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Theory: PID and Stereotypes

Stability in voting behavior → Partisanship

- Competing explanations for partisanship:
  - Michigan: Party Identification = Voters identify with party as „group object“
  - Rat. Choice: Party Evaluation = Voters have „running tally“ of party performance
  - Concepts often mix in literature
    - Different roots in social psychology: PID → Social Identity, PE → Attitude
    - Greene: Partisanship is a social identity with partisan base in electorate

- Partisan stereotypes: Other identities are important, too
  - S. „describe“ parties and partisan groups
  - S. link parties to attitudes and social groups (stable, public) → partisan coalitions
  - S. seem to guide individual to link personal identity to politics
    - Miller: Relation to groups influences relation to parties
    - Parties „care for“ groups is modal way of thinking about politics
Theory: Interpersonal effects

- Most electoral research assumes individual choice
  - Many allusions of interpersonal effects → Resurgent interest
  - No unified framework yet → most work draws on Lazarsfeld
- Party Identification mainly treated as individual choice
  - „Traditional“ interpersonal effect: Inheritance from parents
  - Growing evidence of continuous, wider social influence:
    - Spouses influence each other (Kohler, Zuckerman, Schmitt-Beck)
    - Children also influence parents (Zuckerman)
    - PID adjusts after spatial mobility (Brown, MacDonald/Franko)
    - Stability of PID depends on PID in circle of friends (Ikeda, Liu)
Theory: Interpersonal PID

- Social identity theory and social categorization
  - Social Identity: Part of self-concept derived from knowledge about group-membership; SI divides people into „us“ and „them“
  - Groups are captured as prototypes of categories („types of people“ → fuzzy set of attributes, including attitudes)
  - Prototypes obey metacontrast
  - Main effects of Prototype-Salience:
    - Depersonalization → Changed perception of self and others
    - Acceptance of prototypical attitudes as own → convergence
- Relating PID to small groups:
  - SIT can be applied to small groups and large groups alike
  - „TAV“: group exerts interpersonal influence but identity rests with large group
  - Identity may be inferred from observing others and via communication
  - Prototype describes group → no idiosyncracies → relates to large groups
  - Walsh: prototype = „lens“ to view politics through and basis of political talk
Model: Categorization


- Individuals as points in space
- Categorization based on distance
- Given a prototype → Group-membership depends on average group size \( w \)
- Metacontrast: Prototypes should optimally describe groups
  - Minimize average distance of members to prototype
  - Maximize average distance of non-members to prototype
- Both functions joined in prototypicality function \( P \), weighted by repulsion \( a \)
- Prototypes = Maxima of \( P \)
- Group = all individuals whose closest prototype is the same
Model: Implementation

- Two levels: Agents define identities, signal attachment to parties on second level
- Agents
  - Vector of uniformly distributed elements → can be mutable („opinions“) or immutable („traits“)
- Social network (current implementation)
  - Square grid with periodic boundaries, Moore neighborhood
- Simulation algorithm
  - Agents picked randomly → find prototype, adopt opinions (not traits)
  - After each round
    - All agents signal attachment to parties based on prototype
    - Parties determine new stereotype for next round
- Parties
  - Parties act as hunters (good = repeat, bad = turn around) by modifying their stereotype
  - Agents attach with probability proportional to distance party from own prototype
  - Movement of parties traces out the partisan stereotypes feasible on agent population
Analysis: Preliminary results

- Currently exploration of model behavior
  - Two phases identified by Salzarulo (2006) in 1D for opinions:
    - Homogeneous phase: Agents converge around central opinion
    - Polarized phase: Agents diverge to extreme ends of opinion scale
  - Analysis compares 2D-baseline case (two opinions) with PID-like situation (one trait, one opinion)
- Main focus: Is model able to produce partisan coalitions, i.e. can we find situations in which parties try to appeal to subpopulations (esp. described by trait)?
Analysis

- **Opinion/trait space**
  - Baseline: Homogenization and polarization as in 1D → Agents move to center of opinion space and four corners, respectively
  - Comparison: Homogenization and Polarization affect opinions but not traits → two dimensions act independently on agent level

- **Partisan stereotypes**
  - Baseline: Stereotypes adapt to agent opinions
    - Homogeneous phase: Parties are drawn to the center
    - Polarized Phase: Parties follow agents to four corners
  - Comparison:
    - Homogeneous phase: Parties are drawn to center → Traits do not enter partisan stereotypes as distinguishing element
    - Polarized phase: two distinct maxima on trait dimension → Parties gain from appealing to subpopulations = coalition potential
Partisan stereotypes

Baseline case, polar. Phase
a = 0.20, w = 0.40
Two opinions

Comparison case, polar. Phase
a = 0.20, w = 0.40
One trait, one opinion
Analysis

● Prototypes
  • Baseline cases: Agents get opinion from prototype → identical → no separate effect on signalling
  • Comparison case:
    - Agents only adopt opinion → Prototype differs from agent position → group can affect agent signaling
    - Prototype depends on joint evaluation of all distances → Polarization → opinion dominates prototypicality function → trait aspects of prototype reflect this
  
● Small group causes emergence of coalition potential
Discussion and outlook

- Central theoretical aspects
  - Concrete mechanism: Party Identification from face-to-face contacts
  - Includes frequent observation of attitude convergence
- Central aspects from analysis
  - Polarization may induce effects on seemingly unrelated areas → Parties fit to social structure may interact with attitudinal processes
  - Issues easier to control → Possible mechanism for „Cleavage politics“?
- Currently: Traits forced into stereotypes
  - Forceless mechanism lacking → Homophily, status reproduction etc.
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