

Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics

How useful can opinion surveys be as inputs to the political process when most people know little about politics but are nevertheless willing to give opinions on even the most esoteric policy issues when asked to do so by pollsters? This study, the first comprehensive treatment of the relationship between knowledge, representation, and political equality in opinion surveys, suggests some surprising answers. Knowledge does matter, and the way it is distributed in society can cause collective preferences to reflect disproportionately the opinions of some groups more than others. Sometimes collective preferences seem to represent something like the will of the people, but frequently they do not. Sometimes they rigidly enforce political equality in the expression of political viewpoints, but often they do not. The primary culprit is not any inherent shortcoming in the methods of survey research. Rather, it is the limited degree of knowledge held by ordinary citizens about public affairs and the tendency for some kinds of people to be better informed than others. Accounting for these factors can help survey researchers, journalists, politicians, and concerned citizens better appreciate the pitfalls and possibilities for using opinion polls to represent the people's voice.

Scott L. Althaus earned his Ph.D. in Political Science at Northwestern University and is associate professor of Speech Communication and associate professor of Political Science at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. His research interests center on the communication processes that equip ordinary citizens to exercise popular sovereignty in democratic societies, as well as on the communication processes by which the opinions of these citizens are conveyed to government officials. His research has appeared in the American Political Science Review, the American Journal of Political Science, Communication Research, Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, the Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, and Political Communication.



Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics

Opinion Surveys and the Will of the People

SCOTT L. ALTHAUS

University of Illinois





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521527873

© Scott L. Althaus 2003

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2003

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Althaus, Scott L., 1966-

Collective preferences in democratic politics : opinion surveys and the will of the people / Scott L. Althaus.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-82099-5 – ISBN 0-521-52787-2 (pb.)

- 1. Public opinion United States. 2. Public opinion. 3. Democracy.
- 4. Political participation. I. Title.

HN90.P8A47 2003

303.3'8'0973-dc21 2003041961

ISBN 978-0-521-82099-8 Hardback ISBN 978-0-521-52787-3 Paperback

Transferred to digital printing 2009

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate. Information regarding prices, travel timetables and other factual information given in this work are correct at the time of first printing but Cambridge University Press does not guarantee the accuracy of such information thereafter.



For Ellen



Contents

List of Figures and Tables	page viii
Acknowledgments	xi
1 Introduction	1
PART I ILLUSIONS OF AGGREGATION	
2 The Power of Noise	29
3 Who Speaks for the People?	59
PART II INFORMATION EFFECTS IN COLLECTION	IVE PREFERENCES
4 The Impact of Information Effects	97
5 The Structure and Causes of Information I	Effects 145
6 The Temporal Dynamics of Information E	ffects 196
PART III OPINION SURVEYS IN DEMOCRATIC	POLITICS
7 Opinion Surveys and the Will of the Peopl	e 243
8 What Surveys Can Tell Us about Public Op	pinion 277
Appendix A: Political Knowledge Indices	314
Appendix B: Methodology	319
References	333
Index	363

vii



List of Figures and Tables

FIGURES

3.1	The prevalence of demographic inequalities among	
	opinion givers	page 72
3.2	Inequalities among well- and ill-informed respondents,	
	by question category	76
3.3	Dispersion effect in opinion on the size of government	84
3.4	Dispersion effect in opinion on affirmative action	86
4.1	Surveyed and fully informed opinion on abortion	
	rights	109
4.2	Surveyed and fully informed opinion on free market	
	solutions to economic problems	111
4.3	Surveyed and fully informed opinion on increasing taxes	
	to reduce the deficit	115
4.4	Surveyed and fully informed opinion on favoring more	
	government	116
4.5	The potential impact of individual-level information	
	effects on the size of collective-level information effects	120
4.6	Actual relationship between the size of individual and	
	collective information effects	121
4.7	Percentage of questions with different surveyed and	
	fully informed collective preferences	127
5.1	Size of information effects by relative lopsidedness of	
	well- and ill-informed opinion givers	149
5.2	Broadcast news stories about gay rights issues,	
	1980–1996	185

viii



Figu	res and Tables	ix
5.3	Information effects over time in support for laws protecting gays from job discrimination, among respondents in lowest knowledge quartile	186
5.4	Information effects in 1992 support for gay rights, among respondents in the lowest knowledge quartile	188
6.1	Changing levels of knowledge about political leaders, party differences, and party control of Congress, 1980–1998	209
6.2	Changing social distribution of political knowledge, interest in campaigns, and interest in public affairs, 1980–1998	214
6.3	Should abortion always be permitted by law?	223
6.4	Should the law permit prayer in public schools?	225
6.5	Should women have an equal role with men?	227
6.6	Predicting future trends in surveyed opinion from t_1	
	measures of fully informed opinion, by type of prediction	233
TAB	LES	
1.1	Low levels of knowledge about politics	11
1.2	The social distribution of political knowledge	16
2.1	Adding error scores to true scores shifts both marginal percentages and means	43
2.2	Average percentage point difference between signal	
	opinions and collective opinions	47
2.3	Average gaps between the means of signal opinions and	
	collective opinions	50
2.4	Percentage of cases with different signal modes and	
	collective modes	52
3.1	Demographic differences in opinionation on the issue	0_
0.1	of limiting foreign imports	68
3.2	Opinion distributions among the highest and lowest	00
3.2	knowledge quartiles	81
4.1	The average size of collective- and individual-level	01
т.1	information effects by question category	123
12		123
4.2	Qualitative differences between surveyed and fully informed	129
12	collective preferences	
4.3	Group differences in information effects	136
5.1	Correlations between size of information effects and	4.50
<i>5</i> 2	measures of group depletion	152
5.2	Impact of question format and survey mode on depletion,	
	dispersion, and size of information effects	165



Figures and Tables x Attitude structure of support for increased spending on welfare programs and poor people 170 Partial correlations between correct answers to policyspecific knowledge items and the size of information effects in individual opinions, controlling for general political knowledge 176 5.5 Individual-level correlations between political knowledge, salience measures, and information effects 180 Attitude structure of support for laws protecting gays from 5.6 job discrimination, by knowledge quartile 189 Attitude structure for 1992 gay rights questions, by 5.7 knowledge quartile 191 6.1 Summary of expectations about the evolution of information effects over time 206 Mean point differences between surveyed and fully 6.2 informed collective opinion, by position in time series 219 Mean point differences between surveyed and fully informed collective opinion, by election year 221 Granger tests for predicting changes in surveyed opinion from measures of fully informed collective opinion 2.2.9 6.5 Summary of findings on the evolution of information effects over time 235 B.1 Logit coefficients for support of abortion rights 327



Acknowledgments

This book is an attempt to conduct public opinion research in what Paul Lazarsfeld (1957) called the "classical tradition": using empirical methods to pursue and refine the foundational questions about popular sovereignty raised by political theorists. If this effort meets with the reader's approval, it is in no small part because of the many people who have either shaped my thinking or tangibly contributed to this project along the way.

It all began on April 20, 1992, when, as a first-year master's student at Northwestern University, I was introduced by Benjamin Page to The Rational Public in his graduate seminar on public opinion. Ben encouraged me from the beginning to forge ahead on a project that eventually became my doctoral dissertation, knowing that it was often critical of his own work. His first priority in research is the pursuit of truth, and he is a worthy role model for all who would devote themselves to the life of the mind. It was also during that momentous April that I was first introduced to Susan Herbst, whose vision for integrating contemporary public opinion research with its historical roots has been a profound influence. The toughest questions always came from Susan, and I am especially grateful to her for reminding me to look toward the bigger picture that lies beyond disciplinary boundaries. My early work on this project was also influenced by Jane Mansbridge, who spurred me to think about political interests in addition to preferences, and by Patricia Conley, whose command of econometrics and patience with my repeated questions made her an indispensable resource.

Over the course of what turned out to be a 10-year project, I have also benefited from the comments, suggestions, and assistance of Allen

xi



xii

Acknowledgments

Barton, Jim Beniger, Stephen Bennett, Joan Black, Dennis Chong, Ken Corioso, Michael Delli Carpini, Robert Eisinger, Tim Fedderson, Kathy Frankovic, Brian Gaines, Doris Graber, Paul Gronke, Michael Hagan, Herbert Jacob, Ken Janda, Scott Keeter, Steven Klepper, Jon Krosnick, Jim Kuklinski, Kurt Lang, Paul Lavrakas, Robert Luskin, Elizabeth Martin, Peter Miller, Jennifer Oats-Sargent, Thomas Patterson, Sam Popkin, Paul Quirk, Brian Roberts, Daniel Robinson, Frank Rusciano, Arthur Sanders, Jacob Shamir, Tom Smith, David Tewksbury, Robert Weissberg, Chris Wlezien, the many graduate students in my public opinion seminars who commented on earlier drafts of the book, and the anonymous reviewers of various manuscripts stemming from this project.

I am especially grateful to Michael Delli Carpini and Robert Entman, who read the manuscript in its entirety and whose excellent advice greatly improved the final product, and to Guido Schuster for his generous assistance in writing, editing, and compiling the simulation program used in Chapter 2. Lewis Bateman, the political science editor at Cambridge University Press, Sarah Gentile, Lauren Levin, Regina Paleski, Teresa Barensfeld, and Eric Schwartz provided invaluable assistance throughout the publishing process. I am also indebted to the University of Michigan's Center for Political Studies for collecting the American National Election Studies data used in this project, and to the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, for making the data available to the scholarly community.

There is a special group of people who deserve my highest thanks, for this project never would have been started or completed were it not for the family members, friends, and mentors who encouraged me to enter graduate school and supported me along the way. My family has always been my biggest supporter. I am especially thankful to my parents, Sean and Sandy Althaus, for keeping me in good humor and for raising me to respect the value of an education. My long hours spent on this project have tested the patience of my children, Colin, Kyra, and Curtis, and I thank them for keeping me focused on what is really important in life. More than anyone else, my biggest debt of thanks is due to my wife, Ellen, for her loving companionship, constant support, readiness to listen, and daily sacrifices of time and attention that freed me to focus on the book. This volume is as much the product of her efforts as it is of mine.



Acknowledgments

xiii

Soli Deo Gloria

Chapters 3 and 4 update and expand arguments that originally appeared in Althaus, Scott L. 1996. "Opinion Polls, Information Effects, and Political Equality: Exploring Ideological Biases in Collective Opinion," *Political Communication* 13 (1): 3–21 and in Althaus, Scott L. 1998. "Information Effects in Collective Preferences," *American Political Science Review* 92(3): 545–58. Excerpts from these articles are reproduced by permission of Taylor & Francis, Inc. (http://www.routledge-ny.com), and the American Political Science Association, respectively.