

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> xiii
<i>List of Tables</i>	xv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xix
I	COMMUNICATION, INFLUENCE, AND THE CAPACITY OF CITIZENS TO DISAGREE
	1
	The Importance of Disagreement in Democratic Politics
	2
	Political Diversity as a Rare Event
	7
	Efficiency and Cost Cutting as Keys to Civic Capacity
	8
	Disagreement and Conflict Avoidance
	9
	Dynamic Models of Opinion Change
	11
	Agent-Based Explanations for Homogeneity
	12
	The Survival of Political Disagreement
	14
	Contrary Evidence Regarding Disagreement
	16
	Networks, Groups, and Complex Forms of Organization
	17
	An Overview of the Argument
	19
	How Is Disagreement Sustained?
	21
	The Plan for this Book
	23
2	NEW INFORMATION, OLD INFORMATION, AND PERSISTENT DISAGREEMENT
	25
	Network Theories of Political Influence
	26
	Political Influence in Heterogeneous Environments
	29
	Observational Requirements and Data Sets
	34
	Heterogeneity and Influence within Networks
	36
	Points of Intersection between Individuals and Aggregates
	40
	Summary and Conclusion
	43
3	DYADS, NETWORKS, AND AUTOREGRESSIVE INFLUENCE
	46
	Contexts, Networks, and Autoregressive Influence
	47

Contents

	Representations of Contextual Effects on Communication	48
	Representations of Network Effects on Communication	49
	Dyads, Networks, and Social Communication	51
	Dyads, Networks, and the 2000 Election	54
	Heterogeneous Opinions Regarding Candidates	60
	Conclusion	63
4	DISAGREEMENT, HETEROGENEITY, AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION	68
	Systematic Sources of Distortion in Communication	70
	Election Campaigns and Social Communication	72
	The Centrality of Political Disagreement	74
	Data and Research Design	75
	Accessibility and the Ease of Judgment	76
	Explaining Accessibility	78
	Reflective Confidence in Political Judgments	85
	Explaining Judgmental Confidence	86
	The Accuracy of Political Judgments	88
	Explaining Accuracy	88
	Taking Account of Accessibility	92
	Conclusion	94
5	DISAGREEMENT, HETEROGENEITY, AND PERSUASION: HOW DOES DISAGREEMENT SURVIVE?	98
	Politics, Interdependence, and the Survival of Disagreement	99
	Data and Research Design	101
	Political Activation Effects in the Campaign	102
	Contingent Effects of Campaign Activation	105
	Campaign Effects on Homogeneity within Networks	106
	Communication and the Survival of Disagreement	109
	Political Influence and Heterogeneity within Networks	113
	Majoritarian Biases and the Survival of Disagreement	115
	Socially Sustained Disagreement	117
	Implications	120
	Conclusion	122
6	AGENT-BASED EXPLANATIONS, PATTERNS OF COMMUNICATION, AND THE INEVITABILITY OF HOMOGENEITY	124
	Analysis versus Synthesis	125
	Agent-Based Models	127
	The Modeling Strategy	129

Contents

	The Axelrod Culture Model	133
	Alterations in the Selection Process	138
	<i>Multi-Agent Cells</i>	139
	<i>Decreased Levels of Self-Selection</i>	142
	<i>Neighborhoods and Workplaces</i>	143
	<i>Selectively Screened Encounters</i>	146
	Conclusion	149
7	AGENT-BASED EXPLANATIONS, AUTOREGRESSIVE INFLUENCE, AND THE SURVIVAL OF DISAGREEMENT	151
	Model Building Strategy	153
	Staunchly Held Opinions	156
	The Interesting Case of the Perverse Holdout	158
	The Collective Impact of Autoregressive Influence	160
	Autoregressive Influence and the Durability of Disagreement	162
	Stability of Networks Due to Autoregressive Influence	167
	Serialization Experiments	169
	Systematically Unpredictable Consequences	173
	Diversity, Complexity, and Predictability	176
	Summary	177
	Conclusion	179
8	HETEROGENEOUS NETWORKS AND CITIZEN CAPACITY: DISAGREEMENT, AMBIVALENCE, AND ENGAGEMENT	180
	The Consequences of Disagreement among Citizens	182
	Likes, Dislikes, and Political Communication	182
	Communication and the Production of Ambivalence	190
	Diverse Networks and Political Engagement	198
	Conclusion	202
	Appendix to Chapter 8	206
9	SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSION	207
	Low Density Networks and Autoregressive Influence	208
	Political Implications for Groups and Individuals	210
	<i>Persistent Disagreement Frequently Occurs within Communication Networks</i>	210
	<i>Disagreement Is More Likely within Extensive Communication Networks</i>	211
	<i>Ambivalence Is a Consequence of Disagreement</i>	211
	<i>Disagreement and Ambivalence Yield Balanced, Less Polarized Opinions</i>	212
	<i>Ambivalence Is Not Simply the Antithesis of Political Engagement</i>	212

Contents

<i>The Effects of Social Capital Depend on Network Structure and Composition</i>	213
<i>Heterogeneous Networks May Be a Product of the Modern Era</i>	213
<i>Disagreement Is Related to the Decline of Partisanship</i>	214
<i>Political Homogeneity Persists within Networks under Particular Circumstances</i>	214
<i>Diversity Produces Important Implications for Political Dynamics</i>	215
Conclusion	216
APPENDIX A: THE INDIANAPOLIS–ST. LOUIS STUDY	218
<i>The Sample</i>	218
<i>Timing Responses</i>	219
<i>Measuring Preferences and Judgments across the Campaign</i>	219
<i>Network Name Generators</i>	220
APPENDIX B: THE OPINION SIMULATION SOFTWARE	222
<i>About the Code</i>	222
<i>Why Are There So Many Files?</i>	225
<i>Running the Model</i>	226
<i>About Days and Schedules</i>	230
<i>Serialization</i>	231
<i>Batch Mode</i>	232
References	235
Index	247