Detecting opinion-based groups and polarisation in survey-based attitude networks and estimating question relevance
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Network visualisation, drawn from attitudinal survey data, exposes the structure of opinion-based groups. We make use of these network projections to identify the groups reliably through community detection algorithms and to examine social-identity-based polarisation. Our goal is to present a method for revealing polarisation in attitudinal surveys. This method can be broken down into the following steps: data preparation, construction of similarity-based networks, algorithmic identification of opinion-based groups, and identification of important items for community structure. We examine the method’s performance and possible scope through applying it to empirical data and to a broad range of synthetic data sets. The empirical data application points out possible conclusions (i.e., social-identity polarization), whereas the synthetic data sets marks out the method’s boundaries. Next to an application example on political attitude survey, our results suggest that the method works for various surveys but is also moderated by the efficacy of the community detection algorithms. Concerning the identification of opinion-based groups, we provide a solid method to rank the item’s influence on group formation and as a group identifier. We discuss how this network approach for identifying polarization can classify non-overlapping opinion-based groups even in the absence of extreme opinions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Shared opinions are an important feature in the formation of social groups [1]. It has been shown that clusters of opinions become signifiers of group identity [2]. In recent studies, public health opinion-groups have been shown to coalesce around a growing trust/distrust in science [3] which has major consequences for public health compliance [4]. As a result, it is important to be able to identify such groups accurately and quickly, and to identify if different opinion-based groups are, or will become, polarised on the clusters of topics they share.

In online communities, such as Facebook groups or subreddit memberships, mutual interests in a subject, or attitudes, are often the primary shared commonality, rather than prior acquaintanceship or geographical proximity. It has been found that in many online communities, users tend to share media aligned with their own values and dismiss alternative views [5]. These groups tend to be driven by homophily [6]. In this study, we will use this idea of shared attitudes to form opinion-based groups with the use of surveys. In a survey, a participant provides responses on many topics with only a small number of possible response options. These responses are typically on an ordinal scale (e.g., a Likert scale) [7]. Often the scale has a limited range of discrete response options, for example five-point and seven-point scales are commonly employed [8]. We use a distance metric, akin to the Manhattan distance, on these scales across all the survey questions, referred to as items, to identify participants with similar opinions to obtain a network of participants linked by shared opinions. This method is discussed in more detail in Ref. [9].

There are other methods for visualising the social structure and belief networks, see for example [10, 11]. However, in these methods the edges are correlations or partial correlations making an edge difficult to interpret and the threshold for lowest correlation value to choose is arbitrary. In our approach, we introduce a cut-off when a giant component is formed containing almost all participants. An edge represents shared agreement, the stronger the weight of the edge, the more agreement the participants. In Ref. [9], this method was introduced as a visualisation tool. In this paper, we take this further by using community detection techniques to identify clusters of participants with similar opinions, i.e., opinion-based groups. We compare this to statistical methods, such as hierarchical clustering on the raw survey data and show they give consistent results with each other and, hence, this is a viable method for detecting opinion-based groups and polarisation.

As surveys can contain hundreds of items, many of which are not expressing attitudes but answering trivial questions leading up to an attitudinal item, we wish to identify which attitudes are closely linked to attitudes of the clusters identified. To do this we apply two feature selection methods to either identify or rank the most relevant items.

The paper is laid out as follows, in section [11] we outline the method for forming the networks, identifying the clusters and the feature selection methods for picking the relevant questions. In section [11] we show the results.
and identify the community detection algorithms as robust methods for detecting the opinion-based groups in similarity networks. Finally in section IV, we discuss the results, give concluding remarks and discuss further research avenues.

II. METHODS

Detecting opinion-based groups using survey data is conducted in a multiple-step procedure. This can be broadly broken down into data restructuring, a similarity-based network method [9], community detection [12–14] and item importance. Based on survey data, the method creates edges between individuals by constructing a similarity-based network. The emerged structure can reveal opinion-based groups and predict social-group formation [15, 16]. Beyond this, we aim to detect the group-relevant opinions. Once we detect these opinion-based groups, our approach provides a method to evaluate the items’ importance on formation of observed social groups.

Survey data often covers multiple contexts with a large number of items. Hence, a subset of items has to be chosen depending on the subject matter of interest. For example, if we focus on political polarisation, then we are interested in identifying political-relevant items which cover attitudes related to party alignment. To uncover these attitude connections, we employ a method to visualise survey data as a similarity network based on the answers of participants. The resulting network sets up participants as nodes and integrates links which are weighted by the similarity scores between participants. Ref. [9] shows that visualising the network structure contains information about groups of individuals that share similar opinions. However, the visualisation and the distinction of groups in the network is highly dependent on layout algorithms, chosen by the user (here: Kamada-Kawai algorithm [17]). A common way in complex networks to partition a graph is the application of community detection algorithms [18]. The introduction of community detection algorithms has the benefit that they do not rely on the visual inspection of the network and that it takes the approach one step further: to reliably uncover opinion-based groups.

We choose three different algorithms. Initially we apply the Girvan-Newman algorithm [12], which uses the edge betweenness centrality to minimise the cross-cutting edges between communities. We then run the statistical-driven Hierarchical Clustering algorithm [14] and finally the Stochastic Block Model used for community detection [13]. Over the last two decades a range of different community detection algorithms evolved (see, for example, [19]). Based on the high complexity of this challenge, there exists no generally applicable algorithm [15]. The introduction of three distinct algorithms ensures the performance and robustness of the community detection.

In the following sections, we explain our approach step by step. Although we show later that our method produces robust results using extensive simulations, to illustrate the application, we run through a specific example: the American National Election Study (ANES) from 2016 [20]. This massive data set captures a broad range of general and political attitudes from the American people and includes over 4000 participants and more than 650 items. We aim to detect opinion-based groups and polarisation in the data set. As an example the ANES data set delivers an ideal candidate to reconfirm polarisation. Although the ANES data set is not intended to reveal opinion-based groups or polarisation, it captures the particular structure of the American two-party system, which is perceived as bipolar [21–23]. We take this party alignment as a ground truth for community detection and polarisation in this data set. Additionally, it works as an orientation to compare the results. For our method, the ANES data set is suitable to investigate polarisation [24]. The first step is to visualise the survey data as a network.

A. Identifying opinion-based groups from survey data: a score-based linking method

Attitudinal survey data provides the basis for a network, using the individuals as nodes and their similarity score as edges. The scales of the items are reformatted into a range between −1 and 1. For instance, a seven-point scale will then be defined by a scale with values of −1, −2/3, −1/3, 0, 1/3, 2/3 and 1. The scale represents a clear ordinal structure. The reformattin is applied to the whole data set.

The similarity measure $S_{ij}$ between the individuals, $i$ and $j$, is the sum of differences between all $n_f$ answers to the items $q_n$ (i.e., the Mahattan distance).

$$S_{ij} = n_f - \sum_{f=1}^{n_f} |q_{if} - q_{jf}|.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The distance is subtracted from the number of items, $n_f$, to allocate the range of the similarity measure between $-n_f$ and $n_f$, this is to aid visualisation so you know an edge represents almost full agreement between two nodes on all items. The similarity measure $S$ is at its maximum and equal to the number of items, $n_f$, if two individuals have identical responses to their items. Links are drawn, where the similarity exceeds a threshold $\theta$, which is chosen when a giant component is formed. Its success criterion is fulfilled, if there are enough links in the network to build a giant component, where a path can be made from at least 80% of the individuals. To achieve this, the threshold will successively be lowered until the network matches the success criterion. While this reduces the number of included individuals, it also reduces the number of additional links. After these three steps, the data can be shown as a network in order to identify opinion-based groups.
For the ANES data set, we identified eight items based on a study from [25] to measure political attitudes. We then run the data refinement and the network construction on these eight selected items (see Table I). To measure political attitudes Malka et al. use a scale consisting of five cultural (homosexuality, abortion, rights of men versus women to jobs, immigration, criminal punishment) and three economic attitudes (income inequality, public versus private business ownership, social welfare) as well as a ten point scale assessing right versus left political ideology.

We removed individuals who did not answer all eight items and so our maximum network size here is 3,081 nodes. With a threshold of 7.0, we get 50,143 links between 2,714 individuals, forming a giant component (88.1% of individuals), where all individuals are connected (see Figure 1). In our next step, we introduce the community detection for identifying possible opinion-based groups in our network.

### B. Detecting opinion-based groups

Community detection in graphs is an active and on-going field of research in of itself, see for example [12, 18, 26]. Currently there exists a range of algorithms to detect group structure from network characteristics [18, 27].

In our analysis, we have chosen three different approaches: Girvan-Newman community detection, Hierarchical Clustering and the Stochastic Block Model. The Girvan-Newman algorithm is a network-based method, which is directly applied to our constructed network. In general, Hierarchical Clustering is applied on the refined data set. The Stochastic Block Model is an inference algorithm which detects communities by model fitting. Detailed descriptions of these can be found in the Supplementary Information.

#### 1. Within Sum of Squares

The Within Sum of Squares (WSS) forms a building block of multiple parts of this analysis, for example, comparing the identified communities of the community detection methods. It is the sum of the squared distance of each individual from their assigned cluster centres. We can calculate the WSS as follows:

$$WSS := \sum_{k=1}^{n_k} \sum_{i \in C_k} \sum_{f=1}^{n_f} (q_{if} - \bar{q}_{kf})^2,$$

where the number of clusters is $n_k$. $C_k$ is the set of individuals in cluster $k$. The average answer item $f$ for cluster $k$ is $\bar{q}_{kf}$. As before, $q_{if}$ is individual $i$’s response to item $f$. The goal of our three community detection methods is to reduce WSS significantly while using the least number of communities possible. For two different community assignments, but with the same number of communities, the community with the lower WSS fits better to the data, as the distance between individuals to others in their community is, on average, smaller. With the WSS, we can generate an elbow plot for the communities, determined by our community detection methods. An elbow plot displays the WSS in relation to the number of communities and gives information about the ideal number of communities in the data [28]. The “elbow” in the plot indicates striking marks for the curve. Successively adding clusters to the data should reduce the total WSS. If the reduction is exceptionally high for an additional cluster, it gives the hint that this might be the ideal number of clusters for the data [29]. So that afterwards adding more clusters to the data just leads to comparatively small changes in the curve (see in Appendix C, Figure 9).

#### 2. Girvan-Newman algorithm

The Girvan-Newman algorithm is one of the first community detection algorithms in complex networks [12]. It is a divisive approach which successively separates the network into communities by erasing links with the highest edge betweenness centrality. It is useful to consider here as the edge betweenness centrality is easy to conceptualise as a quantity when dealing with these similarity networks, edges between clusters are particularly what we are interested in minimising in the detection of opinion-based groups. Also, the edge betweenness centrality is used to measure within community polarisation [30].

Our goal is it to detect polarisation in the data or network within the ANES data set from 2016. On the constructed network, we run the Girvan-Newman algorithm until it splits the given network into two separate communities. In order to obtain a statement about the overall structure, we re-compute the Girvan-Newman community detection to the biggest communities if the first division has led to an insufficient minimum group size (smaller community at least 5% of size of the bigger community). For the ANES data set, the first split up was a cutoff of a group with 41 nodes. As a second step, the
Girvan-Newman algorithm aims for the biggest remaining cluster with 2,673 nodes.

After applying the Girvan-Newman algorithm (see Figure 2), we are able to show that in the network only 190 edges have to be eliminated to divide the graph into two components. The resulting community sizes that we have detected were 1,818 and 855. It can be seen that one of these components corresponds mostly to democrats (blue nodes) and the smaller one to republicans (red nodes).

3. Stochastic Block Model for community detection

A generally applicable algorithm to produce a model to generate networks with community (block) structure is called the Stochastic Block Model [31]. The model, based on statistical inference, describes the link formation as a process that takes places more often within than between communities. The community detection is viewed as a challenge of fitting the Stochastic Block Model to a network in order to reveal a probability-based community structure. Based on this, through an integrated optimisation process a suitable Stochastic Block Model candidate is selected. The flexibility of the Stochastic Block Model means that there exist a variety of approaches for applying and configuring it [27]. Besides the flexibility, another advantage is the computational complexity in $O(N \ln N)$ [27], and therefore the speed of execution is fast compared to the Girvan-Newman algorithm. One drawback of this method, in comparison to the Girvan-Newman algorithm and the Hierarchical Clustering method, is that it is built on stochastic computation. Multiple runs of this method may yield different communities for the same network. It is also not guaranteed that the result is the optimal solution. Nonetheless, [27] assess the Stochastic Block Model as a strong candidate for community detection.

In our approach, we use an algorithm in the Python module graph-tool [32]. This function uses an agglomerative heuristic, the Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithm, for optimisation [33]. The core of the function is a one-dimension minimisation based on the golden section search. More details about the algorithm and its variants can be found in Refs. [13, 55, 56].

4. Hierarchical Clustering

The Hierarchical Clustering method is applied directly to the data set, thus without constructing a similarity network. The core of analysis is a distance matrix which contains every distance between the individuals. The distance projects the dissimilarity in their answers over all items. In an iterative process the Hierarchical Clustering merges individuals by clustering the most similar (lowest distance) together.

The comparison of the three community detection methods arises from the need to choose the ideal number of communities. One approach is to compute a measurement which takes the distances of the answers in each community, the Within Sum of Squares (WSS), into account. The WSS makes it possible to quantify the vari-
ability between individuals for a given community assignment. With it, we are able to compare the three methods and, additionally, decide which is the ideal number of communities.

C. Selecting relevant items

Selecting relevant items from large data sets is an important component of our method. Often, to reduce complexity and to include only relevant items, a selection step for the items must be made \emph{a priori}. Therefore, a tool for distinguishing between influential and noisy items would be beneficial to assess the item selection and moreover, rank them in relation to their influence on opinion-based group structure. By this means, for the item selection noisy items could be dropped and more essential items could be integrated. Running an analysis on a multitude of data sets, the influences of items for different data sets could be compared. Here we tackle this challenge by introducing a tool for item ranking.

The responses of the survey data constitutes a corresponding vector of opinions for every individual. The differences in their responses form our network structure and opinion-based groups. After the determination of polarisation and community assignment, we introduce a measurement to locate the relevant items for this particular community structure. Thus, every item is ranked by their meaningfulness.

The basic concept consists of randomly selecting an item from a data set, shuffling the responses and reallo-
FIG. 3: Item selection: Violin plot for the eight items from the ANES data set 2016. It shows the distribution of the average percentage change between the original WSS and the recalculated WSS, in the case of shuffling the items.

Following our example, we computed the item rank method to evaluate the items influence on the community assignments. We ran our method on the eight items from the ANES data set 2016 and simulated it 1000 times, by that, on average, each WSS-distance distribution is based on 125 shuffles of that item. It shows that the item Welfare (V161209) had the highest and the item Immigration (V161192) the lowest influence.

As a comparison for our item rank method we test it against two other methods of feature selection, the Random Forest classifier [35], and Boruta [36]. Random Forests are a substantial modification of the classification trees method that attains near state of the art performance for classification across a wide range of data sets [37]. A Random Forest model is formed from an ensemble of classification trees, where the trees are constructed so they are uncorrelated with each other. A new data point is classified in the model by checking the class that each of the classification trees gives and taking the majority vote of these. The Random Forest model also natively provides item importance measures that can be used to rank the importance of items to the opinion group classification. Please refer to Appendix B.1 for further details.

Boruta is another feature selection method that builds on the Random Forests classifier. It is noted for tackling the ‘all-relevant’ problem, where, as the names suggests, we seek to find all features that are relevant for the model’s ability to classify the opinion-based groups. Several studies have used it successfully as a feature selection tool in a wide range of areas from Fisheries’ management [38] to gene expression [39]. It is a wrapper for the Random Forest algorithm, where it uses a statistical test to identify items that are confirmed to be important, unimportant or undetermined. We are concerned with those items that are deemed to be important to the opinion-based groups under study here. Please refer to Appendix B.2 for further details.

The results of the feature selection for the eight items is shown in Table II. They are also used in the violin plot (see Figure 3) and represent here the average change in the WSS for every item. The second column (Random Forest) shows the values to assess the rank of each item. Evidently, it also ranks Welfare and Race relations as the two most important items but differs in the rest. The Boruta method defines 7 out of 8 items as important for the community split-up, and validates therefore the selected items for the community detection. Additionally, like the Random Forest method it ranks the item Gay marriage as the least important item, whereas the item rank method evaluates Immigration as the least important one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Item rank</th>
<th>Random Forest</th>
<th>Boruta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>V161209</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race relations</td>
<td>V161198</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>V161232</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun control</td>
<td>V161187</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>V161189</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay marriage</td>
<td>V161231</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>V161201</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>V161192</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Results for the feature selection by the item rank method, random forest classification and Boruta. The methods were applied on the selected features from the ANES data set 2016, and based on the community detection from the Girvan-Newman algorithm.

III. RESULTS

In this section, we validate the previously shown methods on synthetic data, expand the analysis to new data sets and discuss what to derive from this approach.

A. Data sets

1. Synthetic data sets

In this section we wish to establish how well our method is able to detect opinion-based groups (the communities) in comparison to Hierarchical Clustering and the Stochastic Block Model. We will use simulated survey data, where we specify the ground truth for who belongs to each opinion-based group. Additionally, by building in items that are stronger, weaker or uncorrelated predictors of group membership we can validate...
the item importance method against other the feature selection methods. This will provide sound footing for its performance against other methods when applying to real world data sets. To summarise, the application to synthetic data sets reveals, due to gradual variations of their parameter, the effectiveness of the presented approach. It shows the performance of the polarisation detection align with our determination (see Appendix D).

A data set is produced by a fixed amount of individuals, items and predefined groups. We assume that each group’s answers to each item is drawn from normal distribution. Group a is answering items with a mean of $\mu_a$ while group b is answering items with a mean of $\mu_b$. The standard deviation is the same for the sake of simplicity. Therefore, the $\mu$-distance is the difference between $\mu_a$ and $\mu_b$, defines how different the two groups are on that item (see Figure 4). Giving each item, essentially two parameters, $\mu$-distance and standard deviation, that we vary.

a. Community detection Based on simulation results, the heatmaps (Appendix D, Figure 11) show the mean percentage of correct allocated nodes from the network by the community detection algorithms. The synthetic data sets are constructed on artificial results from 100 individuals, with responses to 7 items on a scale from 1-7. The items are ranked in 4 different categories of influence, determined by an increasing standard deviation. The community structure is an equal division into two groups of size 50. The $\mu$-distance ranges from 0.6 to 6.0 with a step size of 0.3 (y-axis). The corresponding standard deviation ranges from 0.3 to 3.0 (x-axis).

The parameters are used to produce heatmaps, which captures the performance of each community detection algorithm on the simulated data. For every parameter combination, we generate 30 data sets to which we apply the community detection algorithms. In the heatmap, generated from a data matrix, every data point is the average percentage of overlap between the detected community and the predefined ground truth. The heatmaps delineate two regions. The dark blue region where the community detection works reliably. This is for a higher difference between the individuals’ responses of the two
distinct communities (higher \( \mu \)-distance) and for a low overlap due to an additional low standard deviation. The light blue regions arise through a large overlap between the item responses. A lower \( \mu \)-distance and a higher standard deviation leads to a larger overlap of the responses between the two components, where there is a high degree of variability of individuals answers for both group on the items. Later, when we are including noise items, the responses will be drawn from a uniform distribution with across both groups.

If we add additional items there is more information on the group structure, leading to an improved performance of the community detection algorithms. For the shown data set and those carried out (see Appendix D), the difference between our community detection algorithms is minor. A notable difference is only a lack of performance for the Hierarchical Clustering where the \( \mu \)-distance is between 1.2 and 3.3 and the standard deviation is 0.3.

b. Item rank Besides assessing the community detection methods, the item rank method can also be assessed by encoding information about how the items influence the community structure within the synthetic data sets. To generate the synthetic data set, items with different levels of information are included. In this way, we can split up into highly informative, less informative and uniformly distributed noise questions. Thus, we can connect the performance of the methods to the potential of the item rank method.

The bar chart (Figure 9), representing a cross-section of the heatmaps (see Appendix D), an equivalent performance of the community detection can be shown. The bar chart captures the proportion of successful community detection in comparison to the ground truth, the proportion of correctly detected importance of items, and also the performance of the Random Forest classification algorithm and the Boruta method for feature selection. By this, it shows what happens in the transition phase, when moving from a dark blue to a light blue region (see Appendix D heatmaps). The bar charts show as expected a similar number of correct allocations for the Girvan-Newman algorithm, Hierarchical Clustering and Stochastic Block Model. The number of completely correct ranked items by the item rank method is around 25 out of 30 for the simulations runs with a maximal \( \mu \)-distance between 3.3 and 6.0. Below 3.0, the proportion of detecting the correct ranking of the question is decreasing. The lack of predictive power of the Random Forest model is striking. It is only able to pick out the correct ranking in a small number of simulations, even when there is a clear community split. The data shows that it performs better in allocating correctly the higher ranked questions but worse in determining the overall ranking. For the same reason, the Boruta method does not determine the rankings accurately. However, it is effective at distinguishing between important and unimportant items.

Applying the approaches on synthetic data sets was beneficial for exploring and comparing the methods under artificial conditions to ensure their robustness in various scenarios. Nevertheless, synthetic data is no substitute for real-world empirical data sets. Furthermore, only by analysing real data sets, inferences can be made and results can be interpreted.

2. Wellcome Trust data

Here, we present a data set from the Wellcome Global Monitor 2018 which has not been previously studied to reveal opinion-based groups. The Wellcome Global Monitor conducted a survey in 2018 in order to collect a data set for over 140 countries with over 140,000 participants. The survey encompasses public attitudes to science and health. We select attitude-related items from the data set, 10 items deal with trust in organisations, institutions and science, and 3 display the individuals attitudes towards vaccines.

Within this data set, we apply our approach to each listed country to detect polarisation and, if applicable, relevant items for community structure. We refine and normalise the data to construct country-specific networks. The networks rely on a item threshold \( \theta \), chosen to be as high as possible but still capturing at least 80% of the country’s individuals. On the networks, we apply the Girvan-Newman algorithm to detect polarisation structure, and also the Hierarchical Clustering to confirm these results. Our approach detects in five countries polarisation on health and science attitudes: Singapore, Venezuela, Cameroon, Congo and Nicaragua (see Table III here: full Table).

The most outstanding result is Singapore. While choosing a threshold from over 11.5, regardless, over 5015 links were added to the network. This means that there are 5015 dyadic links where two individuals overlap in over 90% of there answers. Beyond that it was possible to separate the network into two communities by only erasing 12 edges. The Hierarchical Clustering gets to the same result as it has an overlap of over 98.5% in community allocation. In the other four countries polarisation is also shown for both community detection methods, with the exception of Cameroon where the overlap of the two method is only about 54%.

The examination through the item rank method reveals three items as the most important for the Girvan-Newman community detection: trust in charity workers,
FIG. 6: Relation between feature selection and community detection algorithms. Each bar represents the simulation results of 30 simulations with the same parameters, the $\mu$-distance is the item displayed on the x-axis. The lowest standard deviation is 0.7, but it increases for less important questions. The results are based on the communities from the Girvan-Newman algorithm. The bars show the performance of the item rank method, Random Forest classifier and Boruta (with Random Forest classifier). The bar reflects the correct ranking of the questions for the 30 per $\mu$-distance.

trust in traditional healers, trust in scientists. We showed how to analyse large data sets and examine the polarisation between opinion groups. For polarised countries, we are able to uncover and rank the important items for the community structure.


Polarisation is often seen as an intrasocietal process of moving toward the extremes on political attitudes, e.g., being further away from each others’ opinion on a scale. Our method identifies polarisation—even in the absence of extreme opinions—by classifying non-overlapping opinion-based groups.

In the previous section, the ANES data set from 2016 was examined with a item selection based on [25]. Here, we investigate additionally the ANES data set from 2012, to display a trend and to demonstrate an approach to consecutive data. Instead of relying on a predetermined selection, we apply the Boruta method to reveal the important items for our opinion-based groups. To apply Boruta to our data set, we reduced the amount of items from the ANES data set 2016 and 2012 to each 34 items based on relevance (see here: reduced item list), selecting those items obviously related to a personal, political attitude position. Further, we only included participants who self-identified as republicans or democrats as the Boruta method requires a ground truth for the item selection. The Boruta method filters out the important items to distinguish between the democrats and republicans in the data set (see Table IV). It shows the items that are at least picked in one out of two data sets as important.

After the normalisation process, the selection of the important items allows us to construct the score-based similarity networks for the ANES data 2012 and 2016. The question is whether the opinion-based clusters are getting more separated, and so easier to detect, or is the opinion-scored network closer together, and therefore it is more difficult to distinguish between communities.

The network for the ANES data set 2012 consists of 2,039 nodes and 31,619 links between them with a minimum threshold of 8.0 (see Figure 7). The two communities, detected by the Girvan-Newman algorithm, are unequally distributed and have a size of 2,493 and 546. The first community includes 1,004 democrats, 942 unknown and 547 republicans, whereas the second community only consists of 308 republicans, 167 unknown and 71 democrats.

Based on the ANES data set 2016, the network includes 2,274 participants and 27,326 links between them, generated with a threshold of 7.8 (see Figure 8). After the community detection by the Girvan-Newman algorithm, there is a split-up into a community with 596 republicans, 151 democrats and 424 unknown (total: 1171) and a second community with 612 democrats, 119 republicans and 372 unknown (total: 1103). For the revealing of the opinion-based groups considerably more edges had to be erased in 2012 in comparison to 2016 and the graph had to be re-split several times as it did not fulfil the minimum community size criterion.

The application of our opinion-based group detection leads to the conclusion that, based on the ten important items, the ANES data is getting more polarised over time (from 2012 to 2016). The ANES data set from 2016 can
TABLE IV: American National Election Studies 2012 and 2016 - Item labels and their answer range. The Boruta method selected the item as important in at least one of the data sets. Only the selected item Birthright Citizenship from 2016 is not mentioned due to the fact that there was no corresponding item in 2012. The table show the items that are used for the network projection method and later for the community detection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label 2012</th>
<th>Label 2016</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Boruta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>abortpre_4point</td>
<td>V161232</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment-Jobs</td>
<td>envjob_self</td>
<td>V161201</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2012/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race relations</td>
<td>aidblack_self</td>
<td>V161198</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2012/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>immig_policy</td>
<td>V161192</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>guarp_self</td>
<td>V161189</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2012/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death penalty</td>
<td>penalty_favopp</td>
<td>V161233x</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence-Spending</td>
<td>defsppr_self</td>
<td>V161181</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2012/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending and Services</td>
<td>spsrvpr_sself</td>
<td>V161178</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2012/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical insurance</td>
<td>inspre_self</td>
<td>V161184</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2012/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuality</td>
<td>gayrt_marry</td>
<td>V161227x</td>
<td>1-3/1-6</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 7: American National Election Survey data 2012, constructed similarity network from the refined data set, with 2 communities, detected by the Girvan-Newman algorithm. The position and shape of the nodes is used to distinguish between the communities. The colour of the nodes represents their party affiliation: republican (red), democrat (blue) and unknown (yellow).

be split up by erasing less cross-cutting edges than 2012, and the groups are visually easier to distinguish.

The results show what is already observed: survey participants become increasingly polarised along party lines on several key opinions in the ANES data set from 2012 and 2016. While the communities are formed around the party affiliation, with each community including a majority of either republicans or democrats, there are some people who self-report membership of each group despite having opinions more aligned with the other group.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this article, we created a network of individuals from a survey linked by similar responses. We use three different clustering algorithms and show that all are consistent with each other at identifying communities of opinion-based groups on both empirical and simulated data. Further to this, we develop a method to identify the rank and importance of the items in a survey. We, again, compare this to the Random Forest and Boruta method to validate it on simulated survey data. All methods can identify im-
FIG. 8: American National Election Studies data 2016, constructed similarity network from the refined data set, with 2 communities, detected by the Girvan-Newman algorithm. The Boruta method provides the item selection. The network projection uses 10 items from the data set. The position and shape of the nodes is used to distinguish between the communities. The colour of the nodes represents their party affiliation: republican (red), democrat (blue) and unknown (yellow).

Important items, but the method introduced here is more robust at ranking the survey items most important to the identified opinion-based groups. This allowed us to identify which items are most important to the opinion-based group that we found in the ANES and Wellcome Trust data. The exploration of our approach on simulated data also points out limitations for our methods (i.e., polarisation detection and item rank). They rely on the performance of the community detection algorithms and, therefore, on the detected communities’ meaningfulness.

Being able to identify opinion-based groups is important for understanding a wide range of social issues that can only be solved by the large-scale coordination of opinions (e.g., climate change; public health interventions; vaccination etc.). This is particularly important in understanding online social media interactions, which provide clear affordances for opinion exchange (e.g., via "likes" and "shares"). While identity has been shown to be central to social opinion processes (e.g., [41, 42]), until now it has been difficult to clearly identify links between bundles of opinions and social identities.

The value of this approach is demonstrated in Ref. [3] which shows opinion-based groups emerging at the start of the COVID crisis, progressively polarising on the dimension of distrust in science; and leading to identity-based differences in compliance with public health guidance. We presented a secondary analysis of Wellcome Trust data identifies countries like Singapore that are highly divided on trust in charity workers and science. Similarly, when we analysed the ANES 2012 and 2016 survey data, we identify items in the US that conservatives and liberals are becoming increasingly polarised on, a phenomenon widely observed in political and social sciences (see, e.g., [23]).

While we identify separate opinion-based groups here, we do not quantify the polarisation, which we aim to address in the future. Network measures to quantify polarisation exist, including using edge betweenness [30]. However, these methods all rely on identifying hubs to detect polarised groups. As we construct similarity-based networks, which are dense and weighted, our topology is different. We tend not to have hubs as every node in an opinion-based group will be linked to every other node in that group. In order to bring methods like this to bear we will need to modify them.

This method for detecting polarisation in opinion-based groups paves the way to investigate the co-constitutive relationship between attitudes and social identity and related phenomena using a network approach.
Appendix A: Community detection algorithms

1. Girvan-Newman algorithm

The community detection algorithm by [12] is a divisive approach which successively separates the network into communities. Contrary to other algorithms like Louvain (modularity optimisation method) [19], it is based on edge betweenness. In our case, we make use of the unweighted edge betweenness centrality in which the edge weights have no influence on the community detection. Using this measure to calculate the centrality of links, it intends to identify through it the community bridging links. It is based on the assumption that links between communities have a higher edge betweenness centrality, caused by their linking ability, given this, a high amount of shortest paths go through the links to connect nodes between the communities. The Girvan-Newman algorithm is structured as follows [12]:

1. The edge betweenness centrality ranks each link.
2. The link with the highest edge betweenness centrality is selected and removed from the graph.
3. All links which were influenced by the removal are selected and their edge betweenness is recalculated.
4. Step 2 and 3 are repeated until every link has been removed from the graph. In our case, we repeat the steps until we split the graph into two components and terminate the algorithm then.

The community detection algorithms are not only assessed due to their ability to select communities, but as well by their computational complexity [19]. The Girvan-Newman algorithm’s bottleneck is the repeated calculation of the edge betweenness centrality for every link in the network. Its algorithmic complexity is $O(m^2n)$, where the input involves $m$, the number of links, and $n$, the amount of nodes. This shows that the performance time is exponentially increasing in relation to the input. Due to the very input-sensitive behaviour, the computational costs limits the usage of this method to networks with a maximum of a couple of thousand nodes.

2. Hierarchical Clustering

The Hierarchical Clustering method is applied directly to the data set, thus without constructing a network. The core of analysis is a distance matrix which contains every distance between the individuals $i$ and $j$. There are various ways of calculating the distance between individuals. Here, we choose the euclidean distance:

$$d(i, j) = \sum_{f=1}^{n_f} (q_{i,f} - q_{j,f})^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

where $d(i, j)$ is the distance square distance between individuals (nodes) $i$ and $j$; and $n_f$ is the number of items and $q_{i,f}$ is individuals $i$’s response to item $f$. The distance between two individuals demonstrates the similarity in their answers over all their items. The calculation of distance and the distance matrix are the essential components for the application of the Hierarchical Clustering. The agglomerative character defines the starting point of the Hierarchical Clustering, each individual is defined as a single, separated cluster. The number of clusters is correspondingly as high as the number of individuals, $N$. From there, the algorithm works as follows:

1. Considering the distance matrix, select the pair of closest clusters (minimal distance).
2. Merge the clusters together and recalculate the distance matrix with the new cluster. The merging of the clusters follow the minimum variance criterion.
3. Step 1 and 2 are repeated until there is only a giant component left that contains all individuals.

Appendix B: Feature selection methods

1. Random Forest

The ethos of Random Forests is to build a series of Classification Trees using randomised data and items and then apply the majority vote of this ensemble of trees to classify data. The process to construct a Random Forest is as follows. For each tree, we draw a bootstrap sample, sampling with replacement. Any individuals that are not used to construct the tree are held as validation data (referred to as an “out-of-bag” sample). Using the bootstrapped sample, we grow a Classification Tree. This process is identical to normal Classification Tree except for one notable difference. At each split, we randomly select $p$ items from the total set of predictors. Using these $p$ variables, we then choose the best variable and split-point. The randomisation of the training set helps to avoid over-fitting. The randomisation of the predictors selected at each split ensures the trees are uncorrelated; otherwise powerful predictors would be likely to be selected, resulting in each tree in the ensemble providing the same information [19]. We repeat this process until we have grown the desired number $F$ of trees. Thanks to the randomisation of the data and predictors, we do not need to prune any of the trees that make up the forest, as would be the case for Classification Trees. The predicted probability for any class is the class’s proportion that each member of the forest voted for.

A valuable side-effect of randomly selected variables for each split in the ensemble of Classification Trees is that it gives us native access to variable importance measures [35] [44]. When a variable is used in a split, the decrease in the Gini node impurity is recorded. We can then rank
variables by the average of all the Gini impurity reductions, allowing us to observe which questions are most important in forming an opinion-based group. Care must be taken when interpreting variable importance scores [45]. Issue's can occur when many categorical variables are included with a diverse range in the number of levels. Impurity measures can favour those with many levels. This is not an issue for us as the number of levels in the categorical variables from any survey remains relatively small and similar to each other. It was noted in [16] that for continuous predictors that, although the most powerful predictor were not always given the highest importance, it ranked predictive variables amount the top on a ranking of variable importance. Additionally, we note similar in our simulation of synthetic survey data, where for categorical variables, the most powerful predictors were ranked highest. Also of note, though we obtain a rank for the importance of estimates we do not know where the cut off for where a item becomes unimportant occurs, of even if it does. The Boruta algorithm methods address this in the Sec. B.2.

2. Boruta

As mentioned in Sec. III, Boruta is a feature selection method where we are concerned with teasing out all relevant feature that are predictive, in our case, of the opinion groups that we have found. Boruta is a wrapper for the Random Forest model, that builds on the easy access to the variable importance measures. Providing a means of identify a point at which items become extraneous to the model. Please refer to [39] for a more extensive discussion of the algorithm’s implementation but well will provide the broads strokes here.

An iteration of Boruta is as follows: It begins by adding a copy of each item to the data set, where each of these are shuffled randomly. These randomised items are called shadow features. The shadow features hold no correlation with the classification that the random forest is trying to build and will provide the benchmark for when an item can be declared important. Variable important is calculated for each item (including shadow features). We note the shadow feature with the largest variable importance and compare all items importance to it. If a item has a variable importance larger than it, they are declared a 'hit', if not they are declared a 'miss'. This process is repeated multiple times so we get, for each items, the fraction of times it was at hit, $p_h$. To find when a item is important or not, we take this fraction, $p_h$, and perform a two tailed statistical test based on the binomial distribution.\(^2\) By default this significance level is set to 5%. For an item, if we fail to reject the null hypothesis, then the item’s importance is indistinguishable from that of the shadow features. As a results we can’t say if it is better or worse than the shadow features. If we can reject the null in favour of the alternative hypothesis, then the item’s importance is difference from that of the shadow features. Interpreting the sign test statistic yields weather the item is important or unimportant to the formation of the observed opinion based group. This processes provides a method of isolating which of features that are important to the formation of opinion based groups that we wish to study.

Appendix C: Example elbow plot

With the Within-cluster Sum of Squares (WSS), we can generate an elbow plot for the communities, determined by our community detection methods. An elbow plot displays the WSS in relation to the number of communities and gives information about the ideal number of communities in the data [28]. The ‘elbow’ in the plot indicates striking marks for the curve. Successively adding clusters to the data should reduce the total WSS. If the reduction is exceptionally high for an additional cluster, it gives the hint that this might be the ideal number of clusters for the data [29]. So that afterwards adding more clusters to the data just leads to comparatively small changes in the curve. It is generated for the three community detection algorithms: Hierarchical Clustering, Girvan-Newman Algorithm and Stochastic Block Model.

We generate an elbow plot for synthetic data and for the ANES data set 2016 as a real data application. The figures illustrate the development of the WSS for each community detection algorithm by raising the predefined number of communities from 1 to 10.

In Figure 9 all community detection algorithm behave the same and select similar network communities. The “elbow” marks at a number of two communities a sudden reduction of the WSS. Splitting the network into more communities only reduces the WSS slightly and we observe a linear curve.

The application on the ANES data set 2016 with the 8 variable selection draws a different picture (see Figure 10). The Hierarchical Clustering method, the Girvan-Newman algorithm and the Stochastic Block Model reduce the WSS by adding communities to the network and the curves' ranges stay close to each other. None of them reveal a clear hint for an ideal number of communities. This leads to the conclusion that the methods perform similar on the ANES 2016 data set but do not provide information about the ideal community split.
FIG. 9: Example of a successful elbow plot. We generated the plot for a synthetic data set that has two communities by definition. We apply the three community detection algorithms Hierarchical Clustering, Girvan-Newman algorithm and Stochastic Block Model and calculate for each number of community the WSS.

FIG. 10: Elbow plot for the ANES data set 2016 for three community detection algorithms: Hierarchical Clustering, Girvan-Newman algorithm and Stochastic Block Model

Appendix D: Method to create our synthetic data sets

The idea of generating a synthetic data set is to offer the possibility to adjust certain parameters and apply our method to them. For the method, you can define the following variables to run the method:

- \( n_{\text{agents}} \) = number of individuals in the data set
- \( n_{\text{items}} \) = number of questions of the created survey
- \( \text{scale}_{\text{steps}} \) = size of scale for every question. It will be the same for every \( n \) questions.
- \( \mu_{\text{max}} \) = maximal \( \mu \)-difference, which defines the highest difference available in the questions. The questions can have a smaller \( \mu \)-difference, if their ranking is lower.
- \( \text{number}_{\text{ranks}} \) = number of differently ranked questions in the data set
- \( n_{\text{comp}} \) = number of predefined communities in the data
- \( \text{sd} \) = lowest standard deviation for the highest ranked questions
- \( \text{split}_{\text{up}} \) = percentages to define the size of the community in relation to the overall number of the individuals.

The number of questions per ranking depends on the number of questions and on the number of ranks and is then normally distributed around an expected value to allow variation. The importance of the questions is set due to a higher or lower \( \mu \)-difference. The higher the importance of the question, the higher the \( \mu \)-difference. The \( \mu_{\text{max}} \) defines the \( \mu \)-difference for the questions with the highest ranking, all the other questions will have a lower \( \mu \)-difference or are noise questions. The method constructs a data set for the number of requested individuals and questions. It is structured like the data used in from the ANES 2016 but without missing data points, and therefore meets our requirements of replicating attitudinal survey data.

1. Simulations based on synthetic data

In order to examine the performance of the three community detection algorithms, we introduced the synthetic data set construction. Therefore, to explore the limits of each community detection algorithm for our approach, we simulate a large number data sets and run the algorithms on them. The results are also representative for different data sets.

The synthetic data sets are constructed on artificial results from 100 individuals, with answers to 6, 7, 8 or 9 questions on a scale from 1-7. The question are ranked in 4 different categories of influences, determined by an increasing mean. The community structure is an equal division into two groups of 50. The \( \mu \)-distance ranges from 0.6 to 6.0 with a step size of 0.3 (y-axis). The corresponding standard deviation ranges from 0.3 to 3.0 (x-axis).

The heatmaps in Figure 11, 12 and 13 indicate the mean percentage of correctly allocated individuals by the community detection algorithms. Each square of the heatmap represents a mean of 30 simulation runs. For example, the value of 1.0 reports that in 30 simulation runs the algorithm allocated all individuals to the correct community.

The results for the Girvan-Newman show the best performance for relatively high \( \mu \)-distance and a low standard deviation. With an increasing standard deviation and a decreasing \( \mu \)-distance, the algorithm is not capable of allocating correctly. The values around 0.5 means that
for example a random allocation algorithm would perform likewise. The results show a slight improvement for adding additional questions to foster the information about the community split-up (see Figure 11a-d, dark regions). Similar behaviour and results can be seen in the heatmaps for the hierarchical clustering and the stochastic block model (see Figure 12 and 13). However, it is striking that the hierarchical clustering method shows a lack of competitiveness, for a low $\mu$-distance (between 0.3 and 3.3) and a standard deviation of 0.3 or 0.6. For that parameter constellation, the results of the Girvan-Newman algorithm and the stochastic block are more convincing.

A consecutive step to the analysis of synthetic data and the determination of communities is the evaluation of the questions and their influence on the community structure. Within the synthetic data set, we determine the importance of the questions by their overlap of the answer distributions of distinct communities. A higher overlap means less information concerning the community structure. The question selection method is therefore able to rank the questions by their influence. Figure 14 shows a detail section of the heatmaps. The construction of the synthetic data sets is the same as in the heatmaps, solely the standard deviation is fixed to 0.7. The figure is separated into the results from the three community detection algorithms. Moreover, the ranking results of the question selection method, the Random forest method and the Boruta package are shown. The bars report the number of successful rankings of all 7 questions for 30 runs. The curve points out the frequency in which the community detection algorithm allocates all individuals of a simulation run correctly. The maximal possible count is 30 for each $\mu$-distance. Over all, it is noticeable that the curves of all three community detection algorithm represent the same dynamics, drawing parallels to the results of the heatmaps. Additionally, the ranking of the questions is related to the performance of the algorithm as it is based on their community allocation. Still the main message is about the outstanding results of the question selection method in relation to the Random forest and the Boruta method. For high $\mu$-distance (3.6-6), the question selection method classifies in more than 25 cases the ranking of the 7 questions correctly. The Random forest method generally does not exceeds 15. In the cases where the community detection does not work, 1.8 and below, the question selection method and Random forest hardly works. The results for ranking the questions in the case of the Boruta method show that it is not working. It has to be mentioned that the Boruta algorithm focuses on the determination of important and unimportant features or items, and not on the correct ranking of the questions. Nevertheless, the question selection method is able to uncover a high amount of information about the influence of each item. All in all, the question selection method performs very well, which may then justify the long time of execution. However, the Random forest method and the Boruta package are many times faster and therefore applicable on a much larger set of features.

Appendix E: Results for the ANES data set from 2012 and 2016

The analysis of the ANES data set from 2012 and 2016 was run for the Girvan-Newman algorithm, the hierarchical clustering and the stochastic block model. Only the networks for the Girvan-Newman algorithm were displayed in the main-section. In order to provide the reader with additional information and to be able to compare the network division of the three community detection algorithms, the networks are shown here.
FIG. 11: Heatmaps for the mean correct allocation of Girvan-Newman algorithm for synthetic data sets, based on 30 runs per parameter constellation. The four heatmaps only differ in the number of integrated items: a) 6, b) 7, c) 8, d) 9.
FIG. 12: Heatmaps for the mean correct allocation of hierarchical clustering for synthetic data sets, based on 30 runs per parameter constellation. The four heatmaps only differ in the number of integrated items: a) 6, b) 7, c) 8, d) 9.
FIG. 13: Heatmaps for the mean correct allocation of stochastic block model for synthetic data sets, based on 30 runs per parameter constellation. The four heatmaps only differ in the number of integrated items: a) 6, b) 7, c) 8, d) 9.
FIG. 14: Relation between feature selection and community detection algorithms. Each bar represents the simulation results of 30 simulations with the same parameters, the $\mu$-distance is the variable displayed on the x-axis. The lowest standard deviation is 0.7, but it increases for less important questions. The results are based on the communities from: a) Girvan-Newman algorithm, b) Hierarchical clustering and c) Stochastic block model. The bars show the performance of the questions selection method, Random forest classifier and Boruta (with Random forest classifier). The bar reflects the correct ranking of the questions for the 30 per $\mu$-distance.
FIG. 15: American National Election Study data 2016, constructed similarity network with 2 communities, detected by: a) Girvan-Newman algorithm, b) Hierarchical clustering, c) Stochastic block model. The position and shape of the nodes is used to distinguish between the communities. The colour of the nodes represents their party affiliation: republican (red), democrat (blue) and unknown (yellow).
FIG. 16: American National Election Survey data 2016, constructed similarity network with 2 communities, detected by: a) Girvan-Newman algorithm, b) Hierarchical clustering, c) Stochastic block model. The position and shape of the nodes is used to distinguish between the communities. The colour of the nodes represents their party affiliation: republican (red), democrat (blue) and unknown (yellow).