

Supplement to:

Rawlings, Craig M. 2022. “Becoming an Ideologue: Social Sorting and the Microfoundations of Polarization.” *Sociological Science* 9: 313-345.

Appendix A: Variables

Table A1: Descriptive Statistics for Variables Used in 2006-2010 GSS Panel Models

	<i>N</i>	μ	SD	Min.	Max.
Ideological ID Strength	254	2.04	0.98	1.00	4.00
Political Ideology	335	4.12	1.45	1.00	7.00
Attitude Extremism	335	0.33	0.06	0.18	0.48
Attitude Alignment	335	0.53	0.04	0.50	0.74
Weak Gay Ties	335	2.19	1.29	0.00	5.00
Weak Nonreligious Ties	335	3.84	1.43	0.00	5.00
Weak Religious Ties	335	2.92	1.09	0.00	5.00
Weak White Ties	335	4.68	0.89	1.00	5.00
Weak Non-White Ties ^a	335	8.07	3.29	3.00	15.00
Weak Conservative Ties	335	3.54	1.37	0.00	5.00
Weak Liberal Ties	335	3.44	1.32	1.00	5.00
Strong Gay Ties	335	1.73	1.03	0.00	5.00
Strong Nonreligious Ties	335	3.15	1.42	0.00	5.00
Strong Religious Ties	335	2.80	1.27	0.00	5.00
Strong White Ties	335	4.01	1.26	1.00	5.00
Strong Non-White Ties ^a	335	5.91	2.83	0.00	15.00
Strong Conservative Ties	335	3.03	1.34	0.00	5.00
Strong Liberal Ties	335	2.87	1.33	1.00	5.00
Age	335	47.72	16.75	18.00	87.00
Education	335	13.91	2.87	2.00	20.00
Socioeconomic Index	335	52.92	19.08	18.50	97.20
Sex: Female	335	1.56	0.50	1.00	2.00
Urban-Rural ^b	335	4.35	2.70	1.00	10.00
Asian	335	0.04	0.20	0.00	1.00
Hispanic	335	0.04	0.20	0.00	1.00
Black	335	0.11	0.31	0.00	1.00
White	335	0.80	0.40	0.00	1.00

^a Combined Asian, Black, and Hispanic.

^b The GSS variable is XNORCSIZ, which is coded between 1 (“a large central city”) and 10 (“open country”).

Table A2: GSS Variables Used in Gauging Attitude Polarization

Variable Name	μ	SD	Min.	Max.
FECHLD	2.07	0.83	1	4
FEPRESCH	2.73	0.77	1	4
FEFAM	2.78	0.83	1	4
MEOVRWRK	2.69	1.06	1	5
RACDIF1	1.65	0.48	1	2
RACDIF3	1.55	0.50	1	2
RACDIF4	1.51	0.50	1	2
HELPPOR	2.93	1.20	1	5
HELPNOT	3.07	1.25	1	5
HELPSICK	2.52	1.28	1	5
HELPBLK	3.55	1.25	1	5
GOD	5.07	1.43	1	6
RELPERSN	2.40	0.98	1	4
SPRTPRSN	2.12	0.94	1	4
PUNSIN	2.65	1.02	1	4
BLKWHITE	1.79	0.90	1	4
ROTAPPLE	2.24	0.97	1	4
PERMORAL	1.97	0.91	1	4
WLTHWHTS	3.53	0.99	1	7
WLTHBLKS	4.80	1.01	1	7
WORKBLKS	4.18	1.14	1	7
INTLWHTS	4.62	1.13	1	7
INTLBLKS	4.28	1.02	1	7
LIVEBLKS	2.88	0.98	1	5
MARBLK	2.79	1.16	1	5
MARASIAN	2.67	1.02	1	5
MARHISP	2.66	1.04	1	5
MARWHT	2.07	1.00	1	5
DISCAFF	2.22	0.70	1	3
FEHIRE	2.45	1.09	1	5
FEJOBFAFF	2.85	1.15	1	4
DISCAFFM	2.52	0.88	1	4
DISCAFFW	2.14	0.85	1	4
NEXTGEN	1.75	0.63	1	4
TOOFAST	2.51	0.76	1	4
ADVFRONT	1.88	0.63	1	4
ASTROLGY	1.47	0.50	1	2
ASTROSCI	2.59	0.61	1	3
SCISTUDY	1.91	0.68	1	3
NATSPAC	2.18	0.72	1	3
NATENVIR	1.47	0.66	1	3
NATHEAL	1.43	0.67	1	3
NATCITY	1.70	0.72	1	3
NATCRIME	1.47	0.62	1	3
NATDRUG	1.51	0.66	1	3
NATEDUC	1.33	0.58	1	3
NATRACE	1.80	0.68	1	3
NATARMS	2.10	0.79	1	3
NATAID	2.52	0.67	1	3
NATFARE	2.18	0.78	1	3
NATSOC	1.46	0.60	1	3
NATMASS	1.65	0.64	1	3
NATPARK	1.74	0.56	1	3
NATCHLD	1.57	0.63	1	3
NATSCI	1.72	0.67	1	3
EQWLTH	3.77	2.01	1	7
TAX	1.48	0.53	1	3
SPKATH	1.21	0.41	1	2
COLATH	4.35	0.48	4	5
LIBATH	1.76	0.43	1	2
SPKRAC	1.36	0.48	1	2
COLRAC	4.49	0.50	4	5

Variable Name	μ	SD	Min.	Max.
LIBRAC	1.68	0.47	1	2
SPKCOM	1.30	0.46	1	2
COLCOM	4.64	0.48	4	5
LIBCOM	1.72	0.45	1	2
SPKMIL	1.29	0.46	1	2
COLMIL	4.42	0.49	4	5
LIBMIL	1.72	0.45	1	2
SPKHOMO	1.14	0.34	1	2
COLHOMO	4.17	0.37	4	5
LIBHOMO	1.79	0.41	1	2
CAPPUN	1.33	0.47	1	2
GUNLAW	1.23	0.42	1	2
COURTS	2.07	0.56	1	3
GRASS	1.55	0.50	1	2
POSTLIFE	1.19	0.39	1	2
AFFRMACT	3.23	0.99	1	4
WRKWAYUP	2.08	1.21	1	5
CLOSEBLK	5.77	2.06	1	9
CLOSEWHT	6.78	1.93	1	9
TRUST	1.70	0.56	1	3
CONFINAN	2.18	0.66	1	3
CONBUS	2.06	0.59	1	3
CONCLERG	2.04	0.66	1	3
CONEDUC	1.90	0.63	1	3
CONFED	2.27	0.68	1	3
CONLABOR	2.18	0.61	1	3
CONPRESS	2.36	0.63	1	3
CONTV	2.32	0.63	1	3
CONSCI	1.67	0.60	1	3
CONLEGIS	2.37	0.63	1	3
CONARMY	1.59	0.66	1	3
OBEY	3.34	1.28	1	5
POPULAR	4.70	0.63	1	5
THNKSELF	2.12	1.26	1	5
HELPOTH	2.55	0.98	1	5
GETAHEAD	1.45	0.69	1	3
GOODLIFE	2.57	1.09	1	5
FEPOL	1.78	0.41	1	2
ABDEFECT	1.25	0.43	1	2
ABNOMORE	1.54	0.50	1	2
ABHLTH	1.12	0.32	1	2
ABPOOR	1.55	0.50	1	2
ABRAPE	1.21	0.41	1	2
ABSINGLE	1.57	0.49	1	2
ABANY	1.57	0.50	1	2
CHLDIDEL	3.10	1.91	0	8
PILLOK	2.40	1.05	1	4
SEXEDUC	1.09	0.29	1	2
DIVLAW	1.91	0.74	1	3
PREMARSEX	2.98	1.24	1	4
TEENSEX	1.50	0.86	1	4
XMARSEX	1.30	0.66	1	4
HOMOSEX	2.38	1.42	1	4
MARHOMO	3.09	1.52	1	5
PORNLAW	1.69	0.53	1	3
SPANKING	2.12	0.85	1	4
LETDIE1	1.32	0.47	1	2
SUICIDE1	1.40	0.49	1	2
SUICIDE2	1.89	0.31	1	2
SUICIDE3	1.89	0.31	1	2
SUICIDE4	1.82	0.39	1	2
POLHITOK	1.31	0.46	1	2
POLABUSE	1.92	0.28	1	2
POLESCAP	1.27	0.44	1	2

Appendix B: Example of Attitude Alignment Measure

Consider an individual i with a hypothetical attitude system consisting of ten attitudes shown in Table B1. Here, we see individual i 's attitude vector \mathbf{v}_i across a variety of attitudes within different domains (religion, health, etc.), which have been scaled between 0 and 1. The table only includes attitudes that are significantly correlated with political ideology (i.e., six attitudes are correlated with being liberal and four with being conservative). Thus, an individual who had both maximally extreme and aligned attitudes would correspond with either the “conservative” or “liberal” columns (see Figure 2a).

Table B1. Attitude Vectors for Focal Individual with Ten Attitudes

	Attitude j	\mathbf{v}_i	Conservative	Liberal
1	Religion 1	0.25	1.00	0.00
2	Religion 2	1.00	0.00	1.00
3	Family 1	0.50	1.00	0.00
4	Family 2	0.50	1.00	0.00
5	Family 3	0.50	0.00	1.00
6	Health 1	0.25	1.00	0.00
7	Health 2	0.25	0.00	1.00
8	Health 3	0.25	0.00	1.00
9	Science 1	.00	0.00	1.00
10	Science 2	.00	0.00	1.00

In order to gauge attitude alignment, we compare the extent to which \mathbf{v}_i satisfies the constraint in a completely polarized attitude structure. Table B2 shows the attitude distance matrix Ω for the focal individual's attitude vector \mathbf{v}_i in Table B1. Following Equation (2), one would derive the constraint satisfaction score for this individual's attitude vector by element-wise subtraction with the corresponding cell of the ideal-typical schema-consistent matrix (\mathbf{R}) shown in Table B3 in which cell entries r_{xy} equal 1.00 when attitude x and attitude y are associated with different ideologies and r_{xy} takes the value of 0 when attitude x and attitude y are associated with the same ideology. One then takes the absolute differences of each cell entry—i.e., $|r_{xy} - \omega_{xy}|$ (shown in Table B4). Finally, one takes the mean of these absolute differences to determine individual i 's attitude alignment score. In this case, individual i has an attitude alignment score of .51.

Table B2. Individual Attitude Distance Matrix (Ω)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	.									
2	0.75	.								
3	0.25	0.50	.							
4	0.25	0.50	0.00	.						
5	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.00	.					
6	0.00	0.75	0.50	0.25	0.25	.				
7	0.00	0.75	0.50	0.25	0.25	0.00	.			
8	0.00	0.75	0.50	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.00	.		
9	0.25	0.75	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.25	0.25	0.25	.	
10	0.25	0.75	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.00	.

Table B3. Ideal-Typically Polarized Attitude Distance Matrix (R)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	.									
2	1.00	.								
3	0.00	1.00	.							
4	0.00	1.00	0.00	.						
5	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	.					
6	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	.				
7	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	.			
8	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	.		
9	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	.	
10	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.

Table B4. Absolute Differences in Ideal-Typically Polarized vs. Observed Attitude Structures ($|R-\Omega|$)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	.									
2	0.25	.								
3	0.25	0.5	.							
4	0.25	0.5	0	.						
5	0.75	0.5	1	1	.					
6	0	0.25	0.5	0.25	0.75	.				
7	1	0.75	0.5	0.75	0.25	1	.			
8	1	0.75	0.5	0.75	0.25	1	0	.		
9	0.75	0.75	0	0.5	0.5	0.75	0.25	0.25	.	
10	0.75	0.75	0	0.5	0.5	0.75	0.25	0.25	0	.