## **Reviewer 1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Comment** | **Response** |
| R1.1 | I do, however, have one (potentially fundamental) concern. The main novelty of the paper is to assess how inequality at the countrylevel shapes the interaction between class-based network segregation and social class. However, there are only 31 countries. The analyses estimate the independent “effects”, at the macro-level, of economic inequality, economic development (GDP) and welfare state type simultaneously, while also estimating the interaction effect between economic inequality and the individual-level interaction between network segregation and class. This is demanding a whole lot from the data, and I’m not sure I would trust the estimates coming out of such a model (even estimating four coefficients with 31 units without an interaction term is probably too demanding). Particularly in light of recent findings about power issues when using country level data, see Doucette 2024. While Doucette’s article is from a different field, I think it could be useful for the authors to engage with this fundamental criticism and do some power analyses to show us how many units their analysis would need to reliably discover interaction effects of different magnitudes. | Simulation / bootstrapping method to observe if it is indeed a matter of false negative (Error type II)  Estimación bayesiana por los clusteres del multinivel revisar lmer |
| R1.2 | Another but related issue is that of how to interpret the estimates. Income inequality/the gini coefficient is correlated with so many other things at the country-level that it is hard if not impossible to know whether it’s indeed the income inequality that is doing the work here, or rather any other variable correlated with income inequality. This is not necessarily a reason not to publish the paper, if this is the best we can do, but I do think it deserves more attention than it is currently receiving. The author acknowledges this problem very briefly towards the end, but I think a more comprehensive discussion would be worthwhile: What other relevant confounders may exist at the country-level? What alternative study designs may cast more light on this phenomenon in future studied (beyond merely saying “longitudinal studies”)? What can we as researchers do to gain more insight into the plausibility of the author’s main claim? | Institutional factors such as institutional trust (at the micro level)  At the macro level can be democracy levels ? |
| R1.3 | The analyses include controls for socioeconomic characteristics such as income, education, and labor market status (see p. 8). Especially income seems to me to be a source of post-treatment bias, as income follows from class position and in turn affects redistributive preferences. Income is one of the mechanisms through which class may affect such preferences, and so controlling for it may introduce bias in the class coefficient (these kinds of issues have been discussed in several contributions on the link between class and attitudes or party choice). I think it may be worthwhile for the author to justify the inclusion of the controls better in terms of a causal model. Which variables are confounders and which ones are mediators? | I do agree that socioeconomic status is indeed understood as mediator of class in this particular case.  Sociodemographic factors might be understood as confounders |
| R1.4 | I would have liked to see more on magnitude and real-world significance of the interaction effect. This is depicted very nicely in Figure 4, but a bit more on the “so-what question” would be good. The findings shown in this figure are the core findings of the whole article, so it would deserve more discussion in the text. What does it tell us about sociological and political phenomena? What’s the real-world significance of the differences shown in the different panels? | Okay this is part of the theorization of the paper in terms of the consequences of this in other domains, such as political behavior |

## Reviewer 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Id** | **Comment** | **Response** |
| R2.1 | The paper argues that homogenous class-based networks foster segregated life-worlds, leading to a larger divide between social classes and diminishing awareness of others’ living conditions. Empirically, the paper shows that working-class homogeneity is associated with higher redistributive preferences, while upper class homogeneity is associated with lower redistributive preferences. Overall assessment: This paper presents an interesting and generally well-crafted analysis of class homogeneity in networks and political attitudes. The authors exhibit strong research skills, and the paper includes a thorough review of existing literature, along with some well-designed figures. However, the empirical contribution is somewhat limited, and the micro-level theoretical framework could be improved. My main comment developed below is about motivating what I believe to be the problems with the micro-level theoretical model. |  |
| R2.2 | Previous research argues that the social class of network members matters for an individual´s attitudes for various reasons (e.g., Paskov and Weisstanner 2022). In relation to this literature, the current paper adds a new micro-level theoretical framework focusing on the homogeneity of networks rather than the content or characteristics of network members. Although this is theoretically appealing, I think this theory is underdeveloped and has problems in making coherent predictions. |  |
| R2.3 | At first glance, the model focusing on network homogeneity appears to be parsimonious and symmetric across classes, but it quickly becomes clear that this is not the case. I will first cite from the abstract. “Homogeneous class-based networks foster segregated lifeworlds, deepening the divide between social classes and diminishing awareness of others' living conditions and perspectives. Specifically, homogeneous upper-class networks may reduce empathy and solidarity toward those in need, lowering support for redistribution. In contrast, homogeneous working-class networks amplify marginalization and strengthen the demand for redistribution.” Two of the mentioned mechanisms, empathy and solidarity, appear to be specific to the upper-class, while the function networks for empathy and solidarity of the working class is less clear. In contrast, the awareness mechanism seems to apply to all social classes. However, it is not evident why the working class's awareness of the living conditions of the upper class (which arises from a less homogeneous network) should lead to reduced support for redistribution. To me, it seems like awareness of the living conditions of the upper classes would likely increase the demand for redistribution. | Mis-información como mecanismo?  class identity como mecanismo en el caso de la clase baja (paper clase y amigos Wright) |
| R2.4 | In the main paper, the arguments provided in the abstract are not developed further. Instead, we are given the following theoretical motivation for the micro-level hypothesis: “I hypothesize that the association between network homogeneity and redistributive preferences is conditional on social class because homogeneous social networks should reinforce attitude similarity.” My interpretation of this statement is that it is the similarity (homogeneity) as such that brings the effects, rather than the characteristics of ties or the content of the relation. Here, the argument seems to be that in-group ties reinforce opinions of typical class positions. This particular view is however not fully tested in the paper. |  |
| R2.5 | Methodologically, the regression models do not convince me that there is such a specific effect of homogeneity that is different from – or on top of – the coefficients of the class composition of the network. Although models include a control variable measuring network size, there is no control for the class position of ties. This means that the specific effect of a homogenous network is different in terms of class composition for the working class and the service class. A homogenous network for workers means that contacts are workers while a homogenous network for the service class implies contacts with CEOs and lawyers. | The main reason why I included the interaction term between network homogeneity and individual class position is explained in lines 33 – 44. The rationale behind this is that the single measure of network “does not distinguish between ego’s class position and refers to the overall degree of segregation”.  Lazos como proxy de segregación / homogeneidad  Therefore, H1 is, by definition, an interaction between the degree of segregation (the share of similar class ties according to ego’s class position) and the individual class position. As follows, regardless of the number of occupations known I see that having similar classes for the working and services classes strengthens their respective average redistributive preferences.  For this reason, I restructure the segregation hypothesis in this order to be clearer on its conditional nature of the hypothesis. [To be done] |
| R2.6 | To show a significant interaction between own class and homogeneity is hence not enough since it just reflects that the homogeneity variable means different things depending on ego's class position (given the construction of the homogeneity variable). To convince the reader that the interaction effect indeed is about homogeneity rather than class composition of the network, one way could be to run a full interaction model including own social class and the social class of network ties (including both worker and service class ties). A substantially different effect of homogenous ties i.e., a more important effect of worker ties for workers and a more important effect of service class ties for those in service class occupations would strengthen the case that homogeneity of ties is what matters  . | redi~tie\_hig\*class+tie\_mid\*class+tie\_low\*class  Explicar bien que la medida de homogeneidad es ingroup ties / total cases  To address this comment, I proceeded guided by the following reasoning:   1. Instead of homogeneity of the network as the share of similar network ties I used the number of network ties for each class referred as class-profiles (low, middle, high). 2. I included the three network ties in the same models as individual class positions. 3. I interacted with the individual class positions with each network ties, individually and in the same model.   First, in line with previous evidence, the class profiles are associated with redistributive preferences. For instance, a higher number of ties to the working class are associated with higher redistributive preferences. Also, middle class ties show a positive but not statistically significant association with redistributive preferences. Finally, a higher number of ties to the higher class is associated with lower redistributive preferences.  Regarding the interaction between individual class position and network class profile, we observe contrasting results. The results of the interaction between the individual class position with the class profiles are not significant for none of the class profiles.  In my opinion, this indicates an advantage of the class-based homogeneity measure as it does not work on the number, but the share of contacts of the same class. I agree that the rationale behind the class profiles interacting with the individual class position follows a similar argumentation in terms of having ties to a similar class. However, a single measure that represents the share instead of the absolute number is more parsimonious than including three interaction terms at the same time. |
| R2.7 | Finally, I do not think that the following conclusion is supported by the current analysis: “These results support the idea that low crossclass embeddedness can reduce collective solidarity as they limit awareness about the living conditions of other classes.” Results however suggest that a low cross-class embeddedness increases “solidarity” for the working class. One interpretation is that authors mean that cross-class embeddedness increases solidarity only for the higher classes, but then it should either be specified that this theoretical model only applies to the service class, or discuss why cross-class interaction reduces solidarity (?) for the working class, which appears to be the result of the models. In summary, the micro-level theory focusing on homogeneous networks is not consistently presented throughout the paper, leading the author to draw ambiguous conclusions. | Need to clarify the theoretical argument in this case |
| R2.8 | Social class is not defined in the paper which makes it a bit unclear if social relations are a part of class or not. | Okay, class is the position within production units … |
| R2.9 | The term upper class is used synonymously with service class. This is a bit problematic since the upper class is often used for a smaller group whereas the service class refers to (in this case) 42% of the population (see Table A5). | This is indeed true. To be more consistent I refer to the higher class as service class throughout the paper. |
| R2.10 | As noted on page 12, Lindh & Andersson use market inequality while the current paper uses GINI post-taxes and transfers. These two are quite different variables and it is unsurprising that they show different results. | Agree, this is a substantial difference. |
| R2.11 | Please clarify why GINI post-taxes and transfers are included in the same model as the welfare state index. How should we interpret the effect of GINI conditioned on the welfare state – as market inequality? | Income inequality represents the factual distribution of economic resources in society. I control by welfare size (redistribution, spending and tax revenue) as indeed I recognize its relevance when it comes to the institutional forces that also affect redistributive preferences. |
| R2.12 | Cross-class embeddedness is not exactly what the dependent variable estimates, rather, it measures homogeneity and hence whether ties are in your own class or not. This might be a subtle but not unimportant difference. | I assume this comment refers to the independent variable. Indeed, it is true that it does not measure the same. |
| R2.13 | The motivation for the descriptive part is (p9-10) largely missing. Please describe the methods and purpose of this analysis. In particular, I do not fully understand the role of Figure 4. | This part plays the role |
| R2.14 | The heading of Table 2 does not declare the dependent variable. | No? |
| R2.15 | I would prefer if model 2 of table 1 should include the respondent’s social class. | This was included in the appendix. It has to be included now included in Table 1. |
| R2.16 | If the authors want to convince the readers of the importance of inequality rather than welfare state size, not only their main effect but also their interactions could be entered in the same model. | Two cross-level interactions with 31 countries? Or the interaction of the welfare state with Gini?  **Approach 1:** redis~network\*class\*ws (cross-level)  Using approach 1, the results indicate that the differences between the service and working classes decrease in contexts of high inequality. In contrast, the differences between the working and service classes become wider in countries with a more encompassing welfare state.  **Approach 2:** redis~ network\*class\*gini + gini \*ws (cross-level)  Using approach 2, the results indicate that the differences between the service and working classes decrease in contexts of high inequality. This holds even controlling by the interaction between Gini and the size of the welfare state  **Approach 3:** redis~ network\*class\*gini + network\*class\*ws (cross-level)  Using approach 3, the results indicate that the differences between the service and working class depend on the size of the welfare state and not on the current income inequality levels. Also, this can be particularly demanding statistically. |

## Reviewer 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Id** | **Comment** | **Response** |
| R3.1 | The current study uses 2017 ISSP data from 31 countries to examine the link between network class segregation, country level inequality, and support for redistribution. The most intriguing findings, in my opinion, are the class and inequality contrasts: lower class respondents with more homogenous networks have more support for redistribution, whereas higher class respondents with more homogenous networks have lower support for redistribution. These class contrasts tend to be a bit more pronounced among countries with lower inequality. |  |
| R3.2 | Overall, I find this article to be important, sophisticated, and interesting. The results are produced well. The research question is creative and important. |  |
| R3.3 | This article is very similar to Lindh and Andersson's 2024 ESR, if I'm not mistaken. The difference seems to be a minor variation on measuring class network composition and selecting a few different attitudinal questions. Now, this similarity is not an insurmountable problem, as both Lindh and Andersson 2024 and this paper provide interesting and important findings. But I think that more care needs to be done to explicitly situate what specific value is added by this paper above Lindh and Andersson. Just to reiterate, I think there is value-added, but the authors need to make a bit more of a clearer and stronger case. | What means to one class to be segregated class-experiences, the experiences of your own – relationships between people of the same class.  Más que extender los mecanismos de clase tradicionales  Explaining better why homogeneity as a way of measuring distance from other classes - particularly how this matter differently for different social classes  Also, what I am focusing here is the differences in economic resources after the welfare state has enacted it’s role / therefore the link between income inequality and redistribution. |
| R3.4 | Know / don't know. If I'm not mistaken, how do we differentiate the homogenous from the isolate? If I'm not mistaken, a hermit and a highly social but highly cocooned upper class person will both score as highly homogenous networks, since both will not know a police officer, for example. How can we differentiate these two contributors to the homogenous, or at least be confident that the hermit is not driving main results? | If I properly understand, isolate refers to people that “do not know” anybody.  People without contacts in the position generator were excluded from the analysis. Therefore the “hermit” case does not play a role in the analytical strategy. (The network size goes from 1 to 10) This means that the cases included in the analysis at least have 1 known occupation. El generador de posiciones no mide aislamiento, sino maximiza la posibilidad de conocer  El generador de nombres está tal vez pensado más para ver este tema |
| R3.5 | Relationships - If I'm not mistaken, all forms of knowing in any capacity are coded as known. But are there reasons to wonder whether the kin-based and the much looser, simply know in some capacity, categories might indicate something that the article is not interested in addressing? Perhaps I am extremely homogenous in my middle-class network formation, but my two siblings rose to the ranks of lawyer and ceo, as a silly example. Do I have a heterogenous network in the way that would alter attitudes? Perhaps, but perhaps a bit more justification of collapsing these types of knowing is needed. | In this case, I am interested in the full network. The research on the network-attitude link has mainly addressed the role in full networks, including weak and strong ties at the same time.  Homogeneity might rise mainly from strong ties, but not unequivocally. However, weak ties contribute to out-group ties. In this sense, I think that theoretically makes sense to split network ties into weak and strong ties, but this goes far from the aim of this paper and that is the main reason it has not been included in the theorization of the hypothesis at the micro level. However, I think it is a promising vein for future research.  Argumento adicional – n individual y poder? |
| R3.6 | I don't totally understand why the EGP categories are collapsed. EGP class categories don't seem terribly overwhelming. Wouldn't it at least make sense to verify that the patterns of association are similar within the collapsed classes? | This is a very interesting point. Originally as the occupation of the position generator is grouped into three groups I decided to mirror this when it comes to the individual class position. Following the recommendation, I estimated the model using a six-class categorization and it led to similar results   * redi~homo\*class6 |