

Supplemental File for

I love you but I hate your politics: The role of political dissimilarity in romantic relationships

Table of Contents:

Table S1. *Demographics by Sample*

Table S2. *Estimates from Separate and Simultaneous Regression Models of Potential Correlates of Perceived Political (Dis)similarity*

Table S3. *Estimates from Separate and Simultaneous Regression Models of Potential Correlates of Partisanship (Dis)similarity*

Table S4. *Estimates from DRSA Models Predicting Potential Correlates of Political Ideology (Dis)similarity*

Table S5. *Comparisons between Full Sample and Dyadic Subset from Section 1b (Correlates of Political (Dis)similarity) for Cross-Sectional Data*

Table S6. *Perceived (Dis)similarity Predicting Relationship Quality using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)*

Table S7. *Political Ideology Similarity: Interaction and Difference Score Approaches*

Table S8. *Simple Slopes of Significant Moderations for Perceived and Partisanship Similarity in Cross-Sectional and Daily Diary Datasets*

Table S9. *Moderators of Perceived Political Similarity in the Cross-Sectional Dataset.*

Table S10. *Moderators of Perceived Political Similarity in the Daily Diary Dataset.*

Table S11. *Moderators of Partisanship Similarity in the Cross-Sectional Dataset.*

Table S12. *Moderators of Partisanship Similarity in the Daily Diary Dataset*

Table S13. *Moderators of Political Ideology in the Cross-Sectional Dataset*

Table S14. *Moderators of Political Ideology in the Daily Diary Dataset*

Summary of Sample Differences

Figure S1. Political ideology (dis)similarity predicting relationship quality in cross-sectional dataset using full scale for y-axis.

Figure S2. Political ideology (dis)similarity predicting relationship quality in daily diary dataset using full scale for y-axis.

Table S1. Demographics by Sample

Characteristic	Across All Samples			Sample 1			Sample 2			Sample 3			Sample 4			Sample 5		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>
Age (Years)	34.9	14.1	4505	34.0	11.1	470	38.7	12.5	1026	36.9	10.9	521	27.4	5.0	36	32.3	7.8	276
Relationship Length (Years)	6.9	7.6	2454	9.0	8.7	449	-	-	-	11.1	8.9	509	5.3	3.8	80	8.7	7.0	277
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Valid %</i>
Gender																		
Man	1721	37.5	44.3	195	41.5	42.5	491	47.8	47.8	249	45.8	47.1	38	47.5	47.5	126	45.0	45.3
Woman	2097	45.7	54.0	251	53.4	54.7	530	51.6	51.6	271	49.8	51.2	40	50.0	50.0	138	49.3	49.6
Nonbinary/Not Listed	67	1.5	1.7	13	2.8	2.8	6	0.6	0.6	9	1.7	1.7	1	1.3	1.3	14	5.0	5.0
Total	3885	84.8	100.0	459	97.7	100.0	1027	100.0	100.0	529	97.2	100.0	79	98.8	100.0	278	99.3	100.0
Race																		
Native American	14	0.3	0.4	4	0.9	0.9	4	0.4	0.4	4	0.7	0.8	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.4	0.4
Asian	355	7.7	9.1	30	6.4	6.4	47	4.6	4.6	26	4.8	5.0	12	15.0	15.0	36	12.9	13.0
Middle Eastern	42	0.9	1.1	3	0.6	0.6	3	0.3	0.3	3	0.6	0.6	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.4	0.4
Black	253	5.5	6.5	26	5.5	5.6	95	9.3	9.3	26	4.8	5.0	2	2.5	2.5	3	1.1	1.1
Pacific Islander	3	0.1	0.1	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.2	0.2	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
White/European	2739	59.8	70.4	340	72.3	72.8	783	76.2	76.2	401	73.7	76.7	50	62.5	62.5	212	75.7	76.5
Hispanic/Latinx	200	4.4	5.1	28	6.0	6.0	29	2.8	2.8	37	6.8	7.1	5	6.3	6.3	7	2.5	2.5
Not Listed	17	0.4	0.4	0	0.0	0.0	6	0.6	0.6	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	2	0.7	0.7
Multiracial	266	5.8	6.8	36	7.7	7.7	59	5.7	5.7	25	4.6	4.8	11	13.8	13.8	15	5.4	5.4
Total	3889	84.8	100.0	467	99.4	100.0	1027	100.0	100.0	523	96.1	100.0	80	100.0	100.0	277	98.9	100.0
Education																		
Elementary or junior high school	4	0.1	0.1	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.2	0.2	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0

Some high school	33	0.7	0.7	5	1.1	1.1	2	0.2	0.2	6	1.1	1.1	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Graduated high school	584	12.7	12.9	47	10.0	10.1	88	8.6	8.6	36	6.6	6.9	2	2.5	2.5	12	4.3	4.4
Some college	1408	30.7	31.2	129	27.4	27.7	232	22.6	22.7	105	19.3	20.1	23	28.8	28.8	34	12.1	12.4
Graduated college	1573	34.3	34.9	187	39.8	40.2	435	42.4	42.6	235	43.2	45.0	27	33.8	33.8	116	41.4	42.2
Post-graduate or professional degree	908	19.8	20.1	97	20.6	20.9	265	25.8	25.9	139	25.6	26.6	28	35.0	35.0	113	40.4	41.1
Total	4510	98.4	100.0	465	98.9	100.0	1022	99.5	100.0	522	96.0	100.0	80	100.0	100.0	275	98.2	100.0
Household Income																		
Under \$15,000	139	3.0	4.0	48	10.2	10.2	33	3.2	3.2	24	4.4	4.7	8	10.0	10.0	9	3.2	3.2
\$15,001 - \$25,000	227	5.0	6.5	35	7.4	7.4	56	5.5	5.5	32	5.9	6.2	7	8.8	8.8	7	2.5	2.5
\$25,001 - \$35,000	266	5.8	7.6	36	7.7	7.7	80	7.8	7.8	35	6.4	6.8	3	3.8	3.8	6	2.1	2.2
\$35,001 - \$50,000	417	9.1	11.9	60	12.8	12.8	120	11.7	11.7	64	11.8	12.4	7	8.8	8.8	10	3.6	3.6
\$50,001 - \$75,000	684	14.9	19.5	99	21.1	21.1	203	19.8	19.8	103	18.9	20.0	16	20.0	20.0	42	15.0	15.1
\$75,001 - \$100,000	599	13.1	17.1	65	13.8	13.8	181	17.6	17.6	78	14.3	15.1	15	18.8	18.8	52	18.6	18.7
\$100,001 - \$150,000	660	14.4	18.8	72	15.3	15.3	195	19.0	19.0	107	19.7	20.7	14	17.5	17.5	64	22.9	23.0
\$150,001 - \$200,000	287	6.3	8.2	24	5.1	5.1	96	9.3	9.3	53	9.7	10.3	2	2.5	2.5	39	13.9	14.0
\$200,001 - \$300,000	125	2.7	3.6	11	2.3	2.3	38	3.7	3.7	9	1.7	1.7	3	3.8	3.8	31	11.1	11.2
Over \$300,000	45	1.0	1.3	7	1.5	1.5	14	1.4	1.4	4	0.7	0.8	0	0.0	0.0	9	3.2	3.2
Would rather not say/Not sure	85	1.9	2.4	21	4.5	4.5	14	1.4	1.4	7	1.3	1.4	8	10.0	10.0	13	4.6	4.7
Total	3512	76.6	100.0	470	100.0	100.0	1027	100.0	100.0	516	94.9	100.0	80	100.0	100.0	278	99.3	100.0
Relationship Status																		
Married/Engaged	2874	62.7	62.7	300	63.8	63.8	704	68.5	68.5	404	74.3	74.3	42	52.5	52.5	182	65.0	65.0
Serious/Committed	1564	34.1	34.1	170	36.2	36.2	252	24.5	24.5	140	25.7	25.7	38	47.5	47.5	98	35.0	35.0
Casually Dating	146	3.2	3.2	0	0.0	0.0	71	6.9	6.9	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Total	4584	100.0	100.0	470	100.0	100.0	1027	100.0	100.0	544	100.0	100.0	80	100.0	100.0	280	100.0	100.0

Orientation																		
Different-Sex Partner	2341	51.1	90.5	403	85.7	87.8	-	-	-	480	88.2	91.6	72	90.0	90.0	242	86.4	87.7
Same-Sex or Nonbinary Partner	245	5.3	9.5	56	11.9	12.2	-	-	-	44	8.1	8.4	8	10.0	10.0	34	12.1	12.3
Total	2586	56.4	100.0	459	97.7	100.0	-	-	-	524	96.3	100.0	80	100.0	100.0	276	98.6	100.0
Rural or Urban																		
Urban	611	13.3	28.9	-	-	-	340	33.1	33.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suburbs and small metros	1207	26.3	57.1	-	-	-	538	52.4	52.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural	297	6.5	14.0	-	-	-	149	14.5	14.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	2115	46.1	100.0	-	-	-	1027	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Region																		
Northeast	936	20.4	30.9	120	25.5	25.5	192	18.7	18.7	118	21.7	22.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Midwest	607	13.2	20.1	93	19.8	19.8	200	19.5	19.5	105	19.3	20.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
South	901	19.7	29.8	150	31.9	31.9	397	38.7	38.7	186	34.2	35.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
West	581	12.7	19.2	106	22.6	22.6	238	23.2	23.2	109	20.0	21.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	3025	66.0	100.0	469	99.8	100.0	1027	100.0	100.0	518	95.2	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-

Characteristic	Sample 6			Sample 7			Sample 8			Sample 9			Sample 10			Sample 11		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>
Age (Years)	36.7	6.7	218	39.7	14.3	129	38.8	13.3	131	48.8	15.5	662	28.8	9.5	204	19.3	1.4	832
Relationship Length (Years)	11.1	6.0	218	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.6	4.8	202	1.3	1.9	719
	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
Gender																		
Man	113	50.9	51.6	64	49.6	49.6	40	30.5	30.5	-	-	-	99	48.5	48.5	306	36.6	36.9
Woman	103	46.4	47.0	62	48.1	48.1	87	66.4	66.4	-	-	-	103	50.5	50.5	512	61.3	61.7

Nonbinary/Not Listed	3	1.4	1.4	3	2.3	2.3	4	3.1	3.1	-	-	-	2	1.0	1.0	12	1.4	1.4
Total	219	98.6	100.0	129	100.0	100.0	131	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	204	100.0	100.0	830	99.4	100.0
Race																		
Native American	1	0.5	0.5	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Asian	3	1.4	1.4	7	5.4	5.4	7	5.3	5.3	-	-	-	11	5.4	5.4	176	21.1	21.1
Middle Eastern	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.8	0.8	0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	31	3.7	3.7
Black	32	14.4	14.7	4	3.1	3.1	4	3.1	3.1	-	-	-	19	9.3	9.3	42	5.0	5.0
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.8	0.8	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
White/European	159	71.6	72.9	100	77.5	77.5	105	80.2	80.2	-	-	-	126	61.8	61.8	463	55.4	55.4
Hispanic/Latinx	5	2.3	2.3	6	4.7	4.7	4	3.1	3.1	-	-	-	39	19.1	19.1	40	4.8	4.8
Not Listed	4	1.8	1.8	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.8	0.8	-	-	-	2	1.0	1.0	2	0.2	0.2
Multiracial	14	6.3	6.4	11	8.5	8.5	9	6.9	6.9	-	-	-	7	3.4	3.4	79	9.5	9.5
Total	218	98.2	100.0	129	100.0	100.0	131	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	204	100.0	100.0	833	99.8	100.0
Education																		
Elementary or junior high school	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.8	0.8	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	2	0.2	0.2
Some high school	0	0.0	0.0	3	2.3	2.4	2	1.5	1.5	15	2.3	2.3	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Graduated high school	4	1.8	1.8	15	11.6	11.9	20	15.3	15.3	113	17.1	17.1	21	10.3	10.7	226	27.1	27.8
Some college	46	20.7	21.0	32	24.8	25.4	35	26.7	26.7	152	23.0	23.0	46	22.5	23.5	574	68.7	70.7
Graduated college	94	42.3	42.9	52	40.3	41.3	53	40.5	40.5	282	42.6	42.6	83	40.7	42.3	9	1.1	1.1
Post-graduate or professional degree	75	33.8	34.2	24	18.6	19.0	20	15.3	15.3	100	15.1	15.1	46	22.5	23.5	1	0.1	0.1
Total	219	98.6	100.0	126	97.7	100.0	131	100.0	100.0	662	100.0	100.0	196	96.1	100.0	812	97.2	100.0
Household Income																		
Under \$15,000	1	0.5	0.5	6	4.7	4.7	10	7.6	7.6	0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$15,001 - \$25,000	6	2.7	2.7	5	3.9	3.9	7	5.3	5.3	72	10.9	10.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$25,001 - \$35,000	11	5.0	5.0	13	10.1	10.1	11	8.4	8.4	71	10.7	10.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$35,001 - \$50,000	25	11.3	11.4	14	10.9	10.9	17	13.0	13.0	100	15.1	15.1	-	-	-	-	-	-

\$50,001 - \$75,000	34	15.3	15.5	26	20.2	20.2	23	17.6	17.6	138	20.8	20.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$75,001 - \$100,000	50	22.5	22.8	20	15.5	15.5	29	22.1	22.1	109	16.5	16.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$100,001 - \$150,000	60	27.0	27.4	17	13.2	13.2	18	13.7	13.7	113	17.1	17.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$150,001 - \$200,000	21	9.5	9.6	11	8.5	8.5	9	6.9	6.9	32	4.8	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$200,001 - \$300,000	4	1.8	1.8	10	7.8	7.8	4	3.1	3.1	15	2.3	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over \$300,000	5	2.3	2.3	4	3.1	3.1	2	1.5	1.5	0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Would rather not say/Not sure	4	1.8	1.8	5	3.9	3.9	1	0.8	0.8	12	1.8	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	219	98.6	100.0	129	100.0	100.0	131	100.0	100.0	662	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Relationship Status																		
Married/Engaged	206	92.8	92.8	82	63.6	63.6	85	64.9	64.9	504	76.1	76.1	41	20.1	20.1	324	38.8	38.8
Serious/Committed	16	7.2	7.2	36	27.9	27.9	37	28.2	28.2	113	17.1	17.1	156	76.5	76.5	508	60.8	60.8
Casually Dating	0	0.0	0.0	11	8.5	8.5	9	6.9	6.9	45	6.8	6.8	7	3.4	3.4	3	0.4	0.4
Total	222	100.0	100.0	129	100.0	100.0	131	100.0	100.0	662	100.0	100.0	204	100.0	100.0	835	100.0	100.0
Orientation																		
Different-Sex Partner	202	91.0	93.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	174	85.3	85.3	768	92.0	92.9
Same-Sex or Nonbinary Partner	14	6.3	6.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	14.7	14.7	59	7.1	7.1
Total	216	97.3	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	204	100.0	100.0	827	99.0	100.0
Rural or Urban																		
Urban	-	-	-	33	25.6	25.6	29	22.1	22.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	209	25.0	25.0
Suburbs and small metros	-	-	-	75	58.1	58.1	74	56.5	56.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	520	62.3	62.3
Rural	-	-	-	21	16.3	16.3	28	21.4	21.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	99	11.9	11.9
Total	-	-	-	129	100.0	100.0	131	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	828	99.2	100.0
Region																		
Northeast	-	-	-	25	19.4	19.4	19	14.5	14.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	462	55.3	61.5

Midwest	-	-	-	23	17.8	17.8	35	26.7	26.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	151	18.1	20.1
South	-	-	-	44	34.1	34.1	57	43.5	43.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	67	8.0	8.9
West	-	-	-	37	28.7	28.7	20	15.3	15.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	71	8.5	9.5
Total	-	-	-	129	100.0	100.0	131	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	751	89.9	100.0

Table S2. *Estimates from Separate and Simultaneous Regression Models of Potential Correlates of Perceived Political (Dis)similarity*

Characteristic	Step 1: Separate Models					Step 2: Simultaneous Model				
	β	SE	t	df	p	β	SE	t	df	p
Demographic										
Age	.037	.020	1.852	2,698	.064					
Education	.007	.019	0.394	2,877	.694					
Household Income	.006	.019	0.302	2,935	.762					
Religiosity	.072	.024	2.996	1,585	.003	-.036	.053	-0.689	322	.492
Personality										
Intellectual Humility	.033	.029	1.149	1,065	.250					
Neuroticism	-.018	.026	-0.682	825	.495					
Openness	.043	.027	1.609	929	.108					
Self-Esteem	.021	.028	0.736	571	.462					
Political										
Family's Politics	.148	.027	5.474	1,121	.000	-.025	.047	-0.521	301	.603
Friends' Politics	.242	.027	8.847	1,313	.000	.038	.053	0.705	323	.481
City Politics	.155	.028	5.554	1,302	.000	.088	.042	2.109	320	.036
Importance of Politics	.123	.023	5.306	1,583	.000	.004	.053	0.075	286	.940
Political Extremity	.233	.018	13.320	2,872	.000	.019	.074	0.256	289	.798
Relationship										
Importance of Shared Politics	.369	.042	8.770	458	.000	.250	.056	4.434	317	.000
Importance of Shared Values	.298	.033	8.909	686	.000	.256	.057	4.527	324	.000
Met Online	.198	.051	3.884	391	.000	.102	.051	2.019	264	.045
Relationship Length	.022	.035	0.633	757	.527					
Relationship Status	.089	.020	4.353	2,620	.000	.023	.050	0.451	266	.653

Note. For step one, regressions were run separately for each characteristic. For step two, all characteristics that were significantly associated with political similarity in step one were simultaneously entered into one model. Satterthwaite degrees of freedom were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Table S3. *Estimates from Separate and Simultaneous Regression Models of Potential Correlates of Partisanship (Dis)similarity*

Characteristic	Step 1: Separate Models					Step 2: Simultaneous Model				
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>e^β</i>	95% CI	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>e^β</i>	95% CI
Demographic										
Age	0.308	0.063	.000	1.361	[1.204, 1.543]	-0.363	0.174	.038	0.696	[0.492, 0.978]
Education	-0.122	0.063	.051	0.885	[0.782, 1.000]					
Household Income	-0.007	0.060	.902	0.993	[0.882, 1.118]					
Religiosity	0.119	0.100	.233	1.127	[0.928, 1.374]					
Personality										
Intellectual Humility	-0.015	0.075	.844	0.985	[0.850, 1.140]					
Neuroticism	-0.170	0.071	.017	0.843	[0.733, 0.970]	-0.271	0.134	.043	0.763	[0.584, 0.988]
Openness	-0.030	0.072	.671	0.970	[0.842, 1.115]					
Self-Esteem	0.056	0.091	.534	1.058	[0.885, 1.263]					
Political										
Family's Politics	0.238	0.136	.081	1.269	[0.972, 1.662]					
Friends' Politics	0.187	0.141	.186	1.205	[0.911, 1.589]					
City Politics	0.094	0.113	.406	1.099	[0.879, 1.372]					
Importance of Politics	0.080	0.084	.344	1.083	[0.918, 1.279]					
Political Extremity	0.296	0.064	.000	1.344	[1.186, 1.525]	0.313	0.175	.073	1.368	[0.976, 1.938]
Relationship										
Importance of Shared Politics	0.569	0.123	.000	1.767	[1.396, 2.260]	0.493	0.134	.000	1.637	[1.265, 2.140]
Importance of Shared Values	0.168	0.105	.111	1.183	[0.962, 1.455]					
Met Online	0.108	0.116	.352	1.113	[0.890, 1.402]					
Relationship Length	0.039	0.142	.784	1.039	[0.791, 1.382]					
Relationship Status	0.314	0.063	.000	1.369	[1.210, 1.548]	0.251	0.133	.058	1.285	[0.992, 1.669]

Note. Politically similar couples were coded as 1, and politically dissimilar couples were coded as 0. Satterthwaite degrees of freedom were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Table S4. *Estimates from DRSA Models Predicting Potential Correlates of Political Ideology (Dis)similarity*

Characteristic	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5
Demographic					
Age	0.483** [0.119, 0.846]	0.505*** [0.286, 0.724]	0.434** [0.128, 0.740]	-0.004 [-0.621, 0.613]	0.036 [-0.112, 0.184]
Education	-0.091*** [-0.122, -0.060]	0.023* [0.005, 0.042]	-0.017 [-0.066, 0.031]	0.058* [0.004, 0.113]	-0.016 [-0.039, 0.008]
Household Income	-0.023 [-0.123, 0.077]	-0.020 [-0.080, 0.040]	0.042 [-0.064, 0.148]	-0.052 [-0.232, 0.129]	-0.005 [-0.053, 0.043]
Religiosity	0.265*** [0.224, 0.3-6]	0.065*** [0.040, 0.090]	0.196** [0.130, 0.262]	0.015 [-0.054, 0.083]	0.003 [-0.030, 0.036]
Personality					
Intellectual Humility	-0.112*** [-0.160, -0.064]	0.005 [-0.025, 0.034]	-0.101 [-0.203, 0.001]	0.025 [-0.067, 0.117]	-0.004 [-0.046, 0.039]
Neuroticism	-0.122*** [-0.172, -0.072]	0.026 [-0.005, 0.057]	-0.278*** [-0.377, -0.180]	0.006 [-0.078, 0.090]	0.018 [-0.031, 0.067]
Openness	-0.144*** [-0.187, -0.102]	0.046*** [0.020, 0.072]	-0.106** [-0.187, -0.026]	-0.044 [-0.036, 0.044]	0.004 [-0.036, 0.044]
Self-Esteem	0.136*** [0.080, 0.183]	0.006 [-0.029, 0.041]	0.236*** [0.133, 0.340]	-0.018 [-0.113, 0.077]	0.002 [-0.050, 0.055]
Political					
Family's Politics	2.609* [0.589, 4.630]	2.265** [0.954, 3.576]	4.175 [-0.802, 9.153]	2.867 [-1.095, 6.829]	-0.237 [-2.230, 1.757]
Friends' Politics	-4.099*** [-5.493, -2.705]	2.144*** [1.255, 3.032]	-3.832* [-6.926, -0.739]	-1.899 [-4.595, 0.797]	1.015 [-0.206, 2.237]
City Politics	0.697 [-1.274, 2.667]	1.752** [0.518, 2.986]	3.698* [0.116, 7.220]	-2.379 [-6.168, 1.410]	0.320 [-1.055, 1.695]
Importance of Politics	0.153*** [0.095, 0.212]	-0.137*** [-0.173, -0.102]	0.110* [0.001, 0.218]	-0.143* [-0.252, -0.034]	-0.081** [-0.128, -0.034]
Relationship					
Importance of Shared Politics	-0.217*** [-0.280, -0.155]	0.150*** [0.112, 0.187]	-0.001 [-0.121, 0.119]	-0.136* [-0.255, -0.018]	0.087*** [0.037, 0.137]
Importance of Shared Values	-0.604*** [-0.084, -0.043]	0.072*** [0.054, 0.091]	-0.093** [-0.150, -0.037]	-0.027 [-0.077, 0.023]	0.018 [-0.008, 0.044]
Met Online	-0.063*** [-0.095, -0.032]	0.029** [0.010, 0.047]	0.008 [-0.015, 0.031]	0.012 [-0.045, 0.070]	0.006 [-0.004, 0.015]
Relationship Length	0.567*** [0.305, 0.829]	0.267*** [0.109, 0.425]	-0.045 [-0.118, 0.028]	-0.161 [-0.609, 0.287]	-0.008 [-0.043, 0.027]
Relationship Status	0.030*** [0.013, 0.047]	0.007 [-0.003, 0.017]	0.003 [-0.003, 0.010]	-0.012 [-0.041, 0.016]	0.000 [-0.003, 0.003]

Notes. 95% confidence intervals are in brackets. We removed political extremity from the DRSA models due to concerns about redundancy, as RSA already accounts for extremity in actor and partner political ideology.

Table S5. Comparisons between Full Sample and Dyadic Subset from Section 1b (Correlates of Political (Dis)similarity) for Cross-Sectional Data

	Type of Political Similarity			
	Political Party		Political Ideology (DRSA)	
	All	Dyadic	All	Dyadic
Demographics				
Age	Yes	No	No	No
Education	No	No	Yes	No
Household Income	No	No	No	No
Religiosity	No	No	No	No
Personality				
Intellectual Humility	No	No	No	No
Neuroticism	Yes	Yes	No	No
Openness	No	No	No	No
Self-Esteem	No	No	No	No
Political				
Family's Politics	No	No	No	No
Friends' Politics	No	No	No	No
City Politics	No	No	No	No
Importance of Politics	No	No	No	No
Political Extremity	Yes	Yes	No	No
Relationship				
Importance of Shared Politics	Yes	Yes	No	No
Importance of Shared Values	No	No	No	No
Relationship status	Yes	Yes	No	No
Met Online	No	Yes	No	No

Table S6. *Perceived (Dis)similarity Predicting Relationship Quality using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)*

Sample	Model	Predictor (standardized)	Beta	Std.Err	z-value	P(> z)
Cross-Sectional	PolSimilar	PolSimilar	0.21	0.02	10.59	< 0.001
	PolSimilar + Similar	PolSimilar	0.12	0.02	5.68	< 0.001
		Similar	0.32	0.02	16.38	< 0.001
		<i>Diff (PS-OS)</i>	<i>-0.20</i>	<i>0.03</i>	<i>-5.88</i>	<i>< 0.001</i>
	PolSimilar + ValuesShared	PolSimilar	0.08	0.02	3.44	0.00
		ValuesShared	0.30	0.02	15.91	< 0.001
		<i>Diff (PS-VS)</i>	<i>-0.23</i>	<i>0.04</i>	<i>-6.42</i>	<i>< 0.001</i>
Daily Diary	PolSimilar	PolSimilar	0.08	0.02	3.25	0.00
	PolSimilar + Similar	PolSimilar	0.06	0.02	2.67	0.01
		Similar	0.09	0.02	3.63	< 0.001
		<i>Diff (PS-OS)</i>	<i>-0.03</i>	<i>0.04</i>	<i>-0.68</i>	<i>0.50</i>
	PolSimilar + ValuesShared	PolSimilar	0.04	0.03	1.57	0.12
		ValuesShared	0.09	0.02	3.85	< 0.001
		<i>Diff (PS-VS)</i>	<i>-0.05</i>	<i>0.04</i>	<i>-1.27</i>	<i>0.21</i>

Table S7. Political Ideology Similarity: Interaction and Difference Score Approaches

Cross-Sectional Analyses	Estimates					95% CI		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	<i>r</i>
<i>Interaction Approach</i>								
Intercept	5.58	0.02	1913.40	235.86	<.001	5.53	5.63	
Actor Pol. Ideology	-0.03	0.03	1731.07	-1.18	.238	-0.08	0.02	0.03
Partner Pol. Ideology	-0.04	0.02	1743.14	-1.94	.052	-0.08	0.00	0.05
A x P Pol. Ideology	0.15	0.02	1828.70	6.44	<.001	0.10	0.19	0.15
<i>Difference Score Approach</i>								
Intercept	5.58	0.02	1806.55	242.73	<.001	5.54	5.63	
Absolute Difference	-0.16	0.02	1821.94	-6.78	<.001	-0.11	-0.11	0.16
Daily Diary Analyses	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	<i>r</i>
<i>Interaction Approach</i>								
Intercept	5.15	0.04	206.43	144.01	<.001	5.08	5.22	
Actor Pol. Ideology	-0.01	0.02	379.14	-0.69	.493	-0.05	0.03	0.04
Partner Pol. Ideology	-0.04	0.02	379.86	-1.81	.071	-0.07	0.00	0.09
A x P Pol. Ideology	0.05	0.02	201.27	2.89	.004	0.02	0.08	0.20
<i>Difference Score Approach</i>								
Intercept	5.27	0.05	206.77	108.42	<.001	5.18	5.37	
Absolute Difference	-0.09	0.04	205.15	-2.42	.016	-0.16	-0.02	0.17

Note: $r = \sqrt{t^2/(t^2+df)}$

Table S8. Simple Slopes of Significant Moderations for Perceived and Partisanship Similarity in Cross-Sectional and Daily Diary Datasets

DV: Relationship Quality	<i>b</i>	+1SD							-1SD						
		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	<i>r</i>	
Perceived Political Similarity															
Cross-Sectional															
Appreciative	0.11	1033.94	3.62	<.001	0.05	0.17	.11	0.22	1021.08	7.99	<.001	0.17	0.28	.24	
Own PT	0.11	888.02	2.73	.006	0.03	0.20	.09	0.26	950.90	6.81	<.001	0.18	0.33	.22	
Perceived Partner PT	0.08	929.08	2.01	.045	0.00	0.15	.07	0.18	953.35	6.07	<.001	0.12	0.24	.19	
Daily Diary															
Perceived Partner PT	-0.03	385.78	-1.04	.298	-.08	.02	.05	0.03	411.54	1.58	.115	-.01	.08	.08	
Partisanship Similarity															
Daily Diary															
Political Stress	0.00	304.20	0.03	.978	-0.17	0.17	.00	-0.25	298.97	-2.99	.003	-0.41	-0.08	.17	

Note: PT = perspective-taking; $r = \sqrt{t^2/(t^2 + df)}$

Table S9. *Moderators of Perceived Political Similarity in the Cross-Sectional Dataset.*

	β	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	.065	.021	3.041	709	.002
Political Similarity	.149	.021	7.008	997	.000
Feeling Appreciated	.547	.022	25.316	1,021	.000
Similarity*Feeling Appreciated	-.018	.020	-0.870	1,028	.384
Intercept	.074	.024	3.094	709	.002
Political Similarity	.170	.023	7.382	1,015	.000
Appreciation	.433	.023	19.172	1,034	.000
Similarity*Appreciation	-.065	.021	-3.072	1,034	.002
Intercept	.078	.027	2.902	685	.004
Political Similarity	.129	.026	5.001	946	.000
Perceived Perspective-Taking	.365	.025	14.707	937	.000
Similarity*Perceived Perspective-Taking	-.06	.024	-2.443	948	.015
Intercept	.080	.029	2.774	681	.006
Political Similarity	.185	.027	6.962	951	.000
Perspective-Taking	.229	.025	9.060	883	.000
Similarity*Perspective-Taking	-.058	.024	-2.376	886	.018
Intercept	.067	.034	1.953	541	.051
Political Similarity	.266	.032	8.313	652	.000
Self-Silencing	-.150	.032	-4.727	658	.000
Similarity*Self-Silencing	.011	.031	0.355	629	.723
Intercept	.047	.034	1.385	467	.167
Political Similarity	.154	.030	5.091	739	.000
Shared Lifestyle	.249	.027	9.099	639	.000
Similarity*Shared Lifestyle	-.031	.027	-1.163	663	.245
Intercept	-.008	.034	-0.248	483	.804
Political Similarity	.100	.031	3.250	723	.001
Shared Values	.315	.030	10.607	596	.000
Similarity*Shared Values	-.013	.025	-0.531	541	.596
Intercept	-.209	.043	-4.880	669	.000
Political Similarity	.169	.041	4.143	805	.000
Importance of Politics	-.035	.032	-1.116	576	.265
Similarity*Importance of Politics	.009	.032	0.276	465	.783

Note. Satterthwaite degrees of freedom were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Table S10. *Moderators of Perceived Political Similarity in the Daily Diary Dataset.*

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	5.18	0.02	197.91	334.12	<.001
Political Similarity	0.00	0.02	363.05	0.18	.86
Appreciated (wp)	0.39	0.02	200.96	26.67	<.001
Similarity* Appreciated (wp)	-0.02	0.01	289.81	-1.19	.234
Feeling Appreciated (bp)	0.55	0.02	390.70	31.30	<.001
Similarity*Appreciated (bp)	-0.02	0.02	409.08	-1.01	.311
Intercept	5.19	0.02	202.19	341.48	<.001
Political Similarity	0.01	0.01	351.50	1.01	.315
Appreciative (wp)	0.40	0.02	184.45	23.19	<.001
Similarity* Appreciative (wp)	-0.01	0.02	262.31	-0.69	.490
Appreciative (bp)	0.67	0.02	385.11	31.03	<.001
Similarity*Appreciative (bp)	-0.03	0.02	418.01	-1.39	.166
Intercept	5.19	0.02	200.00	267.41	<.001
Political Similarity	0.00	0.02	368.65	0.22	.824
Perc. Partner Perspective-Taking (wp)	0.39	0.02	171.64	22.46	<.001
Similarity*Perc. Partner PT (wp)	-0.01	0.02	241.87	-0.29	.771
Perc. Partner Perspective-Taking (bp)	0.53	0.02	404.32	22.59	<.001
Similarity*Perc. Partner PT (bp)	-0.04	0.02	402.64	-1.96	.051
Intercept	5.18	0.02	194.98	232.14	<.001
Political Similarity	0.03	0.02	370.55	1.36	.176
Own Perspective-Taking (wp)	0.34	0.02	186.08	14.32	<.001
Similarity*Own PT (wp)	-0.01	0.02	282.78	-0.42	.674
Own Perspective-Taking (bp)	0.59	0.04	395.40	16.92	<.001
Similarity*Own PT (bp)	-0.03	0.03	406.54	-0.86	.393
Intercept	5.18	0.03	199.59	200.10	<.001
Political Similarity	0.06	0.02	394.92	2.66	.008
Self-Silencing (wp)	-0.14	0.01	151.62	-11.32	<.001
Similarity*Self-Silencing (wp)	0.01	0.01	225.70	1.00	.318
Self-Silencing (bp)	-0.30	0.02	383.37	-12.98	<.001
Similarity*Self-Silencing (bp)	-0.02	0.02	345.56	-0.88	.378
Intercept	5.18	0.03	236.25	151.05	<.001
Political Similarity	0.05	0.03	408.75	1.90	.058
Political Stress (wp)	0.01	0.04	57.69	0.24	.812
Similarity*Political Stress (wp)	0.01	0.05	59.39	0.27	.789
Political Stress (bp)	-0.04	0.16	358.11	-0.28	.782
Similarity*Political Stress (bp)	0.19	0.17	314.03	1.10	.274

Note. *WP* = within-person; *BP* = between-person

Table S11. *Moderators of Partisanship Similarity in the Cross-Sectional Dataset.*

	β	SE	t	df	p
Intercept	.037	.028	1.312	426	.190
Political Similarity	.030	.026	1.167	422	.244
Feeling Appreciated	.558	.027	20.378	720	.000
Similarity*Feeling Appreciated	.010	.026	0.378	719	.706
Intercept	.040	.032	1.244	444	.214
Political Similarity	.025	.029	0.867	442	.386
Appreciation	.423	.028	15.312	733	.000
Similarity*Appreciation	.001	.027	0.029	733	.977
Intercept	-.002	.037	-0.041	463	.968
Political Similarity	.015	.034	0.439	462	.661
Perspective-Taking	.221	.029	7.677	640	.000
Similarity*Perspective-Taking	-.011	.028	-0.392	649	.695
Intercept	-.003	.033	-0.782	460	.434
Political Similarity	-.020	.031	-0.653	460	.514
Perceived Perspective-Taking	.394	.030	13.254	718	.000
Similarity*Perceived Perspective-Taking	-.031	.028	-1.096	724	.274
Intercept	-.036	.056	-0.644	433	.520
Political Similarity	.115	.051	2.259	423	.024
Self-Silencing	-.067	.049	-1.371	354	.171
Similarity*Self-Silencing	.017	.048	0.365	362	.715
Intercept	.032	.036	0.882	460	.378
Political Similarity	.036	.033	1.109	457	.268
Shared Lifestyle	.277	.029	9.669	636	.000
Similarity*Shared Lifestyle	-.016	.028	-0.574	616	.566
Intercept	-.030	.035	-0.847	470	.398
Political Similarity	.001	.032	0.022	464	.983
Shared Values	.344	.029	12.062	602	.000
Similarity*Shared Values	-.041	.026	-1.542	597	.124
Intercept	-.260	.046	-5.648	635	.000
Political Similarity	.062	.046	1.344	645	.179
Importance of Politics	-.045	.034	-1.344	460	.179
Similarity*Importance of Politics	-.030	.039	-0.765	425	.445

Table S12. *Moderators of Partisanship Similarity in the Daily Diary Dataset*

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	5.23	0.03	187.15	211.41	<.001
Political Similarity	-0.08	0.03	188.36	-2.38	.019
Appreciated (wp)	0.37	0.02	202.79	15.32	<.001
Similarity* Appreciated (wp)	0.03	0.03	197.04	1.02	.310
Feeling Appreciated (bp)	0.52	0.03	412.96	20.42	<.001
Similarity*Appreciated (bp)	0.04	0.04	390.74	1.22	.224
Intercept	5.22	0.02	189.16	217.74	<.001
Political Similarity	-0.06	0.03	191.34	-1.91	.057
Appreciative (wp)	0.39	0.03	182.04	13.68	<.001
Similarity* Appreciative (wp)	0.02	0.04	178.97	0.46	.648
Appreciative (bp)	0.69	0.03	349.67	20.92	<.001
Similarity*Appreciative (bp)	-0.02	0.04	362.87	-0.47	.635
Intercept	5.22	0.03	188.89	166.19	<.001
Political Similarity	-0.07	0.04	189.55	-1.61	.110
Perc. Partner Perspective-Taking (wp)	0.36	0.03	161.57	12.83	<.001
Similarity*Perc. Partner PT (wp)	0.06	0.04	163.43	1.63	.105
Perc. Partner Perspective-Taking (bp)	0.54	0.04	387.74	14.57	<.001
Similarity*Perc. Partner PT (bp)	-0.03	0.05	393.22	-0.58	.563
Intercept	5.22	0.04	187.15	143.98	<.001
Political Similarity	-0.06	0.05	187.43	-1.34	.183
Own Perspective-Taking (wp)	0.30	0.04	177.99	7.72	<.001
Similarity*Own PT (wp)	0.06	0.05	176.83	1.25	.214
Own Perspective-Taking (bp)	0.61	0.05	374.73	11.50	<.001
Similarity*Own PT (bp)	-0.05	0.07	381.05	-0.64	.522
Intercept	5.23	0.04	191.99	123.98	<.001
Political Similarity	-0.07	0.05	192.22	-1.33	.184
Self-Silencing (wp)	-0.12	0.02	146.62	-6.00	<.001
Similarity*Self-Silencing (wp)	-0.03	0.03	146.34	-1.25	.212
Self-Silencing (bp)	-0.29	0.04	403.82	-7.57	<.001
Similarity*Self-Silencing (bp)	-0.02	0.05	379.58	-0.41	.679
Intercept	5.26	0.05	204.17	99.72	<.001
Political Similarity	-0.12	0.07	205.67	-1.80	.074
Political Stress (wp)	0.06	0.06	37.27	0.95	.349
Similarity*Political Stress (wp)	-0.08	0.09	47.53	-0.92	.362
Political Stress (bp)	-0.46	0.22	328.50	-2.15	.033
Similarity*Political Stress (bp)	0.83	0.33	353.70	2.54	.011

Note. *WP* = within-person; *BP* = between-person

Table S13. Moderators of Political Ideology in the Cross-Sectional Dataset

DV: Relationship Quality	-1SD						+1SD					
	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
<i>Appreciated</i>												
<i>a1</i>	0.06	0.02	2.70	.01	0.02	0.10	-0.04	0.02	-1.70	.09	-0.08	0.01
<i>a2</i>	0.02	0.01	1.43	.15	-0.01	0.04	0.02	0.01	1.68	.09	0.00	0.04
<i>a3</i>	-0.03	0.04	-0.84	.40	-0.10	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.55	.58	-0.05	0.08
<i>a4</i>	-0.04	0.04	-1.01	.31	-0.13	0.04	-0.10	0.03	-2.92	.00	-0.16	-0.03
<i>a5</i>	0.01	0.02	0.83	.41	-0.02	0.04	0.05	0.02	3.13	.00	0.02	0.08
<i>Appreciative</i>												
<i>a1</i>	0.02	0.02	1.01	.31	-0.02	0.07	-0.05	0.02	-2.32	.02	-0.10	-0.01
<i>a2</i>	0.00	0.01	0.18	.86	-0.02	0.03	0.03	0.01	2.22	.03	0.00	0.06
<i>a3</i>	-0.04	0.04	-0.92	.36	-0.12	0.04	0.09	0.03	2.47	.01	0.02	0.15
<i>a4</i>	-0.10	0.05	-2.09	.04	-0.20	-0.01	-0.08	0.04	-1.98	.05	-0.15	0.00
<i>a5</i>	0.02	0.02	1.29	.20	-0.01	0.05	0.04	0.02	2.55	.01	0.01	0.08
<i>Perc. Partner Perspective-Taking</i>												
<i>a1</i>	-0.02	0.03	-0.50	.62	-0.08	0.05	-0.03	0.04	-0.71	.48	-0.10	0.05
<i>a2</i>	0.01	0.02	0.70	.49	-0.02	0.05	0.06	0.02	2.69	.01	0.02	0.11
<i>a3</i>	0.01	0.05	0.13	.90	-0.10	0.11	0.09	0.04	2.26	.02	0.01	0.17
<i>a4</i>	0.01	0.07	0.17	.87	-0.13	0.15	-0.07	0.05	-1.47	.14	-0.17	0.02
<i>a5</i>	0.00	0.02	0.22	.83	-0.04	0.05	0.03	0.02	1.50	.13	-0.01	0.08
<i>Own Perspective-Taking</i>												
<i>a1</i>	-0.02	0.03	-0.63	.53	-0.09	0.04	-0.05	0.04	-1.22	.22	-0.13	0.03
<i>a2</i>	0.02	0.02	0.96	.34	-0.02	0.06	0.04	0.02	1.93	.05	0.00	0.09
<i>a3</i>	0.08	0.06	1.36	.17	-0.04	0.20	0.09	0.04	2.08	.04	0.01	0.18
<i>a4</i>	-0.2	0.07	-2.67	.01	-0.35	-0.05	-0.13	0.06	-2.33	.02	-0.24	-0.02
<i>a5</i>	0.02	0.02	0.72	.47	-0.03	0.06	0.04	0.03	1.61	.11	-0.01	0.10
<i>Self-Silencing</i>												
<i>a1</i>	-0.04	0.02	-1.67	.10	-0.09	0.01	-0.01	0.02	-0.49	.62	-0.06	0.04
<i>a2</i>	0.04	0.01	3.00	.00	0.02	0.07	0.04	0.02	2.77	.01	0.01	0.07
<i>a3</i>	0.06	0.04	1.56	.12	-0.01	0.13	0.00	0.04	-0.02	.98	-0.09	0.08
<i>a4</i>	-0.12	0.04	-2.97	.00	-0.19	-0.04	-0.12	0.04	-2.71	.01	-0.20	-0.03
<i>a5</i>	0.04	0.02	1.91	.06	0.00	0.08	0.03	0.02	1.73	.08	0.00	0.07
<i>Shared Lifestyle</i>												
<i>a1</i>	0.00	0.02	0.09	.93	-0.05	0.05	-0.04	0.03	-1.57	.12	-0.09	0.01
<i>a2</i>	0.02	0.01	1.57	.12	-0.01	0.05	0.05	0.02	3.10	.00	0.02	0.09
<i>a3</i>	-0.02	0.04	-0.44	.66	-0.09	0.06	0.09	0.04	2.29	.02	0.01	0.17
<i>a4</i>	-0.16	0.04	-3.52	.00	-0.24	-0.07	-0.13	0.04	-3.13	.00	-0.21	-0.05
<i>a5</i>	0.00	0.02	0.02	.99	-0.04	0.04	0.06	0.02	3.09	.00	0.02	0.10
<i>Shared Values</i>												
<i>a1</i>	0.01	0.02	0.27	.79	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.03	-1.01	.31	-0.09	0.03
<i>a2</i>	0.02	0.01	1.65	.10	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.02	1.01	.31	-0.02	0.05
<i>a3</i>	-0.01	0.04	-0.19	.85	-0.09	0.07	0.08	0.03	2.42	.02	0.01	0.14
<i>a4</i>	-0.09	0.05	-1.74	.08	-0.20	0.01	-0.07	0.03	-1.97	.05	-0.13	0.00
<i>a5</i>	0.02	0.02	0.97	.33	-0.02	0.06	0.04	0.02	2.26	.02	0.01	0.08
<i>Importance of Politics</i>												
<i>a1</i>	-0.01	0.05	-0.15	.88	-0.11	0.09	-0.01	0.03	-0.21	.84	-0.07	0.06
<i>a2</i>	0.05	0.03	1.45	.15	-0.02	0.11	0.04	0.02	2.20	.03	0.00	0.08
<i>a3</i>	0.06	0.10	0.64	.52	-0.13	0.25	0.09	0.05	1.88	.06	0.00	0.19
<i>a4</i>	-0.12	0.10	-1.21	.23	-0.33	0.08	-0.17	0.06	-2.92	.00	-0.28	-0.06
<i>a5</i>	0.08	0.04	2.11	.04	0.01	0.16	0.01	0.02	0.36	.72	-0.03	0.05

Table S14. *Moderators of Political Ideology in the Daily Diary Dataset*

DV: Relationship		-1 SD						+1 SD					
Quality		<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
<i>Appreciated</i>													
	<i>a1</i>	-0.06	0.02	-2.80	.005	-0.11	-0.02	0.02	0.02	0.97	.330	-0.02	0.06
	<i>a2</i>	0.03	0.01	2.62	.009	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.58	.562	-0.02	0.03
	<i>a3</i>	0.06	0.02	2.83	.005	0.02	0.10	-0.03	0.02	-1.08	.281	-0.07	0.02
	<i>a4</i>	-0.01	0.02	-0.34	.735	-0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	1.25	.211	-0.02	0.07
	<i>a5</i>	0.00	0.02	-0.17	.866	-0.04	0.03	-0.03	0.03	-1.31	.191	-0.09	0.02
<i>Appreciative</i>													
	<i>a1</i>	0.00	0.02	0.08	.937	-0.04	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.87	.387	-0.02	0.06
	<i>a2</i>	0.02	0.01	1.80	.072	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.01	1.09	.275	-0.01	0.03
	<i>a3</i>	0.02	0.02	0.80	.423	-0.03	0.06	-0.05	0.02	-1.90	.057	-0.10	0.00
	<i>a4</i>	0.03	0.02	1.71	.088	0.00	0.06	-0.01	0.02	-0.38	.701	-0.05	0.04
	<i>a5</i>	-0.02	0.02	-1.30	.192	-0.06	0.01	0.03	0.03	1.19	.236	-0.02	0.09
<i>Perc. Partner Perspective-Taking</i>													
	<i>a1</i>	0.00	0.03	0.10	.919	-0.05	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.64	.523	-0.04	0.07
	<i>a2</i>	0.02	0.01	1.24	.214	-0.01	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.80	.424	-0.02	0.04
	<i>a3</i>	0.10	0.02	4.32	<.001	0.06	0.15	-0.04	0.03	-1.50	.132	-0.09	0.01
	<i>a4</i>	0.04	0.02	1.85	.064	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.03	0.46	.646	-0.04	0.06
	<i>a5</i>	-0.10	0.03	-3.87	<.001	-0.15	-0.05	0.01	0.03	0.29	.774	-0.06	0.08
<i>Own Perspective Taking</i>													
	<i>a1</i>	-0.02	0.03	-0.67	.506	-0.08	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.31	.754	-0.05	0.07
	<i>a2</i>	0.02	0.02	1.19	.234	-0.01	0.05	0.02	0.02	1.10	.273	-0.01	0.05
	<i>a3</i>	0.10	0.03	3.88	<.001	0.05	0.15	0.00	0.03	-0.01	.989	-0.05	0.05
	<i>a4</i>	0.02	0.02	0.90	.370	-0.02	0.06	0.05	0.03	1.78	.075	0.00	0.10
	<i>a5</i>	-0.07	0.03	-2.55	.011	-0.13	-0.02	-0.06	0.04	-1.61	.107	-0.13	0.01
<i>Self-Silencing</i>													
	<i>a1</i>	0.04	0.03	1.21	.226	-0.02	0.10	-0.06	0.04	-1.84	.066	-0.13	0.00
	<i>a2</i>	0.01	0.02	0.65	.515	-0.02	0.05	0.04	0.02	2.12	.034	0.00	0.07
	<i>a3</i>	-0.03	0.03	-1.10	.270	-0.08	0.02	0.05	0.03	2.11	.035	0.00	0.11
	<i>a4</i>	0.10	0.02	4.06	<.001	0.05	0.14	0.05	0.03	1.77	.076	0.00	0.10
	<i>a5</i>	-0.12	0.03	-3.50	<.001	-0.19	-0.05	-0.04	0.03	-1.21	.225	-0.10	0.02
<i>Political Stress</i>													
	<i>a1</i>	-0.03	0.04	-0.73	.464	-0.11	0.05	-0.04	0.04	-0.90	.369	-0.11	0.04
	<i>a2</i>	0.06	0.02	2.56	.011	0.01	0.11	-0.01	0.03	-0.28	.781	-0.06	0.04
	<i>a3</i>	-0.01	0.03	-0.50	.614	-0.07	0.04	0.04	0.03	1.36	.174	-0.02	0.11
	<i>a4</i>	0.09	0.03	2.78	.005	0.03	0.15	0.05	0.03	1.64	.101	-0.01	0.11
	<i>a5</i>	-0.07	0.05	-1.45	.147	-0.16	0.02	-0.11	0.05	-1.96	.050	-0.21	0.00

Summary of Sample Differences

Did main variables differ by sample?		
Relationship quality	Yes, $F(9, 3547) = 18.14, p < .001$	Sample 4 ($M = 4.55, SD = 0.96$) had lower values than Samples 7 ($M = 4.81, SD = 0.98$) and 8 ($M = 4.80, SD = 1.00$); Sample 5 ($M = 4.78, SD = 0.95$) had higher values than Samples 1 ($M = 4.48, SD = 1.14$), 7, 8, and 9 ($M = 4.65, SD = 1.10$); Sample 6 ($M = 4.58, SD = 1.16$) had lower values than Samples 7, 8, and 9; Sample 8 had higher values than Samples 1, 4, 5, and 6; Sample 9 had lower values than Sample 8
Perceived political similarity	Yes, $F(7, 2943) = 4.44, p < .001$	Samples 2 ($M = 4.78, SD = 1.18$) and 5 ($M = 4.78, SD = 0.95$) had higher values than Sample 1 ($M = 4.48, SD = 1.14$)
Partisanship	Yes ($\chi^2 = 294.33, df = 15, p < .001$)	Sample 5 had a higher proportion of Democrats (64.4%) than Samples 1 (51.1%), 7 (46.5%), 8 (35.1%), and 9 (41.2%). Sample 1 had a higher proportion of Democrats than Sample 9.
Political ideology	Yes, $F(10, 4552) = 29.45, p < .001$	Sample 1 ($M = 3.14, SD = 1.62$) was more conservative than Sample 5 ($M = 2.63, SD = 1.33$); Sample 2 ($M = 3.85, SD = 1.91$) was more conservative than Sample 1, 3 ($M = 3.11, SD = 1.66$), 4 ($M = 2.95, SD = 1.69$), 5, 10 ($M = 3.03, SD = 1.19$), 11 ($M = 3.14, SD = 1.45$); Sample 3 was more conservative than Sample 5; Sample 6 ($M = 3.55, SD = 1.93$) was more conservative than Sample 5; Sample 7 ($M = 3.74, SD = 2.04$) was more conservative than Sample 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11; Sample 8 ($M = 3.87, SD = 2.10$) was more conservative than Sample 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11; Sample 9 ($M = 4.04, SD = 1.80$) was more conservative than Sample 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11; Sample 11 was more conservative than Sample 5.
Were 2b analyses significant when controlling for sample?		
Perceived political similarity predicting relationship quality	Yes, $b = 0.23, df = 1902.61, t = 10.16, p < .001$	
Partisanship similarity predicting relationship quality	Yes, $b = 0.20, df = 1332.45, t = 2.76, p = .01$	

Ideology similarity predicting relationship quality	DRSA: Yes, α_5 value remained significant when controlling for sample. A x P Interaction: Yes, $b = 0.05$, $df = 1820.99$, $t = 6.09$, $p < .001$ Absolute Difference: Yes, $b = -0.15$, $df = 1809.30$, $t = -6.65$, $p < .001$
Were 2b results moderated by sample?	
Perceived political similarity predicting relationship quality	Yes, there were significant negative interactions with Samples 4, 5, and 7.
Partisanship similarity predicting relationship quality	Yes, there was a significant negative interaction with Sample 5.
Ideology similarity predicting relationship quality	DRSA: No, there were no significant similarity effects for any of the samples. A x P Interaction: No, three-way interaction with Sample was not significant, $F(1492.13) = 1.59$, $p = .160$ Absolute Difference: Yes, $F(1508.63) = 3.23$, $p = .007$, significant effects were only found for Samples 1 and 11 (Sample 3, $p = .065$).

Figure S1. Political ideology (dis)similarity predicting relationship quality in cross-sectional dataset using full scale for y-axis.




Figure S2. Political ideology (dis)similarity predicting relationship quality in daily diary dataset using full scale for y-axis.

