45, $SD = 4.52$) from a mid-sized university in the Southwest were recruited. The sample consisted of 44.0% Caucasians, 31.1% Latino/a or Hispanics, 6.7% Black/ African Americans, 9.1% Asian/ Asian Americans/Pacific Islander, and 1.9% identified as Native American, 6.7% as Other, and .5% not reporting. Angelo State university undergraduate students who participated fulfilled a course requirement and/or received extra credit in the psychology course in exchange for participating in the study.

Procedure

Participants accessed the survey via a link to PsychData. After providing informed consent, participants were directed to read a fictitious resume and job description of a Resident Director position of an unspecified Texas University. The participants were asked to use this information to answer the questionnaire items.

The information provided for the fictitious job applicant was: name, previous work experience, education, email, phone number, and organizations the applicant is a member of. There were three versions of a fictitious resume used. They only differed in the name of one of their previously held jobs: One being "College Republican Grassroots Coordinator", the second being "College Democrat Grassroots Coordinator", and the third being a neutral

condition, "Student Government Grassroots Coordinator". The three resumes did not differ in any other way. The job description used for the Resident Director position came from the "Residence Hall Director" position that a Texas university posted in 2018.

Once the participants reviewed the resume and job description, they were asked to answer questions about hiring decisions they would make and perceptions about the attributes of the job applicant. Once they completed these questions, the participants were asked to complete the affective polarization items. After completing the affective polarization questions, participants were asked to fill out a demographic questionnaire. After completing the demographic questionnaire, participants were prompted to read a debriefing statement.

Instruments

Questionnaire items that assessed participants' perceptions of the attributes of the job applicant and hiring related decisions that would impact the applicant were derived from previous research that studied parental status as it relates to perceptions of job candidates (Fuegen, Biernat, Haines, & Deaux, 2004). Attributes of the applicant include: Competency (2 items, $\alpha = .74$), Commitment (1 item), Agency (6 items, $\alpha = .88$), and Warmth (8 items, $\alpha = .89$). Decisions regarding the applicant are: Performance Standards set (8 items, $\alpha = .96$), Candidacy (2 items, $\alpha = .87$).

One way of measuring affective polarization were derived from previous research (Iyengar et al., 2012; Levendusky, 2017). The method was asking how fond the participant feels about the Republican party, the Democratic party, Mitt Romney, and President Barack Obama. A response may range from 0 to 100. A 0 indicates the 'coldest' a participant may feel; on the other hand, a 100 indicates the 'warmest' a participant may feel towards the

person/party in question.

A demographic questionnaire asked participants for their age, gender, ethnicity, year in school, major, employment status, what job they currently have, what field their desired profession is in, partisan identity, ideological identity, and previous experience evaluating resumes.

RESULTS

Correlations

A Pearson correlation was conducted to assess the relationship between age, gender, partisanship, ideology, affective polarization, commitment, competency, agency, warmth, performance standards set, and perceived candidacy. There were a few notable significant correlations.

There was a significant correlation between gender and perceived warmth of the job applicant, $r(206) = .16, p < .05$, such that females viewed the applicant as warmer. Gender was not significantly correlated with any other dependent measure.

There was a significant correlation between participant's partisanship (1 = Democrat, 2 = Republican), and participant's ideology (1 = Extremely Liberal, 7 = Extremely Conservative), $r(202) = .55, p < .001$, in the direction that would be expected. Partisanship was not significantly correlated with any other measure. Ideology was not significantly correlated with any other measure.

Affective polarization was significantly correlated with higher performance standards set for the job applicant, $r(202) = .17, p < .05$, such that participants that reported higher levels of affective polarization also set higher performance standards for the job applicant.

The perceptions of the job applicant's commitment were significantly correlated with perceptions of job applicant's competency, $r(209) = .71, p < .001$, agency, $r(209) = .27, p < .001$, warmth, $r(209) = .23, p < .01$, candidacy, $r(208) = .24, p < .01$, and higher performance standards set, $r(208) = .24, p < .001$.

The perceptions of job applicant's competency were significantly correlated with perceptions of the job applicant's agency, $r(209) = .28, p < .001$, warmth, $r(209) = .32, p < .001$.

.001, candidacy, $r(208) = .34, p < .001$, and higher performance standards set, $r(206) = .24, p < .001$.

The perceptions of job applicant's agency were significantly correlated with perceptions of the job applicant's warmth, $r(209) = .66, p < .001$, and candidacy, $r(206) = .62, p < .001$.

The perceptions of job applicant's warmth were significantly correlated with perceptions of the job applicant's candidacy, $r(208) = .42, p < .001$.

Higher performance standards set for the job applicant were significantly correlated with perceptions of the job applicant's candidacy, $r(207) = .15, p < .05$. See Appendix B for Correlation Table.

MANOVA

Items measuring A.P. were standardized into Z-scores and aggregated together to create a single score of A.P. for each participant. This A.P. variable was split into three categories: Low A.P., Average A.P., and High A.P.. Low A.P. scores were coded as below a -1 standard deviation. Average A.P. scores were coded as between -1 and +1 standard deviations. High A.P. scores were coded as above +1 standard deviation. The variable was split into a trichotomy, or three groups, rather than a dichotomy, as suggested by Gelman & Park (2008).

A three-way 2 (participant's partisanship: Democrat = 107, Republican = 95, 7 participants did not respond) x 3 (partisanship alignment between participant and job applicant: Matched Partisanship = 62, Mismatched Partisanship = 63, Neutral Condition = 78, 6 participants did not respond) x 3 (participant's level of affective polarization: Low A.P. = 44, Average A.P. = 125, High A.P. = 34, 6 participants did not respond) Multivariate

Analysis of Variance was conducted. This analysis did not reveal significant multivariate effects for the job applicant dimensions. However, due to the exploratory nature of the study, a follow up univariate analysis was conducted to examine the significant correlation between A.P. and performance standards. Significant univariate effects were found for levels of affective polarization on performance standards set for the job applicant, $F(2,177) = 3.94, p < .05$. A Bonferonni posthoc test determined that participants with low A.P. ($M = 62.41, SD = 3.25$), expressed significantly lower performance standards set than both those with average A.P. ($M = 70.27, SD = 1.78$), and high A.P. ($M = 76.18, SD = 3.44$). No other significant effects were found. See Appendix C for MANOVA table and Appendix D for Univariate results table.

DISCUSSION

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether higher levels of A.P. would lead to less favorable perceptions of job applicants from the opposing political party. A.P., in fact, was not significantly correlated with the job applicant's perceived competency, warmth, or agency. One explanation may be that A.P. has no effect on perceptions of a job applicant. This explanation, however, seems unlikely, in light of previous findings that have shown that A. P. can impact perceptions of attractiveness and economic decisions (Nicholson & Coe, 2016; McConnel, Maralit, Mahlotra, & Levendusky, 2017). It seems likely that other perceptions and behaviors would be associated with this negative discrepancy as well. A second explanation for the lack of significant effect of A.P. on perceptions may be that utilizing resumes may not have portrayed a clear enough picture of the job applicant.

According to some research, professional recruiters only spend an average of six seconds reading through a resume when acquiring if an applicant should progress through the hiring process (Evans, 2012). Thus, in evaluating candidates for the hypothetical job in the present study, participants may not have acquired a full picture of the applicant (including the applicant's political party involvement) in their brief look at the resume. Thus, future studies should examine A.P. in the context of a more salient hiring technique, such as an interview. A third explanation may be that the questionnaire items used did not adequately capture the intended measures. Future studies should use real organizational data on hiring rates if provided the opportunity to do so.

The present study found a relationship between A.P. and performance standards set, in which higher levels of A.P. were positively associated with higher levels of job standards

set for the applicant. Thus, participants who have more negative feelings toward members of the opposing political party, have higher expectations for performance of job applicants. This relationship may be explained by other individual differences, such as perfectionistic tendencies, need for structure, or need for control. Shoss, Callison, & Witt (2015) have suggested that other-oriented perfectionism, a personality trait described as evaluating others based on unrealistic standards, may impact interpersonal behavior among employees. In the current study, perhaps a person high in perfectionistic tendencies may have higher standards of both coworkers and of political parties. The higher standards and expectations of opposing political parties may lead to more A.P. for when they are not met. Future studies should examine the influence of other individual differences in the dynamics of how A.P. is related to behaviors and perceptions of others.

As A.P. has been documented as being on the rise (Iyengar, Lelkes, Levendusky, Malhotra, & Westwood, 2018), the potential impact of the negative feelings, evidenced through A.P. must be understood. This includes understanding what behaviors are impacted outside of voting, as well as exploring personality traits that may be associated with higher levels of A.P.. A better understanding of the antecedents and consequences of A.P. can facilitate the development of interventions designed to reduce the damaging impact of these negative emotions.

Limitations

It is important to note limitations so that appropriate conclusions may be drawn. First, the sample used in this study is made overwhelmingly of undergraduate college students and it is possible that older adults with more job experience might make different decisions about potential job applicants. In addition, this study asked participants to make a hiring decision

based on only a resume. This may not reflect the real world, in which personnel decisions are usually made based on multiple predictors, including interviews and other selection instruments. Therefore, future studies should examine this issue using older, more experienced participants, in settings that include other selection techniques.

Additionally, the present study utilized self-report measures which are accompanied by several general limitations. Participants may not have read each question carefully, may not have understood the question being asked, or may not have answered the question truthfully/accurately. A second flaw in the design of the study was that an outdated measure of A.P. was used. One of the A.P. measurements asked respondents about their feelings of different presidential candidates. The candidates used in the measure were from the 2012 election (Barack Obama and Mitt Romney). Future studies may do well to include questions about current political candidates.

Importantly, the present study highlights the need for more research expanding upon the present study investigating A.P. in the workplace. Do supervisors and subordinates treat each other differently if partisanship status is known? Does that impact who is in a leaders' in group? By addressing the limitations noted above, fruitful research may be conducted in this area of Industrial/Organizational Psychology.

Future Directions

The study of political A.P. should not be limited to workplace decision making nor the voting booths of Washington. This section proposes some areas of research for A.P. within other domains of study. A.P. may be studied within the Health Psychology area that focuses on mental and physiological well-being. Second, future research could attempt to understand the antecedents beyond television and media that may lead to a rise of A.P.. In

addition, the role of geographic regions should be taken into account when researchers examine aspects of A.P..

Health psychologists should investigate other potential consequences of A.P.. In particular, health may be impacted by higher levels of negative emotion stemming from the political divide. A.P. is a complex construct as it constitutes both positive emotions for one's own partisan party with negative emotions of the opposing political group. Pressman, Gallagher, & Lopez (2013) emphasize that positive emotions have been negatively associated with self-reports of pain and disease, while negative emotions have been associated with higher rates of cardiac disease and mortality. It may be that individuals who experience negative emotions who do not know how to effectively cope with them may report higher levels of stress, anxiety, or other markers of poor well-being. Thus, growing levels of A.P. could be contributing to a national health crisis that will need to be addressed. Understanding the role A.P. plays in the condition of people's health may help identify people who are likely to experience negative emotion; which in turn, may increase their risk of negative effects on mental health.

Iyengar, Lelkes, Levendusky, Malhotra, & Westwood (2018) point out that much research has studied the origins of A.P. by investigating the impact of the main-stream media. Recently, Heatherly, Lu, & Lee (2017) have looked at the involvement of online social networking sites (SNSs), specifically the role of Facebook. The findings of Heatherly and colleagues suggest that people with higher amounts of A.P. are less likely to have discussions with those across the political aisle. They have suggested that SNSs may, in fact, be doing more harm than good by contributing to A.P.. Researchers should continue to investigate the role of SNSs (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Reddit, etc) and garner a greater

understanding of how discourse takes place within each specific SNS, and how it can impact A.P. among users.

It is also important for researchers to take into account geographic location when conducting research on A. P. and interpreting results. Feinberg, Tullett, Mensch, Hart, & Gottlieb (2017) have suggested that geography plays an important part in one's political identity. What may constitute a conservative/liberal viewpoint in the southern red states such as Texas and Alabama may not be the same definition of a conservative/liberal viewpoint in California and New York. Expanding upon this further, differences may be seen in an individual who identifies liberal, who is high in A.P., in a blue state than a similar liberal in a red state.

Conclusion

Overall, there is a scarce amount of research being conducted on A.P.. The present study contributes to the literature by highlighting the need to study A.P. outside of voting behavior. It has been suggested that A.P. may impact decisions within the workplace, from hiring decisions to evaluations of ones' supervisors, peers, and subordinates. In addition, A.P. may be of interest to those interested in health outcomes and those who want to study the origins of the tension that is on the rise in the United States. Ultimately, researchers should take factors, such as geographic location, into account with regards to their interpretations and be cautious in not over-reaching in their conclusions from the results of any single study.

REFERENCES

- Bogardus, E. S. (1925). Measuring social distances. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 9, 299-308.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1947). Measurement of personal-group relations, *Sociometry*, 10(4), 306-311.
- Evans, W. (2012, March 12). *You have 6 seconds to make an impression: How recruiters see your resume*. Retrieved from www.theladders.com/career-advice/you-only-get-6-seconds-of-fame-make-it-count
- Feinberg, M., Tullett, A.M., Mensch, Z., Hart, W., & Gottlieb, S. (2017). The political reference point: How geography shapes political identity. *PLoS ONE*, 12 (2). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0171497
- Fleisher, R., & Bond, J. R. (2001). "Evidence of increasing polarization among ordinary citizens." In *American political parties: Decline or resurgence?*, Washington, DC: CQ Press, 55-57.
- Fuegen, K., Biernat, M., Haines, E., & Deaux, K. (2004). Mothers and fathers in the workplace: How gender and parental status influence judgements of job-related competence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60, 737-754.
- Garrett, R. K., Gvirsman, S. D., Johnson, B. K., Tsfati, Y., Neo, R., & Dal, A. (2014). Implications of pro- and counterattitudinal information exposure for affective polarization. *Human Communication Research*, 40(3), 309-332.
- Gelman, A. & Park, D. K. (2008). Splitting a predictor at the upper quarter or third and the lower quarter or third. *The American Statistician*, 62(4), 1-8. doi: 10.1198/000313008X366226

- Heatherly, K.A., Lu, Y. & Lee, J. K. (2017). Filtering out the other side? Cross-cutting and like-minded discussions on social networking sites. *News media & society*, 19(8), 1271-1289.
- Hetherington, M. J. (2002). "Resurgent mass partisanship: the role of elite polarization." *American Political Science Review*, 95(3), 619-631.
- Iyengar, S., Sood, G., & Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology: A social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(3), 405-431.
- Iyengar, S., & Westwood S. J. (2015). Fear and loathing across party lines: New evidence on group polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(3), 690-707.
- Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., & Westwood, S. J. (2018). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. Retrieved from <https://www.dartmouth.edu/~seanjwestwood/papers/ARPS.pdf>
- Karakayali, N. (2009). Social distance and affective orientations. *Sociological Forum*, 24(3), 537-562.
- Levendusky, M. (2017). Americans, not partisans: Can priming american national identity reduce affective polarization? *The Journal of Politics*, 80(1), doi:10.1086/693987
- Mason, L. (2015). "I disrespectfully agree": The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59, 128-145.
- McCarty, N., Poole, K., & Rosenthal, H. (2001). "The hunt for party discipline in congress." *American Political Science Review*, 95, 673-688.
- McConnel, C., Margalit, Y., Malhotra, N., & Levendusky, M. (2017). The economic consequences of partisanship in a polarized era. *American Journal of Political Science*. 62(3). doi: 10.1111/ajps.12330

- McLaughlin, B. (2016). Commitment to the team: Perceived conflict and political polarization. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods and Applications*, doi:10.1027/1864-1105/a000176
- Nicholson, S. P., Coe, C.M., Emory, J., & Song, A.V. (2016). The politics of beauty: The effects of partisan bias on physical attractiveness. *Political Behavior*, 38(4), 883-898.
- Pressman, S. D., Gallagher, M. W., & Lopez, S. J. (2013). Is the emotion-health connection a “first-world problem”? *Psychological Science*. 24(4), 544-549.
- Rogowsky, J.D., & Sutherland, J. L. (2016). How ideology fuels affective polarization. *Political Behavior*, 38(2), 485-508.
- Shoss, M., Callison, K., & Witt, L. A. (2015). The effects of other-oriented perfectionism and conscientiousness on helping at work. *Applied Psychology*, 64(1).
doi: 10.1111/apps.12039
- Webster, S. W., & Abramowitz, A. I. (2017). The ideological foundations of affective polarization in the U.S. electorate. *American Politics Research*, 45(4), 621-647.

APPENDICES

Appendix A



12/4/2017

Dr. Cheryl Stenmark
Dept. of Psychology, Sociology, & Social Work
Angelo State University
San Angelo, TX 76909

Dear Cheryl:

The proposed project submitted for your student, Jacob Miranda, titled, "*Affective Polarization: Does Political Affiliation Affect an Applicant's Hireability?*" has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board and approved in accordance with federal regulations 45 CFR 46.

The protocol is approved for one year effective December 4, 2017. Please be aware that the protocol will expire one year from its original approval date. If the study will continue beyond that date, you must submit a request for continuation before the current protocol expires.

The approved addendum is for protocol #STE-120417. Please include this number in the subject line of in all future communications with the IRB regarding the protocol.

Sincerely,



Teresa (Tay) Hack, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board

Appendix B

Table 1. Correlations among study variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Age		-.15*	.05	-.04	-.03	-.01	-.07	.02	-.05	.04	.07
2. Gender			.01	.04	.05	.05	.02	.13	.16*	-.01	.06
3. Partisanship				-.04	-.01	-.05	-.03	-.03	.04	-.00	-.06
4. AP					-.05	-.07	-.03	-.06	-.04	.19*	-.04
5. Alignment						-.08	-.12	-.09	-.04	-.01	-.09
6. Commitment							.71**	.27**	.23**	.24**	.24**
7. Competency								.28**	.32**	.27**	.34**
8. Agency									.66**	.13	.62**
9. Warmth										.07	.42**
10. Performance Standards											.15*
11. Candidacy											

Note: * indicates a correlation that is significant at the .05 level. ** indicates a correlation that is significant at the .001 level. Gender: 1 = male, 2 = female. Partisanship: 1 = Democrat, 2 = Republican. Alignment: 1 = matched, 2 = neutral, 3 = mismatched.

Appendix C

Table 2. Multivariate Analysis of Variance

2 (Partisanship) x 3 (Alignment) x 3 (AP) Multiple Analysis of Variance

<i>Effect</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Partial η^2</i>
Partisanship	6	1.01	.42	.03
Alignment	12	.718	.73	.02
AP	12	1.53	.11	.05
Partisanship x Alignment	12	.88	.57	.03
Partisanship x AP	12	1.14	.32	.04
Alignment x AP	24	.61	.93	.02
Partisanship x Alignment x AP	24	.73	.83	.02

Appendix D

Table 3

2 (Partisanship) x 3 (Alignment) x 3 (AP) Multiple Analysis of Variance Univariate Results; Results for AP only.

<i>Source</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
AP				
Commitment	2	.56	.57	.01
Competency	2	.01	.99	.00
Agency	2	.90	.41	.01
Warmth	2	.17	.85	.00
Performance Standards	2	4.61*	.01	.05
Candidacy	2	.36	.70	.00
Wilks' Lambda	12	1.52	.11	.05

*Note: * p < .05*