

Wiser than the Wisest of Crowds: The Asch Effect and Polarization Revisited

Dragos Ristache
dragosr@bu.edu
Boston University

Fabian Spaeh
fspaeh@bu.edu
Boston University

Charalampos E. Tsourakakis
ctsourak@bu.edu
Boston University

June 2024

Abstract

In 1907, Sir Francis Galton independently requested 787 villagers to estimate the weight of an ox. Although none of them guessed the exact weight, the average estimate was remarkably accurate. This phenomenon is also known as wisdom of crowds. In a clever experiment, Asch employed actors to demonstrate the human tendency to conform to others' opinions. The question we ask is the following: what would Sir Francis Galton have observed if Asch had interfered by employing actors? Would the wisdom of crowds become even wiser or not? The problem becomes intriguing when considering the inter-connectedness of the villagers. This is the central theme of this work. Specifically, we examine a scenario where n agents are interconnected and influence each other. The average of their innate opinions provides an estimator of a certain quality for an unknown quantity θ . How can one improve or reduce the quality of the original estimator in terms of the mean squared error (MSE) by utilizing Asch's strategy of hiring a few stooges?

We present a new formulation of this problem, assuming that the nodes adjust their opinions according to the Friedkin-Johnsen opinion dynamics with susceptibility parameters [2]. We demonstrate that selecting k stooges for both maximizing and minimizing the MSE is NP-hard. Additionally, we demonstrate that our formulation is closely related to either maximizing or minimizing polarization [39] and present an NP-hardness proof. We propose a greedy heuristic that we implement efficiently, enabling it to scale to large networks. We test our algorithm on various synthetic and real-world datasets collected from Twitter against various baselines. Although the MSE and polarization objectives differ, we find in practice that maximizing polarization often yields solutions that are nearly optimal for minimizing the wisdom of crowds in terms of MSE. Lastly, our analysis of real-world data reveals that even a small number of stooges can significantly influence the conversation surrounding the controversial topic of the war in Ukraine, resulting in a relative increase of the MSE of 207.80% (maximization) or a decrease of 50.62% (minimization).

1 Introduction

Opinion dynamics is a fascinating area of research that seeks to understand how individual beliefs and attitudes evolve over time within a social network. At its core, this field is driven by the desire to unravel the complex interplay between individual psychology, social influence, and network structure. By studying opinion dynamics, researchers aim to shed light on how opinions spread and converge within communities, how consensus is reached or polarization occurs, and how external factors such as media or political events can impact collective opinion. The insights gained from this research have profound implications for various domains, including politics, marketing, and public policy, as they can help predict and influence societal trends and behaviors. Researchers have developed a wide range of opinion dynamics models [41] that aim to model how humans change their expressed opinions over time and have used them to optimize various objectives [1, 9, 14, 28, 39, 43, 46, 48, 50, 51].

The concept of the wisdom of crowds highlights the collective intelligence that emerges when diverse groups of individuals come together to make decisions [47]. This phenomenon was first observed by Sir Francis Galton, who noted that the average guess (or according to some, the median guess) of 787 villagers

regarding the weight θ of an ox was remarkably close to the actual value, as documented in the literature [33]. At the same time it is also well known that humans influence each other. Solomon Asch conducted a set of seminal experiments in the study of social psychology and opinion dynamics [4]. These experiments aimed to investigate the extent to which social pressure from a majority group could influence an individual to conform. In a series of controlled experiments, participants were asked to match the length of a line on one card with one of three lines on another card. Unbeknownst to the subject, the other participants in the room were confederates of the experimenter and instructed to give incorrect answers unanimously in certain trials. The results showed that a significant proportion conformed to the majority’s incorrect answer, even when the correct answer was obvious. Asch’s experiments highlight the powerful influence of group conformity on individual judgment and decision-making, shedding light on the dynamics of opinion formation and change within social groups. At the same time, another phenomenon of interest to our work is polarization [34] that represents a significant challenge in social systems, characterized by the division of opinions into distinct and often opposing camps. In social media, echo chambers refer to situations in which individuals are exposed primarily to opinions and information that reinforce their existing beliefs, leading to a narrowing of their perspectives and an increase in polarization. This phenomenon is often observed in online social networks and media platforms, where algorithms and social dynamics create filter bubbles that isolate users from diverse viewpoints [6, 16].

The goal of our work is to study the wisdom of crowds and polarization from an optimization perspective using a popular opinion dynamics model as the underlying opinion formation mechanism. Specifically, we examine the generalized Friedkin-Johnsen (FJ) model (c.f. Equation (1) and [1]) that accommodates varying levels of susceptibility to persuasion among nodes. The selection of these two phenomena is not arbitrary; in fact, we demonstrate through experiments that according to the generalized Friedkin-Johnsen opinion dynamics model, maximizing polarization results in a significant decrease in the collective wisdom of the network agents, which is comparable to a near-optimal scenario. We also provide theoretical evidence why this is the case. Overall, in this work we make the following contributions:

- We propose four new optimization problems that allow for the inclusion of k stooges. The first two aim to maximize and minimize the mean squared error (MSE) of the average opinion value estimator at equilibrium, relative to the unbiased estimator of the average of innate opinions. The final two problems are dedicated to optimizing the polarization of opinions at equilibrium. Following the approach of Abebe et al. [1], our optimization variables are the resistance parameters, which encapsulate Asch’s scenario of agents acting as stooges, with the flexibility to accommodate k stooges in our model.
- We prove that all formulations are NP-hard.
- We show that the problem is neither sub- nor supermodular and therefore not amenable to standard methods of convex optimization as other formulations in this line of research. Nonetheless, we provide an efficient greedy heuristic. To enable scalability, we provide a method for fast recomputation of the equilibrium opinions together with lazy evaluations.
- We run several experiments on synthetic and real-world data against natural baselines. This shows the merit of our heuristic, and provides interesting insights into the behavior of MSE and polarization, and their relationship under the FJ opinion dynamics. We observe that even for a small number of stooges, the relative increase or decrease achieved is substantial for both objectives across real-world datasets. For instance, in the case of 50 stooges on the Twitter network discussing real-world opinions about the Ukraine war, the mean squared error (MSE) can experience a relative increase of up to 207.80% and a decrease of up to 50.62%.

2 Related work

Models of Opinion Dynamics [41] explores how individual beliefs and attitudes evolve over time within a social network [3]. These models aim to understand how interactions among individuals lead to the formation of collective opinions, consensus [21], or polarization [39]. They often consider factors such as peer influence, social pressure [8], and individual stubbornness or resistance [1, 30] to change. By studying

these dynamics, researchers can gain insights into the mechanisms behind opinion formation and change in various social contexts.

Friedkin and Johnsen [26] expanded the simple averaging French-DeGroot model [21, 25] to include individuals’ inherent beliefs and biases. Each node $v \in V$ represents an individual with an *innate opinion* s_u and an *expressed opinion*. For each node v , the innate opinion $s_v \in [0, 1]$ remains constant over time and is private, while the expressed opinion $x_v(t) \in [0, 1]$ is public and changes over time $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ due to social influence. Lower/higher values correspond to less/more favorable opinions on a given topic, and we use the convention that an opinion is neutral if it is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$. Initially, $x_v(0) = s_v$ for all users $v \in V$. At each subsequent time step $t > 0$, all users $v \in V$ update their expressed opinion $x_v(t)$ as the average of their innate opinion and the expressed opinions of their neighbors, as $x_v(t + 1) = \frac{1}{1 + \deg(v)}(s_v + \sum_{u \in N(v)} x_u(t))$. As the number of rounds t tends to ∞ , the expressed opinions reach an equilibrium x^* under mild conditions that are well understood [41]. A popular variant of the FJ model is the generalized FJ model that allows for each node to have a varying degree of susceptibility to persuasion [17]. This model has been used by several papers [1, 19, 30] and we discuss it in full detail in Section 3. Numerous other models of opinion dynamics exist, and interested readers can refer to the comprehensive survey by Proskurnikov and Tempo [41] for an in-depth exploration.

Optimizing Objectives within the Friedkin-Johnsen Model Although the concept of influence maximization has a rich history in discrete models, beginning with the groundbreaking work of Kempe, Kleinberg, and Tardos [35] (see also [44, 45]), the application of influence maximization in continuous opinion dynamics models has been largely overlooked, with the emphasis primarily on developing the models themselves. The seminal work of Gionis, Terzi, and Tsaparas inaugurated a new line of research [31]. They tackle the challenge of optimizing the aggregate sum of opinions at equilibrium by selecting k nodes and consistently fixing their expressed opinion to 1. Although their approach employs the conventional Friedkin-Johnsen (FJ) model as outlined in the previous paragraph, it inherently incorporates the concept of stubbornness, as the opinions of the chosen k nodes remain unchanged. Musco, Musco, and Tsourakakis [39] considered optimizing an objective that balances between disagreement and polarization at equilibrium. The disagreement of an edge is the squared difference of the equilibrium opinions of its endpoints, i.e., $d_{uv}(\mathbf{x}^*) = (x_u^* - x_v^*)^2$. The total disagreement is defined as the sum of pairwise disagreements over all edges, i.e., $D_{G, \mathbf{x}^*} = \sum_{(u,v) \in E} d_{uv}(\mathbf{x}^*)$. Since then numerous other formulations along with algorithmic solutions have been derived [9, 46, 48, 50, 51]. For example, Gaitonde, Kleinberg, and Tardos [28], along with Chen and Racz et al. [14, 43], explored budgeted adversarial interventions on inherent opinions. Their studies unveiled significant connections between spectral graph theory and opinion dynamics. Closest to our work lies the work of Abebe et al. [1] who pioneered adversarial interventions at the susceptibility level using the generalized FJ model. They consider an unbudgeted optimization problem that is neither convex nor concave and designed a local search algorithm that reveals a remarkable structure on the local optima of the objective functions. Chan and Shan proved the NP-hardness of the same problem subject to budget constraints [13].

Wisdom of Crowds (WoC) is a concept popularized by James Surowiecki [47], suggesting that under certain conditions, the aggregated judgment of a diverse group of individuals can be surprisingly accurate, even outperforming expert opinions. The phenomenon of the WoC has been recognized since the time of Galton [33] and is considered the starting point for formal recognition of the WoC in the modern era despite earlier references in Aristotle’s “Politics,” discussing the idea of collective judgment. Research has shown that the spread of misinformation online can significantly influence the WoC [22]. Additionally, exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinions on social platforms like Facebook has been studied to understand its impact on collective decision-making [5]. Furthermore, experimental evidence suggests that social conventions can reach tipping points, beyond which collective behaviors can change dramatically [12]. Several studies have examined how interventions impact the WoC, both from a theoretical perspective [7, 11, 20, 23, 32] and through empirical analysis using real-world data [7, 38]. Our work is most closely related to the recent study by Tian et al. [49], which also examines the impact of social influence on Wisdom of Crowds (WoC) but employs a distinct statistical model with different optimization variables.

3 Preliminaries

Generalized Friedkin-Johnsen (FJ) Model. We consider the following generalized FJ model. There exists a set V of *agents*, where each agent $v \in V$ is associated with an *innate opinion* $s_v \in [0, 1]$. Each agent has a different level of propensity for conforming, captured by the *resistance* parameter $\alpha_v \in [0, 1]$, which is also known as the stubbornness of node v [1]. Higher resistance values signify agents who are less susceptible to changing their opinion. The agents interact with one another in discrete time steps. Consider an undirected graph $G = (V, E, W)$ represented by the column stochastic matrix $W = [w_{uv}]_{u,v \in V}$ with $w_{uv} \geq 0$. We shall refer to W as the *random walk matrix* or the *influence structure*, as w_{uv} corresponds to how much node u influences node v . The opinion dynamics evolve in discrete time $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ according to the following model [2, 19, 26]:

$$\boxed{x_v(0) = s_v, \quad x_v(t+1) = \alpha_v s_v + (1 - \alpha_v) \sum_u w_{uv} x_u(t).} \quad (1)$$

for all $v \in V$. It is known that this process converges to a unique equilibrium [1] given some well understood conditions [30, 41], and we therefore assume the existence of a unique equilibrium throughout our work. We denote the opinion of v at equilibrium as $x_v^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_v(t)$. We describe an instance of the generalized FJ model via the tuple (W, α, \mathbf{s}) for $\alpha = (\alpha_v)_{v \in V}$ and $\mathbf{s} = (s_v)_{v \in S}$.

Absorbing Random Walk Interpretation. Analogously to [31], we can interpret the opinion formation process of Equation (1) via an absorbing random walk. Let us use the random variable $X(t) \in V$ to denote the state of the random walk at step t . We start the random walk in state $X(0)$. In each step t , we randomly decide to stop the random walk and remain in state $X(t)$ with probability $\alpha_{X(t)}$. In this case, we write $X(\infty) = X(t)$ and stop the random process. If we do not end the random walk, we transition to another state u with probability $w_{u,X(t)}$. After the transition, we repeat the process of deciding to end the random walk or continue transitioning. We can use this interpretation to characterize the equilibrium opinion of each state $v \in V$ as $x_v^* = \mathbb{E}[s_{X(\infty)} \mid X(0) = v]$.

4 Problem Definitions

Let $\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V} s_v$ be the average innate opinion. Inspired by Galton’s findings [33] we assume that it is an unbiased estimator of the true quantity θ . Let $\hat{\theta}^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V} x_v^*$ be the average opinion at equilibrium under the FJ dynamics. The *mean squared error* (MSE) and the *polarization* [39] for the equilibrium \mathbf{x}^* are defined respectively as

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V} (x_v^* - \hat{\theta})^2, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Polarization} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V} (x_v^* - \hat{\theta}^*)^2. \quad (3)$$

Consider an instance of opinion dynamics (W, α, \mathbf{s}) under the generalized FJ model (Equation (1)). We can set a node u to be a *stooge* by setting its resistance value α_u to 0 or 1. It is worth noting that provably, this may not be an optimal choice to optimize either the MSE or the polarization, but it gives us a clear interpretation of the stooge’s role. In our work, we consider these problems:

Problem 1 (Optimizing MSE). *Given (W, α, \mathbf{s}) and an integer k , choose a set of k stooges from the node set and their resistance values so that the MSE (Equation 2) at equilibrium is maximized or minimized.*

Problem 2 (Optimizing Polarization). *Given (W, α, \mathbf{s}) and an integer k , choose a set of k stooges from the node set and their resistance values so that polarization (Equation 3) at equilibrium is maximized or minimized.*

In other words, Problems 1 and 2 aim to identify a set of nodes in the network that will become stooges either for the common good (minimization) or for adversarial reasons (maximization) with respect to the altered equilibrium. Upon a closer look on Equations (2) and (3), we can see how similar the two measures are; the former is centered around the original estimator $\hat{\theta}$ while the latter around the equilibrium average $\hat{\theta}^*$. We will establish this similarity further for our hardness results and in our experimental evaluation. Recall also that we assume that the generalized FJ dynamics reach an equilibrium both before and after selecting stooges, as the problem of determining the existence of an equilibrium is already well-established in the literature [30, 41].

5 Hardness

All four optimization formulations from Problems 1 and 2 are NP-hard. Furthermore, we show in Section 6 that they are neither sub- nor supermodular. We first show the hardness of maximizing the polarization; the remaining proofs follow with small adaptations. In our problem, we pick a subset $S \subseteq V$ of $|S| \leq k$ stooges for which we can change the resistance values α_u arbitrarily. We use Polarization[†] to denote the polarization of the equilibrium opinions after changing the resistance values of vertices in S . We formulate a decision version of this problem: Given an instance (W, α, \mathbf{s}) , an integer k and a threshold τ , is there a subset $S \subseteq V$ of stooges with $|S| \leq k$ such that Polarization[†] $\geq \tau$. Analogous decision versions can be formulated for the other three problems.

Theorem 1. *Maximizing and minimizing the polarization (Prob. 2) is NP-hard.*

Proof. Let us first consider the maximization. We extend the proof of [31] to our setting, as we also reduce the decision version of vertex cover on regular graphs to our problem: Given an instance of vertex cover consisting of a regular graph H with vertex degree d and an integer k , we construct an instance to our problem by modifying H as follows. We introduce a special vertex \tilde{u} which is totally absorbing (i.e. $\alpha_{\tilde{u}} = 1$) and has innate opinion $s_{\tilde{u}} = 0$. We further add a large empty graph \bar{K}_ℓ where every node $u \in \bar{K}_\ell$ has innate opinion $s_u = 0$ and resistance $\alpha_u = 1$. In the original graph H , we set $\alpha_u = 0$, $s_u = 1$, and $w_{\tilde{u}u} = \frac{1}{d+1}$ for all nodes $u \in V(H)$. We further set $w_{uv} = \frac{1}{d+1}$ for all $(u, v) \in E(H)$ and $w_{uv} = 0$, otherwise. As such, our resulting instance consists of the nodes $V = V(H) \cup \bar{K}_\ell \cup \{\tilde{u}\}$. Furthermore, we use a threshold τ defined below, as a function of n , k , ℓ , and d . We can show that H has a vertex cover of size k if and only if there is a set of at most k stooges such that Polarization[†] $\geq \tau$.

(\Rightarrow) Assume first that $S \subseteq V$ is a vertex cover of H with $|S| \leq k$. In this case, we can pick the vertices S and set $\alpha_u \leftarrow 1$ such that $x_u = 1$ for all $u \in S$. We can verify that this is indeed a solution to our decision problem by computing the equilibrium opinions using the absorbing random walk interpretation for opinion dynamics. For any vertex $v \in V$, we consider a random walk on the modified graph G starting in v . If $v \in S$ then the random walk is absorbed immediately after a single step in v itself, which has innate opinion $s_v = 1$ and thus $x_v^* = 1$. If $v \notin S$ then the random walk may get absorbed after the first step in \tilde{u} with probability $\frac{1}{d+1}$. If instead, the random walk goes over an edge in the original graph H (with probability $\frac{d}{d+1}$), we must have reached a vertex in S since S forms a vertex cover of H . Since every vertex $u \in S$ is absorbing, $x_v^* = \frac{d}{d+1}$. We compute the average equilibrium opinion as

$$\hat{\theta}^* = \frac{1}{|V|} \left(\sum_{u \in S} x_u^* + \sum_{u \in V(H) \setminus S} x_u^* + \sum_{u \in \bar{K}_\ell} x_u^* + x_{\tilde{u}}^* \right) = \frac{k + (n - k) \frac{d}{d+1} + 0}{n + \ell + 1} \leq \epsilon$$

where ϵ can be made arbitrarily small by choosing a large enough ℓ . This means that the polarization is at least

$$\text{Polarization}^\dagger = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{u \in V} (x_u^* - \hat{\theta}^*)^2 \geq \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{u \in V(H)} ((x_u^*)^2 - 3\epsilon) = \frac{1}{|V|} \left(k + (n - k) \left(\frac{d}{d+1} \right)^2 - 3n\epsilon \right) =: \tau$$

and we define τ to be exactly at this lower bound.

(\Leftarrow) Conversely, assume that H has no vertex cover of size k . Let now S be any set of stooges. We still have that $x_u^* \leq 1$ for all $u \in S$ and $x_u^* \leq \frac{d}{d+1}$ for all $u \in V(H) \setminus S$. However, because there is no vertex cover of size k , there must exist a vertex $v \in V(H)$ from which we can take two steps without getting absorbed in a node $u \in S$ with opinion $x_u^* = 1$. Thus, $x_v^* \leq \frac{d}{d+1} - (\frac{1}{d+1})^2$. Since the total opinion could not have increased compared to before, we still have $\hat{\theta}^* \leq \epsilon$. We compute the polarization as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Polarization}^\dagger &= \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{u \in V} (x_u^* - \hat{\theta}^*)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|V|} \left(\sum_{u \in V(H)} ((x_u^*)^2 + \epsilon^2) + (\ell + 1)\epsilon^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{u \in V(H)} (x_u^*)^2 + \epsilon^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|V|} \left(k + (n - k - 1) \left(\frac{d}{d+1} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{d}{d+1} - \left(\frac{1}{d+1} \right)^2 \right)^2 \right) + \epsilon^2 < \tau \end{aligned}$$

which is true for sufficiently small ϵ , which we can achieve by choosing a large ℓ .

To show NP-hardness for minimization, we only need to change the innate opinions of the vertices $u \in V(H)$ to $s_u = 0$ and $s_{\bar{u}} = 1$. The MSE is large because of the disparity of opinions between vertices in the empty graph \bar{K}_ℓ and vertices in H . A vertex cover of H now allows us to effectively reduce the opinions of vertices in H and we use this to define our threshold. Analogously to the above, we can also show that if there is no vertex cover in H , we cannot reduce the opinions below the threshold for sufficiently large ℓ . \square

Since the number of stooges corresponds exactly to the number of vertices in the vertex cover, we also inherit the inapproximability of vertex cover [36]. An identical result holds for the MSE:

Theorem 2. *Maximizing and minimizing the MSE (Problem 1) is NP-hard.*

Proof. Establishing the NP-hardness of the MSE is easier compared to the polarization the equilibrium x^* is centered around $\hat{\theta}$ (see Equation (2)) rather than $\hat{\theta}^*$. Let us first consider the maximization of the MSE. We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1. Note that the average opinion of the innate opinions is

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{|V|} \left(\sum_{u \in V(H)} s_u + \sum_{u \in \bar{K}_\ell} s_u + s_{\bar{u}} \right) = \frac{1}{n + \ell + 1} < \epsilon$$

where ϵ serves the same purpose as in the proof of Theorem 1. We can thus again make ϵ arbitrarily small by choosing a large value ℓ , and carry out the same proof. The adaption to the minimization works analogously to the adaption made for the proof of Theorem 1. \square

6 Proposed methods

The work of Gionis et al. [31], which launched a research stream of optimization under the FJ opinion dynamics, uses that their objective can be formulated as a monotone submodular function. A set function $f: 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is called submodular if it has diminishing returns, i.e. $f(A \cup \{v\}) - f(A) \geq f(B \cup \{v\}) - f(B)$ for all sets $A \subseteq B \subseteq V$ and $v \in V$. Monotone submodular functions can be approximately maximized to a $(1 - 1/e)$ -factor subject to a cardinality constraint [24], and minimized in polynomial time [27]. Particularly, Gionis et al. leverage the property of diminishing returns in their objective to obtain an $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximate solution. We demonstrate that our problems lacks submodularity, and is thus is less structured and not amenable to standard techniques of convex optimization; it is also straight-forward to establish the absence of supermodularity, which we defer to the Appendix. Here, we detail the lack of submodularity for the polarization (Problem 2). Problem 1 also lacks sub- and supermodularity, which can be easily shown via a simplification of our arguments.




Figure 1: An example graph that shows that our objective is not submodular. We use \overline{K}_ℓ to denote the empty graph on ℓ nodes. Resistances and innate opinions of all nodes are as stated in the figure (for convenience, we allow negative innate opinions). We use a sufficiently large ℓ such that the contribution of v and w to the polarization vanishes.

Absence of Submodularity. Let us consider the example network described in Figure 1. To simplify calculations, we assume that ℓ is large enough so that we may ignore the contributions of v and w to the polarization. The example is based on the following idea: Selecting v as a stooge and changing its resistance to $\alpha_v = 1$ raises the polarization as opinions in the empty graph increase, while they remain 0 in the complete graph. However, selecting w as an additional stooge and changing its resistance to $\alpha_w = 0$ raises the opinions in the empty graph even more and the additional increase in polarization is therefore larger.

- *Adding no stooges:* In the original graph, we have $x_u^* = 0$ for all $u \in \overline{K}_\ell$ since it is equally likely to assume the innate opinion of v and w in a random walk starting from u . Therefore, $\hat{\theta}^* = 0$ as well as Polarization $^* = 0$.
- *Adding v as stooge:* We select v as a stooge and change its resistance to $\alpha_v = 1$. This changes the equilibrium opinions to $x_v^\dagger = 1$, $x_w^\dagger = 2\beta - 1$, and therefore also $x_u^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(x_v^\dagger + x_w^\dagger) = \beta$ for all $u \in \overline{K}_\ell$. Thus, $\hat{\theta}^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}x_u^\dagger$ and Polarization $^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(x_u^\dagger - \hat{\theta}^\dagger)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\theta}^{\dagger 2} = \frac{1}{4}\beta^2$.
- *Adding v and w as stooges:* We additionally select w as a stooge. Note that changing its resistance to 0 would result in a decrease in polarization to 0, so we change its resistance to $\alpha_w = 0$. We obtain $x_v^\ddagger = x_w^\ddagger = 1$, as well as $x_u^\ddagger = 1$ for all $u \in \overline{K}_\ell$. Therefore, $\hat{\theta}^\ddagger = \frac{1}{2}$ and Polarization $^\ddagger = \frac{1}{4}$.

We therefore have Polarization $^\ddagger - \text{Polarization}^* = \frac{1}{4}\beta^2$ which is smaller than the increase Polarization $^\ddagger - \text{Polarization}^\dagger = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \beta^2)$ for $\beta < \sqrt{1/2}$. This proves that our objective does not show diminishing returns. Note also that the ratio between the two increases is unbounded since we can select β arbitrarily small, which defies applications of approximate submodularity. This alludes to the hardness of our problem as it shows non-convexity, and is related to [14].

Absence of Supermodularity. A set function $f: 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is supermodular if $-f$ is submodular. We show that the Problems 1 and 2 are not supermodular. We can easily see this on a lollipop graph consisting of a complete graph K_n connected to a path P_m . Assume that the resistance of every vertex $u \in K_n$ is non-zero, and the innate opinions are all $s_u = 0$. The resistance of every vertex $v \in P_m$ is $\alpha_v = 0$. Let $\tilde{v} \in P_m$ be the vertex that is connected to the complete graph and $\hat{v} \in P_m$ be another arbitrary vertex. The idea is to select \hat{v} and \tilde{v} as potential stooges in our example. As such, we use innate opinions $s_{\tilde{v}} = s_{\hat{v}} = 1$ and $s_v = 0$ for all other vertices $v \in P_m \setminus \{\tilde{v}, \hat{v}\}$. By this definition, the equilibrium opinion of each vertex $w \in K_n \cup P_m$ is $x_w^* = 0$. We therefore have that Polarization = 0 and MSE = 0 as \tilde{v} and \hat{v} are the only vertices with non-zero innate opinion and their contribution therefore diminishes for large enough n and m .

Now, let us consider the scenario where we choose a vertex $v \in \{\tilde{v}, \hat{v}\}$ as a stooge and make it fully resistant. This means all vertices $w \in P_m$ that are farther away from the complete graph than v now have equilibrium opinion $x_w^\dagger = 1$. The equilibrium opinions for all other vertices also increase and we thus obtain an increase in MSE and polarization. Let us designate the vertex $\tilde{v} \in P_m$ connected to the complete graph as a stooge. Now, adding \hat{v} as a second stooge does not result in an any increase in MSE. This shows that in this scenario, the problem does exhibit strictly diminishing returns and is therefore not supermodular.

Greedy Heuristic. Despite the lack of submodularity, we design a greedy algorithm to optimize the MSE and polarization. We describe it in terms of maximizing the MSE in detail as Algorithm 1. However, the

Algorithm 1 Greedily Selecting Stooges

```
1: function APPROXIMATELAZYGREEDY( $G, \phi, \epsilon$ )
2:   Let  $(W, \alpha, s) = G$ 
3:    $S \leftarrow \emptyset$  // initialize stooges
4:    $\delta_{v,\beta} \leftarrow \infty$  for all  $v \in V$  and  $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$  // initialize marginal gains
5:    $x \leftarrow \text{APPROXIMATEEQUILIBRIUM}(G, V, s)$ 
6:   while  $|S| \leq k$  do
7:      $\delta_{\text{prev}} \leftarrow 0$ 
8:      $\delta_{\text{max}} \leftarrow 0$ 
9:      $(v_{\text{max}}, \beta_{\text{max}}) \leftarrow (\perp, \perp)$ 
10:    for  $(v, \beta) \in (V \setminus S) \times \{0, 1\}$  in order of decreasing  $\delta_{v,\beta}$  do
11:      if  $\delta_{\text{prev}} > \phi \cdot \delta_{v,\beta}$  then // marginal gain too small
12:        break
13:      end if
14:      Let  $\alpha_u^{(v,\beta)} = \alpha_u$  for all  $u \in V \setminus \{v\}$  and  $\alpha_v^{(v,\beta)} = \beta$ 
15:      Let  $G^{(v,\beta)} = (V, W, \alpha^{(v,\beta)})$  // opinion dynamic with  $v$  as stooge
16:       $x^{(v,\beta)} \leftarrow \text{APPROXIMATEEQUILIBRIUM}(G^{(v,\beta)}, \{v\}, x, \epsilon)$ 
17:       $\delta_{v,\beta} \leftarrow \text{MSE}(x^{(v,\beta)}) - \text{MSE}(x)$ 
18:      if  $\delta_{v,\beta} > \delta_{\text{max}}$  then
19:         $\delta_{\text{max}} \leftarrow \delta_{v,\beta}$ 
20:         $(v_{\text{max}}, \beta_{\text{max}}) \leftarrow (v, \beta)$ 
21:      end if
22:       $\delta_{\text{prev}} \leftarrow \delta_{v,\beta}$ 
23:    end for
24:     $S \leftarrow S \cup \{v_{\text{max}}\}$  // add  $v_{\text{max}}$  as stooge and update opinion dynamic
25:     $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha^{(v_{\text{max}}, \beta_{\text{max}})}$ 
26:     $x \leftarrow x^{(v_{\text{max}}, \beta_{\text{max}})}$ 
27:  end while
28:  return  $S$ 
29: end function

30: function APPROXIMATEEQUILIBRIUM( $G, U, x, \epsilon$ )
31:   Let  $(W, \alpha, s) = G$ 
32:   while  $U \neq \emptyset$  do // as long as there are active nodes
33:      $x' \leftarrow x$ 
34:     for  $v \in U$  do
35:        $x'_v \leftarrow \alpha_v s_v + (1 - \alpha_v) \sum_{u \in V} w_{uv} x_u$ 
36:       if  $|x'_v - x_v| < \epsilon$  then
37:          $U \leftarrow U \setminus \{v\}$  // deactivate  $v$ 
38:       else
39:          $U \leftarrow U \cup \{u \in V : w_{uv} > \epsilon\}$  // activate influential neighbors of  $v$ 
40:       end if
41:     end for
42:      $x \leftarrow x'$ 
43:   end while
44:   return  $x$ 
45: end function
```




Figure 2: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the MSE (top) and polarization (bottom) on the Vax instance.

algorithm can be easily adapted to minimizing the MSE or optimizing the polarization. We split the selection of stooges in two parts: computing an approximation to the equilibrium opinions, and an approximate version of the lazy greedy algorithm. The former is implemented by repeated application of Equation 1 until convergence. Additionally, we deactivate nodes whose opinion is changing less than a small threshold $\epsilon \geq 0$ and stop updating their opinions. This avoids unnecessary computation where the equilibrium opinions of large parts of the graph are already reached. We implement the greedy selection by considering all pairs of vertices and extreme-value resistances $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$. As in the well-known lazy greedy algorithm, we keep track of the marginal gain of the MSE (or polarization) for each pair. For a submodular objective, the marginal gains decrease in each subsequent iteration of the outer while-loop due to diminishing returns. After adding a stooge, we can now order the remaining pairs in decreasing order of their prior marginal gains before the addition. We can stop recomputing the marginal gains as soon as all prior marginal gains fall below the current maximum, since we know they can only decrease and will therefore never exceed the current maximum. Since our function is however not submodular and we cannot guarantee diminishing returns, we do not know whether the marginal gains are decreasing. We account for it by introducing some multiplicative slack $\phi \geq 1$ and only stop recomputing marginal gains once the slack times an updated marginal gain fall below the current maximum.

7 Experimental Evaluation

We evaluate Algorithm 1 on Problems 1 and 2 against several intuitive baselines. We show further results in Appendix A. We used Python 3 and ran our methods on a 2.9 GHz Intel Xeon Gold 622R processor with 384GB RAM. Our code is available online¹

7.1 Setup

Synthetic Instances. We consider different random graphs for our synthetic experiments. We use a $\text{GNP}(n, p)$ model where each possible edge on a graph of size n is included independently with probability p . We also consider a more refined stochastic block model which we refer to as `RndCommunities`. It has

¹<https://github.com/MKL0L/asch-effect-polarization>




Figure 3: Innate opinions (s), equilibrium opinions before (x^*) and after adding stooges for optimizing the MSE ($x^*(\text{MSE})$) and the polarization ($x^*(\text{Polarization})$). We show maximization (left) and minimization (right) on the Baltimore-Follow dataset.

a total of $n = 300$ nodes of which 200 form a big community and the remaining 100 nodes form 10 small communities of size 10, each. Small communities are only connected to the big community, not to each other. Each intra-community edges exists independently with probability 0.5 and each inter-community edge with probability 0.3. We choose this model as it simulates the existence of several disconnected small communities connected to a large, expander-like core as described in [37]. We also consider random trees $\text{RndTree}(n)$ where we pick a tree uniformly at random from the set of all trees on n vertices by choosing a random Prüfer sequence [42] and converting it into a tree (see also [10]). We also run experiments on a star graph with 150 leaves (denoted *Star*) and a 10×5 grid graph (denoted *Grid*). Unless otherwise noted, we sample innate opinions independently from $\mathcal{N}(\mu = \frac{1}{2}, \sigma^2 = \frac{1}{2})$ which we clip for convenience to $s_v \in [0, 1]$. Throughout, we use resistance values of $\alpha_v = \frac{1}{2}$ for all nodes.

Real-World Instances. We use a new Twitter dataset [15] compiled using twAowler [40] before Twitter changed its data collection policy. We create two instances *Vax* and *War*, consisting of a network of users which posted about the Ukraine war and vaccinations. We include an undirected edge between two users if there is at least one follow or a mention relationship between them. The *Vax* and *War* datasets are on the same graph of 3 409 nodes and 11 508 edges, consisting of users who have expressed opinions on both topics. The opinions are obtained by parsing 12 257 tweets posted by these users. The sentiment of the tweets was analyzed using ChatGPT-3.5. We provide the prompts we used in Appendix A. The sentiment scores ranged from 0 to 10 (and were subsequently normalized to the interval $[0, 1]$), where 0 indicates complete opposition to vaccination, 10 represents full support, and 5 denotes neutrality. For this dataset, we assume that the number of tweets act as a proxy on how opinionated a user is. Specifically, we give higher resistance values to users with many tweets, and we detail the exact formula in Appendix A.

We use further instances generated from Twitter by Garimella et al. [29]. Each instance captures users which posted with a specific hashtag, and we infer an extreme innate opinion $s_v \in \{0, 1\}$ from the sentiment expressed in that post. Users form a graph where the edges express the retweet or follow relationship between the users. Note that the resulting graph is also undirected even though these relationships are directed. We use resistances $\alpha_v = \frac{1}{2}$ for all nodes.

Algorithms. We use the greedy heuristic described in Algorithm 1 with parameters $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$ and $\phi = 1.1$, which we refer to as *Greedy*. For baselines, we consider selecting stooges randomly (*Random*), according to descending maximum degree (*MaxDegree*), or descending betweenness-centrality (*Centrality*). For each of these baselines, we also follow a greedy approach to decide the modified resistance values: From the set of selected stooges S , we pick the stooge $u \in S$ such that its change in resistance to either $\alpha_u = 0$ or $\alpha_u = 1$ maximizes (or minimizes) the objective. We continue this for all remaining stooges. All algorithms use the fast approximate calculation of the equilibrium opinions as stated in Algorithm 1 with $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$. We stop an algorithm early when additional stooges do not lead to any further improvement. As an additional baseline,




Figure 4: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the MSE on the *Vax* dataset. We show $\text{Bias}^2 = (\hat{\theta} - \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_u x_u^*)^2$, variance (polarization), and the MSE.




Figure 5: Comparing the set of stooges chosen for optimizing the MSE and Polarization. We report the Jaccard similarity on both sets for an increasing number of stooges. The left plot shows the maximization and the right plot the minimization for different random graphs. We report mean and standard deviation across five runs.

we use a brute-force approach (Brute Force) which enumerates all possible subsets of stooges.

Evaluation Metrics. For our experiments, we report the MSE and Polarization as defined in Equations 2 and 3. To compare two sets of stooges $A, B \subseteq V$, we use the Jaccard similarity index $J(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|}$.

7.2 Real-World Experiments

We now evaluate our algorithm and baselines on real-world datasets obtained from Twitter (cf. Appendix A for the full results). We further note that results on synthetic data follow similar trends as on real-world data, but the advantage of our greedy approach over baselines is even more pronounced.

We show the result of the maximization and minimization objectives on the *Vax* instance in Figure 2. Our greedy approach consistently outperforms the other baselines. Selecting stooges based on centrality or the maximum degree only proves sensible for a few stooges. Figure 3 shows the opinion distribution before and after adding stooges, on the *Baltimore-Follow* and *Vax* instances using *Greedy*. Notice that the overall MSE and polarization for *Vax* is small due to the non-polarizing effect of the FJ model [18] and also due to the large number of nodes in the network compared to the stooges. However, the relative increase we obtain is substantial ($\geq 40\%$ for *Vax*) as indicated by the plots. We can also see how maximization of the MSE and Polarization increases extreme opinions that are far from the true mean θ , and minimization pushes opinions closer together.

Figure 4 shows the decomposition of the MSE into bias and variance, for an increasing number of stooges selected by *Greedy*. The bias remains low throughout which indicates that both the MSE and Polarization objectives are similar:




Figure 6: Runtime on $\text{GNP}(n, 0.05)$ for an increasing number of vertices n , for selecting 50 stooges over 5 runs. We omit the standard deviation as runtimes are well concentrated.

Comparing MSE and Polarization. In order to explore the differences between optimizing the MSE (Problem 1) and the Polarization (Problem 2), we showcase the difference in the set of stooges selected by Algorithm 1 for both objectives (Figure 5). We can see that similar stooges are selected for both objectives. Furthermore, using the set of stooges selected for the other objective (i.e. using the stooges selected for optimizing the MSE for the Polarization and vice versa) results in a loss in objective of at most 1% for maximization and 6% for minimization for the random graphs in Figure 5.

Scalability. Figure 6 shows the runtime of our approach and the three baselines. Our greedy approach clearly outperforms the different baselines as it lazily avoids recomputation. We note, however, that this kind of optimization would also be possible for the baseline approaches. Centrality is the most expensive among the baseline approaches as it requires identifying the k vertices with maximum centrality, which can be prohibitive for large values of n .

8 Conclusion

We investigate the influence of social conformity using the Friedkin-Johnsen model on the wisdom of crowds by extending the classic experiment of Sir Francis Galton with a twist inspired by Asch’s conformity experiments. In particular, we explore the impact of introducing stooges (i.e., biased individuals) on the group’s collective estimation accuracy. We demonstrate NP-hardness for both maximizing and minimizing the mean squared error (MSE) of the group’s estimate. Our study reveals a connection between optimizing MSE and polarization in opinion dynamics. Despite the computational challenges, we propose a greedy heuristic that works well on synthetic and real-world datasets, suggesting practical implications for understanding and potentially manipulating collective decision-making processes in connected societies. A major open question is the design of approximation algorithms for our objectives.

References

- [1] Abebe, R., Chan, T.H., Kleinberg, J.M., Liang, Z., Parkes, D.C., Sozio, M., Tsourakakis, C.E.: Opinion dynamics optimization by varying susceptibility to persuasion via non-convex local search. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data* **16**(2), 33:1–33:34 (2022)
- [2] Abebe, R., Kleinberg, J.M., Parkes, D.C., Tsourakakis, C.E.: Opinion dynamics with varying susceptibility to persuasion. In: *KDD*. pp. 1089–1098. ACM (2018)
- [3] Acemoglu, D., Como, G., Fagnani, F., Ozdaglar, A.E.: Opinion fluctuations and disagreement in social networks. *Math. Oper. Res.* **38**(1), 1–27 (2013)
- [4] Asch, S.E.: Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American* **193**(5), 31–35 (1955)
- [5] Bakshy, E., Messing, S., Adamic, L.A.: Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on facebook. *Science* **348**(6239), 1130–1132 (2015)

- [6] Baumann, F., Lorenz-Spreen, P., Sokolov, I.M., Starnini, M.: Modeling echo chambers and polarization dynamics in social networks. *Physical Review Letters* **124**(4), 048301 (2020)
- [7] Becker, J., Brackbill, D., Centola, D.: Network dynamics of social influence in the wisdom of crowds. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **114**(26), E5070–E5076 (2017)
- [8] Bindel, D., Kleinberg, J.M., Oren, S.: How bad is forming your own opinion? *Games Econ. Behav.* **92**, 248–265 (2015)
- [9] Biondi, E., Boldrini, C., Passarella, A., Conti, M.: Dynamics of opinion polarization. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Syst.* **53**(9), 5381–5392 (2023)
- [10] Broder, A.Z.: Generating random spanning trees. In: *FOCS*. pp. 442–447. IEEE Computer Society (1989)
- [11] Buechel, B., Hellmann, T., Klößner, S.: Opinion dynamics and wisdom under conformity. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **52**, 240–257 (2015)
- [12] Centola, D., Becker, J., Brackbill, D., Baronchelli, A.: Experimental evidence for tipping points in social convention. *Science* **360**(6393), 1116–1119 (2018)
- [13] Chan, T.H., Lee, C.S.: On the hardness of opinion dynamics optimization with l_1 -budget on varying susceptibility to persuasion. In: *COCOON*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13025, pp. 515–527. Springer (2021)
- [14] Chen, M.F., Rácz, M.Z.: An adversarial model of network disruption: Maximizing disagreement and polarization in social networks. *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.* **9**(2), 728–739 (2022)
- [15] Chen, T., Wang, X., Tsourakakis, C.: Twitter Ukraine Vaccination dataset, <https://github.com/tsourakakis-lab/twitter-ukraine-vax>
- [16] Chen, T., Wang, X., Tsourakakis, C.E.: Polarizing opinion dynamics with confirmation bias. In: *SocInfo*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13618, pp. 144–158. Springer (2022)
- [17] Cialdini, R.B.: The science of persuasion. *Scientific American* **284**(2), 76–81 (2001)
- [18] Dandekar, P., Goel, A., Lee, D.T.: Biased assimilation, homophily, and the dynamics of polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**(15), 5791–5796 (2013)
- [19] Das, A., Gollapudi, S., Munagala, K.: Modeling opinion dynamics in social networks. In: *WSDM*. pp. 403–412. ACM (2014)
- [20] Das, A., Gollapudi, S., Panigrahy, R., Salek, M.: Debiasing social wisdom. In: *KDD*. pp. 500–508. ACM (2013)
- [21] DeGroot, M.H.: Reaching a consensus. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **69**(345), 118–121 (1974)
- [22] Del Vicario, M., Bessi, A., Zollo, F., Petroni, F., Scala, A., Caldarelli, G., Stanley, H.E., Quattrociocchi, W.: The spreading of misinformation online. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**(3), 554–559 (2016)
- [23] Eger, S.: Opinion dynamics and wisdom under out-group discrimination. *Math. Soc. Sci.* **80**, 97–107 (2016)
- [24] Fisher, M.L., Nemhauser, G.L., Wolsey, L.A.: An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—II, pp. 73–87. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (1978). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0121195>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0121195>
- [25] French Jr, J.R.: A formal theory of social power. *Psychological review* **63**(3), 181 (1956)

- [26] Friedkin, N.E., Johnsen, E.C.: Social influence and opinions. *Journal of mathematical sociology* **15**(3-4), 193–206 (1990)
- [27] Fujishige, S.: *Submodular functions and optimization*. Elsevier (2005)
- [28] Gaitonde, J., Kleinberg, J.M., Tardos, É.: Adversarial perturbations of opinion dynamics in networks. In: *EC*. pp. 471–472. ACM (2020)
- [29] Garimella, K., Morales, G.D.F., Gionis, A., Mathioudakis, M.: Quantifying controversy on social media. *ACM Trans. Soc. Comput.* **1**(1), 3:1–3:27 (2018)
- [30] Ghaderi, J., Srikant, R.: Opinion dynamics in social networks with stubborn agents: Equilibrium and convergence rate. *Automatica* **50**(12), 3209–3215 (2014)
- [31] Gionis, A., Terzi, E., Tsaparas, P.: Opinion maximization in social networks. In: *SDM*. pp. 387–395 (2013)
- [32] Golub, B., Jackson, M.O.: Naive learning in social networks and the wisdom of crowds. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **2**(1), 112–149 (2010)
- [33] Greshko, M.: The real wisdom of the crowds. *National Geographic* (2020)
- [34] Haidt, J., Bail, C.: Social media and political dysfunction: A collaborative review. Unpublished manuscript, New York University (2022)
- [35] Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J.M., Tardos, É.: Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. *Theory Comput.* **11**, 105–147 (2015)
- [36] Khot, S., Regev, O.: Vertex cover might be hard to approximate to within 2-epsilon. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **74**(3), 335–349 (2008)
- [37] Leskovec, J., Lang, K.J., Dasgupta, A., Mahoney, M.W.: Statistical properties of community structure in large social and information networks. In: *WWW*. pp. 695–704. ACM (2008)
- [38] Madirolas, G., de Polavieja, G.G.: Improving collective estimations using resistance to social influence. *PLoS computational biology* **11**(11), e1004594 (2015)
- [39] Musco, C., Musco, C., Tsourakakis, C.E.: Minimizing polarization and disagreement in social networks. In: *WWW*. pp. 369–378. ACM (2018)
- [40] Pratikakis, P.: *twawler: A lightweight twitter crawler* (2018)
- [41] Proskurnikov, A.V., Tempo, R.: A tutorial on modeling and analysis of dynamic social networks. part ii. *Annual Reviews in Control* **45**, 166–190 (2018)
- [42] Prufer, H.: Neuer beweis eines satzes uber permutationen. *Archiv der Mathematik und Physik* **27**, 742–744 (1918)
- [43] Rácz, M.Z., Rigobon, D.E.: Towards consensus: Reducing polarization by perturbing social networks. *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.* **10**(6), 3450–3464 (2023)
- [44] Richardson, M., Domingos, P.M.: Mining knowledge-sharing sites for viral marketing. In: *KDD*. pp. 61–70. ACM (2002)
- [45] Sadeh, G., Cohen, E., Kaplan, H.: Sample complexity bounds for influence maximization. In: *ITCS. LIPIcs*, vol. 151, pp. 29:1–29:36. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2020)
- [46] Sun, H., Zhang, Z.: Opinion optimization in directed social networks. In: *AAAI*. pp. 4623–4632. AAAI Press (2023)
- [47] Surowiecki, J.: *The wisdom of crowds*. Anchor (2005)

- [48] Tang, W., Tian, L., Zheng, X., Luo, G., He, Z.: Susceptible user search for defending opinion manipulation. *Future Generation Computer Systems* **115**, 531–541 (2021)
- [49] Tian, Y., Wang, L., Bullo, F.: How social influence affects the wisdom of crowds in influence networks. *SICON* **61**(4), 2334–2357 (2023)
- [50] Zhu, L., Bao, Q., Zhang, Z.: Minimizing polarization and disagreement in social networks via link recommendation. In: *NeurIPS*. pp. 2072–2084 (2021)
- [51] Zhu, L., Zhang, Z.: A nearly-linear time algorithm for minimizing risk of conflict in social networks. In: *KDD*. pp. 2648–2656 (2022)

Table 1: We compute the set of stooges for maximization and minimization of the MSE, and report the Jaccard similarity between both sets across five runs.

Graph type	GNP(150, 0.05)	RndCommunities	RndTree(150)	Grid	Star
Jaccard sim.	0.34 ± 0.07	0.83 ± 0.10	0.13 ± 0.05	0.27 ± 0.05	0.03

A Additional Experiments

A.1 Description of Experimental Setup

Resistances and Innate Opinions for Vax and War. Here, we detail the formula used to set the resistance of a user for the real world datasets Vax and War, which are both compiled from Twitter data. Let tw_u be the number of tweets of user u . We use the following formula to set the resistance values for each node u :

$$\alpha_u \sim \begin{cases} U(0.4, 0.6) & \text{if } 1 \leq tw_u \leq 5 \\ U(0.5, 0.7) & \text{if } 5 < tw_u \leq 10 \\ U(0.6, 0.8) & \text{if } 10 < tw_u \leq 20 \\ U(0.7, 0.9) & \text{if } tw_u > 20. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

ChatGPT-3.5 Prompts. We used the following prompts to extract an opinion for each tweet.

1. Return only integer rate for the following tweet. The rate represents its opinion towards COVID vaccination with an integer between 0 to 10, with 10 being very positive and supportive of vaccination, 0 being very negative and skeptical about it, and 5 being completely neutral. COVID vaccination is also called vax.
2. Return an integer in the range 0 to 10 (without additional comments, no letters at the sentence) for the following tweet. The rate represents its opinion towards a hypothetical war between Ukraine and Russia with an integer between 0 to 10, with 10 being totally supportive of Ukraine, 0 being totally supportive of Russia, and 5 being completely neutral.

A.2 Experimental Results on Synthetic Data

Optimization of MSE and Polarization. Figures 7 and 8 show MSE and polarization for an increasing number of stooges under Algorithm 1 (Greedy) and baselines. Our algorithm consistently outperforms the baselines, even the stooge selection of the baseline algorithms does work well for a small number of stooges. Interestingly, the Random baseline performs almost as well as MaxDeg and Centrality on our synthetic instances. In Figure 9, we show the behavior of our algorithms when the innate opinions are sampled from different distributions. Even though the variance of the innate opinions are kept equal, we can see that more extreme opinions lead to a higher MSE in the equilibrium opinions and make the network more susceptible for an increase in MSE by adding stooges via Greedy.

Figure 10 shows the innate and equilibrium before and after adding stooges. This shows how the maximization and minimization objectives clearly differ in bringing opinions together or farther apart. Optimizing for the MSE and the polarization results in approximately the same distribution over equilibrium opinions.

Stooge Location. We run experiments to showcase where our approach and baselines selects stooges. We run Greedy to select 10 stooges. In Figure 11, we determine the minimum distance of a vertex to any stooge, and group the vertices according to this distance. We show the MSE among each of these groups. We observe that for maximization, our greedy approach selects a set of stooges (distance 0) that itself experiences a high MSE. This is reversed for minimization. Furthermore, the MSE remains relatively constant for groups of other distances, but this is not the case for the baseline methods.




Figure 7: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the MSE on synthetic instances. We show the MSE for an increasing number of stooges, and report mean and standard deviation across five runs. Note that both the graph structure and the innate opinions are randomly generated for synthetic random graphs.




Figure 8: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the polarization, analogously to Figure 8.




Figure 9: Maximizing the MSE on RndCommunities when innate opinions are sampled from a uniform distribution $s_v \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$ (left), normal distribution $s_v \sim \mathcal{N}(0.5, \sigma^2)$ (center), and exponential distribution $s_v \sim \text{Exp}(\sigma^{-1})$ (right) where we choose $\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{12}$ such that the all variances coincide with the variance of the uniform distribution.

Comparing Minimization and Maximization. Table 1 shows the Jaccard similarity between the set of stooges selected for the maximization and minimization objectives. The size of the intersection varies with the network structure, as is apparent from the difference in intersection sizes. The maximal intersection is achieved for RndCommunities, indicating that community structures contain a set of influential nodes responsible for controlling the wisdom of crowds.

Parameters of Algorithm 1. We now want to experimentally motivate the parameter choices of Greedy. Figure 12 contains the MSE and runtimes achieved by Algorithm 1 for different parameter choices. We vary the accuracy ϵ of the equilibrium opinions and the slack ϕ for the lazy evaluation. We observe that with $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$ and $\phi = 1.1$, we are able to extract almost as much values as for a better accuracy ϵ or larger slack ϕ , while using only a fraction of the time. We further investigate the approximation guarantee obtained via these parameter choices by comparing with a brute force approach in Figure 13. Our greedy approach is able to extract almost all of the value of the brute force search.




Figure 10: Distribution of the innate opinions (s), equilibrium opinions before (x^*) and after adding stooges for optimizing the MSE ($x^*(\text{MSE})$) and the Polarization ($x^*(\text{Polarization})$). We show maximization (left) and minimization (right) on a several synthetic instances.




Figure 11: MSE of the set of nodes nodes at a given distance to the stoozes, for maximization (left) and minimization (right), on a Grid instance. Error bars show a 10th of a standard deviation.




Figure 12: Performance of Algorithm 1 for different choices of ϵ and ϕ for an increasing number of stoozes, on RndTree(1000) instances. For the left plot, we fix $\phi = 1.1$ and vary ϵ . For the right plot, we fix $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$ and vary ϕ . We show the loss in MSE compared to the optimal parameter choices $\epsilon = 0$ (left) and $\phi = \infty$ (right).




Figure 13: Comparing Greedy with a brute force search on GNP(150, 0.05) instances.




Figure 14: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the MSE on various real-world datasets, analogous to Figure 7

A.3 Additional Experimental Results on Real-World Data

We now showcase experimental results on the real-world instance War and the instances of Garimella et al. [29]. Analogous to Figures 2, and 2 we show the optimization of the MSE and the polarization. Table 2 summarizes the relative increase and decrease for both objectives on 50 stooges.




Figure 15: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the MSE on various real-world datasets, analogous to Figure 7




Figure 16: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the MSE on various real-world datasets, analogous to Figure 7




Figure 17: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the polarization on various real-world datasets, analogous to Figure 7




Figure 18: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the polarization on various real-world datasets, analogous to Figure 7




Figure 19: Maximization (left) and minimization (right) of the polarization on various real-world datasets, analogous to Figure 8

Table 2: We report the relative increase and decrease for optimizing MSE and polarization on real-world instances for 50 stooges.

Dataset	MSE		Polarization	
	Maximization	Minimization	Maximization	Minimization
war	207.80%	50.43%	206.16%	50.62%
vax	43.25%	19.96%	28.22%	2.32%
vaxnovax-retweet	0.84%	1.13%	0.84%	1.13%
leadersdebate-follow	6.90%	6.32%	6.89%	6.10%
leadersdebate-retweet	5.82%	7.93%	5.82%	7.93%
russia-march-follow	5.40%	5.22%	5.40%	5.24%
russia-march-retweet	2.58%	3.26%	2.58%	3.26%
baltimore-follow	12.96%	10.99%	12.39%	10.73%
baltimore-retweet	3.18%	5.03%	3.18%	5.03%
beefban-follow	11.31%	9.61%	11.20%	9.47%
beefban-retweet	3.98%	5.00%	3.98%	5.00%
gunsense-follow	6.48%	4.64%	6.09%	4.64%
gunsense-retweet	4.03%	5.82%	4.03%	5.82%