

# Coevolutionary Dynamics of Actions and Opinions in Social Networks

Hassan Dehghani Aghbolagh, Mengbin Ye, Lorenzo Zino, Ming Cao, and Zhiyong Chen

**Abstract**—Modeling opinion formation and decision-making processes, important in their own rights, have been treated as separate problems in the study of dynamical models for social networks. Empirical studies suggest a deep intertwining between these two processes, and in this paper, we bridge the gap in the existing research by proposing a novel coevolutionary model. In the model, each individual can select an action from a binary set, and also holds an opinion on which action they prefer. Actions and opinions coevolve on a two-layer network structure. Under some reasonable assumptions on the network structure and asynchronous updating mechanics, we use rigorous analysis to establish that for all initial conditions, the actions converge in a finite number of time steps while opinions converge asymptotically. Next, we provide sufficient conditions for the emergence and the stability of polarized equilibria, whereby the population splits into two communities, each selecting and supporting one of the actions. Finally, numerical simulations are used to examine “pluralistic ignorance”, whereby a social group incorrectly assumes the opinions of others due to the actions observed.

**Index Terms**—dynamics on networks, opinion dynamics, decision making, evolutionary game theory, polarization

## I. INTRODUCTION

THROUGHOUT the past decades, researchers in different fields have studied different complex dynamical processes in social networks, such as opinion formation and collective decision making [1]–[5]. A central approach is the development and analysis of mathematical models for social dynamics, which have helped to understand and predict how individual interactions can lead to complex collective behavior emerging in the wider social network [4], [6]–[9].

The field of opinion dynamics studies models of the formation and evolution of opinions in groups of individuals, with roots in the 1950s. In the seminal French model [10], the temporal evolution of the opinions of individuals under

social influence is captured by a weighted averaging procedure. Under mild network connectivity assumptions, individuals eventually agree on a common opinion; that is, they reach a consensus [10], [11]. Several generalizations of this model have been proposed. We mention the work by Friedkin and Johnsen [12], which posits that an individual’s existing prejudices can lead to persistent disagreement, and the model has been extended and validated experimentally [3], [13]. The Altafini model [14] considers the presence of antagonistic interactions and may yield *bipartite consensus*, where individuals are polarized into two camps with opposing opinions [14]–[17]. Interested readers may refer to [1], [18], [19] for a review of different opinion dynamic models and their analysis.

On another research front, the study of collective decision-making in networks of interacting agents has gained popularity in the past few decades. In particular, the use of evolutionary game theory has allowed researchers to develop and study realistic mathematical models that describe and predict how an individual decides on which action to take (e.g., a product to buy, or a social convention to adopt), choosing from a finite set of possibilities (often binary choices), and how these decisions are revised after interacting with other decision-making individuals [2], [9], [20], [21]. The study of these models, in particular those based on the paradigm of coordination games on networks and its extensions [20], has allowed to shed light on the emergent behavior of complex social system, including the evolution of social norms and conventions, and nontrivial interactions between heterogeneous types of agents [8], [22], and has paved the way for the design of intervention policies to control the network [23].

Results from the social psychology literature, including empirical evidence, indicate a strong relationship between the opinions held and decisions taken by individuals. These studies suggest that, within a social community, the exchange of opinions can affect individuals’ actions, while the way people form opinions can be influenced by observing what other people do. For instance, it is shown in [24] that teachers decide to revise content delivery methods after forming the opinions about which method is more effective [25]. In another example, [26] showed that policymakers shifted their attitudes about work-oriented reforms when they observed the impact of these actions in other regions [25]. Readers may refer to [27]–[29] for more examples along these lines.

Despite evidence of this complex intertwining between decision making and opinion formation, to the best of our knowledge, there is a lack of a proper mathematical framework

H. D. Aghbolagh and Z. Chen are with the School of Engineering, University of Newcastle, Callaghan, 2308, NSW, Australia. Emails: hassan.dehghaniaghbolagh@newcastle.edu.au, zhiyong.chen@newcastle.edu.au. M. Ye is with the School of Electrical Engineering, Computing and Mathematical Sciences, Curtin University, Bentley 6102, WA, Australia. Email: mengbin.ye@curtin.edu.au. L. Zino and M. Cao are with the Faculty of Science and Engineering, ENTEG, University of Groningen, Groningen 9747 AG, Netherlands. Emails: {lorenzo.zino, m.cao}@rug.nl The work of H.D. Aghbolagh is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship; the work of M. Ye by the Western Australian Government under the Premier’s Science Fellowship Program; the work of L. Zino and M. Cao by the European Research Council (ERC-CoG-771687).

for capturing the dynamic coevolution of individuals' opinions and actions in social networks. Recently, models were proposed to consider coevolution of private and expressed opinions [30], [31], but no decision-making process is present in these works. On the other hand, [32] proposes a decision-making process influenced by individuals' opinions, which are however assumed to be time-invariant. Some preliminary efforts to model the coevolution of individuals' actions and opinions can be found in [33]. However, the complexity of the framework proposed in [33] hinders its analytical tractability, mostly limiting its findings to numerical simulations; a rigorous convergence result can only be established in the limit case where the opinion formation process is not affected by the decision-making process [34].

As the first key contribution of this paper, we build on the previous works in [33], [34] and propose a novel coevolutionary model in which individuals make decisions and revise their opinions by interacting on a two-layer network, whereby they observe others' actions on an influence layer and communicate their opinions on a communication layer. The proposed framework is formalized within a game-theoretic paradigm. Specifically, individuals simultaneously update their opinion and action, aiming to maximize a payoff function that consists of four terms, accounting for i) the individuals' tendency to coordinate with others' actions observed on the influence layer; ii) the opinion formation and exchange on the communication layer, iii) the (possible) presence of individuals' existing prejudices, and iv) the individuals' tendency to act consistently with their opinion, respectively. Within this framework, individuals' decision making and opinion formation processes are inherently intertwined in a nontrivial fashion, capturing the complex social psychological evidence described in the above. Our model unifies the fields of opinion dynamics and collective decision making, by encompassing and generalizing the French-DeGroot [10], [11] and the Friedkin-Johnsen [3], [12] opinion dynamics models, and coordination games on networks [9], [20]–[22]; these classical models are obtained with specific choices of the payoff function parameters.

As the second key contribution, we perform a rigorous analysis of the proposed coevolutionary model. Under reasonable assumptions on the network structure and the model parameters, we prove that the game defining the model is a generalized ordinal potential game [35]. Exploiting the corresponding potential function, we provide a comprehensive characterization of the long-term behavior of the coevolutionary dynamics. In particular, we prove that individuals' actions converge in finite time, while opinions converge asymptotically. Our general convergence result significantly advances the limited theoretical analysis in the literature, that only considered the special scenario in which a full intertwining of the action and opinion mechanisms was not present [33], [34].

As our final contribution, we use the coevolutionary model to explore two real-world phenomena. In particular, we investigate *polarization* and *pluralistic ignorance*. Building on our general convergence result, we derive sufficient conditions for the existence and the stability of polarized equilibria, in which the network is divided into two groups supporting

and taking opposite actions. Interestingly, polarization — which is often observed in real-world social networks [36], [37]— is a stable phenomenon in our model without requiring the presence of antagonistic interactions or strongly biased assimilation (as in [14]–[16], [38], [39]), which are not always realistic assumptions [40]. Then, numerical simulations are employed to explore the social psychological phenomenon of pluralistic ignorance, which arises when some individuals in a community hold an incorrect assumption about the thoughts, feelings, and/or behaviors of others in the population [41]. Via simulations, we show that our model is capable of qualitatively reproducing the classical empirical findings in [42].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Preliminaries including graph theory and game theory are introduced in Section II. Then, the coevolutionary model is presented in Section III, for which convergence results are provided in Section IV. Section V is devoted to the analysis of polarization and pluralistic ignorance phenomena. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Notation

We denote the set of real, nonnegative real, and nonnegative integer numbers as  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , and  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ , respectively. A vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is denoted with bold lowercase fonts, with  $i$ th entry  $x_i$ . A matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is denoted with bold capital fonts, where  $a_{ij}$  denotes the generic  $j$ th entry of the  $i$ th row. The column vector of all ones is denoted by  $\mathbf{1}$  and the identity matrix is  $\mathbf{I}$ , with the appropriate dimension determined in the context. Given a vector  $\mathbf{x}$  or a matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}^\top$  and  $\mathbf{A}^\top$  are the transpose vector and matrix, respectively. Given a scalar quantity  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , the function  $\text{sgn}(x)$  denotes its sign, with  $\text{sgn}(0) = 0$ .

### B. Graph Theory

A (weighted) directed network is defined as a triple  $\mathcal{G}_A = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_A, \mathbf{A})$ , where  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$  is the *node set*, indexed by positive integer numbers;  $\mathcal{E}_A \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  is the *edge set*, where  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_A$  if and only if there is a link from node  $i$  to node  $j$ ; and  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$  is the *weight matrix*, so that its generic entry  $a_{ij} > 0 \iff (i, j) \in \mathcal{V}$ . The edge  $(i, i) \in \mathcal{E}_A$  represents a *self-loop*. A network is undirected iff  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^\top$ . We say that a weight matrix is *row-stochastic* (*column-stochastic*) if its rows (columns) sum to 1, that is, if  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$  ( $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{1}^\top$ ). Weight matrices that are both row- and column-stochastic are said to be *doubly-stochastic*.

Given a network  $\mathcal{G}_A = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_A, \mathbf{A})$  and a node  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , we define the neighbors of node  $i$  as the set  $\mathcal{N}_i^A := \{j : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_A\}$ . Given a pair of nodes  $i$  and  $j$ , we say that  $i$  is connected with  $j$  if there exists a sequence of edges  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  such that  $e_h \in \mathcal{E}_A$ , for all  $h = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $e_1 = (i, p)$ , and  $e_k = (q, j)$ , for some  $p, q \in \mathcal{V}$ . We say that a network is (strongly) *connected* if and only if  $i$  is connected with  $j$ , for every pair of distinct nodes  $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{G}_A$  is strongly connected if and only if  $\mathbf{A}$  is an irreducible matrix [43].

Given two networks  $\mathcal{G}_A$  and  $\mathcal{G}_W$  with the same node set  $\mathcal{V}$ , we define a *two-layer network* as  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_A, \mathbf{A}, \mathcal{E}_W, \mathbf{W})$ , where the edge set and weight matrix of each original network




Fig. 1: The two-layer network structure utilized in the co-evolutionary model.

form a layer of the two-layer network [44]. In general,  $\mathcal{E}_A \neq \mathcal{E}_W$  and thus the two layers have different edges. We say that the two-layer network is connected if and only if both layers are separately connected. An example of a two-layer network is illustrated in Fig. 1.

### C. Game Theory

A game  $\Gamma = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{f})$  is defined by a set of players  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ ; a set of strategies  $\mathcal{A}$  that the players can choose, where a strategy  $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$  can be, in general, a scalar or a vector<sup>1</sup>; and a payoff vector,  $\mathbf{f} = [f_1, \dots, f_n]^\top$ , where  $f_i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the *payoff function* of player  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ . Let  $z_i \in \mathcal{A}$  represent the strategy of individual  $i$ ; then, the state variable of the game  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$  can be defined by gathering the strategies of the  $n$  individuals into a single vector (or matrix if strategies are vectors). The payoff function  $f_i(\zeta, \mathbf{z})$  determines the payoff that individual  $i$  receives for choosing strategy  $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$ , given the state of the system is  $\mathbf{z}$ . In the following, we will provide the definition of a generalized ordinal potential game [35], which will be used in the rest of this paper.

*Definition 1:* A game  $\Gamma = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{f})$  is called a *generalized ordinal potential game* if there exist a potential function  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for any pair of states  $\mathbf{z}$  and  $\mathbf{z}'$  that differs in a single component  $z_i \neq z'_i$  (i.e., the state of a single player), then, for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , the following holds:

$$f_i(z_i, \mathbf{z}) - f_i(z'_i, \mathbf{z}) > 0 \implies \Phi(\mathbf{z}) - \Phi(\mathbf{z}') > 0 \quad (1)$$

Notice that in some game-theoretic literature, when referring to changes in the potential due to updates in the state of a player  $i$ , the potential function is written as a function of two arguments, that is,  $z_i$  and a vector containing all the other entries of the state  $\mathbf{z}$ . For the sake of readability, we decided to adopt a simpler notation.

Finally, suppose that at each time step  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , individual  $i$  has the opportunity to revise their state. In this paper, we will consider individuals using a well-known concept in game theory known as best-response updating to revise their state. Formally, we can define the set of best responses as follows.

*Definition 2:* Given a game  $\Gamma = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{f})$ , the *best response strategies* for player  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  given the state of the system

$\mathbf{x}$  are defined as

$$\mathcal{B}_i(f_i(\cdot, \mathbf{z})) := \operatorname{argmax}_{\zeta \in \mathcal{A}} f_i(\zeta, \mathbf{z}). \quad (2)$$

Note that, in general, the best response is not unique, and multiple strategies might be contained in the set  $\mathcal{B}_i(f_i(\cdot, \mathbf{z}))$ .

## III. COEVOLUTIONARY MODEL

In this section, we will propose the coevolutionary model, casting it as a best-response dynamics in a game-theoretic framework.

### A. Setting

In this paper, we consider a population of  $n \geq 2$  interacting individuals, each assigned a two-dimensional state variable (or strategy)  $\mathbf{z}_i(t) = (x_i(t), y_i(t)) \in \mathcal{A} = \{-1, 1\} \times [-1, 1]$ , representing individual  $i$ 's *action* and *opinion*, respectively, at discrete-time instants  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Individual  $i$ 's action at time  $t$ ,  $x_i(t)$ , represents their choice on two alternative actions of  $-1$  and  $+1$ , while the opinion  $y_i(t) \in [-1, 1]$ , represents individual  $i$ 's attitude orientation towards the two actions. Actions are gathered in the *action vector*  $\mathbf{x}(t) = [x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t)]^\top \in \{-1, +1\}^n$ , while opinions are gathered in the *opinion vector*  $\mathbf{y}(t) = [y_1(t), \dots, y_n(t)]^\top \in [-1, 1]^n$ . These two vectors determine the *state of the system*, which can be written by gathering them in an  $n$ -by-2 matrix  $\mathbf{z}(t) = [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = [z_1(t)^\top, \dots, z_n(t)^\top]^\top$ .

We propose an example to clarify the concepts of action and opinion, although the model has a broad range of applications. In the context of spelling conventions in the English language,  $x_i(t) = +1$  and  $x_i(t) = -1$  may represent individual  $i$  using the spelling “center” and “centre”, respectively [45]. Then,  $y_i(t)$  represents individual  $i$ 's attitude, with a positive and negative  $y_i(t)$  representing individual  $i$  preferring “center” and “centre”, respectively; the magnitude of  $y_i(t)$  indicates the strength of preference. If  $y_i(t) = 0$ , then individual  $i$  is neutral to both options.

We consider a setting in which individuals interact on a two-layer network  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_A, \mathbf{A}, \mathcal{E}_W, \mathbf{W})$ , which we assume to be connected, and in which the two nonnegative weight matrices are row-stochastic. That is,  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$ . Specifically, individuals are able to observe actions through an *influence layer*  $\mathcal{G}_A = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_A, \mathbf{A})$  and share opinions across a *communication layer*  $\mathcal{G}_W = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_W, \mathbf{W})$ , and the individuals' actions and opinions evolve mutually through the interactions on  $\mathcal{G}_A$  and  $\mathcal{G}_W$ , as illustrated in Fig. 1. We will present the action and opinion evolutionary dynamics using a game-theoretic framework, and show that the dynamics are consistent with classical models of opinion dynamics and collective decision-making. We start by presenting the payoff function.

### B. Payoff Function

Given state  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , we propose the following payoff function  $f_i(\zeta, \mathbf{z})$  for individual  $i$  for selecting strategy  $\zeta =$

<sup>1</sup>A more general formulation, which is beyond the scope of this paper, may consider scenarios in which the strategy set can vary between players.




Fig. 2: Schematic of the co-evolutionary model

$(\zeta_a, \zeta_o)$ , with action  $\zeta_a \in \{-1, +1\}$  and opinion  $\zeta_o \in [-1, 1]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_i(\zeta, z) = & \frac{\lambda_i(1-\beta_i)}{4} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij} \left[ (1-x_j)(1-\zeta_a) \right. \\
 & \left. + (1+\alpha)(1+x_j)(1+\zeta_a) \right] \\
 & - \frac{1}{2} \beta_i(1-\lambda_i)(1-\gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij} (\zeta_o - y_j)^2 \\
 & - \frac{1}{2} \beta_i(1-\lambda_i)\gamma_i(\zeta_o - u_i)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_i \beta_i (\zeta_a - \zeta_o)^2. \quad (3)
 \end{aligned}$$

The payoff function is made of four terms, as illustrated in Fig. 2. The first term rewards individuals to conform their action with the one observed on the influence layer. The second term leads individuals to near their opinions with the ones of their neighbors on the communication layer. The third anchors individuals to their prejudices. The fourth yields individuals to make decisions consistent with their opinions and vice versa. These terms are weighted by a set of model parameters;  $\beta_i \in [0, 1]$  and  $\lambda_i \in [0, 1]$  represent the contribution of the opinion dynamics and collective decision-making in determining individual  $i$ 's payoff for having action  $\zeta_a$  and opinion  $\zeta_o$ . The weights  $a_{ij}$  and  $w_{ij}$  correspond to entries in the weight matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$ . The parameter  $\gamma_i \in [0, 1]$  represents individual  $i$ 's attachment to an existing prejudice or external influence source, denoted by  $u_i \in [-1, 1]$ . Finally, the parameter  $\alpha$  captures a possible payoff superiority of one action with respect to the other, termed *advantage* [9]. Without any loss in generality, if one action offers a payoff advantage with respect to the other, the action is identified as “+1” in the set  $\mathcal{A}$ , which implies that  $\alpha \geq 0$ . In the sequel, we clarify why  $\beta_i$  and  $\lambda_i$  represent said contributions, and explain the parameters in more detail, but first, we further explore the payoff function  $f_i$  and how it is used to define the coevolutionary model dynamics. For notational convenience, we will sometimes omit explicitly writing the state of the system  $z = (x, y)$  when there is no risk of confusion, and thus we use  $f_i(\zeta)$  to denote  $f_i(\zeta, z)$ .

Before presenting the update rule of the coevolutionary dynamics, we will present a result on the maximizers of the payoff function in Eq. (3), which allows us to characterize the best-response strategies of the coevolutionary game  $\Gamma$ . Given a state of the system  $z$  and an individual  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , let us define

the quantity  $\delta_i(z)$  as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_i(z) = & 2\lambda_i\beta_i(1-\lambda_i) \left[ (1-\gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j + \gamma_i u_i \right] \\
 & + \frac{(1-\beta_i)\lambda_i}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij} \left[ 2x_j + \alpha(1+x_j) \right]. \quad (4)
 \end{aligned}$$

The following two results characterize the best response strategies for the payoff function in Eq. (3). For the sake of readability, the proofs are reported in Appendix A.

*Proposition 1:* For the coevolutionary game  $\Gamma = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{f})$  on the two-layer network  $\mathcal{G}$ , with the  $i$ th entry of  $\mathbf{f}$  defined in Eq. (3), and the function  $\delta_i(z)$  defined in Eq. (4), consider a player  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ . Suppose also  $\lambda_i \in [0, 1]$  and  $\beta_i \in (0, 1]$ . If  $\delta_i(z) \neq 0$ , then the best-response strategy  $\mathcal{B}_i(f_i(\cdot, z(t))) = (\zeta_a, \zeta_o)$ , with

$$\zeta_a = \text{sgn}(\delta_i) \quad (5a)$$

$$\zeta_o = (1-\lambda_i) \left[ (1-\gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j + \gamma_i u_i \right] + \lambda_i \text{sgn}(\delta_i) \quad (5b)$$

If  $\delta_i(z) = 0$ , then  $\mathcal{B}_i(f_i(\cdot, z(t))) = \{(+1, \zeta_o), (-1, \bar{\zeta}_o)\}$ , with

$$\zeta_o = (1-\lambda_i) \left[ (1-\gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j + \gamma_i u_i \right] + \lambda_i \quad (6a)$$

$$\bar{\zeta}_o = (1-\lambda_i) \left[ (1-\gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j + \gamma_i u_i \right] - \lambda_i. \quad (6b)$$

The limit case of  $\beta_i = 0$  is given in the following corollary.

*Corollary 1:* Let  $\beta_i = 0$  and i)  $\delta_i \neq 0$ , then  $\mathcal{B}_i(f_i(\cdot, z(t))) = \{(\text{sgn}(\delta_i), \zeta_o), \zeta_o \in [-1, +1]\}$ ; or ii)  $\delta_i = 0$ , then  $\mathcal{B}_i(f_i(\cdot, z(t))) = \mathcal{A}$ .

*Remark 1:* In general, the best-response strategy might not be unique. In particular, we observe that, for  $\beta_i \neq 0$ , the payoff function  $f_i$  has always a unique best-response, unless for  $\delta_i = 0$ , in which case there are two responses that provide the same payoff: one with positive action  $\zeta_a = +1$  and one with negative action  $\zeta_a = -1$ . In the limit case  $\beta_i = 0$ , opinions do not influence the payoff. Hence, every  $\zeta_o \in [-1, 1]$  provides the same payoff. In this case, the payoff function  $f_i$  has always infinite best-responses, as characterized in Corollary 1.

### C. Dynamics

We are now in position to define the update dynamics for the individuals' actions and opinions. We consider an asynchronous rule. Specifically, at each discrete time instant  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , a single<sup>2</sup> individual  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  becomes active and updates their opinion and action simultaneously. In the next section when we present the main convergence result of this paper, we provide an explicit assumption on how individuals are selected to activate at each time step. However, our model is general to allow convergence analysis of  $z(t)$  under different assumptions on agent activation sequences, and so no explicit assumption is imposed in this section, where we simply focus on presentation of the individual dynamics.

<sup>2</sup>Our model can be readily extended to consider a non-singleton set of individuals activating at each time instant, or all individuals (corresponding to synchronous updating among the population).

**TABLE I:** Relation of the co-evolutionary model to classical models of opinion dynamics and decision-making.

$\lambda_i$	$\beta_i$	$f_i(\zeta, z)$	Model
0	1	$-\frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma_i)\sum_{j\in\mathcal{V}}w_{ij}(\zeta_o-y_j)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_i(\zeta_o-u_i)^2$	Friedkin-Johnsen opinion dynamics [12]
1	0	$\frac{1}{4}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{V}}a_{ij}\left[(1-x_j)(1-\zeta_a) + (1+\alpha)(1+x_j)(1+\zeta_a)\right]$	Coordination games on networks [9], [20]–[22]
1	1	$-\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_a-\zeta_o)^2$	Self-centered agents

If individual  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  becomes active at time  $t$ , then they revises their state  $z_i(t)$  according to a best-response update, that is,

$$z_i(t+1) \in \mathcal{B}_i(f_i(\cdot, z(t))) \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is the best response strategies defined in Eq. (2) and  $f_i$  is the payoff in Eq. (3). As we have observed in Remark 1, in general, the best response might not be unique, and in such scenarios, we should select a tie-break rule to unequivocally determine the system evolution. Proposition 1 and Corollary 1 give explicit expressions for the best response strategies for the payoff function  $f_i$ , which allows us to write explicit expressions for Eq. (7), and resolve ties (which occur if  $\delta_i = 0$ , or  $\lambda_i = 0$ , or  $\beta_i = 0$ , or  $\lambda_i = \beta_i = 1$ ).

In particular, we make explicit the best-response update rule of the coevolutionary dynamics as follows. For active individual  $i$  with  $\beta_i \in (0, 1]$ , the state is updated as

$$x_i(t+1) = \mathcal{S}(\delta_i(z(t))) \quad (8)$$

$$y_i(t+1) = (1-\lambda_i)\left[(1-\gamma_i)\sum_{j\in\mathcal{V}}w_{ij}y_j(t) + \gamma_i u_i\right] + \lambda_i \mathcal{S}(\delta_i) \quad (9)$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}(\delta_i(z(t))) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } \delta_i(z(t)) > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } \delta_i(z(t)) < 0 \\ x_i(t) & \text{if } \delta_i(z(t)) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The above update rule resolves the tie in which both actions  $-1$  and  $+1$  give the same payoff. Specifically, we have adopted a conservative method for resolving ties, enforcing an agent to stick with the current action when both possible actions give equal reward, consistent with the social psychology literature on the presence of inertia in decision-making and status-quo bias [46]. Finally, if  $\beta_i = 0$ , following a similar approach, we set that  $y_i(t+1) = y_i(t)$ , which translates to  $y_i(t) = y_i(0)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , while  $x_i(t+1)$  is given in Eq. (8).

To summarize, the proposed coevolutionary model is formulated as a best-response dynamics for the *coevolutionary game*  $\Gamma = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{f})$  on a two-layer network  $\mathcal{G}$ , with a two-dimensional set of strategies  $\mathcal{A} = \{-1, +1\} \times [-1, +1]$ , and the payoff vector is defined with its  $i$ th entry in Eq. (3).

#### D. Motivation of The Coevolutionary Framework

To conclude the presentation of the coevolutionary framework, we elaborate on its features and show how it extends and unifies models from the fields of opinion dynamics [1], [3], [12] and collective decision-making [9], [20]–[22]. To begin, notice that by setting  $\lambda_i = 0$  and  $\beta_i = 1$ , the best-response update in Eq. (7) (expressed explicitly in Eq. (9)) is the seminal

Friedkin–Johnsen opinion dynamics model [3], [12], where  $1-\gamma_i$  is individual  $i$ 's susceptibility to interpersonal influence, and  $u_i$  is an existing prejudice (often assumed to be  $u_i = y_i(0)$ ). In such a scenario, individual  $i$ 's opinion at the next time-step,  $y_i(t+1)$  is a weighted average (convex combination) of prejudice  $u_i$  and the opinions of their neighbors at the current time-step,  $y_j(t), j \in \mathcal{N}_i^W$ . On the other hand, for  $\beta_i = 0$  and  $\lambda_i = 1$ , the best-response in Eq. (7) (expressed in Eq. (8) and thus with  $\delta_i$  comprising of only the second term on the right-hand-side of Eq. (4)) yields the classical decision-making dynamics captured by coordination games on networks [20], [22]. Then, individual  $i$ 's action at the next time step  $x_i(t+1)$  aims to coordinate with the most popular action among  $i$ 's neighbors, adjusted if there is an advantage  $\alpha > 0$ , which often represents an innovation [9], [21]. This is summarized in Table I.

The term  $\frac{1}{2}\lambda_i\beta_i(\zeta_a - \zeta_o)^2$  in Eq. (3) forms the coupling mechanism, and thus  $\lambda_i$  and  $\beta_i$  capture the strength of the decision-making and opinion dynamics processes, respectively, in shaping individual  $i$ 's coevolutionary dynamics. Notice that when  $\lambda_i = \beta_i = 1$ , individual  $i$  is totally self-centered and closed to influence from other individuals; their opinion is precisely aligned with their action and both states remain stationary for all time. When  $\lambda_i \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta_i \in (0, 1)$ , individual  $i$ 's action influences their opinion formation process and  $i$ 's opinion influences their decision-making. To see this, notice that  $x_i(t+1)$  appears in Eq. (9) via the term  $\mathcal{S}(\delta_i(z(t)))$ , while  $y_i(t+1)$  appears in Eq. (8) via the term  $\delta_i$  after rearranging Eq. (9) and substituting into Eq. (4). This also means that the action and opinion evolution of individual  $i$  are shaped by the opinions and actions of their neighbors, respectively.

There is strong evidence from the social psychology literature that an individual's actions, and those of their neighbors, can influence the individual's opinion or attitude. Similarly, an individual's opinion, and those of their neighbors, can play a key role in shaping their decision-making. Surprisingly, few efforts have explored this coupling via mathematical models except our two related works [33], [34] which explored a variant of the proposed model. This paper extends and consolidates the coevolutionary framework, which is illustrated in the schematic in Fig. 2. Using simulations, [33] examined the emergence of different collective population phenomena, including the persistence of unpopular norms (in which the majority of the population adopt an action that is the opposite of their opinion preference), and the diffusion of a social innovation. Convergence for a restrictive special case of the model was considered in [34]. In this paper, besides establishing a more comprehensive and general convergence result, we investigate other collective population phenomena arising

from the coevolutionary framework, namely polarization and pluralistic ignorance.

#### IV. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section, we establish a general convergence result for the proposed coevolutionary dynamics, which is one of the main theoretical contributions of this work. To keep the exposition clear, the proofs for each theorem, lemma or corollary are presented in the Appendix.

In Section III, we presented our coevolutionary model in a game-theoretic framework, casting the update mechanism as a best-response dynamics to the payoff function Eq. (3). Our convergence analysis is thus inspired by game-theoretic methods, in particular the theory of potential games [35]. To begin, we introduce the following function and establish two associated technical results that prove the function is in fact a potential function for the coevolutionary game:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathbf{z}) = & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} \eta_i \frac{a_{ij}}{2} \left[ (1 + \alpha)(1 + x_j)(1 + x_i) \right. \\ & \left. + (1 - x_i)(1 - x_j) \right] \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{w_{ij}}{2} (y_i - y_j)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_i)} (y_k - u_k)^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\lambda_i}{(1 - \lambda_i)(1 - \gamma_i)} (y_k - x_k)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $\eta_i = \lambda_i(1 - \beta_i)/4\beta_i(1 - \lambda_i)(1 - \gamma_i)$ .

The following lemma, whose proof is reported in Appendix B, connects the potential function to the payoff function in Eq. (3) under an assumption on the parameters.

*Assumption 1:* Suppose that all the parameters are homogeneous, i.e.,  $\lambda_i = \lambda \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\gamma_i = \gamma \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\beta_i = \beta \in (0, 1)$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ . Suppose further that the two layers are undirected, that is,  $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}^\top$ , and  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^\top$ , and that each individual has a self-loop on the influence layer, that is,  $a_{ii} > 0$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ .

*Lemma 1:* Under Assumption 1, the coevolutionary game  $\Gamma = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{f})$  on the two-layer network  $\mathcal{G}$  is a generalized ordinal potential game with potential function  $\Phi$ , defined in Eq. (11).

Next, we provide an explicit lower bound on the increase in the potential function if an agent that activates changes action according to the coevolutionary dynamics in Eqs. (8) and (9). Its proof is reported in Appendix B

*Corollary 2:* Consider the coevolutionary model on the two-layer network  $\mathcal{G}$  in which individuals update their actions and opinions according to Eq. (8) and Eq. (9), respectively. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. If agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  is active at time  $t$ , and  $x_i(t) \neq x_i(t+1)$ , then

$$\Phi(\mathbf{z}(t+1)) - \Phi(\mathbf{z}(t)) > \min_{k \in \mathcal{V}} \xi \lambda (1 - \beta) a_{kk} > 0 \quad (12)$$

where  $\xi = [\beta(1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma)]^{-1} > 0$ .

In Section III-C, we detailed the general model dynamics, whereby a single agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  activates at each discrete time

$t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  to update their state  $\mathbf{z}_i(t) = (x_i(t), y_i(t))$ . However, there can be a number of different mechanisms governing the sequence of agent activations. In our work, we secure a general convergence result by assuming a particular mechanism, as we now detail.

*Assumption 2:* There exists a  $T \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that in every time window  $[t; t+T)$ ,  $\forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , each agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  activates at least once<sup>3</sup>.

This assumption ensures that every agent will activate at least once in  $T$  time steps. It covers a broad range of scenarios, since  $T$  can be much greater than  $n$  (allowing agents to update multiple times inside of  $T$  time steps), and imposes no restriction or requirement on the ordering of the agent activations. Other assumptions on the activation sequence can be considered, which may lead to different convergence results. For instance, one could assume that at every time step, every agent has a positive probability of becoming active, or that every agent activates infinitely often as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  [2].

Although we proved in Lemma 1 that the coevolutionary game is a generalized ordinal potential game, we cannot exploit existing convergence results on potential games such as those detailed in [35]. This is because in our game, the strategy space for each player (individual) is a Cartesian product of a finite strategy set (actions) and a continuous strategy set (opinions). Additional analysis is required. We first present a convergence result for the opinion vector under the assumption that the action vector is fixed, which is key for the proof of our main convergence result, reported in the following. For the sake of readability, the proof is postponed to Appendix C.

*Lemma 2:* Consider a modified coevolutionary model on the two-layer network  $\mathcal{G}$ , where individuals update their opinions according to Eq. (9) while the actions are held constant,  $x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) = x_i^*$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , and let action vector be denoted by  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \{-1, +1\}^n$ . Then, under Assumption 1, there is a unique opinion vector  $\mathbf{y}^* \in [-1, 1]^n$  that is the unique equilibrium of the opinion dynamics in Eq. (9). Further, if Assumption 2 also holds, then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_i(t) = y_i^*$  asymptotically.

Finally, we are ready to present the main convergence result of our paper, whose proof is reported in Appendix D. This result establishes that for all initial conditions, the system converges to a steady state.

*Theorem 1:* Consider a coevolutionary model on the two-layer network  $\mathcal{G}$  in which individuals update their opinions and actions according to Eq. (9) and Eq. (8), respectively. Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then, the state of the system  $\mathbf{z}(t)$  converges to a steady state  $\mathbf{z}^*$ . Specifically, the action vector  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  converges to  $\mathbf{x}^*$  in finite time, while the opinion vector  $\mathbf{y}(t)$  converges to  $\mathbf{y}^*$  asymptotically.

Thus, the key conclusion on the dynamics of the coevolutionary model is that under Assumption 1 on the parameters, and Assumption 2 on the activation mechanism for the agents, the actions and opinions of all individuals converge to an equilibrium  $\mathbf{z}^* = (\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ , which is a Nash equilibrium of the

<sup>3</sup>Note this implies  $T \geq n$ .

coevolutionary game. However, there are generally speaking a number of different Nash equilibria which the system can converge to, and it is difficult to provide insight into regions of attraction for the equilibria due to the highly nonlinear dynamics (although Lemma 2 indicates that for a given action equilibrium  $\mathbf{x}^*$ , the opinion equilibrium  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is unique). In the next section, we provide a region of attraction for a specific type of equilibrium, under further conditions.

Before concluding this section, we would like to stress that the fundamental properties detailed in Lemma 1 and Corollary 2, which are key for the convergence analysis, are structural properties of the coevolutionary dynamics and are independent of the activation mechanism. This suggests that future work may consider convergence analysis under different assumptions on the activation mechanism.

## V. EMERGENT REAL-WORLD PHENOMENA

In the rest of this paper, we will utilize the proposed coevolutionary model and the convergence result in Theorem 1 to investigate some specific emergent phenomena of the model, which may have several interesting real-world applications. Besides the phenomenon of unpopular norms and shifts in social conventions, which could be reproduced and studied following the paradigm proposed for a similar coevolutionary model in [33], [34], we will show that our model can reproduce polarization and pluralistic ignorance. Specifically, in Section V-A, we derive analytical results, supported by numerical simulations, to show that the proposed coevolutionary dynamics can lead to the emergence and persistence of polarization in a population, which is a typical phenomenon of many social systems [36], [37]. Then, in Section V-B, we will numerically illustrate how the phenomenon of pluralistic ignorance, which is well-known and extensively studied in the social psychology literature [41], [42], can emerge in a population over time.

### A. Polarization

Here, we investigate how the model may lead to the emergence of stable polarized states, in which a portion of the population opts for and supports one action, and the rest of the population takes and supports the other one. Given the set of agents  $\mathcal{V}$ , we denote by  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  a partitioning of the agents into two disjoint sets  $\mathcal{V}_p$  and  $\mathcal{V}_n$  satisfying  $\mathcal{V}_p \cap \mathcal{V}_n = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_p \cup \mathcal{V}_n = \mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{V}_p \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{V}_n \neq \emptyset$ . With this notion of a partition in place, we introduce the following definitions of polarization in the network.

*Definition 3:* Given a state of the system  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \{-1, 1\}^n \times [-1, 1]^n$ , we say that

- the action vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is *polarized* if there exists a partition of the agents  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  such that  $x_i = -1$ , for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$  and  $x_j = +1$ , for all  $j \in \mathcal{V}_p$ .
- the opinion vector  $\mathbf{y}$  is *polarized* if there exists a partition of the agents  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  such that  $y_i < 0$ , for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$  and  $y_j > 0$ , for all  $j \in \mathcal{V}_p$ .
- the state  $\mathbf{z}$  is *polarized* if there exists a partition of the agents  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  such that  $x_i = -1$  and  $y_i < 0$ , for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$ , and  $x_j = 1$  and  $y_j > 0$ , for all  $j \in \mathcal{V}_p$ .

- the state  $\mathbf{z}^*$  is a *polarized equilibrium* if it is a polarized state, and it is an equilibrium of the coevolutionary model in Eqs. (9)–(8).

In the following, we will perform our analysis under the simplifying assumptions that i) the communication layer on which agents exchange opinions and the influence layer on which they observe the others' actions coincide, ii) no action has a payoff advantage over the other, and iii) agents are not attached to any existing prejudice  $u_i$ . These assumptions are gathered in the following.

*Assumption 3:* We assume that  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}$ ,  $\alpha = 0$ , and  $\gamma = 0$ .

Under Assumption 3, the opinion and action updates rules are simplified as follows

$$\begin{cases} y_i(t+1) = (1-\lambda) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij} y_j(t) + \lambda \mathcal{S}(\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t))) \\ x_i(t+1) = \mathcal{S}(\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t))) \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where

$$\delta_i(\mathbf{z}) = 2\lambda\beta(1-\lambda) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij} y_j + (1-\beta)\lambda \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij} x_j. \quad (14)$$

The following result provides a sufficient condition for the existence of a polarized equilibrium, with the proof in Appendix E.

*Theorem 2:* Consider the coevolutionary model on the two-layer network  $\mathcal{G}$  under Assumptions 1–3, in which individuals update their opinions and actions according to Eq. (13). Suppose there exists a partitioning of the agents  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{d}_p &:= \min_{i \in \mathcal{V}_p} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij}, & \bar{d}_p &:= \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}_p} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} \\ \underline{d}_n &:= \min_{i \in \mathcal{V}_n} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ij}, & \bar{d}_n &:= \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}_n} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

such that the following three conditions are verified:

$$\lambda > \max \left( \frac{\bar{d}_p - \underline{d}_n}{1 + \bar{d}_p - \underline{d}_n}, \frac{\bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p}{1 + \bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p} \right) \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{\lambda(\underline{d}_p + \bar{d}_n - 1) + \underline{d}_p - \bar{d}_n}{1 - (1-\lambda)(\underline{d}_p + \bar{d}_n - 1)} + \frac{(1-\beta)(2\underline{d}_p - 1)}{2\beta(1-\lambda)} > 0 \quad (17)$$

and

$$\frac{\lambda(\underline{d}_n + \bar{d}_p - 1) + \underline{d}_n - \bar{d}_p}{1 - (1-\lambda)(\underline{d}_n + \bar{d}_p - 1)} + \frac{(1-\beta)(2\underline{d}_n - 1)}{2\beta(1-\lambda)} > 0. \quad (18)$$

Then the coevolutionary model in Eq. (13) has a polarized equilibrium  $\mathbf{z}^*$  with respect to the partitioning  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ .

Theorem 2 indicates that a polarized equilibrium  $\mathbf{z}^*$  exists with respect to a partitioning  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  if the three conditions of Eqs. (16)–(18) are satisfied. While the latter two conditions are not easy to digest, all three conditions can be easily computed. However, the result provides no indication of the stability or basin of attraction for  $\mathbf{z}^*$ . Next, we provide a more conservative sufficient condition, which however allows to prove not only the existence of a polarized equilibrium but also a notion of stability and attractiveness from a set of initial conditions. The proof is reported in Appendix F.

*Theorem 3:* Consider a coevolutionary model on the two-layer network  $\mathcal{G}$  under Assumptions 2–3, in which individuals update their opinions and actions according to Eq. (13). Assume that there exists a partitioning of the agents  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} > \max\left(\frac{1-2\lambda}{1-\lambda}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{\beta(1-\lambda)}{1-\beta\lambda}\right)\right), & i \in \mathcal{V}_p \\ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ij} > \max\left(\frac{1-2\lambda}{1-\lambda}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{\beta(1-\lambda)}{1-\beta\lambda}\right)\right), & i \in \mathcal{V}_n. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Then, if the initial condition  $\mathbf{z}(0)$  is a polarized state,  $\mathbf{z}(t)$  will be polarized for any  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{z}(t) = \mathbf{z}^*$ , where  $\mathbf{z}^*$  is the polarized equilibrium with respect to the partition  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ .


Theorem 3 provides easier to check conditions, viz. Eq. (19), for the existence of a polarized equilibrium  $\mathbf{z}^*$ . Moreover, under these conditions, a large region of attraction for  $\mathbf{z}^*$  is identified, being the set of initial conditions  $\mathbf{z}(0)$  which is polarized with respect to the partition  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ . From another perspective, the set of polarized states with respect to  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  is a *positive invariant set* of the system dynamics.

This result demonstrates that polarization can emerge and become stable in a population where opinions and actions co-evolve. Such a finding is notable, since in the opinion dynamics literature, polarization has been typically attributed to antagonistic interactions under restrictive signed network structure assumptions [14], [15] or strong biased assimilation [38], [39]. Here, we show that when an individual's opinion co-evolves with their action, polarization can emerge purely through coordination and social influence. In the following example, we show via simulation results that the behavior proved in Theorem 3 seems to be resistant to small perturbations of the network and that the region of attraction of polarized equilibria may be larger, whereby polarization can emerge even from non-polarized initial states.

*Example 1:* We consider 20 interacting individuals divided into two groups  $\mathcal{V}_p = \{1, \dots, 10\}$  and  $\mathcal{V}_n = \{11, \dots, 20\}$ . Groups are generated as directed Erdős–Rényi random graphs [44], where each link is present with probability  $p = 0.2$ , independent of the other edges. Then, the two groups are connected by two links between two pairs of nodes (one from each group), selected uniformly at random. Last, weights are selected randomly from a uniform distribution and rescaled such that the overall influence matrix is row-stochastic. The network obtained is presented in Fig. 3.

We set  $\alpha = \gamma = 0$ ,  $\beta = 0.5$ , and  $\lambda = 0.6$ . With these parameters, the inequality conditions in Theorem 3 are satisfied. However, Assumption 1 is not satisfied, since self-loops are not present for all the nodes. Furthermore, we initialize the system with  $\mathbf{z}(0)$ , where most of the nodes in  $\mathcal{V}_p$  have  $x_i(0) = \text{sgn}(y_i(0)) = +1$  and most of the nodes in  $\mathcal{V}_n$  have  $x_i(0) = \text{sgn}(y_i(0)) = -1$ . However, we randomly assign some exceptions to this rule, so that the initial state  $\mathbf{z}(0)$  is not polarized, as shown in Fig. 3a. We simulate the system by selecting one agent uniformly at random at each time step to activate and update their states, checking that all agents activate at least once during the simulation.

While the initial state  $\mathbf{z}(0)$  is outside the region of attraction identified in Theorem 3, the numerical simulation reported in



**Fig. 3:** Network and simulation of Example 1. In (a) and (b), the network and the actions are shown at time  $t = 0$  and  $t = 150$ , respectively. Nodes are colored in green if  $\text{sgn}(y_i) = x_i = +1$ , in red if  $\text{sgn}(y_i) = x_i = -1$ , and in yellow if  $\text{sgn}(y_i) \neq x_i$ . In (c), the temporal evolution of the opinion are shown to converge to a polarized scenario.

Fig. 3 shows that the coevolutionary model still converges to the polarized equilibrium with respect to  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ . This suggests the region of attraction for polarized equilibria may be larger than that identified in our theoretical findings.

We conclude this section by presenting a special case in which all the agents have a uniform influence at the partition-level, that is, there exists a partition  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  such that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} = d, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_p, \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ij} = d, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_n \quad (20)$$

In this scenario, a complete characterization of the polarized equilibrium can be performed, showing the emergence of a *bipartite consensus* state, in which all the agents in the same partition have the same opinion. The proof is in Appendix G.

*Corollary 3:* Consider a coevolutionary model on the two-layer network  $\mathcal{G}$  under Assumptions 1–3, in which individuals update their opinions and actions according to Eq. (13). Suppose that there exists a partition  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  such that Eq. (20) holds true for some  $d > 1/2$ . Then there exists a polarized equilibrium in the form

$$y_i^* = y^+, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_p, \quad y_j^* = y^-, \forall j \in \mathcal{V}_n \quad (21)$$

with

$$y^+ = \frac{\lambda}{1 - (1 - \lambda)(2d - 1)}, \quad y^- = -\frac{\lambda}{1 - (1 - \lambda)(2d - 1)}. \quad (22)$$



## B. Pluralistic Ignorance

In this section, we explore how the social psychological phenomenon of *pluralistic ignorance* [41] can be observed as an emergent behavior in our model. Pluralistic ignorance refers to a situation whereby a significant number of individuals in a population hold an incorrect assumption about the thoughts, feelings, and/or behavior of others in the population. The most common such situation is when a group of individuals underestimates the number of others who hold similar opinions. Such a phenomenon has been widely studied in the literature, with empirical examples concerning overestimation of support among white Americans for racial segregation in 1960s America [47], or underestimation of the rejection of alcohol consumption practices on university campuses in the 1990s [42].

In particular, we revisit the classical work of Prentice and Miller [42], which reported four empirical studies gathering field data on the opinions and behaviors of undergraduate students at Princeton University concerning the culture of rampant alcohol consumption. Study 3 explored how individuals internalized social norms when exposed to pluralistic ignorance over time. Prentice and Miller surveyed via telephone a random sample of 25 female and 25 male sophomore students on Princeton campus, first in September at the beginning of the semester year, and then again in December. The subjects were asked several questions about Princeton’s alcohol policies, their own opinion toward drinking alcohol, and their estimate of the average student’s attitude. The students ranked their own comfort level and their estimate of the average student’s comfort level with alcohol drinking, using a number between 0 and 10.

In the following example, we show that with reasonable choices of parameters, our model can qualitatively reproduce the empirical data reported in the study described above.

*Example 2:* In order to apply our model to the work of Prentice and Miller [42], we let  $\mathbf{y} = [\mathbf{y}_f^\top, \mathbf{y}_m^\top]^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{y}_f, \mathbf{y}_m \in [-1, 1]^{25}$  are the vectors of attitudes (opinions) of female and male subjects, respectively. In addition, we define  $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_f^\top, \mathbf{x}_m^\top]^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}_m \in \{-1, 1\}^{25}$  represent the vectors of behavior (actions) of female and male students, respectively. The mean value of  $\mathbf{x}$ , denoted by  $\bar{x}$ , is a reasonable choice to represent the “social norm”, as it measures the average behavior of the society.

The initial states are reproduced randomly using a normal distribution with the mean and standard deviation values reported in [42, Study 3]. Then, the initial state values are re-scaled to fit the strategy space of our model. Note that, in our setting,  $x_i = -1$  and  $x_i = +1$  represent the rejection and embracing of heavy alcohol consumption by agent  $i$ , respectively. Consistent with our model definition,  $y_i$  is individual  $i$ ’s preference towards the choices of rejecting or supporting alcohol consumption. In addition, we set  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{y}(0)$ .

Prentice and Miller discuss that, “men are simply more inclined to react to feeling deviant from the norm with conformity” [42]. In our model, this can be reasonably interpreted as  $\lambda_m > \lambda_f$ , since according to Eq. (3) and Eq. (4), a larger  $\lambda$  means the coordination game mechanism has a great




Fig. 4: Simulation illustrating the emergence and resolution of pluralistic ignorance among female and male agents, respectively, closely following the findings in [42].

impact on the payoff. In context, the individual strongly favors adopting the action currently in the majority (the social norm). Moreover, noting Eq. (9), when updating their opinions, the male agents put more weight on their own action, which is influenced by the social norm. On the other hand, [42] also states that, “men might be expected to feel greater pressures to learn to be comfortable with alcohol”. In our setting, this can be approached by adjusting  $\gamma_m < \gamma_f$ . As  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{y}(0)$ ,  $\gamma_m < \gamma_f$  implies that male subjects tend to be less attached to their initial opinion.

Considering the observations above, we set the parameters of the model as  $\alpha = 0$ ,  $\lambda_f = 0.2$ ,  $\lambda_m = 0.6$ ,  $\beta_f = \beta_m = 0.4$ ,  $\gamma_f = 0.8$ , and  $\gamma_m = 0.3$ . In addition, we generate a two-layer graph with uniformly random weights to represent the student network; both layers are Erdős–Rényi random graphs, with each link present with probability  $p$ . We assume the influence layer denser relative to the communication layer, captured by setting  $p = 0.1$  and  $p = 0.04$ , respectively. This reflects that opinions are mostly private and shared between few friends, while actions are public and observed within the whole campus environment.

Figure 4 plots the evolution over time of the mean values of  $\mathbf{y}_f$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_m$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_f$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_m$ . According to [42], at the start of their experiment in September, it was found that both male and female students displayed strong pluralistic ignorance, whereby the majority of students were each privately against the social norm of heavy alcohol consumption, but estimated that their peers preferred heavy alcohol consumption, and all individuals participated in alcohol consumption to a greater degree than they were comfortable with. In our simulation, we initialize individuals’ opinions and behaviors with the same discrepancy.

Prentice and Miller reported that by December when they interviewed the participants again, male participants had tended to resolve pluralistic ignorance over time by internalization of the social norm, moving their private attitudes to conform to strong drinking culture. In contrast, female participants reacted with alienation by mostly retaining their private beliefs, but continuing to participate in the social norm of heavy alcohol consumption [42].

Our simulation is qualitatively similar to the outcomes described by Prentice and Miller. In the simulation, the male agents tend to internalize the social norm,  $\bar{x}$ , by moving their opinions, viz.  $\bar{y}_m$  to be closer to the social norm. On the other hand, female agents remain attached to their initial opinion, and their opinion, viz.  $\bar{y}_f$  remains significantly less supportive of heavy alcohol consumption.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we proposed a novel coevolutionary model of actions and opinions that captures the complex interplay between opinion formation and decision-making processes in a social network, utilizing a game-theoretic framework. We provided a rigorous analysis of the model, establishing finite-time convergence of the actions and asymptotic convergence for the opinions, for any initial condition. Then, we utilized the coevolutionary model to explore various real-world phenomena. Besides the emergence of unpopular norms, which were studied on a simplified version of the model [33], [34], the proposed model can represent stable polarization and the emergence of pluralistic ignorance.

The vast range of real-world phenomena that our model can represent and its amenability to perform rigorous analytical studies pave the way for a wide horizon of future research. First, many real-world systems present a high degree of heterogeneity, which may impact the behavior of the system [44]. Our convergence result for homogeneous communities should be generalized to heterogeneous population parameters, as a key step toward studying more complex social systems. Second, our simulations suggest polarization can emerge from non-polarized initial states, beyond the sufficient conditions we theoretically identified, and even in the absence of antagonistic interactions. Further study of the polarization phenomenon is promising, in particular considering the ongoing debate in the social psychology literature concerning the role and presence of negative social influence [40]. Third, several other complex social phenomena might be tackled using our flexible model framework, from diffusion of innovation [9], [21] to the adoption of social conventions and behaviors [8], [45], possibly leveraging the model to design and assess intervention policies to shape the system's evolution [23]. Finally, a validation of the proposed model against empirical data and the development of techniques to calibrate its parameters will be crucial to enable its practical use in real-world problems.

## APPENDIX

### A. Proof of Proposition 1 and Corollary 1

Note that as  $\zeta_a \in \{-1, +1\}$ , we can determine the maximizers by simply comparing the maximum values obtained for  $f_i$  subject to  $\zeta_a = -1$  and  $\zeta_a = +1$ , respectively. To begin, we consider the case  $\zeta_a = +1$ . Computing the derivative of  $f_i(+1, \zeta_o)$  with respect to  $\zeta_o$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f'_i(+1, \zeta_o) &= -(1 - \lambda_i)\beta_i(1 - \gamma_i)\zeta_o \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij} \\ &\quad + (1 - \lambda_i)\beta_i(1 - \gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j \\ &\quad - (1 - \lambda_i)\beta_i\gamma_i(\zeta_o - u_i) - \lambda_i\beta_i(\zeta_o - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The second derivative of  $f_i(+1, \zeta_o)$  with respect to  $\zeta_o$  is  $f''_i(+1, \zeta_o) = -\beta_i < 0$ , which implies that  $f_i(+1, s)$  is strictly concave, and hence has a unique maximum. By using Fermat's (interior extremum) theorem, we solve  $f'_i(+1, \zeta_o) = 0$  and obtain the following maximizer:

$$\zeta_o^+ = (1 - \lambda_i)(1 - \gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j + (1 - \lambda_i)\gamma_i u_i + \lambda_i. \quad (24)$$

We are left with verifying that the maximizer belongs to the opinion domain, that is,  $\zeta_o^+ \in [-1, +1]$ . Since  $\lambda_i \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\gamma_i \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\mathbf{W}$  is stochastic, we have that  $\zeta_o$  in Eq. (24) is a convex combination of  $u_i \in [-1, 1]$  and  $y_j \in [-1, 1]$ ,  $\forall j \in \mathcal{V}$ , and  $+1$ . It follows that  $\zeta_o^+ \in [-1, +1]$ .

Next, consider  $\zeta_a = -1$ . Let  $\zeta_o^-$  be the maximizer of Eq. (3) subject to  $\zeta_a = -1$ . Similar to the above, one can differentiate  $f_i(-1, \zeta_o)$  with respect to  $\zeta_o$ , and solving  $f'_i(-1, \zeta_o) = 0$  for  $\zeta_o$ , one obtains

$$\zeta_o^- = (1 - \lambda_i)(1 - \gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j + (1 - \lambda_i)\gamma_i u_i - \lambda_i \quad (25)$$

which can be shown to belong to the domain  $\zeta_o^- \in [-1, +1]$ , similar to  $\zeta_o^+$ .

Now, we are left with comparing the two maxima. Define

$$h = (1 - \lambda_i)(1 - \gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j + (1 - \lambda_i)\gamma_i u_i. \quad (26)$$

Then, one can write  $\zeta_o^+ = h + \lambda_i$  and  $\zeta_o^- = h - \lambda_i$ . Using the definitions of  $\zeta_o^+$  and  $\zeta_o^-$  in Eq. (24) and Eq. (25), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(+1, \zeta_o^+) - f_i(-1, \zeta_o^-) &= \\ &\quad - 2(1 - \lambda_i)(1 - \gamma_i)\lambda_i\beta_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}(h - y_j) \\ &\quad - 2(1 - \lambda_i)\gamma_i\lambda_i\beta_i(h - u_i) + 2\lambda_i h\beta_i(1 - \lambda_i) \\ &\quad + \frac{(1 - \beta_i)\lambda_i}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij} [2x_j + \alpha(1 + x_j)] \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Substituting the expression for  $h$  in Eq. (26) into the right hand side of Eq. (27) and simplifying, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(+1, \zeta_o^+) - f_i(-1, \zeta_o^-) &= 2\lambda_i\beta_i(1 - \lambda_i)(1 - \gamma_i) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j \\ &\quad + 2\lambda_i\beta_i(1 - \lambda_i)\gamma_i u_i + \frac{(1 - \beta_i)\lambda_i}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij} [2x_j + \alpha(1 + x_j)]. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

This immediately yields that

$$\delta_i(\mathbf{z}) = f_i(+1, \zeta_o^+)(\mathbf{z}) - f_i(-1, \zeta_o^-)(\mathbf{z}) \quad (29)$$

where  $\delta_i$  was defined in Eq. (4). The quantity  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z})$  being positive or negative is therefore equivalent to the pair  $(+1, \zeta_o^+)$  or  $(-1, \zeta_o^-)$ , respectively, being the unique maximizer of  $f_i$  for given  $\mathbf{z}$ . The quantity being zero is equivalent to  $f_i$  having two maximizers, namely  $(+1, \zeta_o^+)$  and  $(-1, \zeta_o^-)$ .

Finally, the limit case  $\beta_i = 0$  can be studied by observing that the to-be-maximized function  $f_i$  depends on  $\zeta$  only through  $\zeta_a$ , so any choice of  $\zeta_o \in [-1, +1]$  gives the same payoff. Hence, the maximizer is determined by comparing the payoff with  $\zeta_a = +1$  and the one with  $\zeta_a = -1$ , which yields the claim.  $\blacksquare$

## B. Proof of Lemma 1 and Corollary 2

From Assumption 1, we have  $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$  and  $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$  for all  $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$ . Combining this with the fact that all parameters are homogeneous, we can consider a generic  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  and write

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathbf{z}) = & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} \eta a_{ij} \left[ (1 + \alpha)(1 + x_j)(1 + x_i) \right. \\ & \left. + (1 - x_i)(1 - x_j) \right] \\ & + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} \eta a_{kl} \left[ (1 + \alpha)(1 + x_l)(1 + x_k) \right. \\ & \left. + (1 - x_k)(1 - x_l) \right] \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij} (y_i - y_j)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} w_{kl} (y_k - y_l)^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\gamma}{(1 - \gamma)} (y_k - u_k)^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\lambda}{(1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma)} (y_k - x_k)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Next, we consider two states  $\mathbf{z}$  and  $\mathbf{z}'$  that differ only in the  $i$ th component, with  $\mathbf{z}_i = \boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_a, \zeta_o)$  and  $\mathbf{z}'_i = \boldsymbol{\zeta}' = (\zeta'_a, \zeta'_o)$ . Then, using Eq. (30), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathbf{z}) - \Phi(\mathbf{z}') = & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} \eta a_{ij} [2x_j + \alpha(1 + x_j)] (\zeta_a - \zeta'_a) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} w_{ij} [(\zeta_o - y_j)^2 - (\zeta'_o - y_j)^2] \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\gamma}{(1 - \gamma)} [(\zeta_o - u_i)^2 - (\zeta'_o - u_i)^2] \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda}{(1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma)} [(\zeta_a - \zeta_o)^2 - (\zeta'_a - \zeta'_o)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Next, we evaluate the expression  $f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \mathbf{z}) - f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}', \mathbf{z})$ , obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \mathbf{z}) - f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}', \mathbf{z}) = & \frac{\lambda(1 - \beta)}{4} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} a_{ij} [2x_j + \alpha(1 + x_j)] (\zeta_a - \zeta'_a) \\ & + \frac{\lambda(1 - \beta)}{4} a_{ii} [2x_i + \alpha(1 + x_i)] (\zeta_a - \zeta'_a) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \beta(1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}} w_{ij} [(\zeta_o - y_j)^2 - (\zeta'_o - y_j)^2] \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \beta(1 - \lambda)\gamma [(\zeta_o - u_i)^2 - (\zeta'_o - u_i)^2] \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \lambda\beta [(\zeta_a - \zeta_o)^2 - (\zeta'_a - \zeta'_o)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Let  $[\beta(1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma)]^{-1} = \xi > 0$ . For the case  $\zeta_a = \zeta'_a$ , we have  $\Phi(\mathbf{z}) - \Phi(\mathbf{z}') = \xi(f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \mathbf{z}) - f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}', \mathbf{z}))$ , from which the statement of the lemma follows. Next, consider the case where  $\zeta_a \neq \zeta'_a$ , and without loss of generality, let  $\zeta'_a = -1$  and  $\zeta_a = +1$  and  $x_i = -1$ . Then, the last term on the right

hand side of Eq. (32) is given by  $-\lambda(1 - \beta)a_{ii}$ . It follows from Eq. (31) and Eq. (32) that

$$\Phi(\mathbf{z}) - \Phi(\mathbf{z}') - \xi\lambda(1 - \beta)a_{ii} = \xi(f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \mathbf{z}) - f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}', \mathbf{z})). \quad (33)$$

Observe then, that  $f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \mathbf{z}) - f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}', \mathbf{z}) > 0$  implies

$$\Phi(\mathbf{z}) - \Phi(\mathbf{z}') > \xi\lambda(1 - \beta)a_{ii} > 0. \quad (34)$$

Suppose now, that  $\zeta'_a = +1$ ,  $\zeta_a = -1$  and  $x_i = +1$ . Then, the last term on the right-hand-side of Eq. (32) is given by  $-\lambda(1 - \beta)a_{ii}(1 + \alpha)$ . It follows from Eq. (31) and Eq. (32) that

$$\Phi(\mathbf{z}) - \Phi(\mathbf{z}') - \xi\lambda(1 - \beta)a_{ii}(1 + \alpha) = \xi(f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \mathbf{z}) - f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}', \mathbf{z})). \quad (35)$$

Observe then, that  $f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \mathbf{z}) - f_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}', \mathbf{z}) > 0$  implies

$$\Phi(\mathbf{z}) - \Phi(\mathbf{z}') > \xi\lambda(1 - \beta)a_{ii}(1 + \alpha) > 0 \quad (36)$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 1. Finally, the minimum of Eq. (34) and Eq. (36) over all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  gives the bound in Corollary 2, by noting  $\alpha \geq 0$ . ■

## C. Proof of Lemma 2

We first prove there is a unique  $\mathbf{y}^*$  that is the equilibrium of the opinion dynamics in Eq. (9) for a given (fixed)  $\mathbf{x}^*$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $\mathbf{x}^* = [\mathbf{1}_r^\top, \mathbf{1}_{n-r}^\top]^\top$  for some  $0 \leq r \leq n$ . Observe from Eq. (9) that any equilibrium  $\mathbf{y}^*$  must have entries  $y_i^*$  such that

$$y_i^* = (1 - \lambda) \left[ (1 - \gamma) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij} y_j^* + \gamma u_i \right] + \lambda x_i^* \quad (37)$$

or in vector form

$$\mathbf{y}^* = (1 - \lambda) \left[ (1 - \gamma) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}^* + \gamma \mathbf{u} \right] + \lambda \mathbf{x}^* \quad (38)$$

where  $\mathbf{u} = [u_1, \dots, u_n]^\top$ . Rearranging for  $\mathbf{y}^*$  yields

$$\left[ \mathbf{I} - (1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma) \mathbf{W} \right] \mathbf{y}^* = (1 - \lambda) \gamma \mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{x}^*.$$

Since  $\mathbf{W}$  is stochastic and irreducible, the Perron–Frobenius Theorem [48] establishes that  $\mathbf{W}$  has a simple eigenvalue equal to 1, with all other eigenvalues having modulus no greater than 1. It follows that the spectral radius of  $(1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma) \mathbf{W}$  is strictly less than 1, and thus  $\mathbf{I} - (1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma) \mathbf{W}$  is invertible. Thus,

$$\mathbf{y}^* = \left[ \mathbf{I} - (1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma) \mathbf{W} \right]^{-1} \left[ (1 - \lambda) \gamma \mathbf{u} + \lambda \mathbf{x}^* \right] \quad (39)$$

is unique.

Next, we prove convergence to  $\mathbf{y}^*$ , given the fixed action vector  $\mathbf{x}^*$ . Using a compact vector form, we verify that the potential function  $\Phi(\mathbf{z})$  can be expressed in quadratic form as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathbf{z}) = & -\frac{1}{2} \left( \mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{G}) \mathbf{y} - 2\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{G} \mathbf{u} - 2\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{L} \mathbf{x}^* \right. \\ & \left. + (\mathbf{x}^*)^\top \mathbf{L} \mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{G} \mathbf{u} \right) + \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}^*) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where  $\mathbf{L} = \frac{\lambda}{(1 - \lambda)(1 - \gamma)} \mathbf{I}$ ,  $\mathbf{G} = \frac{\gamma}{(1 - \gamma)} \mathbf{I}$ , and

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}^*) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{j \neq i} \eta \frac{a_{ij}}{2} \left[ (1 + \alpha)(1 + x_j^*)(1 + x_i^*) + (1 - x_i^*)(1 - x_j^*) \right].$$

Note that according to [48],  $(I - W + L + G)$  is positive definite for any  $\lambda \neq 0$  and  $\gamma \neq 0$  (c.f. Chapter 6, and the definition of  $M$ -matrices). Therefore,  $\Phi(z) = \Phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is continuous in  $\mathbf{y}$ , and, for fixed  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^*$ , bounded from above and from below, i.e.,  $\underline{\Phi} \leq \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}) \leq \bar{\Phi}$ , where  $\bar{\Phi}$  and  $\underline{\Phi}$  represent the value of  $\Phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  at the global maximum and global minimum with respect to  $\mathbf{y}$ , constrained to  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^*$ , respectively.

In Lemma 1, we proved that the coevolutionary game is a generalized ordinal potential game with potential function  $\Phi$ . For convenience, denote  $\Phi(t) := \Phi(\mathbf{z}(t)) = \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}(t))$ . By using  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}(t+1)$  and  $\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{z}(t)$  in Eq. (1), it follows that under the best-response update in Eq. (7), there holds

$$\Phi(t+1) - \Phi(t) > 0 \quad (41)$$

if agent  $i$  is active at time  $t$  and  $y_i(t+1) \neq y_i(t)$ . It follows from Assumption 2 that

$$\Phi(t+T) - \Phi(t) \geq 0 \quad (42)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$  with equality if and only if  $\mathbf{y}(t+T) = \mathbf{y}(t)$ . In other words,  $\Phi(t)$  must strictly increase over any time window of period  $T$  unless  $y_i(t+T) = y_i(t)$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ . This is because every agent activates at least once inside the time window, and thus either at least one agent  $i$  changes its opinion  $y_i(t+T) \neq y_i(t)$  or every agent has an unchanged opinion over that time window. In the latter case, clearly the opinions have reached an equilibrium, and the results above establish there is a unique equilibrium vector  $\mathbf{y}^*$ .

This implies that the sequence  $\Phi_t \triangleq \{\Phi(t)\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$  is monotonically increasing across every time period  $T$ , and as we established earlier, it is bounded from above by the unique global maximum  $\bar{\Phi}$ . It follows from the monotone convergence theorem for sequences, that the sequence  $\Phi_t$  converges asymptotically to  $\bar{\Phi}$ , and hence  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{y}^*$  asymptotically. ■

#### D. Proof of Theorem 1

The proof centers around the potential function defined in Eq. (11), and its properties established in Lemma 1 and Corollary 2. We establish convergence by focusing on proving that actions must converge to a steady state  $\mathbf{x}^*$  in a finite number of time steps. Letting  $\tau$  denote the time step for which the action has converged, that is,  $\mathbf{x}(t+1) = \mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}^*$  for all  $t \geq \tau$ , convergence of the opinion vector  $\mathbf{y}(t)$  follows immediately from Lemma 2.

Note that  $\Phi(z)$  is bounded from above and from below, and let us denote the maximum and minimum value of  $\Phi(z)$  by  $\bar{\Phi}$  and  $\underline{\Phi}$ , respectively. With an abuse of notation, we write the potential function as an explicit function of the time, that is  $\Phi(t) = \Phi(\mathbf{z}(t))$ . Assume without loss of generality that node  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  is active at time  $t$ . Then,  $\mathbf{z}(t+1)$  may differ from  $\mathbf{z}(t)$  only in the  $i$ th row. Now, if individual  $i$  chooses to change their action, i.e.  $x_i(t+1) \neq x_i(t)$ , then we know from Corollary 2 and Eq. (12) that the difference in potential is bounded from below by a positive constant, i.e.,  $\Phi(t+1) - \Phi(t) > c > 0$ .

Recall from Assumption 2, that every individual will activate at least once in every time window  $[t; t+T)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

Thus, there can be at most  $\lfloor \frac{\bar{\Phi} - \underline{\Phi}}{c} \rfloor$  time instants where the active agent  $i$  has  $x_i(t+1) \neq x_i(t)$  for  $t < \bar{T}$  for some  $\bar{T} \in \{\mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \infty\}$ . If  $\bar{T}$  is finite, then convergence to a maximum of  $\Phi$  (though not necessarily the global maximum) must occur and consequently  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  converges to some  $\mathbf{x}^*$  associated with the maximum in finite time, before  $\bar{T}$ .

If  $\bar{T} = \infty$  on the other hand, this would imply that there exist an infinitely long sequence of agent activations in which  $x_i(t+1) = x_i(t)$  for every active agent  $i$ , during which the opinions converge asymptotically to some steady state vector  $\mathbf{y}^*$  as detailed in Lemma 2, and then there exists an agent  $j$  such that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_j(t+1) \neq x_j(t)$ . That is, an agent chooses to change their action after a long time period in which no action has changed, while the opinions have reached to a neighborhood of the opinion equilibrium. We are now going to show such an infinitely long sequence cannot exist, by showing that if there is a sufficiently long but finite sequence with no action change, then it is not possible for any future action change for any agent after this sequence.

To establish the contradiction, suppose that there is a finite sequence of agent activations with no change in the actions, except agent  $i$  who activates at the end of this sequence and changes action. Let  $t_2$  be the time step at end of this sequence, and let  $t_1$ , with  $t_1 < t_2$ , be the supremum time step inside this sequence at which agent  $i$  was last active before  $t_2$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $x_i(t_1) = x_i(t_1+1) = -1$  which implies  $x_i(t_2+1) = +1 \neq x_i(t_2) = x_i(t_1+1) = -1$ . Now, Eq. (10) implies that  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_1)) \leq 0$  while  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_2)) > 0$ . We are going to show that  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_2))$  being positive creates a contradiction.

First, we consider the special case  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_1)) = 0$ , which implies

$$2\lambda\beta \left[ (1-\lambda)(1-\gamma) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij} y_j(t_1) + (1-\lambda)\gamma u_i \right] + \frac{(1-\beta)\lambda}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij} [2x_j(t_1) + \alpha(1+x_j(t_1))] = 0. \quad (43)$$

Rearranging Eq. (9) and substituting it into the first term of Eq. (43) with  $x_i(t_1+1) = -1$ , we can write Eq. (43) as:

$$2\lambda\beta [y_i(t_1+1) + \lambda] + \frac{(1-\beta)\lambda}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij} [2x_j(t_1) + \alpha(1+x_j(t_1))] = 0. \quad (44)$$

Now, positivity of  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_2))$  implies

$$2\lambda\beta(1-\lambda)(1-\gamma) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij} y_j(t_2) + 2\lambda\beta(1-\lambda)\gamma u_i + \frac{(1-\beta)\lambda}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij} [2x_j(t_2) + \alpha(1+x_j(t_2))] > 0. \quad (45)$$

Similarly, by recalling Eq. (9) and with  $x_i(t_2+1) = +1$ , we can write Eq. (45) as follows:

$$2\lambda\beta [y_i(t_2+1) - \lambda] + \frac{(1-\beta)\lambda}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij} [2x_j(t_2) + \alpha(1+x_j(t_2))] > 0. \quad (46)$$

By hypothesis,  $x_j(t_2) = x_j(t_1)$  for all  $j \neq i$ , which implies that  $\mathbf{x}(t_2) = \mathbf{x}(t_1)$ . Thus, we can rearrange Eq. (44) and substitute it into the left hand side of Eq. (46) to obtain

$$2\lambda\beta[y_i(t_2+1) - \lambda - y_i(t_1+1) - \lambda] > 0. \quad (47)$$

By taking this sequence to be sufficiently long, then Lemma 2 guarantees asymptotic convergence of  $\mathbf{y}(t)$  to  $\mathbf{y}^*$ , and thus  $\mathbf{y}(t_2+1)$  and  $\mathbf{y}(t_1+1)$  are both in a small neighborhood of  $\mathbf{y}^*$ . Further, we have  $y_i(t_1+1) = y_i^* + \hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_1}$  and  $y_i(t_2+1) = y_i^* + \hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_2}$  with  $|\hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_2}| \leq |\hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_1}|$ . This allows us to write

$$2\lambda\beta[\hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_2} - \hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_1} - 2\lambda] > 0. \quad (48)$$

Noting that  $\hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_2} - \hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_1} \leq 2|\hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_1}|$ , it follows that for a sufficiently small  $\hat{\varepsilon}_i^{t_1}$  (as occurs when there is a sufficiently long sequence of agent activations with no actions changing), the left of Eq. (48) cannot be positive, which results in a contradiction.

Now, we consider the case  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_1)) < 0$ . Again, by hypothesis,  $x_j(t_2) = x_j(t_1)$  for all  $j \neq i$ . Note that this implies that  $\mathbf{x}(t_2) = \mathbf{x}(t_1)$ . Using this and adding and subtracting  $2\lambda\beta(1-\lambda)(1-\gamma)\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}y_j(t_1)$  to the left hand side of Eq. (45), we obtain

$$2\lambda\beta(1-\lambda)(1-\gamma)\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}(y_j(t_2) - y_j(t_1)) + \delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_1)) > 0 \quad (49)$$

Similar to the above, if the sequence in question is sufficiently long, then Lemma 2 guarantees the asymptotic convergence of  $\mathbf{y}(t)$  to  $\mathbf{y}^*$ , and also that  $\mathbf{y}(t_1)$  and  $\mathbf{y}(t_2)$  are in a small neighborhood of  $\mathbf{y}^*$ . Moreover,  $y_i(t_1) = y_i^* + \varepsilon_i^{t_1}$  and  $y_i(t_2) = y_i^* + \varepsilon_i^{t_2}$  with  $|\varepsilon_i^{t_2}| \leq |\varepsilon_i^{t_1}|$ . As a result, we can write Eq. (49) as follows:

$$2\lambda\beta(1-\lambda)(1-\gamma)\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}(\varepsilon_j^{t_2} - \varepsilon_j^{t_1}) + \delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_1)) > 0 \quad (50)$$

Note that  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_1)) < 0$  and  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}(\varepsilon_j^{t_2} - \varepsilon_j^{t_1}) \leq 2|\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} w_{ij}\varepsilon_j^{t_1}|$ . As a result, for a sufficiently small  $\varepsilon_j^{t_1}$ , which is guaranteed if the sequence is sufficiently long, the left hand side of Eq. (50) can never be positive. Therefore,  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t_2)) > 0$  cannot hold, which implies that the action  $x_i(t_2+1)$  in fact does not change from  $x_i(t_2)$ .

To conclude, we showed that there cannot exist an infinitely long sequence of agent activation such that the actions do not change, while the opinions are converging asymptotically to its unique equilibrium  $\mathbf{y}^*$ . This implies that the actions change at most  $\lfloor \frac{\Phi - \Phi}{c} \rfloor$  times in a finite number of time steps; with the actions converging in finite time, asymptotic convergence of the opinions follows from Lemma 2. ■

## E. Proof of Theorem 2

The proof is comprised of two parts. First, we prove that given a fixed action vector  $\mathbf{x}^*$  that is polarized with respect to a partitioning  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ , and under the conditions in Eq. (16), the unique vector  $\mathbf{y}^*$  that satisfies the equilibrium conditions for Eq. (13) is polarized. Second, we show that conditions in Eq. (17) and Eq. (18) guarantee that the action vector  $\mathbf{x}^*$  in Part 1 is invariant under Eq. (13), which implies that  $\mathbf{z}^*$  is a polarized equilibrium of the coevolutionary model.

*Part 1:* Let  $\mathbf{x}^*$  be an action vector that is polarized with respect to a partitioning  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ . Define  $y_m^+ = \min_{i \in \mathcal{V}_p} y_i^*$  and  $y_m^- = \min_{i \in \mathcal{V}_n} y_i^*$ , where  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is the unique equilibrium opinion vector if  $\mathbf{x}^*$  was fixed (see Lemma 2). From Eq. (13), the equilibrium evaluates to be

$$y_i^* = \lambda\mathcal{S}(\delta_i(\mathbf{z})) + (1-\lambda)\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij}y_j^* + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ik}y_k^*\right). \quad (51)$$

It follows that  $y_m^+ \geq y_m^-$  and

$$y_m^+ \geq \lambda + (1-\lambda)[\underline{d}_p y_m^+ + (1-\underline{d}_p)y_m^-] \quad (52)$$

and

$$y_m^- \geq -\lambda + (1-\lambda)[\bar{d}_n y_m^- + (1-\bar{d}_n)y_m^+]. \quad (53)$$

Rearranging Eq. (53) and substituting in Eq. (52), and then solving for  $y_m^+$  yields

$$y_m^+ \geq \lambda \frac{1 - (1-\lambda)(1 + \bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p)}{1 - (1-\lambda)(\bar{d}_n + \underline{d}_p) - (1-\lambda)^2(1 - \bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p)} \quad (54)$$

Expanding and simplifying the denominator on the right-hand-side of Eq. (54) yields  $\lambda(1 + (1-\lambda)(1 - \bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p))$ . As  $\bar{d}_n < 1$  by definition, it follows that

$$1 + (1-\lambda)(1 - \bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p) > 1 - (1-\lambda)\underline{d}_p \quad (55)$$

Further,  $\underline{d}_p < 1$  by definition, which implies  $(1-\lambda)\underline{d}_p < 1$ . Thus,  $1 + (1-\lambda)(1 - \bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p) > 1 - (1-\lambda)\underline{d}_p > 0$ . As the denominator on the right-hand-side of Eq. (54) is positive, the right-hand-side of Eq. (54) is positive if and only if  $1 - (1-\lambda)(1 + \bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p) > 0$  or

$$\lambda > \frac{\bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_n}{1 + \bar{d}_p - \underline{d}_n}. \quad (56)$$

That is,  $y_i^* > 0$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}_p$  if Eq. (56) holds. Using analogous arguments, but for the quantities  $y_M^+ = \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}_p} y_i^*$  and  $y_M^- = \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}_n} y_i^*$ , it follows that  $y_i^* < 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_n$  if

$$\lambda > \frac{\bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p}{1 + \bar{d}_n - \underline{d}_p}. \quad (57)$$

This secures Eq. (16).

*Part 2:* We now show that Eq. (17) and Eq. (18) are sufficient for the  $\mathbf{x}^*$  polarized with respect to the partitioning  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  to be an equilibrium.

For any  $i \in \mathcal{V}_p$  and all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $x_i(t) = +1 = x_i(t+1) = +1$  if and only if  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t)) > 0$ , which from Eq. (14) is implied by

$$2\lambda\beta(1-\lambda)(\underline{d}_p y_m^+ + (1-\underline{d}_p)y_m^-) + (1-\beta)\lambda(2\underline{d}_p - 1) > 0 \quad (58)$$

where  $y_m^-$  and  $y_m^+$  were defined in *Part 1* of this proof. Noting Eq. (13) and simplifying the term  $\lambda$ , we can write Eq. (58) as follows

$$2\beta(y_m^+ - \lambda) + (1-\beta)(2\underline{d}_p - 1) > 0. \quad (59)$$

Substituting  $y_m^+$  from Eq. (54) and simplifying yields Eq. (17).

Following a similar argument, for any  $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$  and all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $x_i(t) = -1$  and  $x_i(t+1) = -1$  if and only if  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) < 0$ , which from Eq. (14) is implied by

$$2\lambda\beta(1-\lambda)(\bar{d}_n y_M^- + (1-\bar{d}_p)y_M^+) - (1-\beta)\lambda(2\bar{d}_n - 1) < 0 \quad (60)$$

where  $y_M^-$  and  $y_M^+$  were defined in *Part 1* of this proof. Utilizing again Eq. (13), we can write Eq. (60) as

$$2\beta(y_M^- + \lambda) - (1 - \beta)(2d_n - 1) < 0. \quad (61)$$

Finally, substituting the expression for  $y_M^-$ , computed to derive Eq. (57), we obtain Eq. (18). ■

### F. Proof of Theorem 3

The proof is based on the following set of arguments. Assuming that  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  and  $\mathbf{y}(t)$  are polarized for a given  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , we start by showing that if

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} > \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\beta(1-\lambda)}{1-\beta\lambda} \right), & i \in \mathcal{V}_p \\ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ij} > \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\beta(1-\lambda)}{1-\beta\lambda} \right), & i \in \mathcal{V}_n \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

holds, then the action vector  $\mathbf{x}(t+1)$  will be polarized; then we show that if also

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} > \frac{1-2\lambda}{1-\lambda}, & i \in \mathcal{V}_p \\ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ij} > \frac{1-2\lambda}{1-\lambda}, & i \in \mathcal{V}_n \end{cases} \quad (63)$$

holds, then the opinion vector  $\mathbf{y}(t+1)$  will also be polarized. Hence, by induction, if  $\mathbf{z}(0)$  is polarized, then  $\mathbf{z}(t)$  will be polarized, for all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Finally, Theorems 1 and 2 are leveraged to guarantee convergence to an equilibrium and that such equilibrium is polarized, respectively.

Let us consider an arbitrary time step  $t$ , at which an agent  $i$  activates, and suppose that the system is in a polarized state  $\mathbf{z}(t) = \mathbf{z}$  with respect to a partition  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ . We start by showing that if Eq. (62) holds, then  $x_i(t+1) = x_i(t)$ , and thus the action vector  $\mathbf{x}$  remains polarized. We demonstrate the computations for agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}_p$ , with the arguments for agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$  being almost identical and thus omitted.

Suppose that the agent active at time  $t$  is agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}_p$ , which implies that  $x_i(t) = +1$ . Now, agent  $i$  will not change action if  $\text{sgn}(\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t))) \geq 0$ . Considering the partitioning  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ , and dropping the time argument  $t$  for convenience, we can write Eq. (14) as:

$$\delta_i(\mathbf{z}) = p \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} y_j + p \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ik} y_k + q \left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (64)$$

where  $p = 2\lambda\beta(1-\lambda)$  and  $q = 2\lambda(1-\beta)$ . Since  $y_k \in [-1, 0]$ ,  $\forall k \in \mathcal{V}_n$  and  $y_j \in (0, +1]$ ,  $\forall j \in \mathcal{V}_p$ , Eq. (64) is implied by

$$\delta_i(\mathbf{z}) \geq -p \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ik} + q \left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} \right). \quad (65)$$

We know that  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ik} = 1 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij}$  because  $\mathbf{W}$  is stochastic. Thus, Eq. (65) is further implied by

$$\delta_i(\mathbf{z}) \geq (p+q) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} - \left( p + \frac{1}{2}q \right) \quad (66)$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{p}{p+q} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\beta(1-\lambda)}{1-\beta\lambda} \right) \quad (67)$$

implies  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}) \geq 0$ , which yields  $x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) = +1$ . Following a similar path for  $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$ , we conclude that the

action vector at  $\mathbf{x}(t+1)$  remains polarized with respect to the partitioning  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ .

Next, we prove that if Eqs. (62) and (63) holds, then  $\text{sgn}(y_i(t+1)) = \text{sgn}(y_i(t))$ , and thus  $\mathbf{y}(t+1)$  is polarized with respect to the same partitioning  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  just as  $\mathbf{y}(t)$ . Again, we consider agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}_p$  being the active agent at time  $t$ , and omit the computations for  $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$  as they follow a similar path.

Consider agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}_p$  as the active agent at time  $t$ . Since Eq. (62) holds, then  $\delta_i(\mathbf{z}(t)) \geq 0$ , as detailed above. Then, with  $y_k(t) \in [-1, 0]$ ,  $\forall k \in \mathcal{V}_n$ , and  $y_j(t) \in (0, +1]$ ,  $\forall j \in \mathcal{V}_p$ , observe that Eq. (9) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} y_i(t+1) &\geq (1-\lambda) \left( -\sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ik} \right) + \lambda \\ &= (1-\lambda) \left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij} - 1 \right) + \lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where the latter holds since  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_n} w_{ij} = 1 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_p} w_{ij}$ . Thus,  $y_i(t+1) > 0$  is implied by the right hand side of Eq. (68) being strictly positive, and this holds if the first condition in Eq. (63) holds. This, combined with Eq. (62), secures Eq. (19). Note that Eq. (62) always holds if  $\lambda > \frac{1}{2}$  because  $w_{ij}$  are nonnegative.

An induction argument can then be used to guarantee that  $\mathbf{z}(t)$  will be polarized, for any  $t \geq 0$ , if  $\mathbf{z}(0)$  is polarized with respect to the partition  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$  and Eq. (19) holds. Finally, Theorem 1—which can be applied since Assumptions 1–2 hold—guarantees that convergence whereby  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{z}(t) \rightarrow \mathbf{z}^*$ . Since  $\mathbf{z}(t)$  is polarized with respect to  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ , and because Eq. (19) verifies conditions (16)–(18) of Theorem 2 (which can be applied since Assumptions 1–3 hold), then  $\mathbf{z}^*$  must be polarized with respect to  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ . ■

### G. Proof of Corollary 3

First, observe that if  $d > 1/2$ , then Eqs. (16)–(18) hold, and Theorem 2 thus establishes that the system has a polarized equilibrium  $\mathbf{z}^* = (\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$  with respect to the partition  $(\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_n)$ . According to Lemma 2,  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is unique, and thus we need only to verify that  $\mathbf{y}^*$  satisfies the expression given in Eqs. (21)–(22). Under Eq. (20), it is straightforward to verify from Eq. (13) (by considering the equilibrium equations) that  $\mathbf{y}^*$  as defined by Eq. (21) satisfies the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{y}^+ = (1-\lambda)(d\mathbf{y}^+(1-d)\mathbf{y}^-) + \lambda \\ \mathbf{y}^- = (1-\lambda)(d\mathbf{y}^-(1-d)\mathbf{y}^+) - \lambda \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

and whose solution is Eq. (22). ■


## REFERENCES

- [1] A. V. Proskurnikov and R. Tempo, "A tutorial on modeling and analysis of dynamic social networks. Part I," *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 43, pp. 65–79, 2017.
- [2] J. Riehl, P. Ramazi, and M. Cao, "A survey on the analysis and control of evolutionary matrix games," *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 45, pp. 87–106, 2018.
- [3] N. E. Friedkin and E. C. Johnsen, *Social Influence Network Theory: A Sociological Examination of Small Group Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, 2011, vol. 33.
- [4] M. Granovetter, "Threshold Models of Collective Behavior," *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 83, no. 6, pp. 1420–1443, 1978.
- [5] A. Flache, M. Mäs, T. Feliciani, E. Chattoe-Brown, G. Deffuant, S. Huet, and J. Lorenz, "Models of Social Influence: Towards the Next Frontiers," *Journal of Artificial Societies & Social Simulation*, vol. 20, no. 4, 2017.

- [6] N. E. Friedkin, "The problem of social control and coordination of complex systems in sociology: A look at the community cleavage problem," *IEEE Contr. Syst. Mag.*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 40–51, 2015.
- [7] P. Cisneros-Velarde, K. Chan, and F. Bullo, "Polarization and fluctuations in signed social networks," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 2020.
- [8] H. Peyton Young, "The Evolution of Social Norms," *Annu. Rev. Econ.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 359–387, 2015.
- [9] H. P. Young, "The dynamics of social innovation," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 108, no. Supplement 4, pp. 21 285–21 291, 2011.
- [10] J. R. P. French Jr, "A Formal Theory of Social Power," *Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 181–194, 1956.
- [11] M. H. DeGroot, "Reaching a consensus," *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, vol. 69, no. 345, pp. 118–121, 1974.
- [12] N. E. Friedkin and E. C. Johnsen, "Social influence and opinions," *J. Math. Sociol.*, vol. 15, no. 3–4, pp. 193–206, 1990.
- [13] S. E. Parsegov, A. V. Proskurnikov, R. Tempo, and N. E. Friedkin, "Novel multidimensional models of opinion dynamics in social networks," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2270–2285, 2017.
- [14] C. Altafini, "Consensus Problems on Networks with Antagonistic Interactions," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 935–946, 2013.
- [15] W. Xia, M. Cao, and K. Johansson, "Structural Balance and Opinion Separation in Trust–Mistrust Social Networks," *IEEE Trans. Control. Netw. Syst.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 46–56, 2016.
- [16] A. V. Proskurnikov, A. S. Matveev, and M. Cao, "Opinion dynamics in social networks with hostile camps: Consensus vs. polarization," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 1524–1536, 2016.
- [17] J. Liu, X. Chen, T. Başar, and M. A. Belabbas, "Exponential convergence of the discrete- and continuous-time altafini models," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 6168–6182, 2017.
- [18] A. V. Proskurnikov and R. Tempo, "A tutorial on modeling and analysis of dynamic social networks. part II," *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 45, pp. 166–190, 2018.
- [19] B. D. O. Anderson and M. Ye, "Recent Advances in the Modelling and Analysis of Opinion dynamics on Influence Networks," *Int. J. Autom. Comput.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 129–149, Feb. 2019.
- [20] M. O. Jackson and Y. Zenou, "Games on Networks," in *Handbook of Game Theory with Economic Applications*. Elsevier, 2015, vol. 4, ch. 3, pp. 95–163.
- [21] A. Montanari and A. Saberi, "The spread of innovations in social networks," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 107, no. 47, pp. 20 196–20 201, 2010.
- [22] P. Ramazi, J. Riehl, and M. Cao, "Networks of conforming or non-conforming individuals tend to reach satisfactory decisions," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 113, no. 46, pp. 12 985–12 990, 2016.
- [23] J. R. Riehl and M. Cao, "Towards optimal control of evolutionary games on networks," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 458–462, 2017.
- [24] M. Q. Patton, "Utilization-focused evaluation," in *International handbook of educational evaluation*. Springer, 2003, pp. 223–242.
- [25] G. T. Henry and M. M. Mark, "Beyond use: Understanding evaluation's influence on attitudes and actions," *Am. J. Eval.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 293–314, 2003.
- [26] D. Greenberg, M. Mandell, and M. Onstott, "The dissemination and utilization of welfare-to-work experiments in state policymaking," *J. Policy Anal. Manag.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 367–382, 2000.
- [27] J. Haidt, "The emotional dog and its rational tail: a social intuitionist approach to moral judgment," *Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 108, no. 4, p. 814, 2001.
- [28] S. Gavrillets and P. J. Richerson, "Collective action and the evolution of social norm internalization," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 114, no. 23, pp. 6068–6073, 2017.
- [29] B. Lindström, S. Jangard, I. Selbing, and A. Olsson, "The role of a "common is moral" heuristic in the stability and change of moral norms," *J. Exp. Psychol. Gen.*, vol. 147, no. 2, p. 228, 2018.
- [30] P. Duggins, "A psychologically-motivated model of opinion change with applications to american politics," *J. Artif. Soc. Soc. Simul.*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2017.
- [31] M. Ye, Y. Qin, A. Govaert, B. D. Anderson, and M. Cao, "An influence network model to study discrepancies in expressed and private opinions," *Automatica*, vol. 107, pp. 371–381, 2019.
- [32] D. Centola, R. Willer, and M. Macy, "The emperor's dilemma: A computational model of self-enforcing norms," *Am. J. Sociol.*, vol. 110, no. 4, pp. 1009–1040, 2005.
- [33] L. Zino, M. Ye, and M. Cao, "A two-layer model for coevolving opinion dynamics and collective decision-making in complex social systems," *Chaos*, vol. 30, no. 8, p. 083107, 2020.
- [34] ———, "A coevolutionary model for actions and opinions in social networks," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1110–1115.
- [35] D. Monderer and L. S. Shapley, "Potential games," *Games Econ. Behav.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 124–143, 1996.
- [36] M. P. Fiorina and S. J. Abrams, "Political polarization in the american public," *Annu. Rev. Political Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 563–588, 2008.
- [37] M. Cinelli, G. De Francisci Morales, A. Galeazzi, W. Quattrociocchi, and M. Starnini, "The echo chamber effect on social media," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 118, no. 9, 2021.
- [38] P. Dandekar, A. Goel, and D. T. Lee, "Biased assimilation, homophily, and the dynamics of polarization," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 110, no. 15, pp. 5791–5796, 2013.
- [39] W. Xia, M. Ye, J. Liu, M. Cao, and X.-M. Sun, "Analysis of a nonlinear opinion dynamics model with biased assimilation," *Automatica*, vol. 120, p. 109113, 2020.
- [40] K. Takács, A. Flache, and M. Mäs, "Discrepancy and disliking do not induce negative opinion shifts," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 11, no. 6, p. e0157948, 2016.
- [41] R. K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Free Press: New York, 1968.
- [42] D. A. Prentice and D. T. Miller, "Pluralistic ignorance and alcohol use on campus: some consequences of misperceiving the social norm," *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 64, no. 2, p. 243, 1993.
- [43] C. D. Godsil and G. Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*. Springer: New York, 2001, p. 207.
- [44] S. Boccaletti, G. Bianconi, R. Criado, C. del Genio, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, M. Romance, I. Sendiña-Nadal, Z. Wang, and M. Zanin, "The structure and dynamics of multilayer networks," *Phys. Rep.*, vol. 544, no. 1, pp. 1 – 122, 2014.
- [45] R. Amato, L. Lacasa, A. Díaz-Guilera, and A. Baronchelli, "The dynamics of norm change in the cultural evolution of language," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 115, no. 33, pp. 8260–8265, 2018.
- [46] W. Samuelson and R. Zeckhauser, "Status Quo Bias in Decision Making," *J. Risk Uncertain.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 7–59, 1988.
- [47] H. J. O'Gorman, "Pluralistic Ignorance and White Estimates of White Support for Racial Segregation," *Public Opin. Q.*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 313–330, 1975.
- [48] A. Berman and R. J. Plemmons, *Nonnegative matrices in the mathematical sciences*. SIAM, 1994.



**Hassan Dehghani Aghbolagh** (S'15) was born in Urmia, Iran. He received his B.Sc., and M.Sc. in Electrical Engineering from the Islamic Azad University of Urmia, and the University of Tabriz, Iran, in 2014 and 2016, respectively. He was a member of Network Control Systems (NCS) Lab at the department of Electrical Engineering, University of Tabriz. He is currently a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Newcastle, Australia, which started in 2018 after he received UNIPRS and UNRSC scholarships. His research interests include modeling and control of multi-agent systems and analysis of opinion dynamics.



**Mengbin Ye** (S'13-M'18) was born in Guangzhou, China. He received the B.E. degree (with First Class Honours) in mechanical engineering from the University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand in 2013, and the Ph.D. degree in engineering at the Australian National University, Canberra, Australia in 2018. From 2018-2020, he was a postdoctoral researcher with the Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Groningen, Netherlands. From 2020 - 2021, he was an Optus Fellow at

the Optus-Curtin Centre of Excellence in Artificial Intelligence, Curtin University, Perth, Australia. In 2021, he commenced a four year Western Australia Premier's Early to Mid-Career Fellowship, hosted by Curtin University. He was awarded the J.G. Crawford Prize (Interdisciplinary) in 2018, ANU's premier award recognising graduate research excellence. He has also received the 2018 Springer PhD Thesis Prize, and was Highly Commended in the Best Student Paper Award at the 2016 Australian Control Conference. His current research interests include opinion formation and decision making in complex social networks, epidemic modelling and control, and cooperative control of multi-agent systems.



**Zhiyong Chen** received the B.E. degree from the University of Science and Technology of China, and the M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees from the Chinese University of Hong Kong, in 2000, 2002 and 2005, respectively. He worked as a Research Associate at the University of Virginia during 2005-2006. He joined the University of Newcastle, Australia, in 2006, where he is currently a Professor. He was also a Changjiang Chair Professor with Central South University, Changsha, China. His research interests include

non-linear systems and control, biological systems, and multi-agent systems. He is/was an Associate Editor of *Automatica*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* and *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*.



**Lorenzo Zino** (M'21) is a PostDoc Researcher at the Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands, since 2019. He received the Laurea degree (B.Sc.) in Applied Mathematics from Politecnico di Torino, Torino, Italy, in 2012, the Laurea Magistrale degree (M.S.) in Mathematical Modeling (summa cum laude) from Politecnico di Torino, in 2014, and the Ph.D. in Pure and Applied Mathematics (with honours) from Politecnico di Torino and Università di Torino (joint

doctorate program), in 2018. He was a Research Fellow at Politecnico di Torino in 2018-19 and a Visiting Research Assistant at New York University Tandon School of Engineering, Brooklyn NY, US, in 2017-18 and in 2019. His current research interests include modeling, analysis, and control of dynamical processes over complex networks, applied probability, network analysis, and game theory.



**Ming Cao** (S'05'M08'SM16) has since 2016 been a professor of networks and robotics with the Engineering and Technology Institute (ENTEG) at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands, where he started as an assistant professor in 2008. He received the Bachelor degree in 1999 and the Master degree in 2002 from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, and the Ph.D. degree in 2007 from Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA, all in Electrical Engineering. From September 2007 to August 2008, he was

a Postdoctoral Research Associate with the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA. He worked as a research intern during the summer of 2006 with the Mathematical Sciences Department at the IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, NY, USA. He is the 2017 and inaugural recipient of the Manfred Thoma medal from the International Federation of Automatic Control (IFAC) and the 2016 recipient of the European Control Award sponsored by the European Control Association (EUCA). He is a Senior Editor for *Systems and Control Letters*, an Associate Editor for *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, and was an associate editor for *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems* and *IEEE Circuits and Systems Magazine*. He is a member of the IFAC Conference Board and a vice chair of the IFAC Technical Committee on Large-Scale Complex Systems. His research interests include autonomous agents and multi-a