

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

POLITICAL DISAGREEMENT

The Survival of Diverse Opinions within Communication Networks

Not only is political disagreement widespread within the communication networks of ordinary citizens, but political diversity within these networks is entirely consistent with a theory of democratic politics built on the importance of individual interdependence. Contrary to commonly held theoretical expectations, the persistence of political diversity and disagreement does not imply that political interdependence is absent among citizens or that political influence is lacking. This book's analysis makes a number of contributions. The authors demonstrate the ubiquitous nature of political disagreement, even within the networks and contexts that comprise the micro-environments of democratic citizens. They show that communication and influence within dyads is autoregressive – that the consequences of dyadic interactions depend on the distribution of opinions within larger networks of communication. They argue that the autoregressive nature of political influence serves to sustain disagreement within patterns of social interaction, as it restores the broader political relevance of social communication and influence.

Robert Huckfeldt is a Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the University of California at Davis. His interests lie in the areas of elections, public opinion, political communication, urban politics, and, more generally, in the relationships among groups and individuals in politics.

Paul E. Johnson is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Kansas. His work includes applications of game theory, social choice theory, and complexity theory. He currently has an avid interest in the development of tools for agent-based modeling and computer simulation in the social sciences, and he is an active contributor to the development of the Swarm Simulation System.

Professor John Sprague has written on voting and elections, the history of socialist voting, voting patterns in the U.S. Supreme Court, lawyers in politics, and crime, including homicide. His academic career has been wholly at Washington University in St. Louis, where he has served as the Sidney W. Souers Professor in Political Science, as well as chair of the Department of Political Science.

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN PUBLIC OPINION AND
POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Series Editors

Dennis Chong, *Northwestern University*

James H. Kuklinski, *University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology publishes innovative research from a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives on the mass public foundations of politics and society. Research in the series focuses on the origins and influence of mass opinion, the dynamics of information and deliberation, and the emotional, normative, and instrumental bases of political choice. In addition to examining psychological processes, the series explores the organization of groups, the association between individual and collective preferences, and the impact of institutions on beliefs and behavior.

Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology is dedicated to furthering theoretical and empirical research on the relationship between the political system and the attitudes and actions of citizens.

Books in the series are listed on the page following the Index.

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

POLITICAL DISAGREEMENT

*The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks*

ROBERT HUCKFELDT

University of California, Davis

PAUL E. JOHNSON

University of Kansas

JOHN SPRAGUE

Washington University in St. Louis



Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson, John Sprague 2004

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2004

Printed in the United States of America

Typeface Sabon 10/12 pt. System L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data

Huckfeldt, R. Robert.

Political disagreement : the survival of diverse opinions within communication
networks / Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague.

p. cm. – (Cambridge studies in political psychology and public opinion)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-83430-9 (hb) – ISBN 0-521-54223-5 (pb)

1. Communication in politics. 2. Political participation. 3. Consensus
(Social sciences) 4. Public opinion. 5. Democracy. I. Johnson, P. E. (Paul E.)
II. Sprague, John D. III. Title. IV. Series.

JA85.H83 2004

320'.01'4-dc22 2003067589

ISBN 0 521 83430 9 hardback

ISBN 0 521 54223 5 paperback

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

*For
Sharon, Carolyn, and Carol*

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i>	xiii
<i>List of Tables</i>		xv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>		xix
1	COMMUNICATION, INFLUENCE, AND THE CAPACITY OF CITIZENS TO DISAGREE	I
	The Importance of Disagreement in Democratic Politics	2
	Political Diversity as a Rare Event	7
	Efficiency and Cost Cutting as Keys to Civic Capacity	8
	Disagreement and Conflict Avoidance	9
	Dynamic Models of Opinion Change	11
	Agent-Based Explanations for Homogeneity	12
	The Survival of Political Disagreement	14
	Contrary Evidence Regarding Disagreement	16
	Networks, Groups, and Complex Forms of Organization	17
	An Overview of the Argument	19
	How Is Disagreement Sustained?	21
	The Plan for this Book	23
2	NEW INFORMATION, OLD INFORMATION, AND PERSISTENT DISAGREEMENT	25
	Network Theories of Political Influence	26
	Political Influence in Heterogeneous Environments	29
	Observational Requirements and Data Sets	34
	Heterogeneity and Influence within Networks	36
	Points of Intersection between Individuals and Aggregates	40
	Summary and Conclusion	43
3	DYADS, NETWORKS, AND AUTOREGRESSIVE INFLUENCE	46
	Contexts, Networks, and Autoregressive Influence	47

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Contents*

	Representations of Contextual Effects on Communication	48
	Representations of Network Effects on Communication	49
	Dyads, Networks, and Social Communication	51
	Dyads, Networks, and the 2000 Election	54
	Heterogeneous Opinions Regarding Candidates	60
	Conclusion	63
4	DISAGREEMENT, HETEROGENEITY, AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION	68
	Systematic Sources of Distortion in Communication	70
	Election Campaigns and Social Communication	72
	The Centrality of Political Disagreement	74
	Data and Research Design	75
	Accessibility and the Ease of Judgment	76
	Explaining Accessibility	78
	Reflective Confidence in Political Judgments	85
	Explaining Judgmental Confidence	86
	The Accuracy of Political Judgments	88
	Explaining Accuracy	88
	Taking Account of Accessibility	92
	Conclusion	94
5	DISAGREEMENT, HETEROGENEITY, AND PERSUASION: HOW DOES DISAGREEMENT SURVIVE?	98
	Politics, Interdependence, and the Survival of Disagreement	99
	Data and Research Design	101
	Political Activation Effects in the Campaign	102
	Contingent Effects of Campaign Activation	105
	Campaign Effects on Homogeneity within Networks	106
	Communication and the Survival of Disagreement	109
	Political Influence and Heterogeneity within Networks	113
	Majoritarian Biases and the Survival of Disagreement	115
	Socially Sustained Disagreement	117
	Implications	120
	Conclusion	122
6	AGENT-BASED EXPLANATIONS, PATTERNS OF COMMUNICATION, AND THE INEVITABILITY OF HOMOGENEITY	124
	Analysis versus Synthesis	125
	Agent-Based Models	127
	The Modeling Strategy	129

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Contents*

	The Axelrod Culture Model	133
	Alterations in the Selection Process	138
	<i>Multi-Agent Cells</i>	139
	<i>Decreased Levels of Self-Selection</i>	142
	<i>Neighborhoods and Workplaces</i>	143
	<i>Selectively Screened Encounters</i>	146
	Conclusion	149
7	AGENT-BASED EXPLANATIONS, AUTOREGRESSIVE INFLUENCE, AND THE SURVIVAL OF DISAGREEMENT	151
	Model Building Strategy	153
	Staunchly Held Opinions	156
	The Interesting Case of the Perverse Holdout	158
	The Collective Impact of Autoregressive Influence	160
	Autoregressive Influence and the Durability of Disagreement	162
	Stability of Networks Due to Autoregressive Influence	167
	Serialization Experiments	169
	Systematically Unpredictable Consequences	173
	Diversity, Complexity, and Predictability	176
	Summary	177
	Conclusion	179
8	HETEROGENEOUS NETWORKS AND CITIZEN CAPACITY: DISAGREEMENT, AMBIVALENCE, AND ENGAGEMENT	180
	The Consequences of Disagreement among Citizens	182
	Likes, Dislikes, and Political Communication	182
	Communication and the Production of Ambivalence	190
	Diverse Networks and Political Engagement	198
	Conclusion	202
	Appendix to Chapter 8	206
9	SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSION	207
	Low Density Networks and Autoregressive Influence	208
	Political Implications for Groups and Individuals	210
	<i>Persistent Disagreement Frequently Occurs within Communication Networks</i>	210
	<i>Disagreement Is More Likely within Extensive Communication Networks</i>	211
	<i>Ambivalence Is a Consequence of Disagreement</i>	211
	<i>Disagreement and Ambivalence Yield Balanced, Less Polarized Opinions</i>	212
	<i>Ambivalence Is Not Simply the Antithesis of Political Engagement</i>	212

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Contents*

<i>The Effects of Social Capital Depend on Network Structure and Composition</i>	213
<i>Heterogeneous Networks May Be a Product of the Modern Era</i>	213
<i>Disagreement Is Related to the Decline of Partisanship</i>	214
<i>Political Homogeneity Persists within Networks under Particular Circumstances</i>	214
<i>Diversity Produces Important Implications for Political Dynamics</i>	215
Conclusion	216
APPENDIX A: THE INDIANAPOLIS–ST. LOUIS STUDY	218
<i>The Sample</i>	218
<i>Timing Responses</i>	219
<i>Measuring Preferences and Judgments across the Campaign</i>	219
<i>Network Name Generators</i>	220
APPENDIX B: THE OPINION SIMULATION SOFTWARE	222
<i>About the Code</i>	222
<i>Why Are There So Many Files?</i>	225
<i>Running the Model</i>	226
<i>About Days and Schedules</i>	230
<i>Serialization</i>	231
<i>Batch Mode</i>	232
<i>References</i>	235
<i>Index</i>	247

Figures

3.1. Contingent probability of agreement within network dyads, by the candidate preference of the discussant in the dyad and the levels of candidate support in the remainder of the network. All respondents are independents.	<i>page</i> 57
3.2. Contingent probability of agreement within network dyads, by the candidate preference of the discussant in the dyad and the levels of candidate support in the remainder of the network. All respondents are strong Republicans.	58
3.3. Contingent probability of agreement within network dyads, by the candidate preference of the discussant in the dyad and the levels of candidate support in the remainder of the network. All respondents are strong Democrats.	59
3.4. Predicted probability of increased favorability toward Bush from pre-election to post-election.	64
3.5. Predicted probability of increased favorability toward Gore from pre-election to post-election.	65
4.1. The effect of various factors on the predicted probability that the main respondent accurately perceives the discussant's vote intention.	90
5.1. Patterns of social connection and implications for electoral change.	116
6.1. The design of the Axelrod Culture Model.	134
6.2. Initial conditions, final conditions, and time paths for the Axelrod Culture Model.	137
6.3. Multi-member cells and the impact of parochialism.	141
6.4. Multiple home grids and work grids.	144

Figures

7.1. The decline of diversity in a model with staunchly held opinions.	158
7.2. Autoregressive networks preserve diversity (one home grid, no work grid).	164
7.3. Autoregressive networks preserve diversity (five home grids, three work grids).	167
7.4. Stability of autoregressive networks against exogenous shocks.	168
7.5. Variety observed across 20 restarts of experiment 7.	171
7.6. Cumulative impact of exogenous shocks in autoregressive networks.	172
7.7. Tipping effects in autoregressive networks.	173
7.8. Autoregressive networks can exhibit resistance and backlash in the face of exogenous shocks.	175
7.9. Impact of exogenous shocks is greater in systems with higher diversity (entropy).	177
B.1. The graphical interface.	227
B.2. A raster represents one neighborhood.	228
B.3. Graphs summarize the state of key variables.	229
B.4. Interaction with the model through the graphical interface.	230

Tables

2.1. Level of diversity within political communication networks for the respondents to the 2000 National Election Study. Weighted data.	<i>page</i> 37
2.2. Patterns of agreement within networks. Weighted data.	39
2.3. Respondent vote by aggregate characteristics of network for the respondents to the 2000 National Election Study. Weighted data.	42
3.1. Respondent agreement with discussants who support Bush, Gore, and neither candidate by partisanship of the respondent and distribution of preferences in the residual network. (Logit models; t-values are in parentheses.)	55
3.2. Change in feeling thermometers toward candidates by respondent party identification, discussant vote, the percent of the residual network that agrees with the discussant, and initial feeling thermometer score.	62
4.1. Accessibility, confidence, and accuracy of main respondent judgments regarding the vote preferences of their discussants.	80
4.2. Confidence and accuracy of main respondent judgments regarding the vote preferences of their discussants, with accessibility control.	92
5.1. Campaign activation effects on political communication.	103
5.2. Campaign effects on political homogeneity within networks.	107
5.3. Discussant effects on Clinton evaluation, contingent on the accuracy and ease of judgments regarding discussants, as well as the correspondence between discussant and the	

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Tables*

	remainder of network. (Least squares; coefficient t-values are in parentheses.)	III
5.4.	The proportion of the respondent's network perceived (by the respondent) to support Clinton regressed on the proportion of the discussant's network perceived (by the discussant) to support Clinton, conditional on whether the main respondent perceives agreement within the respondent-discussant dyad.	118
6.1.	Axelrod culture model. Five issues with three opinions per issue.	136
6.2.	Multi-agent grid. Five agents per cell (10 × 10 grid). Five issues with three opinions per issue; parochialism = 0.95.	140
6.3.	Restricted self-selection: The "Coleman" model. Five issues with three opinions per issue.	143
6.4.	Axelrod agents in a model with five home grids and three workplaces. Five issues with three opinions per issue; parochialism = 0.5.	146
6.5.	Identity-based selection of discussants. Five issues with three opinions per issue.	148
7.1.	Staunchly held opinions in the Axelrod culture model (10 × 10 grid). Five issues with three opinions per issue.	157
7.2.	Autoregressive influence in the Axelrod culture model (10 × 10 grid). Five issues with three opinions per issue.	163
7.3.	Autoregressive influence with five home neighborhoods and three workplaces. Five issues with three opinions per issue.	166
7.4.	Opinion distributions in one run of the autoregressive influence model.	170
8.1.	Network effects on number of likes and dislikes regarding the candidates, controlling for individual education, age, and party identification. Negative binomial regressions. Weighted data. (t-values for coefficients are shown in parentheses.)	185
8.2.	Estimated network effects on likes and dislikes toward candidates.	187
8.3.	Network effects on intensity, polarization, and ambivalence. Weighted data. Negative binomial regressions.	192
8.4.	Estimated effects on intensity, polarization, and ambivalence.	194

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Tables*

8.5. Interest and turnout as a function of political distributions in network. Weighted data.	199
8.6. Network effects on political engagement.	201
8.7. Network effects on likes and dislikes regarding the candidates by partisan preference, with controls for education, age, strength of partisanship and political knowledge. Negative binomial regressions. Weighted data.	204
B.1. Classes and files in Opinion-2.0.	224

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Acknowledgments

Turning a question on its head sometimes ends up being a productive exercise. Arthur Conan Doyle took advantage of this fact when he led Holmes to wonder why the dog had failed to bark. For us, the original motivating question was, what are the sources and consequences of agreement and homogeneity within political communication networks? We do not apologize for the question. Quite to the contrary, we think it continues to raise important issues and yield fundamental insights regarding the nature of groups and individuals in politics.

At the same time, the structure of any question is self-limiting, as it excludes important observations that do not qualify as answers. By turning the original question on its head, we thus open up a new set of possibilities, asking, if individuals are interdependent, what are the circumstances that make it possible for disagreement to survive? We kept bumping up against this question in various settings: when we encountered empirical evidence pointing to the persistence of disagreement within the context of influential communication processes; when we studied racial polarization in politics – a situation in which political heterogeneity within racial groups *has* come close to disappearing far too often; when we realized the imperfect fit between the classic literature on small group influence and the typical contexts of political persuasion.

The result of this exercise is the recognition that persistent disagreement and diversity within communication networks does not necessarily constitute evidence of individual independence. In some contexts, heterogeneity may indeed be a consequence of individual independence. At the same time, and in other contexts, agreement *and* disagreement may *both* be understood within the context of influential patterns of political communication among citizens.

This book represents a continuing preoccupation for all three of us. We have pursued these themes individually as well as collectively for some time, and none of us has any intention of stopping any time soon.

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Acknowledgments*

This may be mixed news for the colleagues and friends who so generously put up with our questions and arguments and requests! (But so it goes.) In anticipation, we thank them all, as well as singling out several for special attention: Brady Baybeck, Bob Boynton, Ted Carmines, Mike Crow, Russ Fazio, Ron Francisco, Charles Franklin, Erik Herron, Carol Kohfeld, Ken'ichi Ikeda, Bob Jackman, Ron Lake, Howie Lavine, Jan Leighley, Milton Lodge, Jeff Mondak, Diana Mutz, Franz Pappi, Bob Salisbury, Gina Sapiro, Mark Schneider, Randy Siverson, Paul Sniderman, and Walt Stone.

We are also grateful to the Political Psychology series editors at Cambridge University Press, Jim Kuklinski and Dennis Chong, as well as to the Political Science editor, Lew Bateman. A number of colleagues have provided us with valuable opportunities to present the project on their campuses: Barry Ames, Larry Bartels, Frank Baumgartner, Kevin Corder, Bob Erikson, Susan Herbst, Jan Leighley, Tali Mendelberg, Peter Nardulli, and Alan Zuckerman. Peter Mohler, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, and colleagues at the Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen in Mannheim have, over a number of years, provided a particularly fertile environment for many of the ideas in this manuscript to develop. Several collaborators – Jeff Levine, Jeanette Morehouse, and Tracy Osborn – made fundamental contributions to parts of the manuscript.

We are also grateful to several journal publishers and editors, first for publishing our work, and then for giving us the permission to incorporate the work into this book. Cambridge University Press gave permission to employ work in Chapter 4 that was previously published as: R. Huckfeldt, J. Levine, and J. Sprague. 2000. "The Dynamics of Collective Deliberation in the 1996 Election: Campaign Effects on Accessibility, Certainty, and Accuracy." *American Political Science Review* 94 (3): 641–51. An earlier version of Chapter 5 was published by Blackwell Publishing as: R. Huckfeldt, P. E. Johnson, and J. Sprague. 2002. "Political Environments, Political Dynamics, and the Survival of Disagreement," *Journal of Politics* 64: 1–21. And an earlier version of Chapter 8 was published by Blackwell Publishing as: R. Huckfeldt, J. Morehouse Mendez, and T. Osborn. 2004. "Disagreement, Ambivalence, and Engagement: The Political Consequences of Heterogeneous Networks," *Political Psychology* 25: 65–96.

The Center for Survey Research at Indiana University in Bloomington was our collaborator in the Indianapolis–St. Louis Project. We are particularly grateful to the director, John Kennedy, as well as to the assistant directors, Nancy Bannister and Kevin Tharp. When we came up with seemingly bizarre ideas, they never blinked. Indeed, they shared our enthusiasm. Their professionalism, expertise, dedication, and creativity were indispensable to the project.

Cambridge University Press

0521542235 - Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within
Communication Networks

Robert Huckfeldt, Paul E. Johnson and John Sprague

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Acknowledgments

The computer model that we developed for this project was a beneficiary of many useful pieces of advice as well as several improvements in the Swarm libraries themselves. The members of the Swarm Development Group as well as the larger Swarm community supplied valuable help at many stages through the Swarm-support e-mail list. In particular, we received great advice from Marcus Daniels of the Santa Fe Institute, Rick Riolo of the University of Michigan, and Lars Erik Cederman, then at UCLA, now at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology.

We are also indebted to the National Science Foundation for support provided through grant SBR-9515314 to Huckfeldt and Sprague and grant SBR-9709404 to Johnson.

Finally, we dedicate this effort to our truly significant others – Sharon, Carolyn, and Carol.