

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING

Political Polarization in the United States and the Implications for the Future Landscape

NIRALI IGOE
SPRING 2023

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree
in Marketing
with honors in Marketing

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Franklin Carter
Clinical Professor, William A. Donan Clinical Professor of Marketing
Thesis Supervisor

Jennifer Coupland
Clinical Professor
Honors Adviser

* Electronic approvals are on file.

ABSTRACT

Researchers have found that in recent years, political polarization levels among Americans have significantly increased. Many have hypothesized the factors that have caused this, some of these factors are; political parties' stances, redistricting, the rise of identity-group politics, and mass media. In recent years, companies have faced consumer activism and customers voting with their money. I propose that the increased political polarization is positively correlated with consumer activism. As political polarization continues to increase, companies have to be warier about their public image, as the cases of consumer activism will also increase.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
1.Introduction	1
2.Literature Review.....	6
5.Hypothesis.....	12
6.Methods and Results	13
7.Conclusion.....	19
Appendix	21

LIST OF FIGURES

Table 1: Summary Statistics of Variables.....	14
Table 2: Regression Results	16

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Franklin Carter, my thesis supervisor, for his mentorship and his passion for research and teaching. His knowledge and experience in research encouraged me to look at my topic from many different angles. During our discussions about the current political climate, I found new ways to approach polarization, as well as research to support my claims. I am honored that he chose to be my advisor.

I would also like to thank my mother, Alison Igoe, for her ongoing patience, support, and encouragement. Her passion for politics was the reason that I chose my thesis topic. She is an inspiration to me; with her incredible career and constant push to be better and learn new things, all while raising my sister and me. Words could not express my gratitude for the sacrifices my mother has made to ensure my success in college and life.

1. Introduction

The political system of the United States, which started as a democratic experiment, has evolved through a series of party developments into what is now recognized as a two-party system. The Constitution contains no reference to political parties or a party system; the framers believed that parties would not play a part in the government of the United States (Calabrese et al, 2008). Political parties evolved in part as a result of differences between the Founding Fathers over their views regarding the ratification of that document. The Federalists, who included George Washington and John Adams, favored ratification, supported a strong central government, and represented New England and the mid-Atlantic (Senate.gov) The Anti-Federalists, represented by Thomas Jefferson, came to be known as the Democratic Republicans; they opposed a central government and held sway in the south. This increasing friction led George Washington to comment on the fractious effect of parties in general: "Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally." said in his Farewell Address, on September 19, 1796. He warned that parties were likely to become potent engines by which . . . unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government." Despite Washington's warning bells, party politics has and likely will dominate US politics.

The Democratic-Republican Party was the predecessor to the current Democratic Party. In its early years, it supported southern interests, including an agrarian economy and slavery. It opposed a strong central government, a national bank, and high tariffs. In the early

20th century, however, it supported progressive reforms and since President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, the Democratic Party has promoted a socially progressive agenda, including social security, and unemployment insurance. The current Democratic Party supports a social safety net, government-provided health insurance, supports equality, and a fair minimum wage. More recently, the party does best with college-educated whites, women, minorities, and labor unions, although recent studies have shown it losing ground with the latter two groups.

The Republican Party was founded by anti-slavery activists and its predecessors were considered to be Northern Whigs. It is currently associated with socially conservative policies and less economic regulation; conservative economics focus on lowering taxes on wealth and limiting government regulation of the economy. Its current social policies focus on immigration restrictions and limiting access to abortion. The party currently tends to attract voters who lack postgraduate degrees, live in rural, ex-urban, or small-town areas, are male, evangelical or Christian, and are blue-collar workers. The party has been most successful in politicizing social issues like abortion, sexual identity, welfare, and government assistance. It recently campaigned against science by opposing vaccines and masking them as a violation of freedom, successfully converting a national health emergency into a social issue.

Increased Political Polarization and Causes

From time to time, smaller parties have gained followers and nominated candidates for office. But though the names changed over time, American politics have been dominated by the two major parties for decades that have come to be known as the Democratic and Republican Parties. For periods of time, the parties have set party interests aside and worked through differences when the country's interests demanded it. In recent decades, however, the political

divisions have increased and political views have become more polarized, more extreme, and the parties' adherents more isolated. The United States is now exceptional in its political divide; studies show that Americans have rarely been as polarized as they are today, with Democrats and Republicans increasingly and starkly divided over climate, racial justice, foreign policy, law enforcement, and just about every other issue (Dimorck, 2021).

Since 1994, the highly negative view that each party's members have held of each other has more than doubled (Pew, 2014). The 2020 election heightened entrenched differences, with each side believing that its opponents represented a danger to the country (Dimrock, Michael). The symptoms of political polarization reached a fever pitch in January 2021 when a group of individuals, unhappy with the results of the previous presidential election, overwhelmed the United States Capitol in an attempt to prevent the certification of that election. A continued increase in polarization has led to a deterioration in the country's effective policymaking. The most recent election left the government almost evenly divided, hindered Congress's effectiveness, hamstrung its ability to legislate, and substantially increased the angry rhetoric in Washington. More alarming is the potential that political polarization has to cause serious economic damage to the country if Congress downgrades the country's credit rating by failing to raise the debt limit, an action that would negatively affect the lives and wallets of average Americans (Edmondson, 2023). Where many constituents would prefer their representatives to reach a consensus on issues that affect their daily lives, more activist, polarized, and vocal party members see any compromise as capitulation.

“Polarization and extremism ranked third across a list of 20 issues that we asked about in the latest FiveThirtyEight/Ipsos poll”(Fuong and Skelley, 2022). Researchers attributed this

increased “affective” polarization to a variety of issues. “Party sorting” has resulted in party membership being less diverse ideologically and socially. Thus members of the opposing parties look less familiar when they glance across the aisle than they did in the past (Kimball, Jill).

This thesis aims to explore the relationship between political polarization and consumer activism. In the past decade, companies have shifted their behavior to take into account consumers’ political behavior and their social activism, particularly after a viral event or movement, for e.g., a mass shooting or racial protest. As a consequence, consumers have discovered their purchasing power and that they can affect a company’s behavior by directing their dollars.

The Pew Research Center conducted a telephone survey of just over 10,000 Americans in 2014, which will be used for data in this thesis. The survey contained a core set of measures of political attitudes and values, political engagement, and demographic characteristics, along with a set of unique questions about issues, lifestyle, and media use. That study showed that individuals who are more politically polarized positively correlate with higher levels of participation in politics and the likelihood of consumer activism. This discovery will further the previous research done on political polarization and relate it to consumer activism. Furthermore, these results could indicate a negative correlation between higher education levels and polarization levels.

The discussion begins by exploring and discussing the triggers and factors that have led to a substantial increase in political polarization over the past decades and connects it to consumer activism and buying behavior (Kimball, 2020) There’s also some evidence that a person’s political identity can influence their behavior - what they buy, where they live, who they

hire. The study will use a regression analysis model to observe the correlation between political polarization, participation in politics, and consumer buying power. Following that observation will be the results and a discussion of the implications.

2.**Literature Review**

A review of the literature points to a common theme of four main factors. The first factor is the congregation of beliefs and attitudes around extreme far right and far left positions, with few remaining individuals holding moderate views. “Over the past twenty years, the number of Americans in the “tails” of this ideological distribution has doubled from 10% to 21%. Meanwhile, the center has shrunk: 39% currently take a roughly equal number of liberal and conservative positions. That is down from about half (49%) of the public in surveys conducted in 1994 and 2004”(Geiger, 2021). Thus, where once people in opposing parties were able to negotiate, agree, and reach a consensus, parties are now so far apart, they see their leaders engaging in consensus as capitulating to evil forces.

A second factor shows the increased occurrence of the politicization of social issues. Social issues are no longer divorced from politics but are now seen by many as an essential or defining element. A third factor shows that people are increasingly identifying themselves by their political views. Finally, individuals are solely identifying with, attracted to, and sympathetic only to people with whom they share political views. People no longer show sympathy to or are willing to acknowledge any commonality with, members of an opposing political party.

Political Polarization Triggers

The majority of Americans do not identify themselves on the far right or far left of the political spectrum. But it is the ideologically oriented and politically active Americans who are

the loudest and who participate at greater rates at every stage of the political process, and therefore have a larger impact. Pew Research discovered that, because the most politically polarized individuals are the most active, the amplification of their voices has greatly increased the overall polarization in American politics. These politically polarized and politically active individuals have been steadily increasing in numbers over the last decade, to the extent that few voters reliably identify as “middle of the road,” or truly independent. In recent years, voters have shown a growing and obvious contempt for those who do not share their views. Americans’ attitudes and opinions of their political opponents have worsened over time faster than in other democracies (Kimball, 2020).

Increased Correlation of Views and Identity

News and Social Media

The rise of the twenty-four-hour news cycle, which has networks filling what used to be traditional news programs with mixed news/opinion/entertainment type fare, provides a type of echo chamber and validation for its viewers’ political ideologies (Kimball, Jill). Studies show that a greater percentage of Democrats trust far more numbers of news sources than Republicans (Jurkowitz et al., 2022). And there is a consistent pattern in the party members’ belief in the credibility of the news sources that Republicans and Democrats rely on. That pattern is further evidence of the increase in political polarization (Jurkowitz et al., 2022).

The preference for the news source tends to dictate the makeup of the audience. Where the content is a mix of news, entertainment, and opinion, the content is skewed to the audience to hold or increase its market share, further amplifying the echo chamber effect. The diversification

of news sources has allowed news stations and media companies to cater to specific political identities to drive viewership (Wojcieszak & Garrett, 2018). News sources pushing a political agenda contribute to the already fractious nature of the increasing political divide by framing issues in a way that is consistent with favoring the “ingroup” and antagonizing the “outgroup”. Individuals then engage in selective exposure to those news sources that validate and reinforce the existing preconceptions of their chosen political groups versus the opposition (Wojcieszak & Garrett, 2018). When media coverage is polarized, members of the public are likely to form opinions in line with political elites they trust and reject information not aligned with this view, even if the information comes from experts (Druckman et al., 2013). This effect is amplified by social media, which use algorithms to channel users' preferences that further narrow their scope and increase their confidence in the “rightness” of their views. They “friend” like-minded individuals, block people who challenge or oppose their views, and share clips of their chosen media personalities.

The “self-sorting” is not limited to news outlets and social media. Researchers have opined that a more salient cause of political polarization than gerrymandering of districts is the tendency of Americans to self-sort politically into like-minded communities. (Dews, 2022). The conclusion is based on the observation that people prefer to live near others who share their cultural and political preferences. (Dews, 2022). ““Ideological silos”” are now common on both the left and right. People with down-the-line ideological positions – especially conservatives – are more likely than others to say that most of their close friends share their political views. Liberals and conservatives disagree over where they want to live, the kind of people they want to live around, and even whom they would welcome into their families.” (Geiger, 2021).

As political operatives have gained political power they have manipulated levers of government to enact changes that have had profound changes on the political landscape, employed political polarization to their advantage, and exacerbated its tendencies. The Supreme Court, although ostensibly apolitical, effected one such political change when it decided the case of *Citizens United v. FEC* in 2010, which had the effect of tilting political power toward those with financial means and large corporations. (Lau, 2019). That decision reversed long-standing restrictions on political donations to allow, under the guise of First Amendment free speech protections, special interest groups, large corporations, and other wealthy groups to give unlimited amounts of money in campaign donations. According to a Brennan Center report, the decision has given a small number of Americans more power at any time since Watergate, with many of the rest disengaging (Lau, 2019). After political maneuvering achieved a significant shift in the Court, the Court waded into the most vitriolic social divide by overturning the fifty-year-old *Roe v. Wade* decision (*Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org.*), set off additional political tremors based on fears that it has other hard-won rights in its sights, and substantially increased the rhetoric surrounding the political polarization chatter.

Generalized weak voter turnout has given a small majority of committed voters a significant amount of power. The 2020 presidential election turned out the highest percentage of registered voters in decades, yet according to the Census Bureau, only 66.8% of Americans returned a ballot. In general, the percentage of voters who participate in primary elections, which choose the parties' candidates, and in the off-year elections, which choose senators and representatives, is far lower. Only 35% of registered voters say they always vote in congressional elections. (Unknown, 2019). Older voters participate in larger numbers, as do educate voters,

women, and whites. More recently voters were driven by specific issues which tended to be social in nature. In recent years, the abortion and Supreme Court nominations motivated conservative voters; more recently concerns over democracy and abortion prompted progressives to turn out in greater numbers (Montenaro, 2022) Social issues appear to be turning out voters in greater numbers both on the right and on the left.

Effects of Polarization and Consumer Activism

As the U.S. becomes more polarized, politicization increases, and companies find themselves more often in a position where statements about social issues are deemed political and rile up consumers. “In environments characterized by low levels of political polarization, companies are embroiled in a relatively small number of political controversies, and as a result are rarely the target of consumer activism. Conversely, in highly polarized environments, people’s political sensibilities are easily offended, which leads to a relatively large number of political controversies. These controversies tend to arise along party lines, meaning they elicit a consumer boycott exclusively from one side of the political spectrum. Such partisan boycotts lead people on the other side of the political spectrum to rally around the company at the center of the controversy and to purchase more of its products. Whether a company’s sales end up decreasing or increasing depends on the nature of the issue at the heart of the controversy as well as on the political beliefs of its core customer base”(Bhattacharya and Neureiter, 2021). It is often difficult to discern what might trigger a consumer backlash, but in the age of the internet, anything may become a viral sensation.

Nike's backing of Kaepernick was a prime example of political controversies and consumer activism that are being seen more frequently. In 2018, Nike took a calculated risk when it featured former NFL football player and racial justice activist Colin Kaepernick in a prime-time ad. Kaepernick's action of kneeling during the national anthem had caused a universal uproar, and Nike knew they would be provoking a conservative boycott. But Nike also likely counted on the fact that those on the other end of the political spectrum would be as politically provoked and spend their money in support of Kaepernick and his fight for racial justice.

Nike was a willing participant and took a calculated risk in the marketplace that the political polarization would work in its favor. But some merchants stumble into the trap unwittingly. More recently, a small, independent baker who had avoided political controversy gave free coffee to protestors who gathered outside his store after George Floyd's death. A confrontation by an opposition activist eventually went viral, and the baker became embroiled in a controversy that cost him thousands of dollars in lost business (Carman, 2023).

As polarization increases, so do the number of political controversies, which result in a surge of consumer activism. In highly polarized environments, consumer activism will result in boycotts and buycotts at different ends of the political spectrum. It is difficult to gauge the impact of those boycotts and buycotts ahead of time. It requires careful analysis of the degree of polarization of the particular issue, the political makeup of their customers, the possible reach, and its impact before deciding whether to take any position.

5.**Hypothesis**

After conducting the literature review, I formed two hypotheses. The first set (H1) looks to reaffirm the results of previous studies on the relationship between political participation and political polarization. The second hypothesis (H2) aims to investigate the relationship between an individual's level of polarization and their likelihood to participate in consumer activism as a consequence. The survey questions the measured political attitudes and values, political engagement, and demographic characteristics, along with a set of unique questions about issues, lifestyle, media use, and other related topics. Fortunately, almost two hundred questions were asked, so no questions had to be transformed for the model. Instead, I selected questions that would answer my hypotheses and provide further insights.

H1.1: Greater levels of political participation are likely to correspond to higher levels of political polarization

H1.2: Greater levels of political participation are likely to correspond to lower levels of political polarization

H2: The more politically polarized an individual, the more likely it is for the individual to participate in consumer activism.

6.**Methods and Results**Data

To test my hypotheses, I used Pew Research Center's 2014 Political Polarization and Typology Survey; a national telephone survey of just over 10,000 Americans investigating domestic politics. Data collection was divided equally into three phases (A, B, and C) with independent samples, non-overlapping interview dates, and separate weighting. Each phase corresponded with The questionnaire focused on discerning a respondent's political attitudes, engagement, and demographic characteristics. There were almost two hundred questions, so I did not feel that it was necessary to consolidate or transform the data for my analysis of new variables. All of the questions that I used from the questionnaire are listed in Chapter 8: Supplementary Materials.

Model

To measure the effects of education, political participation on political polarization, and ultimately consumer activism, I needed a model to determine whether the variables have significant relationships and the strength of the connections. Due to having multiple variables, I chose to use multiple regression. This model can estimate the force of impact that multiple variables will have on a dependent variable. In this analysis, the dependent variable is whether or not a respondent has made a political contribution. Regression models allow for changes to a variable and will show what effect the change has on the dependent variable.

Model:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Political Polarization} = & \text{Intercept (Political Contribution)} + b1 \text{ (Political} \\ & \text{Participation)} + b2 \text{ (Up on Current News)} + b3 \text{ (Political Compromise)} + b4 \\ & \text{(Immigration)} - b5 \text{ (Gun Ownership)} + b6 \text{ (Abortion)} + b7 \text{ (Sex)} + b8 \text{ (Age)} + b9 \\ & \text{(Education)} - b10 \text{ (Race)} \end{aligned}$$

Table 1: Summary Statistics of Variables

<u>Descriptive Statistics</u>					
Variable	Mean	Median	Min	Max	Standard Deviation
Past Political Contribution	1.5927	2	1	2	0.4914
Political Participation	1.8349	1	1	5	1.1847
Up to Current News	1.6837	1	1	4	0.8943
Political Compromise	1.5267	1	1	9	1.0097
Immigration	1.7767	2	1	2	0.4165
Gun Ownership	1.4855	1	1	2	0.4999
Abortion	1.4367	1	1	2	0.4961
Sex	1.5159	2	1	2	0.4998
Age	52.5392	55	18	99	18.4005
Education	4.8975	5	1	8	1.8427
Race	1.4591	1	1	7	1.2788

The descriptive statistics for the variables are listed above in **Table 1**. These statistics reveal a lot about the respondents, and what the respondents think about themselves and the political landscape. The mean for Past Political Contribution indicates that many respondents have not contributed financially to political campaigns or organizations supporting candidates. The mean and standard deviation for Political Participation indicate that there is some variation

in the responses, which means that there is variety in the respondents and the levels of participation in politics. The variable for Up to Current News was based on whether respondents thought they know what was going on in government and public affairs. With the mean being between one and two, and the standard deviation is less than one, it can be deduced that many of the respondents believe that they are up to date with their news.

For the political topics, results were almost evenly split between traditionally conservative and liberal views. For immigration, the typical conservative answer to the question would be that illegal immigrants living in the U.S. illegally should not be eligible for citizenship. The mean indicates that there is a skew to liberal responses, however, the standard deviation indicates around forty percent variance from the mean. Gun ownership responses that are conservative would be answer protection of the right of Americans to own guns is more important than gun control. The mean indicates more conservative-leaning responses, but again the standard deviation is fifty percent. Lastly, abortion answers leaned slightly conservative; however, the standard deviation was almost fifty percent. All the political topics were somewhat evenly dispersed with liberal and conservative viewpoints.

In addition to the variable, demographics were also used in the model; sex, age, education, and race. The mean for sex indicates that there were more female respondents than males. The standard deviation for age indicates that there is a lot of variance among the respondents. This is a good thing because it means that it is reflective of the U.S. population and is not skewed to the opinions of one generation. Education did not have a very high standard deviation, and the mean indicates that the majority of respondents had some college experience, if not more. This is an important variable to have, as will answer my hypothesis about education

and its relationship to political polarization. The mean and standard deviation for Race reflects that the respondents were primarily white, with some minorities being recorded.

Regression Model

Table 3: Regression Results

<i>Regression Statistics</i>			
Multiple R	0.958598007		
R Square	0.918910138		
Adjusted R Square	0.918322966		
Standard Error	0.47543525		
Observations	2956		
ANOVA			
	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>
Regression	10.00	7546.09	754.61
Residual	2946.00	665.91	0.23
Total	2956.00	8212.00	
	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>
Past Political Contribution	0.0000	#N/A	#N/A
Political Participation	0.1136	0.0082	13.8390
Up to Current News	0.1515	0.0108	13.9908
Political Compromise	0.0331	0.0087	3.8178
Immigration	0.2101	0.0196	10.7188
Gun Ownership	0.0799	0.0186	4.2877
Abortion	0.2009	0.0167	12.0005
Sex	0.1663	0.0174	9.5683
Age	0.0001	0.0005	0.1330
Education	-0.0056	0.0047	-1.1950
Race	0.0321	0.0071	4.5370

The regression results are listed above in Table 3. The results were very good, 96% of the variance was explained, as indicated by the R-squared value. There were 2956 respondents used for the analysis. There were many interesting findings from the analysis.

The immigration variable seems to have the greatest effect on the regression model. The coefficient is positive which means that if a respondent is anti-immigration, then the likelihood of them contributing politically is greater. Thus immigration is a variable that is more linked to a respondent being highly polarized. The insights that could be drawn from this is that a person's immigration stance is a political topic that provides a good indication as to how conservative, moderate, or liberal they may be. Further research would need to be done to examine the extent to which immigration correlates to political polarization, and in turn political consumer activism.

If the respondent was pro-life, they are more likely to politically contribute. This is similar to the conclusions that can be drawn from immigration respondents. The coefficient is also positive, which means that if a respondent is pro-life, then the likelihood of them contributing politically is greater. The findings for pro-life and immigration responses align with what has been going on in the news and historically. Both of these issues have been highly controversial in the news and among voters, which supports what the analysis is saying.

In terms of education and political polarization, the education variable was negative. The negative correlation coefficient indicates that as education increases, the political contribution will decrease, as well as political polarization levels. Essentially, people who are more fanatic and polarized are less educated and more likely to participate in consumer activism. More educated adults, in particular those with graduate degrees, are more likely to have liberal

views than those with less education and are more likely to identify with the democratic party.

College graduates often see racial inequality, poverty, and crime as systemic and structural problems, while less educated voters attribute those problems to individual and parochial issues. College graduates tend to have higher income levels, which allows them to vote for their values, whereas less educated voters tend to vote for their economic self-interest.

Another interesting finding was that lower-educated men tend to attach to political groups and become more polarized. Whereas higher-educated men tend not to attach and be more moderate. Logically this makes sense, more educated men tend to have very busy careers and have more of a sense of belonging. This sense of belonging means that they are not likely to hastily join political groups, unlike less educated men.

Lastly, minority groups want to contribute and be active in their political participation. This could stem from a lack of representation in politics, and wanting to change the political landscape, as well as many policies harming their lifestyles. For immigrants who have fled communist or socialist countries, the Republicans focus on the evils of socialism has a particular resonance.

7.

Conclusion

Historically, consumer activism aimed at forcing companies to make their products safer, more ethical, environmentally friendly, or to require companies to stop testing products on animals. Perhaps the most famous of the consumer activists, Ralph Nader and the “Nader’s Raiders” challenged General Motors and the safety of automobiles in general and highlighted environmental issues, among other things. Ralph Nader established several consumer advocacy groups, including the Public Interest Research Group, The Center for Auto Safety, and Public Citizen. Conscious consumerism was boosted by Greta Thunberg, who encouraged companies and consumers to take social responsibility by taking an interest and getting involved in climate change activism. The young woman’s uncompromising stance and message captivated the media and social message platforms, which gave it the type of viral spread necessary to capture world attention. More recently, savvy activists have used their considerable buying power to try to effect political change by holding companies to account on very politically charged issues.

The more the distance between the political poles seems to grow, the greater the consumer activism seems to be. The question is what effect it will have on marketing strategy, companies in particular, and the economy in general, and who will get caught in the crossfire. As previously observed, Nike took a calculated risk, took advantage of a politically charged situation, and produced an effective advertisement. It produced both boycotts and “buycotts”. It is not clear which was more effective. What is clear is that Nike waded into a fraught political issue and appears to have survived.

Sometimes a company's political statement gets inextricably entwined with its business model, which was the case of Ben and Jerry's Ice Cream. The company has long been known for its political activism and refused to sell its product in Israeli settlements because it believed that selling in occupied Palestinian territory was inconsistent with its values. When the parent company reversed the decision, they lost a court challenge.

At times a company's political stance works against its interests. When Disney opposed Florida's "don't say gay" legislation, it experienced a significant backlash from conservative activists, which prompted the governor to revoke its special tax district. Dolce and Gabbana featured an ad, intended to spark interest in its Shanghai fashion show, which rebounded to its detriment when a Chinese model featured trying to eat spaghetti with chopsticks was labeled racist. The brand was boycotted and canceled its show. In contrast, Gillette, a subsidiary of Proctor & Gamble, successfully co-opted the online #MeToo movement to focus attention on bullying and toxic masculinity to draw millions of views over a period of days.

A review of the literature shows that politics have become increasingly polarized, with a combination of education, wealth, gender, age, and religion often determining on which end of the political spectrum you fall. The more politically polarized you suggest the more politically active you are, and the more likely you are to manifest your activism through consumer behavior. Politically active consumers more and more engage in boycotts and buycotts to show their disapproval of businesses that express political opinions with which they disagree. For businesses that choose to take the risk, it is a minefield with hidden dangers that is difficult to negotiate. But for almost all businesses, increased political polarization and consumer activism have opened a new frontier through which businesses have to carefully wend their way.

Appendix

Appendix A: Questions Used from Pew Research Center Political Typology/Polarization Questionnaire [Including the shortened, corresponding names in the tables]

OFTVOTE How often would you say you vote...[READ IN ORDER]?

Q.40 Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs...[READ]?

50mm. I like elected officials who make compromises with people they disagree with [OR]
I like elected officials who stick to their positions

Q.100 Have you ever contributed money to a candidate running for public office or to a group working to elect a candidate?

Q.122 Which comes closer to your view about how to handle immigrants who are now living in the U.S. illegally? Should they [READ AND RANDOMIZE]

Q.123 What do you think is more important – to protect the right of Americans to own guns, OR to control gun ownership?

Q.124 Do you think abortion should be [READ AND RANDOMIZE]

EDUC What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received? [DO NOT READ] [INTERVIEWER NOTE: Enter code 3-HS grad if R completed training that did NOT count toward a degree]

RACE Which of the following describes your race? You can select as many as apply. White, Black or African American, Asian or Asian American or some other race. [RECORD UP TO FOUR IN ORDER MENTIONED BUT DO NOT PROBE FOR ADDITIONAL] [IF R VOLTS MIXED BIRACIAL, PROBE ONCE: What race or races is that?]

Appendix B: Correlation Matrix Between Variables

Correlation Matrix of Political Participation Variables											
	Past Political Contribution	Political Participation	Up to Current News	Political Compromise	Immigration	Gun Ownership	Abortion	Sex	Age	Education	Race
Past Political Contribution	0.241	0.197	0.150	0.012	-0.008	-0.003	0.014	0.014	-2.781	-0.296	0.088
Political Participation	0.197	1.403	0.415	0.040	0.001	0.025	0.033	-0.014	-7.575	-0.583	0.200
Up to Current News	0.150	0.415	0.799	0.052	-0.012	0.019	0.032	0.038	-4.833	-0.474	0.171
Political Compromise	0.012	0.040	0.052	1.019	-0.038	-0.051	0.060	0.000	0.715	-0.212	0.011
Immigration	-0.008	0.001	-0.012	-0.038	0.173	0.050	-0.034	0.015	-0.259	0.090	0.035
Gun Ownership	-0.003	0.025	0.019	-0.051	0.050	0.250	-0.056	0.043	0.150	0.108	0.074
Abortion	0.014	0.033	0.032	0.060	-0.034	-0.056	0.246	-0.014	0.389	-0.151	0.032
Sex	0.014	-0.014	0.038	0.000	0.015	0.043	-0.014	0.250	0.676	-0.020	-0.004
Age	-2.781	-7.575	-4.833	0.715	-0.259	0.150	0.389	0.676	338.464	3.079	-4.342
Education	-0.296	-0.583	-0.474	-0.212	0.090	0.108	-0.151	-0.020	3.079	3.394	-0.364
Race	0.088	0.200	0.171	0.011	0.035	0.074	0.032	-0.004	-4.342	-0.364	1.635

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arora, Swapan Deep, et al. "Polarization and Social Media: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda." *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Elsevier, 9 Aug. 2022, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0040162522004632>.

Barrett, Paul, et al. "How Tech Platforms Fuel U.S. Political Polarization and What Government Can Do about It." *Brookings*, Brookings, 9 Mar. 2022, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2021/09/27/how-tech-platforms-fuel-u-s-political-polarization-and-what-government-can-do-about-it/>.

Bureau, US Census. "2020 Presidential Election Voting and Registration ." *Census.gov*, 8 Oct. 2021, <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2021/2020-presidential-election-voting-and-registration-tables-now-available.html>.

Carman, Tim. "A Va. Bakery Gave BLM Activists Free Coffee. Then Came the Backlash." *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 11 Mar. 2023, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/food/2023/03/10/red-truck-bakery-protests-warrenton/>.

Carothers, Thomas, and Andrew O'Donohue. "How Americans Were Driven to Extremes." *Foreign Affairs*, 23 Feb. 2023, [https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2019-09-25/how-americans-were-driven-extremes?](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2019-09-25/how-americans-were-driven-extremes?check_logged_in=1&utm_medium=promo_email&utm_source=lo_flows)

[check_logged_in=1&utm_medium=promo_email&utm_source=lo_flows](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2019-09-25/how-americans-were-driven-extremes?check_logged_in=1&utm_medium=promo_email&utm_source=lo_flows)

;utm_campaign=registered_user_welcome&utm_term=email_1&utm_content=20230327.

Dews, Fred. “A Primer on Gerrymandering and Political Polarization.” *Brookings*, Brookings, 9 Mar. 2022, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brookings-now/2017/07/06/a-primer-on-gerrymandering-and-political-polarization/>.

Dimock, Michael, and Richard Wike. “America Is Exceptional in Its Political Divide.” *The Pew Charitable Trusts*, The Pew Charitable Trusts, 29 Mar. 2021, <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/trust/archive/winter-2021/america-is-exceptional-in-its-political-divide>.

Druckman, J.N., Klar, S., Krupnikov, Y., Levendusky, M. & Ryan, J. B.. How Affective Polarization Shapes Americans’ Political Beliefs: A Study of Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*. 8. 223-234, 2021

Edmondson, Catie. “Debt Talks Are Frozen as House Republicans Splinter over a Fiscal Plan.” *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 29 Mar. 2023, <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/29/us/politics/house-republicans-debt-limit-budget-biden.html>.

Geiger, Abigail. “Political Polarization in the American Public.” Pew Research Center - U.S. Politics & Policy, Pew Research Center, 9 Apr. 2021, <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/>.

Ivan B. Dylko, How Technology Encourages Political Selective Exposure, *Communication Theory*, Volume 26, Issue 4, 1 November 2016, Pages 389–409, <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12089>

Johnson, Prince Ghuman & Matt. “How Political Polarization Influences Consumer Behavior.” *Pop Neuro*, Pop Neuro, 3 May 2022, <https://www.popneuro.com/neuromarketing-blog/consumer-behavior-activism-politics-marketing-strategy-sales-psychology-polarization-political-ideology>.

Jurkowitz, Mark, et al. “U.S. Media Polarization and the 2020 Election: A Nation Divided.” *Pew Research Center's Journalism Project*, Pew Research Center, 28 Mar. 2022, <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2020/01/24/democrats-report-much-higher-levels-of-trust-in-a-number-of-news-sources-than-republicans/>.

Kimball, Jill. “U.S. Is Polarizing Faster than Other Democracies, Study Finds.” *Brown University*, 2020, <https://www.brown.edu/news/2020-01-21/polarization>.

Kolbert, Elizabeth. “How Politics Got so Polarized.” *The New Yorker*, 27 Dec. 2021, <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2022/01/03/how-politics-got-so-polarized>.

Lau, Tim. “Citizens United Explained.” *Brennan Center for Justice*, 29 Mar. 2023, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/citizens-united-explained>.

McCoy, Jennifer, and Benjamin Press. "What Happens When Democracies Become Perniciously Polarized?" Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Jan. 2022, <https://carnegieendowment.org/2022/01/18/what-happens-when-democracies-become-perniciously-polarized-pub-86190>.

Montanaro, Domenico. "Key GOP Groups Are More Fired up to Vote in Midterms than Democrats, NPR Poll Finds." NPR, NPR, 2 Nov. 2022, <https://www.npr.org/2022/11/02/1133169243/poll-democrats-republicans-election-midterms-voters>.

Mitchell, Amy, et al. "Political Polarization & Media Habits." Pew Research Center's Journalism Project, Pew Research Center, 28 Aug. 2020, <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2014/10/21/political-polarization-media-habits/>.

Nadeem, Reem. "Beyond Red vs. Blue: The Political Typology." Pew Research Center - U.S. Politics & Policy, Pew Research Center, 17 Nov. 2022, <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2021/11/09/beyond-red-vs-blue-the-political-typology-2/>.

Neureiter, Michael, and C.B. Bhattacharya. "Why Do Boycotts Sometimes Increase Sales? Consumer Activism in the Age of Political Polarization." Business Horizons, Elsevier, 4 Feb. 2021, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0007681321000276>.

R. A. S. Malick, M. Murtaza and K. A. Qureshi, "A Knowledge Graph-Based Framework for Integrated Network-Centric Warfare Strategies for Cyber-Physical-Social World," 2022 International Conference on Cyber Warfare and Security (ICCWS), Islamabad, Pakistan, 2022, pp. 42-48, doi: 10.1109/ICCWS56285.2022.9998467.

Rogowski, J. C. & Sutherland, J. L. How Ideology Fuels Affective Polarization. *Political Behavior*. 485-508, 2015

Unknown. "Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization." *Oyez*, 2021, <https://www.oyez.org/cases/2021/19-1392>.

Unknown. "Who Votes, Who Doesn't, and Why." Pew Research Center - U.S. Politics & Policy, Pew Research Center, 31 Dec. 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2006/10/18/who-votes-who-doesnt-and-why/>.

Wilson, Anne E, et al. "Polarization in the Contemporary Political and Media Landscape." *Science Direct, Elsevier*, 18 Aug. 2020, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352154620301078>.

Wojcieszak, M. & Garrett, R. K. "Social Identity, Selective Exposure, and Affective Polarization: How Priming National Identity Shapes Attitudes Toward Immigrants Via News Selection." *Human Communication Research*. 44, 2019

ACADEMIC VITA

OBJECTIVE

Highly motivated and passionate college student studying Business with a concentration in Marketing. Looking to demonstrate and further her time management and organizational skills in a professional environment.

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Science in Marketing - Pennsylvania State University • State College, PA May 2023

- Schreyer Honors Scholar
 - Thesis focused on US Political Polarization

Honors

- President Sparks Award Fall 2021, President Freshmen Award Fall 2019, Dean's List Honoree for Spring 2020 in the College of the Liberal Arts, Penn State CAS 100 Public Speaking Contest Nominee

WORK EXPERIENCE

Pennsylvania State University - Teaching Assistant, State College, PA Aug 2022 - Present

- Ran classes with 80 undergraduate students
- Coordinated and graded case studies
- Managed a semester-long Global Marketing Project
- Organized study groups and office hours

Unicef - Intern, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire Jun 2022 – Jul 2022

- Responsible for researching potential partnerships
- Communicated with various organizations regarding funding
- Assisted in running a national UNICEF event that partnered with influencers
- Provide support to other organization departments

Pennsylvania State University - Resident Assistant, State College, PA Aug 2021 – May 2022

- Responsible for 36 residents
- Plan and run weekly community builders
- Educate residents on housing policy and campus resources
- Provide support socially, academically, and professionally

Restaurant Media Group - Social Media Manager , Montville, N J Jan 2021 – July 2021

- Mentor new employees and provide guidance about responsibilities
- Amplify restaurants' online presence by editing photos and captions for weekly social media postings

- Conduct social media audits and determine improvements to accounts' online presence
- Create marketing proposals for new clients
- Interact with clients and handle last-minute requests regarding their social media accounts

Carnegie Institution for Science and Technology - Intern, Washington, D.C.

Oct 2018 - May 2019

- Created charts and graphics using Pearl coding
- Mapped earthquakes
- Transferred seismologic data to computer
- Kept up to date on seismologic events, including research and data analysis

Activities

- **Fencing**
 - Division 1 Athlete on Penn State Fencing Team
- **Athletic Director Leadership Institute**
 - Attend leadership development seminars
- **Jacobs Fellows Program**
 - Interact with various industry professionals
 - Complete projects that include product research, social media campaigns, and marketing campaigns

SKILLS

- Proficient in Microsoft Word, Powerpoint, Excel, Teams,
- Experienced in Canva graphic design and Adobe photoshop
- Comfortable with Public Speaking