Online Appendix: Affective Partisan Political Polarization and Political Violence

Security Studies

James A. Piazza
Liberal Arts Professor of Political Science
The Pennsylvania State University
jap45@psu.edu

Appendix Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, U.S. Survey

	Obs.	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Believe Political Violence Necessary	1,889	1.878772	1.12682	1	5
Anti-Republican Polarization	1,899	5.466035	2.337057	2	10
Anti-Democrat Polarization	1,899	5.934702	1.223217	2	10
Age	1,909	47.30854	16.8913	18	98
Gender (Male = 1)	1,909	.4698795	.4992227	0	1
Household income	1,862	9.341031	6.920383	1	24
Unemployed	1,909	.1162913	.3206579	0	1
Education level	1,894	4.568638	1.91948	1	8
Democrat	1,909	.4484023	.4974609	0	1
Republican	1,909	.3452069	.4755603	0	1
Conservative ideology	1,909	4.01781	1.734983	1	7
White, non-Hispanic	1,909	.7092719	.4542173	0	1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,909	.1000524	.3001485	0	1
Asian, Pacific Islander	1,909	.0550026	.2280451	0	1
Native American	1,909	.0115244	.1067592	0	1
Hispanic, Latinx	1,909	.1178628	.32253	0	1
Christian	1,909	.635935	.4812931	0	1
Religiosity	1,909	6.235202	3.955425	0	12
Politically engaged	1,909	.3708748	.4831656	0	1
Follows news	1,909	5.170246	1.671639	1	7
Obtains news from Cable	1,908	.1137317	.3175683	0	1
Obtains news from Social Media	1,908	.1954927	.3966834	0	1
Aggressive personality	1,909	10.47197	3.255197	4	20
South	1,909	.3907805	.4880532	0	1
West	1,909	.1838659	.3874763	0	1
Midwest	1,909	.2058669	.4044397	0	1

Appendix Table 2. Descriptive Statistics, Cross-National Sample of Consolidated Democracies

	Obs.	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Level of Political Violence (VDEM)	2,945	1.224788	1.029984	0	4
Polarization	3,020	1.678808	.9929269	0	4
Polity 2 score	3,916	8.71859	1.426969	6	10
Regime Age (Polity Durable score)	3,878	31.37339	36.943	0	209
Proportional election system	3,731	.5371214	.4986869	0	1
Majoritarian election system	3,731	.3210935	.4669592	0	1
Ethno-linguistic fractionalization	3,605	.3627808	.2345929	0	.930175
Gini	2,142	40.20551	9.830497	23.7	65.8
Population (log)	3,887	16.08101	1.643625	12.27981	21.02531
GDP per capita (log)	3,794	9.200514	1.032811	6.319	11.314
Civil War, Past 5 Years	4,183	.1754721	.3804159	0	1

Appendix Table 3. Representativeness of U.S. Sample to US Population

	Sample	U.S. Population
Male %	47.0%	49.9%
Median age	46 yrs	38.6 yrs
Household Income (median)	50-55K	70K
White %	76.6%	76.3%
Black/African American %	10.7%	13.4%
Hispanic/Latinx %	12.3%	18.8%
Education: Bachelor's or more %	42.6%	32.0%
South %	39.1%	38.3%
West %	18.4%	23.9%
Northeast %	22.0%	17.1%
Midwest %	20.6%	20.8%

Survey Instrument

Pre-survey, standard demographic indicators provided by Lucid:

- Respondent party identification
- Respondent age
- Respondent gender
- Respondent household income
- Respondent education level
- Respondent race

Control Variables:

Employment Status
Q: Which of the following categories best describes your employment status?
A: employed, working 1 to 39 hours per week, employed working 40 or more hours per week, not employed and looking for work, not employed and not looking for work, retired, disabled and not able to work.

Conservative ideology
Q: In general, do you think of yourself as:
A: extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road, slightly conservative, conservative, extremely conservative.

Religion
Q: What is your religion?:
A: Protestant, Catholic, Mormon, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Eastern Orthodox, Other Christian, Other non-Christian, Religious or spiritual but not affiliated with an organized religion, other, none.

Religiosity
Q: If religious or spiritual, how often do you attend religious or spiritual services?
Q: If religious or spiritual, how often do you pray?
A: never, once a year or less, a few times a year, once or twice a month, once a week, more than once a week

Politically engaged
Q: Did you vote in the most recent presidential election?
A: Yes, no, no, not registered to vote
Q: In the past three years how often have you contacted a member of government or politician, urged another person to vote or participated in a political meeting or protest?
A: never, one time, a few times, frequently

Follows news
Q: How often would you say you follow the news or current events?
A: never, less than once a month, at least once a month, at least once a week, several times a week, at least once per day, multiple times per day

Obtains news from Cable, Obtains news from Social Media
Q: Where do you get most of your new from?
A: television, regular broadcast, cable news, print newspapers or magazines, online newspapers or journals, online blogs, social media like Facebook or Twitter, radio, other, please specify

Aggressive Personality/Trait Aggression
Q: Given enough provocation, I may hit another person.
Q: Other people always seem to get the breaks.
Q: I have trouble controlling my temper.

Q: When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them.
A: completely false for me, somewhat false for me, neither true nor false, somewhat true for me, completely true for me

Region
Q: In which state do you live?
A: coded based upon whether state is located in Northeast, South, Midwest, West

Independent Variables (Affective Polarization):

Q: How much do you agree with the following statement?: Republicans are a threat to the nation's well-being.
Q: How much do you agree with the following statement?: Democrats are a threat to the nation's well-being.
Q: How much do you agree with the following statement?: Republicans love America more.
Q: How much do you agree with the following statement?: Democrats love America more.
A: strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat agree, strongly agree.

Dependent Variable (Support for Political Violence):

Q: Do you believe it is sometimes necessary to use violence to achieve your political goals?
A: strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat agree, strongly agree.

Appendix Table 4. Polarization and Political Violence Levels in Cross-National Sample of Democracies in Analysis

Country	Sample Years	Level of Political Violence (VDEM) 0-4 scale	Polarization 0-4 scale	Polity Score
Albania	15	0.5	1.0	8.6
Austria	14	0.1	2.0	10.0
Bangladesh	12	3.2	3.4	6.0
Belgium	15	0.1	1.0	8.7
Benin	14	1.0	0.7	6.7
Bolivia	24	1.4	2.0	8.2
Botswana	32	0.0	1.0	7.5
Brazil	26	2.3	3.1	8.0
Bulgaria	26	0.3	2.0	8.6
Burkina Faso	2	3.0	1.0	6.0
Burundi	10	2.5	2.0	6.0
Canada	37	0.8	1.0	10.0
Cape Verde	17	0.0	1.0	9.9
Central African Republic	1	4.0	3.0	6.0
Chile	27	1.0	1.1	9.0
Colombia	25	3.7	2.8	7.3
Comoros	12	3.0	2.8	8.5
Croatia	9	0.6	3.0	9.0
Czech Republic	23	0.0	0.7	9.6
Denmark	14	0.0	0.0	10.0
Dominican Republic	25	0.1	1.7	7.6
Ecuador	19	1.0	2.8	7.8
El Salvador	25	1.1	3.1	7.2
Estonia	25	0.1	1.1	8.1
Finland	15	1.0	1.0	10.0
France	7	2.0	1.9	9.0
Georgia	13	0.9	3.3	6.5
Germany	22	0.2	1.0	10.0
Ghana	16	2.0	1.0	7.6
Guatemala	21	1.0	2.0	8.0
Guinea-Bissau	1	1.0	1.0	6.0
Honduras	1	2.0	2.0	7.0
Hungary	27	0.6	2.7	10.0
India	35	2.5	2.1	8.6
Indonesia	17	3.0	3.4	7.6
Ireland	15	0.0	0.0	10.0

Israel	37	1.8	3.0	6.2
Italy	15	0.0	2.3	10.0
Jamaica	23	1.9	1.0	9.2
Japan	10	1.0	1.0	10.0
Kyrgyzstan	6	1.0	2.0	7.0
Latvia	23	0.3	0.6	8.0
Lebanon	7	2.0	3.0	6.0
Lesotho	21	2.0	2.0	7.9
Liberia	11	1.1	3.0	6.0
Lithuania	25	0.0	0.6	10.0
Malawi	18	1.0	2.0	6.0
Malaysia	6	2.0	3.0	6.0
Mauritius	11	1.0	3.0	10.0
Mexico	20	1.5	1.3	7.7
Mongolia	21	2.0	3.0	10.0
Namibia	14	0.0	2.0	6.0
Netherlands	14	1.0	1.0	10.0
Nigeria	2	4.0	3.0	7.0
Norway	15	0.5	0.3	10.0
Pakistan	18	2.1	1.0	7.3
Panama	28	1.0	1.6	8.8
Paraguay	25	1.0	1.0	7.7
Peru	16	1.0	2.2	9.0
Philippines	18	2.1	2.1	8.0
Poland	25	0.2	2.3	9.4
Portugal	15	0.0	0.0	10.0
Romania	19	0.2	1.4	8.6
Russia	7	1.0	1.0	6.0
Senegal	16	2.3	2.1	7.4
Sierra Leone	10	2.0	3.0	7.0
Slovakia	21	0.1	1.9	9.2
Slovenia	24	0.1	2.1	10.0
South Africa	23	1.7	2.1	8.8
South Korea	12	1.0	3.0	8.0
Spain	15	1.0	1.3	10.0
Sri Lanka	6	2.7	3.7	6.0
Sweden	15	1.0	1.0	10.0
Switzerland	7	0.3	1.0	10.0
Thailand	17	3.1	3.1	8.6
Trinidad and Tob	30	1.0	1.0	9.7
Tunisia	4	1.0	2.0	6.8
Turkey	28	2.6	2.7	7.6
Ukraine	20	1.0	1.3	6.5

United Kingdom	14	0.5	1.0	9.9
Uruguay	32	0.4	0.4	9.9
Venezuela	24	1.3	1.3	8.0
Zambia	12	1.7	2.3	6.6

Robustness Checks: U.S. Survey Analysis

To test the robustness of the findings in the main analysis, I conducted several further checks.

The results of the first set of these are summarized in Appendix Table 5 below. In model 1, I reran the estimation using a naïve version of the model which includes only the polarization and the partisan identity variables. In model 2, I reran the full model applying survey weights that I constructed using U.S. Census summary statistics. Specifically, I weighted the sample by respondent gender, race, ethnicity, region, education level and age. In models 3 and 4, I ran the analyses using dichotomous measures of the dependent variable and included anti-Republican and anti-Democrat measures of polarization separately. In model 5 I ran an ordinary least squares version of the main model. In models 6 and 7 I ran the analysis using the disaggregated, individual questions assessing respondent polarization – whether the respondent believes that Democrats/Republicans "love America more" and whether the respondent thinks Democrats/Republicans "are a threat to the nation's wellbeing" – as predictors of support for political violence. Finally, in model 8 I reran the analysis using a more comprehensive measure of support for political violence. Specifically, I constructed an additive index using five survey questions asking about subject support for political violence. This index combines subject responses to the question on which the main independent variable is built along with four other question that identify more specific forms and motivations of political violence.[1] This additive

[1] These four additional questions include: "Do you strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat agree or strongly agree with the following statements?:" "Citizens upset by government should never use violence to express their feelings" (original, reverse-coded); "When politicians are damaging the country, citizens should send threats to scare them straight" (derived from Kalmoe 2014); " The worst politicians should get a brick through the window to make them stop hurting the country." (derived from Kalmoe 2014); "Some of the problems citizens have with the government could be fixed with a few well-aimed bullets." (derived from Kalmoe 2014). Answers to these are combined into an additive index ranging between 5 and 25 ($\alpha = .8062$). Because this index includes so many potential values, I use an OLS technique to analyze it. Note, I also analyzed the effects of

index of subject support for violence helps to capture a wider range of violent behaviors, including threats and destruction of property.

The results of these robustness tests reproduce the main findings. Respondents who think that co-partisans love America more are more likely to support political violence. Respondents who think that partisan opponents are a threat to the US are also more likely to support political violence. These findings help to disaggregate the "ingroup love" and "outgroup hate" contributors to the relationship between polarization and support for political violence.

polarization on each of these individual components of the additive index. The results of these tests, along with a short discussion, is provided in the appendix.

Appendix Table 5. Robustness checks, U.S. Survey Results: Polarization and Support for Political Violence

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8] [3]
Anti-Republican Polarization	0.089***	0.084**	0.203**		0.053***			0.345***
	(0.025)	(0.029)	(0.073)		(0.015)			(0.053)
Anti-Democrat Polarization	0.103**	0.069*		0.291*	0.057**			0.132*
	(0.038)	(0.043)		(0.135)	(0.021)			(0.076)
Dems Love US More						0.079*		
						(0.046)		
Repubs. Love US More						0.290***		
						(0.044)		
Dems Threat to US							0.373***	
							(0.043)	
Repubs. Threat to US							0.186***	
							(0.045)	
Democrat	-0.292*	-0.094			-0.056	0.019	0.148	-0.458*
	(0.121)	(0.130)			(0.075)	(0.133)	(0.136)	(0.271)
Republican	-0.155	-0.075			-0.015	-0.365*	-0.310*	0.170
	(0.128)	(0.146)			(0.081)	(0.148)	(0.149)	(0.293)
Age		-0.015***	-0.040***	-0.009	-0.009***	-0.013***	-0.014***	-0.062***
		(0.003)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.007)
Gender (Male = 1)		0.272**	0.570*	0.182	0.140**	0.254**	0.259**	0.938***
		(0.095)	(0.258)	(0.328)	(0.052)	(0.096)	(0.096)	(0.190)
Household income		-0.004	0.032	0.002	-0.001	-0.004	-0.004	-0.037*
		(0.008)	(0.019)	(0.025)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.015)
Unemployed		-0.132	-0.278	-0.867	-0.101	-0.097	-0.181	-0.647*
		(0.144)	(0.399)	(0.783)	(0.082)	(0.146)	(0.147)	(0.296)
Education level		0.011	0.031	0.009	0.001	0.020	0.014	0.011
		(0.028)	(0.074)	(0.093)	(0.015)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.054)
Conservative ideology		0.129**	0.030	-0.104	0.065**	0.073*	0.077*	0.258***
		(0.042)	(0.076)	(0.121)	(0.020)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.073)
White, non-Hispanic		-0.580*	1.410	-1.725*	-0.330*	-0.545*	-0.635*	-1.898**
		(0.316)	(1.094)	(0.921)	(0.181)	(0.314)	(0.314)	(0.655)
Black, non-Hispanic		-0.421	1.801	-0.673	-0.221	-0.344	-0.425	-1.802*
		(0.347)	(1.118)	(1.154)	(0.196)	(0.341)	(0.342)	(0.709)
Asian, Pacific Islander		-0.330	1.486	-	-0.193	-0.370	-0.334	-1.139
		(0.340)	(1.064)		(0.197)	(0.344)	(0.343)	(0.715)
Native American		-0.709	1.573	-	-0.382	-0.598	-0.873*	-2.096*
		(0.589)	(1.007)		(0.269)	(0.503)	(0.504)	(0.974)
Hispanic, Latinx		-0.373	1.335	-1.998*	-0.241	-0.335	-0.422	-1.230*
		(0.321)	(1.041)	(1.074)	(0.185)	(0.322)	(0.322)	(0.669)
Christian		-0.035	-0.239	0.219	-0.049	-0.057	-0.057	-0.140

		(0.122)	(0.295)	(0.432)	(0.068)	(0.123)	(0.124)	(0.245)
Religiosity		-0.009	0.054	0.005	0.004	-0.013	-0.009	0.055*
		(0.016)	(0.037)	(0.051)	(0.008)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.030)
Politically engaged		0.259*	0.250	0.495	0.156**	0.302**	0.227*	0.533**
		(0.104)	(0.261)	(0.326)	(0.056)	(0.103)	(0.104)	(0.205)
Follows news		-0.046	0.026	0.204*	-0.020	-0.048	-0.032	-0.199**
		(0.033)	(0.087)	(0.115)	(0.017)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.062)
Obtains news from Cable		-0.028	0.194	0.178	0.014	-0.054	-0.037	0.019
		(0.161)	(0.426)	(0.432)	(0.082)	(0.157)	(0.157)	(0.297)
Obtains news from Soc. Media		-0.128	0.049	0.468	-0.043	-0.121	-0.113	-0.047
		(0.129)	(0.293)	(0.408)	(0.069)	(0.124)	(0.125)	(0.250)
Aggressive personality		0.129***	0.144***	0.220***	0.068***	0.130***	0.116***	0.262***
		(0.018)	(0.037)	(0.049)	(0.008)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.029)
South		-0.053	0.059	0.427	-0.021	-0.095	-0.097	-0.132
		(0.126)	(0.337)	(0.440)	(0.069)	(0.126)	(0.127)	(0.249)
West		0.200	0.409	0.574	0.149*	0.153	0.185	0.294
		(0.153)	(0.359)	(0.571)	(0.082)	(0.151)	(0.151)	(0.299)
Midwest		0.142	0.071	0.166	0.080	0.123	0.154	0.025
		(0.141)	(0.419)	(0.499)	(0.079)	(0.144)	(0.144)	(0.285)
Constant / Constant cut 1[1]	1.081***	1.512**	-6.417***	-5.885***	0.993***	1.540**	1.905***	8.198***
	(0.291)	(0.552)	(1.408)	(1.698)	(0.288)	(0.473)	(0.477)	(1.044)
Model	Naïve, Ordered Logit	Weighted, Ordered Logit	Logit[2]	Logit[2]	OLS	Ordered Logit	Ordered Logit	OLS
Obs	1,889	1,829	827	602	1,829	1,829	1,829	1,829
χ^2 / F	25.75***	7.06***	110.67***	47.39***	9.44***	249.71***	288.11***	19.84***
Pseudo r^2	0.0055		0.1851	0.1288	0.1157	0.0552	0.0637	0.2049

Notes:
*** $p \leq .000$ ** $p \leq .01$ * $p \leq .1$
[1] Only first constant cut is reported to conserve space in models 1-3, 5 and 6
[2] Dependent variable truncated to dichotomous measure coded 1 for respondents who strongly or somewhat agree that it is sometimes necessary to use violence to achieve your political goals.
[3] Dependent variable constructed as additive index based upon agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

- It is sometimes necessary to use violence to achieve your political goals (original).
- Citizens upset by government should never use violence to express their feelings. (original, reverse-coded)
- When politicians are damaging the country, citizens should send threats to scare them straight (derived from Kalmoe 2014).
- The worst politicians should get a brick through the window to make them stop hurting the country (derived from Kalmoe 2014).
- Some of the problems citizens have with the government could be fixed with a few well-aimed bullets (derived from Kalmoe 2014)

As a further check I also reran the analyses on the individual components of the aggregated dependent variable (in Appendix Table 5, model 8). Appendix Table 6 presents a summary of results for estimations of the effect of political polarization on the five individual questions that were used to construct the aggregated measure of support for political violence summarized in model 8 of Appendix Table 4. Note that Cronbach Alpha test results indicate that these five questions can be combined into an additive index ($\alpha = .8062$). However, for transparency sake, I also present disaggregated results.

All of the questions asked the subject to agree or disagree with a statement using a 5-point Likert Scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree; agree or strongly agree. Model 1 presents the results for the individual question used in the main analysis: "It is sometimes necessary to use violence to achieve political goals." As reported for the main analysis, subjects who exhibit both anti-democrat and anti-republican polarization are more agree with this statement. In model 2, subjects who exhibit anti-Republican polarization are more likely to agree with the statement "When politicians are damaging the country, citizens should send threats to scare them straight." However, anti-Democrat subjects were not more likely to agree with the statement. In model 3, subjects who exhibit anti-Republican polarization are more likely to agree that "The worst politicians should get a brick through the window to make them stop hurting the country," while subjects exhibiting anti-Democrat polarization do not. In model 4, both anti-Democrat and anti-Republican subjects are likely to agree that "Some of the problems citizens have with government could be fixed with a few well-aimed bullets," though the relationship is borderline for anti-Democrat subjects. Finally, in model 5, only subjects exhibiting anti-Democrat polarization are not likely to agree that, "Citizens upset by government should never use violence to express their feelings," suggesting that such subjects believe that

using violence when they are upset by the government is sometimes acceptable. (Note, in the aggregate measure, responses to this question were inverted).

- What these results show is that across all individual questions, some subjects exhibiting political polarization – aversion to rival partisans – endorsed political violence in some way. Both anti-Democrat and anti-Republican partisans endorsed political violence, though not for every question, even though the individual questions are statistically and conceptually closely related to one another. Future research may delve deeper to investigate why there is a partisan split for some of the individual questions.

Appendix Table 6. U.S. Survey Results: Specific Political Violence Questions

Survey question:	[1] Sometimes necessary to use violence to achieve political goals	[2] When politicians are damaging the country, citizens should send threats to scare them straight	[3] Worst politicians should get a brick through the window to make them stop hurting the country	[4] Some of the problems citizens have with government could be fixed with a few well-aimed bullets	[5] Citizens upset by government should never use violence to express their feelings
Anti-Republican Polarization	0.084**	0.145***	0.177***	0.218***	0.016
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.027)
Anti-Democrat Polarization	0.071*	-0.005	-0.002	0.069†	-0.063*
	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.044)	(0.039)
Democrat	-0.104	-0.274*	-0.209	-0.152	0.241*
	(0.133)	(0.130)	(0.136)	(0.147)	(0.134)
Republican	-0.072	0.080	-0.107	0.133	0.012
	(0.146)	(0.143)	(0.150)	(0.162)	(0.146)
Age	-0.015***	-0.018***	-0.029***	-0.035***	0.021***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Gender (Male = 1)	0.271**	0.288**	0.442***	0.394***	-0.434***
	(0.095)	(0.094)	(0.100)	(0.109)	(0.096)
Household income	-0.004	-0.017*	-0.014*	-0.028**	0.018*
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.008)
Unemployed	-0.138	-0.166	-0.178	-0.320*	0.123
	(0.146)	(0.142)	(0.150)	(0.163)	(0.146)
Education level	0.012	-0.011	0.001	0.001	-0.038
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.027)
Conservative ideology	0.126***	0.120**	0.125**	0.150***	-0.026
	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.036)
White, non-Hispanic	-0.615*	-0.731*	-0.412	-0.583*	0.751*
	(0.311)	(0.306)	(0.332)	(0.344)	(0.304)
Black, non-Hispanic	-0.448	-0.696*	-0.640*	-0.704*	0.488
	(0.338)	(0.332)	(0.357)	(0.372)	(0.330)
Asian, Pacific Islander	-0.350	-0.460	-0.104	-0.286	0.258
	(0.340)	(0.336)	(0.350)	(0.371)	(0.336)
Native American	-0.811	-0.320	-1.032*	-1.090*	0.477
	(0.503)	(0.468)	(0.535)	(0.557)	(0.468)
Hispanic, Latinx	-0.405	-0.378	-0.280	-0.366	0.421
	(0.318)	(0.314)	(0.335)	(0.350)	(0.312)
Christian	-0.044	0.016	-0.047	-0.102	0.013
	(0.123)	(0.121)	(0.127)	(0.137)	(0.122)
Religiosity	-0.006	0.016	0.040*	0.046**	0.014
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.015)
Politically engaged	0.264*	0.280**	0.086	0.101	-0.136
	(0.103)	(0.102)	(0.108)	(0.119)	(0.105)
Follows news	-0.045	-0.078*	-0.085**	-0.096**	0.113***
	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.034)	(0.031)
Obtains news from Cable	-0.040	0.093	-0.137	-0.282	0.052
	(0.156)	(0.155)	(0.174)	(0.199)	(0.161)
Obtains news from Social Media	-0.118	0.094	0.141	-0.085	0.113
	(0.124)	(0.120)	(0.124)	(0.133)	(0.120)
Aggressive personality	0.130***	0.104***	0.103***	0.110***	-0.060***

	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.015)
South	-0.055	-0.110	-0.071	-0.117	-0.093
	(0.126)	(0.124)	(0.131)	(0.143)	(0.126)
West	0.198	0.014	-0.010	-0.024	-0.133
	(0.150)	(0.147)	(0.156)	(0.169)	(0.151)
Midwest	0.141	-0.047	-0.070	-0.077	-0.095
	(0.143)	(0.142)	(0.153)	(0.167)	(0.145)
Constant / Constant cut 1[1]	1.521**	0.459	0.901*	1.579**	-2.159***
	(0.520)	(0.508)	(0.540)	(0.569)	(0.516)
Model	Ordered Logit	Ordered Logit	Ordered Logit	Ordered Logit	Ordered Logit
Obs	1,829	1,829	1,829	1,829	1,829
χ^2	214.12 ***	249.11***	334.04***	351.97	1,829
Pseudo r^2	0.0473	0.0529	0.0767	0.0936	0.0474

Notes:
*** $p \leq .000$ ** $p \leq .01$ * $p \leq .1$ † $p = .120$
[1] Only first constant cut is reported to conserve space in models 1, 2 and 3
[2] Dependent variable collapsed into dichotomous measure coded 1 for respondents who strongly or somewhat agree that it is sometimes necessary to use violence to achieve your political goals.

Robustness Checks: Cross National Analysis

Several checks are conducted to test the robustness of the findings of the second analysis. These are presented in Appendix Tables 7 and 8.

In model 1 of Appendix Table 7, the tests are rerun including a temporally lagged version of the dependent variable on the right-hand side of the equation. This helps to account for the lagged effects of previous spells of political violence in countries. In model 2, the analysis is rerun using a multilevel mixed effects model in which country cases are nested. This helps to account for country-specific effects or idiosyncrasies. It is possible that polarization, and its effect on political violence in democracies, is the product of extreme political parties that use divisive and hateful invective against their political enemies or demonized outgroups. To account for this potential confounder, the analysis is rerun in model 3 including a control variable for party use of hate speech. This variable is derived from the political parties hate speech ("v2smpolhate_ord") ordinal indicator from Varieties of Democracy (Coppedge et al. 2020). Legacies other forms of political violence such domestic terrorism might also make countries more prone to experiencing current political violence. Therefore an indicator of past domestic terrorism are included as a control in a robustness check in model 4. This variable is derived from the Global Terrorism Database and is coded 1 for any country-year observation in which domestic terrorism has occurred at any time in the past five years.[2]

In all of these tests, the main result is reproduced. Polarization is a significant, positive predictor of political violence.

[2] Data and codebook available from https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/.

In Appendix Table 8 the analysis is rerun using different measures of political violence as dependent variables. In model 1, the dependent variable is a dichotomous measure of civil war occurrence, using data from UCDP-PRIO.[3] In model 2, the dependent variable is a dichotomous measure coded 1 for the occurrence of any intrastate, societal, ethnic, or communal violence in the country. Data for this indicator were obtained from Major Episodes of Political Violence (MEPV).[4] Finally, in model 3, the dependent variable is a count of the number of casualties due to domestic terrorism in the country. Data for this variable are derived from the Global Terrorism Database (GTD)[5] respectively. The results of these robustness checks all reproduce the main findings of the analysis: politically polarized democracies experience more political violence.

[3] Coded 1 for any country-year observation in which a civil war occurred. Data and codebook available from: https://www.prio.org/data/4.
[4] Coded 1 for any country-year observation in which intrastate, societal, ethnic or communal violence occurred. Data and codebook available from: https://www.systemicpeace.org/inscrdata.html.
[5] Measured as a count of casualties – people wounded, killed or directly adversely affected – by domestic terrorist attacks. Data and codebook available from: https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/.

Appendix Table 7. Robustness Models, Cross-National Sample of Consolidated Democracies Results: Polarization and Political Violence

DV: Level of Political Violence (VDEM)	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
Polarization$_{n-1}$	0.191*	1.011***	0.696***	0.912***
	(0.096)	(0.146)	(0.079)	(0.063)
Polity 2 score$_{n-1}$	-0.071	-0.100	-0.024	-0.049
	(0.073)	(0.124)	(0.068)	(0.051)
Regime Age (Polity Durable score)$_{n-1}$	0.008	-0.008	0.015***	0.013***
	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Proportional election system$_{n-1}$	-0.438*	-0.681*	-0.468**	-0.320*
	(0.240)	(0.335)	(0.161)	(0.137)
Majoritarian election system$_{n-1}$	0.001	0.108	0.063	0.435**
	(0.280)	(0.311)	(0.194)	(0.162)
Ethno-linguistic fractionalization$_{n-1}$	-0.110	3.878*	0.284	0.240
	(0.385)	(1.902)	(0.330)	(0.264)
Gini$_{n-1}$	0.009	-0.040*	0.029***	0.019**
	(0.009)	(0.022)	(0.007)	(0.006)
Population (log)$_{n-1}$	0.229***	1.509***	0.551***	0.321***
	(0.055)	(0.282)	(0.043)	(0.040)
GDP per capita (log)$_{n-1}$	-0.314**	-1.112***	-0.917***	-0.806***
	(0.120)	(0.325)	(0.103)	(0.081)
Lagged Level of Pol. Violence	5.141***			
	(0.215)			
Hate Speech by Politicians			0.547***	
			(0.100)	
Domestic Terrorism, past 5 years				1.223***
				(0.129)
Constant / Constant Cut 1	3.141*	11.549*	2.409*	-0.611
	(1.737)	(5.394)	(1.412)	(1.157)
Obs.	1,436	1,439	1,064	1,439
Wald χ^2	627.46***	130.33***	608.80***	856.91***
Pseudo r^2	0.7279		0.2756	0.2569
Model	Ordered Logit with Lagged DV	Multilevel Mixed Effects Ordered Logit, Nested by Country	Ordered Logit, Control for Hate Speech	Ordered Logit, Control for past Domestic Terrorism

Notes:
*** $p \leq .000$ ** $p \leq .01$ * $p \leq .1$
Standard errors clustered by country and year
For models 1, 3-5 only the first constant cut reported to conserve space

Appendix Table 8. Other Forms of Political Violence, Cross-National Sample.

	[1] DV: Civil War (UCDP-PRIO)	[2] DV: Civil Conflict (MEPV)	[3] DV: Domestic Terrorism Casualties (GTD)
$Polarization_{n-1}$	0.269* (0.106)	0.352† (0.219)	0.300* (0.145)
Polity 2 $score_{n-1}$	-0.957*** (0.113)	-0.690*** (0.180)	-0.862*** (0.140)
Regime Age (Polity Durable $score)_{n-1}$	0.009* (0.004)	-0.003 (0.006)	-0.024** (0.008)
Proportional election $system_{n-1}$	0.689* (0.304)	-0.640 (0.414)	-0.028 (0.314)
Majoritarian election $system_{n-1}$	0.235 (0.344)	0.568 (0.457)	0.369 (0.376)
Ethno-linguistic $fractionalization_{n-1}$	-0.801 (0.569)	1.809* (0.763)	0.244 (0.633)
$Gini_{n-1}$	-0.016 (0.010)	0.032* (0.019)	0.019 (0.016)
Population $(log)_{n-1}$	0.956*** (0.071)	1.042*** (0.147)	1.277*** (0.097)
GDP per capita $(log)_{n-1}$	0.129 (0.132)	1.040*** (0.265)	0.322* (0.174)
Civil War, past 5 years	Omitted[1]	4.650*** (0.376)	2.875*** (0.400)
Constant / Constant Cut 1	-12.109*** (1.732)	-28.405*** (4.143)	-16.533*** (2.534)
Obs.	1,490	1,490	1,490
Wald χ^2	253.10***	268.33***	988.97***
Pseudo r^2	0.3499	0.6810	0.0805
Model	Logit	Logit	Negative Binomial

Notes:
*** $p \leq .000$ ** $p \leq .01$ * $p \leq .1$ † $p = .108$
[1] Civil war control is omitted because dependent variable is a measure of civil war.

Appendix Table 9. Endogeneity Tests, Cross-National Sample, GMM Estimations with Arrelano-Bond Estimators

	[1] Level of Political Violence (VDEM)
Polarization$_{n-1}$	0.398***
	(0.011)
Polity 2 score$_{n-1}$	-0.022***
	(0.005)
Regime Age (Polity Durable score)$_{n-1}$	0.005***
	(0.000)
Proportional election system$_{n-1}$	0.027
	(0.026)
Majoritarian election system$_{n-1}$	0.284***
	(0.029)
Ethno-linguistic fractionalization$_{n-1}$	0.146**
	(0.049)
Gini$_{n-1}$	0.012***
	(0.001)
Population (log)$_{n-1}$	0.222***
	(0.007)
GDP per capita (log)$_{n-1}$	-0.313***
	(0.014)
Constant	-0.920***
	(0.200)
Obs.	1439
Wald χ^2	8464.79***
Sargan Test χ^2	1015.93***
Difference χ^2	5687.57***

Notes:
*** $p \leq .000$ ** $p \leq .01$ * $p \leq .1$