Florida International University FIU Digital Commons

FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations

University Graduate School

3-18-2021

Political Misfit at Work: Examining the Effects of Political Affiliation Dissimilarity in Selection and Work Processes

Alexander Snihur Florida International University, asnih002@fiu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd

Part of the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons, Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons, Other Political Science Commons, and the Social Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Snihur, Alexander, "Political Misfit at Work: Examining the Effects of Political Affiliation Dissimilarity in Selection and Work Processes" (2021). *FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 4669. https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/4669

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the University Graduate School at FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcc@fiu.edu.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Miami, Florida

POLITICAL MISFIT AT WORK: EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF POLITICAL AFFILIATION DISSIMILARITY IN SELECTION AND WORK PROCESSES

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

PSYCHOLOGY

by

Alexander C. Snihur

To: Dean Michael R. Heithaus College of Arts, Sciences and Education

This dissertation, written by Alexander C. Snihur, and entitled Political Misfit at Work: Examining the Effects of Political Affiliation Dissimilarity in Selection and Work Processes, having been approved in respect to style and intellectual content, is referred to you for judgement.

We have read this dissertation and recommend that it be approved.

Valentina Bruk-Lee

Chockalingam Viswesvaran

Hock-Peng Sin

Asia Eaton, Major Professor

Date of Defense: March 18, 2021

The dissertation of Alexander C. Snihur is approved.

Dean Michael Heithaus College of Arts, Sciences and Education

Andrés G. Gil Vice President for Research and Economic Development and Dean of the University Graduate School

Florida International University, 2021

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my wonderful family and friends who have been instrumental in uplifting me, supporting me, and motivating me to be the absolute best version of myself. To my loving parents, William Snihur Jr. and May Cain Snihur, thank you for always believing in me and for giving me the opportunity to pursue my dreams. I would not be where I am today if I did not have your shoulders to stand upon. To my incredible twin sister, Ariel Snihur, thank you for always being honest with me and encouraging me, even when times were rough. To my warmhearted grandparents, both here and up above, thank you for your unconditional, unwavering love, guidance, and optimism over the years. To my compassionate girlfriend, Ayaka Terashi, thank you for your constant support, understanding, and positivity throughout this entire process. Lastly, to all of my friends who have always cheered me on, thank you for inspiring me to always do better.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to graciously acknowledge those who have helped me along my journey to successfully develop and complete my dissertation.

To my mentor, friend and Dissertation Chair, Dr. Asia Eaton, thank you for all of the time and resources you spent towards refining my dissertation with me. I truly appreciate all of your guidance, practicality, and wisdom throughout this entire process, and for always having my best interests in mind.

To my other mentor, friend and dissertation committee member, Dr. Valentina Bruk-Lee, thank you for developing my skills as a researcher/practitioner, enabling me to flourish throughout my doctorate education, and successfully complete my dissertation. I could not have gotten where I am today without your expertise and advocacy over the years.

To the other members of my Dissertation Committee, Dr. Chockalingam Viswesvaran and Dr. Hock-Peng Sin, I want to thank each of you for all of your outstanding support, guidance, and wonderful feedback throughout the entire process.

This dissertation is the culmination of the unwavering encouragement from my Dissertation Committee and I am extremely grateful and thankful for each of you. Now starts the beginning of my exciting professional career and the next beautiful chapter in my life!

iv

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

POLITICAL MISFIT AT WORK: EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF POLITICAL AFFILIATION DISSIMILARITY IN SELECTION AND WORK PROCESSES

by

Alexander C. Snihur

Florida International University, 2021

Miami, Florida

Professor Asia Eaton, Major Professor

Over the last two decades, political affiliation membership has become an increasingly divisive social identity in the United States. Many organizational researchers have pushed for more investigation into understanding the effects of this salient yet understudied identity in the workplace. The purpose of the current dissertation was to answer the call to action and examine the influence of political affiliation (Republican or Democrat) (dis)similarity on two discrete parts of the work process. Study one assessed how political affiliation (dis)similarity between a rater and a fictitious job applicant affected perceptions of applicant hireability through the potential mediators of applicant liking and applicant competence. Using Qualtrics Panel Service, a total sample of 270 working adult men successfully completed the online, between-subjects, experimental vignette resume study. The results of the study suggested that a (mis)match in political affiliation membership between job applicants and raters affects applicant liking, which subsequently affects hiring intentions for Republican raters. Implications for job applicants, hiring managers, organizations, and federal legislation are discussed.

Study two investigated the extent to which (dis)similar political affiliation membership between supervisor-subordinate dyads in the workplace relates to the relational outcomes of supervisor support and leader-member exchange (LMX), the attitudinal outcomes of job satisfaction and affective commitment, and the well-being outcome of perceived stress. Subordinate liking of one's supervisor was proposed as the mediator through which political affiliation (dis)similarity affected these outcomes. Using Qualtrics Panel Service, a total of 209 working adult men and women successfully completed the online cross-sectional survey. The results of the second study indicated that a (mis)match in political affiliation membership between a supervisor and a subordinate in the workplace significantly related to subordinate perceptions of supervisor support, LMX, job satisfaction, affective commitment, and stress, indirectly, through supervisor liking. Implications for employees, supervisors, organizations, and federal legislation are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PA	GE
I COLLECTED PAPERS INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Problem	1
The Problem Statement	1
Visible and Invisible Diversity Variables at Work	2 5
Political Affiliation	9
Social Identity Theory (SIT)	/ 8
Similarity-Attraction Paradigm (SAP)	9
The Political Affiliation Model (PAM)	10
Stereotype Content Model (SCM)	10
Purpose of Collected Papers	13
Description of Collected Papers	14
COLLECTED PAPER 1	14
COLLECTED PAPER 2	17
Implications of Collected Papers Research	17
References	20
References	20
II STUDY #1. POLITICAL AFFILIATION AND HIRING	26
Introduction	20
Methods	27
Results	30
Discussion	50
References	50 58
Annendix	63
Аррения	05
III STUDY #2: POLITICAL AFEILATION AND DVADS AT WORK	77
Introduction	,
Methods	70
Results	07 92
Discussion	100
References	106
Annendix	112
	.115
VITA	.127

I. COLLECTED PAPERS INTRODUCTION

This collected papers dissertation examines the impact of political affiliation dissimilarity between employees and raters/managers on two different parts of the work process: 1) discrimination against applicants during organizational selection and 2) employee's relational, attitudinal, and well-being at work once hired. The background to the problem, problem statement, supporting empirical research, purpose of each study, and implications of the collected papers dissertation are discussed below.

Background to the Problem

The old adage that workers should leave their personal lives at the door when going to work is unrealistic in this day and age. Research has shown that political discussions cutting across party lines are regularly occurring in the workplace, with a recent survey revealing that 67% of men and 46% of women engage in political conversations at work (Chaudhary, 2020; Mutz & Mondak, 2006; Swigart et al., 2020). With the advent of social media, people can be more public with their political opinions, and likewise are being exposed to more political news articles, videos, and advertisements than ever before (Iyengar et al., 2012; Johnson & Roberto, 2018).

This persistent exposure of the American public to negative political campaigning has a positive and significant correlation with Republicans and Democrats disliking constituents of the opposite political party (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015). Partisan division is substantial in the current political climate, and nationally representative polls find that partisans views of the opposing political party "…are now more *negative* than at any other point in nearly a quarter of a century" (Pew, 2016). While partisan identification has become extremely integral to one's self-identity and group membership

compared to twenty-five years ago, surprisingly, research on political affiliation at work is sparse within the field of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Corrington et al., 2020; Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Roth et al., 2017; Swigart et al., 2020). This prompts the question: How exactly does political affiliation, and political affiliation dissimilarity in particular, influence personnel decisions and workplace functioning?

The Problem Statement

It is clear that the political climate in the United States has become increasingly hostile and polarized over the last two decades (Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Krupenkin, 2018; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Pew, 2016, 2017; Swigart et al., 2020). Recent evidence shows that Democrats and Republicans have more drastic differences in ideology when asked about different political content areas (i.e., climate, immigration, racial attitudes), than several other social groups (Caucasian vs. African American, college grad vs. non-college grad) (Pew, 2019b). These findings complement a nationally representative 2016 Pew Research study where strong evidence for overt animosity between members of the two major U.S. political parties was found. Democratic respondents thought Republicans were more "close-minded," "dishonest," "immoral," and "unintelligent" compared with other Americans. Conversely, Republican respondents thought Democrats were more "close-minded," "lazy," and "dishonest" compared to other Americans (Pew, 2016).

While negative perceptions about members of the opposite political party appear to be growing in the United States (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Pew, 2017), the absence of researchers examining the effect of this social identity on work processes, such as

personnel selection and organizational dynamics, is concerning. Only a handful of studies have assessed the influence of political affiliation identification in personnel decisions, and these scant studies have found troubling results: a mismatch in political party affiliation between job applicants and hiring managers/raters can lead to lower liking of applicants, expectations for their job performance, and ultimately a lesser chance of being hired (Gift & Gift, 2015; Roth et al., 2019; Wade & Roth, 2015). In addition, Inbar and Lammers (2012) found that more than one-third of psychologists who identified as a Democrat would *openly* discriminate against Republican colleagues when making a hiring decision, and one-sixth reported they would discriminate against their colleagues when reviewing their work.

In regard to personal outcomes and organizational attitudes in the workplace, political identity dissimilarity with one's coworkers can lead to political-identity based incivility at work, with the targets of this aggression reporting lower levels of job satisfaction, and increased levels of turnover intentions and burnout (He et al., 2019). In that study, participants answered questions about how often they were the targets of uncivil behaviors from coworkers of the opposing political party. He et al. (2019) found that opposing party members would put the participants down, be condescending, or make insulting and disrespectful remarks towards them. This study demonstrated that political-identity based incivility acted as a mediator between co-worker political identity dissimilarity, and negative workplace consequences.

Therefore, a mismatch of political affiliation membership seems to foster hostile and uncivil interactions between employees at work, reflecting spill-over from the broader political climate in the U.S. to the workplace. Beck and Shen (2018) confirm that

larger societal political events outside of work can influence work-related outcomes. Specifically, they found that individuals who voted for the losing candidate in the 2016 U.S. presidential election had significant detriments in their levels of job engagement and job performance in the days following the election.

Based on the limited research to date, it appears that both macro level political events and partisanship on an individual level can influence workplace dynamics and organizational outcomes. Investigation concerning exactly how political affiliation dissimilarity can affect work processes is warranted, and multiple requests for more empirical research on this timely, impactful, topic have been made (Corrington et al., 2020; Gift & Gift, 2015; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019; Swigart et al., 2020). This work is especially needed in light of the paucity of laws that protect individuals who are harassed at work or are discriminated against for employment decisions based on their political affiliation. For example, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex and national origin (E.E.O.C., 2019). However, currently there is no federal law under which the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has the authority to prevent any such political affiliation discrimination from occurring in the workplace (E.E.O.C., 2019).

Given the failure of I-O researchers, and U.S. laws and policies, in addressing issues of political affiliation adversity at work, the objective of this collected papers dissertation is two-fold. First, we will examine how a political affiliation membership mismatch may lead to detrimental applicant outcomes during the organizational selection process. Second, we will assess how political affiliation dissimilarity between employees

and managers at work affects personal functioning, relational functioning, and well-being at work after an employee is hired. This research is expected to substantiate the need for federal laws and organizational policies that will inhibit adverse workplace interactions, outcomes, and hiring practices, that stem from political affiliation differences.

Visible and Invisible Diversity Variables at Work

The makeup of the United States population has rapidly changed over the last 20 years, becoming more diverse in terms of age, gender, and race, with the "post-millennial" generation on track to be the most ethnically-diverse generation to date (Barak, 2016; Pew, 2018, 2019a). Due to these globalization trends, organizations are utilizing more diverse, cross-functional teams to address complex and challenging issues (Dijk et al., 2012). Public sentiment regarding diversity seems to have followed suit, with more than half of Americans believing that racial and ethnic diversity is "very good" for the country, and 75% of Americans believing that it is "very or somewhat important" for companies and organizations to promote racial and ethnic diversity in the workplace (Pew, 2019a). As a result, companies are now more than ever grappling with how to compose and accommodate a workforce that is representative of this change in demographics (Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Pew, 2019a).

In line with these population trends and public sentiment, over half of U.S. companies with more than 100 employees have implemented some sort of diversity and inclusion program, with 75% of the largest firms in the U.S. spending an estimated \$10 billion annually on these initiatives (Hays-Thomas & Bendick, 2013). It is clear that organizations are placing a priority on having a "diverse" workforce. Typically, diversity is conceptualized as relating to differences between individuals on some attribute or

characteristic, that may lead to the perception that another person is different from oneself (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). This definition can apply to almost any personal characteristic, but traditionally since the 1980's, diversity has been defined in terms of overt, visible, surface level, demographic identity variables such as age, gender, and race, which can be reasonably discerned after a brief interaction (Bell, 2007; Bell et al., 2011; Hays-Thomas & Bendick, 2013; Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007; Stahl et al., 2010; Summers et al., 2018; Webber & Donahue, 2001).

However, there have been calls to action for researchers to investigate the nature and effects of more covert, and concealable, deep level demographic identity variables in the workplace (Bell, 2007; Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007; Nkomo et al., 2019). These deep level demographic identity variables refer to enduring psychological characteristics such as beliefs, values, and attitudes, which researchers believe exert greater influence on organizational outcomes, than surface level demographic identity variables (Harrison et al., 2002; Hollenbeck et al., 2004). Examples from prior research include individuals' sexual orientation, class, religion, and political affiliation (Drydakis, 2009; Kallschmidt & Eaton, 2018; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019; Summers et al., 2018).

While these variables may not be as obvious as visible identity variables, it is important to note that much empirical research has found that just by looking at another person's picture or face, or hearing their voice, individuals can categorize each other by their concealable identities at rates better than chance (Tskhay & Rule, 2013). Some of the concealable identity comparisons that were tested included, Jewish vs. non-Jewish, Gay vs. Straight, Republican vs. Democrat, and rich vs. poor (Bjornsdottir & Rule, 2017; Rice & Mullen, 2003; Rule & Ambady, 2010; Tskhay & Rule, 2013). These studies

demonstrate that concealed social identities and memberships can be detected from even the most minimal of cues.

In terms of the influence of sexual orientation in workplace selection, evidence shows that individuals tend to rate gay male and lesbian applicants less positively than heterosexual male applicants, and that gay males receive less callbacks for jobs than heterosexual males using otherwise identical resumes (Drydakis, 2009; Horvath & Ryan, 2003). Further, two independent studies found that participants rated gay and straight men as being more suited for professions that were aligned with stereotypes about their groups (e.g., nurses vs. managers) (Barrantes & Eaton, 2018; Rule et al., 2016). Studies investigating religious beliefs in work contexts found that this invisible demographic identity variable can cause disparate treatment in personnel selection, precipitate harassment, and lead to implicit and explicit discrimination in the workplace (Ghumman et al., 2013; King & Ahmad, 2010; Thyer & Myers, 2009). While there has been some investigation into how concealable social identities, such as one's sexual orientation and religion, can influence workplace outcomes, there has been minimal exploration surrounding how political affiliation membership as a social identity variable may do the same (He et al., 2019; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Roth et al., 2017; Summers et al., 2018).

Political Affiliation

Political affiliation has recently been noted as a largely overlooked social identity within the organizational and management literatures (Corrington et al., 2020; Gift & Gift, 2015; Iyengar et al., 2012; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019; Swigart et al., 2020). Political affiliation is a meaningful and salient identity that

can be readily used to categorize others (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Pew, 2016, 2019b; Roth et al., 2019; Wade & Roth, 2015). Researchers ague that political party affiliation is a relatively enduring, deep level social identity variable that ought to affect work attitudes and behaviors to a larger extent than surface level demographic characteristics (Roth et al., 2019; Roth et al., 2017; Swigart et al., 2020). For example, Iyengar and Westwood (2015) found that individuals from opposing political parties discriminate against each other to a greater extent than individuals from different ethnicities. One reason political affiliation identity may be such a strong basis for categorization and discrimination is that individuals choose their political party affiliation, unlike their gender or race. Compared to surface level identity variables, this may increase the likelihood that partisans are held accountable for their political affiliation and its social consequences (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015).

Social Identity Theory (SIT)

While little work in I-O psychology and management has examined political affiliation as a social identity at work, decades of research supports the general principle that individuals' social identities, and their perceptions of others social identities, powerfully affect their attitudes, cognitions, and behaviors (Hogg & Turner, 1985; Tajfel, 1982). A social identity is a person's knowledge that he or she is a part of a social category or group (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Tajfel, 1982). According to the metatheory of Social Identity Theory (SIT) people have strong tendencies to categorize themselves and others according to social identities, and assume that members of a particular social group (i.e., male/female, Democrat/Republican) are "like" others in the group, and see things from the same perspective (Stets & Burke, 2000). As a result, individuals categorized as

being in one's "in-group" are viewed more favorably, in contrast to "out-group" members who are viewed as different from oneself, and subsequently perceived in a more negative light (Iyengar et al., 2012; Roth et al., 2019; Stets & Burke, 2000; Tajfel, 1982). While in the past SIT has typically been coupled with the examination of salient demographic identities such as gender, race, and ethnicity (Colella et al., 2017), there has been a shift in recent years in applying SIT to the more covert, concealable identity of political affiliation (Gift & Gift, 2015; Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019).

Similarity-Attraction Paradigm (SAP)

The Similarity-Attraction Paradigm (SAP), which is commonly tested within the SIT framework, serves as another foundation for the present work (Avery et al., 2008; Lindsey et al., 2017; Riordan, 2000; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019; Schaffer & Riordan, 2013; Wade & Roth, 2015). The main tenant of this theory is that individuals who are similar to one another will display high levels of interpersonal attraction and liking towards one another (Byrne, 1971, 1997). This is due to the inherent assumption that individuals who are similar based on social identity categorizations have similar beliefs and values, life experiences, and even perceive the world in a similar way.

These assumptions of similarity usually result in desirable, easy, and positive interactions and outcomes among these individuals (Byrne, 1971; Roth et al., 2019). For example, research has shown that employees and supervisors who perceived themselves as similar in regard to race and gender felt enhanced and pleasant feelings of support, trust, and inclusion during interactions (Foley et al., 2006; Jeanquart-Barone, 1993; Pelled et al., 1999). This is in stark contrast to employees who perceived themselves as

being dissimilar with their supervisor, which evoked trying and unpleasant interactions such as relationship conflicts and incivility (He et al., 2019; Jehn et al., 1999; Miller et al., 2019; Tepper et al., 2011). Therefore, perceived dissimilarity can lead to detriments in interpersonal attraction and liking at work.

Cunningham (2007) found that dissimilarity can be related to additional negative workplace outcomes. Using a cross-sectional survey, Cunningham (2007) found evidence that perceived demographic differences were positively associated with perceived deeplevel dissimilarity (i.e., differences in personality, values, and attitudes). Subsequently, perceived deep-level dissimilarity was positively associated with organizational turnover intentions, and negatively related to coworker satisfaction. Taken together, SAP, as tested within a SIT framework, serves as a parsimonious theory with clear predictions for how political affiliation similarity and dissimilarity between individuals should relate to relational, attitudinal, well-being, and hireability at work.

The Political Affiliation Model (PAM)

Roth et al. (2017) were the first to develop a model attempting to describe the implications of political affiliation similarity on employment decisions, specifically, based on SAP. In their Political Affiliation Model (PAM), they hypothesized a serial mediation in which political affiliation similarity, would lead to perceived overall similarity between individuals, then liking, and ultimately personnel outcomes, such as hiring and promotions, and individual outcomes, such as attitudes, applicant attraction, and contextual performance. Roth and colleagues (2019) were the first to test parts of the PAM model. The authors utilized an experimental design across two studies, manipulating political party affiliation on a fictitious applicant's social media page. They

next asked participants to rate applicants based on expected levels of task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), which were used as indicators of hireability. The researchers found in both studies that applicant liking was positively and significantly related to both hireability indicators.

However, Study 1 did not find that political affiliation similarity predicted overall perceived similarity, bringing into question whether serial mediation using overall perceived similarity was necessary. Indeed, research in relational demography directly correlates demographic similarity (i.e., gender, race, age) between individuals with the proposed outcomes, through one mediator (such as liking), thereby skipping overall similarity as an intermediate step in the process (Bakar & McCann, 2014; Schaffer & Riordan, 2013). One of the limited studies that examined political affiliation membership at work also used political affiliation dissimilarity as a direct antecedent to the mediator of political incivility, which was subsequently used to predict turnover, burnout, and job satisfaction (He et al., 2019).

Stereotype Content Model (SCM)

The Stereotype Content Model (SCM) is another theory utilized to understand how social perceptions of others are created, and how these perceptions may affect selection, interpersonal, and well-being outcomes at work and beyond (Fiske, 2018). The basic premise of the SCM is that there are two main dimensions individuals use to judge, assess, and perceive others: warmth and competence (Cuddy et al., 2008; Fiske, 2018). The SCM states that individuals first want to know other's intent towards them (i.e., whether they are a friend or foe), which is measured by perceptions of warmth (Fiske, 2018). The dimension of warmth is extremely similar to the notion of liking in both SAP

and PAM, and liking is included in the measurement operationalization for warmth (Fiske, 2018).

The SCM posits that those who are viewed as having high levels of warmth will elicit active facilitation (i.e., help and support) from others since they are perceived as friends, whereas those seen as lacking warmth elicit active harm (i.e., negative interactions, contempt, envy) from others as they are viewed as foes (Cuddy et al., 2008; Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske, 2018). This aligns with the in-group, out-group logic stipulated in both the SIT and SAP (Byrne, 1971, 1997; Stets & Burke, 2000; Tajfel, 1982). As noted, the dimension of warmth in the SCM is very similar to the mediator of liking in the aforementioned theories (i.e., SAP and PAM). For the sake of parsimony, the current studies will utilize liking (in lieu of warmth from SCM) as a mediator between interpersonal political affiliation dissimilarity, and relevant personal and organizational outcomes.

According to the SCM, competence (i.e., capability) is the second major dimension individuals utilize to perceive and judge others. Competence reflects whether others can actually pursue their intentions (Cuddy et al., 2007, 2008; Fiske, 2018). Items related to the competence dimension typically asks about whether individuals or groups are viewed as competent, intelligent, skilled, and efficient (Fiske, 2018). Individuals that are perceived highly in both likability and competence dimensions are the targets for pride and admiration from others, while people perceived as low in both dimensions, receive feelings of disgust and contempt from others (Cuddy et al., 2008). Research by Eaton et al. (2019) demonstrates that SCM has implications for organizational research. They found that that gender and race stereotypes influence dimensions of job applicant

likeability and competence, which subsequently affect the hireability of the job candidates. It is likely in the current political climate that members of the opposite political party may view the other as lacking both likeability and competence dimensions. Therefore, it follows that competence may also be utilized as a potential mediator between interpersonal political affiliation dissimilarity, and relevant organizational outcomes.

This collected papers dissertation will attempt to build off of the work Roth et al. (2017) and Roth et al. (2019) by simplifying their proposed model, and at same time investigating the effects of political affiliation identity on novel (i.e., not yet investigated) perceptions of hireability during organizational selection, and relational, attitudinal, and personal health consequences for workers in different parts of the work process. Political affiliation identity is an important and emerging frontier for SAP, PAM, and SCM research, which desperately needs more attention given: 1) the scarcity of empirical papers to date investigating this social identity variable; 2) the current intense political climate and partisan division in the United States; and 3) the implications this research has for organizational policies and federal law (Corrington et al., 2020; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Pew, 2016, 2017, 2019b; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019; Swigart et al., 2020).

Purpose of Collected Papers

The purpose of the collected papers is to address a call to action by Industrial and Organizational psychologists to examine the influence of political affiliation dissimilarity on two distinct parts of the work processes. Study one will assess how political affiliation dissimilarity between a rater and fictitious job applicant affects hireability outcomes

during employee selection. Study 2 will assess how political affiliation dissimilarity between a supervisor and subordinate impacts novel relational, attitudinal, and well-being outcomes. This collection of papers will examine the means by which political affiliation may influence important organizational and hireability outcomes. Our hope is that more researchers will be prompted to examine this social identity categorization, while companies and legislatures will take heed of implications for policy changes that stem from this research.

Description of Collected Papers

This dissertation will involve two distinct studies, resulting in two collected papers, centered around how political affiliation dissimilarity relates to different parts of the work process. This collected papers takes a comprehensive approach in investigating exactly how political affiliation may influence important hireability outcomes in personnel selection, and novel employee relational, attitudinal, and well-being outcomes at work.

COLLECTED PAPER 1

Purpose and Hypotheses

The purpose of the first collected paper is to investigate *if* and *how* dissimilarity in political affiliation between a rater/hiring manager and fictitious job applicant affects hireability outcomes during the organizational selection process. The mediators of applicant liking and competence will be tested as casual mechanisms through which political affiliation dissimilarity affects applicant hireability. Based on the theories of SAP, PAM, and SCM, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1a-b: Participant and job applicant political affiliation will interact to predict applicant liking and perceived competence, such that increased political affiliation similarity between participants and job applicants will relate to increased a) applicant liking and b) perceived applicant competence *Hypothesis 2a-b:* The interaction between the participant's and job applicant's political affiliation on the outcome of hiring intentions will be mediated by a) applicant liking and b) perceived applicant competence, such that increased political affiliation similarity will relate to increased hireability ratings



Figure 1. Conceptual Diagram of Hypothesized Model for Study 1

Methods

This study used a between-subjects experimental vignette resume design. All participants were provided with background context and information explaining that they will be assuming the role of a hiring manager and evaluating a job applicant for a particular position within a fictitious company. All participants were given the same information, so they had the same frame of reference (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014). Participants were then asked to examine a resume that belonged to the fictitious job applicant. The job applicant's political affiliation was the IV for the study, which consisted of three levels (Democrat, Republican, and Control), and participants were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions. All three resumes were identical in every way to ensure that the fictitious candidates were equally qualified (i.e., job applicant name, gender, education, GPA, work experience, etc.) and to ensure there were no confounds. The only difference between the conditions was the political affiliation of the job applicant, implied through their leadership role in a political organization as stated in the resume. After examining the resume, the participants then answered questions about the job applicant's hireability. A manipulation check was used to ensure that the participants noticed the political affiliation of the job applicant.

Publication Submission and Formatting

The journal for this manuscript has yet to be decided. This manuscript follows APA format (7th edition).

COLLECTED PAPER 2

Purpose

The purpose of the second collected paper was examine how political affiliation dissimilarity between a supervisor and subordinate in the workplace affects novel employee relational (supervisor support and LMX), attitudinal (job satisfaction and affective commitment) and well-being (perceived stress) outcomes at work. The mediator of supervisor liking was tested as the primary mechanism through which political affiliation dissimilarity affects these outcomes. This study elucidates *why* and *how* political affiliation dissimilarity in the workplace may influence organizational outcomes that have yet to be investigated in this context.

Hypothesis 1: Supervisor and subordinate political affiliation membership will interact to predict supervisor liking, such that increased political affiliation similarity between supervisors and their subordinates will relate to increased supervisor liking

Hypothesis 2a-b: Supervisor liking will be positively related to the relational outcomes of a) supervisor support, and b) LMX

Hypothesis 3a-b: Supervisor liking will be positively related to the attitudinal outcomes of a) job satisfaction, and b) affective commitment

Hypothesis 4: Supervisor liking will be negatively related to the personal health outcome of perceived stress

Hypothesis 5: The effects of the political affiliation dissimilarly between the subordinate and the supervisor on all of the outcomes (relational, attitudinal, and personal) will be mediated by liking of the supervisor



Figure 2. Conceptual Diagram of Hypothesized Model for Study 2

Methods

This study utilized a cross-sectional survey design. Participants completed a 15minute survey asking them to think about their workplace and to answer questions regarding their job satisfaction, perceptions of supervisor support and competence, leader member exchange, affective commitment, their perceived stress, political affiliation, their perceived supervisor's political affiliation, and how much they like their supervisor. They were then asked relevant demographic questions (i.e., age, gender, race, education, organizational tenure, tenure with supervisor, frequency of interactions with supervisor, supervisor gender, supervisor race). Attention checks were distributed throughout the survey to ensure the integrity of the collected responses.

Publication Submission and Formatting

The journal for this manuscript has yet to be decided. This manuscript follows APA format (7th edition).

Implications of Collected Papers Research

This collected papers dissertation answer calls to action for more empirical research about political affiliation membership and its effect on organizational processes, and it will address several gaps in the Industrial and Organizational Psychology and Management literatures. Specifically, these studies elucidate exactly how political affiliation membership may affect selection outcomes during organizational hiring, as well as relational, attitudinal, and well-being outcomes at work. The findings from these studies may have implications for the E.E.O.C., and U.S. federal law regarding workplace discrimination laws and protections that ought to be enacted. Further, this research may demonstrate that organizations may need to do more in order to keep and foster positive and developmental work environments for all employees, regardless of political beliefs. The findings from this research may indicate that organizations may need to train recruiters, hiring managers, and supervisors, to avoid making selection and performance decisions based on job-irrelevant demographic information. Given the current hostile and polarizing political climate in the U.S., this dissertation will provide timely meaningful and practical implications for researchers, HR practitioners, and the government.

References

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1988). Comments on the motivational status of self-esteem in social identity and intergroup discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18(4), 317–334.
- Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best practice recommendations for designing and implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(4), 351–371.
- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2008). What are the odds? How demographic similarity affects the prevalence of perceived employment discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 235–249.
- Bakar, H. A., & McCann, R. M. (2014). Matters of demographic similarity and dissimilarity in supervisor–subordinate relationships and workplace attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 41, 1–16.
- Barak, M. E. M. (2016). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Barrantes, R., & Eaton, A. A. (2018). Sexual orientation and leadership suitability: How being a gay man affects perceptions of fit in gender-stereotyped positions. *Sex Roles*, 79, 549–564.
- Beck, J. W., & Shen, W. (2019). The effects of US presidential elections on work engagement and job performance. *Applied Psychology*, 68(3), 547–576.
- Bell, S. T. (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 595–615.
- Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., Lukasik, M. A., Belau, L., & Briggs, A. L. (2011). Getting specific about demographic diversity variable and team performance relationships: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 37(3), 709–743.
- Bjornsdottir, R. T., & Rule, N. O. (2017). The visibility of social class from facial cues. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(4), 530–546.
- Byrne, D. E. (1971). The attraction paradigm. New York, NY: AcademicPress.
- Byrne, D. (1997). An overview (and underview) of research and theory within the attraction paradigm. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14(3), 417–431.
- Chaudhary, M., (March 4, 2020). More than half of your employees are talking politics at work. *HR Technologist*. Retrieved from

https://www.hrtechnologist.com/news/culture/more-than-half-of-your-employees-are-talking-politics-at-work-surveys-reflective/

- Colella, A., Hebl, M., & King, E. (2017). One hundred years of discrimination research in the Journal of Applied Psychology: A sobering synopsis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 500–513.
- Corrington, A., Hebl, M., Stewart, D., Madera, J., Ng, L., & Williams, J. (2020). Diversity and inclusion of understudied populations: A call to practitioners and researchers. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 72(4), 303– 323.
- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS map: behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(4), 631–648.
- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 61–149.
- Cunningham, G. B. (2007). Perceptions as reality: The influence of actual and perceived demographic dissimilarity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(1), 79–89.
- Dijk, H., Van Engen, M. L., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2012). Defying conventional wisdom: A meta-analytical examination of the differences between demographic and job-related diversity relationships with performance. *Organizational Behavior* and Human Decision Processes, 119(1), 38–53.
- Drydakis, N. (2009). Sexual orientation discrimination in the labour market. *Labour Economics*, 16(4), 364-372.
- Eaton, A. A., Saunders, J. F., Jacobson, R. K., & West, K. (2019). How gender and race stereotypes impact the advancement of scholars in STEM: Professors' biased evaluations of physics and biology post-doctoral candidates. *Sex Roles*, *82*, 127–141.
- Fiske, S. T. (2018). Stereotype content: Warmth and competence endure. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(2), 67–73.
- Foley, S., Linnehan, F., Greenhaus, J. H., & Weer, C. H. (2006). The impact of gender similarity, racial similarity, and work culture on family-supportive supervision. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(4), 420–441.
- Gift, K., & Gift, T. (2015). Does politics influence hiring? Evidence from a randomized experiment. *Political Behavior*, *37*(3), 653–675.

- Ghumman, S., Ryan, A. M., Barclay, L. A., & Markel, K. S. (2013). Religious discrimination in the workplace: A review and examination of current and future trends. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28(4), 439–454.
- Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., Gavin, J. H., & Florey, A. T. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface-and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(5), 1029–1045.
- Hays-Thomas, R., & Bendick, M. (2013). Professionalizing diversity and inclusion practice: Should voluntary standards be the chicken or the egg? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 6(3), 193–205.
- He, Y., Costa, P. L., Walker, J. M., Miner, K. N., & Wooderson, R. L. (2019). Political identity dissimilarity, workplace incivility, and declines in well-being: A prospective investigation. *Stress and Health*, 35(3), 256–266.
- Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1985). Interpersonal attraction, social identification and psychological group formation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(1), 51–66.
- Hollenbeck, J. R., DeRue, D. S., & Guzzo, R. (2004). Bridging the gap between I/O research and HR practice: Improving team composition, team training, and team task design. *Human Resource Management*, *43*, 353–366.
- Horvath, M., & Ryan, A. M. (2003). Antecedents and potential moderators of the relationship between attitudes and hiring discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. *Sex Roles*, 48(3-4), 115–130.
- Horwitz, S. K., & Horwitz, I. B. (2007). The effects of team diversity on team outcomes: A meta-analytic review of team demography. *Journal of Management*, 33(6), 987–1015.
- Inbar, Y., & Lammers, J. (2012). Political diversity in social and personality psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(5), 496–503.
- Iyengar, S., & Krupenkin, M. (2018). Partisanship as Social Identity; Implications for the Study of Party Polarization, *The Forum*, *16*(1), 23-45.
- 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., Sood, G., & Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology a social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *76*(3), 405–431.

- Jeanquart-Barone, S. (1993). Trust differences between supervisors and subordinates: Examining the role of race and gender. *Sex roles, 29*(1-2), 1–11.
- Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(4), 741–763.
- Johnson, A. F., & Roberto, K. J. (2018). Right versus left: How does political ideology affect the workplace?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(8), 1040–1043.
- Kallschmidt, A. M., & Eaton, A. A. (2019). Are lower social class origins stigmatized at work? A qualitative study of social class concealment and disclosure among White men employees who experienced upward mobility. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 113, 115–128.
- King, E. B., & Ahmad, A. S. (2010). An experimental field study of interpersonal discrimination toward Muslim job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(4), 881– 906.
- Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work group diversity. Annual Review of Psychology, 58, 515–541.
- Lindsey, A. P., Avery, D. R., Dawson, J. F., & King, E. B. (2017). Investigating why and for whom management ethnic representativeness influences interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(11), 1545– 1563.
- Miller, C., Richard, O. and Ford, Jr, D. (2019). Ethno-racial similarity, relationship conflict and trust in supervisor-subordinate dyads. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 30 (2), 246–269.
- Mutz, D. C., & Mondak, J. J. (2006). The workplace as a context for cross-cutting political discourse. *The Journal of Politics*, 68(1), 140–155.
- Nkomo, S. M., Bell, M. P., Roberts, L. M., Joshi, A., & Thatcher, S. M. (2019). Diversity at a critical juncture: New theories for a complex phenomenon. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*(3), 498-517.
- Pelled, L. H., Ledford, G. E., & Mohrman, S. A. (1999). Demographic dissimilarity and workplace inclusion. *Journal of Management Studies*, *36*(7), 1013–1031.
- Pew Research Center. (2016). *Partisanship and political animosity in 2016*. Retrieved from https://www.people-press.org/2016/06/22/partisanship-and-political-animosity-in-2016/

- Pew Research Center. (2017). *The partisan divide on political values grows even wider*. Retrieved from https://www.people-press.org/2017/10/05/the-partisan-divide-on-political-values-grows-even-wider/
- Pew Research Center. (2018). Early benchmark show 'post-millenials' on track to be most diverse, best-educated generation yet. Retrieved from https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/11/15/early-benchmarks-show-postmillennials-on-track-to-be-most-diverse-best-educated-generation-yet/
- Pew Research Center. (2019a). Americans see advantages and challenges in country's growing racial and ethnic diversity. Retrieved from https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2019/05/08/americans-see-advantages-and-challenges-in-countrys-growing-racial-and-ethnic-diversity/
- Pew Research Center. (2019b). In a politically polarized era, sharp divides in both partisan coalitions. Retrieved from https://www.people-press.org/2019/12/17/in-a-politically-polarized-era-sharp-divides-in-both-partisan-coalitions/
- Rice, D. R., & Mullen, B. (2003). Isaac, Ishmael, and Janus: Past and future lessons regarding the ethnic categorization of faces. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 17, 1129–1147.
- Riordan, C. (2000). Relational demography within groups: Past developments, contradictions, and new directions. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 19, 131–173.
- Roth, P. L., Goldberg, C. B., & Thatcher, J. B. (2017). The role of political affiliation in employment decisions: A model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(9), 1286–1304.
- Roth, P. L., Thatcher, J. B., Bobko, P., Matthews, K. D., Ellingson, J. E., & Goldberg, C. B. (2019). Political affiliation and employment screening decisions: The role of similarity and identification processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/apl0000422
- Rule, N. O., & Ambady, N. (2010). Democrats and Republicans can be differentiated from their faces. *PLoS ONE*, *5*(1), e8733.
- Rule, N. O., Bjornsdottir, R. T., Tskhay, K. O., & Ambady, N. (2016). Subtle perceptions of male sexual orientation influence occupational opportunities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(12), 1687–1704.
- Schaffer, B. S., & Riordan, C. M. (2013). Relational demography in supervisorsubordinate dyads: An examination of discrimination and exclusionary treatment. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 30(1), 3–17.

- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*(3), 224–237.
- Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(4), 690–709.
- Summers, J. K., Howe, M., McElroy, J. C., Ronald Buckley, M., Pahng, P., & Cortes-Mejia, S. (2018). A typology of stigma within organizations: Access and treatment effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(7), 853–868.
- Swigart, K. L., Anantharaman, A., Williamson, J. A., & Grandey, A. A. (2020). Working While Liberal/Conservative: A Review of Political Ideology in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 46(6), 1063–1091.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *33*(*1*), 1–39.
- Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. (2011). Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(2), 279–294.
- Thyer, B. A., & Myers, L. L. (2009). Religious discrimination in social work academic programs: Whither social justice?. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought*, 28(1-2), 144–160.
- Tskhay, K. O., & Rule, N. O. (2013). Accuracy in categorizing perceptually ambiguous groups: A review and meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 17(1), 72–86.
- United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2019). *Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964*. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/titlevii.cfm
- Wade, J., & Roth, P. (2015, December). Social media and personnel selection: How does new technology change an old game? Paper presented at the Thirty Sixth International Conference on Information Systems, Fort Worth, TX.
- Webber, S. S., & Donahue, L. M. (2001). Impact of highly and less job-related diversity on work group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 27(2), 141–162.
- Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20, 77–140.

II. STUDY #1: POLITICAL AFFILIATION AND HIRING

Alexander C. Snihur¹

Alexander C. Snihur (Researcher, asnih002@fiu.edu, 786-436-9766) ¹Florida International University, DM383C, 11200 SW 8th St, Miami, FL, 3319

Introduction

The political atmosphere in the United States has become increasingly hostile, polarizing, and divisive over the last two decades (Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Pew, 2016, 2017; Swigart et al., 2020). Polls show that both Democrats and Republicans describe members of the opposing party as "close-minded," "dishonest," and "immoral" compared with other Americans (Pew, 2016). In addition, scientific studies have found that members of both political parties in the United States harbor implicit and explicit biases towards each other (Inbar & Lammers, 2012; Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015). For example, Inbar and Lammers (2012) found that more than one-third of psychologists who identified as a Democrat said they would openly discriminate against Republican colleagues when making a hiring decision, and one-sixth stated they would discriminate against their colleagues when reviewing their work. This presents a concern for organizations since partisan identification has become even more integral to one's self-identity and group membership over the last twenty-five years ago (Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Roth et al., 2017; Swigart et al., 2020).

While there has been some investigation into how concealable social identities such as sexual orientation and religion can bias hiring outcomes (Barrantes & Eaton, 2018; Ghumman et al., 2013; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; King & Ahmad, 2010; Roth et al., 2017; Summers et al., 2018), there has been minimal exploration of political identity as a basis for hiring discrimination or favoritism. In general, political affiliation is known to serve as a strong basis for social categorization and discrimination processes (Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Krupenkin, 2018; Roth et al., 2019; Roth et al., 2017; Swigart et al., 2020). In fact, since political identity is a chosen rather than inherited identity, preliminary evidence has shown that this increases the likelihood that partisans are held more accountable for their political affiliation membership and its social consequences (Iyengar & Westood, 2015; Roth et al., 2019). Thus, hiring discrimination against individuals on the basis of political affiliation may be even stronger than for inherited or non-controllable social identities.

The first question the current study will address is: Does dissimilar political affiliation membership between a hiring manager and a job applicant detrimentally impact the likelihood of a job applicant getting hired? The second question that will be addressed is whether perceptions of applicant liking and competence act as mechanisms through which political affiliation dissimilarity in organizational selection processes affects hireability outcomes. This work is especially important given the paucity of laws that protect individuals who may be discriminated against for employment decisions based on their political affiliation. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin (E.E.O.C., 2019). However, there is currently no federal law under which the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has the authority to prevent any such political affiliation discrimination or adverse impact from occurring in organizational selection (E.E.O.C., 2019; Swigart, 2020).

Theoretical Framework & Hypotheses

Social Identity Theory (SIT)

Psychology researchers have long investigated *how* and *why* individuals tend to identify with social groups, and how these identities influence behaviors (Bell et al., 2011; Hogg & Turner, 1985; Tajifel, 1982). In his Social Identity Theory (SIT)
metatheory, Tajifel (1978) states that a social identity is an individual's self-concept that comes from his/her knowledge of membership in a social group (or groups), and that there is emotional significance and value attached to that membership. Social identity is what allows for the categorization of individuals as "in-group" or "out-group" members (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Members of the same social group (i.e., Democrat/Republican) are expected to be similar to others in the group and view things from the same perspective (Stets & Burke, 2000). People are therefore inclined to treat members of their own group positively with favoritism and liking, while those in the perceived "out-group" are viewed in a more negative light (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Van Rossem, 2018). While in the past SIT has been used in the examination of salient demographic identities such as gender, race, and ethnicity (Colella et al., 2017), there has been a shift in recent years in utilizing SIT as an overarching framework to better understand the effects of the more covert identity of political affiliation (Gift & Gift, 2015; Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019).

Similarity Attraction Paradigm (SAP)

The Similarity-Attraction Paradigm (SAP) is frequently used within the SIT metatheory to examine attitudes, interpersonal attraction, and behaviors between people based on dimensions like demographic characteristics (Avery et al., 2007; Lindsey et al., 2017; Riordan, 2000; Roth et al., 2017, 2019; Schaffer & Riordan, 2013; Wade & Roth, 2015). The theory posits that those who are similar to one another will have high levels of interpersonal attraction and liking towards one another (Byrne, 1971, 1979). SAP notes that similar individuals (based on social identity categorizations) are expected to have

similar values, beliefs, life experiences, and perceive the world in a comparable way. As a result, these similar individuals have more positive interactions and attitudes towards one another (Byrne, 1971; Riordan, 2000).

Supposedly dissimilar individuals, on the other hand, have more negative interactions with and attitudes towards one another, which can ultimately lead to deleterious hiring and organizational outcomes (Gift & Gift, 2015; He et al., 2019; Inbar & Lammers, 2012; Roth et al., 2019). For example, Roth and colleagues (2019) and Wade and Roth (2015) both found that in an organizational hiring process, job applicants were viewed as having lower organizational citizenship behaviors and expected task performance when their political affiliation was dissimilar to that of the raters. Based on both SIT and SAP theories, political affiliation dissimilarity in a hiring manger-job applicant dyad should lead to decreased levels of liking and ultimately lower hireability outcomes, especially because individuals *choose* rather than inherit their political affiliation views, allowing more blame and responsibility to be placed on the individual (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015).

Political Affiliation Model (PAM)

More recently Roth and colleagues (2017) used SIT and SAP to develop a model attempting to describe the implications of political affiliation similarity on employment decisions. In their political affiliation model (PAM) they hypothesized a serial mediation in which political affiliation similarity would lead to perceived overall similarity between individuals, then liking, and ultimately personnel outcomes. Roth and colleagues (2019) tested the PAM using an experimental design, manipulating the political party of a fictitious applicant through content on their social media page. They did this across two

studies, which asked participants to rate applicants' expected levels of task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). Applicant liking was positively and significantly related to both outcomes in both studies.

However, Study 1 did not find that political affiliation similarity predicted overall perceived similarity, bringing into question whether serial mediation using overall perceived similarity was necessary. Indeed, research in relational demography directly correlates demographic similarity between individuals (i.e., gender, race, age) with the proposed outcomes, through one mediator (such as liking), thereby skipping overall similarity as an intermediate step in the process (Bakar & McCann, 2014; Schaffer & Riordan, 2013). Other preliminary research examining political affiliation dissimilarity has done the same.

Stereotype Content Model (SCM)

The Stereotype Content Model (SCM) is another theory utilized to understand how social perceptions are created and how these perceptions may affect personal and group-level outcomes (Fiske, 2018). The basic tenant of the SCM is that there are two dimensions we use to judge and assess others: warmth and competence (Cuddy et al., 2008; Fiske, 2018). The SCM posits that individuals first want to know other's intent towards them (i.e., whether they are friend or foe), which is measured by perceptions of warmth (Fiske, 2018). The dimension of warmth is extremely similar to the notion of liking in both SIT and the SAP, and liking is included in the measurement operationalization for warmth (Fiske, 2018). The SCM stipulates that those who are viewed with high levels of warmth will elicit active facilitation (help and support) from others as they are perceived as friends, whereas those seen as lacking warmth elicit active harm (negative interactions, contempt, and envy) from others as they are viewed as foes (Cuddy et al., 2008; Fiske, 2018).

The second dimension of competence (i.e., capability) is also used to judge and assess others, and ostensibly reflects whether others can actually pursue their intentions (Cuddy et al., 2008; Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske, 2018). Items related to the competence dimension typically asks about whether individuals are perceived as intelligent, skilled, and efficient. Research in the I-O and social psychology literature has shown that perceived competence is an integral mechanism through which hireability judgments are made for job applicants (Eaton et al., 2019; Lai & Babcock, 2013). In the context of political affiliation as a social identity variable, Gift and Gift (2015) noted that employers would be more likely to hire job applicants of the same partisan affiliation as themselves, since they are viewed as more competent than those from an opposing political party.

Current Study

The current study aims to shed additional light on the effects of political identity dissimilarity, and further exploring causal mechanisms (He et al., 2019; Wade & Roth, 2015). Our study will advance the work done by Roth and colleagues (2019) and Wade and Roth (2015) in several ways. First, our study will answer the call from the Roth et al. (2019) paper, by measuring the actual political affiliation membership of the raters directly to avoid issues that are inherent with using proxies for political affiliation. For example, Gift and Gift (2015) assumed the political affiliation of their participants based overall county voting records in the 2008 presidential election. Next, both the Roth and colleagues (2019) and Wade and Roth (2015) studies used expected task performance and expected organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) as proxies for applicant hirability.

Instead of using a proxy measure of hireability, our study will explicitly ask raters about their hiring intentions for the applicants. Third, neither study integrated the Stereotype Content Model (SCM), which is frequently utilized within a selection context which the current study will test (Eaton et al., 2019; Fiske, 2018).

In order to combine the theories of SAP, PAM, and SCM parsimoniously, liking will be utilized as a primary mediator for the current study (in lieu of warmth), and applicant competence will be examined as a secondary potential mediator between hiring manager-job applicant political affiliation dissimilarity, and hireability outcomes. Based on these theories, which stipulate that we like and prefer in-group members and those similar to us, and that we systematically categorize others in terms of liking and competence, we proposed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1a-b: Participant and job applicant political affiliation will interact to predict applicant liking and perceived competence, such that increased political affiliation similarity between participants and job applicants will relate to increased a) applicant liking and b) perceived applicant competence *Hypothesis 2a-b:* The interaction between the participant's and job applicant's political affiliation on the outcome of hiring intentions, will be mediated by a) applicant liking and b) perceived applicant competence, such that increased political affiliation similarity will relate to increased hireability ratings



Figure 1. Conceptual Diagram of Hypothesized Model for Study 1

Pretesting

Before running the study, we ran a pretest to find a politically neutral job position to utilize in the vignette for the hiring study. Thirty-three individuals, with political and demographic characteristics similar to those of the study sample, participated in pretesting. Pre-test participants rated nine different job positions on dimensions of liberalism/conservativism, on a scale from 1 (*extremely liberal*) to 7 (*extremely conservative*). A t-test was run to determine which position raters perceived to be the most politically neutral, rated closest to the scale midpoint of 4 (*moderate/middle-of-theroad*). The position of "financial manager" was the only job position not significantly different from the scale midpoint (M = 3.55, SD = 1.82, t(32) = -1.43, p > .05, 95% CI = -1.10 to 0.19). Therefore, we tailored the hiring study vignette specifically for the politically neutral position of financial manager. This ensured that the job position in the actual study would not favor a Republican or Democrat job applicant. Participants would then be able make decisions based solely on the job applicant's characteristics and experiences, and the job itself would not interact with the applicant's political affiliation.

We then developed a job applicant resume with three variations, one for each of the applicant political affiliation conditions (Republican, Democrat, and Control). The resumes were identical in every way, ensuring that all three fictitious candidates were equally qualified, including the job applicant name, gender, education, GPA, work experience, etc. The fictious resumes had appropriate job qualifications for the financial manager position (see the Appendix for the Resume Materials). In terms of the manipulation, the only difference between the resumes was the expressed political affiliation membership of each applicant. This manipulation took place under the "Leadership Experience" section for each resume. We crafted leadership positions that were indicative of the applicant's political affiliation including, "Vice President: The Republicans of America Club" (Republican condition), "Vice President: The Democrats of America Club" (Democrat condition), and "Vice President: Finance and Investment Club" (Control condition).

Methods

Participants

The 270 participants for the study were recruited through Qualtrics Panel Service which is commonly used in psychological research (Roth et al., 2019). All participants were required to meet the following criteria: be at least 18 years old, be male, be either a Republican or a Democrat, be a United States citizen, and work full time (40+ hours per

week) for an organization within the U.S. The sample was evenly split between Republicans (50%) and Democrats (50%). Only male participants were chosen to match the gender of the fictitious job applicant, keeping the gender match between the job applicant and the participants constant. All of these 270 participants met the initial screening criteria, passed the two attention check questions, and the political affiliation manipulation check, ensuring that only those participants who noticed the political affiliation of the applicant were included in the analyses.¹

In terms of demographics, the sample (N = 270) consisted of exclusively male participants with an average age of 42.29 (SD = 11.41). Participants worked an average of 43.95 hours per week and worked at their current organization for an average of 9.92 years (SD = 8.22). In total about three-fourths of the participants had previous hiring experience (75.9%). When breaking this down by political party membership the results were quite similar, about 51.2% of Democrats (n = 105) and 48.8% of Republicans (n =100) had hiring experience. Most of the participants had at least a bachelor's degree (73.4%). The participants consisted of 59.6% Whites (n = 161), 15.6% Hispanic Americans (n = 42), 13.7% African Americans (n = 37), 8.5% Asian Americans (n = 23), 1.9% Native American (n = 5), and 0.7% other (n = 2). A breakdown of the participant's job industry information can be found in Table 1.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through Qualtrics Panel, a web-based participant recruitment service, and were invited to take a 10-minute survey. Once eligibility criteria

¹ We did not have access to partial data and were unable to determine the number of individuals who did not meet the initial screening criteria or failed to pass any of the study checks. This should not be much of a concern as the effects of political affiliation (dis)similarity would only be present if the rater actually noticed the job applicant's political affiliation.

were met, participants completed a consent form acknowledging that they could leave the study at any time and that their responses were anonymous. All participants were prompted to read the same instructions asking them to take on the role of a hiring manager for a fictitious financial bank based in the United States. Participants were then asked to examine and evaluate the resume of a job applicant who is applying for the position of financial manager. Participants were told they would need to give their perceptions of how this candidate would perform in the job, and that they should carefully read the entire resume as they would be quizzed on the content after.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of three resume conditions (Republican, Democrat, or Control). All aspects of the resumes between the conditions were held constant and except for the political affiliation membership of the fictitious job applicant, noted in the "Leadership Experience" section. After reading the instructions and examining the fictitious resume, participants responded to two recollection questions about the resume, one of which was the manipulation check, ensuring applicants were attuned to the applicant's political affiliation membership. The manipulation check asked "What leadership experience did the applicant report having?" Then participants responded to questions regarding applicant liking, applicant warmth, perceived applicant competence, and hiring intentions. The participants also indicated their own demographic information (i.e., political affiliation, age, gender, race, education, organizational tenure, etc.).

Measures

Political Affiliation

Political affiliation membership was assessed for the participants using a categorical single item consistent with past research (Swigart et al., 2020). The item asked "Which best describes your Political Party Affiliation?" The three answer choices included "Democrat," "Republican," or "Other".

Applicant Liking

Applicant liking was measured using the 4-item scale developed by Wayne and Ferris (1990) and the referent was changed from *subordinate* to *job applicant* for all items. A sample item is "I think this job applicant would make a good friend." Each item was rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for applicant liking was 0.89.

Applicant Warmth

Applicant warmth was measured using the 4-item scale developed by Fiske et al. (2002). A sample item is "Do you believe the job applicant is sincere?" Each item was rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for applicant warmth was 0.89. This exploratory measure was used because of its similarity to liking, and its fit within the SCM.

Perceived Competence

Perceived applicant competence was measured using 3-items from adopted from Moss-Racusin et al. (2012). A sample item is "Based on the resume you read, did the applicant strike you as competent?" and "How likely is it that the applicant has the necessary skills for this job?". Each item was rated on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*not at*

all) to 5 (*extremely*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for perceived competence was 0.89.

Hiring Intentions

Applicant hireability was measured using 4-items adopted from Madera et al. (2009). A sample item is "How likely would you be willing to hire this applicant?" and "To what extent is this a top-notch candidate?" Each item was rated on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for hiring intentions was 0.91.

Demographic Variables

These items captured participant's age, gender, race, sexual orientation, education, occupation, average number of hours worked per week, hiring experience, and organizational tenure.

Results

Data Screening

Following suggestions from DeSimone and Harms (2018), the survey included two direct instructed attention check questions (e.g., Please choose "Strongly Disagree" for this item) to minimize low quality response data. In addition, only those participants who answered the manipulation check correctly, and were attuned to the political affiliation of the job applicant, were included in the analyses. Survey completion time was also used as the unobtrusive data method used to determine low quality data and to screen participants (DeSimone & Harms, 2018; DeSimone et al., 2015). The stringent time requirement Qualtrics Panel enforced was that any participant who completed the survey faster than one-half of the median time was automatically dropped for not responding thoughtfully.

Data Analyses

A priori power analysis conducted with G*Power at $\alpha = .05$ power level at .80, indicated that the minimum sample of 155 is needed to detect a small to medium effect size ($f^2 = .08$). Since we had a total of 270 valid responses, we successfully recruited enough participants to participate in the study. All data analyses were run in SPSS Version 23. All descriptive statistics (e.g., means, and standard deviations), scale reliabilities, scale scatter plots were examined and tested to ensure normality of the data (except for demographic variables). Cronbach's alpha was at least $\alpha = .70$ for the measures to be included in further data analysis (Cronbach, 1951). Descriptive statistics including the means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and Pearson's *r* correlations are displayed in Table 2.

Mediation analyses were conducted with Preacher and Hayes (2008) bootstrapping procedure to estimate direct and indirect effects. Analyses were conducted using the PROCESS Macro version 3.3 for SPSS, which calculated bias corrected 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals around the indirect effects, using 5,000 bootstrap samples (Hayes & Little, 2017). Then, moderated mediation analyses were conducted to test the hypothesized relative conditional indirect effects. The index of moderated mediation was utilized as the formal test of moderated mediation, which quantifies the slope of the relationship between the indirect effect and the moderator (Hayes & Little, 2017).

The Effect of Applicant Political Affiliation and Rater Political Affiliation on Liking Effect of Rater Political Affiliation Comparing Republican Vs. Democrat Applicant Conditions

When comparing the Republican job applicant to the Democrat job applicant on applicant liking (m), the regression coefficient for the interaction with rater political affiliation was statistically significant (b = -0.78, SE = 0.22, t(264) = -3.51, p < .05, 95% CI = -1.22, -0.34). This indicates that the difference in the average applicant liking (m) for those Republican job applicants, versus Democratic job applicants, depends on the raters' political affiliation membership (w). See Table 3.

Effect of Rater Political Affiliation Comparing Republican Vs. Control Applicant Conditions

When comparing the Republican job applicant to the Control job applicant on applicant liking (m), the regression coefficient for the interaction with rater political affiliation was statistically significant (b = -0.50, SE = 0.23, t(264) = -2.21, p < .05, 95% CI = -0.94, -0.05). This indicates that the difference in the average applicant liking (m) for those Republican job applicants, versus Control job applicants, is dependent on the raters' political affiliation membership (w). See Table 3.

Effect of Rater Political Affiliation Comparing Democrat Vs. Control Applicant Conditions

Lastly, when specifically comparing the Democrat job applicant to the Control job applicant on applicant liking (m), the regression coefficient for the interaction with rater political affiliation was not statistically significant (b = 0.29, SE = 0.22, t(264) = 1.28, p > .05, 95% CI = -0.15, 0.72). This indicates that the difference in the average applicant

liking (m) for those Democrat job applicants, versus Control job applicants, was not dependent on the raters' political affiliation membership (w). See Table 4.

Simple Effects for Rater Political Affiliation and Applicant Political Affiliation on Liking

When the Rater is a Republican

The simple slopes can now be interpreted at the various levels of rater political affiliation membership (w), starting with those Republican raters. When the raters evaluating the resumes were Republicans, they liked Republican job applicants significantly more than Democrat job applicants (b = -0.43, SE = 0.15, t(264) = -2.91, p < .05, 95% CI = -0.73, -0.14). However, Republican raters did not like Republican job applicants significantly more or less than Control job applicants (b = -0.22, SE = 0.16, t(264) = -1.40, p > .05, 95% CI = -0.54, 0.10). Additionally, there was no evidence to suggest that Republican raters differentially liked Democrat job applicants compared to Control job applicants. Note that these simple slope regression coefficients also represent the "a paths" that will be used as evidence for the mediation hypotheses. See Tables 3-4.

When the Rater is a Democrat

When the raters evaluating the resumes were Democrats, they liked Democrat job applicants significantly more than Republican job applicants (b = 0.35, SE = 0.17, t(264) = 2.10, p < .05, 95% CI = 0.02, 0.68). However, Democrat raters did not like Republican job applicants significantly more or less than Control job applicants (b = 0.28, SE = 0.16, t(264) = 1.72, p > .05, 95% CI = -0.04, 0.59). Lastly, there was no evidence to suggest that Democrat raters differentially liked Democrat job applicants compared to those

Control job applicants. Note that these simple slope regression coefficients also represent the "a paths" that will be used as evidence for the mediation hypotheses. See Tables 3-4.

Therefore, Hypothesis 1a, which stated that rater and job applicant political affiliation similarity will interact to predict liking, was supported. Specifically, when the political affiliation between the rater and job applicant matched, it led to an increase in applicant liking.

The Mediational Role of Applicant Liking on Hiring Intentions

To test Hypothesis 2a, and investigate the relative indirect effect of job applicant political affiliation membership on hiring intentions, mediation analyses were performed using the PROCESS Macro, version 3.3 for SPSS (Hayes & Little, 2017). Bias corrected 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals were calculated around the indirect effects, using 5,000 bootstrap samples.

Applicant Liking as a Mediator for Hiring Intentions

As noted above, the simple slopes for the interaction represented the "a paths" for the relative indirect effects of job applicant political affiliation membership on hiring intentions, through applicant liking. Regardless if the rater was a Republican or Democrat, the simple slope regression coefficients were both significant for the comparison between the Republican and Democrat job applicant conditions, on applicant liking (b = -0.43, b = 0.35, p 's < .05). See Tables 3-4. Results indicated that applicant liking positively and significantly predicted applicant hiring intentions, while controlling for the job applicant's political party (b = 0.83, SE = 0.05, t(266) = 15.98, p < .05, 95% CI = 0.73, 0.94). See Tables 3-4. Therefore, hypothesis 2a, which stated that applicant liking would act as a mediator between applicant political affiliation membership and hiring intentions was supported.

Moderated Mediation with Liking as Mediator

Next, a moderated mediation analysis examined the relative conditional indirect effect of applicant political affiliation membership on hiring intentions, through the proposed mediator of applicant liking. This analysis was done in PROCESS using Model 7. The index of moderated mediation was utilized as the formal test of moderated mediation (Hayes & Little, 2017).

Conditional Indirect effect of Republican Vs. Democrat Job Applicant Comparison

Based on the index of moderated mediation (*index* = -0.65, 95% CI = -1.10 to - 0.23) the indirect effect of the Republican job applicant versus the Democrat job applicant on hiring through liking is moderated by rater political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). In other words, the extent to which Republican vs. Democrat job applicants were seen as differentially hireable due to differences in liking depended on rater political affiliation. See Table 3.

Conditional Indirect effect of Republican Vs. Control Job Applicant Comparison

Based on the index of moderated mediation (*index* = -0.42, 95% CI = -0.85 to - 0.03) the indirect effect of the Republican job applicant versus the Control job applicant on hiring through liking is moderated by rater political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). In other words, the extent to which Republican vs. Control job applicants were seen as differentially hireable due to differences in liking depended on rater political affiliation. See Table 3.

Conditional Indirect effect of Democrat Vs. Control Job Applicant Comparison

Based on the index of moderated mediation (*index* = 0.24, 95% CI = -0.09 to 0.57) the indirect effect of the Democrat job applicant versus the Control job applicant on hiring through liking is not moderated by rater political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). In other words, the extent to which Democrat vs. Control job applicants were seen as differentially hireable due to differences in liking, did not depend on rater political affiliation. See Table 4.

Simple Indirect Effects

When the Rater is a Republican

We can now examine these moderated relative indirect effects further as a function of rater political affiliation membership. Specifically, when the raters evaluating the job applicant resumes were Republicans, they liked the Republican job applicant more than the Democrat job candidate, and this applicant liking did in fact lead to a significant increase in hiring intentions for the Republican job applicant (*conditional effect* = -0.36, 95% CI = -0.64 to -0.10). However, Republican raters were not more likely to hire a Republican job applicant, compared to a Control job applicant (*conditional effect* = -0.19, 95% CI = -0.44 to 0.05). Further, there was no evidence to suggest that Republican raters had any hiring preferences for Democrat job applicants compared to Control job applicants (*conditional effect* = 0.18, 95% CI = -0.09 to 0.44). See Tables 3-4.

When the Rater is a Democrat

For this relative conditional indirect effect, when the raters evaluating the job applicant resumes were Democrats, they did like the Democrat job applicant more than the Republican job applicant. However, this applicant liking did not lead to any significant differences in hiring intentions between the Democrat job applicant and the Republican job applicant (*conditional effect* = 0.29, 95% CI = -0.02 to 0.62). Democrat raters were not more likely to hire a Republican job applicant, compared to a Control job applicant (*conditional effect* = 0.23, 95% CI = -0.07 to 0.55). Further, there was no evidence to suggest that Democrat raters had any hiring preferences for Democrat job applicants compared to Control job applicants (*conditional effect* = -0.06, 95% CI = -0.27 to 0.14). See Tables 3-4.

Therefore, Hypothesis 2a, which stated that the indirect effect of applicant political affiliation membership, on hiring intentions, through liking, would depend on rater political affiliation, was partially supported. More specifically, only when the rater was a Republican, and they viewed a Republican job applicant relative to a Democrat job applicant, were they more likely to hire that candidate.

The Effect of Applicant Political Affiliation and Rater Political Affiliation on Competence

Relative Conditional Indirect Effects for the Comparison Between Resume Conditions, Using the Republican Job Applicant Condition as the Referent Group

The overall interaction across the three conditions, between the raters' political affiliation membership (w) and the job applicant's political affiliation membership (x) on applicant competence (m) is not statistically significant (b = 0.19, SE = 0.19, t(266) = 1.01, p > .05, 95% CI = -0.18, 0.55). This is corroborated by the "Test of highest order unconditional interaction" that is generated in the PROCESS output, which tests the model fit after including the moderator (Hayes & Little, 2017). In this case the interaction

is not significant as well, and the model does not fit any better when including the moderator in the analysis ($\Delta R^2 = .006$, f(2, 264) = 0.78, p > .05). Since rater political affiliation membership does not moderate the relationship between the job applicant's political affiliation membership and applicant competence, there is no need to probe the interaction at different levels of the moderator, in relation to the comparison groups. See Table 5.

Relative Indirect Effects for the Comparison Between Resume Conditions, Using the Democrat Job Applicant Condition as the Referent Group

The overall interaction across the three conditions, between the raters' political affiliation membership (w) and the job applicant's political affiliation membership (x) on applicant competence (m) is not statistically significant as well (b = -0.10, SE = 0.18, t(264) = -0.54, p > .05, 95% CI = -0.45, 0.26). This is corroborated by the "Test of highest order unconditional interaction" that is generated in the PROCESS output, which tests the model fit after including the moderator (Hayes & Little, 2017).

In this case the interaction is not significant, and the model does not fit any better when including the moderator in the analysis ($\Delta R^2 = .006$, f(2, 264) = 0.78, p > .05). Since rater political affiliation membership does not moderate the relationship between the job applicant's political affiliation membership and applicant competence, there was no need to probe the interaction at different levels of the moderator, in relation to the comparison groups. See Table 6. Therefore, hypothesis 1b, which stated that rater and job applicant political affiliation similarity will interact to predict competence, was not supported.

The Mediational Role of Applicant Competence on Hiring Intentions

To test Hypothesis 2b, and investigate the relative indirect effect of job applicant political affiliation membership on hiring intentions, mediation analyses were performed using the PROCESS Macro, version 3.3 for SPSS (Hayes & Little, 2017). Bias corrected 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals were calculated around the indirect effects, using 5,000 bootstrap samples.

Applicant Competence as a Mediator for Hiring Intentions

There were no significant differences in the simple slopes for applicant competence, between any of the comparisons for job applicant conditions, based on rater political affiliation membership (Republican Applicant vs. Democrat Applicant, b = 0.05, SE = 0.19, p > 0.5; Republican Applicant vs. Control Applicant, b = -0.04, SE = 0.19, p > 0.5; Democrat Applicant vs. Control Applicant, b = -0.09, SE = 0.17, p > 0.5). See Tables 5-6. Additionally, applicant competence positively and significantly predicted applicant hiring intentions, while controlling for the job applicant's political party (b = 0.89, SE = 0.03, t(266) = 25.83, p < .05, 95% CI = 0.82, 0.96). See Tables 4-5. Therefore, hypothesis 2b, which stated that applicant competence would act as a mediator between applicant political affiliation membership and hiring intentions was not supported.

Moderated Mediation with Competence as Mediator

Next, a moderated mediation analysis examined the relative conditional indirect effects of applicant political affiliation membership on hiring intentions, through the proposed mediator of applicant competence. This analysis was done in PROCESS using Model 7. The index of moderated mediation was utilized as the formal test of the moderated mediation (Hayes & Little, 2017).

Conditional Indirect Effect of Republican Vs. Democrat Job Applicant Comparison

Based on the index of moderated mediation (*index* = -0.25, 95% CI = -0.71 to 0.21) the indirect effect of the Republican job applicant versus the Democrat job applicant on hiring through competence is not moderated by rater political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). See Table 5. In other words, the extent to which Republican vs. Democrat job applicants were seen as differentially hireable due to differences in competence, did not depend on rater political affiliation.

Conditional Indirect Effect of Republican Vs. Control Job Applicant Comparison

Based on the index of moderated mediation (*index* = -0.25, 95% CI = -0.70 to 0.20) the indirect effect of the Republican job applicant versus the Control job applicant on hiring through competence is not moderated by rater political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). See Table 5. In other words, the extent to which Republican vs. Control job applicants were seen as differentially hireable due to differences in competence, did not depend on rater political affiliation.

Conditional Indirect Effect of Democrat Vs. Control Job Applicant Comparison

Based on the index of moderated mediation (*index* = 0.01, 95% CI = -0.45 to 0.46) the indirect effect of the Democrat job applicant versus the Control job applicant on hiring through competence is not moderated by rater political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). See Table 6. In other words, the extent to which Democrat vs. Control job applicants were seen as differentially hireable due to differences in competence, did not depend on rater political affiliation.

Discussion

The results suggest that a mismatch in political affiliation membership between equally qualified job applicants and hiring managers/raters does affect hiring intentions, through applicant liking. Specifically, if the rater was a Republican, they liked a Republican job applicant more than a Democrat job applicant, and were more likely to hire the Republican job applicant. If the rater was a Democrat, they liked a Democrat job applicant more than a Republican job applicant, but had similar intentions to hire either applicant. These effects were significant only for these comparisons. One possible explanation for the observed effects is that individuals with more conservative political ideology (e.g., Republicans), score lower on the personality trait openness to experience, compared to those with liberal political ideology (e.g., Democrats) (Fatke, 2017). This is a definitional feature of liberalism versus conservatism, as openness to experience refers to being receptive to new ideas, approaches, and experiences, which can translate to Democrats being more receptive to hiring someone different from oneself compared to Republicans (Fatke, 2017; McCrae & Costa, 2003).

Republican raters did not like Republican or Democrat job applicants significantly more or less than the Control job applicants. The same was true for Democrat raters, who did not like Democrat or Republican job applicants significantly more or less than the Control job applicants. However, when we examined the applicant liking means for each resume condition (Republican, Democrat, and Control) as a function of Republican or Democrat raters, the implications were clear. No matter if there was a Republican or Democrat rater, the applicant from a political outgroup was always liked the least, the Control applicant fell in the middle, and the applicant from the political ingroup was

always liked the most. See Figure 2. It was this combination of slight loathing for members of one's political out-group and slight favoritism for members of one's political in-group, that worked in tandem to produce significant differences in liking, when Republican job applicants were compared with Democrat job applicants. Applicant competence did not act as a process mechanism through which political affiliation (dis)similarity affected the rater's intent to hire the job applicant.

This study advances the scant literature investigating the effects of political affiliation membership on organizational selection processes in several ways and answered several calls for more research on political affiliation (Corrington et al., 2020; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Roth et al., 2019; Swigart et al., 2020). Based on the findings, it seems that in-group favoritism and out-group dislike play together play a role to influence perceptions of applicants (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This makes sense given the increasingly hostile and polarized political climate in the United States over the last two decades (Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Pew, 2016, 2017; Swigart et al., 2020). The results show that political affiliation is a meaningful and salient identity that is used to categorize equally qualified candidates even in a fictitious organizational selection process (Gift & Gift, 2015; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Roth et al., 2019; Wade & Roth, 2015).

Further, this study explicitly asked the raters about their hiring intentions towards the job applicant, which has not been done in prior studies on this topic. For example, Roth et al. (2019) and Wade and Roth (2015) operationalized expected task performance and expected organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), as indicators of hireability. Also, neither study integrated the SCM, which is frequently utilized within a selection

context (Eaton et al., 2019; Fiske, 2018). Our study was the first to examine perceived competence as a potential mediator in the context of political affiliation identity and organizational selection.

Additionally, this study answered the call from the Roth et al. (2019) paper, by directly measuring the actual political affiliation membership of the raters rather than estimating it, which other research has done (Bermiss & McDonald, 2018; Gift & Gift, 2015; Wade & Roth, 2015). This more direct method eliminates the need for guessing the participants' political party memberships, which should strengthen the validity of the findings. The current study utilized a robust experimental design where participants were randomly assigned to view one of three resume conditions. The resumes were professional, realistic, and equivalent in every way except for the manipulation of applicant political affiliation membership.

We did not want to exaggerate the salience of political affiliation signals typically found on applicant resumes, so we gave participants only one clear indicator of the job applicant's political affiliation under the "Leadership Experience" section of the resumes (Roth et al., 2019). The manipulations for political affiliation were realistic and did not mention working for any specific political campaigns, which might have inadvertently influenced the results (Gift & Gift, 2015; Wade & Roth, 2015). It is important to note that the participants in the study worked full-time and fortunately around 75% of them had previous hiring experience which increased the ecological validity of our findings.

In terms of theory, applicant competence did not act as a mediator for hiring outcomes. Rather, applicant liking served as a mediator through which political affiliation (dis)similarity affected the rater's intent to hire the job applicant. This aligns with SIT,

SAP, PAM, and SCM frameworks, where those in one's in-group are viewed more favorably and are liked more than those in one's out-group (Byrne, 1971, 1997; Roth et al., 2017; Tajfel, 1982). It is possible that competence may act as a process mechanism for certain social identities (i.e., race and gender) during organizational selection processes and not others (Eaton et al., 2019). Further, this study simplifies prior models that postulated a serial mediation from political affiliation similarity, to perceived overall similarity between individuals, to applicant liking, and personnel outcomes (Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019). Our study provides evidence for using liking as the sole process mechanism for political affiliation (dis)similarity, which makes for a more parsimonious model (Bakar & McCann, 2014; Schaffer & Riordan, 2013).

Implications

Given the hostile and salient political climate in the United States coupled with the results of this study, it is clear that there are important implications for both organizations and job applicants alike (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Pew, 2016, 2017; Swigart et al., 2020). Organizations could train recruiters and hiring managers to make hiring decisions only based upon job-relevant information. Also, organizations could utilize more objective selection procedures in conjunction with resume screening, that are known to have high predictive validities with job performance, such as structured interviews, work sample tests, and cognitive ability tests (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Using a compensatory approach to evaluate applicant jobrelevant knowledge, skills, and abilities during organizational selection would help to offset the influence of political affiliation membership during hiring (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011).

Job applicants should be mindful of the costs and the benefits of including work experience, leadership positions, or professional affiliations that may indicate a stance on a political issue or their political affiliation membership (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Roth et al., 2019; Wade & Roth, 2015). Such political affiliation indicators may not be job relevant. Even if they are, the results from this study show that whether these political indicators hurt or benefit the applicant is dependent on the rater and applicant having the same political affiliation membership. An applicant is unlikely to know beforehand the political view of the recruiter or hiring manager, and therefore the risk and reward of including such information is left to chance. Job applicants may be better served staying politically neutral and not including any potential political affiliation indicators on a resume. Our results showed that raters did not like those politically neutral job applicants any more or less than those applicants who displayed their political affiliation, regardless of the rater's political affiliation. Therefore, those politically neutral job applicants have a similar likelihood of being hired, without the additional risk that those more overt partisan job applicants have.

Lastly, this study demonstrates that political affiliation in-group favoritism and outgroup dislike plays an important role for personnel selection decisions, which might highlight the need for legislation such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to potentially include one's political affiliation as a protected identity (E.E.O.C., 2019; Iyengar et al., 2012; Roth et al., 2019; Stets & Burke, 2000; Swigart et al., 2020). Based on the current study and several others, political affiliation membership is a salient social identity that may be used to categorize job applicants which can potentially lead to disparate treatment in an organizational setting (Inbar & Lammers, 2012; Gift & Gift,

2012; He et al., 2019; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Roth et al., 2019; Wade & Roth, 2015). While there are some specific exceptions, making employment decisions based on an applicant's political affiliation is generally legal across most of the United States, without any protections for job applicants. Our hope is that more researchers will be encouraged to investigate the effects of this salient social identity in organizational selection processes, while job applicants, companies, and legislatures will take note of and consider the implications of this research.

Limitations

First, the outcome of interest for the current study was hiring intentions. While these are sentiments are strongly associated with the actual hiring of an employee, it is still an immediate proxy to determine whether an applicant is actually hired or not. However, as prior research shows, intentions are a good proximal indicator of actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Jiang et al., 2012; Steel & Ovalle, 1984). Second, because our study utilized a fictitious vignette, the lack of external validity could pose a threat to the generalizability of our findings, though the internal validity of our fictitious experimentally designed study was strong. The fictitious resumes developed were tailored to the job position, realistic, and professional, and hiring managers do commonly screen resumes online. It is important to note that three-fourths (75.9%) of the participants did have previous hiring experience, which helps support the validity of these findings in a real-world hiring situation. However, participants knew that they were not making real employment decisions. Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility that socially desirable responding may have attenuated the magnitude of the observed effects of political affiliation on organizational selection (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012).

Third, data was collected in October 2020, right before the contentious 2020 Presidential Election, which could also have exacerbated the influence of political affiliation as a social identity during organizational selection processes. Fourth, we only looked at people who were Republican and Democrats, but this is an oversimplification of people's political views in the United States. Fifth, while we employed an experimental study design, and many theoretical frameworks support the temporal associations of the variables, we hypothesized a mediation model with cross-sectional data. Lastly, although though other studies included both genders, to account for gender effects in the current study, we utilized an all male sample and therefore we cannot say that these observed effects hold for women (Roth et al., 2019; Wade & Roth, 2015).

Future Research

Future studies should examine political affiliation membership in different parts of the work process and in various organizational settings. The current study operationalized political party affiliation as a binary variable made up of the two largest parties in the United States (e.g., Republicans and Democrats). While this is a great place to start, future studies can expand this operationalization and include more political parties (i.e., Libertarian, Independents, etc.) to see how and if these various political memberships affect hiring outcomes. Also, it would be interesting to examine if utilizing extremist political groups, such as the Alternative-Right Conservatives, and Democratic Socialists elicit more emotions, and affect hiring decisions to a greater extent.

Future research ought to explore how other social identities interact with political affiliation membership (i.e., race, religion, gender), as people inherently have multiple identities at the same time. For example, the current study utilized male job applicants in the resume conditions and only recruited male participants. It would be interesting to examine how and if these associations hold for female job applicants with female hiring managers/raters. Future researchers should also think of more creative ways to measure hiring decisions. For example, Gift and Gift (2015) measured callback rates from actual recruiters after sending out fictitious politically branded resumes. Finally, given that the selection process encompasses more than just screening resumes and involves multiple stages (i.e., application, interviews, etc.), it would be fascinating to examine how political affiliation plays a role in personnel decisions if a job applicant reveals his/her political views during a different part of the hiring process, such as during an interview.

References

- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2008). What are the odds? How demographic similarity affects the prevalence of perceived employment discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 235–249.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 50(2), 179-211.
- Bakar, H. A., & McCann, R. M. (2014). Matters of demographic similarity and dissimilarity in supervisor-subordinate relationships and workplace attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 41, 1–16.
- Barrantes, R., & Eaton, A. A. (2018). Sexual orientation and leadership suitability: How being a gay man affects perceptions of fit in gender-stereotyped positions. Sex Roles, 79, 549–564.
- Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., Lukasik, M. A., Belau, L., & Briggs, A. L. (2011). Getting specific about demographic diversity variable and team performance relationships: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 37(3), 709–743.
- Bermiss, Y. S., & McDonald, R. (2018). Ideological misfit? Political affiliation and employee departure in the private-equity industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(6), 2182-2209.
- Byrne, D. E. (1971). The attraction paradigm. New York, NY: AcademicPress.
- Byrne, D. (1997). An overview (and underview) of research and theory within the attraction paradigm. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14(3), 417–431.
- Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2011). *Applied Psychology in Human Resource Management*. Pearson, New York, NY.
- Colella, A., Hebl, M., & King, E. (2017). One hundred years of discrimination research in the Journal of Applied Psychology: A sobering synopsis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 500–513.
- Corrington, A., Hebl, M., Stewart, D., Madera, J., Ng, L., & Williams, J. (2020). Diversity and inclusion of understudied populations: A call to practitioners and researchers. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 72(4), 303– 323.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297–334.

- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS map: behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(4), 631–648.
- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 61–149.
- DeSimone, J. A., & Harms, P. D. (2018). Dirty data: The effects of screening respondents who provide low-quality data in survey research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33(5), 559–577.
- DeSimone, J. A., Harms, P. D., & DeSimone, A. J. (2015). Best practice recommendations for data screening. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(2), 171–181.
- Eaton, A. A., Saunders, J. F., Jacobson, R. K., & West, K. (2019). How gender and race stereotypes impact the advancement of scholars in STEM: Professors' biased evaluations of physics and biology post-doctoral candidates. *Sex Roles*, 82, 127– 141.
- Fatke, M. (2017). Personality traits and political ideology: A first global assessment. *Political Psychology*, *38*(5), 881-899.
- Fiske, S. T. (2018). Stereotype content: Warmth and competence endure. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(2), 67–73.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878–902.
- Gift, K., & Gift, T. (2015). Does politics influence hiring? Evidence from a randomized experiment. *Political Behavior*, *37*(3), 653–675.
- Ghumman, S., Ryan, A. M., Barclay, L. A., & Markel, K. S. (2013). Religious discrimination in the workplace: A review and examination of current and future trends. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28(4), 439–454.
- Hayes, A. F., & Little, T. (2017). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. New York, NY: Guilford publications.
- He, Y., Costa, P. L., Walker, J. M., Miner, K. N., & Wooderson, R. L. (2019). Political identity dissimilarity, workplace incivility, and declines in well-being: A prospective investigation. *Stress and Health*, 35(3), 256–266.

- Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1985). Interpersonal attraction, social identification and psychological group formation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(1), 51–66.
- Inbar, Y., & Lammers, J. (2012). Political diversity in social and personality psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(5), 496–503.
- Iyengar, S., & Krupenkin, M. (2018). Partisanship as Social Identity; Implications for the Study of Party Polarization, *The Forum*, *16*(1), 23-45.
- 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., Sood, G., & Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology a social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *76*(3), 405–431.
- Jiang, K., Liu, D., McKay, P. F., Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. (2012). When and how is job embeddedness predictive of turnover? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal* of Applied Psychology, 97(5), 1077–1096.
- Johnson, A. F., & Roberto, K. J. (2018). Right versus left: How does political ideology affect the workplace?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(8), 1040–1043.
- King, E. B., & Ahmad, A. S. (2010). An experimental field study of interpersonal discrimination toward Muslim job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(4), 881– 906.
- Lai, L., & Babcock, L. C. (2013). Asian Americans and workplace discrimination: The interplay between sex of evaluators and the perception of social skills. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(3), 310–326.
- Lindsey, A. P., Avery, D. R., Dawson, J. F., & King, E. B. (2017). Investigating why and for whom management ethnic representativeness influences interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(11), 1545– 1563.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Madera, J. M., Hebl, M. R., & Martin, R. C. (2009). Gender and letters of recommendation for academia: Agentic and communal differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(6), 1591–1599.

- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16474–16479.
- Pew Research Center. (2016). *Partisanship and political animosity in 2016*. Retrieved from https://www.people-press.org/2016/06/22/partisanship-and-political-animosity-in-2016/
- Pew Research Center. (2017). *The Partisan Divide on Political Values Grows Even Wider*. Retrieved from https://www.people-press.org/2017/10/05/the-partisandivide-on-political-values-grows-even-wider/
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539–569.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), 879–891.
- Riordan, C. (2000). Relational demography within groups: Past developments, contradictions, and new directions. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 19, 131–173.
- Roth, P. L., Goldberg, C. B., & Thatcher, J. B. (2017). The role of political affiliation in employment decisions: A model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(9), 1286–1304.
- Roth, P. L., Thatcher, J. B., Bobko, P., Matthews, K. D., Ellingson, J. E., & Goldberg, C. B. (2019). Political affiliation and employment screening decisions: The role of similarity and identification processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/apl0000422
- Schaffer, B. S., & Riordan, C. M. (2013). Relational demography in supervisorsubordinate dyads: An examination of discrimination and exclusionary treatment. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 30(1), 3–17.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 262–274.
- Steel, R. P., & Ovalle, N. K. (1984). A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(4), 673–686.

- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*(3), 224–237.
- Summers, J. K., Howe, M., McElroy, J. C., Ronald Buckley, M., Pahng, P., & Cortes-Mejia, S. (2018). A typology of stigma within organizations: Access and treatment effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(7), 853–868.
- Swigart, K. L., Anantharaman, A., Williamson, J. A., & Grandey, A. A. (2020). Working While Liberal/Conservative: A Review of Political Ideology in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 46(6), 1063–1091.
- Tajfel, H. E. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. E. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *33*(*1*), 1–39.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In: W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2019). *Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964*. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/titlevii.cfm
- Van Rossem, A. H. (2019). Generations as social categories: An exploratory cognitive study of generational identity and generational stereotypes in a multigenerational workforce. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(4), 434–455.
- Wade, J., & Roth, P. (2015, December). Social media and personnel selection: How does new technology change an old game? Paper presented at the Thirty Sixth International Conference on Information Systems, Fort Worth, TX.
- Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 487–499.

Appendix

Table 1. Participant Industry Breakdown

Industry	Percentage
Other Services (except public administration)	13.0%
Information (i.e., publishing, telecommunications)	12.2%
Manufacturing	10.0%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	9.6%
Health Care and Social Assistance	8.5%
Finance and Insurance	8.1%
Educational Services	8.1%
Construction	6.7%
Retail Trade	6.3%
Transportation and Warehousing	3.7%
Management of Companies and Enterprise	3.3%
Public Administration	2.6%
Utilities	2.2%
Accommodation and Food Services	1.5%
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	0.7%
Waste Management and Remediation Services	0.7%
Real Estate	0.7%
Wholesale Trade	0.7%
Mining, Quarrying, Oil and Gas Extraction	0.7%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	0.4%

Sample Size N = 270.

Variable	М	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rater Political Affiliation Membership	0.50	.50	(n/a)				
2. Applicant Liking	3.61	.75	00	(.89)			
3. Applicant Competence	3.66	.85	.01	.62**	(.89)		
4. Applicant Warmth	3.48	.76	02	.71**	.65**	(.89)	
5. Hiring Intentions	3.88	1.23	01	.70**	.85**	.71*	(.91)

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas and intercorrelations of the study variables

N = 270. Values on the diagonal are coefficient alphas. *p < .05, **p < .001.
Tables 3-4 with Applicant Liking as Mediator

 Table 3. Moderated Mediation estimates for job applicant political membership and hiring intentions, through liking (With Republicans as the Referent Group)

Mediation &	& Moderation	Models						
		А	pplicant	Liking (M	.)			
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Constant	3.38	0.13	26.72	.000**	3.13	3.63		
X ₁ : Rep Vs. Dem	0.35	0.17	2.10	.036*	0.02	0.68		
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control	0.28	0.16	1.72	.087	-0.04	0.59		
Rater Political Party (W)	0.43	0.16	2.65	.009*	0.11	0.74		
X1 * Rater Political Party (W)	-0.78	0.22	-3.51	.001**	-1.22	-0.34		
X2 * Rater Political Party (W)	-0.50	0.23	-2.21	.028*	-0.94	-0.05		
Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s)	$\Delta R^2 = 0.045^*$ F(2, 264) = 6.27, p < .05							
Conditional Effects of X to M, at W	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Moderator Value: Democrat Rater								
X ₁ : Rep Vs. Dem	0.35	0.17	2.10	.036*	0.02	0.68		
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control Moderator Value: Republican Rater	0.28	0.16	1.72	.087	-0.04	0.59		
X ₁ : Rep Vs. Dem	-0.43	0.15	-2.91	.004*	-0.73	-0.14		
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control	-0.22	0.16	-1.40	.163	-0.54	0.10		
Moderate	d Mediation I	Model						
		Н	liring Int	entions (Y)			
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Constant	0.59	0.20	2.91	.004*	0.19	0.98		
X ₁ : Rep Vs. Dem	-0.18	0.10	-1.84	.067	-0.36	0.01		
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control	-0.21	0.10	-2.18	.030*	-0.40	-0.02		
Applicant Liking (M)	0.83	0.05	15.98	.000**	0.73	0.94		
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI				
X ₁ : Rep Vs. Dem Comparison								
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	0.29	0.16	-0.02	0.62				
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	-0.36	0.14	-0.64	-0.10				
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index -0.65	<i>SE</i> 0.22	<i>LLCI</i> -1.10	ULCI -0.23				
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control Comparison								
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	0.23	0.16	-0.07	0.55				
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	-0.19	0.13	-0.44	0.05				

Note. $N = 270 \ *p < .05, \ **p < .001.$ C = Coefficient. SE = Standard error. LLCI/ULCI = bias corrected lower/upper limit confidence intervals. R² = percentage of variance accounted for in outcomes by predictors. All analyses used 5000 bootstrap samples. The Republican applicant was coded as the referent group "0", and the Democrat and Control applicants were coded as the target groups "1". For the moderator values the Democrat Rater was coded as "0", and Republican Rater was coded as "1".

SE

0.21

LLCI

-0.85

ULCI

-0.03

Index

-0.42

Index of Moderated

Mediation

Mediation	n & Moder	ation Mo	dels			
		Α	Applicant	Liking (M)	
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	3.73	0.11	34.31	.000**	3.52	3.95
X ₁ : Dem Vs. Rep	-0.35	0.17	-2.10	.036*	-0.68	-0.02
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control	-0.07	0.15	-0.51	.613	-0.37	0.22
Rater Political Party (W)	-0.36	0.16	-2.30	.022*	-0.67	-0.05
X1 * Rater Political Party (W)	0.78	0.22	3.51	.001**	0.34	1.22
X2 * Rater Political Party (W)	0.29	0.22	1.28	.202	-0.15	0.72
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Delta R^2 =$	0.045*		
interaction(s)		F((2, 264) =	6.27, <i>p</i> < .0)5	
Conditional Effects of X to M, on W	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Moderator Value: Democrat Rater						
X1: Dem Vs. Rep	-0.35	0.17	-2.10	.036*	-0.68	-0.02
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control	-0.07	0.15	-0.51	.613	-0.37	0.22
Moderator Value: Republican Rater						
X1: Dem Vs. Rep	0.43	0.15	2.91	.004*	0.14	0.73
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control	0.21	0.17	1.26	.209	-0.12	0.54

 Table 4. Moderated Mediation estimates for job applicant political membership and hiring intentions, through liking (With Democrats as the Referent Group)

Moder	ated Mediat	ion Mo	del						
		Hiring Intentions (Y)							
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
Constant	0.41	0.20	2.08	.039*	0.02	0.80			
X ₁ : Dem Vs. Rep	0.18	0.10	1.84	.067	-0.01	0.36			
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control	-0.03	0.10	-0.34	.735	-0.22	0.16			
Applicant Liking (M)	0.83	0.05	15.98	.000**	0.73	0.94			
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W X ₁ : Dem Vs. Rep Comparison	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI					
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	-0.29	0.16	-0.61	0.02					
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	0.36	0.14	0.09	0.65					
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index 0.65	<i>SE</i> 0.22	<i>LLCI</i> 0.23	<i>ULCI</i> 1.08					
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control Comparison									
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	-0.06	0.10	-0.27	0.14					
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	0.18	0.14	-0.10	0.44					
Index of Moderated	Index	SE	LLCI	ULCI					
Mediation	0.24	0.17	-0.09	0.57					

Note. $N = 270 \ *p < .05, \ **p < .001. C = Coefficient. SE = Standard error. LLCI/ULCI = bias corrected lower/upper limit confidence intervals. R² = percentage of variance accounted for in outcomes by predictors. All analyses used 5000 bootstrap samples. The Democrat applicant was coded as the referent group "0", and the Republican and Control applicants were coded as the target groups "1". For the moderator values the Democrat Rater was coded as "0", and Republican Rater was coded as "1".$

Tables 5-6 with Applicant Competence as Mediator

Table 5. Moderated Mediation estimates for job applicant political membership and hiring intentions, through competence (With Republicans as the Referent Group)

Mediatio	on & Moderati	on Mode	1			
		Ар	plicant Co	ompetence	(M)	
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	3.65	0.15	25.00	.000**	3.36	3.93
X ₁ : Rep Vs. Dem	0.05	0.19	0.25	.800	-0.33	0.43
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control	-0.04	0.19	-0.22	.825	-0.41	0.32
Rater Political Party (W)	0.19	0.19	1.01	.315	-0.18	0.55
X1 * Rater Political Party (W)	-0.28	0.26	-1.10	.272	-0.79	0.22
X2 * Rater Political Party (W)	-0.28	0.26	-1.07	.287	-0.79	0.24
Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s)		F	$\Delta R^2 = (2, 264) =$	= 0.006 = 0.78, p >	05	
Moder	ated Mediatior	Model				
			Hiring In	tentions (Y)	
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	0.27	0.14	1.95	.052	-0.00	0.55
X ₁ : Rep Vs. Dem	-0.15	0.10	-2.07	.040*	-0.29	-0.01
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control	-0.05	0.10	-0.71	.481	-0.19	0.10
Applicant Competence (M)	0.89	0.03	25.83	.000**	0.82	0.96
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI		
X1: Rep Vs. Dem Comparison						
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	0.04	0.18	-0.31	0.40		
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	-0.21	0.14	-0.49	0.07		
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index -0.25	<i>SE</i> 0.23	<i>LLCI</i> -0.71	<i>ULCI</i> 0.21		
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control Comparison						
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	-0.04	0.17	-0.36	0.30		
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	-0.28	0.15	-0.59	0.01		
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index	SE 0 23	<i>LLCI</i> -0.70	ULCI 0.20		

Note. $N = 270 \ *p < .05$, **p < .001. C = Coefficient. SE = Standard error. LLCI/ULCI = bias corrected lower/upper limit confidence intervals. R² = percentage of variance accounted for in outcomes by predictors. All analyses used 5000 bootstrap samples. The Republican applicant was coded as the referent group "0", and the Democrat and Control applicants were coded as the target groups "1". For the moderator values the Democrat Rater was coded as "0", and Republican Rater was coded as "1".

Mediatio	n & Mode	ration M	odel						
	Applicant Competence (M)								
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
Constant	3.70	0.13	29.46	.000**	3.45	3.94			
X1: Dem Vs. Rep	-0.05	0.19	-0.25	.801	-0.43	0.33			
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control	-0.09	0.17	-0.53	.599	-0.42	0.25			
Rater Political Party (W)	-0.10	0.18	-0.54	.589	-0.45	0.26			
X1 * Rater Political Party (W)	0.28	0.26	1.10	.272	-0.22	0.79			
X2 * Rater Political Party (W)	0.01	0.26	0.02	.983	-0.50	0.51			
Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s)		F	$\Delta R^2 = (2, 264) =$	= 0.006 = 0.78, p > .0	05				

 Table 6. Moderated Mediation estimates for job applicant political membership and hiring intentions, through competence (With Democrats as the Referent Group)

Moder	rated Media	tion Mo	del			
			Hiring In	tentions (Y))	
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	0.12	0.14	0.91	363	-0.14	0.39
X ₁ : Dem Vs. Ren	0.15	0.10	2 01	040*	0.01	0.29
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control	0.10	0.10	1.36	.175	-0.04	0.24
Applicant Competence (M)	0.89	0.03	25.83	.000**	0.82	0.96
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W X ₁ : Dem Vs. Rep Comparison	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI		
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	-0.04	0.18	-0.40	0.30		
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	0.21	0.14	-0.07	0.49		
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index 0.25	<i>SE</i> 0.23	<i>LLCI</i> -0.19	<i>ULCI</i> 0.73		
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control Comparison						
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	-0.08	0.17	-0.41	0.25		
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	-0.08	0.16	-0.39	0.24		
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index 0.005	<i>SE</i> 0.23	<i>LLCI</i> -0.45	<i>ULCI</i> 0.46		

Note. N = 270 * p < .05, **p < .001. C = Coefficient. SE = Standard error. LLCI/ULCI = bias corrected lower/upper limit confidence intervals. R² = percentage of variance accounted for in outcomes by predictors. All analyses used 5000 bootstrap samples. The Democrat applicant was coded as the referent group "0", and the Republican and Control applicants were coded as the target groups "1". For the moderator values the Democrat Rater was coded as "0", and Republican Rater was coded as "1".

Simple Slope Figures



Figure 2. Interaction between applicant and rater political affiliation membership on applicant liking.



Figure 3. Interaction between applicant and rater political affiliation membership on applicant competence.

Error Bars: +/- 1 SE

Supplementary Analyses

Tables 7-8 With Applicant Warmth as Mediator

Table 7. Moderated Mediation estimates for job applicant political membership and hiring intentions, through warmth (With Republicans as the Referent Group)

Mediation	& Moderatio	n Model						
	Applicant Warmth (M)							
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Constant	3.27	0.13	25.72	.000**	3.02	3.52		
X1: Rep Vs. Dem	0.37	0.17	2.23	.026*	0.04	0.71		
X2: Rep Vs. Control	0.22	0.16	1.38	.169	-0.10	0.54		
Rater Political Party (W)	0.44	0.16	2.74	.007*	0.12	0.76		
X1 * Rater Political Party (W)	-0.80	0.22	-3.58	.000**	-1.25	-0.36		
X2 * Rater Political Party (W)	-0.64	0.23	-2.84	.005*	-1.09	-0.10		
Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s)	-0.64 0.23 -2.84 .005* -1.09 $\Delta R^2 = 0.051*$ $F(2, 264) = 6.27, p < .001$							
Conditional Effects of X to M, at W	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Moderator Value: Democrat Rater								
X ₁ : Rep Vs. Dem	0.37	0.17	2.23	.026*	0.04	0.71		
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control	0.22	0.16	1.38	.169	-0.10	0.54		
Moderator Value: Republican Rater								
X ₁ : Rep Vs. Dem	-0.43	0.15	-2.88	.004*	-0.72	-0.14		
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control	-0.42	0.16	-2.64	.009*	-0.74	-0.11		

Moderated 1	Mediation	Model				
		E	liring Int	entions (Y))	
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	0.67	0.19	3.44	.000**	0.29	1.05
X1: Rep Vs. Dem	-0.19	0.09	-1.96	.051	-0.37	0.00
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control	-0.11	0.09	-1.20	.233	-0.30	0.07
Applicant Warmth (M)	0.83	0.05	16.28	.000**	0.73	0.93
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI		
X1: Rep Vs. Dem Comparison						
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	0.31	0.16	-0.01	0.62		
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	-0.36	0.13	-0.61	-0.11		
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index -0.67	<i>SE</i> 0.20	<i>LLCI</i> -1.10	ULCI -0.27		
X ₂ : Rep Vs. Control Comparison						
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	0.19	0.16	-0.13	0.51		
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	-0.35	0.11	-0.58	-0.13		
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index -0.54	<i>SE</i> 0.20	<i>LLCI</i> -0.93	ULCI -0.15		

Note. $N = 270 \ *p < .05, \ **p < .001.$ C = Coefficient. SE = Standard error. LLCI/ULCI = bias corrected lower/upper limit confidence intervals. R² = percentage of variance accounted for in outcomes by predictors. All analyses used 5000 bootstrap samples. The Republican applicant was coded as the referent group "0", and the Democrat and Control applicants were coded as the target groups "1". For the moderator values the Democrat Rater was coded as "0", and Republican Rater was coded as "1".

Mediatio	n & Moder	ation M	odel					
	Applicant Warmth (M)							
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Constant	3.65	0.11	33.35	.000**	3.43	3.86		
X ₁ : Dem Vs. Rep	-0.37	0.17	-2.23	.026*	-0.71	-0.04		
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control	-0.15	0.15	-1.02	.308	-0.44	0.14		
Rater Political Party (W)	-0.36	0.16	-2.32	.021*	-0.67	-0.05		
X1 * Rater Political Party (W)	0.80	0.22	3.58	.000**	0.36	1.24		
X2 * Rater Political Party (W)	0.16	0.22	0.71	.476	-0.28	0.60		
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Delta R^2 =$	0.051*				
interaction(s)		F(z)	2, 264) =	6.27, <i>p</i> < .0	01			
Conditional Effects of X to M, on W	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Moderator Value: Democrat Rater								
X1: Dem Vs. Rep	-0.37	0.17	-2.23	.026*	-0.71	-0.04		
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control	-0.15	0.15	-1.02	.308	-0.44	0.14		
Moderator Value: Republican Rater								
X1: Dem Vs. Rep	0.43	0.15	2.88	.004*	0.14	0.72		
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control	0.01	0.17	0.05	.958	-0.32	0.34		

 Table 8. Moderated Mediation estimates for job applicant political membership and hiring intentions, through warmth (With Democrats as the Referent Group)

Moder	ated Mediat	ion Mo	del					
		Hiring Intentions (Y)						
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Constant	0.48	0.19	2.54	.012*	0.11	0.86		
X ₁ : Dem Vs. Rep	0.19	0.09	1.96	.051	-0.00	0.37		
Applicant Warmth (M)	0.83	0.09	16.28	.000**	0.73	0.26		
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W X ₁ : Dem Vs. Rep Comparison	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI				
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	-0.31	0.16	-0.63	0.02				
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	0.36	0.13	0.11	0.61				
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index 0.67	<i>SE</i> 0.21	<i>LLCI</i> 0.26	ULCI 1.08				
X ₂ : Dem Vs. Control Comparison								
Moderator Value: Dem Rater	-0.13	0.11	-0.34	0.10				
Moderator Value: Rep Rater	0.01	0.12	-0.24	0.24				
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index 0.13	<i>SE</i> 0.17	LLCI -0.20	<i>ULCI</i> 0.45				

Note. $N = 270 \ *p < .05, \ **p < .001. C = Coefficient. SE = Standard error. LLCI/ULCI = bias corrected lower/upper limit confidence intervals. R² = percentage of variance accounted for in outcomes by predictors. All analyses used 5000 bootstrap samples. The Democrat applicant was coded as the referent group "0", and the Republican and Control applicants were coded as the target groups "1". For the moderator values the Democrat Rater was coded as "0", and Republican Rater was coded as "1".$

Simple Slope Supplementary Figure



Figure 4. Interaction between applicant and rater political affiliation membership on applicant warmth.

Resume Materials

Republican Resume Condition

Bradley Miller

3220 N.E. 58th Street • Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308 Mobile: 786-465-0163 • Email: bmiller@gmail.com

Built and maintained financial models to make capital budgeting decisions, allocate resources and

Performed financial and accounting analysis and process improvement(s) associated with financial

· Executed short and long term custom financial strategies to reach company goals

Provided robust modeling reports to facilitate executive-level decision making

EDUCATION

.

SKILLS

Bachelor's Degree in Finance, GPA: 3.64 University of Houston, Houston, TX

forecast cash/investment needs

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Financial Analyst – Citi Group

management

Finance Intern – Morgan Stanley

August 2017 – May 2020

Minor: Business Administration

Major: Finance

Customer Service

Analytical Skills

Market Knowledge

May 2017 - July 2017

- Microsoft Excel, Word
- QuickBooks Accounting Program

Assisted with the development of business proposals

Analyzed market trends to predict business and revenue growth
Reviewed wide range of legal documents for financial considerations
Communicated and formally presented company spending and trends

• Strategic and Financial Planning

· Generated monthly and quarterly budget reports

- LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE
 - Vice President: The Republicans of America Club
 - Member: The American Finance Association (AFA)

REFERENCES

Available upon request

Democrat Resume Condition

Bradley Miller

3220 N.E. 58th Street • Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308 Mobile: 786-465-0163 • Email: bmiller@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Bachelor's Degree in Finance, GPA: 3.64

University of Houston, Houston, TX

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Financial Analyst – Citi Group

August 2017 – May 2020

May 2017 - July 2017

Minor: Business Administration

Major: Finance

- Executed short and long term custom financial strategies to reach company goals
- Built and maintained financial models to make capital budgeting decisions, allocate resources and forecast cash/investment needs
- Performed financial and accounting analysis and process improvement(s) associated with financial management
- Assisted with the development of business proposals
- Provided robust modeling reports to facilitate executive-level decision making

Finance Intern – Morgan Stanley

- Generated monthly and quarterly budget reports
- Analyzed market trends to predict business and revenue growth
- Reviewed wide range of legal documents for financial considerations
- Communicated and formally presented company spending and trends

SKILLS

- Microsoft Excel, Word
- QuickBooks Accounting Program
- Strategic and Financial Planning
- Customer Service
- Market Knowledge
- Analytical Skills

LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

- Vice President: The Democrats of America Club
- Member: The American Finance Association (AFA)

REFERENCES

Available upon request

Control Resume Condition

Bradley Miller

3220 N.E. 58th Street • Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308 Mobile: 786-465-0163 • Email: bmiller@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Bachelor's Degree in Finance, GPA: 3.64 University of Houston, Houston, TX

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Financial Analyst - Citi Group

August 2017 - May 2020

May 2017 - July 2017

Minor: Business Administration

• Executed short and long term custom financial strategies to reach company goals

Major: Finance

- Built and maintained financial models to make capital budgeting decisions, allocate resources and forecast cash/investment needs
- Performed financial and accounting analysis and process improvement(s) associated with financial management
- Assisted with the development of business proposals
- Provided robust modeling reports to facilitate executive-level decision making

Finance Intern – Morgan Stanley

- Generated monthly and quarterly budget reports
- Analyzed market trends to predict business and revenue growth
- Reviewed wide range of legal documents for financial considerations
- · Communicated and formally presented company spending and trends

SKILLS

- Microsoft Excel, Word
- QuickBooks Accounting Program
- Strategic and Financial Planning

- Customer Service
- Market Knowledge
- Analytical Skills

LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

- Vice President: Finance and Investment Club
- **Member**: The American Finance Association (AFA)

REFERENCES

Available upon request

III. STUDY #2: POLITICAL AFFILIATION AND DYADS AT WORK

Alexander C. Snihur¹

Alexander C. Snihur (Researcher, asnih002@fiu.edu, 786-436-9766) ¹Florida International University, DM 383C, 11200 SW 8th St, Miami, FL, 33199

Introduction

The old adage that workers should leave their personal lives at the door when going to work is unrealistic in this day and age. Research has shown that political discussions occur regularly in the workplace, with one recent survey revealing that 67% of men and 46% of women engage in political conversations at work (Chaudhary, 2020; Mutz & Mondak, 2006; Swigart et al., 2020). It is also clear that the political climate in the United States has become increasingly hostile and polarized over the last two decades (Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Pew, 2016, 2017; Swigart et al., 2020). People's views of the opposing political party "…are now more *negative* than at any other point in nearly a quarter of a century" (Pew, 2016), and voters are passionate about their own parties' success *and* the opposing parties' downfall (Wolf et al., 2012).

It is likely that these negative perceptions regarding opposing political parties also extend into the workplace. However, while there has been much research examining the nature and consequences of demographic dissimilarity between managers and subordinates, this is not the case for the variable of political affiliation (Avery et al., 2008; Corrington et al., 2020; Lindsey et al., 2017; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Roth et al., 2017; Swigart et al., 2020). One of the few studies to investigate political affiliation dissimilarity between coworkers found that this form of dissimilarity lead to political incivility at work, and subsequently lessened job satisfaction and increased turnover and burnout among the workforce (He et al., 2019). While this is a starting point, there is still a dearth of empirical studies in the Industrial-Organizational Psychology and Management literatures that examine the influence of political affiliation similarity and dissimilarity on workplace outcomes (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019; Swigart et al., 2020).

In the present paper, we broadly investigate the extent to which dissimilar political affiliation between individuals at work has detrimental effects on novel relational, attitudinal, and well-being outcomes. More specifically, this study will examine political affiliation dissimilarity between supervisor-subordinate dyads in the workplace and how it affects the relational outcomes of supervisor support and leadermember exchange (LMX), the attitudinal outcomes of job satisfaction and affective commitment, and the personal well-being outcome of perceived stress. The second question the present study seeks to address is whether supervisor liking acts as the mechanism through which political affiliation dissimilarity in the workplace relates to these organizational outcomes (See Figure 1).



Figure 1. Conceptual Diagram of Hypothesized Model for Study 2

Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

Social Identity Theory (SIT)

There has been much empirical investigation regarding how individuals identify with groups and organizations, and how these social identities influence behaviors (Bell et al., 2011; Hogg & Turner, 1985; Tajfel, 1982). According to Tajfel (1978), social identity is "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership." Social identities allow for social categorization to occur between individuals (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). People then compare and contrast those in their "in-group" with those in "out-groups." In doing this, members of the same social group (i.e., male/female, Democrat/Republican) are expected to be "like" others in the group and see things from the same perspective (Stets & Burke, 2000).

According to Social Identity Theory (SIT), individuals tend to treat members of their own group positively with favoritism and liking, while those in the perceived "outgroup" are viewed in more negative light (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). SIT posts that group membership favors the in-group at the expense of the out-group (Van Rossem, 2018). While in the past SIT has typically been coupled with the examination of overt demographic identities such as gender, race, and ethnicity (Colella et al., 2017), there has been a shift in recent years towards applying SIT to the more concealable identity of political affiliation (Gift & Gift, 2015; Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019). SIT is generally understood as a meta-theoretical perspective (Ellemers & Haslam, 2011) within which more specific theories are tested.

Similarity-Attraction Paradigm (SAP)

The Similarity-Attraction Paradigm (SAP) is commonly used within the SIT framework to examine the effects of social identity differences and similarities (Avery et al., 2008; Lindsey et al., 2017; Riordan, 2000; Roth et al., 2017, 2019; Schaffer & Riordan, 2013; Wade & Roth, 2015). SAP posits that those who are similar to one another will have high levels of interpersonal attraction and liking towards one another (Byrne, 1971, 1979). SAP states that there is an inherent assumption that similar individuals (based on social identity categorizations, such as political affiliation) have similar beliefs and values, life experiences, and even perceive the world in a similar way. Therefore, it is likely that there are more positive interactions and attitudes between similar individuals, while conversely perceived dissimilarity can lead to detriments in interpersonal attraction and liking, and ultimately negative workplace behaviors and outcomes (Byrne, 1971; He et al., 2019; Riordan, 2000; Roth et al., 2019).

Supporting SAP, I-O psychology research finds that supervisor-subordinate dyads who were similar in regard to gender and race had more positive and pleasant interactions accompanied by feelings of support and trust (Foley et al., 2006; Jeanquart-Barone, 1999; Pelled et al., 1999). Conversely, employees in dissimilar supervisor-subordinate pairings have more unpleasant interactions such as relationship conflicts at work (Jehn et al., 1999; Miller et al., 2019; Tepper et al., 2011). Based on both SIT and SAP theories, it can be expected that political affiliation dissimilarity between a supervisor-subordinate dyad could lead to decreased levels of liking, especially because individuals choose rather than inherit their political affiliation views, allowing more blame and responsibility to be placed on the individual for their group membership (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015).

Stereotype Content Model (SCM)

The Stereotype Content Model (SCM) is another theory within the SIT framework used to understand how social perceptions of others are created and how these perceptions may affect relational, attitudinal, and personal health outcomes (Fiske, 2018). The basic tenant of the SCM is that there are two primary dimensions on which people judge and assess others: warmth and competence (Cuddy et al., 2008; Fiske, 2018; Fiske et al., 2002). The SCM posits that individuals first want to know other's intent towards them (i.e., whether they are friend or foe), which is measured by perceptions of warmth (Fiske, 2018). The dimension of warmth is extremely similar to the notion of liking in both SIT and the SAP, and liking is included in the measurement operationalization for warmth (Fiske, 2018). The SCM stipulates that those who are viewed with high levels of warmth will elicit active facilitation (help and support) from others as they are perceived as friends, whereas those seen as lacking warmth elicit active harm (negative interactions, contempt, and envy) from others as they are viewed as foes (Cuddy et al., 2008; Fiske, 2018; Fiske et al., 2002).

The second dimension of social judgment is competence (i.e., capability), which reflects whether others can actually pursue their intentions (Cuddy et al., 2008; Fiske, 2018; Fiske et al., 2002). Items related to the competence dimension typically ask about whether individuals are perceived as intelligent, skilled, and efficient. While we will include perceived supervisor competence in the current study (as it is relevant according to the SCM), there are no formal hypotheses for the role it plays in the supervisorsubordinate relationship. While prior research demonstrates that perceived competence of job applicants is relevant for hireability during organizational selection processes (Eaton

et al., 2019), it is less clear how workers' perceptions of supervisor's competence (as a function of similarity) might affect workers' attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, our examination of competence as a mediating variable is exploratory.

In order to integrate SAP and SCM parsimoniously, liking will be utilized as a mediator for the current study (in lieu of warmth) between supervisor-subordinate political affiliation dissimilarity, and the relational, attitudinal, and personal health outcomes. Based on SAP and SCM, we predict the following for how supervisor-subordinate political affiliation dissimilarity will relate to subordinate's liking of their supervisor:

Hypothesis 1: Subordinate and supervisor political affiliation membership will interact to predict supervisor liking, such that increased political affiliation similarity between subordinates and their supervisors will relate to increased supervisor liking.

The Relationship Between Liking and Relational Outcomes

Supervisor Support

Supervisor support is a positive job resource that represents both the emotional and instrumental assistance, guidance, and feedback employees receive from their supervisors (House, 1981). The tenants of both SIT and SAP make the case that subordinates who are dissimilar with their supervisor will perceive lower levels of social support from their superior (Byrne, 1971, 1979). Research has shown that supervisorsubordinate dissimilarity leads to lower levels of liking and interpersonal attraction, which subsequently affects subordinate perceptions of support (Bakar & McCann, 2014; Schaffer & Riordan, 2013). Supervisor liking seems to act as the casual mechanism

between subordinate-supervisor demographic dissimilarity and perceived supervisor support (Schaffer & Riordan, 2013). It follows that liking will act in the same fashion with regard to the social identity variable of political affiliation, given the currently polarized political climate (Pew, 2019; Roth et el., 2017; Roth et al., 2019; Swigart et al., 2020)

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

LMX is defined as a measure of a reciprocal, overall working relationship quality between a subordinate and a supervisor, where each dyadic relationship is different between the supervisor and each of his/her subordinates (Liden et al., 1997). While LMX, or working relationship quality, may seem similar to liking (Dulebohn et al., 2012), it has been shown to be conceptually distinct; liking provides incremental variance above and beyond that of LMX in relation to various organizational outcome variables (Dulebohn et al., 2017). Additionally, a meta-analysis by Dulebohn et al. (2017) found that liking between a subordinate and supervisor is an antecedent to LMX, such that higher levels of liking, positively impacts the development of LMX. Therefore, we expect that:

Hypothesis 2a-b: Supervisor liking will be positively related to the relational outcomes of a) perceived supervisor support, and b) LMX.

The Relationship Between Liking and Attitudinal Outcomes

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the most studied variables in the Industrial and Organizational literature (Judge et al., 2002; Judge et al., 2001). Job satisfaction has typically been conceptualized as a multi-dimensional construct that includes the facets of pay, promotion, fringe benefits, and supervision to name a few (Spector, 1994). Therefore, it is logical that a subordinate's liking for his/her supervisor would be positively associated with overall job satisfaction. A meta-analysis by Dulebohn and colleagues (2017) corroborates this notion and found that across 28 independent studies the correlation between supervisor liking and job satisfaction was medium to large, positive, and significant (r = .41).

Affective Commitment

The current study will also measure the affective commitment component of Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Organizational Commitment Model as a downstream consequence of liking. The three-component organizational commitment model includes three forms of commitment: affective, normative, and continuance. Affective commitment is the most researched construct out of the three and is typically used when researchers examine organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1991; Meyer et al., 2002). Affective commitment is defined as an employee having an emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1991). Research has shown that subordinates view supervisors as critical representatives for the organizations for which they work (Bakar & McCann, 2014; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Frone, 2000). For example, a meta-analytic study by Meyer et al. (2002), found that affective commitment had a medium to large positive correlation with supervisor satisfaction (r = .42). Therefore, it is likely that how much a subordinate likes his/her supervisor will relate to the affective commitment they have towards the same organization.

Hypothesis 3a-b: Supervisor liking will be positively related to the subordinate attitudinal outcomes of a) job satisfaction, and b) affective commitment.

The Relationship Between Liking and Personal Health Outcomes

Perceived Stress

Perceived stress is an important occupational health and well-being variable that has garnered much attention in the I-O Literature (Hassard et al., 2018; Spector & Goh, 2001). Several studies depict how the relationship between subordinates and their supervisors can negatively affect employee health and well-being (Dormann & Zapf, 1999; Spector & Goh, 2001). Berry and Worthington Jr. (2001) conducted an experiment and found that relationship quality (including liking) between individuals was associated with levels of stress. The researchers found that those in unhappy romantic relationships, characterized by dislike for the partner, had higher levels of stress. These findings had high internal validity given that the researchers utilized a pre-posttest design measuring participants cortisol levels (i.e., physiological stress) before and after introducing a relationship quality manipulation (imagining a pleasant or unpleasant relationship). These findings extend into the workplace where a meta-analysis conducted by Viswesvaran et al. (1999) show that supportive and positive supervisor-subordinate relationships at work positively affect worker well-being, since perceived stressors and strain outcomes were reduced.

Hypothesis 4: Supervisor liking will be negatively related to the subordinate health outcome of perceived stress.

Liking as the Casual Mechanism

Research, including meta-analytic studies, depicts liking as the mediator between perceived similarity and a host of outcomes ranging from job satisfaction, to affective commitment, to supervisor support, to turnover intentions, and job performance

(Dulebohn et al., 2017; Schaffer & Riordan, 2013). The current study will examine political affiliation similarity in this way, which only a handful of studies have attempted (He et al., 2019; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019). Based on SAP and the SCM, this polarizing and meaningful social identity variable is likely to explain significant variance in the relational, attitudinal, and personal health outcomes we are examining (Iyengar et al., 2012; Iyengar & Westwood 2015; Roth et al., 2017; Swigart et al., 2020).

Hypothesis 5: The effects of political affiliation dissimilarly between the subordinate and the supervisor on all of the outcomes (relational, attitudinal, and personal) will be mediated by the subordinate's liking of the supervisor.

Methods

Participants

A total of 209 participants were recruited through Qualtrics Panel Service, which is commonly utilized in psychological research, to recruit willing participants who will participate in surveys (Roth et al., 2019). All participants met the following criteria to take part in the study: they were least 18 years old, self-identified as Democrat or Republican, were a United States citizen, had an immediate supervisor at work, and worked full time (40+ hours per week) for an organization within the U.S. All of these participants met the initial screening criteria and passed the two attention check questions.² Nine participants were excluded from all further analyses since they did not know the political affiliation of their supervisor.

In terms of demographics, the final sample (N = 200) had an average age of 40.26 (SD = 11.47) and worked an average of 43.14 (SD = 6.97) hours per week. The sample

² We did not have access to partial data and were unable to determine the number of individuals who did not meet the screening criteria or failed to pass any of the study checks.

was evenly split between Republicans (50%) and Democrats (50%), and males (51%) and females (49%). Participants worked with their current supervisor for an average of 5.50 years (SD = 4.93) and worked at their current organization for an average of 9.00 years (SD = 7.05). Most of the participants had at least a bachelor's degree (58%). The participants consisted of 63.5% Whites (n = 127), 16.5% Hispanic Americans (n = 33), 13% African Americans (n = 26), 5% Asian Americans (n = 10), 1.5% Native Americans (n = 3), 0.5% other (n = 1). A breakdown of the participant's job industry information can be found in Table 1.

The participants also answered a few demographic questions about their supervisor, and the breakdown is as follows. The supervisors had an estimated average age of 46.23 (SD = 10.41), and 69% were male while 31% were female. Further, most supervisors were White (78.5%), and participants reported that 45% of their supervisors were Democrat and 55% were Republican.

While subordinate perceptions of their supervisor's political membership was the psychologically meaningful variable in this study, and the independent variable of interest, we also endeavored to examine correspondence between subordinates' perception of the supervisors political affiliation and the supervisor's actual political affiliation. To do so, participants were asked to provide their supervisor's email if they wanted to, so we could double check the accuracy of the subordinate's perception of their supervisor's political party affiliation. Of these 101 supervisors that we emailed, 23 responded with their political party, and there were 17 correct matches (73.91%) with the subordinate's perception of their supervisor's political affiliation. However, what

mattered for this study was the subordinate's perceptions of the supervisor's political affiliation.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through the use of Qualtrics Panel, a web-based participant recruitment service, and were invited to take a 15-minute survey. Participants first completed a consent form acknowledging that they could leave the study at any time and that their responses would remain anonymous. Participants then completed a survey asking them to report on the following scales: their political affiliation, their perceived supervisor's political affiliation, liking of supervisor, supervisor competence, job satisfaction, supervisor support, leader member exchange, affective commitment, and perceived stress. Participants were also asked relevant demographic questions about themselves (e.g., age, gender, race, education, organizational tenure, tenure with supervisor, frequency of interactions with supervisor, etc.) and about their supervisor (e.g., gender, race, age, etc.). Two questions about stress due to the Covid-19 pandemic were included for use as potential control variables. Two attention checks were utilized to ensure the integrity of the collected responses and to show that participants were focused on the study.

Measures

Political Affiliation

Political affiliation was assessed for the participant, as well as his/her perception of his/her supervisor's political affiliation using a categorical single item, consistent with past research (Swigart et al., 2020). The item asked, "Which best describes your Political Party Affiliation?" The three answer choices included "Democrat", "Republican", or

"Other". The same question was asked about the participant's perception of his/her supervisor's political affiliation.

Supervisor Liking

Supervisor liking was measured using the 4-item Liking of Supervisor Scale developed by Turban et al. (1990). A sample item is "Working with my supervisor is a pleasure." Each item was rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for supervisor liking was 0.91.

Perceived Supervisor Competence

Supervisor competence was measured using a 3-item measure adopted from Moss-Racusin et al. (2012). The items include "Do you believe your supervisor is competent?" "How qualified do you think you think your supervisor is for his/her position?" and "Do you think your supervisor has the necessary skills to perform his/her job?" Each item was rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for perceived supervisor competence was 0.90.

Supervisor Support

Perceived supervisor support was measured using an 8-item scale by Eisenberger et al. (1997) that was created to measure perceived organizational support. Each item was modified to reflect an employee's supervisor rather than their organization. Some sample items are "My supervisor really cares about my well-being." and "My supervisor would forgive an honest mistake on my part." Each item was rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for supervisor support was 0.83.

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

The relational variable of LMX was measured using the 7-item scale developed by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995). The scale assesses the extent to which an effective leadership relationship is present between dyadic partners, such as a supervisor and subordinate. Some items include "How well does your supervisor recognize your potential?" and "Do you know where you stand with your supervisor and do you usually know how satisfied your supervisor is with what you do?" Each item was on a 5-point Likert scale, with the specific answer choices varying for each scale item. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for LMX was 0.90.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured using the 36-item scale developed by Paul Spector (Spector, 1994). Some sample items from this scale include, "I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated." and "My supervisor is unfair to me." Each item was rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*disagree very much*) to 6 (*agree very much*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for job satisfaction was 0.95.

Affective Commitment

Affective commitment was measured using the 8-item sub-scale from the Allen and Meyer (1990) organizational commitment scale. Sample items include, "This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me" and "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization." Each item was rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for affective commitment was 0.79.

Perceived Stress

The well-being variable of perceived stress was measured using the 4-item scale developed by Motowidlo et al. (1986). Some sample items include "I feel a great deal of stress because of my job" and "My job is extremely stressful" Each item was rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for work stress was 0.85.³

Demographic Variables

These items captured the participant's age, gender, race, education, occupation, average number of hours worked per week, organizational tenure, tenure with supervisor, supervisor gender, supervisor ethnicity and frequency of interactions with supervisor.

Results

Data Screening

Following suggestions from DeSimone and Harms (2018), the survey included 2 direct instructed attention check questions (e.g., Please select "Disagree very much") to minimize low quality response data. Survey completion time was also used as the unobtrusive data method used to determine low quality data and to screen participants (DeSimone & Harms, 2018; DeSimone et al., 2015). The time requirement Qualtrics Panel enforced was that any participant who completed the survey faster than one-half of the median time was automatically dropped for not responding thoughtfully. Additionally, nine employees who did not know their supervisor's political party affiliation were excluded from all analyses.

³ Only two of the four stress items in the scale were utilized for Cronbach's Alpha and for all analyses. When the reverse scored items were included, the α did not meet the .70 requirement. Importantly, the analyses led to similar findings whether the 2-item or 4-item measure of stress was used.

Data Analyses

A priori analysis conducted with G*Power at $\alpha = .05$ power level at .80, indicated that the minimum sample of 155 is needed to detect a small to medium effect size (f^2 =.08). Since we had a total of 200 valid responses, we successfully recruited enough participants to participate in the study. All data analyses were run in SPSS Version 23. All descriptive statistics (e.g., means, and standard deviations), scale reliabilities, scale scatter plots were examined and tested to ensure normality of the data (except for demographic variables). Cronbach's alpha was at least $\alpha = .70$ for the measures to be included in further data analysis (Cronbach, 1951). Descriptive statistics including the means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and Pearson's *r* correlations are displayed in Table 2.

Mediation analyses were conducted with Preacher and Hayes (2008) bootstrapping procedure to estimate direct and indirect effects. Analyses were conducted using the PROCESS Macro version 3.3 for SPSS, which calculated bias corrected 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals around the indirect effects, using 5,000 bootstrap samples (Hayes & Little, 2017). Then, moderated mediation analyses were conducted to test the hypothesized conditional indirect effects. The index of moderated mediation was utilized as the formal test of moderated mediation, which quantifies the slope of the relationship between the indirect effect and the moderator (Hayes & Little, 2017).

The Effect of Supervisor Political Affiliation and Subordinate Political Affiliation on Supervisor Liking

The regression coefficient for the interaction between supervisor political affiliation and subordinate political affiliation on supervisor liking was statistically

significant (b = 1.27, SE = 0.32, t(196) = 3.94, p < .001, 95% CI = 0.64, 1.91). This indicates that how much a subordinate likes his/her supervisor depended on the political affiliation match between the supervisor and the employee. See Table 3.

Simple Effects for Supervisor Political Affiliation and Subordinate Political Affiliation on Supervisor Liking

The simple slopes can now be interpreted at various levels of subordinate political affiliation membership, starting with those Republican subordinates. The simple effect of supervisor political affiliation membership on supervisor liking was statistically significant for among those Republican subordinates (b = 0.57, SE = 0.26, t(196) = 2.24, p < .05, 95% CI = 0.07, 1.08). Specifically, Republican subordinates liked Republican supervisors (M = 4.28, SD = 0.69), more than Democrat supervisors (M = 3.70, SD = 0.89). See Figure 2.

The simple effect of supervisor political affiliation membership on supervisor liking, was also statistically significant for Democrat subordinates (b = -0.70, SE = 0.20, t(196) = -3.55, p < .001, 95% CI = -1.09, -0.31). Democrat subordinates liked Democrat supervisors (M = 4.16, SD = 0.87), more than Republican supervisors (M = 3.46, SD =0.92). Therefore, hypothesis 1 was fully supported. Note that these simple slope regression coefficients also represent the "a paths" that will be used as evidence for the mediation hypotheses. See Table 3 and Figure 2.

Zero Order Correlations

The correlations between supervisor liking and the five outcomes are depicted below. Supervisor liking was positively related to the relational outcomes of supervisor support (r = 0.76, p < .001) and LMX (r = 0.74, p < .001). Supervisor liking was positively related to the attitudinal outcomes of job satisfaction (r = 0.61, p < .001) and affective commitment (r = 0.55, p < .001). Lastly, supervisor liking was negatively related to the personal health outcome of perceived stress (r = -0.18, p < .001). Therefore, hypotheses 2a-b, 3a-b, and 4 were all fully supported. See Table 2.

The Mediational Role of Supervisor Liking for Study Outcomes

To investigate the indirect effect of supervisor political affiliation membership on the study outcomes, mediation analyses were performed using the PROCESS Macro, version 3.3 for SPSS (Hayes & Little, 2017). Bias corrected 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals were calculated around the indirect effects, using 5,000 bootstrap samples. As noted above, the simple slopes for the interaction represented the "a paths" for the indirect effects of supervisor political affiliation membership on each of the outcomes, through supervisor liking, depending on the subordinate's political affiliation.

Supervisor Liking as a Mediator for Supervisor Support

Results indicated that supervisor liking positively and significantly predicted perceived supervisor support, while controlling for the supervisor's political party (b = 0.62, SE = 0.04, t(196) = 16.14, p < .001, 95% CI = 0.54, 0.70). See Table 3.

Supervisor Liking as a Mediator for LMX.

Results indicated that supervisor liking positively and significantly predicted LMX, while controlling for the supervisor's political party (b = 4.67, SE = 0.30, t(196) = 15.65, p < .001, 95% CI = 4.08, 5.25). See Table 4.

Supervisor Liking as a Mediator for Job Satisfaction

Results indicated that supervisor liking positively and significantly predicted job satisfaction, while controlling for the supervisor's political party (b = 22.99, SE = 2.10, t(196) = 10.97, p < .001, 95% CI = 18.85, 27.12). See Table 5.

Supervisor Liking as a Mediator for Affective Commitment

Results indicated that supervisor liking positively and significantly predicted affective commitment, while controlling for the supervisor's political party (b = 0.49, SE = 0.05, t(196) = 9.28, p < .05, 95% CI = 0.38, 0.59). See Table 6.

Supervisor Liking as a Mediator for Stress

Results indicated that supervisor liking negatively and significantly predicted stress, while controlling for the supervisor's political party (b = -0.27, SE = 0.10, t(196) = -2.64, p < .05, 95% CI = -0.47, -0.07). See Table 7.

Taking the entire indirect effect into consideration for each of the outcomes, there is evidence to support full mediation. Therefore, hypothesis 5, that political affiliation dissimilarity between the supervisor and subordinate on the outcomes (relational, attitudinal, and personal) would be mediated by supervisor liking, was supported.

Moderated Mediation with Liking as the Mediator for Study Outcomes

Next, several moderated mediation analyses were run to examine the conditional indirect effect of supervisor political affiliation membership on each of the various study outcomes, through the proposed mediator of supervisor liking. The analyses were done in PROCESS using Model 7. The index of moderated mediation was utilized as the formal test of moderated mediation (Hayes & Little, 2017).

Conditional Indirect Effect of Supervisor Liking on Supervisor Support

Based on the index of moderated mediation (*index* = 0.79, 95% CI = 0.35 to 1.29) the indirect effect of supervisor political affiliation membership on supervisor support, through supervisor liking is moderated by subordinate political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). In other words, the extent to which subordinates perceived differing levels of supervisor support due to differences in supervisor liking, depended on political affiliation (dis)similarity between the supervisor and the subordinate. See Table 3.

Conditional Indirect Effect of Supervisor Liking on LMX

Based on the index of moderated mediation (*index* = 5.94, 95% CI = 2.79 to 9.49) the indirect effect of supervisor political affiliation membership on LMX, through supervisor liking was moderated by subordinate political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). In other words, the extent to which subordinates perceived differing levels of LMX due to differences in supervisor liking, depended on political affiliation (dis)similarity between the supervisor and the subordinate. See Table 4.

Conditional Indirect Effect of Supervisor Liking on Job Satisfaction

The index of moderated mediation (*index* = 29.28, 95% CI = 13.36 to 47.51) indicated that the indirect effect of supervisor political affiliation membership on job satisfaction, through supervisor liking, was moderated by subordinate political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). In other words, the extent to which subordinates reported differing levels of job satisfaction due to differences in supervisor liking, depended on political affiliation (dis)similarity between the supervisor and the subordinate. See Table 5.

Conditional Indirect Effect of Supervisor Liking on Affective Commitment

The index of moderated mediation (*index* = 0.62, 95% CI = 0.29 to 1.02) indicated that the indirect effect of supervisor political affiliation membership on affective commitment, through supervisor liking was moderated by subordinate political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). Therefore, the extent to which subordinates reported differing levels of affective commitment due to differences in supervisor liking, depended on political affiliation (dis)similarity between the supervisor and the subordinate. See Table 6.

Conditional Indirect Effect of Supervisor Liking on Stress

The index of moderated mediation (*index* = -0.34, 95% CI = -0.69 to -0.07) indicated that the indirect effect of supervisor political affiliation membership on stress, through supervisor liking was moderated by subordinate political membership (Hayes & Little, 2017). Therefore, the extent to which subordinates reported differing levels of stress due to differences in supervisor liking, depended on political affiliation (dis)similarity between the supervisor and the subordinate. See Table 7.

Simple Indirect Effects on Study Outcomes

Since all of the indices of moderated mediation were significant, we examined the indirect effects on the outcomes further, probing them as a function of subordinate political affiliation membership (Republican or Democrat).

When the Subordinate is a Republican

For the relational study outcomes, Republican subordinates liked Republican supervisors more than the Democrat supervisors, and this difference in supervisor liking related to significant increases in perceived supervisor support (*conditional effect* = 0.36,

95% CI = 0.04 to 0.73), and LMX (*conditional effect* = 2.68, 95% CI = 0.27 to 9.49) towards the Republican supervisor. The same pattern occurs with the attitudinal study outcomes. Republican subordinates liked Republican supervisors more than the Democrat supervisors, and the difference in liking related to significant increases in job satisfaction (*conditional effect* = 13.18, 95% CI = 1.16 to 26.52), and affective commitment (*conditional effect* = 0.28, 95% CI = 0.03 to 0.57), when the Republican employee had a Republican supervisor. Lastly for the personal health outcome of stress, Republican subordinates liked Republican supervisors more than Democrat supervisors, and the difference in supervisor liking related to significant decreases in stress (*conditional effect* = -0.22, 95% CI = -0.44 to -0.08), for Republican subordinates when their supervisor was also a Republican. See Tables 3-7.

When the Subordinate is a Democrat

For the relational study outcomes, Democrat subordinates liked the Democrat supervisors more than the Republican supervisors, and this difference in supervisor liking, related to significant increases in perceived supervisor support (*conditional effect* = -0.43, 95% CI = -0.73 to -0.16), and LMX (*conditional effect* = -3.27, 95% CI = -5.62 to -1.23) towards the Democrat supervisor. The same pattern occurs with the attitudinal study outcomes. Democrat subordinates liked the Democrat supervisors more than the Republican supervisors, and the difference in supervisor liking related to significant increases in job satisfaction (*conditional effect* = -16.10, 95% CI = -27.44 to -5.86), and affective commitment (*conditional effect* = -0.34, 95% CI = -0.59 to -0.13), when the Democrat employees had a Democrat supervisor. Lastly for the personal health outcome of stress, Democrat subordinates liked Democrat supervisors more than Republican

supervisors, and the difference in supervisor liking related to significant decreases in stress (*conditional effect* = 0.19, 95% CI = 0.04 to 0.39), for the Democrat subordinates when the supervisor was also a Democrat. See Tables 3-7.

Discussion

From the results, it is clear that a perceived (mis)match in political affiliation membership between a supervisor and a subordinate in the workplace significantly relates to subordinate relational (perceived supervisor support, and LMX), attitudinal (job satisfaction and affective commitment), and health outcomes (stress), through supervisor liking. Specifically, Republican subordinates liked Republican supervisors more than Democrat supervisors, and Democrat subordinates liked Democrat supervisors more than Republican supervisors. When the political affiliation between the supervisor support, LMX, job satisfaction, and affective commitment, and decreases in stress for the subordinate, through the process mechanism of supervisor liking. The converse is true as well, where dissimilarity in political affiliation membership between supervisors and subordinates was associated with decreased supervisor liking and it was detrimental for all five outcomes. Together the findings paint a clear picture of the potential influence of political affiliation membership within organizations and the workplace.

This study advances the dearth of literature within the I-O and Management fields investigating the effects of political affiliation membership within the work environment in several ways. First, the results are consistent with SIT, SAP, and the SCM, depicting political affiliation as a salient social identity even in professional supervisor-subordinate work relationships. Those with the same political memberships (i.e., the in-group) are
seen in a positive light, while those with differing political memberships (i.e., the outgroup) are seen in a more negative light (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Van Rossem, 2018). In-group favoritism and out-group disklike may both play a role in how subordinates perceive their supervisors, stemming from political affiliation (dis)similarity, and this has consequences for many organizational outcomes, which ought to be taken seriously (Byrne, 1971, 1997; Roth et al., 2017; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Second, this study investigated previously underexamined yet important workplace outcomes (e.g., supervisor support, LMX, affective commitment, and stress) in relation to political affiliation (dis)similarity between supervisor-subordinate dyads, broadening the effects of this phenomena. Third, we found supporting evidence for supervisor liking as a process mechanism, linking supervisor-subordinate political affiliation (mis)match with the outcomes. Fourth, this study answered the call from the Roth et al. (2019) paper, by directly measuring the actual political affiliation membership of participants rather than estimating it, which other research has done (Gift & Gift, 2015; He et al., 2019; Wade & Roth, 2015). For example, He et al. (2019), had participants answer questions about their own political views and that of their coworkers, without double checking if the participants had accurate perceptions about their coworker's actual political views. In this study we went a step further and obtained the supervisor's actual account of their own political affiliation, in addition to obtaining the subordinates perspective, which strengthened the validity of our findings.

Implications

In light of the current hostile political climate within the United States, in conjunction with the results of this study, there are many practical implications for

employees, supervisors, and organizations (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015; Pew, 2016, 2017). First, even though political discussions occur regularly in today's workplace, subordinates ought to be cautious about having discussions with their supervisors that would indicate one's political affiliation identity (Chaudhary, 2020; Corrington et al., 2020; Swigart et al., 2020). Political affiliation is job-irrelevant information, yet a subordinate's perception of their supervisor's political membership can have repercussions for important organizational and personal outcomes if there is a mismatch on this identity between the parties. He et al. (2019) found that political affiliation dissimilarity in the workplace negatively affected employee well-being, and a host of outcomes (e.g., burnout, turnover, and job satisfaction) due to politically based coworker incivility. On the other hand, if a subordinate perceives a match in political affiliation with their supervisor, it may benefit the subordinate and relevant organizational outcomes as the current study found. Ultimately, it is a gamble for subordinates to engage in political conversations in the workplace, and employees ought to weigh and consider potential advantages as well as consequences for having these kinds of conversations with those they work with.

Supervisors should be strategic about disclosing or indicating their political affiliation membership. If a supervisor knows their political affiliation matches that of a subordinate, it may be beneficial for the supervisor to disclose their political membership. In this instance, the subordinate may like the supervisor more as he/she would view the supervisor as an in-group companion (Van Rossem, 2018). But even if supervisor-subordinate dyads do not have similar political affiliation memberships there is still hope for supervisors to engender subordinate liking towards them by identifying other points

of similarity (e.g., gender and race) with their subordinates, which can cultivate positive interactions and liking (Foley et al., 2006; Jeanquart-Barone, 1999; Pelled et al., 1999).

However, if subordinates perceive subtle hints of in-group favoritism and outgroup dislike from a supervisor (stemming from political affiliation (dis)similarity), they may view their workplace as inequitable. As a general rule, and to minimize liability, organizations should implement policies to discourage employees from disclosing their political affiliation viewpoints as this characteristic is not job relevant, and can lead to discrimination of employees in the workplace. If political discussions still occur in the workplace, organizations can alternatively set ground rules that help foster civil and respectful conversations among employees and build a positive workplace culture that allows for amicable political discourse (Corrington et al., 2020). Also, organizations should prioritize trainings for diversity of thought, where employees and supervisors are taught to be more accepting of those with diverse viewpoints, in addition to focusing on diversity as demographic representation based on other social identities such as ethnicity or gender (Corrington et al., 2020; He et al., 2019).

Lastly, while there is current federal legislation making discrimination in the workplace illegal on the basis of race, religion, national origin, color, gender, age, disability, and even genetic information to name a few (i.e., Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and The Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008), the there is no such protection for employees on the basis of political affiliation membership (E.E.O.C., 2019; Swigart et al., 2020). To potentially minimize adverse workplace interactions, behaviors, and outcomes stemming from the polarizing identity of political affiliation, and to better protect all employees, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity

Commission (EEOC) ought to consider investigating complaints of discrimination on the basis of political affiliation membership.

Limitations

First, our data was mainly single source and self-reported in relation to the study outcomes, which could potentially increase common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012). Relationships between the variables may be artificially inflated due to this but research has shown that an employees' own perception is a valid indicator of his/her work environment and is robustly associated with organizational outcomes (Chan, 2009; Pindek & Spector, 2016). Second, this data was collected in October 2020, right before the contentious 2020 Presidential Election, which could have exacerbated the effects of political affiliation membership on workplace outcomes. However, organizations will inevitably need to deal with how political affiliation membership may influence the work environment and employee relationships to a great extent every 4 years, with the occurrence of the United States Presidential Election. Third, while many theoretical frameworks support the temporal associations of the variables in our model, we hypothesized a mediation model with cross sectional data, so we cannot make definitive casual claims, however a model of reverse causality is unlikely with this model. Logically, however, it is more likely that political affiliation (dis)similarity would affect supervisor liking and downstream outcomes, rather than these outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction) causing one to dislike their supervisor, and therefore believe they have a political mismatch. Lastly, as we did not examine some sort of control or politically neutral dyad in this study, we are unable to definitively determine

whether it is in-group favoritism, out-group dislike, or some combination of the two that is the driving the associations in the current study.

Future Research

The current study operationalized political party affiliation as a binary variable made up of the two largest parties in the United States (e.g., Republicans and Democrats). While this is a great place to start, future studies can expand this operationalization and include more political parties (i.e., Libertarian, Independents, etc.) to see how and if these various political memberships affect workplace outcomes between employees. Also, this study examined how a (mis)match in political affiliation influences supervisorsubordinate dyads from the subordinate perspective. This is only half the picture and it is just as important to investigate how political affiliation membership affects relational, attitudinal, and organizational outcomes from the supervisor's perspective. For example, would a supervisor be more prone to giving negative performance evaluations to those employees who have dissimilar political affiliation memberships with the supervisor? Moreover, the effects of political affiliation dis(similarity) on the essential organizational outcome of job performance must be evaluated in future, to fully depict the influence of this polarizing social identity in the workplace (Johnson & Roberto, 2018). There should also be additional investigation into the effects of political affiliation (dis)similarity on all different types of work relationships, such as co-workers at the same organizational level, and between job applicants and hiring managers, to gain a more holistic perspective on how the social identity of political affiliation affects individuals across the entire work process (Corrington et al., 2020; He et al., 2019; Johnson & Roberto, 2018; Roth et al., 2017; Roth et al., 2019; Swigart et al., 2020).

It would be interesting for researchers to investigate potential processes and behaviors other than liking that may be underling these associations. For example, supervisors may be treating employees differentially based on their political affiliation membership. He and colleagues (2019) found that employees' experience political identity-based incivility, which detrimentally impacted their job attitudes and well-being. Finally, researchers should continue to explore whether in-group favoritism, out-group dislike, or a combination of the two is driving political affiliation (dis)similarity to influence these workplace outcomes.

References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18.
- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2008). What are the odds? How demographic similarity affects the prevalence of perceived employment discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 235–249.
- Bakar, H. A., & McCann, R. M. (2014). Matters of demographic similarity and dissimilarity in supervisor–subordinate relationships and workplace attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 41, 1–16.
- Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., Lukasik, M. A., Belau, L., & Briggs, A. L. (2011). Getting specific about demographic diversity variable and team performance relationships: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 37(3), 709–743.
- Berry, J. W., & Worthington Jr., E. L. (2001). Forgivingness, relationship quality, stress while imagining relationship events, and physical and mental health. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48(4), 447-455.
- Byrne, D. E. (1971). The attraction paradigm. New York, NY: AcademicPress.
- Byrne, D. (1997). An overview (and underview) of research and theory within the attraction paradigm. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14(3), 417–431.
- Chan, D. (2009). So why ask me? Are self-report data really that bad? In C. E. Lance, & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and methodological myths and urban legends:*

Doctrine, verity and fable in the organizational and social sciences (pp. 311–338). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Chaudhary, M., (March 4, 2020). More Than Half of Your Employees Are Talking Politics at Work, Surveys Reflektive. HR Technologist. https://www.hrtechnologist.com/news/culture/more-than-half-of-your-employeesare-talking-politics-at-work-surveys-reflective/
- Colella, A., Hebl, M., & King, E. (2017). One hundred years of discrimination research in the Journal of Applied Psychology: A sobering synopsis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 500–513.
- Corrington, A., Hebl, M., Stewart, D., Madera, J., Ng, L., & Williams, J. (2020).
 Diversity and inclusion of understudied populations: A call to practitioners and researchers. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 72(4), 303–323
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297–334.
- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 61–149.
- DeSimone, J. A., & Harms, P. D. (2018). Dirty data: The effects of screening respondents who provide low-quality data in survey research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33(5), 559–577.
- DeSimone, J. A., Harms, P. D., & DeSimone, A. J. (2015). Best practice recommendations for data screening. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(2), 171–181.
- Dormann, C., & Zapf, D. (1999). Social support, social stressors at work, and depressive symptoms: testing for main and moderating effects with structural equations in a three-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(6), 874–884.
- Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1715–1759.
- Dulebohn, J. H., Wu, D., & Liao, C. (2017). Does liking explain variance above and beyond LMX? A meta-analysis. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(1), 149–166.

- Eaton, A. A., Saunders, J. F., Jacobson, R. K., & West, K. (2019). How gender and race stereotypes impact the advancement of scholars in STEM: Professors' biased evaluations of physics and biology post-doctoral candidates. *Sex Roles*, *82*, 127–141.
- Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5), 812–820.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.
- Ellemers, N., & Haslam, S. A. (2011). *Social identity theory*. Handbook of theories of social psychology. New York, NY: Sage Publications.
- Fiske, S. T. (2018). Stereotype content: Warmth and competence endure. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(2), 67–73.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878– 902.
- Foley, S., Linnehan, F., Greenhaus, J. H., & Weer, C. H. (2006). The impact of gender similarity, racial similarity, and work culture on family-supportive supervision. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(4), 420–441.
- Frone, M. R. (2000). Interpersonal conflict at work and psychological outcomes: testing a model among young workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 246–255.
- Gift, K., & Gift, T. (2015). Does politics influence hiring? Evidence from a randomized experiment. *Political Behavior*, *37*(3), 653–675.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quartely*, 6(2), 219–247.
- Hassard, J., Teoh, K. R., Visockaite, G., Dewe, P., & Cox, T. (2018). The cost of workrelated stress to society: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(1), 1–17.
- Hayes, A. F., & Little, T. (2017). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. New York, NY: Guilford publications.

- He, Y., Costa, P. L., Walker, J. M., Miner, K. N., & Wooderson, R. L. (2019). Political identity dissimilarity, workplace incivility, and declines in well-being: A prospective investigation. *Stress and Health*, 35(3), 256–266.
- Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1985). Interpersonal attraction, social identification and psychological group formation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(1), 51–66.
- House, J. S. (1981). Work stress and social support. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- 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., Sood, G., & Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology a social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *76*(3), 405–431.
- Jeanquart-Barone, S. (1993). Trust differences between supervisors and subordinates: Examining the role of race and gender. *Sex roles, 29*(1-2), 1–11.
- Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*(4), 741–763.
- Johnson, A. F., & Roberto, K. J. (2018). Right versus left: How does political ideology affect the workplace?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(8), 1040–1043.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530–541.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction– job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376–407.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15, 47–120.
- Lindsey, A. P., Avery, D. R., Dawson, J. F., & King, E. B. (2017). Investigating why and for whom management ethnic representativeness influences interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(11), 1545– 1563.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.

- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20–52.
- Miller, C., Richard, O. and Ford, Jr, D. (2019). Ethno-racial similarity, relationship conflict and trust in supervisor-subordinate dyads. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 30 (2), 246–269.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16474–16479.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Packard, J. S., & Manning, M. R. (1986). Occupational stress: its causes and consequences for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 618-629.
- Mutz, D. C., & Mondak, J. J. (2006). The workplace as a context for cross-cutting political discourse. *The Journal of Politics*, 68(1), 140–155.
- Pelled, L. H., Ledford, G. E., & Mohrman, S. A. (1999). Demographic dissimilarity and workplace inclusion. *Journal of Management Studies*, *36*(7), 1013–1031.
- Pew Research Center. (2016). *Partisanship and political animosity in 2016*. Retrieved from https://www.people-press.org/2016/06/22/partisanship-and-political-animosity-in-2016/
- Pew Research Center. (2017). *The partisan divide on political values grows even wider*. Retrieved from https://www.people-press.org/2017/10/05/the-partisan-divide-on-political-values-grows-even-wider/
- Pew Research Center. (2019). Americans see advantages and challenges in country's growing racial and ethnic diversity. Retrieved from https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2019/05/08/americans-see-advantages-and-challenges-in-countrys-growing-racial-and-ethnic-diversity/
- Pindek, S., & Spector, P. E. (2016). Organizational constraints: a meta-analysis of a major stressor. Work & Stress, 30(1), 7-25.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539-569.

- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), 879–891.
- Riordan, C. (2000). Relational demography within groups: Past developments, contradictions, and new directions. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 19, 131–173.
- Roth, P. L., Goldberg, C. B., & Thatcher, J. B. (2017). The role of political affiliation in employment decisions: A model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(9), 1286–1304.
- Roth, P. L., Thatcher, J. B., Bobko, P., Matthews, K. D., Ellingson, J. E., & Goldberg, C. B. (2019). Political affiliation and employment screening decisions: The role of similarity and identification processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/apl0000422
- Schaffer, B. S., & Riordan, C. M. (2013). Relational demography in supervisorsubordinate dyads: An examination of discrimination and exclusionary treatment. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 30(1), 3–17.
- Spector, P. E. (1994). Job satisfaction survey.
- Spector, P. E., & Goh, A. (2001). The role of emotions in the occupational stress process. *Research in Occupational Stress and Well-Being*, *1*, 195–232.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. Social Psychology Quarterly, 63(3), 224–237.
- Swigart, K. L., Anantharaman, A., Williamson, J. A., & Grandey, A. A. (2020). Working While Liberal/Conservative: A Review of Political Ideology in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 46(6), 1063–1091.
- Tajfel, H. E. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *33*(*1*), 1–39.
- Tajfel, H. E. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In: W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. (2011). Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(2), 279–294.
- Turban, D. B., Jones, A. P., & Rozelle, R. M. (1990). Influences of supervisor liking of a subordinate and the reward context on the treatment and evaluation of that subordinate. *Motivation and Emotion*, 14(3), 215–233.
- Van Rossem, A. H. (2019). Generations as social categories: An exploratory cognitive study of generational identity and generational stereotypes in a multigenerational workforce. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(4), 434–455.
- Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, J. I., & Fisher, J. (1999). The role of social support in the process of work stress: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(2), 314–334.
- Wade, J., & Roth, P. (2015, December). Social media and personnel selection: How does new technology change an old game? Paper presented at the Thirty Sixth International Conference on Information Systems, Fort Worth, TX.
- Wolf, M. R., Strachan, J. C., & Shea, D. M. (2012). Forget the good of the game: Political incivility and lack of compromise as a second layer of party polarization. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 56(12), 1677–1695.

Appendix

Industry	Percentage
Finance and Insurance	13.5%
Information (i.e., publishing, telecommunications)	13.0%
Construction	11.5%
Manufacturing	11.0%
Health Care and Social Assistance	11.0%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	9.5%
Other Services (except public administration)	7.5%
Educational Services	5.0%
Public Administration	4.0%
Retail Trade	3.0%
Management of Companies and Enterprise	2.0%
Accommodation and Food Services	2.0%
Transportation and Warehousing	1.5%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	1.5%
Waste Management and Remediation Services	1.5%
Real Estate	1.0%
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	0.5%
Utilities	0.5%
Mining, Quarrying, Oil and Gas Extraction	0.5%

Sample Size N = 200.

Variable	М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Employee Political Affiliation	0.50	0.50	(n/a)								
2. Supervisor	0.55	0.50	(0)**								
Political Affiliation	0.55	0.50	.68**	(n/a)							
3. Supervisor	4.12	0.84	.12	.01	(.91)						
4. Supervisor Competence	4.23	0.84	.00	06	.67**	(.90)					
5. Supervisor Support	3.98	0.69	.05	.00	.76**	.71*	(.83)				
6. LMX	27.93	5.25	.06	02	.74**	.68**	.75**	(.90)			
7. Job Satisfaction	155.0	31.3	.02	06	.61**	.54**	.71**	.63**	(.95)		
8. Affective Commitment	3.61	0.74	.04	.01	.55**	.47**	.61**	.56**	.77**	(.79)	
9. Stress	2.72	1.22	.04	.07	18**	22**	37**	22**	53**	42**	(.85)

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas and intercorrelations of the study variables

 $\overline{N = 200}$. Values on the diagonal are coefficient alphas. *p < .05, **p < .001.

Tables 3-7 with Supervisor Liking as Mediator

Table 3. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on supervisor support, through supervisor liking, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Mediation & Moderation Models									
Supervisor Liking (M)									
C SE t p LLCI ULCI	Antecedent C								
4.16 0.09 46.13 .000** 3.99 4.34	Constant 4.16								
-0.70 0.20 -3.55 .000** -1.09 -0.31	Supervisor Political Affiliation (X) -0.70								
-0.46 0.26 -1.78 .076 -0.97 0.05	Subordinate Political Affiliation (W) -0.46								
1.27 0.32 3.94 .000** 0.64 1.91	Interaction Between Supervisor and 1.27 Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)								
$\Delta R^2 = 0.072 **$	Test(s) of highest order unconditional								
F(1, 196) = 15.52, p < .001	interaction(s)								
C SE t p LLCI ULCI	Conditional Effects of X to M, at W C								
	Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation								
-0.70 0.20 -3.55 .000** -1.09 -0.31	Democrat -0.70								
0.57 0.26 2.24 .026* 0.07 1.08	Republican 0.57								
-0.70 0.20 -3.55 .000** -1.09 0.57 0.26 2.24 .026* 0.07	Moderator:Subordinate Political AffiliationDemocrat-0.70Republican0.57								

Moderated Mediation Model										
	Supervisor Support (Y)									
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI				
Constant	1.43	0.17	8.66	.000**	1.10	1.76				
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X) Supervisor Liking (M)	-0.01 0.62	0.06 0.04	-0.97 16.14	.923 .000**	-0.13 0.54	0.12 0.70				
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI						
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation										
Democrat	-0.43	0.15	-0.73	-0.16						
Republican	0.36	0.18	0.04	0.73						
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index 0.79	<i>SE</i> 0.24	<i>LLCI</i> 0.35	<i>ULCI</i> 1.29						

Mediation & Moderation Models									
	Supervisor Liking (M)								
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
Constant	4.16	0.09	46.13	.000**	3.99	4.34			
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.70	0.20	-3.55	.000**	-1.09	-0.31			
Subordinate Political Affiliation (W)	-0.46	0.26	-1.78	.076	-0.97	0.05			
Interaction Between Supervisor and Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)	1.27	0.32	3.94	.000**	0.64	1.91			
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Delta R^2 =$	0.072**					
interaction(s)		<i>F</i> (1	, 196) = 1	5.52, <i>p</i> < .0	01				
Conditional Effects of X to M. at W	С	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI			
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation				1					
Democrat	-0.70	0.20	-3.55	.000**	-1.09	-0.31			
Republican	0.57	0.26	2.24	.026*	0.07	1.08			
Moderate	d Mediation	Model		u an					
	G	C.F.	LM	X (Y)					
Antecedent	C	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
Constant	8.90	1.28	6.95	.000**	6.38	11.42			
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.32	0.50	-0.65	.517	-1.31	0.66			
Supervisor Liking (M)	4.67	0.30	15.65	.000**	4.08	5.25			
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI					
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation									
Democrat	-3.27	1.12	-5.62	-1.23					
Republican	2.68	1.30	0.27	5.41					
Index of Moderated	Index	SF		ULCI					
	mucx	55		OLCI					

Table 4. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on LMX, through supervisor liking, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Mediation & Moderation Models										
	Supervisor Liking (M)									
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI				
Constant	4.16	0.09	46.13	.000**	3.99	4.34				
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.70	0.20	-3.55	.000**	-1.09	-0.31				
Subordinate Political Affiliation (W)	-0.46	0.26	-1.78	.076	-0.97	0.05				
Interaction Between Supervisor and Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)	1.27	0.32	3.94	.000**	0.64	1.91				
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Delta R^2 =$	0.072**						
interaction(s)		F(1, 196) = 1	5.52, <i>p</i> < .0	001					
Conditional Effects of X to M. at W	С	SE	t	D	LLCI	ULCI				
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation				r						
Democrat	-0.70	0.20	-3.55	.000**	-1.09	-0.31				
Republican	0.57	0.26	2.24	.026*	0.07	1.08				
Moderate	d Mediation	Model	110 /	e						
Antondant	C	\$E	Job Satis	faction (Y)						
Antecedent	C	SE	l	p	LLCI	ULCI				
Constant										
	62.55	9.00	6.95	.000**	44.80	80.29				
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	62.55 -3.94	9.00 3.52	6.95 -1.12	.000** .264	44.80 -10.88	80.29 3.00				
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X) Supervisor Liking (M)	62.55 -3.94 22.99	9.00 3.52 2.10	6.95 -1.12 10.97	.000** .264 .000**	44.80 -10.88 18.85	80.29 3.00 27.12				
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X) Supervisor Liking (M) Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	62.55 -3.94 22.99 Effect	9.00 3.52 2.10 SE	6.95 -1.12 10.97 <i>LLCI</i>	.000** .264 .000** ULCI	44.80 -10.88 18.85	80.29 3.00 27.12				
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X) Supervisor Liking (M) Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation	62.55 -3.94 22.99 Effect	9.00 3.52 2.10 SE	6.95 -1.12 10.97 <i>LLCI</i>	.000** .264 .000** ULCI	44.80 -10.88 18.85	80.29 3.00 27.12				
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X) Supervisor Liking (M) Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation Democrat	62.55 -3.94 22.99 Effect -16.10	9.00 3.52 2.10 SE 5.55	6.95 -1.12 10.97 <i>LLCI</i> -27.44	.000** .264 .000** <i>ULCI</i> -5.86	44.80 -10.88 18.85	80.29 3.00 27.12				
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X) Supervisor Liking (M) Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation Democrat Republican	62.55 -3.94 22.99 Effect -16.10 13.18	9.00 3.52 2.10 <i>SE</i> 5.55 6.44	6.95 -1.12 10.97 <i>LLCI</i> -27.44 1.16	.000** .264 .000** <i>ULCI</i> -5.86 26.52	44.80 -10.88 18.85	80.29 3.00 27.12				
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X) Supervisor Liking (M) Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation Democrat Republican	62.55 -3.94 22.99 Effect -16.10 13.18	9.00 3.52 2.10 SE 5.55 6.44 SE	6.95 -1.12 10.97 <i>LLCI</i> -27.44 1.16	.000** .264 .000** <i>ULCI</i> -5.86 26.52	44.80 -10.88 18.85	80.29 3.00 27.12				

 Table 5. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on job satisfaction, through supervisor liking, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Mediation & Moderation Models									
	Supervisor Liking (M)								
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
Constant	4.16	0.09	46.13	.000**	3.99	4.34			
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.70	0.20	-3.55	.000**	-1.09	-0.31			
Subordinate Political Affiliation (W)	-0.46	0.26	-1.78	.076	-0.97	0.05			
Interaction Between Supervisor and Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)	1.27	0.32	3.94	.000**	0.64	1.91			
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Delta R^2 =$	0.072**					
interaction(s)		F(1	, 196) = 1	5.52, <i>p</i> < .0	001				
Conditional Effects of X to M. at W	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation				r					
Democrat	-0.70	0.20	-3.55	.000**	-1.09	-0.31			
Republican	0.57	0.26	2.24	.026*	0.07	1.08			
Melente	1	M. J.I							
Moderate	a Mediation	Model	active Co		<u>a</u> 2				
Antecedent	C	SE	t	n		ULCI			
	6	52	i	P	LLCI	oner			
Constant	1.60	0.23	7.09	.000**	1.15	2.04			
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	0.01	0.09	0.12	.902	-0.16	0.18			
Supervisor Liking (M)	0.49	0.05	9.28	.000**	0.38	0.59			
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI					
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation									
Democrat	-0.34	0.12	-0.59	-0.13					
Republican	0.28	0.14	0.03	0.57					
Y. J (M. J	T 1	C.F.							
Mediation	0.62	<u>ье</u> 0.19	0.29	1.02					

 Table 6. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on affective commitment, through supervisor liking, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Mediation & Moderation Models									
	Supervisor Liking (M)								
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
Constant	4.16	0.09	46.13	.000**	3.99	4.34			
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.70	0.20	-3.55	.000**	-1.09	-0.31			
Subordinate Political Affiliation (W)	-0.46	0.26	-1.78	.076	-0.97	0.05			
Interaction Between Supervisor and Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)	1.27	0.32	3.94	.000**	0.64	1.91			
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Lambda R^2 =$	0.072**					
interaction(s)		F(1	, 196) = 1	5.52, <i>p</i> < .0	001				
Conditional Effects of X to M, at W	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation				^					
Democrat	-0.70	0.20	-3.55	.000**	-1.09	-0.31			
Republican	0.57	0.26	2.24	.026*	0.07	1.08			
Malante	1 M. P. C.	M. J.I							
Moderate	a Mediation	Niodel	Porosivod	Stross (V)					
Antecedent	С	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI			
		~-	-	r					
Constant	3.73	0.44	8.56	.000**	2.87	4.58			
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	0.18	0.17	1.03	.302	-0.16	0.51			
Supervisor Liking (M)	-0.27	0.10	-2.64	.009*	-0.47	-0.07			
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI					
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation									
Democrat	0.19	0.09	0.04	0.39					
Republican	-0.15	0.10	-0.38	-0.00					
Index of Moderated	Index	SF		UI CI					
Mediation	-0.34	0.16	-0.69	-0.07					

Table 7. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on perceived stress, through supervisor liking, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Simple Slope Figure



Figure 2. Interaction between supervisor and subordinate political affiliation membership on supervisor liking.

Supplementary Tables 8-12 with Supervisor Competence as Mediator

 Table 8. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on supervisor support, through supervisor competence, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Mediation & Moderation Models								
	Supervisor Competence (M)							
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Constant	4.33	0.09	46.33	.000**	4.15	4.52		
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11		
Subordinate Political Affiliation (W)	-0.43	0.27	-1.60	.111	-0.96	0.10		
Interaction Between Supervisor and Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)	0.88	0.34	2.61	.010*	0.22	1.54		
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Lambda R^2 = 0$	0.034**				
interaction(s)		F(1, 196) =	6.83, <i>p</i> < .0)5			
Conditional Effects of X to M, at W Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Woderator. Subordinate Fontical Attination								
Democrat	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11		
Republican	0.36	0.27	1.37	.172	-0.16	0.89		

Moderated Mediation Model									
	Supervisor Support (Y)								
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
Constant	1.48	0.18	8.11	.000**	1.12	1.84			
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X) Supervisor Competence (M)	0.06 0.58	0.07 0.04	0.86 14.28	.391 .000**	-0.08 0.50	0.20 0.66			
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI					
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation									
Democrat	-0.30	0.13	-0.57	-0.04					
Republican	0.21	0.18	-0.10	0.59					
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index 0.51	<i>SE</i> 0.23	<i>LLCI</i> 0.10	<i>ULCI</i> 0.98					

Mediation & Moderation Models								
		Supe	rvisor Co	mpetence	(M)			
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Constant	4.33	0.09	46.33	.000**	4.15	4.52		
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11		
Subordinate Political Affiliation (W)	-0.43	0.27	-1.60	.111	-0.96	0.10		
Interaction Between Supervisor and Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)	0.88	0.34	2.61	.010*	0.22	1.54		
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Lambda R^2 = 0$).034**				
interaction(s)		F(1, 196) =	6.83, <i>p</i> < .0)5			
Conditional Effects of X to M. at W	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation				P				
Democrat	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11		
Republican	0.36	0.27	1.37	.172	-0.16	0.89		
Moderate	d Mediation	Model						
	G	C.F.	LNI	$\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{Y})$	1101			
Antecedent	C	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
Constant	0.85	1.45	6 70	000**	6 00	12 72		
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	0.16	0.55	0.79	.000 777	-0.93	1 24		
Supervisor Competence (M)	4.25	0.33	13.08	.000**	3.61	4.89		
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI				
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation								
Democrat	-2.18	0.99	-4.17	-0.22				
Republican	1.55	1.32	-0.82	4.31				
T. J. STM. J	т 1	C.F.						
Mediation	3.73	5E 1.65	0.65	7.15				

Table 9. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on LMX, through supervisorcompetence, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Mediation & Moderation Models						
	Supervisor Competence (M)					
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	4.33	0.09	46.33	.000**	4.15	4.52
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11
Subordinate Political Affiliation (W)	-0.43	0.27	-1.60	.111	-0.96	0.10
Interaction Between Supervisor and Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)	0.88	0.34	2.61	.010*	0.22	1.54
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Lambda R^2 = 0$	0.034**		
interaction(s)	F(1, 196) = 6.83, p < .05					
Conditional Effects of X to M, at W	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation						
Democrat	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11
Republican	0.36	0.27	1.37	.172	-0.16	0.89
Moderat	ad Madiation	Model				
	Ich Satisfaction (V)					
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	71.10	9.95	7.15	.000**	51.48	90.71
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-1.66	3.77	-0.44	.661	-9.01	5.77
Supervisor Competence (M)	20.04	2.23	9.00	.000**	15.65	24.44
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI		
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation						
Democrat	-10.27	64.73	-20.29	-1.51		
Republican	7.30	6.20	-3.54	21.11		
Index of Moderated	Index	SE	LLCI	ULCI		
Mediation	17.57	7.85	3.07	34.44		

Table 10. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on job satisfaction, through supervisor competence, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Mediation & Moderation Models						
	Supervisor Competence (M)					
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
	4.22	0.00	46.22	000**	4.15	1.52
Constant	4.33	0.09	46.33	.000**	4.15	4.52
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11
Subordinate Political Affiliation (W)	-0.43	0.27	-1.60	.111	-0.96	0.10
Interaction Between Supervisor and Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)	0.88	0.34	2.61	.010*	0.22	1.54
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Delta R^2 = 0$	0.034**		
interaction(s)	F(1, 196) = 6.83, p < .05					
Conditional Effects of X to M. at W	С	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation				r		
Democrat	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11
Republican	0.36	0.27	1.37	.172	-0.16	0.89
Moderate	d Mediation	Model		• •	an	
	Affective Commitment (Y)					
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	1.82	0.25	7 39	000**	1 34	2 31
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	0.06	0.09	0.62	.533	-0.13	0.24
Supervisor Competence (M)	0.42	0.06	7.51	.000**	0.30	0.52
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI		
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation						
Democrat	-0.21	0.11	-0.46	-0.03		
Republican	0.15	0.13	-0.08	0.43		
T. J. STM. J	T 1	C.F.				
Index of Moderated Mediation	0.36	SE 0.17	0.06	0.73		

Table 11. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on affective commitment, through supervisor competence, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Mediation & Moderation Models						
	Supervisor Competence (M)					
Antecedent	С	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	4.33	0.09	46.33	.000**	4.15	4.52
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11
Subordinate Political Affiliation (W)	-0.43	0.27	-1.60	.111	-0.96	0.10
Interaction Between Supervisor and Subordinate Political Affiliation (X*W)	0.88	0.34	2.61	.010*	0.22	1.54
Test(s) of highest order unconditional			$\Delta R^2 = 0$	0.034**		
interaction(s)	F(1, 196) = 6.83, p < .05					
Conditional Effects of X to M. at W	С	SE	t	п	LLCI	ULCI
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation				r		
Democrat	-0.51	0.20	-2.51	.013*	-0.92	-0.11
Republican	0.36	0.27	1.37	.172	-0.16	0.89
Moderate	d Mediation	Model		<u> </u>		
	Perceived Stress (Y)					
Antecedent	C	SE	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	3 94	0.48	8 80	000**	3.06	4 82
Supervisor Political Affiliation (X)	0.14	0.40	0.84	402	-0.19	0.48
Supervisor Competence (M)	-0.31	0.10	-3.05	.003*	-0.50	-0.11
Relative Conditional Indirect Effect of X on Y, through M, at W	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI		
Moderator: Subordinate Political Affiliation						
Democrat	0.16	0.08	0.02	0.34		
Republican	-0.11	0.10	-0.35	0.06		
-						
Index of Moderated	Index	SE 0.14	LLCI	ULCI		
Iviediation	-0.2/	0.14	-0.58	-0.03		

Table 12. Moderated Mediation estimates for supervisor political membership on perceived stress, throughsupervisor competence, depending on subordinate political affiliation membership

Supplementary Simple Slope Figure



Figure 3. Interaction between supervisor and subordinate political affiliation membership on supervisor competence.

VITA

ALEXANDER SNIHUR

Miami, Florida

2012-2016	B.A., Psychology University of Miami Coral Gables, Florida
2019	M.S., Industrial and Organizational Psychology Florida International University Miami, Florida
2021	PhD, Industrial and Organizational Psychology Florida International University Miami, Florida

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Burnard, M., Bruk-Lee, V., Snihur, A., & Allen, J. (2020). Is all conflict the same? The role of perceived intensity in understanding its effects. *Stress and Health*. doi:10.1002/smi.3022

McAuliffe, W.H., Carter, E.C., Berhane, J., Snihur, A.C., & McCullough, M.E. (2019). Is Empathy the Default Response to Suffering? A Meta-Analytic Evaluation of Perspective Taking's Effect on Empathic Concern. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. doi:10.1177/1088868319887599

Snihur, A.C., & Lanz, J.J. (2019, April). *Climate scientist stress: The role of interpersonal conflict*. Poster accepted for the 34th annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Washington, D.C.

Snihur, A.C., Lanz, J. J., & Manapragada, A. (2018, April). *Climatologist Stress: Are Climate Scientists Feeling the Heat*? In V. D. Julie (Chair), I/O to the Rescue: Managing Crises in the Aftermath of Hurricane Harvey. Symposium conducted at the 33rd meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, II.

Snihur, A.C., McAuliffe, W., & McCullough, M. (2016, April) *A meta-analytic evaluation of the relationship between perspective-taking and empathy.* Poster presented at the Undergraduate UM Research, Creativity, and Innovation Forum at the University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL.

Snihur, A.C., McAuliffe, W., & McCullough, M. (2015, July) *A series of meta-analytic tests on relationship between perspective-taking and empathy in C.D. Batson's Research.* Poster presented at the Undergraduate PRIME Research Summer Forum at the University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL.

Wang, C., Ponnapalli, A.R., Buckman, B., Snihur, A.C. (2019, April). *Authenticity at work: Establishing a nomological net using meta-analysis*. Poster accepted for the 34th annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Washington, D.C.