**“Partner paper”**

**Option 1**

Starting point:

macro-level polarisatie and boiling it down to intra-couple dynamics.

For that to work, we need to move back up from partners to society. This includes adding and modelling (?) partner stability/change and intercouple polarization due to intracouple change. Without step the opening claims would not be convincing/too distant.

Conclusion:

I think this is interesting, but a different paper.

Implication:

not Science on this paper (i.e. for science a broad claim and thorough worked through assessment is need). Not saying why shouldn’t do that, but it is basically another paper (or at least a completely new three quarters).

**Option 2**

Starting point:

Recent events (brexit, covid) which have been linked to intra-couple tensions. Which is ofcourse newsworthy, but hardly fits a literature that mainly shows partner influences, doesn’t it? Well actually, it shows selection and attitudinal homophily. Actual influence is a completely different story. In this paper we make major strides to testing influences with a XYZ model and unique 10 wave partner dyad data. And particularly because we can do that, we can also push the theoretical development of partner influences on political attitudes, but theorizing under what circumstances partners have more influence.

In conclusion we can link to polarization etc.

Contributions:

-Methodological new stuff and cool data

-Theorizing differential impact

Focus:

substantial, but still major methodological argument.

Top journal in polisci or pub opinion 🡪 I say let’s try the APSR shit again

Needed:

*I did not consider if and how this can be modelled; you include random intercepts and slopes right? If so, can we model the slopes too, for instance based on diff between intercepts? I think something like this is need for some of the below.*

1) We have a core H (H1 below)

* How to deal with convergence? You already factor in the trend of the individual right with random intercept and impact time for individual, right?

Maybe make convergence a core part of the paper; partner influence has two manifestations:   
a) convergence, decreasing distance between partners  
b) lagged “shock” effects  
Focus on the latter, but would be cool if we could model convergence more: who moves to whom?

* Partners move in direction of the least extreme one (considering the population mean) – and this can be interacted with gender, education

2) After H1 we need to think through dyad thingies before turning to gender and education:

* I don’t think relationship duration should matter, because you model shock (indirectly but still). If anything, the longer the relationship the more likely if one partner changes ‘all of a sudden’ you consider it seriously, because longer duration implies some form of trust and consider the other’s ideas seriously
* Relationship quality and talking about politics – I wouldn’t miss either, so I’m happy if kept excluded

3) then include the gender and education hierarchy logic. I would drop the income one.

4) In het verlengde van 3 is ook internal efficacy of interesse (liever efficacy) toe te voegen als interactie: less efficacy (of groter gat met partner, more likely to be influenced)

5) no hypo’s on difference between attitudes (DVs), but reflect on it afterwards

**Previous doc I sent round:**

**Hypotheses**

Formulation depends on what exactly we can study data wise. Currently formulated focusing on change in attitudes of ego and consequently of partner. [Readibility is not optimal, hehe]

***Baseline partner influence***

On top of selection effects, we assume that partners influence each other, not in the balancing/intra-couple polarization way, but in terms of moving towards each other. This assumption is based on the observation that partners are the core political discussion partner (Beck, 1991; Bello & Rolfe, 2014; Kolter-Berkowitz, 2001).

Focusing on existing couples, this should reflect in an exogenous change among one partner increasing the chance the other partner chances attitudes too. Of course, possible partner influence implies partner can also return to the previous attitude, but on average we would expect an impact.

*H1: To the degree that a partnered person’ attitudes change, the attitudes of the person’s partner change in the same direction.*

However, not all partner dyads function similarly. From several sociological and political studies we can derived new hypo’s on how this effect is conditional.

***Conditioning partner influences***

The literature on voting and SES has shown that – assuming heterosexual couple – the male partner’s position has more impact on the female’ partner’s political position, than vice versa (De Graaf & Heath, 1992; Hauserman et.al, 2016; Strom, 2014). Important here is that men are generally (seen as) the breadwinner and the impact of policies on their income is leading in shaping economic rational political reasoning. This work dovetails SES and gender. We will pull these apart in income, education and gender.

Income is directly linked to the reason above. Education and gender tap other mechanisms too, but these would lead to expectations in the same direction. Regarding gender, politics is generally considered masculine, and women are less rewarded socially for presenting their own opinion. In line with this, women consider themselves less knowledgeable and influential than men do (Coffé & Bolzendahl, 2011; Verba et al., 1997). Actually, accounting for actually knowledge, men do consider women less knowledgeable (Mendez & Osborn, 2017). Consequently, men are, on average, less likely to listen to women than vice versa.

Similarly, higher-educated people tend to be more politically interested and their internal efficacy is higher. Within a couple it can then be expected that the higher-educated partner has a stronger influence.

Income hierarchy

*H2:* *To the degree the partnered person changing attitudes its income is higher than that person’s partner income, the influence of the change of the first on the attitudes of the second is stronger.*

Gender hierarchy

*H3: If the partnered person changing attitudes is male, the influence of the change of that person on the attitudes of the female partner is stronger, than when the first is female and the second male.*

Educational hierarchy

*H4: To the degree the partnered person changing attitudes its education is higher than that person’s partner’s education, the influence of the change of the first on the attitudes of the second is stronger.*

***Could add***

Partner = higher educated: pluralist attitudes and individualism more likely so less trouble by holding different opinions.

H5: The higher the alter is educated the less the alter is influenced by ego’s change.