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Overview

- What is political sophistication?
- How should we measure political sophistication?
- If we use survey questions, what questions should we use?
What is political sophistication?

- Bob Luskin: “the extent to which [a person’s personal belief system] is large, wide-ranging, and highly constrained.”
- Me (perhaps following Zaller and Krosnick): the capacity of citizens to understand, process, and utilize new political information.
- Commonly conflated with political knowledge—although I would argue that these are distinct concepts.
- Also known as political expertise.
Under various guises, expertise and/or knowledge have long been a concern of political scientists.

“The democratic citizen is expected to be well informed about political affairs. He is supposed to know what the issues are, what their history is, what the relevant facts are, what alternatives are proposed, what the party stands for, what the likely consequences are. By such standards the voter falls short.”

Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee, Voting (1954: 308)
Measuring political sophistication

Since political scientists first recognized the importance of political sophistication, there has been debate over measurement:

- The levels of conceptualization (*The American Voter*; Converse and Luskin’s “active use” measure): do citizens think in ideological terms?
- Ideological constraint (Converse; Jackson and Marcus; “schema theory”): does the voter’s personal belief system “hang together,” or is it randomly arranged? (nonattitudes?)
- “Recognition and understanding” (Converse; Luskin): do voters recognize and understand ideological labels?
- Differentiation (Luskin; Zaller): can voters make distinctions between party/candidate issue positions?
- Information-holding/knowledge (Delli Carpini and Keeter)
- Interviewer evaluation (ANES)
Comparing differentiation and knowledge

This project looks at the use of both Luskin-style “differentiation” and political knowledge items included in various surveys of the mass public.

To do this, we need to look at how each type of item performs as an indicator of sophistication more broadly. How can we do this?
In a traditional multiple choice test:

\[ \text{score} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \]

In other words, we simply add up the number of correct answers to get the score.

Thus a simple approach to measuring sophistication would be to add up the number of knowledge items that people get right. But this doesn’t indicate how good each question is—all it does is give us a score for each respondent.
A promising approach to more in-depth analysis of questions comes from the family of item-response theory latent variable models.

These models were originally developed for standardized testing in the fields of educational psychology and test development—psychologists refer to these models of underlying (unobserved or latent) ability as psychometric models.
In political science, IRT models have mostly been used for spatial models of roll-call voting and Supreme Court decision-making; Poole and Rosenthal’s NOMINATE is a special case, while “purer” IRT models have been used by Clinton, Jackman, and Rivers (for roll-calls) and Martin and Quinn (for Supreme Court voting).

However, there has been some application to political knowledge and sophistication: Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996) use them in their book on political knowledge, while Levendusky and Jackman had a working paper circa 2003, contemporaneous with my dissertation research, introducing IRT models as well.
As we saw before, in a traditional multiple choice test:

\[
\text{score} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i
\]

The IRT model allows us to also determine the difficulty of each question and the question’s discrimination—how well the item separates low-scoring and high-scoring respondents from each other.

The scores are called the abilities of the respondents.
In the IRT model, the probability that the observed response to question $i$ by respondent $j$ is correct is given by

$$z_{ij} = -\alpha_i + \beta_i \theta_j + \epsilon_{ij}$$

where $\alpha$ is the difficulty of the question, $\beta$ is the discrimination parameter for the question, and $\theta$ is the respondent’s ability—for our purposes, level of sophistication.

In other words, whether or not a respondent got a particular question right is determined by his or her ability $\theta_j$, the difficulty of the question $\alpha_i$, and the question’s discrimination $\beta_i$. Of course, it is also subject to measurement error ($\epsilon_{ij}$).
The functional form

The $z_{ij}$ aren’t observed, so we must treat this like a probit:

$$\Pr(c_{ij} = 1|\theta_i) = \Phi(-\alpha_i + \beta_i \theta_i)$$

All of these parameters—$\alpha_i$, $\beta_i$, and $\theta_i$—are unknown. Using traditional approaches like maximum-likelihood estimation, this would be impossible to solve because of the large number of parameters.
Identifying the IRT model

With sufficient identifying conditions—namely, that both $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are distributed normally, that the respondent abilities $\theta_j$ are independent and distributed standard normal, and constraining one of the $\beta_i$ to be positive—the model is tractable.

The end result gives us estimates of the respondent abilities, which may be useful for second-stage analyses, as well as the difficulties and the discrimination parameters for each item (question). Estimation is readily available using Martin and Quinn’s MCMCpack for R.
Benefits of IRT

There are a number of key advantages of using IRT models over a naïve summated scale:

- The contribution of each item is adjusted based on its difficulty and ability to discriminate, rather than equal weights being assumed.
- The respondent abilities are true interval variables rather than integer counts, which may be useful in second-stage estimation.
- Random measurement error is accounted for in the model.
- If used with MCMC, missing data are handled gracefully.

Of course, the key disadvantage is that finding a solution to the IRT model is more complex than generating a summated scale!
The 1998 Dutch Parliamentary Election Study (DPES) included a battery of items suitable for this analysis:

- Knowledge of EU membership status of various nations.
- Knowledge of name, party, and position of four Dutch political figures.
- Knowledge of governing coalition members (and non-members).
- Knowledge of the relative strength of major parties in the Dutch parliament.
- Identification of relative positions of main parties on five major issues. (Differentiation measure.)

The following graphs show the relative performance of items within each of these groups.
EU membership items

Item difficulties

Turkey not in EU
Norway not in EU
Sweden in EU
Lithuania not in EU
Poland not in EU
Spain in EU
Italy in EU
France in EU
USA not in EU
Germany in EU
Party leader items

Item difficulties

Bukman (2nd Chamber Chair)
Bukman (CDA)
Bukman (Name)
Jorritsma (Ministry)
Jorritsma (VVD)
Jorritsma (Name)
de Graaf (Party Leader)
de Graaf (D66)
de Graaf (Name)
Wallage (Party Leader)
Wallage (PvdA)
Wallage (Name)
Item discrimination parameters

Bukman (2nd Chamber Chair)
Bukman (CDA)
Bukman (Name)
Jorritsma (Ministry)
Jorritsma (VVD)
Jorritsma (Name)
de Graaf (Party Leader)
de Graaf (D66)
de Graaf (Name)
Wallage (Party Leader)
Wallage (PvdA)
Wallage (Name)
Party size ID items

![Graph showing item difficulties with size comparisons: PvdA > VVD, D66 > GroenLinks, CDA < PvdA, VVD > D66. The graph plots difficulty levels with markers for each comparison.](image-url)
Party size ID items

Item discrimination parameters

- Size: VVD > D66
- Size: CDA < PvdA
- Size: D66 > GroenLinks
- Size: PvdA > VVD
Coalition membership items

Item difficulties

Senioren 2000 not in gov
SP not in gov
AOV not in gov
Unie 55+ not in gov
CD not in gov
RPF not in gov
GPV not in gov
SGP not in gov
GroenLinks not in gov
D66 in gov
VVD in gov
CDA not in gov
PvdA in gov

Difficulty

−1 0 1
Coalition membership items

Item discrimination parameters

- Senioren 2000 not in gov
- SP not in gov
- AOV not in gov
- Unie 55+ not in gov
- CD not in gov
- RPF not in gov
- GPV not in gov
- SGP not in gov
- GroenLinks not in gov
- PvdA in gov
- CDA not in gov
- VVD in gov
- D66 in gov

Discrimination

0 1 2 3
Issue placement items

Item difficulties

Minority assimilation (GroenLinks > VVD)
EU unification (PvdA > GPV)
Asylum seekers (VVD < GroenLinks)
Income differences (PvdA < VVD)
Euthanasia (CDA < VVD)
Item discrimination parameters

- Minority assimilation (GroenLinks > VVD)
- EU unification (PvdA > GPV)
- Asylum seekers (VVD < GroenLinks)
- Income differences (PvdA < VVD)
- Euthanasia (CDA < VVD)
Validation of the Measure

The respondent abilities were validated against other measures in the model:

- Correlation with simple knowledge scale based on photo IDs: \( r = 0.95 \).
- Correlation with knowledge scale based on number of completely correct IDs: \( r = 0.85 \).
- Correlation with respondent’s self-reported political interest scale: \( r = 0.47 \).
- Correlation with respondent’s self-reported civic participation scale: \( r = 0.29 \).
- Correlation with respondent’s level of educational attainment: \( r = 0.34 \).
Another application: ANES

Recent editions of the American National Election Studies also provide a wealth of potential knowledge items:

- Knowledge of key political figures.
- Knowledge of largest party in each chamber of Congress.
- Knowledge of biographical details of presidential and vice-presidential candidates. (2000)
- Placement of parties and candidates on political issues. (Differentiation.)
- Placement of parties and candidates on a liberal-conservative scale. (Differentiation.)
1992 party/candidate placement items

**Item difficulties**

- Abortion: Clinton < Bush
- Jobs: Democrats < GOP
- Jobs: Clinton < Bush
- Svc/$: GOP > Democrats
- Svc/$: Bush > Clinton
- Democrats < GOP
- Clinton < Bush

Difficulty scale:

-1 0 1

●
1992 party/candidate placement items

Item discrimination parameters

Abortion: Clinton < Bush
Jobs: Democrats < GOP
Jobs: Clinton < Bush
Svc/$: GOP > Democrats
Svc/$: Bush > Clinton
Democrats < GOP
Clinton < Bush

Discrimination parameters:

- Abortion: Clinton < Bush
- Jobs: Democrats < GOP
- Jobs: Clinton < Bush
- Svc/$: GOP > Democrats
- Svc/$: Bush > Clinton
- Democrats < GOP
- Clinton < Bush
1992 knowledge items

Item difficulties

- K: GOP more cons. party
- ID Quayle
- ID Rehnquist
- ID Yeltsin
- ID Foley
- K: Judicial review
- K: Pres nom. judges
- K: Democrat House majority
- K: Democrat Senate majority

Difficulty Score:
-1 0 1
1992 knowledge items

Item discrimination parameters

- K: Democrat Senate majority
- K: Democrat House majority
- K: Pres nom. judges
- K: Judicial review
- ID Foley
- ID Yeltsin
- ID Rehnquist
- ID Quayle
- K: GOP more cons. party

Discrimination parameters: 0, 1, 2, 3
1996 party/candidate placement items (group 1)

Item difficulties

- Help Blacks: Clinton < Dole
- Jobs: Clinton < Dole
- HIns: Clinton < Dole
- Svc/$: GOP > Democrats
- Svc/$: Dole > Clinton
- Democrats < GOP
- Clinton < Dole

Difficulty

-1 0 1
1996 party/candidate placement items (group 1)

Item discrimination parameters

- Help Blacks: Clinton < Dole
- Jobs: Clinton < Dole
- HIns: Clinton < Dole
- Svc/$: GOP > Democrats
- Svc/$: Dole > Clinton
- Democrats < GOP
- Clinton < Dole
1996 party/candidate placement items (group 2)

Item difficulties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abortion: Clinton &lt; Dole</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion: Democrats &lt; GOP</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime: Clinton &lt; Dole</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvJobs: Clinton &lt; Dole</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvJobs: Democrats &lt; GOP</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvReg: Clinton &lt; Dole</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvReg: Democrats &lt; GOP</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph:
- EnvReg: Democrats < GOP
- EnvReg: Clinton < Dole
- EnvJobs: Democrats < GOP
- EnvJobs: Clinton < Dole
- Crime: Clinton < Dole
- Abortion: Democrats < GOP
- Abortion: Clinton < Dole
1996 party/candidate placement items (group 2)

Item discrimination parameters

- EnvReg: Democrats < GOP
- EnvReg: Clinton < Dole
- EnvJobs: Democrats < GOP
- EnvJobs: Clinton < Dole
- Crime: Clinton < Dole
- Abortion: Democrats < GOP
- Abortion: Clinton < Dole

Discrimination parameters:

- Environment regulations: Democrats < GOP
- Environment regulations: Clinton < Dole
- Environmental jobs: Democrats < GOP
- Environmental jobs: Clinton < Dole
- Crime: Clinton < Dole
- Abortion: Democrats < GOP
- Abortion: Clinton < Dole
1996 knowledge items

Item difficulties

- K: GOP Senate majority
- K: GOP House majority
- ID Gingrich
- ID Yeltsin
- ID Rehnquist
- ID Gore

Difficulty
1996 knowledge items

Item discrimination parameters

- K: GOP Senate majority
- K: GOP House majority
- ID Gingrich
- ID Yeltsin
- ID Rehnquist
- ID Gore

Discrimination

0 1 2 3
2000 party/candidate placement items (group 1)

Item difficulties

Help Blacks: Clinton < Bush
Jobs: Dems < GOP
Jobs: Gore < Bush
Svc/$: GOP > Dems
Svc/$: Bush > Gore
Svc/$: Bush > Clinton
Gore < Bush
Clinton < Bush
2000 party/candidate placement items (group 1)

Item discrimination parameters

Help Blacks: Clinton < Bush
Jobs: Dems < GOP
Jobs: Gore < Bush
Svc/$: GOP > Dems
Svc/$: Bush > Gore
Svc/$: Bush > Clinton
Gore < Bush
Clinton < Bush

Discrimination parameters

0 1 2 3
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
2000 party/candidate placement items (group 2)

Item difficulties

EnvReg: Gore < Bush
Guns: Gore < Bush
EnvJobs: Gore < Bush
Abortion: Gore < Bush
Help Blacks: Dems < GOP
Help Blacks: Gore < Bush
2000 party/candidate placement items (group 2)

Item discrimination parameters

- EnvReg: Gore < Bush
- Guns: Gore < Bush
- EnvJobs: Gore < Bush
- Abortion: Gore < Bush
- Help Blacks: Dems < GOP
- Help Blacks: Gore < Bush

Discrimination parameters:

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
2000 knowledge items

Item difficulties

- K: GOP Senate majority
- K: GOP House majority
- ID Reno
- ID Blair
- ID Rehnquist
- ID Lott
2000 knowledge items

Item discrimination parameters

K: GOP Senate majority
K: GOP House majority
ID Reno
ID Blair
ID Rehnquist
ID Lott

Discrimination
0 1 2 3
2000 candidate biographical items

Item difficulties

- K: Lieberman Jewish
- K: Lieberman CT
- K: Cheney Methodist
- K: Cheney WY
- K: Gore Baptist
- K: Gore TN
- K: Bush Methodist
- K: Bush TX
2000 candidate biographical items

Item discrimination parameters

- K: Lieberman Jewish
- K: Lieberman CT
- K: Cheney Methodist
- K: Cheney WY
- K: Gore Baptist
- K: Gore TN
- K: Bush Methodist
- K: Bush TX

Discrimination parameters:

- K: Bush TX: 0
- K: Bush Methodist: 1
- K: Gore TN: 2
- K: Gore Baptist: 3
- K: Cheney WY: 0
- K: Cheney Methodist: 1
- K: Lieberman CT: 0
- K: Lieberman Jewish: 1
Findings

- Knowledge items appeared to outperform party placement items in the Netherlands, at least in 1998.
- In the U.S., both knowledge items and party/candidate placement items appeared to perform similarly in all three years examined. (But note weak performance of Supreme Court and congressional leader IDs.)
- Most candidate biographical data questions in 2000 did not perform well (particularly religion), perhaps due to low public awareness and low salience.
Future extensions

- Additional years (2002, 2005 DPES; 2004 ANES) and countries (Britain, Canada, ...).
- Should consider the possibility of multidimensionality.
- Importance of general versus domain-specific political knowledge.
- Need to account for the known error in the estimated abilities when used in second-stage analysis, rather than using point estimates. Quinn and Martin argue it is not problematic—but we could produce better estimates of the effects of the abilities if we account for the known error.
- Incorporating ideological measures like RU (recognition/understanding) and AU (active use) into the analysis.