

Online Appendix A: Item Wording

Table A1a. Partisan Identity Items in the Original Language of Each Country

United Kingdom	Netherlands	Sweden
When I speak about this party, I usually say “we” instead of “they”.	Als ik over deze politieke partij praat, dan zeg ik ‘wij’ in plaats van ‘zij’.	När jag pratar om partiet så säger jag oftast “vi” snarare än “de”.
I am interested in what other people think about this party.	Ik ben geïnteresseerd in wat andere mensen van deze partij vinden.	Jag är intresserad av vad andra tycker om partiet.
When people criticize this party, it feels like a personal insult.	Als mensen kritiek leveren op deze partij, dan voel ik mij persoonlijk beledigd.	När andra kritiserar partiet känns det som en personlig förolämpning.
I have a lot in common with other supporters of this party.	Ik heb veel gemeen met andere mensen die deze partij steunen.	Jag har mycket gemensamt med andra anhängare av partiet.
If this party does badly in opinion polls, my day is ruined.	Als deze partij het slecht doet in een peiling, dan word ik daar chagrijnig van.	Om partiet fått dåliga siffror så är min dag förstörd.
When I meet someone who supports this party, I feel connected.	Als ik iemand ontmoet die deze partij steunt, dan voel ik me net die persoon verbonden.	När jag träffar anhängare av partiet så känner jag samhörighet.
When I speak about this party, I refer to them as “my party”.	Als ik over deze partij praat, dan verwijs ik ernaar als ‘mijn partij’.	När jag pratar om partiet säger jag ”mitt parti”.
When people praise this party, it makes me feel good.	Als mensen positief praten over deze partij, dan geeft me dat een goed gevoel.	När någon berömmar partiet så får det mig att må bra.

Table A1b. Partisan Identity Items in Italian and their English Translation

Italian	English Translation
Quando parlo di (nom del partito) io in genere dico 'noi' piuttosto che 'loro'.	When I speak about this party, I usually say “we” instead of “they”.
Sono molto interessato a quello che gli altri pensano di (nom del partito).	I am interested in what other people think about this party.
Quando qualcuno critica (nom del partito) lo sento come un insulto personale.	When people criticize this party, it feels like a personal insult.
Quando qualcuno loda il/la (nom del partito) lo vivo come un complimento personale.	When people praise this party, it makes me feel good.
Lo ho alcune qualita' che sono tipiche di (nom del partito).	I have a lot in common with other supporters of this party.
Lo non mi comporto come una tipica persona di (nom del partito).	I don't behave like a typical voter of this party.
I limiti di (nom del partito) sono anche i miei.	The weaknesses of this party are also mine.
I successi del (nom del partito) sono anche i miei.	The successes of this party are also mine.
Se la televisione o un giornale criticasse il/la (nom del partito) mi sentirei molto Imbarazzato.	If TV or a newspaper criticized this party, I would feel very embarrassed.
Lo mi comporto come una persona di (nom del partito).	I behave like a typical voter of this party.

Table A2a. Ideological Intensity Scale – UK

Item	Response Categories
Item 1	Left- Right value 1: Government should redistribute incomes.
Item 2	Left- Right value 2: Big business takes advantage of ordinary people.
Item 3	Left- Right value 3: Ordinary working people do not get their fair share.
Item 4	Left- Right value 4: There is one law for the rich and one for the poor.
Item 5	Left- Right value 5: Management will always try to get the better of employees.
Response categories	(1) Strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, (5) strongly agree
Scale reliability coefficient alpha (unfolded)	0.85
Ideology Mean and SD (unfolded; 0=right, 1=left)	0.71 (0.21)
Among Conservative Party Supporters (unfolded)	0.57 (0.20)
Among Labour Party Supporters (unfolded)	0.79 (0.16)
Intensity Mean value and Standard Error (folded)	0.31 (0.33)
Correlation with Partisan Identity Strength	0.17

Data: British Election Study Online Panel Wave 4.

Note: All items are combined to form an ideology scale (unfolded) which ranges from 0 (right) to 1 (left). To calculate intensity, the ideology scale is folded at the scale mean, its absolute value taken, and rescaled from 0 (least ideological intensity) to 1 (greatest intensity). Intensity is set to zero for those who identify with right-wing parties and they score above the mean and for left-wing party identifiers if they score below.

Table A2b. Ideological Intensity Scale –Sweden Citizen Panel 8

Item	Response Categories
Reduce income differences in society.	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Reduce Swedish foreign aid to developing countries.	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Increase unemployment benefits	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Reduce the public sector	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Lower taxes	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Scale reliability coefficient alpha (unfolded)	0.85
Ideology Mean value and Standard Error (unfolded; 0=left, 1=right)	0.36 (0.27)
Intensity Mean value and Standard Error (folded)	0.42 (0.36)
Correlation with Partisan Identity Strength	0.17

Data: Swedish Citizen Panel 8, 2013.

Note: All items are combined into an ideology scale (unfolded), which ranges from 0 (right) to 1 (left). To calculate intensity, the ideology scale is folded at the scale mean, its absolute value taken, and rescaled from 0 (least ideological intensity) to 1 (greatest intensity). Intensity is set to zero for those who identify with right-wing parties and score below the mean and for left-wing party identifiers if they score above. Roughly half of the respondents were asked questions in the ideological intensity scale reducing the overall N.

Table A2c. Issue Intensity Scales – Italy.

Item	Response Categories
You have to make abortion harder.	1- Strongly disagree to 5 – Strongly agree
Enterprises should be free to hire or fire anyone.	1- Strongly disagree to 5 – Strongly agree
Immigrants are a threat to our culture.	1- Strongly disagree to 5 – Strongly agree
Regions should keep tax money for self-administration.	1- Strongly disagree to 5 – Strongly agree
Immigrants are a threat to Italian jobs.	1- Strongly disagree to 5 – Strongly agree
Alpha	0.63
Mean (Std. Dev.) (unfolded scale)	0.45 (0.22)
Mean (Std. Dev.) (folded scale)	0.33 (0.31)
Correlation with Partisan Identity Strength	0.09

Data: Italian Election Study (Wave 1).

Note: All items are combined into an ideology scale (unfolded), which ranges from 0 (left) to 1 (right). To calculate intensity, the ideology scale is folded at its mean, its absolute value taken, and rescaled from 0 (least ideological intensity) to 1 (greatest intensity). Intensity is set to zero for those who identify with right-wing parties and score below the mean and for left-wing party identifiers if they score above. Roughly half of the respondents were asked questions in the ideological intensity scale reducing the overall N.

Table A2d. Ideological Intensity Scale (Economic Issues) for Sweden (corresponding to Figure 8).

Economic Issue Items	Response Categories
Reduce the public sector	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Lower taxes	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Reduce income inequality in society	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
More privatized healthcare	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Increase the retirement age	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Raise restaurant VAT	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Abolish the tax deduction for household services	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
More private enterprise and market economy	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Green society even if it means low or no economic growth	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Prohibit distribution of profits in tax-funded health care	(1) Very good proposal – (5) Very bad proposal
Alpha	0.92
Mean (Std. Dev.) (unfolded scale)	0.57 (0.26)
Mean (Std. Dev.) (folded scale)	0.45 (0.28)
Correlation with Partisan Identity Strength	0.29

Data: 2014 Swedish Election Study.

Note: Issue scales were created based on two policy issues representative of each party's platform and scaled to range from 0 to 1. To calculate intensity, the ideology scale is folded at its mean, its absolute value taken, and rescaled from 0 (least ideological intensity) to 1 (greatest intensity). Intensity is set to zero for those who identify with right-wing parties and score above the mean, and for left-wing party identifiers if they score below.

Table A3: Issue Importance Scale

Party	Policy Issue I	Policy Issue II	Response Categories	Mean (Std. Dev.)
Social Democrats	Economy	Immigration	1 (not at all important) -7 (very important)	0.79 (0.20)
Moderate Party	Economy	Employment	1 (not at all important) -7 (very important)	0.81 (0.21)
Green Party	Environment	Climate Change	1 (not at all important) -7 (very important)	0.91 (0.13)
Liberal People's Party	Economy	Employment	1 (not at all important) -7 (very important)	0.76 (0.23)
Centre Party	Environment	Immigration	1 (not at all important) -7 (very important)	0.73 (0.23)
Christian Democrats	Economy	Education	1 (not at all important) -7 (very important)	0.85 (0.14)
Left Party	Economy	Immigration	1 (not at all important) -7 (very important)	0.66 (0.25)
Sweden Democrats	Employment	Immigration	1 (not at all important) -7 (very important)	0.90 (0.17)

Data: Swedish Citizen Panel 8 and 8-2.

Note: Issue scales were created based on two policy issues representative of each party's platform and scaled to range from 0 to 1.

Online Appendix B: Analysis

Table B1. Fit Statistics for 4 Wave Measurement Invariance Model (BES Data)

	<i>chi square</i>	<i>df</i>	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Fully unconstrained model	7668.84	458	.984	.101	.070
Model with uncorrelated item factors	2799.02	450	.995	.058	.043
Metric invariance model	3056.37	471	.994	.060	.045
Scalar invariance model	3300.66	543	.994	.058	.045

Note: $N=1537$.

Table B2. Fit Statistics for 4 Wave Multi-Group Measurement Model (BES Data)

	<i>chi square</i>	<i>df</i>	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Model for Labour partisans ($N=621$)	1703.74	540	.994	.059	.054
Model for Conservative partisans ($N=667$)	1383.97	540	.995	.048	.046
Simple two group model*	2980.22	989	.995	.056	.049
Metric invariance model*	3881.69	1113	.992	.062	.054
Scalar invariance model*	3118.34	1073	.994	.054	.050

Note: * $N=1288$.

Table B3. Motivated reasoning in the UK among Labour and Conservative Party supporters (corresponding to Figure 4)

	How Likely Will Party Win Majority in Election?	
	Among Conservative Party Supporters	Among Labour Party Supporters
Partisan Identity Strength	0.24 (0.02)	0.28 (0.02)
Ideological Intensity	-0.06 (0.02)	0.00 (0.01)
Education	-0.08 (0.01)	-0.13 (0.01)
Gender (female)	0.05 (0.00)	0.05 (0.00)
Age	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.00)
Constant	0.57 (0.02)	0.56 (0.02)
R squared	0.07	0.09
N	2,028	2,168

Data: British Election Study (Wave 4)

Note: Coefficients are obtained from an OLS regression. All variables are scaled to range from 0 to 1, except for age, which is measured in decades. Bolded coefficients indicate $p < 0.05$. The exact question wording is “How likely do you think it is that the Conservatives/Labour will win the majority of the seats in the General Election so it will be able to form a government on its own?” Response options from 0 (very unlikely) to 10 (very likely).

Table B4. Motivated reasoning in Sweden (corresponding to Figure 5)

	How Likely Will Party Be Part of Govt. Coalition?
Partisan Identity Strength	0.99 (0.18)
Ideological Intensity	-0.07 (0.09)
Education	-0.43 (0.12)
Gender (female)	0.16 (0.06)
Age	-0.01 (0.02)
<i>Party (omit Left Party)</i>	
Social Democrats	1.15 (0.12)
Centre Party	0.15 (0.20)
People's Liberal Party	0.42 (0.16)
Moderates	0.74 (0.12)
Christian Democrats	0.85 (0.21)
Green Party	0.42 (0.14)
Sweden Democrats	-0.65 (0.16)
Cut 1	-1.45 (0.21)
Cut 2	-0.34 (0.20)
Cut 3	1.31 (0.20)
Pseudo R squared	0.10
N	1,293

Data: Swedish Citizen Panel

Note: Coefficients are obtained from an ordered probit regression. All variables are scaled to range from 0 to 1, except for age, which is measured in decades. Bolded coefficients indicate $p < 0.05$. Only half of the respondents were asked questions in the ideological intensity scale reducing the overall N. Exact question wording is “How likely is it that your party will be part of the governing coalition” Original response options (prior to recoding) are 1 (very likely) to 4 (not at all likely).

Table B5. Motivated reasoning in the Netherlands (corresponding to Figure 6)

	Own Party Likely to be in Government
Partisan Identity Strength	1.77 (0.27)
Ideological Intensity	1.10 (0.16)
<i>Party (Omit VVD)</i>	
Labour Party	-0.13 (0.21)
PVV	-2.83 (0.17)
CDA	-2.12 (0.17)
SP	-2.28 (0.16)
D66	-1.20 (0.19)
Green Party	-3.22 (0.20)
Christian Union	-3.33 (0.23)
SGP	-3.87 (0.31)
Animals Party	-3.54 (0.32)
<i>Demographics</i>	
Age	0.00 (0.00)
Education	-0.17 (0.17)
Gender	0.05 (0.08)
Class	-0.43 (0.19)
Union	-0.04 (0.10)
Constant	2.05 (0.25)
Pseudo R squared	0.21
N	3,733

Data: 2014 Internet Campaign Panel

Note: Coefficients are obtained from a logistic regression. All variables are scaled to range from 0 to 1, except for age, which is measured in decades. Bolded coefficients indicate $p < 0.05$. Exact question wording is “Who is in government?” Original response options (prior to recoding) are 0 (no) to 1 (yes). The dependent variable is coded as 1 if respondent considers the inparty in government and 0 if respondent does not consider the inparty to be in government.

Table B6. Inparty Vote in Italy (corresponding to Figure 7)

	InParty Vote
Partisan Identity Strength	2.36 (0.39)
Ideological Intensity	0.99 (0.22)
Education	-0.09 (0.27)
Gender	-0.21 (0.13)
Age	0.19 (0.22)
Constant	-1.60 (0.29)
R squared	0.05
N	925

Data: Italian National Election Study

Note: Coefficients are obtained from a logistic regression. All variables are scaled to range from 0 to 1, except for age, which is measured in decades. Bolded coefficients indicate $p < 0.05$. The dependent variable gauges vote intention and asked before the election. Issue positions used for the construction of “Ideological Intensity” were asked of roughly half the sample.

Table B7. Affective Polarization in the UK among Conservative and Labour Party Supporters (corresponding to Figure 7)

	Affective Polarization	
	Among Conservative Party Supporters	Among Labour Party Supporters
Partisan Identity Strength	0.31 (0.02)	0.31 (0.02)
Ideological Intensity	0.08 (0.01)	0.09 (0.01)
Age	0.01 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Gender	0.01 (0.00)	0.03 (0.00)
Education	-0.05 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)
Constant	0.57 (0.02)	0.53 (0.02)
R squared	0.24	0.24
N	1,061	1,179

Data: British Election Study (Wave 4)

Note: Dependent variable is the difference between inparty and outparty rating. Coefficients are obtained from an OLS regression. All variables are scaled to range from 0 to 1, except for age, which is measured in decades. Bolded coefficients indicate $p < 0.05$. The exact question wording is “How much do you like or dislike each of the following parties?” Response options range from 0 (strongly dislike) to 10 (strongly like).

Table B8. Affective Polarization in Sweden (Coalition) (corresponding to Figure 9)

	Inparty Rating – InCoalition Parties' Rating	InParty Rating – OutCoalition Parties' Rating
Partisan Identity Strength	0.08 (0.01)	0.16 (0.01)
Ideological Intensity	-0.08 (0.00)	0.23 (0.00)
Education	-0.04 (0.00)	-0.05 (0.00)
Gender	-0.01 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Age	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Constant	0.58 (0.01)	0.65 (0.01)
R squared	0.07	0.41
N	3,082	3,082

Data: Swedish Election Panel

Note: Dependent variable in model in the left column is constructed as the difference between the ratings of the inparty and coalitional parties (i.e. incoalition). Dependent variable in the model in the right column is constructed as the difference between the ratings of the inparty and parties from the oppositional coalition (i.e. outcoalition). All variables are scaled to range from 0 to 1, except for age, which is measured in decades. Bolded coefficients are significant at $p < 0.05$.

Table B9a. Emotions in Sweden - Anger (corresponding to Figure 10)

	Anger
Partisan Identity Strength	-0.03 (0.05)
Issue Importance	-0.04 (0.05)
Status Threat	0.20 (0.07)
Issue Threat	0.05 (0.07)
Status Threat X Partisan Identity	0.59 (0.08)
Issue Threat X Partisan Identity	0.56 (0.08)
Status Threat X Issue Importance	-0.12 (0.08)
Issue Threat X Issue Importance	0.09 (0.08)
Constant	0.09 (0.04)
R squared	0.34
N	1,472

Data: Swedish Citizen Panel 8

Note: Coefficients are obtained from an OLS regression. All variables are scaled to range from 0 to 1, except for age, which is measured in decades. Bolded coefficients indicate $p < 0.05$. Anger is measured by a scale made up of three questions: how angry, hostile, and disgusted the respondent felt while reading the blog entry. Response options ranged from 1 (a great deal) to 4 (not at all).

Table B9b. Emotions in Sweden - Enthusiasm (corresponding to Figure 11)

	Enthusiasm
Partisan Identity Strength	0.17 (0.05)
Issue Importance	-0.01 (0.05)
Status Reassurance	0.16 (0.07)
Issue Reassurance	0.12 (0.07)
Status Reassurance X Partisan Identity	0.68 (0.08)
Issue Reassurance X Partisan Identity	0.55 (0.08)
Status Reassurance X Issue Importance	0.04 (0.08)
Issue Reassurance X Issue Importance	0.18 (0.08)
Constant	0.01 (0.04)
R squared	0.50
N	1,482

Data: Swedish Citizen Panel 8

Note: Coefficients are obtained from an OLS regression. All variables are scaled to range from 0 to 1, except for age, which is measured in decades. Bolded coefficients indicate $p < 0.05$. Enthusiasm is measured by a scale made up of three questions: how hopeful, proud, and enthusiastic the respondent felt while reading the blog entry. Response options ranged from 1 (a great deal) to 4 (not at all).