

Dynamics of Polarization Under Normative Institutions and Opinion Expression Stewarding.

Atrisha Sarkar

Schwartz Reisman Institute for Technology and Society
Vector Institute for Artificial Intelligence
University of Toronto
Canada
atrisha.sarkar@utoronto.ca

Gillian K. Hadfield

Schwartz Reisman Institute for Technology and Society
Vector Institute for Artificial Intelligence
Faculty of Law
University of Toronto
Canada
g.hadfield@utoronto.ca

ABSTRACT

Although there is mounting empirical evidence for the increase in affective polarization, few mechanistic models can explain its emergence at the population level. The question of how such a phenomenon can emerge from divergent opinions of a population on an ideological issue is still an open issue. In this paper, we establish that human normativity, that is, individual expression of normative opinions based on beliefs about the population, can lead to population-level polarization when ideological institutions distort beliefs in accordance with their objective of moving expressed opinion to one extreme. Using a game-theoretic model, we establish that individuals with more extreme opinions will have more extreme rhetoric and higher misperceptions about their outgroup members. Our model also shows that when social recommendation systems mediate institutional signals, we can observe the formation of different institutional communities, each with its unique community structure and characteristics. Using the model, we identify practical strategies platforms can implement, such as reducing exposure to signals from ideological institutions and a tailored approach to content moderation, both of which can rectify the affective polarization problem within its purview.

KEYWORDS

Game theory, Normative systems, Computational social science

1 INTRODUCTION

The role of social media and polarization of the public sphere has become one of the most discussed topics in academic and popular discourse [5, 38]. Both from an empirical and theoretical point of view, much attention has been paid to the design of social media platforms, in particular, how the structure of the network can promote the formation of an echo chamber, that is, an interaction pattern of users that reinforces users' beliefs and opinions by isolating them from opposing viewpoints [18, 19]. Existing theoretical models of polarization are based on a combination of technological and psychological factors [1, 36]. These models suggest that a platform's content recommendation system, in combination with a homophily-based pattern of interaction, reinforces a psychological confirmation bias that solidifies users' preexisting false beliefs. However, simplistic attempts to mitigate this problem by exposing people to opposing viewpoints have been shown to make the problem even worse by increasing polarization [6]. Alternate models have shown that polarization, especially the kind in which people

form contradictory beliefs when presented with the same factual information, can be a rational phenomenon based on differences in subjective past experiences [23, 50]. And a large-scale experiment on the Facebook platform demonstrated that increasing the share of a user's feed that is coming from like-minded people and publishers did not significantly affect any measures of polarization [43]. Together, this literature suggests that it will be difficult to use content-based methods to decrease ideological polarization of beliefs.

An alternative approach has argued that mitigation efforts should focus on affective polarization, meaning the rhetorical intensity with which opposing viewpoints are expressed and characterized by strong partisanship and deep negative animosity toward political opponents [57]. Although there is a rise in affective polarization, not just in the political sphere but also along several contentious issues globally [10, 49], there are still open questions around the phenomenon. For example, existing models of polarization do not explain how ideological positions relate to the expression of opinions through extreme rhetoric. We also lack a model to study the dynamics of affective polarization that can capture the cluster of empirical observations associated with the process, namely, misperceptions about out-group beliefs, frequent engagement on social media, and overall higher participation in political opinion expression [35, 58].

In this paper, we present a model of affective polarization that arises from differences in the expression of normative opinions when there is a perception of a group conflict. Human normativity is the process of coordinating norm expression, that is, value-driven judgements and sanctions about right and wrong behaviour. Norm expression in this context refers to verbal criticisms, rebukes, and any expression of value-driven feeling directed against another individual who may or may not share the same normative value. We develop a game-theoretic model that relies primarily on strategic coordination of norm expression with others in a community. Within human normativity, the particular content of the norm is often arbitrary, and the expression or enforcement of the norm does not rely on the material benefit associated with the particular norm in question [11]. This property makes human normativity an appropriate model for ideological thinking, since typical positions along which affective polarization manifests – vaccine opposition, climate change scepticism, religious intolerance, can appear irrational when evaluated in light of their material consequences.

Although the clustering of ideological positions without connection to evidence-based reasoning or material benefits has been

one concern, another has been the ‘toxicity’ of discourse in online spaces [39]. If the first is the question of *what* is being expressed, the second is the question of *how* it is being expressed. The manner of expression, especially when it comes to violent and hate speech, has been a growing concern and especially difficult to manage on digital platforms [20]. We relate this question to one of intensity of norm expression, that is, how intensely one personally sanctions perceived norm violation through speech expression on online platforms. In experimental settings, variations in the degree of norm enforcement have often been observed, depending on the belief about the degree to which a norm is established in a community [14]. Relating that to norm expression in an online space, the connection between the extremity of opinion and extremity of expression is a salient one. If the two are uncorrelated, then platform moderation based on extreme expression will address the problem of extreme opinions, and vice versa. Using our microfoundational model, we establish a correlation between the two, which provides a positive outlook for platform governance.

Institutions play a crucial role in human normative systems [4]. Institutional actions convey information about the community. In a microfoundation model, institutions are modelled as providers of strategically valuable information about the beliefs of the population that helps coordinate normative behaviour in individuals [21]. Recent years have seen a significant rise in opinion leaders, independent partisan media, and political influencers, in online spaces that perform the above function [47]. Their role has been referred to as one of norm entrepreneurs, and there have also been calls to consider regulation and reevaluate their roles and responsibilities towards the health of our social institutions [16]. Our paper develops a model of *institutional stewarding* – a process of shaping the long-run beliefs in a community based on who participates in norm expression. We consider two types of institutions, participatory institutions, that have the goal of maximising participation, and ideological institutions, that have the goal of moving the normative expression to one extreme. We elucidate the optimal strategies for each of these institutions, and show that ideological institutions achieve their objective by making a community believe that the outgroup is more extreme than in reality. This provides a mechanistic explanation for recent empirical studies showing similar patterns of behaviour on online platforms [17, 46]. We also show that when there are multiple such institutions present in a platform and people hold heterogeneous beliefs, the platform’s recommendation system can form institutional communities, and the process has a polarising effect.

Finally, our model also explains the *type* of the polarization that emerges under ideology-driven norm expression. By now, there is mounting empirical evidence that shows that the landscape of affective polarization is one of *perceived* polarization, meaning that while the broader population remains mostly non-polarised on most issues, individuals with higher degree of partisanship perceive the population to be more polarised [12, 56]. Furthermore, people further to the extremes systematically overestimate their ‘outgroup’ to be more extreme than in reality [35]. This phenomenon is not only localised to the political climate of the United States, but has been reproduced across the globe [49], and also in laboratory experiments [32]. There is also an association of this phenomenon with partisan

media consumption, voter turnout, and overall greater participation in the political process [56, 58]. Given that online platforms have become the de facto avenue for partisan opinion expression, it is not surprising that this ‘false polarization’ [35] is the dominant story of polarization in online platforms. We highlight that this is a population phenomenon; due to difference in participation, a population seems more polarised publicly, which is different from individuals changing their opinion in a filter bubble towards one extreme. Despite this evidence, there are still limited models in the literature that can explain the emergence of this phenomenon. Existing explanations are based on theories of social identity [34] and a set of cognitive biases [27]. Although such models provide valuable insight into individual psychology, it is difficult to translate them into mitigation strategies that platforms can implement to remedy the problem. In comparison, our model highlights that a simple strategy of a customised approach to moderating extreme *expression* can have the beneficial secondary effect of correcting distortion about outgroup beliefs and thus reducing polarization.

We organise the rest of the paper as follows. In Sec. 2, we present the basic structure of the norm expression game, the coordination game that models the process of normative opinion expression in individuals. In Sec. 3, we present the process of *institutional stewarding*, by which institutions influence the descriptive beliefs in the normative opinion expression game by generating signals about the opinions of the approval and disapproval groups. In that section, we also develop a Markov Decision Process (MDP) based optimisation procedure for generating an optimal signalling policy for two types of institutions – participatory and ideological. In Sec. 4, we extend this idea to a more realistic environment with multiple institutions, a population with heterogeneous beliefs, and an environment in which an online platform’s recommendation system mediates the institutional stewarding process. We show the formation of institutional communities and discuss the opinions and belief characteristics of each institutional community. We conclude by presenting implications for policies that can mitigate the population polarization identified in our model.

2 NORMATIVE OPINION EXPRESSION GAME

We model individual behaviour of opinion expression on a normative question as a strategic relation between the individual (focal player) and a representative player from their ‘ingroup’ who share their overall position on the normative question. We capture this process using a normative opinion expression game. First, we present the main constructs of the game, followed by an equilibrium analysis that determines individual behaviour.

2.1 Opinions

Each individual, indexed as i , holds private opinions $o_i \in [0, 1]$ on a particular normative question. Using game-theoretic terminology, the opinion of the player i is their *type* which is private information. The opinions can be drawn from an arbitrary opinion distribution $f_{(o_A, o_D)}$, where (o_A, o_D) is the mean approval and disapproval opinions on which the distribution is parameterized. The values $o_i < 0.5$ indicate *disapproval* on the focal issue and $o_i \geq 0.5$ indicates *approval*. Opinions lying on the continuum between 0 and 1 represent the diversity of opinions that go beyond a simple yes/no dichotomy.




Figure 1: Opinion expression game from a focal agent i 's perspective. The agent has an opinion of approval ($o_i \geq 0.5$), and their rhetoric intensity is a result of the equilibrium of the (imperfect information) game that captures the strategic relationship between the focal player and a representative in-group player drawn from the population. Table 1 describes the parameters of this interaction.

At the two extremes, an opinion of $o_i = 1$ or $o_i = 0$ denotes complete support for or against the normative question, respectively. On the other hand, opinion between 0 and 1 indicates that on average an individual may support (or not support) a particular position, but under some contexts, they may have opposite opinions. As a simple illustration, consider, for example, the normative question of whether animal testing should be prohibited. While one may generally support prohibition, there may be contexts, such as the development of critical life-saving drugs, where the same individual might be okay with it. Contrast this with another individual who opposes animal testing in all possible circumstances. Simply put, the opinion o_i captures the strength of approval or disapproval of an individual with respect to the normative question.

2.2 Rhetoric intensity

Whereas opinion represent a individual private position on an issue, rhetoric intensity deals with the question of *how* one chooses to express it. Continuing on the previous example, an individual who has absolute support for prohibition ($o_i = 1$) can choose to express that opinion mildly or may also express the same opinion in an extreme way with verbal abuse that crosses the limits of a civil discourse. Therefore, making this distinction between opinion and the rhetoric used to share that opinion, the variable rhetoric intensity γ_i on a scale from 0 to 1 captures how one expresses that opinion, ranging from an extremely mild expression ($\gamma \approx 0$) to a threat of violence or other forms of extreme behaviour ($\gamma \approx 1$).

2.3 Descriptive beliefs

These sets of variables capture an individual i 's belief about the attributes of the two subpopulations, namely the approval group




Figure 2: The utility of expressing opinion (after deducting the cost) as a function of rhetoric intensity for the focal player. The utility maximizing rhetoric intensity of the focal player decreases with the increase in representative in-group player's rhetoric intensity.

and the disapproval group. The set of attributes include belief about the mean opinion of the subpopulation that agrees with i 's overall opinion ($o_{in,i}$), where the value $\hat{o}_{in,i}$ represents the individual's estimate of $E_f[o | o \geq 0.5]$ when i 's own opinion is of approval and $E_f[o | o < 0.5]$ $o_i \geq 0.5$ and < 0.5 , when i 's own opinion is of disapproval, respectively. We refer to this subpopulation as the *ingroup* from the perspective of the individual i . Similarly, the mean opinion of the subpopulation that disagrees with the overall opinion of i 's is denoted by $o_{out,i}$ and we refer to that as the *outgroup* from the perspective of an individual. Next, we denote the estimate of the *proportion* of the population that has the opinion of approval as \hat{n} . This can be estimated based on the cumulative distribution function of the opinion distribution f ; $\hat{n}_i = F_{o \sim f}(o = 0.5)$ for $o_i < 0.5$ and $\hat{n}_i = (1 - F_{o \sim f}(o = 0.5))$ for $o_i \geq 0.5$, respectively, where $F_{o \sim f}$ is the c. d. f of the belief distribution f . When we consider homogeneous beliefs, that is, when everyone within the same subgroup, approval or disapproval, has common beliefs, we drop the subscript i since it becomes redundant. The final attribute is the belief about the mean rhetoric intensity of the outgroup ($\gamma_{out,i}$). An attribute missing from descriptive belief is the mean rhetoric intensity of the in-group subpopulation. We model that as a strategic choice variable in the normative opinion expression game that captures the strategic relation between an individual and their in-group partner. Thereby, the rhetoric intensity of the ingroup becomes a strategic variable that an individual estimates based on the equilibrium outcome and not as part of the descriptive beliefs based on which that game is played. Table 1 shows the list of descriptive beliefs for ease of reference in the rest of the paper.

2.4 Cost and utilities

The opinion expression game is played between an individual, indexed as i and a representative in-group player indexed as $-i$. This is a symmetric game, and the following equation formalises the utility in the game for player i as a function of both player's rhetoric intensity γ_i, γ_{-i} .

Parameters	Parameter type	Description
\hat{n}	Descriptive belief	Estimated proportion of in-group in the population
$\hat{o}_{-i,\text{in.}}$		Mean opinion of in-group
$\hat{o}_{\text{out.}}$		Mean opinion of out-group
$\gamma_{\text{out.}}$		Rhetoric intensity of the out-group
α		Level of enforcement of a platform's moderation policy
$\gamma_{-i,\text{in.}}$	Strategic choices	Rhetoric intensity of the in-group representative player
γ_i		Rhetoric intensity of the focal player
o_i	Private information	Opinion of the focal player

Table 1: Parameters that define the interaction between two players within a group.

$$\begin{aligned}
 u_i(\gamma_i, \gamma_{-i}; o_i) = & \underbrace{\hat{n} \cdot \hat{o}_{-i,\text{in.}} \cdot o_i \cdot \gamma_i^{(1-\gamma_{-i,\text{in.}})} + (1 - \hat{n}) \cdot \hat{o}_{\text{out.}} \cdot o_i \cdot \gamma_i}_{\text{Utility from expressing opinion}} \\
 & - \underbrace{(\alpha + \gamma_{\text{out.}}) \cdot \gamma_i}_{\text{Cost of expressing opinion}} \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

The above utility equation consists of three parts that capture i) the strategic relation between the player and their in-group, ii) the utility they player gets from their expression as a function of the characteristics of the outgroup, and iii) the cost the platform and the outgroup enforces on the player's expression.

The first part ($\hat{n} \cdot \hat{o}_{-i,\text{in.}} \cdot o_i \cdot \gamma_i^{(1-\gamma_{-i,\text{in.}})}$) says that utility from an individual's opinion is a result of a cumulative effect of the opinion, the mean ingroup opinion and the proportion of ingroup population put together. This utility is also scaled by a rhetoric intensity factor ($\gamma_i^{(1-\gamma_{-i,\text{in.}})}$). With a higher ingroup rhetoric intensity, an individual can *free-ride* by moderating one's own rhetoric intensity. Whereas a lower ingroup rhetoric intensity requires the individual to increase their own rhetoric. Therefore, the nature of the strategic relationship between the individual and the ingroup partner is one of strategic complements. The rhetoric intensity factor captures this utility.

The second part of the utility function ($(1 - \hat{n}) \cdot \hat{o}_{\text{out.}} \cdot o_i \cdot \gamma_i$) includes the utility one gets from expressing their opinion as a result of the characteristics of the outgroup. The utility is constructed on the basis of the alignment of the mean outgroup's opinion and the individual's own opinion. The relation between the individual and outgroup is not a complementary relation, meaning that when the outgroup has higher rhetoric intensity, that does not increase the utility of the individual but rather decreases the utility. Therefore, the rhetoric intensity factor for this relation is not scaled by the exponent as in the relation with the ingroup.

Finally, the utility also includes a cost factor, thus capturing the dual nature of normative opinion expression. One gets utility from expressing their opinion but also incurs cost when that opinion runs counter to members of the population and other external factors. In our case, the level of moderation of the platform (α) is an exogenous factor. A stricter moderation policy (higher α) incurs a higher cost on the expression of opinions with increasing rhetoric intensity. The final cost factor represents the rivalrous relation

with the outgroup, that is, higher rhetoric intensity of the outgroup increases the cost.

The dual nature of rhetoric expression as represented using the cost and utility makes the total utility concave with respect to the rhetoric intensity. This means that there is an optimal rhetoric intensity for an individual at which the marginal benefit of opinion expression equals the marginal cost, and at that rhetoric intensity the individual gets the highest utility. Figure 2 shows this relationship; rhetoric intensity of the individual indexed as i is shown on the axis x and the axis y represents the total utility. The optimal rhetoric intensity also depends on the rhetoric intensity of the in-group player ($\gamma_{\text{in},i}$), shown in the figure as the three separate utility curves, and the optimal rhetoric intensity decreases with the increase in the ingroup player's rhetoric intensity, which highlights the complementary relationship.

2.5 Equilibrium

With all the key components of the opinion expression game set up, in this section, we present the analysis of the equilibrium rhetoric intensity that determines the outcome of the game. Since the game is one of imperfect information due to the private opinions of the individuals determining the strategic decisions, the game's outcome can be analysed using the formal solution concept of *ex-interim* symmetric Bayesian Nash equilibrium in continuous strategies. This is because the type, i.e. one's own opinion, is known and private to the individual player, and the strategic decision of selecting the rhetoric intensity is made before a player has complete information about the opinion (i.e. the type) of the representative player.

Given a particular assignment of the set of variables in descriptive belief, the optimal rhetoric intensity of the focal player i can be found by taking the partial derivative of the utility in Equation 1 with respect to γ_i . Similarly, the non-focal player $-i$'s optimal rhetoric can be calculated in the same way by taking the partial derivative of the utility with respect to the focal player i 's rhetoric intensity. The intersection of these sets of functions (best response curves) determines an equilibrium rhetoric intensity at which either player cannot gain utility by unilaterally changing their rhetoric intensity. The equations for the two sets of best response (*BR*) curves are as follows.

$$BR_i(\gamma_{-i}) = \min \left[1, \left(\frac{\hat{n} \cdot \hat{o}_{-i} \cdot o_i \cdot (1 - \gamma_{-i})}{\alpha + \gamma_{\text{out.}} - \hat{o}_{\text{out.}} \cdot o_i \cdot (1 - \hat{n})} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_{-i}}} \right] \quad (2)$$




Figure 3: Best response curves of the optimal rhetoric intensity for the focal player (shown in red) and the representative in-group player (shown in blue) as a function of each other's rhetoric intensity. The intersection of the two curves represents the equilibrium rhetoric intensity. The plots are shown for different opinion values (type) of the focal player, and we see that as the opinion moves to the extreme, the symmetric equilibrium rhetoric intensity becomes higher.

$$BR_{-i}(\gamma_i) = \min \left[1, \left(\frac{\hat{n} \cdot o_i \cdot \hat{\delta}_{-i} \cdot (1 - \gamma_i)}{\alpha + \gamma_{out} - \hat{\delta}_{out} \cdot \hat{\delta}_{-i} \cdot (1 - \hat{n})} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_i}} \right] \quad (3)$$

The Bayesian Nash equilibrium of an imperfect information game assigns strategies for every possible *type* of a player. This means that in our case, there is an equilibrium rhetoric intensity that corresponds to the opinion o_i of the focal player. We can establish this relation by solving the set of Equations 2 and 3 based on the equilibrium condition $BR_i(\gamma_{-i, in}^*) = BR_{-i}(\gamma_i^*)$ where $(\gamma_i^*, \gamma_{-i, in}^*)$ represents the pair of equilibrium rhetoric intensities. Other than the parameters in the set of descriptive beliefs, which are treated as constants, the solutions to these equations are a function of the opinion o_i of the focal player.

Fig. 3 shows the plot of the two best response curves (the focal player is shown in red, the best response curve of the non-focal player is shown in blue), the equilibria (intersection of the two curves), and the manner in which the equilibria change with increasing opinion value of the focal player i . Focusing on the symmetric equilibria, i.e. equilibria in which the optimal rhetoric intensity of the focal player and the representative in-group player is the same ($\gamma_i^* = \gamma_{in}^*$), we see that with increasing opinion values o_i , the equilibrium rhetoric intensity becomes higher. This is because at more extreme opinion values, the higher utility that comes from the increased extremity of opinion can offset the cost incurred due to increased rhetoric intensity.

We note that there are two different forms of the best response functions. At lower values ($o_i = 0$ and $o_i = 0.57$ in the plots), the best response takes a concave form whereas for moderate to high opinion values ($o_i = 0.6$ and higher in the plots) it takes a convex shape. This is due to the difference in optimal rhetoric intensity across different opinion values in response to when the partner's rhetoric intensity is zero. In general, when the other player's rhetoric is zero, the focal player can compensate by increasing their rhetoric intensity. However, when the utility from opinion is low (as in at moderate opinion values), this compensatory response is not enough to bring positive utility to the focal player. In such cases, the best response is to keep their rhetoric intensity to zero to avoid the cost. Compare this to the other extreme in which the partner's rhetoric intensity is at the maximum 1, and in that case, irrespective of the opinion of the focal player, it is always optimal to reduce their rhetoric intensity to zero. This difference in response

results in two different forms of the best response functions, and the following theorem makes use of this finding.

THEOREM 1. *For all agents i , such that $o_i > \frac{\alpha + \gamma_{out} + \epsilon}{2(\hat{n} \cdot \hat{\delta}_{in} + (1 - \hat{n}) \cdot \hat{\delta}_{out})}$ the agent i 's optimal rhetoric intensity is greater than zero.*

PROOF. When the following condition is true $\hat{n} \cdot \hat{\delta}_{-i} \cdot o_i \cdot (1 - \gamma_{-i}) + \epsilon > \alpha + \gamma_{out} - \hat{\delta}_{out} \cdot o_i \cdot (1 - \hat{n})$ in Eqn. 2, $\lim_{\gamma_{-i} \rightarrow \infty} BR_i(\gamma_{-i}) = 1$. Whereas, $BR(\gamma_{-i} = 1) = 0$. Therefore, by Intermediate Value Theorem, there exists a value of $\gamma_{-i}^* > 0$ and $\gamma_i^* > 0$ such that $BR(\gamma_{-i}^*) = \gamma_{-i}^*$ and $\gamma_{-i}^* = \gamma_i^*$. Similarly, by symmetry, $BR(\gamma_i^*) = \gamma_i^*$. Therefore, an equilibrium with $\gamma_i^* > 0$ is guaranteed to exist for the above condition. \square

COROLLARY 1.1. *If there exists an opinion $o_i \in [0.5, 1]$ for an individual i such that $\gamma_i^* = 0$, then for all individuals i' with opinion $o'_i \in [0.5, o_i]$, the optimal rhetoric intensity $\gamma_{i'}^*$ is also zero. Conversely, if there exists an opinion $o_i \in [0, 0.5]$ for an individual i such that $\gamma_i^* = 0$, then for all individuals i' with opinion $o'_i \in [0, o_i]$, the optimal rhetoric intensity $\gamma_{i'}^*$ is also zero.*

The implication of the above theorem and the corollary is as follows. If we consider that the rhetoric intensity $\gamma = 0$ encodes the act of staying silent and not expressing one's opinion, then individuals who are more likely to stay silent are those with moderate opinions.

3 INSTITUTIONAL STEWARDING

The normative opinion expression game presented in the previous section is a static game in which the descriptive beliefs were held constant and we analyzed the strategic decision of opinion expression with chosen rhetoric intensity as the equilibrium of the static game. In this section, we present the institutional stewarding process, that is, when individuals choose actions based on the static opinion expression game, and institutions can influence the beliefs in the game by conveying strategically relevant information. We show that based on their own long-run objectives, institutions can use their coordination capacity to sway publicly expressed opinion by shaping who expresses their opinion and who stays silent. We model silence as an equilibrium rhetoric intensity close to zero.

Ingroup and Outgroup signalling. The nature of the institutions we consider in our model are those that convey information about




Figure 4: Schematic representation of the institutional stewarding process. [1] An institution randomly samples a signal that conveys information about approval and disapproval group’s opinions from the institution’s signalling scheme. [2] The focal agent updates their descriptive belief based on the signal [3]. The focal agent estimates the equilibrium rhetoric intensity and expresses opinions. [4] A community of agents who express opinions based on the same signal. [5] The focal agent updates descriptive beliefs based on the expressed opinion in the community.

the population’s opinions. Traditional media, such as newsprint and talk radio, as well as new media institutions, such as political influencers and independent online media, fall under this bucket. We model the actions of institutions as a set of signals, one conveying information about the population that approves a particular position, and another about the population that disapproves of that position. More concretely, these signals manifest themselves in the form of the choice made by institutions about who to interview for a particular story, whose opinion to share on social media, and choosing the bias and slant [41] in the content of the reporting that conveys information about each of the positions of the group.

Signalling policy and bounded confidence constraints. By adding their own slant to a story that conveys information about a population, media institutions can generate biased signals that differ from the true opinion of the two groups in the population (see [48] for a recent systematic review). We refer to this slant and bias as the institution’s signalling policy and can be represented as the distribution $\pi(o_I|\hat{\delta})$, where o_I is the institution’s signal and $\hat{\delta}$ is the institution’s estimate of the true approval or disapproval opinion. Even though an institution can bias its signalling policy, the generated signals cannot be arbitrary; rather, those signals need to convey some meaningful information about the population. Based on the Bounded Confidence model of Hegselmann and Krause [45],

we model this requirement with the help of a constraining distribution C that connects the generated signal and the estimated true belief. The constraining distribution C models the random variable of the absolute difference between the signal and the beliefs. We choose C as an uniform distribution in the domain $\hat{\delta} \pm \frac{\tau}{2}$ and 0 outside of this range. Although we choose a specific distribution for our analysis, without loss of generality, one can choose an alternate distribution that better reflects the relation between the institution’s signalling constraint and the true beliefs. The only requirement in the institutional stewarding process being that the signal should convey *some* information.

3.1 Institutional stewarding sequence

The institutional stewarding process involves repeated cycles of signal generation by the institution acting as senders and belief update by community members acting as receivers. Fig. 4 shows the sequence of steps involved in one cycle, and we describe the sequence in more detail below.

- (1) The institution holds prior belief about the mean opinion of the approval and disapproval group. It randomly selects $\pi(o_{\geq 0.5, I} | \hat{\delta}_{\geq 0.5})$ or $\pi(o_{< 0.5, I} | \hat{\delta}_{< 0.5})$ as the signal-generating distribution and generates a random signal o_I conditioned on their prior beliefs.
- (2) Each signal receiver interprets the signal as one about their *ingroup* or *outgroup* based on their own opinion o_i , and updates their descriptive belief about the corresponding group based on the Bayes rule as follows:

$$f_{\text{posterior}}(o^{t'} | o_I) = \frac{C(o_I; \hat{\delta}^{(t)}, \tau) \cdot f_{\text{prior}}(\hat{\delta}^{(t)})}{\int C(o_I; \hat{\delta}^{(t)}, \tau) \cdot f_{\text{prior}}(\hat{\delta}^{(t)}) d\hat{\delta}^{(t)}} \quad (4)$$

where $C(o_I; \hat{\delta}^{(t)}, \tau)$ is the likelihood of the institution generating the signal based on the constraining distribution C and $f_{\text{prior}}(\hat{\delta}^{(t)})$ is the prior belief about the corresponding group at time-step t . $f_{\text{posterior}}(o^{t'} | o_I)$ is the posterior belief about the group after the receiver updates their belief based on the signal. The limits of the integral in the marginal are $[0.5, 1]$ or $[0, 0.5]$ depending on whether the signal is being generated for the approval or disapproval group, respectively.

- (3) Each receiver expresses their opinion based on the new posterior descriptive beliefs from the previous step and the equilibrium rhetoric intensity of the opinion expression game. The equilibrium is estimated based on descriptive beliefs after the posterior update.
- (4) Individuals with an equilibrium rhetoric intensity greater than a threshold $\epsilon \sim 0$ express their opinion and interact with each other within a platform.
- (5) Based on the mean opinion of the disapproval and approval in the expressed opinions, everyone in the population (both who expressed and who stayed silent) update their beliefs using Bayes rule. But this time, note that the signal comes from the community expressing their opinions.

Based on the above two steps of belief update, the descriptive beliefs get updated twice, once upon receiving the institutional signal (in step 1) and then again after community members have expressed and based on the collective opinions of the community (in step 5).




Figure 5: Reward heatmap that shows the optimal signalling policy for different institutions and for outgroup and ingroup signals. y - axis shows the institutions' estimate of the true outgroup/ingroup belief and x axis shows the corresponding signals to generate. Brighter regions show the combinations where each institution receives highest reward. We see that although the signals of ingroup information is similar for both institutions, ideological institutions get higher reward for more extreme signals of outgroup information.

3.2 Participatory and Ideological Institutions

Although we presented the general structure of the institutional stewarding process, we left open the question of how the institutional incentives drive the construction of the optimal signalling policy. In this section, we address this question and also the consequences of these incentives on the beliefs of the population. We consider two types of institutions: i) *Participatory institutions*: institutions whose objective is to maximise the number of people who express their opinion, and ii) *ideological institutions*: institutions which have the incentive to move the mean opinion towards one extreme, that is, 0 or 1. We show that each of these incentives results in a different signalling strategy by the two types of institutions.

To compute the optimal signalling strategy, the institution needs to solve an optimisation problem. The optimisation problem can be formulated as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) with the institution's estimate of the descriptive belief ($\hat{o}_{\geq 0.5}$ and $\hat{o}_{< 0.5}$) as the state and the generated signal ($\hat{o}_{\geq 0.5, I}$ and $\hat{o}_{< 0.5, I}$) as the action, and the optimal policy generates the mapping from one to the other. Note that the state transition, i.e. the change in the descriptive belief of the population from one time step to next in the institutional stewarding process, depends only on the belief at the previous time step. Therefore, the Markovian nature of this transition makes it apt for the optimisation problem from the perspective of the institution to be formulated as an MDP. For each institution, there are

two separate MDPs to be solved; one that generates the optimal signalling policy for information about the approval group and one for the disapproval group. In both MDPS, the usual constructs of *State*, *Action*, *Transition*, *Rewards* is as follows:

- *State*: The descriptive belief of the population ($\hat{o}_{\geq 0.5}$ or $\hat{o}_{< 0.5}$)
- *Action*: The signals to generate ($\hat{o}_{\geq 0.5, I}$ and $\hat{o}_{< 0.5, I}$)
- *Transition*: The change in the beliefs based on the two sequential Bayesian updates in step 2 and step 5 in the sequence of the institutional stewarding process.
- *Rewards*: We formulate two reward functions, one for participatory institutions (R_{pa}) and another for the ideological institutions (R_{id}).

$$R_{pa}(\hat{o}^t, o_I^t) = 2\left(\frac{N_E^{t+1}}{N} - 0.5\right)$$

$$R_{id}(\hat{o}^t, o_I^t) = 1 - 2|1 - E[o_{E(\geq 0.5)}^{t+1}]|$$

where $N_E^t = \{i : \gamma_i^* > 0\}$, that is, the number of agents who express their opinion at time t . For the ideological objective, $E[o_{E(\geq 0.5)}^t]$ is the mean opinion of the population that expresses approval; higher this value, the higher the rewards for the ideological institution.

3.2.1 Optimal signalling policy. Based on the reward structure of the two institutions, we solve the MDP using the Value Iteration algorithm [51]. In Fig. 5, we plot the reward heatmap for the entire signaling space, for both sets of signalling distributions (approval and disapproval). x axis shows the descriptive beliefs for the disapproval group (left panels) and the approval group (right panels), and the y axis shows the signals values for the participatory institution (top panel) and ideological institution. For the ideological institution, we choose the one with the objective of moving the expressed opinion towards approval (bottom panel). The brighter regions in the heatmap indicate higher rewards. We can see from the plot that the institutional signal has to align with the descriptive beliefs (brighter section near the diagonal). This is not surprising since this follows straightforwardly from the bounded confidence constraints. Due to those constraints on the generated signals, signals further away from the descriptive beliefs fetch lower rewards for the institution since those signals are rejected by the receivers and do not fetch the rewards that the institution wants.

A notable departure from this pattern is the outgroup information signalling by ideological institutions. Ideological institutions get higher rewards when the opinion of the population is towards one extreme (in this case, one of approval). The institution can achieve that by suppressing the moderate opinion holders in the approval group since that reduces the mean opinion of approval expressed in the population. The reward map indicates that the best strategy for such institutions is to make the outgroup seem more extreme than they are. As the induced outgroup beliefs \hat{o}_{out} closer to 0, the lower bound of the opinion for which the optimal rhetoric intensity is to express opinion instead staying silent moves closer to 1 (Theorem. 1). On the other hand, participatory institution's optimal signalling strategy is to make it seem that both the approval and disapproval groups are more moderate than they really are. That strategy ensures that the lower bound for opinion expression




Figure 6: Effect of institutional stewarding (participatory and ideological) on ingroup and outgroup descriptive beliefs and proportion of participation within a population. Shown here for the population of approval opinion holders.

moves closer to 0.5 and, therefore, it is optimal for even moderate opinion holders to express their opinions.

3.2.2 Long run dynamic. Next, we analyze the long-run dynamics of the population beliefs by running simulations of a population of $N = 100$ agents with opinions drawn from a bimodal Gaussian distribution with parameters $\mu_1 = 0.3, \mu_2 = 0.7, \sigma_{\{1,2\}} = 0.05$, mixture coefficient 0.5. We model the beliefs about the approval and disapproval group in the population using a Beta distribution with parameter $a = 5, b = 2$ and $a = 2, b = 5$, respectively. The belief about the rhetoric intensity of the outgroup is also model as a Beta distribution with parameters $a = 2, b = 5$. The rhetoric intensity threshold at which an individual stays silent is modelled as a negative exponential distribution with exponential decay parameter of 0.3.

We run the simulations under homogeneous beliefs, which means that within a group (approval or disapproval), all agents share the same beliefs about their approval and disapproval population. We run three sets of simulations for 100 timesteps with each set corresponding to the dynamic under the participatory, ideological, and *no institutional* stewarding. For the *no institutional* stewarding run, we include only steps 3,4, and 5, of the institutional stewarding process thereby eliminating the institutional signals completely and the beliefs being updated solely based on the community interactions. We repeat the process for 30 runs and Fig. 6 shows the plot of the mean and standard deviation of the following set of attributes of the population i) descriptive belief of the outgroup (from the perspective of the approval group members) in Fig. 6a bottom half, descriptive belief of the ingroup (from the perspective of the approval group members) in Fig. 6a top half, and participation rate (measures as the proportion of the population who express their

opinion, either of approval or disapproval) in Fig. 6b. We also repeat the simulation runs twice, once with $\alpha = 0.1$, that is, with more lenient platform moderation policy and once with $\alpha = 0.3$, that is, with less lenient platform moderation policy. The participatory, ideological, and non-institutional signal is shown with a smooth, dashed, and dotted line, respectively. Although we show the plots for the beliefs of the approval group in Fig. 6a, the beliefs of the disapproval group have identical patterns but with the range of opinion values flipped for the ingroup and outgroup beliefs.

Based on the simulations, we see a general trend that beliefs under stewarding of participatory institution converge toward moderate opinion levels and participation remains stable at high levels. Whereas, without any institutional stewarding, participation collapses to 0 over time under a stricter moderation ($\alpha = 0.3$). On the other hand, with a lenient moderation ($\alpha = 0.1$), participation proportion under ideological institution is worse than without any institutional stewarding.

We also observe couple of additional interesting findings. We see a move towards more extreme outgroup beliefs under ideological institutional stewarding when the platform moderation policy becomes more lenient. This is because with a more lenient enforcement, the lower bound of optimal rhetoric level of opinion expression moves towards moderate opinions, thereby increasing participation. In response, the ideological institutions compensates by making the outgroup seem even more extreme than they otherwise would with the goal of suppressing moderate opinion holders' participation. Another interesting finding is the resultant effect on ingroup beliefs. Although ingroup signalling does not differ much between participatory and ideological institutions, we observe that ingroup beliefs diverge further to the extreme under ideological

institutions. This is due to the combined effect of the ideological institution suppressing the participation of moderate opinion holders along with members updating their beliefs based on the community signals (step 5 of the institutional stewarding process). In short, this means that although ideological institutions signal less biased signals about the group agreeing with the opinion they want to move towards, their signals about the outgroup nevertheless distort the beliefs of the former population further toward the extreme.

4 ONLINE PLATFORMS AND INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNITY FORMATION

While the analysis of a single institution within a population with homogeneous beliefs offers valuable insights, the reality of online platforms is much more complex. On platforms like Reddit, Twitter, and YouTube, digital communities are formed around a central theme, such as subreddits on Reddit, influential accounts on Twitter (X), channels on YouTube. Many of these digital communities are normative, where members share, discuss, and enforce their perceptions of right and wrong, often along the partisan axis [13, 55]. This highlights the presence of a diverse population with heterogeneous beliefs and multiple institutions, each stewarding the beliefs of the community that falls within its scope. In this section, using the process of institutional stewarding presented earlier, we develop a model of institutional community formation for both participatory and ideological institutions within a platform. Furthermore, we analyse the characteristics of the beliefs of each institutional community and show how ideological institutional communities give rise to phenomenon of false polarization, i.e., individuals with more extreme opinion perceive the outgroup to be more extreme than in reality. This phenomenon is a primary identified factor in affective polarization [35].

4.1 Institutional community formation

For most online platforms, it is common to use a recommendation algorithm that connects users with communities or accounts that match their interests and engagement patterns. Although there are several differences between platforms on how these processes are implemented in practice, we use a minimal set of key entities common to most platforms: institutions, users, and the platform.

The role of institutions and users is modelled identically to that presented earlier in the institutional stewarding model. In reality, these institutions are often channels, subreddits, accounts etc. that generate information signals about approval and disapproval groups on normative issues. We use three categories of institutions in our model of multiple institutions, one participatory institution, one ideological institution that has the objective of moving the expressed opinion towards approval, and one ideological institution that has the objective of moving the expressed opinion towards disapproval. As before, users within the population are modelled as receivers of institutional signals and they express opinion within the digital space provided by the platform. Finally, the platform is an intermediary between the institutions and the user and are responsible for a) the recommender systems that recommends an institution and the institutional signal to an user based on their past interactions with the institution. b) Maintaining an institutional

community – a digital space for each institution where users react to institutional signals by expressing their opinion and interacting with others in the community. One can think of this digital space as the comment and user interaction sections available in most platforms, c) maintaining the moderation of the digital space, which in our case is done by controlling the moderation strictness parameter α .

With the main components of the models in place, we present the sequence of steps involved in the institutional community formation. The main idea behind the process is the user’s preference for ‘interacting’ with the institution that generates information signals that allow the user to express their opinion. Participation involves expression of their opinion and the community exists in the digital space that the platform provides for the institution. The recommender system in turn recommends the institutions in proportion to the user’s past interaction and the predicted beliefs of the user by the recommender systems. Since participatory institutions generate signals that allow moderate opinion holders to participate in the community, whereas ideological institutional signals suppress moderate opinion participation, we see a higher representation of moderate opinion holders in participatory institutional communities.

The objective of the platform is to maximise user participation within the platform. It does this by selecting the right institution for the user and ensuring that the signals it recommends from the selected institution is not rejected by the user. We elaborate this point and the overall process as described above in further detail below.

Initial setup: Various participatory and ideological institutions in the platform generate signals based on their optimal signalling strategy. On a given issue, due the diversity of the content and institutions in the platform, we assume that there are content available for the recommender system to present to an user across the entire opinion signalling spectrum for both approval and disapproval.

At each time step t

- (1) For each user i , the platform’s recommender system samples a participatory and ideological institutional signal with probability $p_{P,i}^{(t)}$ and $p_{I,i}^{(t)}$, respectively. At time $t = 0$, $p_{P,i}^{(0)}$ and $p_{I,i}^{(0)}$ are initialised to 0.5.
- (2) The recommender system predicts the outgroup and in-group beliefs of the user and uses the optimal signaling policy to generate signal for the user.

The user receives the signal and either *accepts* or *rejects* the signal according to the following decision rule:

- If the signal violates the bounded confidence constraints, the user rejects the signal.
- If the optimal rhetoric intensity based on the posterior belief induced by the signal is less than a small threshold, the user rejects the signal. This decision rule reflects the inclination of users to accept signals from institutions that enable them to participate in the expression of their opinion.
- In all other cases, the user accepts the signal, updates their belief based on Bayes rule and expresses their opinion in the digital space provided by the platform for the corresponding institutions.




Figure 7: Dynamic process of institution institutional community formation under a platform's recommendation system.

- (3) Each user who expressed their opinion in the digital space is added to the institutional community maintained by the platform for that time step.
- (4) Each user who was added to the institutional community observe the opinion of other users within the community and update their corresponding descriptive beliefs.
- (5) The recommender systems updates probabilities $p_{P,i}^{(t+1)}$ and $p_{I,i}^{(t+1)}$ proportional to the number of times the user i accepted signals generated by each institution.

In the above process, platform ensures that its objective of user participation is achieved by, first, selecting the right institution for the user by updating the probabilities $p_{P,i}^{(t+1)}$ and $p_{I,i}^{(t+1)}$ at each time step, and second, selecting the right signal for the user from the institution's optimal signalling policy such that the signals are not rejected due to bounded confidence constraints.

4.2 Institutional community characteristics

We can analyse the characteristics of institutional communities that form when a group of users interact with the institutional signal by expressing their opinion (Step 4 of the process described earlier). We answer the following two questions about the characteristics of the community: *What are the outgroup beliefs of the members in each institutional community?*, *What is the opinion distribution of the members in each institutional community?*

To analyse the composition of the institutional communities, we run a simulation with a population of $N = 100$ with the following parameters: opinions drawn from a bimodal Gaussian distribution with parameters $\mu_1 = 0.3, \mu_2 = 0.7, \sigma_{\{1,2\}} = 0.05$, mixture coefficient 0.5. We model the beliefs about the approval and disapproval group in the population using a Beta distribution with parameter $a = 5, b = 2$ and $a = 2, b = 5$, respectively. The threshold at which an individual stays silent is modelled using an exponential decay distribution with decay parameter 0.3. We answer the two questions

about the characteristics of the community at $t = 100$ in order for the recommender system to stabilize the probabilities $p_{P,i}^{(t+1)}$ and $p_{I,i}^{(t+1)}$ for each user.

Fig. 9 shows the difference in opinion distribution for the participatory and ideological communities for both the approval and disapproval groups. There is a statistically significant difference in the distribution of opinions between the two communities with the mean opinion of the ideological institutional community more extreme than that of participatory institutional communities. This difference results directly from moderate opinion holders rejecting signals from ideological institutions more often than extreme opinion holders, and the recommender system responding to that interaction pattern. Next, we look at the difference in outgroup beliefs of the two communities. We select the approval group for analysis, although the characteristics are the same for both groups. Fig. 8 shows a scatterplot of outgroup beliefs of the approval group with opinions on the x axis and outgroup beliefs on the y axis. We see a significant difference between the two communities with respect to outgroup beliefs, similar to the results in the single institutional stewarding results. However, we also note a negative linear relationship between the user's opinion and the beliefs about outgroup. This relationship result from a combination of the optimal signalling schemes constructed by the institutions and extreme opinion holders participating in ideological communities more frequently. As extreme opinion holders participate more in ideological institution communities, their outgroup belief also drift towards one extreme, a dynamic we observed in Sec. 3.2.2). Once that happens, even the participatory institutional signals generated by the recommender system follow that drift to avoid rejection of the signal due to bounded confidence constraints.

5 RELATED WORK

Polarization as a phenomenon of twenty-first century politics has been one of the most widely discussed subject in academic literature




Figure 8: Outgroup beliefs (of the approval group) within each institutional community. *x* axis shows agents’ opinions and *y* axis shows corresponding outgroup belief of the corresponding agent. Agents with more extreme opinions hold more extreme belief about outgroup.




Figure 9: Opinion distribution within each institutional community. Ideological institutional communities have more extreme opinion representation that participatory communities.

spanning the fields of economics [9, 36], psychology [28], political science [24], computer science [37], law [16] with regular reviews help us make sense of this vast literature [5, 12, 30, 53, 54]. In this section, we present the relevant literature on models of polarization. We also include how our model of normativity that helps us explain polarization relates to models of normativity used in studying other social phenomena.

Models of individual polarization: One of the earliest theoretical models to demonstrate belief and opinion polarization due to the

homophily and network structure is Golub and Jackson [19]. Concerns about the rise of polarization in broader public discourse have led to empirical, theoretical, and computational approaches to the detection of filter bubbles [44] and echo chambers in social networks and recommendation systems [1, 7, 42]. However, studies such as those of Bail et al. [6] also show that presenting people with information that they perceive to contradict their deeply held beliefs can result in further increased polarization. In that context, the question of why presenting people with the same information can lead to two separate conclusions has been a major point of inquiry. One line of models, mostly from cognitive science, points the blame at human cognitive biases and highlights that humans are agents with imperfect information processing capacity [52]. The other line of models takes a different methodological approach and provides rational choice-based explanation for the same behaviour, mostly relying on differences across individuals on past experiences. To make the case, Singer et al. take an agent-based approach [50], Jern et al. take a Bayesian approach [26], and Haghtalab et al. take a learning theoretic approach [23]. Our model is methodologically similar to the latter; we use a rational choice based model to explain the process of incorrect beliefs and behaviours resulting from those beliefs. However, the phenomenon we explain in the process is one of affective polarization at the population level, which is conceptually different than individuals coming to different conclusions or rejecting factual information.

Models of affective polarization: The dominant narrative around affective polarization points to social identity theory [25]. The theory suggests that individuals increasingly perceive their primary identity along partisan lines and the increase in affective polarization is a consequence of a cluster of cognitive processes rooted in group identity based social psychology. While rational choice based models of affective polarization are fewer in literature, there have been few recent works that fill that gap. Algara and Zur [2] propose a model based on the theoretical model of the Downsian spatial framework. Using a combination of empirical and theoretical approaches, the model proposes that the affective polarization arises from the ideological proximity to one’s preferred party and ideological distance to other existing parties. Another model by Yaouanq [31] proposes ideological thinking arising from motivated beliefs that forms in anticipation of future preferred policy outcomes. Although this set of models provides an explanation of the emergence of affective polarization that social identity theory lacks, there are still aspects of the phenomenon that the two models cannot explain. For example, why do we observe affective polarization along the lines that are not connected to electoral politics [49] and the association with increased media consumption and online participation [58]. Our model that brings together rational choice-based underpinnings of human normativity, institutional stewarding, and personalization from recommendation systems provide those explanations.

Models of normativity: Normative models are an important framework for studying cooperation in human groups, and the existing literature spans multiple disciplines (see Legros and Cislighi [33] for a general review). Specific recurring research questions revolve around the role of norms in economic and social behaviour [15], the design of norm-driven intervention strategies towards positive behaviour change [8], and the role of norms in experimental and

behavioural game theory [29]. From a theoretical point of view, the application of game-theoretic models of human normativity is commonly seen in public goods problems and the management of the commons [3]. One exception is the Hadfield and Weingast model that uses the theory of human normativity as a microfoundation for the rule of law [22]. Within the literature on social norms, significant attention has been paid to problems in which individual and group welfare are in direct conflict *a. la.* prison dilemma-type social interactions. However, the role of social norms has also been established in a more broader category of social interactions beyond where the interest of collective good is in direct opposition with individual incentives. Examples of such interactions include a coordination problem and the type of conflict that materialises as between the high-risk choice with higher collective utility and the low-risk choice of lower collective utility, as exemplified in a stag hunt game. The normative opinion expression game we use in our models is motivated by the above line of literature that uses a game-theoretic approach to model human normativity, but with a focus on population polarization.

Belief distortions in our model play a major role in explaining the process of institutional stewarding. A related work on distorted beliefs is the recent work by Morsky and Akcay [40], which addresses the role of false beliefs in sustaining cooperation. Similarly to our model, the paper models both micro-level individual behaviour as a coordination game mediated by conditional conformance and the population impact at the macrolevel. However, there are two key differences from our work. First, Morsky and Akcay focus on the problem of norm maintenance and, therefore, use a public goods game as the interaction scenario. Whereas we model the interaction process relevant to our problem through a game of normative opinion exchange. However, there is a commonality between the models with respect to the coordination structure and descriptive norms. Second, the aetiology of the belief distortion in Morsky and Akcay is exogenous to the model and is modelled as specific biases of over- and underestimation of the true level of cooperation in the population. In our case, the origin of belief distortion is endogenous and follows minimally from the agents following their optimal action in the opinion expression game and imperfect observations of who stays silent in a population.

6 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this paper, we present a model that shows that differences in a population in normative opinion expression can give rise to population level polarization. Although human normativity is a fundamental quality of our society, we also show that affective polarization does not have to be a natural consequence. The phenomenon arises from the alignment of individual norm expression, institutional incentives, and the recommendation system of online platforms, which leaves open the possibility of designing mitigation strategies at each level. We identify at least two such strategies for online platforms as follows:

- *A tailored approach to content moderation:* In our model, the difference in rhetoric intensity arise from the difference in utility each individual receive in their normative opinion expression. The moderation strictness parameter (α) was invariant with the individual's opinion. If online platforms

have a custom content moderation policy that allows more leniency (lower α) in the expression of the opinion of moderate opinion holders, the resulting difference in optimal rhetoric intensity between extreme and moderate opinion holders can be corrected.

- *Prioritizing signals from participatory institutions:* Platforms can tailor their recommendation strategy to prioritise signals from participatory institutions more than ideological institutions for extreme opinion holders. Since extreme opinion holders do not reject signals from participatory institutions, a higher proportion of participatory institutional signals can bring their beliefs about outgroup opinions closer in line with less polarised participatory institutional communities.

7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the following people for their feedback on this work: Graham Noblit, Valerie Platsko, Kathryn E. Spier, Peter Marbach, Ashton Anderson.

REFERENCES

- [1] Faisal Alatawi, Lu Cheng, Anique Tahir, Mansooreh Karami, Bohan Jiang, Tyler Black, and Huan Liu. 2021. A survey on echo chambers on social media: Description, detection and mitigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.05084* (2021).
- [2] Carlos Algara and Roi Zur. 2023. The Downsian roots of affective polarization. *Electoral Studies* 82 (2023), 102581.
- [3] John M Anderies and Marco A Janssen. 2016. *Sustaining the commons*. Independent.
- [4] Masahiko Aoki. 1996. Towards a comparative institutional analysis: motivations and some tentative theorizing. *The Japanese Economic Review* 47 (1996), 1–19.
- [5] Swapan Deep Arora, Guninder Pal Singh, Anirban Chakraborty, and Moutusy Maity. 2022. Polarization and social media: A systematic review and research agenda. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 183 (2022), 121942.
- [6] Christopher A Bail, Lisa P Argyle, Taylor W Brown, John P Bumpus, Haohan Chen, MB Fallin Hunzaker, Jaemin Lee, Marcus Mann, Friedolin Merhout, and Alexander Volfovsky. 2018. Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115, 37 (2018), 9216–9221.
- [7] Eytan Bakshy, Solomon Messing, and Lada A Adamic. 2015. Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science* 348, 6239 (2015), 1130–1132.
- [8] Cristina Bicchieri, Eugen Dimant, Michele Gelfand, and Silvia Sonderegger. 2022. Social norms and behavior change: The interdisciplinary research frontier.
- [9] Levi Boxell, Matthew Gentzkow, and Jesse M Shapiro. 2017. *Is the internet causing political polarization? Evidence from demographics*. Technical Report. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- [10] Levi Boxell, Matthew Gentzkow, and Jesse M Shapiro. 2022. Cross-country trends in affective polarization. *Review of Economics and Statistics* (2022), 1–60.
- [11] Robert Boyd and Peter J Richerson. 1992. Punishment allows the evolution of cooperation (or anything else) in sizable groups. *Ethology and sociobiology* 13, 3 (1992), 171–195.
- [12] Aaron Bramson, Patrick Grim, Daniel J Singer, William J Berger, Graham Sack, Steven Fisher, Carissa Flocken, and Bennett Holman. 2017. Understanding polarization: Meanings, measures, and model evaluation. *Philosophy of science* 84, 1 (2017), 115–159.
- [13] Michael Conover, Jacob Ratkiewicz, Matthew Francisco, Bruno Gonçalves, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. 2011. Political polarization on twitter. In *Proceedings of the international aaai conference on web and social media*, Vol. 5. 89–96.
- [14] Eugen Dimant, Michele Joy Gelfand, Anna Hochleitner, and Silvia Sonderegger. 2023. Strategic behavior with tight, loose, and polarized norms. *Loose, and Polarized Norms (April 2, 2023)* (2023).
- [15] Jon Elster. 1989. Social norms and economic theory. *Journal of economic perspectives* 3, 4 (1989), 99–117.
- [16] Frank Fagan. 2017. Systemic social media regulation. *Duke L. & Tech. Rev.* 16 (2017), 393.
- [17] Tasja-Selina Fischer, Castulus Kolo, and Cornelia Mothes. 2022. Political influencers on YouTube: Business strategies and content characteristics. *Media and Communication* 10, 1 (2022), 259–271.

- [18] Kiran Garimella, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Aristides Gionis, and Michael Mathioudakis. 2018. Political discourse on social media: Echo chambers, gatekeepers, and the price of bipartisanship. In *Proceedings of the 2018 world wide web conference*. 913–922.
- [19] Benjamin Golub and Matthew O Jackson. 2012. How homophily affects the speed of learning and best-response dynamics. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127, 3 (2012), 1287–1338.
- [20] Robert Gorwa, Reuben Binns, and Christian Katzenbach. 2020. Algorithmic content moderation: Technical and political challenges in the automation of platform governance. *Big Data & Society* 7, 1 (2020), 2053951719897945.
- [21] Gillian K Hadfield and Barry R Weingast. 2012. What is law? A coordination model of the characteristics of legal order. *Journal of Legal Analysis* 4, 2 (2012), 471–514.
- [22] Gillian K Hadfield and Barry R Weingast. 2014. Microfoundations of the Rule of Law. *Annual Review of Political Science* 17 (2014), 21–42.
- [23] Nika Haghtalab, Matthew O Jackson, and Ariel D Procaccia. 2021. Belief polarization in a complex world: A learning theory perspective. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118, 19 (2021), e2010144118.
- [24] Christopher Hare and Keith T Poole. 2014. The polarization of contemporary American politics. *Polity* 46, 3 (2014), 411–429.
- [25] Shanto Iyengar, Yphtach Lelkes, Matthew Levendusky, Neil Malhotra, and Sean J Westwood. 2019. The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual review of political science* 22 (2019), 129–146.
- [26] Alan Jern, Kai-Min K Chang, and Charles Kemp. 2014. Belief polarization is not always irrational. *Psychological review* 121, 2 (2014), 206.
- [27] John T Jost, Delia S Baldassarri, and James N Druckman. 2022. Cognitive-motivational mechanisms of political polarization in social-communicative contexts. *Nature Reviews Psychology* 1, 10 (2022), 560–576.
- [28] Jiin Jung, Patrick Grim, Daniel J Singer, Aaron Bramson, William J Berger, Bennett Holman, and Karen Kovaka. 2019. A multidisciplinary understanding of polarization. *American Psychologist* 74, 3 (2019), 301.
- [29] Erin L Krupka and Roberto A Weber. 2013. Identifying social norms using coordination games: Why does dictator game sharing vary? *Journal of the European Economic Association* 11, 3 (2013), 495–524.
- [30] Emily Kubin and Christian von Sikorski. 2021. The role of (social) media in political polarization: a systematic review. *Annals of the International Communication Association* 45, 3 (2021), 188–206.
- [31] Yves Le Yaouanq. 2018. *A model of ideological thinking*. Technical Report. Discussion Paper.
- [32] Jeffrey Lees and Mina Cikara. 2020. Inaccurate group meta-perceptions drive negative out-group attributions in competitive contexts. *Nature human behaviour* 4, 3 (2020), 279–286.
- [33] Sophie Legros and Beniamino Cislighi. 2020. Mapping the social-norms literature: An overview of reviews. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 15, 1 (2020), 62–80.
- [34] Yphtach Lelkes. 2021. Policy over party: comparing the effects of candidate ideology and party on affective polarization. *Political Science Research and Methods* 9, 1 (2021), 189–196.
- [35] Matthew S Levendusky and Neil Malhotra. 2016. (Mis) perceptions of partisan polarization in the American public. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80, S1 (2016), 378–391.
- [36] Gilat Levy and Ronny Razin. 2019. Echo chambers and their effects on economic and political outcomes. *Annual Review of Economics* 11 (2019), 303–328.
- [37] Soo Ling Lim and Peter J Bentley. 2022. Opinion amplification causes extreme polarization in social networks. *Scientific Reports* 12, 1 (2022), 18131.
- [38] Philipp Lorenz-Spreen, Lisa Oswald, Stephan Lewandowsky, and Ralph Hertwig. 2023. A systematic review of worldwide causal and correlational evidence on digital media and democracy. *Nature human behaviour* 7, 1 (2023), 74–101.
- [39] Ariadna Matamoros-Fernández and Johan Farkas. 2021. Racism, hate speech, and social media: A systematic review and critique. *Television & New Media* 22, 2 (2021), 205–224.
- [40] Bryce Morsky and Erol Akçay. 2021. False beliefs can bootstrap cooperative communities through social norms. *Evolutionary Human Sciences* 3 (2021), e36.
- [41] Sendhil Mullainathan and Andrei Shleifer. 2005. The market for news. *American economic review* 95, 4 (2005), 1031–1053.
- [42] Tien T Nguyen, Pik-Mai Hui, F Maxwell Harper, Loren Terveen, and Joseph A Konstan. 2014. Exploring the filter bubble: the effect of using recommender systems on content diversity. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on World wide web*. 677–686.
- [43] Brendan Nyhan, Jaime Settle, Emily Thorson, Magdalena Wojcieszak, Pablo Barberá, Annie Y Chen, Hunt Allcott, Taylor Brown, Adriana Crespo-Tenorio, Drew Dimmery, et al. 2023. Like-minded sources on Facebook are prevalent but not polarizing. *Nature* 620, 7972 (2023), 137–144.
- [44] Eli Pariser. 2011. *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. penguin UK.
- [45] Hegselmann Rainer and Ulrich Krause. 2002. Opinion dynamics and bounded confidence: models, analysis and simulation. (2002).
- [46] Steve Rathje, Jay J Van Bavel, and Sander Van Der Linden. 2021. Out-group animosity drives engagement on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118, 26 (2021), e2024292118.
- [47] Martin J Riedl, Josephine Lukito, and Samuel C Woolley. 2023. Political Influencers on Social Media: An Introduction. *Social Media+ Society* 9, 2 (2023), 20563051231177938.
- [48] Francisco-Javier Rodrigo-Ginés, Jorge Carrillo-de Albornoz, and Laura Plaza. 2023. A systematic review on media bias detection: What is media bias, how it is expressed, and how to detect it. *Expert Systems with Applications* (2023), 121641.
- [49] Kai Ruggeri, Bojana Večkalov, Lana Bojanić, Thomas L Andersen, Sarah Ashcroft-Jones, Nélida Ayacaxli, Paula Barea-Arroyo, Mari Louise Berge, Ludvig D Bjørndal, Asli Bursahoğlu, et al. 2021. The general fault in our fault lines. *Nature Human Behaviour* 5, 10 (2021), 1369–1380.
- [50] Daniel J Singer, Aaron Bramson, Patrick Grim, Bennett Holman, Jiin Jung, Karen Kovaka, Anika Ranginani, and William J Berger. 2019. Rational social and political polarization. *Philosophical Studies* 176 (2019), 2243–2267.
- [51] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. 2018. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press.
- [52] Charles S Taber and Milton Lodge. 2006. Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American journal of political science* 50, 3 (2006), 755–769.
- [53] Joshua A Tucker, Andrew Guess, Pablo Barberá, Cristian Vaccari, Alexandra Siegel, Sergey Sanovich, Denis Stukal, and Brendan Nyhan. 2018. Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. *Political polarization, and political disinformation: a review of the scientific literature* (March 19, 2018) (2018).
- [54] Jay J Van Bavel, Steve Rathje, Elizabeth Harris, Claire Robertson, and Anni Sternisko. 2021. How social media shapes polarization. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 25, 11 (2021), 913–916.
- [55] Isaac Waller and Ashton Anderson. 2021. Quantifying social organization and political polarization in online platforms. *Nature* 600, 7888 (2021), 264–268.
- [56] Jacob Westfall, Leaf Van Boven, John R Chambers, and Charles M Judd. 2015. Perceiving political polarization in the United States: Party identity strength and attitude extremity exacerbate the perceived partisan divide. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 10, 2 (2015), 145–158.
- [57] Moran Yarchi, Christian Baden, and Neta Kligler-Vilenchik. 2021. Political polarization on the digital sphere: A cross-platform, over-time analysis of interactional, positional, and affective polarization on social media. *Political Communication* 38, 1-2 (2021), 98–139.
- [58] Daniel Yudkin, Stephen Hawkins, and Tim Dixon. 2019. The perception gap: How false impressions are pulling Americans apart. (2019).