

between the parties or exposure to differing media sources or negative campaign ads. Instead, they contend, it is primarily affective—that is, “based on a primordial sense of partisan identity that is acquired very early in life and persists over the entire life cycle.”

- **McGhee, Eric, Seth Masket, Boris Shor, Steven Rogers, and Nolan McCarty.** “A Primary Cause of Partisanship? Nomination Systems and Legislator Ideology.” *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (2014): 337–351.

In an era of polarization, many have argued that opening up primary voting to nonparty members would force

candidates to moderate their messages, rather than appealing to their own party’s base. To test this idea, the authors compared electoral results under the different nominating systems used by every state over the past 20 years with a database of state legislative roll-call votes developed by Shor and McCarty. They found that there were consistent levels of polarization across time regardless of the way legislators were nominated. “The results of this analysis suggest that the openness of a primary election system has little to no effect on the ideological positions of the politicians it elects,” they write. That is, Democrats remain liberal and Republicans remain conservative. If anything, they find that when primary systems are more open, more extreme candidates are nominated.