Political involvement on multiple levels. Homophily in political talk among confidants

TÜNDE CSERPES

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO

07.04.2013.

HTTPS://GITHUB.COM/IDNUT/EGONET13

Outline

1. Theoretical and statistical considerations

2. Political involvement and citizenry

3. Homophily in ego networks

4. Data and measurement

5. Full model

6. Results

7. Further considerations

1. A relational framework

- Categorical gaze (White et al. 1976)

- Focus on transactional contexts (Emirbayer 1997)
  - Political talk as an act of communication

- Multi-level framework (Lubbers et al. 2010; Bandyopadhyay, Rao & Sinha 2011)
  - Relationships are embedded in ego's, cross sectional data

- "The basic question is how various similarities and differences between people influence their interpersonal choices and thus the distribution of social relationships among them." (Blau 1962)

2. Political talk, political action

- Call for returning to the social logics of politics
  - "Applying the social logic of politics does more than reframe analysis; it advances knowledge of political behavior" (Zuckerman 2005)

- Political discussions, attitudes, and political behavior
  - Mansbridge (1999) " Everyday Talk in the Deliberative System"
  - bottom up contributions of citizens
    - "Everyday political talk may not be rigorously deliberative, but without it we cannot understand the democratic character of deliberative systems." (Conover 2005)

3. Homophily in ego-networks

- Multi-dimensional
  - Homophily: similarity on a specific characteristics between two individual

- Which dimension matters in predicting specific outcomes?
  - "Homophily is important in effective communication only if it occurs on relevant variables" (Rogers & Bhowmik 1970-1971)

- May be studied at multiple levels

4. Data

- Chicago Area Study (CAS)
  - University of Illinois Institute for Government & Public Affairs http://igpa.uillinois.edu/

- 2010 & 2011: multi-method project on immigration and politics
  - Maria Krysan, PI, with Andy Clarno, Nilda Flores Gonzalez, Pamela Popielarz, Xòchitl Bada

- Four suburban Lake County, IL communities
  - Rapid Latino population growth in recent decades
  - Many non-Latino immigrants
  - Communities differ by racial composition, social class, history

CAS 2010 survey

- Administered in English and Spanish

- NSF support

- Question modules on:
  ◦ *Demographic traits*
  ◦ *Personal networks*
  ◦ Voluntary association, church & political participation
  ◦ Attitudes toward immigrants & immigration
  ◦ *Political involvement*
  ◦ Contact, perceived threat, prejudice

Name generator

- "From time to time, most people discuss important matters with other people. Looking back over the last six months, who are the people with whom you discussed matters important to you?"

- Questions unique to CAS

  - Was [NAME] born in the US?

  - Where does [NAME] live now?

- Handling missing data

Measurement of focal relationship(s)

- Frequency of political talk (Level-1)
  - daily
  - weekly
  - monthly
  - yearly
  - never (reference category in the ordered cumulative logit model)

- Homophily
  - Homophily on gender, race, education, and whether someone was born in the US (Level-1)
  - Proportion of ego´s homophilous ties on gender, race, education, and whether someone was born in the US (Level-2)

5. Descriptives

Ego	Proportion	Homophily	Proportion
Female	0.58	Same gender *	0.63
Noncitizen	0.06	Same citizenry *	0.88
Nonwhite	0.37	Same race *	0.90
College	0.70	Same education *	0.72

Level-2 (ego)
N=719
*proportion of homophilous relationships in the ego networks

Confidant	Proportion	Homophily	Proportion
Female	0.53	Same gender	0.64
Noncitizen	0.14	Same citizenry	0.88
Nonwhite	0.34	Same race	0.89
College	0.66	Same education	0.72

Level-1 (relationship)
N=2606

6. Full model and analysis plan

I   Dimensions of homophily (Level-1, Level-2)

II   Individual characteristics of the survey respondents (Level-2)

      Relationship-level characteristics (Level-1)

III   Individual level political action and citizenship status (Level-2)

IV   Network-level characteristics (Level-2)

      Interactions (Level-2)

Outcome: political talk

Ordered cumulative logit model

HLM software

$$\eta_{ij} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}*MENTION_j + \gamma_{02}*NETSIZE_j + \gamma_{03}*EFEMALE_j + \gamma_{04}*EAGE_j + \gamma_{05}*ERACED_j +$$
$$\gamma_{06}*EEDUCD_j + \gamma_{07}*PARTNERE_j + \gamma_{08}*NONCITIZ_j + \gamma_{09}*ELIVEDTH_j + \gamma_{010}*E1_j +$$
$$\gamma_{011}*E4_j + \gamma_{012}*E5_j + \gamma_{013}*E6_j + \gamma_{014}*E7_j + \gamma_{015}*PROPPOLI_j + \gamma_{016}*PROPHOUS_j +$$
$$\gamma_{017}*LCATHETE_j + \gamma_{10}*(TIEAGE_{ij} - \overline{TIEAGE}_{..}) + \gamma_{20}*(TIEKIN_{ij} - \overline{TIEKIN}_{..}) +$$
$$\gamma_{30}*(TIECOWOR_{ij} - \overline{TIECOWOR}_{..}) + \gamma_{40}*(STRANS\_N_{ij} - \overline{STRANS\_N}_{..}) +$$
$$\gamma_{41}*DENSITYD_j*(STRANS\_N_{ij} - \overline{STRANS\_N}_{..}) + \gamma_{50}*(TIEHOUS_{ij} - \overline{TIEHOUS}_{..}) +$$
$$\gamma_{60}*(HETFEMAL_{ij} - \overline{HETFEMAL}_{..}) + \gamma_{70}*(HETMIGR_{ij} - \overline{HETMIGR}_{..}) +$$
$$\gamma_{71}*NONCITIZ_j*(HETMIGR_{ij} - \overline{HETMIGR}_{..}) + \gamma_{72}*PROPKIN_j*(HETMIGR_{ij} - \overline{HETMIGR}_{..}) +$$
$$\gamma_{73}*PHETMIGR_j*(HETMIGR_{ij} - \overline{HETMIGR}_{..}) + \gamma_{80}*(HETRACE_{ij} - \overline{HETRACE}_{..}) +$$
$$\gamma_{90}*(HETEDUC_{ij} - \overline{HETEDUC}_{..}) + \delta_{(2)} + \delta_{(3)} + \delta_{(4)}$$

Findings I

…to discuss politics

- Relationships between individuals of different citizenship status are **more likely(**)** to be used

- Interracial core relationships are used **less likely (**)**

- Homophily on education and gender are not good predictors

- Order in name generator **(***): less likely**

Findings II

I   Dimensions of homophily (Level-1, Level-2)
II   Individual characteristics of the survey respondents (Level-2)
     Relationship-level characteristics (Level-1)
III   Individual level political action and citizenship status (Level-2)
IV   Network-level characteristics (Level-2)
     Interactions (Level-2)

…to discuss politics

- Individual level
  - Effects are washed away
  - age, female, nonwhite, college, partnered, noncitizen, city tenure

- Relationship level
  - Same household **(***): more likely**
  - Coworkers **(***): more likely**
    - Mutz and Mondak (2006)
  - Length of relationship, relationship with family members: not significant predictors

Findings III

…to discuss politics

- Individual level
  - how politically active are you **(***): more likely**
  - have you written a blog/discussion board about immigration? **(***): more likely**

- Network composition
  - proportion of relationship with frequent political talk **(***): more likely**

Findings IV

… to discuss politics

- Network composition
  - proportion of household **(***): less likely**
  - heterogeneity of the physical distance of confidants from ego **(*): more likely**

- Structure
  - Number of transitive triads **(***): more likely**
  - Transitive triads X ego-network density **(**): less likely**

7. Conclusion

- A theory applied

- Talking about politics is associated with political action

- Political talk occurs behind closed doors!
  - Homophily
  - Importance of spatiality
  - Citizenship literature

- The structure of ego-networks did matter for the relationship level outcome!

Further work…

- "We follow relational sociology in claiming that network research ideally simultaneously addresses the *structure* of networks, the formation or dissolution of particular *connections*, and the *meaning* attached to these structures and connections." (Fuhse and Mützel 2011)

- meaning structure of a network
  - individual perception and expectations
  - interpersonally established expectations and cultural forms

Full model

Final estimation of fixed effects (with robust standard errors)

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Standard error	t-ratio	Approx. d.f.	p-value
For INTRCPT1 slope, β_0)					
INTRCPT2, γ_{00}	-6.146569	0.374064	-16.432	2572	<0.001
MENTION, γ_{01}	-0.148414	0.033948	-4.372	2572	<0.001
NETSIZE, γ_{02}	0.093823	0.060169	1.559	2572	0.119
EFEMALE, γ_{03}	0.063452	0.079731	0.796	2572	0.426
EAGE, γ_{04}	-0.002713	0.003108	-0.873	2572	0.383
ERACED, γ_{05}	0.084040	0.095021	0.884	2572	0.377
EEDUCD, γ_{06}	-0.003705	0.097970	-0.038	2572	0.970
PARTNERE, γ_{07}	-0.110048	0.085063	-1.294	2572	0.196
NONCITIZ, γ_{08}	-0.024341	0.201671	-0.121	2572	0.904
ELIVEDTH, γ_{09}	0.000182	0.002432	0.075	2572	0.940
E1, γ_{010}	-0.271186	0.048166	-5.630	2572	<0.001
E4, γ_{011}	-0.123810	0.106986	-1.157	2572	0.247
E5, γ_{012}	0.545318	0.171063	3.188	2572	0.001
E6, γ_{013}	-0.218204	0.130075	-1.678	2572	0.094
E7, γ_{014}	0.196998	0.205095	0.961	2572	0.337
PROPPOLI, γ_{015}	5.402124	0.137378	39.323	2572	<0.001
PROPHOUS, γ_{016}	-1.227008	0.253809	-4.834	2572	<0.001
LCATHETE, γ_{017}	0.295446	0.139899	2.112	2572	0.035
For TIEAGE slope, β_1					
INTRCPT2, γ_{10}	0.001596	0.003007	0.531	2572	0.596
For TIEKIN slope, β_2					
INTRCPT2, γ_{20}	0.078156	0.117387	0.666	2572	0.506
For TIECOWOR slope, β_3					
INTRCPT2, γ_{30}	0.801696	0.125970	6.364	2572	<0.001
For STRANS_N slope, β_4					
INTRCPT2, γ_{40}	0.188197	0.052886	3.559	2572	<0.001
DENSITYD, γ_{41}	-0.236680	0.079253	-2.986	2572	0.003
For TIEHOUS slope, β_5					
INTRCPT2, γ_{50}	1.757500	0.160370	10.959	2572	<0.001
For HETFEMAL slope, β_6					
INTRCPT2, γ_{60}	0.095613	0.091020	1.050	2572	0.294
For HETMIGR slope, β_7					
INTRCPT2, γ_{70}	0.840176	0.300642	2.795	2572	0.005
NONCITIZ, γ_{71}	0.511631	0.413952	1.236	2572	0.217
PROPKIN, γ_{72}	-0.799921	0.306586	-2.609	2572	0.009
PHETMIGR, γ_{73}	-1.131478	0.409889	-2.760	2572	0.006
For HETRACE slope, β_8					
INTRCPT2, γ_{80}	-0.355612	0.135108	-2.632	2572	0.009
For HETEDUC slope, β_9					
INTRCPT2, γ_{90}	-0.020355	0.090980	-0.224	2572	0.823
For THOLD2, δ_2	2.185272	0.075578	28.914	2572	<0.001
For THOLD3, δ_3	4.786226	0.101983	46.932	2572	<0.001
For THOLD4, δ_4	6.405545	0.141060	45.410	2572	<0.001