Polarized Speech on Online Platforms

Suyash Fulay^{1*}, Deb Roy¹

Affiliations:

¹Massachusetts Institute of Technology *Corresponding author. Email: sfulay@mit.edu

Abstract: While political polarization has increased as measured through surveys, currently we lack comprehensive, longitudinal, and ecologically valid measurement of the polarization of online political speech that spans social media platforms. Using language models, we analyze ~2.5 billion comments on Reddit and Twitter across ~1.7 million accounts from 2007-2023 and find that polarized speech has been rising on both platforms since their inception, with outgroup polarization levels higher on Twitter than Reddit. On Twitter, while U.S. politicians on the left have been consistently more polarized than everyday users, politicians on the right experienced the highest growth in polarization, overtaking journalists, media, and everyday users over the past four years. Today, politicians, the group listened to the most for their political rhetoric, are far more polarized than everyday users. Additionally, while polarized speech is typically lower for accounts with more followers, right-leaning political influencers are an exception to this trend, which may influence perceptions of polarization on the left versus the right. Polarization is more diffuse across users on Twitter than on Reddit, where it is localized to a few communities. Polarization also varies by topic, with right-leaning users twice as likely to use polarized rhetoric about immigration as leftleaning users while left-leaning users are somewhat more likely to be polarized around healthcare. Our large-scale analysis reveals previously unknown patterns of polarization across platforms, groups, and topics that will help us better contextualize polarized content and potentially intervene to reduce it.

Introduction

The rise of online platforms has ushered in a new era of political discussion, offering individuals unprecedented opportunities to engage, express their opinions, and shape public discourse. Politicians, journalists, media organizations, and everyday citizens participate in political discussion online, and in turn influence one another in what has become a significant element of the public sphere (1,2). However, as social media use has grown so have worries about the state of our political discourse online. Social media use can affect opinions on important issues such as vaccination (3), and exposure to online content has offline consequences. For example, social media played a large role in the organization of the January 6th attack on the U.S. Capitol (4) and Facebook's algorithms promoted hate speech towards Rohingva Muslims in Myanmar, eventually contributing to ethnic cleansing by the government (5). While we acknowledge that social media does not provide a representative sample of society at large, its use is undoubtably widespread. Seventy percent of Americans reported using social media in 2021, with twenty-three percent using Twitter and eighteen percent using Reddit (6). Political talk online is also common in both explicitly political and apolitical online spaces (7.8). Thus, while inherent limitations exist when studying political discourse on social media, its widespread nature and potential to impact beliefs and have real world consequences makes it essential to understand.

Current research has identified three main forms of political polarization (9). Structural polarization, such as the presence of echo chambers and filter bubbles, has been well studied on social media platforms (10). Issue polarization, the sorting of policy positions along party lines, has also increased and there has been some work attempting to capture this phenomenon online (11,12). Finally, affective polarization, or the tendency to dislike and distrust partisans from the out party, has risen dramatically over the past decade, particularly in the United States when measured by surveys (13).

We extend the notion of affective polarization to political speech online and provide a longitudinal, cross-platform view of how political discourse, specifically attitudes towards political groups and politicians, has evolved. In contrast to the artificial context of a survey, our study delves into the language patterns of millions of users engaging in active political discussion, which not only reflects their own opinions but also shapes the perceptions of the many millions of additional users exposed to their rhetoric (14). Social media has been described as a "social prism" through which a true reflection of society is often distorted; thus, it is of vital importance to understand how political discourse on these platforms has evolved and may be contributing the problems of polarization and social fragmentation that are weakening democracies around the world (15).

Previous work has studied polarizing and other uncivil rhetoric in congressional tweets and polarized discussion about specific topics over brief periods of time (16-21). We expand on this work by analyzing every comment made by politically active users on Reddit and a comprehensive portion of Twitter over the entire history of both platforms. To our knowledge, this is the first work that studies polarized speech at such a large scale and is not limited to a specific group, topic, time period, or platform.

Our main, novel findings are:

i) Outgroup polarized speech is *higher* and *more diffuse* on Twitter than Reddit, and polarization is driven by only a few large communities on Reddit.

- ii) Politicians are the most polarized group today, outstripping journalists, the media, and everyday users. However, this has not always been the case. While left-leaning politicians have always been more polarized than everyday left-leaning users, prior to 2019 right-leaning politicians and everyday users were equally polarized. Starting in 2016 each cohort of right-leaning politicians on Twitter has been more polarized than any cohort prior to 2016, leading to a rapid acceleration of polarized content specifically amongst right-leaning politicians (see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2).
- iii) While audience size is negatively related to polarization, this trend sharply breaks for right-leaning influencers, suggesting that visibility of polarized content (per account) may be higher on the right than the left.
- iv) Topics exhibit significant differences in levels of polarization across platforms and party lines; immigration is nearly twice as polarized on the right than the left, while healthcare is somewhat more polarized on the left than the right.

Results

Our analysis focuses on Twitter and Reddit, two large social media networks that host a significant amount of political discussion throughout the platforms and serve different groups of users (6). On Twitter, we study four main types of users: politicians, journalists, media accounts, and everyday users. The politician group primarily consists of elected members of or candidates running for U.S. Congress, but also includes governors and the executive branch (22,23). Journalists were identified by (24) and covered reporters and writers working for U.S. based English language media organizations (e.g., The New York Times) and major news outlets (e.g., CNN and Fox News). The media group includes the official accounts for these types of organizations, also collected by (24). Finally, we classify politically active users (i.e., those that follow at least ten politicians) that are not media, journalists, or politicians as "everyday users" and segment these users by follower count.

Polarization has been measured in a variety of ways in the literature, ranging from quantitative methods that measure ideological polarization (12) to qualitative coding of tweets (25) to machine learning classification of tweets (16). Since we are interested in measuring politically polarized speech at scale across groups and platforms, we adopt a machine learning classification approach that can be applied to millions of tweets or Reddit comments.

We draw on literature from political science, specifically surveys measuring affective polarization. Typically, these surveys use a "thermometer" rating from zero to one hundred to measure how citizens feel about certain political groups or politicians (13). Using this as the theoretical underpinning, we find comments towards a political group or entity and examine how many of them convey "dislike or distrust" (phrasing explicitly drawn from these surveys) to get an empirical measure of polarization that reflects natural, online discourse. We are careful to only label comments that exhibit negative or positive feeling *towards the specific political group or entity* as opposed to general comment valence to capture partisan feeling.

Concretely, we start by considering the set of political comments, which consist of comments that contain a reference to a political group (e.g., "liberals", "republicans") or a politician (e.g., "Biden", "Trump"). We then classify that comment as being positive, negative, or neutral towards the reference political group. For example, posts such as "*the gop is a lawless party led by an as-yet-unindicted criminal*" or "*i can't stand you @aoc your green deal sucks like you suck as a*

politician" would be classified as negatively polarized, as they exhibit clear negative feelings towards a political group or entity. See S1.6 for examples of polarized speech. We fine-tune several language models for this task and ensure that our results are robust to the specific model choice. By using these models, our measure of polarization ranges from negative one to positive one and can be interpreted as the percentage of negatively polarized comments minus the percentage of positive comments towards the specified political group. We use positive one as maximum *negative* polarization throughout this work.

When reporting results and comparisons between groups, we show the results of a one-sided t-test, one-sided Mann-Whitney U test, and significance of coefficients on multinomial regressions to ensure robustness. However, we note that since we are dealing with an extremely large amount of data, these tests will detect very small effect sizes. Thus, while we do report test statistics and p-values, we believe that focusing on the effect sizes will be more useful for the reader to determine whether differences in polarization are meaningful.

Group and Platform Trends

Twitter

Many groups contribute to political discourse, including journalists, the media, politicians, and the public. However, we have not fully understood *which* of these groups plays the biggest role in contributing to polarized discourse. Are politicians and journalists more likely to blame and attack their outgroup, or is it members of the public? Considering these groups have varying levels of influence, knowing which ones are more likely to use polarizing language can provide a clearer picture of the increasing polarization perceived by many Americans (25).

We find that today, politicians exhibit the highest levels of polarization (m = 0.652, CI = [0.646, 0.658]) exceeding journalists (m = 0.206, CI = [0.202, 0.209]), media (m = 0.134, CI = [0.123, 0.145]) and everyday users on both Reddit (m = 0.307, CI = [0.305, 0.308]) and Twitter (0.478, CI = [0.478, 0.479]). Comparing politicians to all other users in 2022 yields significant differences in levels of polarization ($U = 5.7 \times 10^{10}$, p(U) < .001, t = 72.45, p(t) < 0.001). See Fig. 1 and S3 for multinomial regressions to verify results across multiple language models. This suggests the users most listened to for their political commentary are also the most likely to use politically polarized rhetoric. One potential reason for this is that outgroup animosity leads to more engagement (15) and politicians may be using social media to promote themselves more than the average user. This could also be a factor driving the over-perception of polarization that has been documented in the American public (26).

Interestingly, we find that this difference between politicians and everyday users has not always existed. While left-leaning politicians (m = 0.576, CI = [0.571, 0.580]) have consistently been more polarized than everyday left-leaning users (m = 0.434, CI = [0.434, 0.434]), with an average gap of ~15%, during the Obama years right-leaning politicians (m = 0.315, CI = [0.302, 0.327]) and everyday users (m = 0.323, CI = [0.318, 0.327]) exhibited similar levels of polarization. This changed in 2016, when polarization of right-leaning politicians started to steadily increase. In 2019 the polarization of right-leaning politicians surpassed everyday right-leaning Twitter users for the first time, and it has been consistently higher since ($U = 4.5 \times 10^{10}$, p(U) < 0.001, t = 64.49, p(t) < 0.001). Investigating this increase further, we find that post-2016, each cohort of right-leaning politicians joining the platform exhibited more polarization than any cohort prior to 2016 ($U = 3.3 \times 10^8$, p(U) < 0.001, t = 25.30, p(t) < 0.001), while on the left the patterns across cohorts are more

mixed (see Fig. 2). During the Biden years, the gap between politicians and everyday users has reached 13% ($U = 2.8 \ge 10^{10}$, p(U) < 0.001, t = 31.43, p(t) < 0.001) and 17% ($U = 6.1 \ge 10^{10}$, p(U) < 0.001, t = 43.16, p(t) < 0.001) for left/right leaning users, respectively.

Journalists (m = 0.185, CI = [.183, .187]) and media outlets (m = 0.159, CI = [0.152, 0.166]) generally exhibit low levels of polarization, although with slight increases over the past sixteen years. See S3 for confirming these findings via multinomial regression and with various language models.

Reddit

Surveys have been consistent in showing rising affective and issue polarization over the past several decades (11,13). Yet, somewhat surprisingly polarized discourse on Reddit has not followed this monotonically increasing trend. On the right, polarization peaked during the Trump years ($U = 1.1 \ge 10^{11}$, p(U) < 0.001, t = 3.19, p(t) = 0.004), primarily driven by new right-leaning users who joined the subreddit r/TheDonald (see Fig. 3). This community became a notable hub for support of then-President Donald Trump (27) and exhibited highly polarized discussions. Then, the ban of r/TheDonald in 2020 due to policy violations, including the promotion of violence and hate speech (28) resulted in a decline in polarization among right-leaning users on the platform, although evidence shows that the users may have simply migrated to other platforms (29). Conversely, left-leaning users experienced heightened polarization during the Obama and Biden years ($U = 9 \ge 10^{11}$, p(U) < 0.001, t = 40.30, p(t) < 0.001). The subreddit r/politics has consistently contributed to the partisan gap (i.e., outgroup - ingroup polarization) among left-leaning users on Reddit.

These results indicate that polarized speech on Reddit has been shaped by specific subreddits during different periods. Waller and Anderson (30) find that, based solely on commenting activity (i.e., in which subreddits users left comments), an increase in structural polarization occurred mainly due to right-leaning users entering the platform in 2016. However, when we consider the political *speech* of users, we find that both the right and left have seen periods of intense polarization, albeit at distinct times. External events and moderation decisions played a large role in the evolution of aggregate polarized speech on Reddit.

Reddit versus Twitter

Both Reddit and Twitter are important platforms for political discussion. However, they have very different properties and attract different types of users. Twitter is generally public, historically limited in post length, and does not have an explicitly defined community structure. On the other hand, Reddit is traditionally pseudo-anonymous, allows unlimited comment length, and users participate in explicitly defined communities. Given these differences, it is difficult to know a priori whether there would be any disparity in the polarization of these two platforms or which platform would be more polarized.

We find that outgroup polarization is higher and ingroup polarization is lower on Twitter as compared to Reddit. Twitter users are ~13% more negative towards their outgroup ($U = 3.2 \times 10^{13}$, p(U) < 0.001, t = 687.29, p(t) < 0.001) and ~6% more positive towards their ingroup ($U = 9.9 \times 10^{12}$, p(U) = 0.009, t = 39.96, p(t) < 0.001) as compared to Reddit users. Although a truly consistent comparison across platforms is difficult, we test robustness to our cutoff for measuring political leaning and find that it does not meaningfully change our results, and we run additional multinomial regressions with various assumptions to check our results (see S4).

One potential reason for this divergence is that Reddit hosts explicit communities (i.e., subreddits) and co-partisan interactions are known to be less toxic (7). On the other hand, the concept of "dunking" on outgroup members is a well-known use of Twitter. Previous research also shows that constraints on length can lead to more uncivil interactions (*31*). Moreover, some of the largest communities on Reddit such as r/SandersForPresident and r/communism are critical of mainstream politicians and parties, which could explain why on aggregate Reddit users seem less positive towards their ingroups (e.g., a "left-leaning" Sanders voter may still be critical of the Democratic Party). However, we note that our analysis is limited by the method in which we inferred political orientation and included users in our sample, and we think important future work should focus on understanding the difference in platform levels of polarization.



Figure 1. For each group and their in/outgroup, average polarization since 2010. The y-axis can be interpreted as the percentage of negative comments minus the percentage of positive comments (higher indicates more negatively polarized). Data pulled from the User Timeline API. See S6 for chart with Historical Powertrack data. Bars shown are 95% confidence intervals.



Figure 2. Average polarization by each cohort of users (cohort defined as the year the user entered the platform) indexed to 2016 to better compare trends. To see the nonindexed series plotted refer to the S6.



Figure 3. Each subreddit and each cohort's contribution to the partisan gap (polarization towards outgroup - polarization towards ingroup) on Reddit. These patterns illustrate the outsize role particular subreddits play in polarized political speech (r/TheDonald and r/politics) as well as the influx and subsequent ban of users on the right post 2016.

Audience Size and Distribution of Polarized Content

Audience Size

In addition to aggregate amounts of polarized speech, understanding the visibility of this speech is paramount as this can affect meta-perceptions of polarization (14). However, there are various factors that may influence the relationship between audience size and polarization. On one hand, perhaps larger accounts are more interested in maximizing engagement, which could lead to the use of outgroup animosity as a tool. On the other hand, larger accounts may be more likely to be careful regarding the content they post to not alienate different members of their sizable audiences.

We empirically find that follower count and polarization are negatively related. For accounts with less than 1K followers, outgroup polarization is 44% (CI = [0.439, 0.440]) and 48% (CI = [0.484, 0.485]) for the left and right, respectively. This is higher than the polarization of 31% (CI = [.305, .312] and 40% (CI = [.388, .408]) for left and right leaning accounts with between 100K and 1M followers, respectively (see Fig. 4 and S5 for confirmatory regressions).

However, we find an important partisan difference in this trend. This negative relationship between followers and polarization breaks sharply for right-leaning accounts with greater than one million followers (m = .473, CI = [0.443, 0.504]), indicating that the visibility of polarized content (per account) from right-leaning users may be greater. Further investigation into these "mega-influencers" reveals that while on the left several of these large accounts are politicians, the top two accounts contributing the most polarized speech are in fact a musician and a comedian. On the right, none of the mega-influencers are politicians, and the top two most polarized accounts are a journalist and a comedian. Thus, while rhetoric from politicians is important to measure, influential political discussion can occur outside the scope of elected officials or even mainstream political media. See Tables S32 and S33 for lists of the top mega influencers on the left and the right.

Distribution of Polarized Content

We have measured aggregate polarization over time, platforms, and different types of users. However, an important facet of polarization is how it is distributed across these users. For example, researchers might target interventions to reduce polarization very differently depending on whether polarized content is confined to a few very active users or if it is more diffuse through the social network. Here, we address two questions; how is the distribution of negative political speech across users different from neutral political speech, and are these distributions different across platforms?

When comparing the distribution of negative and neutral political speech, the top decile of Twitter users by number of negative polarized tweets contributes 44% of all negatively polarized comments, whereas the top decile by neutral political tweets contributes 38%. A similar trend exists on Reddit (52% and 43% for negative and neutral, respectively). This indicates a smaller number of users contribute to a larger share of negative political content as compared to neutral political content. Additionally, negative political content is more concentrated in the top decile of users on Reddit as compared to Twitter (52% and 44%). This may be driven by user activity from the few highly polarized subreddits we examined previously (i.e., r/TheDonald and r/politics). Overall, we see that polarized content is more concentrated on Reddit and diffuse on Twitter. See S5.3 for a more formal comparison of these distributions confirmed via the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test and plots of the Lorenz curves.



Figure 4. Average polarization of all comments left by users within the specified range of followers.

Topics

Over the past several years we have seen an increase in ideological polarization, in which partisans either shift their positions to align more with the party line or they simply have more extreme policy preferences (11). However, these measures do not capture a different kind of issue-based polarization; namely, on which topics are partisans most likely to blame or attack the other side? This type of issue polarization is noteworthy as it is based on how people really behave when discussing these topics, and it points us to areas that potentially inflame partisans beyond policy disagreement.

We study the topic contexts in which polarized speech tends to occur and find that topic polarization varies across platforms and types of users (see Fig. 5). On Twitter, social welfare $(exp(\beta) = 2.603, CI = [2.481, 2.731])$, law and crime $(exp(\beta) = 1.961, CI = [1.891, 2.034])$, and the economy $(exp(\beta) = 1.834, CI = [1.786, 1.883])$ are generally outgroup polarized topics, whereas on Reddit education $(exp(\beta) = 2.615, CI = [2.518, 2.715])$ is also particularly polarized. We find that right-leaning everyday users are significantly more polarized on immigration than left-leaning users across both Reddit ($exp(\beta) = 1.703$, CI = [1.625, 1.785]) and Twitter ($exp(\beta) =$ 2.253, CI = [2.146, 2.365]). However, for politicians this partial difference disappears; immigration seems equally highly polarized for both right and left leaning politicians on Twitter $(exp(\beta) = 3.406, CI = [3.076, 3.771])$. Surprisingly, topics such as the environment, which are traditionally one of the most "issue-polarized" topics (32) are not extremely affectively polarized on Twitter $(exp(\beta) = 1.445, CI = [1.387, 1.506])$, suggesting a difference between topics that elicit explicit negativity towards the outgroup and topics for which there are differences in opinion on policy or importance. While valuable on their own, we also hope that researchers or companies interested in interventions to reduce polarization can use these findings to deploy their methods (33) more effectively.



Topic Coefficients and Interactions

Figure 5. We run a multinomial regression, regressing the polarity of a comment on the topic, the author's political leaning, and an interaction of the topic and the political leaning of the user. The exponentiated coefficients are shown. The topic coefficient represents the increase in the probability that a comment will exhibit negative outgroup polarization if it contains the specified topic. The interaction coefficient represents the increase in the probability that a comment will exhibit negative outgroup polarization if it contains the specified topic. The interaction coefficient represents the increase in the probability that a comment will exhibit negative polarization if it came from a right-leaning user instead of left-leaning user for the specified topic. We control for temporal trends when performing this analysis.

Discussion

We have conducted a comprehensive analysis of polarized speech on social media platforms, specifically focusing on Reddit and Twitter over a period of sixteen years and attempting to understand how polarization has evolved across different groups and platforms.

Our findings reveal substantial polarization today amongst politicians, more so than everyday users, media, and journalists. While this has been consistently true for left-leaning politicians over the past decade, an influx of right-leaning politicians to Twitter during the Trump years and onwards has resulted in politicians being about 15% more polarized than the average politically active user today. Since political elites have a significant amount of influence on our political discourse and public opinion it is noteworthy that now they are more likely to engage in polarizing discourse than any other group (34).

Additionally, we find that polarization tends to decrease with the number of followers an account has. This may suggest that more work could focus on polarized speech by smaller accounts, as much of the current literature focuses on political elite and influencers (14,23,24). We also find that the largest right-leaning accounts break this pattern and exhibit high levels of negative outgroup polarization. Given that meta-perceptions of polarization are often exaggerated, and social media is such a large part of citizens' exposure to political discourse, it is plausible that this gap between influential left and right-leaning accounts could further skew perceptions of polarization.

Twitter users are more likely to be polarized towards their outgroups than Reddit users. Given the influential nature of Twitter in political discussion and agenda setting (1), it is important to know that it hosts more outgroup polarized speech than at least one other widely used platform. Additionally, our analysis of Reddit also reveals that, unlike surveys of polarization over the past decade, the amount of polarized speech has not been monotonically increasing due to new users entering Reddit and subsequently certain communities being banned. This implies that the evolution of the health of online discussion can diverge from metrics estimated by surveys. Our finding that left-leaning polarization on Reddit was highest during the Biden years and first Obama term, while right-leaning polarization was highest during the Trump presidency is also an interesting divergence from previous work that finds polarized content from elites tends to increase when they are the minority party (14, 24).

At a time when aggregate affective polarization is at an all-time high, although polarized speech has generally increased on online platforms, not all groups and platforms have polarized to the same degree. We note that these findings are limited to social media and thus we do not draw conclusions beyond the population studied; however, given the prevalence and importance of social media it is important that we understand who is contributing most to polarized discourse, on which platforms and in what contexts. We believe that mapping these differences is a step towards enabling social media users to contextualize the polarized content they encounter and motivate them to seek out online spaces, whether within these platforms or beyond, that foster constructive political communication.

References

- P. Barberá, A. Casas, J. Nagler, P. Egan, R. Bonneau, J. Jost, J. Tucker. Who Leads? Who Follows? Measuring Issue Attention and Agenda Setting by Legislators and the Mass Public Using Social Media Data. *American Political Science Review*, **113(4)**, 883– 90 (2019). doi:10.1017/S0003055419000352.
- L. M. Kruse, D. R. Norris, J. R. Flinchum. Social Media as a Public Sphere? Politics on Social Media. *The Sociological Quarterly*, **59(1)**, 62–84 (2018). doi:10.1080/00380253.2017.1383143.
- W. Jennings, G. Stoker, H. Bunting, V.O. Valgarðsson, J. Gaskell, D. Devine, L. McKay, M.C. Mills. Lack of Trust, Conspiracy Beliefs, and Social Media Use Predict COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy. *Vaccines*. 2021; 9(6):593. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9060593</u>
- S. Frenkel. The storming of Capitol Hill was organized on social media. *The New York Times*. (2021). <u>https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/06/us/politics/protesters-storm-capitolhill-building.html</u>
- Amnesty International. The Social Atrocity: Meta and the Right to Remedy for the Rohingya. *Amnesty International*. (2022). https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/ASA16/5933/2022/en/
- 6. Pew Research Center. Social Media Use in 2021 (2021). https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/04/07/social-media-use-in-2021/
- 7. A. Rajadesingan, C. Budak, P. Resnick. Political Discussion is Abundant in Non-political Subreddits (and Less Toxic). *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, **15(1)**, 525-536 (2021). doi:10.1609/icwsm.v15i1.18081.
- J.A. Tucker, A. Guess, P. Barbera, C. Vaccari, A. Siegel, S. Sanovich, D. Stukal, B. Nyhan. Social Media, Political Polarization, and Political Disinformation: A Review of the Scientific Literature. *SSRN*. (2018). <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3144139</u>
- 9. E. Kubin, C. von Sikorski. The role of (social) media in political polarization: a systematic review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, **45(3)**, 188206 (2021). doi:10.1080/23808985.2021.1976070.
- 10. L. Terren, R. Borge-Bravo. Echo Chambers on Social Media: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Review of Communication Research*, **9**, 99–118 (2021).
- 11. Pew Research Center. Political Polarization in the American Public (2014). https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-theamericanpublic/
- M. Hohmann, K. Devriendt, M. Coscia. Quantifying ideological polarization on a network using generalized Euclidean distance. *Sci. Adv.* 9, eabq2044 (2023). doi:10.1126/sciadv.abq2044.
- 13. S. Iyengar, Y. Lelkes, M. Levendusky, N. Malhotra, S. Westwood. The Origins and Consequences of Affective Polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, **22(1)**, 129-146 (2019).
- 14. S. Moore-Berg, L. Ankori-Karlinsky, B. Hameiri, E. Bruneau. Exaggerated metaperceptions predict intergroup hostility between American political partisans.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, **117(26)**, 14864-14872 (2020). doi:10.1073/pnas.2001263117.

- 15. Chris Bail. Breaking the Social Media Prism (2021).
- A. O. Ballard, R. DeTamble, S. Dorsey, M. Heseltine, M. Johnson. Dynamics of Polarizing Rhetoric in Congressional Tweets. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 48, 105-144 (2023). doi:10.1111/lsq.12374.
- 17. S. Rathje, J Van Bavel, S. Van der Linden. Out-group animosity drives engagement on social media. *PNAS.* **118(26)**, (2021).
- J. Golbeck, J. M. Grimes, A. Rogers. Twitter use by the U.S. Congress. J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci., 61, 1612-1621 (2010). doi:10.1002/asi.21344.
- 19. Y. Theocharis, P. Barberá, Z. Fazekas, S.A. Popa. The Dynamics of Political Incivility on Twitter. *SAGE Open*, **10(2)**. (2020). doi:10.1177/2158244020919447.
- 20. J. A. Frimer, H. Aujla, M. Feinberg, L. J. Skitka, K. Aquino, J. C. Eichstaedt, R. Willer. Incivility Is Rising Among American Politicians on Twitter. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 14(2), 259-269 (2023). doi:10.1177/19485506221083811.
- M. Yarchi, C. Baden, N. Kligler-Vilenchik. 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), 98-139 (2021). doi:10.1080/10584609.2020.1785067.
- 22. Ballotpedia. https://ballotpedia.org/Main_Page.
- 23. P. Barberá. Birds of the Same Feather Tweet Together: Bayesian Ideal Point Estimation Using Twitter Data. *Political Analysis*, **23(1)**, 76-91 (2015). doi:10.1093/pan/mpu011.
- 24. M. Wojcieszak, A. Casas, X. Yu, J. Nagler, J. Tucker. Most users do not follow political elites on Twitter; those who do show overwhelming preferences for ideological congruity. *Sci. Adv.*, 8, eabn9418 (2022). doi:10.1126/sciadv.abn9418.
- 25. A. Russell. U.S. Senators on Twitter: Asymmetric Party Rhetoric in 140 Characters. *American Politics Research*, **46(4)**, 695–723 (2018). doi:10.1177/1532673X17715619.
- 26. J. Westfall, L. Van Boven, J. Chambers, C. Judd. Perceiving Political Polarization in the United States: Party Identity Strength and Attitude Extremity Exacerbate the Perceived Partisan Divide. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, **10(2)**, 145–58 (2015). <u>http://www.jstor.org/stable/44290057</u>.
- 27. C. Flores-Saviaga, B.C. Keegan, S. Savage. Mobilizing the Trump Train: Understanding Collective Action in a Political Trolling Community (2018). *Proceedings of the Twelfth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- A. Trujillo, S. Cresci. Make Reddit Great Again: Assessing Community Effects of Moderation Interventions on r/The_Donald. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 6, CSCW2, Article 526 28 pages (2022). doi:10.1145/3555639.
- 29. M.H. Ribeiro, et al. (2021). Do Platform Migrations Compromise Content Moderation? Evidence from r/The_Donald and r/Incels. Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact., **5**, CSCW2, Article 316 24 pages (2021). doi:10.1145/3476057.

- 30. I. Waller, A. Anderson. Quantifying social organization and political polarization in online platforms. *Nature*, **600**, 264-268 (2021). doi:10.1038/s41586-021-04167-x.
- K. Jaidka, A. Zhou, Y. Lelkes. Brevity is the Soul of Twitter: The Constraint Affordance and Political Discussion. *Journal of Communication*, 69(4), 345-372 (2019). doi:10.1093/joc/jqz023.
- 32. Pew Research Center. (2019). In a Politically Polarized Era, Sharp Divides in Both Partisan Coalitions.
- 33. R. Hartman, W. Blakey, J. Womick, et al. Interventions to reduce partisan animosity. *Nat Hum Behav*, **6**, 1194-1205 (2022). doi:10.1038/s41562-022-01442-3.
- 34. J. Druckman, E. Peterson, R. Slothuus. How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation. *American Political Science Review*, **107(1)**, 57-79 (2013). doi:10.1017/S0003055412000500
- N. Marchal. "Be Nice or Leave Me Alone": An Intergroup Perspective on Affective Polarization in Online Political Discussions. *Communication Research*, 49(3), 376–398 (2022). doi:10.1177/00936502211042516.
- 36. G. De Francisci Morales, C. Monti, & M. Starnini. No echo in the chambers of political interactions on Reddit. *Scientific Reports*, 11, 2818. (2021). doi:10.1038/s41598-02181531-x.
- 37. Comparative Agendas Project. Datasets/Codebooks, United States (2015). https://www.comparativeagendas.net/datasets_codebooks

Supplementary Materials

Materials and Methods

S1 Data

S2 Models

S3 Twitter

S4 Platform Comparisons

S5 Audience size and Influence

S6 Additional Charts

Figs. S1 to S15

Tables S1 to S34

References (35–37)

Supplementary Materials for

Polarized Speech on Online Platforms

Suyash Fulay, Deb Roy

Corresponding author. sfulay@mit.edu

The file includes:

Materials and Methods S1 Data S2 Models S3 Twitter S4 Platform Comparisons S5 Audience size and Influence S6 Additional Charts Figs. S1 to S15 Tables S1 to S34 References (*35–37*)

Materials and Methods

Materials

Twitter Data

We collect our initial set of political partisans by following the method of Barbera et al. (23), which infers political orientation of a Twitter user based on their following patterns of a set of political elites. We see the expected bimodal distribution of our measure of partisanship theta (see S1.1). Then, we collect tweets in two ways. First, we use the User Timeline API, which allows us to collect the last 3200 tweets of each user. We find that 64.6% of users fall below this threshold, meaning we collect their entire timeline. Since for the temporal analysis the 3200-tweet limit could introduce bias, we also pull data from one day each month from 2006 onwards for a sample of users using the Historical Powertrack API, which has no restriction on the number of previous tweets. We additionally pull the tweets of politicians, media, and journalists using account IDs provided by (24) as well as the Ballotpedia dataset. We discard retweets; while previous work has studied engagement with polarized content, usually from political elites (24) our focus is on the polarization of original tweets.

To find relevant tweets, we use a set of keywords corresponding to major political groups and parties as well as the most popular political figures (35). See S1.2 for a list of keywords that were used.

Reddit Data

We use a similar method to Barbera et al. (23) to infer the political leaning of Reddit users. Instead of following patterns of political elites, we use commenting patterns in a set of political subreddits. Users that left at least ten comments in political subreddits are included in our sample. We see a similar bimodal distribution play out on Reddit like Twitter, in that users typically comment primarily in left-leaning or right-leaning subreddits. See S1.1 for more detail on inferring the political orientation of Reddit users. We then collect *all* comments from these users across all subreddits. While previous work has often studied interactions in specific political subreddits (*36*) it has recently been shown that a significant amount of political discourse on Reddit happens in non-political subreddits (*7*). Thus, we ensure to collect every comment made by a politically active user, even if that user is posting in non-political subreddits.

Methods

Labeling Polarized Speech

Previous work on polarized speech has typically labeled speech that attempts to create division between the speaker and an outgroup, or speech that attempts to show intra-party loyalty, as "polarized" speech (16). We adopt a similar approach, using Iyengar's (13) definition of affective polarization as "expressing dislike or distrust" towards the outgroup or members of the outgroup as our standard for negatively polarized speech (conversely, comments exhibiting "like or trust" would be positively polarized). Annotators were asked to either label the comment as exhibiting explicit "affective polarization", which could include ad-hominem attacks/compliments towards political group or person, or "partisan", where the author exhibits (dis)like or (dis)trust towards a group but in the context of governance. However, we are careful to only label comments that are negative towards or lay blame on a specific group or person. See S1.6 for examples of polarized speech. A team of three annotators labeled 4500 examples of political speech, evenly split amongst user types (everyday Twitter, everyday Reddit, politicians, and journalists) with 800 overlapping tweets/comments. This number of examples is in line with other work measuring polarized speech using machine learning (14) and our reasonable out of sample accuracy and model agnostic results give us confidence that the results are robust. For labeling whether a comment contained either affectively polarized or partisan speech, the inter-annotator agreement was .77 using Krippendorf's alpha.

Training Polarized Speech Classifier

Given the importance of the classifier in our analysis, we train three separate classifiers to ensure that our results are not driven by any one model. We use language models available from the HuggingFace library, which are BERT, GPT2, and a version of BERT further fine-tuned on a tweet sentiment task. The best performing individual model is the fine-tuned BERT sentiment classifier,

which achieves an accuracy of 82% and we use for the main results and charts. Since we are primarily interested in group and temporal differences, we also run our analysis only based on the comments for which all three classifiers agree to ensure precise estimates. For that subset of comments, we achieve an accuracy of 89%. We use five-fold cross validation to measure these metrics out-of-sample. We also replicate our results with all the models individually using all available political comments and find that they agree. See S2.1 for details on model training, alternative metrics, and performance relative to various baselines. We also break down performance across different political orientations and reference groups to ensure that there are no major systematic errors.

Topic Classifier

We use a set of topics compiled by the Comparative Agendas Project (*37*) and have three annotators label the same examples outlined above. We only keep topics for which we see at least fifteen examples in the training set. On a set of 800 overlapping examples, the annotators agreed 87% of the time with a Krippendof's alpha of .63. We achieve 91% out of sample accuracy using five-fold cross validation, and a macro F1 score of .67. See S2.2 for a detailed breakdown of performance over the different topics.

S1 Data

Group	Total Posts	Political Posts	Total Authors
Twitter	988,344,411	66,791,701	1,188,080
Politicians	2,197,330	197,295	1,361
Journalist	2,129,798	442,967	1,165
Media	251,065	33,503	93
Reddit	1,514,559,439	29,513,175	467,438

Table S1

S1.2 Partisan Scores on Reddit and Twitter

After applying the method of Barbera et al. to Twitter and Reddit, we see a bimodal distribution of partisan scores in both cases. To translate the Barbera method to Reddit, instead of a binary entry in a matrix indicating a follow relationship, we insert the log number of positive scoring comments a user made in each subreddit. Then, the application of Barbera's method would yield conceptually similar results; users that comment in similar subreddits would have similar values across the primary principal component. As expected on both platforms, there are more left leaning than right leaning users, and we use the same cutoffs as previous work (23) of -1.2 and 0 to determine left vs. right leaning users (we flipped the signs as necessary such that on both platforms, a higher theta meant more liberal, and a lower theta meant more conservative). We inspected some users as a sanity check for both Reddit and Twitter. As expected, on Reddit the high theta users primarily comment in r/politics and r/Liberal, while the low theta users comment primarily in r/Conservative. Likewise, on Twitter the users with higher theta primarily followed left-leaning politicians, and vice-versa for users with lower theta.



Figure S1. Distribution of Twitter partisan scores



Figure S2. Distribution of Reddit partisan scores

S1.3 Subreddits to Infer Political Orientation

These were the subreddits we used to find "politically active" users and infer their political orientation using Barbera's method.

Table S2

S1.4 Average Polarization in Training Data

As a sanity check, we measure the polarization of the different groups in our training set. As expected, politicians are more polarized than everyday users and journalists, and Twitter users exhibit slightly more partian alignment.

Average Polarization (Training Data)



Figure S3

Average Polarization (Senti BERT Fine-tuned Classifier)



Figure S4



Figure S5

S1.5 List of political keywords

Pol Orient	Type	Name
L	group	antifa, dems, liberals, liberal, leftist, leftists, libtard, libtards, libs, democratic party,left-wing, dem, left wingers, left winger, libruls, progressive, progressives, democrat, democrats
L	name	obama, clinton, biden, sanders, pelosi, jimmy carter, al gore, warren, michael bloomberg, john kerry,kamala harris, aoc, ocasio-cortez, charles schumer, cory booker, andrew cuomo, madeleine albright, john edwards, maxine waters, anthony weiner,michael dukakis, julian castro, dianne feinstein, al franken, joe biden, bernie sanders, nancy pelosi, elizabeth warren, chuck schumer, adam schiff,ilhan omar, gavin newsom, amy klobuchar, tulsi gabbard, ted lieu, kirsten gillibrand, rashida tlaib, eric swalwell, katie porter, john lewis,chris murphy, ayanna pressley, claire mccaskill, beto orourke, martin omalley
L	twitter	 @barackobama, @hillaryclinton, @billclinton, @joebiden, @berniesanders, @speakerpelosi, @algore, @ewarren, @mikebloomberg, @johnkerry,@senkamalaharris, @repaoc, @senschumer, @corybooker, @nygovcuomo, @madeleine, @repmaxinewaters, @juliancastro, @diannefeinstein, @alfranken,@petebuttigieg, @ilhan, @nycmayor, @adamschiff, @sensanders, @senwarren, @repadamschiff, @ilhanmn, @gavinnewsom, @amyklobuchar, @tulsigabbard, @tedlieu, @sengillibrand, @senfeinstein, @rashidatlaib, @repswalwell, @repkatieporter, @repjohnlewis, @chrismurphyct, @ayannapressley,@teampelosi, @clairecmc
R	group	trumpster, trumpeters, republican party, far right, right wing, far-right, republican, republicans, alt-right, repubs,maga, repub, right-wing, right winger, right wingers, conservative, conservatives, alt\-right, gop
R	name	trump, schwarzenegger, pence, palin, romney, cheney, ted cruz, jeb bush, ben carson, paul ryan,mcconnell, gingrich, marco rubio, henry kissinger, bob dole, mike huckabee, chris christie, rand paul, dan quayle, lindsey graham,jared kushner, jeff sessions, donald rumsfeld, rick santorum, ron desantis, jim jordan, john mccain, mitt romney, matt gaetz, kevin mccarthy,marjorie taylor greene, trey gowdy, john boehner, devin nunes, josh hawley, greg abbott, marsha blackburn, chuck grassley, dan crenshaw, tim scott,adam kinzinger, jeff flake, mike lee, tom cotton
R	twitter	@realdonaldtrump, @schwarzenegger, @sarahpalinusa, @mittromney, @sentedcruz, @georgehwbush, @secretarycarson, @speakerryan, @senatemajldr, @newtgingrich, @marcorubio, @senatordole, @govmikehuckabee, @chrischristie, @randpaul, @lindseygrahamsc, @jaredkushner, @jeffessions, @rumsfeldoffice, @ricksantorum,@secretaryperry, @barrygoldwater, @speakerboehner, @nikkihaley, @tedcruz, @govrondesantis, @jim_jordan, @senjohnmccain, @repmattgaetz, @gopleader,@mattgaetz, @repmtg, @rondesantisfl, @tgowdysc, @devinnunes, @hawleymo, @gregabbott_tx, @marshablackburn, @chuckgrassley, @repdancrenshaw,@senatortimscott, @adamkinzinger, @jeffflake, @senmikelee, @sentomcotton

Table S3

S1.6 Polarized Speech Examples

Affectively Polarized Speech

Affectively polarized speech encompasses ad-hominem attacks as well as comments that express distrust that the group/party is doing what's right (for themselves and the country). This is grounded in the feeling thermometer and trust questions that surveys use, as well as the general definition of affective polarization that is "dislike and distrust to those from the out party".

Comment	Affect
i can't stand you @aoc your green deal sucks ass like you suck as a politician	Negative

i'm not sure people grasp how far to the right gop is going and has gone. i'm not sure people	Negative
understand that their freedom, democracy is on the line.	
@wikileaks @hillaryclinton haha!!!!! go wikileaks! good thing hillary can laugh at the mess she's made!"	Negative
at least they're admitting that blm was burning towns down and committing violence because obama told them it was	Negative
yes, the gop is a lawless party led by an asyet- unindicted criminal."	Negative
@premr that was credit card reform measure signed into law by president obama	Neutral
obama was not the most leftist president in history. contextually (contrasting the politics of the time they were in office), the most leftist president in history was probably thomas jefferson.	Neutral
i don't see why trump would pardon him. has he said anything on the matter? this isn't even related to anything about trump either.	Neutral
Happy birthday joe biden !	Positive
i absolutely adore maxine waters . she doesn't pull any punches.	Positive
conservative women are level headed and actually use their head when they process information	Positive

Table S4

Partisan Speech

These comments are not necessarily ad-hominem attacks. However, they often blame negative outcomes on a group/person or criticize their governance. Sometimes they reference specific topics/policies, which often does not happen in "affectively polarized" comments. The comment explicitly blames/praises a certain group/person or clearly implying a positive/negative sentiment, and often attempts to criticize their competence.

Comment	Affect
there is one major political party in the world that doesn't believe in climate change. the republican party . as long as the party that continue to deny the problem is in power, we won't be able to make the changes necessary to solve it. #climatechange	Negative
the way to keep guns out of our schools is not to put guns in them. trumps suggestion today is absolutely unfathomable and must be stopped.	Negative
if gop senators spent more time doing their job, they'd realize america is broke and a health entitlement program is stupid!	Negative
the fact that the biden administration is spending \$86 million to pay for hotel rooms for illegal immigrants is absurd. let's take care of our homeless veterans and hurting americans first.	Negative
over and over again, obama's foreign policy actions have proven reckless and not in our nation's best interest.	Negative
i mean, it makes sense. they are a publicly traded company subject to sec and congressional oversight. since all 3 houses are controlled by liberals , only makes sense to silence the opposing party.	Neutral

i don't refute that point. my point is that obama has taken more total below-the-belt punches than his predecessors, and that you'd have to be an, extremist, not a moderate, to believe/claim otherwise.	Neutral
not sure what to think of this"hacker group claims to have romney's tax returns" http.//t.co/rdlbsrrf via @mashable	Neutral
sarah palin suggests she will get involved in kentucky senate race #politics	Neutral
thanks @realdonaldtrump for approving sd's disaster declaration for severe storms and flooding. this will help local units of	Positive
government & amp; certain non-profit organizations to rebuild critical infrastructure and facilities that have been severely damaged.	
so glad that @debrarodman73, @vvfordelegate, @adamsfordel, @pwcdanica, @chrishurstva and so many more progressive leaders are headed to the house of delegates! @vahousedems	Positive
@ingrahamangle i can't think of a more important reason to support president trump in his re-election.	Positive

Table S5

S2 Models

S2.1 Polarization Model

We fine tune the *cardiffnlp/twitter-roberta-base-sentiment*, *bert-base-uncased*, and *gpt2* classifiers from Huggingface on our 4500 labeled examples using five-fold cross validation to get a robust estimate of out of sample performance. For data cleaning, we keep all comments that are under 250 characters (the Twitter limit) and lowercase all text. We fine tune all the models for three epochs, with a batch size of eight and performance evaluation every 200 gradient updates. The only hyperparameter tuning we do is on the learning rate, which we adjust to 1.25e-5 for *bertbase-*

uncased and *gpt2* and 2.5e-5 for *cardiffnlp/twitter-roberta-base-sentiment* to ensure smooth training. We then use the weights of the model with the lowest evaluation cross entropy loss. We see that fine-tuning the base models allows us to reach the best performance across our outcomes, as measured by the macro F1 score. We benchmark it against an untrained BERT sentiment classifier as well as the VADER model, which only uses semantic information to create a sentiment score.

First, we report the macro F1 scores of all models as well as a set of baselines. We report all the models separately as well as the joint model's performance on training examples that have the same prediction across all three models.





Figure S6



Figure S7

Additionally, we report the precision and recall breakdown by class for each classifier. We make two observations; first, the untuned sentiment model has high recall but low precision, likely due to the data distribution being different between the pre-training data (predicting sentiment) and the task predicting polarization. However, after fine-tuning the model we see a more reasonable balance between precision and recall is found that maximizes the F1-score. Additionally, since the fine-tuned sentiment model has better recall on polarized comments than the original BERT or GPT models, we see that this model is more likely to predict a comment as being polarized. However, while the models display different sensitivities to predicting whether a comment is polarized, we show that all our main findings are robust to the choice of model.



Figure S8



Joint Model Performance across Classes



We also estimate the model performance across the different political orientations of users and the different reference groups to ensure that any biases in performance would not be materially impacting our results. We find very similar performance across political orientations and reference political groups, though the model is marginally better at predicting polarization of content by left-leaning users. However, we find that our main results are consistent regardless of model choice, giving us more confidence that they are accurate.

Metric	L	R
Macro F1	0.75	0.69
Orig F1	0.51	0.51
VADER F1	0.44	0.45
Baseline F1	0.3	0.3

Table S6. Joint Model performance across author political orientations

L	R
0.74	0.7
0.51	0.51
0.45	0.44
0.3	0.3
	L 0.74 0.51 0.45 0.3

Table S7. Joint Model performance across political reference groups

Metric	L	R
Macro F1	0.71	0.68
Orig F1	0.52	0.52
VADER F1	0.44	0.45
Baseline F1	0.29	0.28

Table S9. Fine-tuned sentiment model performance across author political orientations

Metric	L	R
Macro F1	0.7	0.69
Orig F1	0.52	0.52
VADER F1	0.44	0.45
Baseline F1	0.29	0.29

Table S10. Fine-tuned sentiment model performance across political reference groups

Metric	L	R
Macro F1	0.63	0.59
Orig F1	0.52	0.52
VADER F1	0.44	0.45
Baseline F1	0.29	0.28

Table S12. Fine-tuned BERT performance across author political orientations

Metric	L	R
Macro F1	0.63	0.59
Orig F1	0.52	0.52
VADER F1	0.44	0.45
Baseline F1	0.29	0.29

Table S13. Fine-tuned BERT performance across political reference groups

Metric	L	R
Macro F1	0.63	0.61
Orig F1	0.31	0.29
VADER F1	0.44	0.45
Baseline F1	0.29	0.28

Table S15. Fine-tuned GPT performance across author political orientations

Metric	L	R
Macro F1	0.64	0.6
Orig F1	0.29	0.3
VADER F1	0.44	0.45
Baseline F1	0.29	0.29

Table S16. Fine-tuned GPT performance across political reference groups

S2.2 Topic Model Performance

Although most comments did not contain any specific topic, we find that we can still reasonably classify the topics when they do occur. Our overall accuracy is 91% when including tweets with no topic and 66% when only considering tweets that contained a given topic. Given the large number of topics and their relative sparsity of occurrence, the classifier's performance is modest. However, this seems roughly in line with other work that attempts to use topic classifiers on political social media data (21).

Topic	Precision	Recall	F1	Support
None	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.85
International affairs	0.65	0.70	0.67	0.03
Economy	0.60	0.62	0.61	0.02
Health	0.58	0.59	0.59	0.02
Immigration	0.77	0.78	0.78	0.02
Civil rights	0.61	0.57	0.59	0.02
Labor	0.70	0.82	0.75	0.01
Environment	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.01
Education	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.01
Law and crime	0.55	0.27	0.36	0.01
Social welfare	0.64	0.41	0.50	0.01
Energy	0.65	0.69	0.67	0.00

Table S18. Topic model performance

S3 Twitter

We first test how group polarization has shifted by using an ordinal logistic regression where we regress the polarity of a comment on an indicator variable corresponding to the period the comment was posted, as well as an interaction between the period and the type of user. A higher coefficient corresponds to higher probability of a comment exhibiting negative polarization. We run separate models corresponding to the political orientation of the users as well as the reference group (ingroup or outgroup). The following regressions are all performed using the Historical Powertrack data, as it has the least probability of a temporal bias, and we also control for time using a covariate representing the year.

-	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Journalist x Biden	-0.82***	-0.98***	-0.95***	-1.29***
2	Media x Biden	-0.96***	-1.2***	-1.55***	-2.01***
3	Politician x Biden	0.3***	0.4^{***}	0.23**	0.49***
4	Journalist x Trump	-1.13***	-1.05***	-1.31***	-1.92***
5	Media x Trump	-1.27^{***}	-1.31^{***}	-1.79***	-2.2***
6	Politician x Trump	-0.15	0.03	-0.18	-0.12
7	Journalist x Obama (2nd)	-0.98***	-0.91***	-1.18***	-1.6***
8	Media x Obama (2nd)	-1.68^{***}	-1.41***	-2.07***	-2.86***
9	Politician x Obama (2nd)	-0.28**	-0.27**	-0.29**	-0.42**
10	Journalist x Obama $(1st)$	-0.67***	-0.69***	-0.73***	-1.09***
11	Media x Obama (1st)	-1.74***	-1.05***	-1.86^{***}	-2.38^{***}
12	Politician x Obama (1st)	-0.74***	-0.36**	-0.67***	-0.87***
13	-1 0	-6.94***	-5.22***	-7.22***	-8.42***
14	0 1	1.4^{***}	0.41^{***}	1.67^{***}	1.62^{***}
15	Obama (1st)	-0.41***	-0.5***	-0.38***	-0.66***
16	Obama (2nd)	0.03	-0.25***	0.06*	-0.08*
17	Trump	-0.06**	-0.14***	0.01	-0.08**

Table S19. Right-leaning outgroup. We highlight the coefficients of politicians in the red boxes. In the Obama era, right-leaning politicians were generally less polarized than the average right-leaning user (indicated by the negative coefficient). Then, in the Trump era they were roughly equal, indicated by non-significant coefficients. Finally, in the Biden era, politicians exceed everyday users in polarization as indicated by the positive coefficient.

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Journalist x Biden	-0.9***	-0.94***	-1.17***	-1.69***
2	Media x Biden	-0.99***	-1.25^{***}	-1.57^{***}	-2.1***
3	Politician x Biden	0.33^{***}	0.37^{***}	0.19*	0.41**
4	Journalist x Trump	-0.92***	-0.94***	-1.13***	-1.5***
5	Media x Trump	-0.9***	-1.04***	-1.67***	-2.1***
6	Politician x Trump	0.53^{***}	0.42^{***}	0.31***	0.57***
7	Journalist x Obama (2nd)	-1.19^{***}	-1.26***	-1.44***	-1.88***
8	Media x Obama (2nd)	-1.09***	-1.07***	-1.57***	-2.07***
9	Politician x Obama (2nd)	0.26^{**}	0.35^{***}	0.2^{*}	0.42***
10	Journalist x Obama (1st)	-1.28***	-1.13^{***}	-1.32^{***}	-1.85^{***}
11	Media x Obama (1st)	-1.52^{***}	-1.3***	-1.85***	-2.26***
12	Politician x Obama (1st)	0.08	0.27^{*}	0.26	0.1
13	-1 0	-6.83***	-5.29***	-6.82^{***}	-8.25***
14	0 1	1.59^{***}	0.52^{***}	1.87^{***}	1.85^{***}
15	Obama (1st)	-0.35***	-0.46***	-0.26***	-0.49***
16	Obama (2nd)	-0.17***	-0.28***	-0.18***	-0.32***
17	Trump	-0.16^{***}	-0.18***	-0.07***	-0.18***

Table S20. Left-leaning outgroup. The positive coefficients on politicians indicates that leftleaning politicians have consistently been more polarized than everyday left-leaning users. However, the largest gap seems to appear during the Trump era.

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Journalist x Biden	-0.33**	-0.26**	-0.48***	-0.6***
2	Media x Biden	-0.72***	-0.54^{***}	-0.67***	-1.15^{***}
3	Politician x Biden	-0.7**	-1.1***	-1.12^{***}	-0.64*
4	Journalist x Trump	-0.35***	-0.09*	-0.43***	-0.7***
5	Media x Trump	-0.66***	-0.29***	-0.68***	-1.01***
6	Politician x Trump	-1.45^{***}	-1.56^{***}	-1.98***	-2.48***
7	Journalist x Obama (2nd)	-0.54***	-0.1**	-0.54^{***}	-0.76***
8	Media x Obama (2nd)	-0.7***	-0.35***	-0.65***	-1.05^{***}
9	Politician x Obama (2nd)	-1.09***	-1.45^{***}	-1.87***	-1.46^{***}
10	Journalist x Obama (1st)	-0.02	-0.11	-0.25*	-0.25
11	Media x Obama (1st)	-0.39*	-0.25*	-0.47*	-0.72*
12	Politician x Obama (1st)	-0.64**	-0.77***	-0.96***	-0.78**
13	-1 0	-4.98***	-3.21^{***}	-4.44***	-5.5***
14	0 1	2.07^{***}	1.4^{***}	2.46^{***}	2.73^{***}
15	Obama (1st)	-0.68***	-0.41***	-0.4***	-0.68***
16	Obama (2nd)	-0.06*	-0.3***	-0.05	-0.14**
17	Trump	-0.18***	-0.37***	-0.14***	-0.22***

Table S21. Right-leaning ingroup. Negative coefficients on politicians indicates that rightleaning politicians were more positive towards their ingroups than everyday users. However, in the Biden era some of this reversed as right-leaning politicians became less favorable towards their ingroup.

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Journalist x Biden	-0.69***	-0.46***	-0.6***	-0.96***
2	Media x Biden	-0.56***	-0.57***	-0.73***	-1.09^{***}
3	Politician x Biden	-1.66***	-2.42^{***}	-1.85***	-2.68***
4	Journalist x Trump	-0.68***	-0.39***	-0.61^{***}	-0.95***
5	Media x Trump	-0.55***	-0.39***	-0.72***	-1.07***
6	Politician x Trump	-1***	-1.58***	-1.89***	-2***
7	Journalist x Obama (2nd)	-0.54***	-0.11***	-0.49***	-0.7***
8	Media x Obama (2nd)	-0.6***	-0.14**	-0.6***	-0.82***
9	Politician x Obama (2nd)	-1.57***	-1.72^{***}	-1.74***	-2.31***
10	Journalist x Obama $(1st)$	-0.58***	-0.1*	-0.45***	-0.64***
11	Media x Obama (1st)	-0.78***	-0.15*	-0.65***	-0.89***
12	Politician x Obama (1st)	-1.23***	-1.36^{***}	-1.69***	-1.47***
13	-1 0	-4.89***	-3.25***	-4.62***	-5.59***
14	0 1	2.32^{***}	1.65^{***}	2.82^{***}	3.04^{***}
15	Obama (1st)	-0.11**	-0.4***	-0.12**	-0.37***
16	Obama (2nd)	-0.13***	-0.4***	-0.13***	-0.33***
17	Trump	-0.06**	-0.13***	0.05^{*}	-0.06*

Table S22. Left-leaning ingroup. Left-leaning politicians are more favorable to their ingroups than everyday left-leaning users.

We then focus on confirming our findings that right-leaning politicians have become more partisan aligned at a faster rate than other groups. We regress the polarity of a comment on an interaction between the year (represented as the number of years from the earliest comment) and the user type. A higher coefficient essentially corresponds to a higher rate of growth in polarization of the group relative to other groups. The clearest trends are that all politicians grew increasingly warm towards their ingroups at a faster rate than journalists, the media, and everyday Twitter users. On the right, negative outgroup partisan speech by politicians also grew faster than the other right-leaning groups.

2	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Politician x year	0.11***	0.09***	0.1^{***}	0.15^{***}
2	Journalist x year	0.01	-0.02*	0.01	0.01
3	Media x year	0.11^{***}	0.01	0.06**	0.09**
4	-1 0	-6.89***	-4.79***	-7.22***	-8.17***
5	0 1	1.44^{***}	0.83***	1.66^{***}	1.84***
6	Journalist	-1.08***	-0.82***	-1.19***	-1.65***
7	Media	-2.28***	-1.4***	-2.36***	-3.15^{***}
8	Politician	-1.11***	-0.75***	-1***	-1.45***
9	year	0	0.03***	0	0.01**

Table S23. Right-leaning outgroup. A positive coefficient indicates that the rate of growth in outgroup polarization of right-leaning politicians and media exceeded that of everyday users. However, we note that the overall polarization of media is low relative to all other groups.

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Politician x year	0.02	0.01	0	0.02
2	Journalist x year	0.06***	0.04***	0.05^{***}	0.06***
3	Media x year	0.05**	0.01	0.01	0.01
4	-1 0	-6.52^{***}	-4.77***	-6.57***	-7.73***
5	0 1	1.9^{***}	1.03^{***}	2.12^{***}	2.37***
6	Journalist	-1.5***	-1.42***	-1.67^{***}	-2.18***
7	Media	-1.38***	-1.13^{***}	-1.73^{***}	-2.16^{***}
8	Politician	0.24^{*}	0.28^{**}	0.23	0.33*
9	year	0.02***	0.04***	0.02^{***}	0.04***

Table S23. Left-leaning outgroup. Journalists grew more polarized faster than any group, albeit at lower levels.

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Politician x year	-0.04	-0.09***	-0.07**	-0.15***
2	Journalist x year	0.02	-0.01	0	-0.01
3	Media x year	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02
4	-1 0	-4.73***	-2.7***	-4.23***	-5.1^{***}
5	0 1	2.3^{***}	1.9^{***}	2.67^{***}	3.11^{***}
6	Journalist	-0.55***	0	-0.47^{***}	-0.61^{**}
7	Media	-0.76***	-0.25*	-0.58**	-0.85**
8	Politician	-0.9***	-0.67***	-1.19^{***}	-0.69*
9	year	0.01*	0.02***	0.01^{*}	0.02^{**}

Table S24. Right-leaning ingroup. Right-leaning politicians generally grew more positive towards their ingroups than everyday users.

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Politician x year	-0.01	-0.08***	-0.02	-0.09**
2	Journalist x year	-0.01	-0.04***	-0.01	-0.03*
3	Media x year	0.02	-0.04***	-0.01	-0.02
4	-1 0	-4.8***	-2.73***	-4.53^{***}	-5.17***
5	0 1	2.41^{***}	2.16^{***}	2.91^{***}	3.45^{***}
6	Journalist	-0.58***	0.02	-0.48^{***}	-0.6***
7	Media	-0.76***	0	-0.65***	-0.82***
8	Politician	-1.25^{***}	-1.1***	-1.62^{***}	-1.46***
9	year	0	0.04***	0.01^{**}	0.03***

Table S25. Left-leaning ingroup

S4 Platform Comparisons

To confirm that indeed from our chosen sample of users, Twitter users show more partisan alignment than Reddit, we run a series of ordinal logistic regressions. We regress the polarity of a comment on the reference group (outgroup or ingroup), the platform (Reddit or Twitter), an interaction between the two variables, and our measure of partisanship *theta*. If the interaction term is negative, this means that the partisan gap is larger on Twitter versus Reddit. We test this model including and excluding users that solely commented in r/TheDonald and r/ChapoTrapHouse.

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2
1	Group X Platform [Ref: Ingroup/Twitter]	-0.38***	-0.8***	-0.43***
2	Group [Ref: Ingroup]	0.81^{***}	1.33^{***}	1.04^{***}
3	Platform [Ref: Twitter]	-0.25^{***}	0.41^{***}	0.01^{+}
4	theta	0.05***	0.03***	0.05^{***}
5	-1 0	-6.5***	-3.6***	-5.83***
6	0 1	2.57^{***}	2.07^{***}	2.92^{***}

Table S26. Right-leaning, exclude extreme subreddits

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2
1	Group X Platform [Ref: Ingroup/Twitter]	-0.46***	-0.78***	-0.73***
2	Group [Ref: Ingroup]	0.72^{***}	1.32^{***}	1.01***
3	Platform [Ref: Twitter]	-0.06***	0.48^{***}	0.32^{***}
4	theta	-0.01***	-0.02***	-0.02***
5	-1 0	-6.91***	-3.85***	-6.29***
6	0 1	2.74^{***}	2.24^{***}	3.15^{***}

Table S27. Left-leaning, exclude extreme subreddits

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2
1	Group X Platform [Ref: Ingroup/Twitter]	-0.41***	-0.84***	-0.48***
2	Group [Ref: Ingroup]	0.8^{***}	1.3^{***}	1.02^{***}
3	Platform [Ref: Twitter]	-0.25***	0.39***	0†
4	theta	0.02***	-0.02***	0†
5	-1 0	-6.31***	-3.5***	-5.65***
6	0 1	2.55^{***}	2.03^{***}	2.89^{***}

 Table S28. Right-leaning, include extreme subreddits

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2
1	Group X Platform [Ref: Ingroup/Twitter]	-0.46***	-0.78***	-0.73***
2	Group [Ref: Ingroup]	0.72^{***}	1.32^{***}	1.01^{***}
3	Platform [Ref: Twitter]	-0.06***	0.48^{***}	0.32^{***}
4	theta	-0.01***	-0.02***	-0.03***
5	-1 0	-6.91^{***}	-3.86***	-6.3***
6	0 1	2.74^{***}	2.24^{***}	3.15^{***}

Table S29. Left-leaning, include extreme subreddits

We also find that varying the cutoff for theta does not materially change this relationship.

Polarization at Differing Cutoffs Measuring Partisanship



Figure S10: Varying the cutoff for inferring political orientation does not meaningfully change the aggregate polarization level.

S5 Audience Size and Influence

S5.1 Audience Size

We run an ordinal logistic regression, regressing the polarity of each comment on the follow count of the user that tweeted it as well as their political orientation, and an interaction of the two (and controlling for time). The relationship between the (log) number of followers and the polarization is negative, but for right-leaning users this is weaker indicated by the positive coefficient on the interaction term.

e.	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Follow Count	-0.04718***	-0.06671***	-0.07107***	-0.09026***
2	Follow Count x R	0.00473^{***}	0.01436***	0.02021^{***}	0.01922^{***}
3	-1 0	-3.732***	-2.59464***	-3.59247^{***}	-4.34885***
4	0 1	3.15124^{***}	2.14114***	3.79735***	3.43972***
5	R	0.10315^{***}	0.03597***	0.07403^{***}	0.09924^{***}

	variable	BERT	Senti	GPT-2	Joint
1	Follow Count	-0.10144^{***}	-0.12617^{***}	-0.13916^{***}	-0.16652***
2	Follow Count x R	0.05921^{***}	0.07233***	0.07477^{***}	0.08869***
3	-1 0	-3.42711^{***}	-2.58325***	-3.79416^{***}	-4.09248***
4	0 1	2.09332***	1.09627***	2.09621^{***}	2.31145^{***}
5	R	-0.16117^{***}	-0.26012***	-0.16614^{***}	-0.25104^{***}

Table S31. Followers vs. polarization (ingroup)

S5.2 Mega-influencer Accounts

Screen Name	Followers
dbongino	3,845,701
w_terrence	1,412,740
IngrahamAngle	4,530,529
DonaldJTrumpJr	9,585,414
TomiLahren	2,296,126
RudyGiuliani	1,545,532
KellyannePolls	3,520,211
DLoesch	1,276,655
ksorbs	1,529,775
JackPosobiec	1,904,913
kayleighmcenany	3,198,451
EricTrump	4,064,036
AnnCoulter	2,109,240
ericbolling	1,130,224
DanScavino	1,657,560
RubinReport	1,311,015

MattWalshBlog	1,243,029
realDailyWire	1,429,077
JustinColeMoore	1,189,858
Cernovich	1,102,161
brandi_love	1,050,979

Table S32. Mega-influencer accounts on the right. We find that on the right, there are a handful of journalists but also accounts that fall outside mainstream politics.

Screen Name	Followers
thelittleidiot	1,127,089.00
chelseahandler	7,719,580.00
BernieSanders	15,552,053.00
ewarren	5,894,853.00
SenSanders	12,502,471.00
RepSwalwell	1,429,334.00
TheLastWord	1,081,113.00
JoeNBC	2,765,504.00
billyeichner	2,318,140.00
YahooNews	1,092,113.00
funder	1,100,941.00
MarkRuffalo	8,364,416.00
BillKristol	1,020,371.00
davidhogg111	1,213,372.00
ananavarro	1,993,938.00
SophiaBush	1,235,356.00

mmpadellan	1,153,899.00
tribelaw	1,365,362.00
mitchellreports	1 928 460 00
Intenenteports	1,720,400.00
VICENews	1,018,161.00

Table S33. Mega-influencer accounts on the left. The left has more of a balanced mix of megainfluencers, with some mainstream media accounts and politicians. However, there are still influencers outside of these traditional categories such as musicians and comedians.

S5.3 Distribution of Polarization across Users

In addition to aggregate measures of polarization, we investigate how users contribute differently to negatively polarized and neutral political speech. As documented in other research, users contribute to content on Reddit and Twitter in accordance with a power law; generally, a small group of users contributes to a large share of comments/tweets (12). However, these distributions are different between negative and neutral content. In Figure S8, we plot the Lorenz curve, where the x-axis represents the decile of users according to the percent of comments/tweets they post, and the y-axis represents the total percent of all comments posted by users in the specified decile or higher. For example, we find that on Twitter, the top decile of users by posting activity of neutral comments post 39/35% of all neutral comments for left/right-leaning users, respectively. However, the top 10% of users by posting activity of negative comments post 46/40% of all negative comments. We broke ties randomly such that each decile contains the same number of observations.

To confirm that the distributions are indeed statistically significantly different, we discretize the contributions into percentiles and run the one-sided Kolmogorov–Smirnov test that determines whether the CDF of negative comments is higher than that of neutral comments. For all users except left-leaning politicians and media on Twitter, we find that the distribution of negative comments is indeed more skewed than neutral comments (p < .05). We note that "Voter" refers to "Twitter" in the chart below.



Contribution of Users to Political Speech by Decile



Туре	Pol Orient	K-S Statistic	p-value
Journalist	L	0.31	0
Reddit	L	0.29	0
Reddit	R	0.29	0
Journalist	R	0.24	0.003
Politician	R	0.19	0.027
Twitter	L	0.17	0.056
Twitter	R	0.17	0.056
Media	L	0.09	0.446
Politician	L	0.08	0.529
Media	R	0.04	0.853

43

Table S34. We report the K-S statistic and corresponding p-value for each group and political orientation. We discretized the distribution into percentiles to compare CDFs.

We also plot the same Lorenz curves as above but now compare the two platforms. On the top chart we examine the distribution of neutral content across users on the two platforms, while on the bottom we examine the distribution of negative content. The red curve (Reddit) above the blue curve (Twitter) indicates that the distribution is more skewed on Reddit than on Twitter.



Figure S12

S6 Additional Charts

S6.1 Historical Powertrack Groups over Time

We sample data over the past decade to pull using the Twitter Historical Powertrack API. Given the API restrictions we are only able to capture a subset of one million tweets; however, we see that the main trends described hold when using this sample of data.



Figure S13. Using a sample of Historical Powertrack data we see very similar trends to the User Timeline data.



Figure 14. A non-indexed chart of polarization by cohort using User Timeline data.

45



Figure S15. A non-indexed chart of polarization by cohort using line data.