

The Cross-Pressured Citizen:

Revisiting Social Influence on Political Behavior

Ted Brader, University of Michigan
Joshua A. Tucker, New York University
Andrew Therriault, New York University

Motivation:

Groups and Political Behavior

- Long history of research on relationship between group membership and political behavior
- One particular interest: “cross-pressures”

Cross-Pressures: Intuition

	Young	Old
Urban	Reinforcing Pressures	Cross-Pressured
Rural	Cross-Pressured	Reinforcing Pressures

Cross-Pressures

- **Lots of hypotheses:**
 - \uparrow Cross pressures \rightarrow \downarrow Partisanship
 - \uparrow Cross pressures \rightarrow \downarrow Political Participation
- **No systematic tests**
- **One problem: no tool for measuring**
 - Particularly in multi-party system

Contributions of Paper

- **Introduce a novel, flexible measure for “cross-pressures”**
 - Any number of parties
 - Any political context
- **Use this measure to test outstanding hypotheses on effects of cross-pressures**
 - Are cross-pressured less partisan?
 - Do cross-pressured participate less?

Cross-Pressures: Measure

	Young	Old
Urban	Reinforcing Pressures: <i>Low CP Score</i>	Cross-Pressured: <i>High CP Score</i>
Rural	Cross-Pressured: <i>High CP Score</i>	Reinforcing Pressures: <i>Low CP Score</i>

Outline of Paper

- **Constructing “Cross Pressure Scores”**
- **Testing Hypotheses:**
 - **Partisanship and political participation at one point in time in one country (Annenberg 2004)**
 - **Partisanship over time in one country (ANES cumulative file, 1952-2004)**
 - **Political participation in multiple countries (CSES, 2nd Wave)**

Constructing Cross-Pressure Scores

- **Four-step Algorithm**
- **Begin with a cross-sectional dataset**
- **Use demographic information and some measure of party preference to calculate cross-pressure scores for each individual respondent based on the relationship between demographics and party preference in the dataset as a whole**
- **Employ this resulting cross-pressure score to predict individual-level political behavior**

The Cross-pressure Score Algorithm

Step 1:

Regress individuals' party preferences on demographic variables via multinomial logit



Step 2:

Calculate predicted probabilities for each individual of supporting each party



Step 3:

Calculate the variation in predicted probabilities for each respondent



Step 4:

Invert and normalize the measure of variation to create cross-pressure scores

Cross-Pressures Scores

Young

Old

Urban

Pr(P1): 0.9
Pr(P2): 0.1
High Variation
Low CP Score

Pr(P1): 0.5
Pr(P2): 0.5
Low Variation
High CP Score

Rural

Pr(P1): 0.5
Pr(P2): 0.5
Low Variation
High CP Score

Pr(P1): 0.1
Pr(P2): 0.9
High Variation
Low CP Score

Creating CP Scores: 2004 Annenberg dataset

- **US is simple (two parties)**
- **Single dataset → no worrying about comparability**
- **Demographic variables: age, gender, education, income, employment status, union household, race, origin, religion & religiosity, urbanity, gun-owner, gay/lesbian**
- **Because of large size, nearly all demographics highly significant in predicting vote choice / intention**

Choices in Creating CP Scores

- **Step 1**
 - What dependent variable (for party preference) should be used?
Most likely, PID or vote choice.
 - Annenberg: Vote choice/intention
 - Which values of the DV (i.e., which parties) should be included in the initial regression?
 - Annenberg: Two parties
 - Which demographic variables should be included?
 - Annenberg: Big list as on previous slide.
- **Step 3**
 - How do we calculate the variation in predicted probabilities?
 - Annenberg: Absolute differences between probabilities
- **Step 4**
 - How do we scale the resulting CP scores?
 - Annenberg: No scaling required in two party case.

Hypotheses Reiterated

- \uparrow Cross pressures \rightarrow \downarrow Partisanship
- \uparrow Cross pressures \rightarrow \downarrow Political Participation

Testing CP Scores: 2004 Annenberg dataset

- **Eight behaviors:**
 - Generic partisanship (binary for partisan / not partisan)
 - PID strength
 - turnout / turnout intention
 - political interest
 - frequency of political discussion
 - whether the respondent tried to influence others
 - whether the respondent attended meetings / rallies during campaign
 - whether the respondent donated to campaigns
- ***Expectation: Higher cross-pressures lead to less partisanship and lower levels of political participation.***

Effects of Cross-Pressure Scores on Political Behaviors in the United States (Annenberg data)

	Partisanship	Partisan Strength	Turnout	Political Interest	Discussion	Influence	Attendance	Contribution
CP Score	-0.351*** (0.041)	-0.326*** (0.043)	-0.202* (0.120)	-0.083*** (0.017)	-0.266*** (0.041)	-0.381*** (0.122)	-0.104 (0.215)	-0.440** (0.187)
Constant	0.305 (0.188)	-0.114 (0.202)	-2.796*** (0.289)	1.021*** (0.046)	-0.228** (0.116)	-2.397*** (0.329)	-4.476*** (0.654)	-6.596*** (0.610)
Observations	78186	71500	15760	62421	80914	9352	9366	9343
Chi-squared	3042.04	4662.02	277.99			1364.24	441.71	1040.48
R-squared				0.170	0.210			

Standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%

NOTE: Other independent variables were omitted from the table for reasons of clarity.

Testing CP Scores: 1952-2004 ANES dataset

- Still two parties
- Use both vote choice and PID as proxies for party preference, to create two different CP scores
- Only presidential years
- *Expectation: Higher cross-pressures lead to lower likelihood of individual partisanship*

Effects of Cross-Pressures on Partisanship (Pooled ANES Data)

	(1)	(2)	(3)
CP Scores (Vote Choice)	-0.296*** (0.065)		-0.180** (0.070)
CP Scores (PID)		-0.374*** (0.066)	-0.310*** (0.071)
Constant	-0.733*** (0.184)	-0.706*** (0.183)	-0.624*** (0.187)
Observations	25457	25663	25374
Chi-squared	1722.31	1763.26	1734.95

Standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1% (two-tailed)

NOTE: Other independent variables were omitted from the table for reasons of clarity.

Testing CP Scores: CSES Wave 2 dataset

- Five countries, to have variation in political systems and number of parties
- 2 in US, 3 in UK, 4 in S. Korea, 6 in Israel, 7 in Poland
- Other choices
- Test whether CP scores affect voter turnout
- *Expectation: Higher cross-pressures lead to lower likelihood of voter turnout.*

Effects of Cross-pressure Scores on Voter Turnout (CSES2 Data)

	US	UK	South Korea	Israel	Poland
CP Score	-0.590 (0.45)	0.408 (0.80)	0.337 (0.69)	-0.998 (0.70)	-1.276* (0.71)
Constant	-1.549* (0.86)	-3.010*** (0.98)	-3.587*** (1.02)	1.895 (1.24)	-3.354*** (0.72)
Observations	1058	857	1486	1205	1783
Chi-squared	183.16	173.79	169.46	70.64	382.29

Standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%

NOTE: Other independent variables were omitted from the table for reasons of clarity.

Robustness checks

- **Different proxies for party preference (PID vs. Vote Choice)**
- **Different numbers of parties (Poland example)**
- **Different sets of variables (core vs. country-specific in CSES)**
- **Different variation calculation methods**

Conclusion

- **Developed a method of calculating cross-pressures**
- **Shown its usefulness in predicting various elements of political behavior in a variety of countries**
- **Demonstrated its robustness to a range of specifications**

Next Steps:

Using CP scores in more comprehensive applications

- **Partisanship in the US**
- **Applying CP scores cross-nationally**