

Authenticity and exclusion: social media recommendation algorithms and the dynamics of belonging in professional networks

Nil-Jana Akpinar^{1*}, Sina Fazelpour²

¹Amazon AWS AI/ML

²Northeastern University

nakpinar@amazon.com, s.fazel-pour@northeastern.edu

Abstract

Homophily—the attraction of similarity—profoundly influences social interactions, affecting associations, information disclosure, and the dynamics of social exchanges. Organizational studies reveal that when professional and personal boundaries overlap, individuals from minority backgrounds often encounter a dilemma between *authenticity* and *inclusion* due to these homophily-driven dynamics: if they disclose their genuine interests, they risk exclusion from the broader conversation. Conversely, to gain inclusion, they might feel pressured to assimilate. How might the nature and design of social media platforms, where different conversational contexts frequently collapse, and the recommender algorithms that are at the heart of these platforms, which can prioritize content based on network structure and historical user engagement, impact these dynamics? In this paper, we employ agent-based simulations to investigate this question. Our findings indicate a decline in the visibility of professional content generated by minority groups, a trend that is exacerbated over time by recommendation algorithms. Within these minority communities, users who closely resemble the majority group tend to receive greater visibility. We examine the philosophical and design implications of our results, discussing their relevance to questions of informational justice, inclusion, and the epistemic benefits of diversity.

1 Introduction

Social media platforms have become an integral part of many people’s professional lives. Across different sectors, individuals see these platforms as affording possibilities for professional development and networking (Donelan 2016; Alsobayel et al. 2016). Academic users, for example, may take to these platforms to share professional news (e.g., publication of new articles), exchange views, seek and advertise opportunities, and form connections and collaborative ties (Britton, Jackson, and Wade 2019; Hurrle and Postatny 2015; Luo, Freeman, and Stefaniak 2020; Knight and Kaye 2016; Klar et al. 2020; Veletsianos 2016; Neal 2012; Sugimoto et al. 2017). In short, these platforms can importantly impact the visibility and reputation of users among their professional networks.

In utilizing social media platforms for these professional purposes, users have to contend with how the platforms can

collapse together different spheres of one’s personal and professional life (Davis and Jurgenson 2014; Boyd 2010). The merging of the (real and imagined) audiences and topics associated with different social contexts complicates the dynamics of self-presentation to professional audiences. It requires users to negotiate, across varied norms and expectations, what to disclose about themselves, when, and how (Ellison, Gibbs, and Weber 2015; Hollenbaugh 2021).

Previous work has highlighted how this loss of distinctness between the personal and the professional can be particularly costly to individuals with minority identities, in digital as well as traditional organizational settings (Vitak 2012; Phillips, Rothbard, and Dumas 2009). In this paper, we examine how *content recommendation algorithms* that are at the heart of these platforms can exacerbate the challenges facing minorities. In particular, we explore the potential compounding effects of these algorithms on a key factor that strains the dynamics of inter-group communication and minority self-presentation even in traditional organizational settings: *homophily*.

To understand how homophily—the attraction to similarity—affects inter-group dynamics of engagement and disclosure, consider the following scenario, which will serve as a running example throughout the paper. Imagine an organizational team composed of individuals from a majority and a minority group identity. All team members share an interest in work-related topics, and their group membership does not influence their engagement on these professional discussions. However, when conversation shifts to non-work-related topics, their interests tend to align with their identity groups (e.g., TV shows from different languages and regions, different sports, music genres, or regional politics). Consequently, they are more likely to participate in discussions about topics that resonate with their cultural or personal identity, and so can engage primarily with those who share those similar interests.

Organizational science research suggests that such homophily-driven dynamics can lead to individuals from minority backgrounds facing a tension between *authenticity* and *inclusion* (Phillips, Rothbard, and Dumas 2009; Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard 2018). If they disclose their genuine interests, they risk exclusion from the broader conversation. Conversely, to gain inclusion, they might feel pressured to assimilate, suppressing their unique perspectives

*Work done outside of Amazon.

and preferences in favor of more widely shared topics. Importantly, opting out of conversations about those non-work topics may also not be a preferable option, as connecting on those topics can deepen interpersonal relations in ways that benefit an individual’s professional opportunities (Ertug et al. 2022)—for instance, when two employees with similar work-related merits are considered for promotion, the one perceived as more “personable” might be chosen (Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard 2018). In this way, homophily can shape both the engagement and disclosure dynamics within diverse groups, potentially reinforcing segregation even in settings where professional interests are aligned.

There are compelling reasons to think that the design and nature of social media platforms, along with their algorithms, may intensify these issues. On social media platforms, the loss of distinction between personal and professional spheres is even more pronounced compared to traditional workplaces, where such overlap is usually limited to specific events like retreats or holiday parties. Moreover, content recommendation algorithms could potentially exacerbate these challenges. Specifically, these algorithms might perpetuate a cycle where initial lack of engagement in topics of differential interest (e.g., TV shows from various cultures) can result in decreased future visibility of posts, *even on topics of shared interest*. This is unlike traditional work settings, where the alignment of professional interests typically guarantees ongoing engagement on such topics among individuals from different groups. By prioritizing content based on past interactions, algorithmic intermediaries on social media can disrupt this pattern, diminishing the likelihood of cross-group engagement even on universally relevant professional topics. In so doing, they can disproportionately disadvantage the professional opportunities of individuals with minority identities.

In this paper, we use agent-based simulation to explore how different content recommendation policies interact with this type of homophily-based communication interaction in diverse groups¹. Agent-based simulation allows us to isolate factors of authenticity and inclusion in highly complex recommendation settings while avoiding interfering with a system in production which can raise ethical concerns. There has been a recent recognition for the importance of simulation and applied modeling for the understanding of long-term effects of recommender systems (Patro et al. 2022; Akpınar et al. 2022a; Zhang et al. 2020; Chaney, Stewart, and Engelhardt 2018). Our setup is inspired by components of a real-world social media recommender system that, to the best of our knowledge, still have variations in productions today (Kamath et al. 2014; Twitter 2023). Overall, our simulations demonstrate how homophilic graph structures can lead to decreased visibility of professional content for minority groups, a disadvantage that is exacerbated by the recommendation algorithm over time. Minority users that are more assimilated to the mainstream, e.g. follow more majority group users or express topic interests more aligned with the majority group, are rewarded with increased cross-

group visibility for their professional content. Lastly, we observe that—even for non-work topics that heavily align with the minority identity—minority group created content is less visible to the majority group than majority group created content. In the addition to authenticity and inclusion, this raises concerns around minority recognition, representation and a lack of amplification for minority voices. We end by discussing the philosophical and design implications of our findings, contextualizing them in relation to issues of informational justice, inclusion, and the epistemic benefits of diversity.

2 Background and related work

2.1 Context collapse and risks to minority and marginalized identities

Previous research has shown how context collapse on social media can pose particular risks to users with minority and marginalized identities. For many such users, social media platforms offer key spaces for joint identity construction with others with similar backgrounds, lived experiences, and interests (Brock 2009; Jackson, Bailey, and Welles 2020; Khazraee and Novak 2018). Importantly, the success of such projects can critically depend on keeping contexts, audiences, and expectations distinct (e.g., to create a safe space for disclosure; to ensure anonymity). The loss of distinctness can thus pose consequential privacy risks to these individuals (Vitak 2012; Dhoest and Szulc 2016). In response, individuals can use various strategies to mitigate the risks or else the tensions due to context collapse. For example, they might sever or limit access (via “unfriending”, “blocking”, or “muting”) (Zhu and Skoric 2021).

While most previous works explore the risks due to the loss of privacy and anonymity that is particular to online settings, we examine homophily-based tensions that also occur in traditional organizational contexts (Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard 2018). Importantly, insofar as disclosing information can further career opportunities (e.g., by deepening interpersonal ties) in these professional settings, *not* revealing information (whether by blocking or limiting access) will not mitigate the risks of homophily-based disparities (though it may reduce them).

2.2 Homophily and inter-group dynamics

Homophily—the tendency of individuals to associate with similar others—influences a wide array of social dynamics, including the formation of interpersonal associations, communication patterns, and the establishment and calibration of trust (Golub and Jackson 2012; O’Connor 2019; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001). This phenomenon is observed both offline and on digital platforms, where various salient attributes such as gender, country of origin, values, occupation, and more, can serve as axes of similarity (Lawrence and Shah 2020). In academia, for example, homophily (e.g., based on gender and national origin) has been shown to influence interaction patterns at events such as conferences (Atzmueller and Lemmerich 2018), patterns of citations (Zhou, Chai, and Freeman 2024), even extending to professional opportunities such as prize nomination

¹The code for this work is available at <https://github.com/nakpinar/authenticity-exclusion-rec-sys>.

and selections (Gallotti and De Domenico 2019).

The consequences of homophily are diverse, affecting personal, interpersonal, and network levels (Ertug et al. 2022; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001). On the one hand, homophily can enhance coordination and communication, foster trust, and increase personal happiness. On the other hand, especially at the network level, homophily can have detrimental effects by limiting exposure to and exchange with dissimilar others, thus reducing overall diversity and potentially leading to intergroup polarization. This segregation can entrench societal divisions and hinder the epistemic benefits of diversity (Baron et al. 1996; Fazelpour and Rubin 2022).

As Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard (2018) note, homophilic tendencies can influence the dynamics of exchange and self-disclosure in professional settings in crucial ways. In particular, even when aligned in professional interests, when it comes to other topics, individuals may engage more readily in conversations with those with similar identities. Conversely, concerned with a lack of engagement, they may be more reluctant to disclose aspects of themselves to those seen as out-groups (See also Phillips, Rothbard, and Dumas 2009). While Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard (2018) focus on the impact of homophily on *disclosure*, we examine how different content recommendation policies interact with homophily’s influence on the *uptake* of information in social networks. We will discuss the relation between the two further in Section 5. There, we also discuss the implications of our findings with respect to the potential homogenizing effects of homophily and its potential detrimental consequences epistemic benefits of diversity.

2.3 Epistemic injustice and exclusion

The particular type of harms that we investigate in this paper are closely related to issues of epistemic injustice and epistemic exclusion (Fricker 2007; Dotson 2014; Settles et al. 2021). Epistemic injustice refers to injustices that impact individuals (particularly those from marginalized groups) in their capacity as *knowers*. For example, testimonial injustice occurs when individuals from marginalized groups are perceived as less credible sources of information and expertise, and their testimony is discounted or less readily taken into account, compared to those from more privileged social positions (Fricker 2007; McKinnon 2016). Closely related is the phenomenon of epistemic exclusion that impacts “what forms of knowledge (epistemology) are valued and which producers of knowledge are deemed legitimate” (Settles et al. 2021, p. 494). In this way, the phenomenon captures the type of exclusion that can particularly affect members of marginalized and historically oppressed groups in academia, whether because of their identity or because of the type of topics or methodologies they may pursue, which might diverge from established disciplinary norms (Dotson 2014).

Importantly, works on epistemic injustice and exclusion often examine the source of these harms in terms of audiences’ (implicit or explicit) *prejudice* (McKinnon 2016; Settles et al. 2021). This prejudice might arise due to harmful *identity* stereotypes (e.g., when members of a minoritized

group are perceived as less credible, lazy, etc.). Or, it might be due to undue prejudice towards certain topics or modes of inquiry (e.g., when socially-oriented applied research is seen as less serious, and it is the type of research that tends to be carried out by members of marginalized groups). Our work extends the scope of consideration. Specifically, we examine how the characteristics of recommender *algorithms* can *compound* and *create* epistemic injustice and exclusion, *even when there is no bias or prejudice among the epistemic community*, at least insofar as their shared epistemic endeavour is concerned.

2.4 Bias and recommender systems

Recommender systems are integral to curating user experience on social media platforms, shaping who and what people may (or may not) interact with on these platforms. Previous work has highlighted how these algorithms can perpetuate, exacerbate, or even generate biases that harm individuals, groups (especially those with minoritized and marginalized identities), and communities (Baeza-Yates 2018; Ekstrand et al. 2018). This issue has garnered attention in the field of algorithmic fairness, which has proposed numerous approaches to define, measure, and address unfairness in ranking and recommendation systems (Akpınar et al. 2022a; Burke 2017; Zehlike et al. 2022; Geyik, Ambler, and Kenthapadi 2019; Akpınar et al. 2022b; Celis, Straszak, and Vishnoi 2018; Biega, Gummadi, and Weikum 2018; Amigó et al. 2023). We refer to the works of Patro et al. (2022) and Chen et al. (2023) for a synthesis of the current state of the fair recommendation area.

Research on “algorithmic glass ceilings” in recommendation systems has revealed how biases related to gender and social similarities are perpetuated, impacting fair representation. Such systemic barriers, prevalent in various platforms, hinder the visibility and equity of women and minorities (Stoica, Riederer, and Chaintreau 2018; Avin et al. 2015).

A different line of work describes the “filter bubble problem of link prediction” (Masrour et al. 2020; Nguyen et al. 2014). Homophilic tendencies and demographic disparities in connection recommendation exacerbate the isolation of minority groups, limiting their visibility and access to diverse perspectives (Hofstra et al. 2017; Fabbri et al. 2020). Research like the work of Akpınar et al. (2022a) demonstrates that, while short-term fairness interventions in social connection recommenders might initially appear effective, they fail to address long-term bias amplification.

2.5 Agent-based modeling of social networks

Agent-based modeling (ABM) describes generative simulation approaches in which heterogeneous *agents* (e.g., users) interact with each other in a controlled *environment* (e.g., recommendations in a social network graph). Although modeling takes place at the individual level, the underlying goal is typically to extract insights about collective phenomena over a long period of time. As such, ABM lends itself well to study longitudinal dynamics in recommender systems (Adomavicius et al. 2021; Patro et al. 2022). Real-world experimental (e.g., A/B testing) and offline (e.g. static data) recommendation settings are often limited to the study

of short-term effects due to financial and ethical concerns or simply because controlling for confounding factors and spurious effects over time is difficult or impossible (Krauth et al. 2020). In contrast, ABM provides complete control over the experimental environment, usually has no financial or ethical adverse effects, and requires no access to real-world data or systems. With this reasoning, simulation has previously been used in the recommender systems context to study homogenization effects (Chaney, Stewart, and Engelhardt 2018), filter bubbles (Aridor, Goncalves, and Sikdar 2020), performance paradoxes (Adomavicius et al. 2021), reinforcement learning for search ranking (Hu et al. 2018), popularity bias in search engines (Fortunato et al. 2006), effects of fairness intervention (Akpınar et al. 2022a), and more (Patro et al. 2022).

3 Methods

3.1 Graph framework

General overview Content recommendation in online social networks typically relies on measures of user interest, content-related features, and tie strength between users. The main objective is to maximize user engagement by recommending the items users are most likely to interact with. In order to conceptualize this, we consider a fixed-size graph with n nodes corresponding to users and directed edges representing *follow* or *connection* relations. Edges are weighted to reflect the probability of engagement between two users. Over time, users create content items and receive recommendations based on the network structure as well as topic interests. We simulate this procedure assuming two groups of users differing in group size, topic preferences and connectivity. While both the majority and minority group users are interested in a shared work-related topic (e.g. academic or hiring related posts), topic preferences diverge in other areas (e.g. politics, religion, or hobbies). We posit a homophilic network wherein users are more inclined to be connected with others within the same group rather than with those from different groups, a notion supported by social science literature (Kossinets and Watts 2006; Louch 2000; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001).

Nodes and content items We assume users belong to one of two groups G_0, G_1 with population shares p_0 and $p_1 = 1 - p_0$ respectively. Each user has an associated preference vector modeled via group-dependent multivariate Gaussians $z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_G, \Sigma_G)$. Here, the i -th entry in z encodes the user’s interest in content items of topic i . For simplicity, we assume all content can be categorized into a finite number of non-intersecting topic groups. We note that preference vectors reflect both which type of content users’ are likely to create, as well as which content they are likely to consume and interact with.

Edge structure Users of social media systems typically have the capability to influence their recommendations by engaging with the user graph directly, such as by following or unfollowing content creators, or blocking specific types of content. To exclusively examine the impact of the recommendation algorithm, our simulation employs a graph

model with static connections. This means that, throughout the observation period, users within the graph do not establish new relationships. Instead, we experiment with the following graph structures:

1. **Homophilic:** Users are more likely to follow users from the same group than opposite groups, i.e. connections are initialized with a stochastic block model with parameters $(p_{\text{maj}}^{\text{edge}}, p_{\text{min}}^{\text{edge}}, p_{\text{cross}}^{\text{edge}})$. Here, $p_{\text{maj}}^{\text{edge}}$ is the probability with which a user from the majority group follows another majority group user, $p_{\text{min}}^{\text{edge}}$ is the probability for a directed edge within the minority group, and $p_{\text{cross}}^{\text{edge}}$ is the probability for cross-group edges.
2. **Random:** Every pair of users i and j has the same probability p^{edge} to form an edge. Note that an edge from i to j is sampled independently from a potential edge from j to i in order to obtain a directed graph.
3. **Complete:** A fully connected graph, i.e. every user follows and is eligible to be recommended content by every other user. This is equivalent to the random graph structure with $p^{\text{edge}} = 1$.

Edge weights Although the network’s directed connections remain unchanged, the weights assigned to these edges, representing the probability of interaction between users i and j (expressed as p_{ij}), are dynamic and change throughout the period under review. Following the descriptions in (Kamath et al. 2014), we model this tie strength using a logistic function

$$\log \frac{p_{ij}}{1 - p_{ij}} = \beta^T \begin{pmatrix} \text{outEdge}(i, j) \\ \text{inEdge}(i, j) \\ \text{dist}(i, j) \\ \text{intCount}(i, j) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Here, β is a set of fixed parameters, $\text{outEdge}(i, j)$ and $\text{inEdge}(i, j)$ are the number of common incoming and common outgoing edges between the users respectively, and $\text{dist}(i, j)$ is the Euclidean distance between users’ topic preference vectors $\|z_1 - z_2\|_2$. Note that, so far, all features are non-directional, i.e. they take the same value for an edge from i to j as for an edge j to i . This changes when considering $\text{intCount}(i, j)$ which denotes the number of times user i has interacted with content created by user j in the past. Interaction could mean the user read, liked, or shared a piece of content. More concretely, we model $\text{intCount}(i, j)$ with a moving average where the interaction count feature at time t is given by

$$\text{intCount}_t(i, j) = \begin{cases} \alpha \text{intNumb}(t, i, j) \\ \quad + (1 - \alpha) \text{intCount}_{t-1}(i, j) \\ \quad \text{if } \text{intNumb}(t, i, j) > 0, \\ \text{intCount}_{t-1}(i, j) \text{ else,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

and $\text{intCount}_0(i, j) = 0$. Here, $\text{intNumb}(t, i, j)$ is the number of times user i interacted with content created by user j in time step t .

The described edge weight model is directly inspired by the work of (Kamath et al. 2014) which describe a tie strength framework called *RealGraph*. While our model is

simplified, the use of exponentially decaying interaction counts, common follower and following counts, similarly in interests and logistic regression modeling is directly based on this previous work. Twitter’s publicly available code library (Twitter 2023) suggests that some alteration of the RealGraph framework may still be in production today. Yet we hypothesize that, while not revealed to the public, reliance on historical user-level interaction data as well as measures of commonality between users are commonplace among social media recommendation algorithms and keep our discussion on a general platform agnostic level.

3.2 Recommendation policy

We retrieve recommendations for users according to different recommendation policies and compare the results. Assuming user i is querying a recommendation at time t , a candidate set of content items is collected by including all content created at time t by followed accounts. Each of the candidate items is then scored by a scoring function s and a single recommendation is retrieved by sampling from the normalized vector of scores. We consider the following scoring procedures.

1. **Random:** Each content item c is assigned the same score $s = s(c)$.
2. **Topic match:** The score of content item c is given by the user’s preference for the topic of c , i.e. $s(c) = z_{\text{topic}(c)}$ where z is the topic preference vector of user i .
3. **RealGraph:** Two sets of scores are retrieved via the topic match procedure and the edge weights procedure described above. We then average the two scores to receive a recommendation policy inspired by the procedure described in (Kamath et al. 2014).

3.3 Simulation procedure

We explore the effects of authenticity in content recommendation and interaction by simulating recommendations in a network of n users over T time steps. Content items are separated into distinct topics and users are separated into a majority group and a minority group. At each time $t \in [T]$, our simulation goes through the following steps.

1. **Content creation step:** Every user in the network independently creates a new content item with probability p_c . The topics for created content are then sampled according to the creators’ topic preference vectors. In our simulations, we set $p_c = 0.2$. To simplify the procedure, only the content created at time t is retained for recommendation and content items created in previous time steps are discarded.
2. **Recommendation step:** Users independently seek out a content recommendations, e.g. by clicking on a particular tab on the website, with probability p_r . Only one piece of content is recommended at a time. Recommendations are retrieved according to one of the recommendation policies outlined in Section 3.2. We set $p_r = 0.8$.
3. **Interaction step:** After recommendations are served, we sample whether users interact with or disregard the suggested content based on topic match. More concretely, a

user with normalized preference vector z interacts with recommended content c with probability $z_{\text{topic}(c)}$. Note that interaction here is a binary concept and could refer to reading, liking, sharing the content or similar.

4. **Update step:** Given the observed interactions, we first update the smoothed interactions counts from Equation 2 and finally the edge weights from Equation 1. All feature matrices are standardized before computing the updated edge weights.

4 Results

Experiments are conducted for different variations of network structure, group sizes, and recommendation policies. For each simulation, we assume 1,000 users and simulate recommendation over 10,000 time steps. To allow the system adequate time to stabilize before making any assessments, we exclude the initial 2,500 time steps from our analysis. If not specified otherwise, we assume a 20% / 80% split of the user population into minority and majority groups. Results are reported as averages over simulation runs.

4.1 Parameter choices and graph structure

Topics and preferences Each post or content item in our simulation is assigned a topic sampled from user-level topic preference distributions. We assume posts fall into one of three categories: (1) Professional topic posts reflecting work related content of equal relevance to the minority and majority groups. (2) Posts covering a mainstream topic of high interest to the majority group and decreased interest to the minority group. (3) Marginal topic posts which are of high interest to the minority group and lower interest for the majority group. This formulation is intentionally vague to encompass a wide array of settings. For example, we could consider a social media platform used by academic scholars to engage in discourse, share research findings and foster professional connections (professional topic). Now assume a large subpopulation of scholars shares a common interests such as weight lifting (mainstream topic) while a minority group prefers to engage in discussions of baking recipes (marginal topic). In a different example, the users may be fashion influencers whose livelihood depends on the recommendation algorithms and the ostensibly unrelated topic interest are Christmas (mainstream) and Ramadan (marginal).

We assume the topic of any given post is sampled from the content creator’s preference vector of the three topics. Preference vectors follow group-dependent normal distributions $z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_G, \Sigma_G)$ where Σ_G is a diagonal matrix with 0.1 on the diagonal, $\mu_{\text{minority}} = (5, 1, 4)$, and $\mu_{\text{majority}} = (5, 4, 1)$. Content topics are sampled according to probabilities implied by the normalized preference vectors. We intentionally select mean topic preference vectors that demonstrate a pronounced collective interest in the work-related topic, alongside reduced interests in the other two topics, which exhibit a strong correlation with group membership. The distribution of resulting topic preferences is illustrated in Figure 4.

Graph structures Our experiments with homophilic network structure use a stochastic block model for graph initialization. With this method, each pair of minority group users


has a probability of forming a directed edge of 50%, each majority group pair has a directed edge probability of 40%, and each cross-group pair has a probability of 10%. These values are selected to produce a graph structure in which individuals are more likely to follow users of the same group, and the minority group has an increased interest in community forming. On average, minority group users have 54.94% minority group followers while majority group users have 94.32% majority group followers with these parameters as illustrated in Figure 5. For the random graph structure, we assume a fixed directed edge probability of 50%. Because of the imbalanced group shares this implies that the average majority group user has a following that consists of 79.98% majority group users, and users of the minority group have a following that comprises 19.92% minority group users.

Edge weight model Directed edge weights are modeled using a logistic function as detailed in Equation 1. For this, we standardize features and use parameter vector $\beta = (1, 1, -1, 5)^T$ which is informed by several assumptions. First, common followers and following accounts are associated to higher tie strength between two users. Second, the more similar – in terms of topic preferences – two users are, the stronger their tie. Since we measure distance between users (reverse similarity), the corresponding parameter is negative. We assume that the the common incoming and outgoing edges as well as the similarity of topic preferences have effects of similar magnitude. Finally, we assume a large positive effect of smoothed interaction count on users’ tie strength. This is reasonable because the interactions counts are the only features that vary over time and increasing their parameter in the tie strength model speeds up our simulation and allows us to observe meaningful results within 10,000 time steps. For interaction count smoothing in Equation 2, we set $\alpha = 0.01$.


4.2 Professional content less promoted for minority group

We first consider recommendations of work-related or professional content from content creators’ point of view. Visibility of professional posts on online social networks can lead to tangible financial advantages such as attracting potential clients or customers, securing business partnerships, and showcasing expertise for career advancement. Additionally, it can result in social advantages like networking with industry peers, gaining recognition within professional communities, and accessing opportunities for collaboration.

Figure 1 depicts the professional content results of our experiment using the real graph recommendation policy for different graph structures. We see that professional topic posts created by minority group users in homophilic networks are, on average over users, time steps and simulation runs, recommended 72.35% as often as comparable posts created by majority group members. Furthermore, the recommendation policy perpetuates the disadvantage for the minority group over time. This amplification effect is explained by a feedback loop of recommendations served in one time step on the edge weight between users in the next step. The edge weight or tie strength between users is a



(a) Moving average (window size = 1,000) of ratio of the average number of recommendations for professional topic content created by minority and majority group users over time.



(b) Moving average (window size = 1,000) of smoothed interaction count of user pairs served professional topic recommendations over time.

Figure 1: Recommendation results for professional topic content using **real graph recommendation policy with colors indicating different network structures**. Results are averaged over 10 simulation runs. Respective plots for random and topic match recommendation policies can be found in Appendix A.

function of agreement between users' interests, the number of common 'followers' and 'following' users, and the smoothed number of previous interactions. Real graph recommendation policy and variation in topic interests lead to interaction counts that are increasing faster for in-group pairings of users than cross-group pairings (Figure 1b) ultimately resulting in more recommendations of work-related content for the majority group based on their size advantage.

Figure 6 explores variations of the experiment with different minority group shares. We find that, as long as the minority group is small, both the decreased visibility for professional content by the minority group and amplification thereof persist. Similar effects emerge when assuming fully connected and random graph structures rather than the homophilic case considered previously. This gives further evidence to our explanation of the real graph policy as culprit for the amplification effect. In fact, Figures 7 and 8 depict analogous results for random and topic match recommendation policies showing that the amplification effect dissipates under these policies. While professional content has equal visibility for minority and majority group members in random and fully connected graph structures, a homophilic graph structure translates to an approximately constant disadvantage for minority group visibility with random recommendation policy.

Overall, our findings suggest that homophilic graph structure leads to decreased visibility of work-related content for minority groups. This disadvantage is perpetuated and amplified by recommendation algorithms like the real graph policy which are based on historical interaction counts.

4.3 Posts by assimilated minorities gain more majority group recommendations

The most important driver for recommendations are follower counts: the more incoming edges (or followers) a user has, the more often we can expect their posts to be recommended to others (Figure 9). Professional posts by minority group users are no exception to this. Yet stratifying our simulation results by group membership of followers reveals an interesting picture. While, on average over all minority group users, 45.02% of followers belong to the majority group, only 15.07% of work-related post recommendations are made to the majority group. Despite considerable followings from both groups, the professional content of many minority group users remains almost invisible to the majority group.

We investigate the characteristics that influence successful recommendation of minority-created professional content to the majority group. As expected, Figure 2 shows that minority group users with more followers from the majority group get their professional content recommended to the majority group more frequently with ($\rho = 0.72$, p -value < 0.05)². While this effect appears particularly strong, we observe various other interesting correlations. Surprisingly, minority group users who follow a greater number of majority group members seem to gain a slight edge in receiving

²Pearson correlation coefficient ρ and p -value of two-sided correlation t -test on data from 20 simulation runs.

recommendations for their professional content on average ($\rho = 0.04$, p -value < 0.05). It's important to note that in our context, follow-relationships are directional, and following more users from the majority group does not necessarily mean having more followers from that group. Instead, the observed advantage can be traced back to the real-graph recommendation policy which draws on common outgoing and incoming edges. Since the majority of follow-relationships (89.89%) are formed within groups rather than across groups, minority users who follow more majority users tend to have more connections in common with other majority users, resulting in more recommendations to the majority group. The bottom row of Figure 2 illustrates the average recommendations of work-related content created by the minority group for majority group users, highlighting the role of topic preferences. Although there is a positive correlation between work-related content preference and recommendations ($\rho = 0.08$, p -value < 0.05), interest in the other two topics appears to be more evidently connected to professional content recommendations. Specifically, minorities with a stronger preference for the majority-related topic receive more recommendations for their work-related content to the majority group ($\rho = 0.14$, p -value < 0.05). In contrast, a higher interest in the minority-specific topic tends to correlate with fewer recommendations of work content to the majority group ($\rho = -0.23$, p -value < 0.05).

Overall, our simulation results indicate that minorities who are more assimilated into the majority group, in terms of expressed topic interests and social connections, gain enhanced cross-group visibility for their professional content.

4.4 Marginal topic content by majority diminishes visibility of minorities

So far, our attention has been directed towards recommending professional posts. These posts hold significance for two main reasons: Firstly, they can directly contribute to tangible financial and career benefits. Secondly, they are equally appealing to users from both minority and majority groups. Besides economic advantages, social media platforms also provide opportunities for collective identity formation and avenues for gaining visibility, amplifying voices, and preserving cultural heritage (Brock 2009; Jackson, Bailey, and Welles 2020; Khazraee and Novak 2018). With this in mind, we turn our analysis towards recommendation of content with mainstream and marginal topics by both minority and majority group platform users.

Figure 3 illustrates the distribution of minority group shares among recommendations of mainstream and marginal topics, alongside the corresponding minority group shares of created content in the same category. In our simulation design, the minority group contributed only 5.72% of mainstream topic content but accounted for 49.29% of marginal topic content, influenced by both topic preferences and group sizes. Notably, minority group-created content is on average recommended less frequently as compared to majority content. Specifically, only 3.40% of mainstream topic recommendations feature minority group posts, whereas 45.51% of marginal topic recommendations incorporate minority group content. Further stratification by




Figure 2: Average number of times professional content created by the minority group is recommended to majority group members in relationship to the number of incoming and outgoing edges and topic preferences. Each point corresponds to one minority group user in one 20 simulation runs using a **homophilic network structure and real graph recommendation policy**. Lines indicate linear approximations.




Figure 3: Average share of minority group recommendations compared across content topics for minority, majority, and all groups. Data covers 20 simulation runs with 10,000 time steps using **real graph recommendation policy and homophilic network structure**. Red lines depict minority group share in content creation for each group, white dots represent means.

the population groups of recommendation receiving users reveals a strong tendency for in-group recommendations over cross-group recommendations which can be problematic for the aforementioned desire to increase visibility and amplify voices by the minority group. Despite the fact that minority group users create around half of the marginal topic content and are, on average more interested and engaged in the marginal topic than majority group users, only 4.95% of marginal topic content recommendations to the majority group feature minority created content. As a simplified illustrative example, consider a social platform with English language recipe videos used by a White non-Hispanic majority and Mexican minority. Assume a video topic of high cultural relevance and interest to the Mexican sub-population of users, e.g. how to make tamales. In this setting our simulation findings suggest that, given a homophilic network structure and recommendation policy relying on previous interactions and common connections, the White non-Hispanic majority group is considerably more likely to receive recommendations for tamales videos created by fellow White non-Hispanic users, despite the platform hosting a sufficiently large number of tamales videos created by Mexican users. On the flip side, when marginal topic recommendations are made to the minority group, minority created content has an increased share of 87.10% which is higher than the minority group share of created content.

We conclude that, while recommendation algorithms can

facilitate community building among minority group users and increase visibility for *marginal topics*, this does not necessarily translate to an amplification of minority voices and visibility for *minority users*.

5 Discussion

Our findings show how certain components of prevalent real-world social media recommender systems can result in a certain type of inter-group homogenization, whereby individuals are more likely to be recommended work-related content created by in-groups. Importantly, this happens, even though individual interest in work-related content is *independent* of the group membership of the content creator. In this section, we discuss the ethical and social implications of our results in terms of potential harms of minorities, potential harms to collective, and the feedback mechanisms that can exacerbate these harms. Moreover, we discuss the limitations of our study as well as directions for future research.

5.1 Potential harms to minorities: injustice and exclusion

Our results show how, in contexts with homophily-based dynamics of association and engagements, certain components of recommendation algorithms can potentially harm individuals from minority groups in different ways. First, insofar as recommendation algorithms can render the professional content created by minority group less visible, they can be seen as producing unjust *allocative* harms. Importantly, such harms are absent from organizational settings that motivate (and are analogous to) our simulations, in which differential engagement is limited to non-work related topics. As a result, certain components of recommendation algorithms can be seen as adversely impacting the professional opportunities of individuals from minority groups, beyond the homophily-driven challenges that they face in traditional, face-to-face settings.

What is more, the recommendation algorithms of the type analyzed here can expand the type of epistemic injustice and exclusion currently faced by members of marginalized communities. As mentioned in Section 2, most current discussions of these issues point to different types of prejudice as the source of these harms (McKinnon 2016; Settles et al. 2021). As our simulations show, however, recommendation algorithms can turn seemingly benign preferences towards in-group generated non-work topics (e.g., preferring to engage in conversation about TV shows that align with one’s cultural background) to yet another source of epistemic exclusion. In this way, the recommendation create yet another source of invisibilization of minority professionals on platforms, visibility on which can contribute to one’s professional opportunities.

Finally, recommendation algorithms analyzed here can be seen as perpetuating two types of representational harm. On the one hand, these algorithms give more visibility to majority-produced content, even when the majority group is recommended marginal non-work related content. That is, the minority voices are diminished, even on the topic on

which they might possess unique background and expertise. This distortion arguably not only harms the minority content producers, but also the majority who are deprived of those users’ insights. What is more, our findings show how posts by assimilated minorities—that is, those with similar preferences to the majority or more deeply embedded in majority network—can gain more majority group recommendations. In this way, and insofar as such recommendations can shape what a “successful minority” looks like, the algorithm can be seen as causing representational harms.

5.2 Potential harms to the collective: loss of diversity’s benefits

Beyond the particular harms to the minority group, the reduced opportunities of cross-group engagement can also harm the community as a whole. This can happen because such engagements play a critical part in enabling the social and epistemic benefits of diversity. For example, inter-group friendships have been shown to be mechanism for reducing prejudice towards out-groups and inter-group anxiety (Levin, Van Laar, and Sidanius 2003). Conversely, the segregation created by homophily can be a mechanism for generating group-based biases and unfairness (O’Connor 2019).

Similarly, cognitive diversity (of perspectives, methods, ways of thinking, etc.) is often valued on account of its epistemic benefits for the community as a whole (Page 2019; Rolin 2019). Often, diversity of sociocultural identities can cause or correlate with cognitive diversity (Page 2019). As Settles et al. (2021) note, for example, “faculty of color are more likely than others to have diverse approaches to their scholarship and to study populations and topics that do not fit neatly within these disciplinary norms” (p. 495). As a result, by reducing the possibility of cross-group exchange, the recommendation algorithms discussed above can diminish cognitive diversity, and so its benefits for the entire community.

5.3 Algorithmic folk theories and feedback loops

Of course, individuals are not passive subjects to policies and algorithms. Recent research on *algorithmic folk theories* offers insight on how individuals (e.g., social media users) form beliefs about the workings of algorithms, and strategically modify their behavior, including self-presentation, in response to that understanding (DeVito et al. 2018). Importantly, this work shows that users from minority and marginalized identities also form beliefs about how social media algorithms interact with their identities (Mayworm et al. 2024; Karizat et al. 2021). Specifically, Karizat et al. use the term *The Identity Strainer* theory to refer users’ folk theory that “an algorithm filters content based on social identity, resulting in the suppression of marginalized social identities on a platform’s social feed” (Karizat et al. 2021, p. 305). Importantly, as Karizat et al. (2021) note, users with minority and marginalized identities can adopt a number of strategies of algorithmic resistance in response to how they perceive algorithms to suppress their content because of their identity.

Our findings provide support for this folk theory, showing how this belief about algorithmic behavior is indeed aligned with outcomes that can emerge from the components of prevalent real-world social media recommender system actually work. In a context where knowledge about the “real” working of algorithms is inaccessible (whether because of technical literacy or, more often, commercial reasons), we believe this type of evidential support and convergence between simulation results and user folk theories can be helpful in empowering users and in supporting calls for transparency.

Our simulations do not consider how users can modify their behavior in response to such understanding (see below on “Limitations and future directions”). But it is not difficult to see how such folk theories (especially, when grounded in real workings of algorithms) can exacerbate the harms discussed above. For example, such a belief can lead individuals from minority groups to largely restrain from expressing identity-related aspects of themselves. This not only exacerbates the harms to minorities (including the psychological burden of navigating the tension), but also the loss of diversity, and thus the harms to the collective as a whole. Future work can examine the implications and trade-offs involved in different strategies (including acts of resistance) that social media users adopt in response to beliefs about identity-based algorithmic suppression.

5.4 Limitations and future directions

While agent-based modeling and simulation provide important tools for the study of long-term recommendation dynamics, they also require a host of assumptions on agent and model behaviour, technical parameters, and underlying values and worldviews (Patro et al. 2022; Friedler, Scheidegger, and Venkatasubramanian 2021). We tried to explain and justify any such assumptions in the main text. Yet our results are limited by a set of technical simplifying assumptions.

For example, our simulation model is static in terms of both network structure and agent behavior. First, the composition of the overall community and how they are interconnected remains the same (i.e., no one leaves or enters the community). Second, individuals do not modify their behavior in response to (their knowledge of) how the algorithms work. This fails to acknowledge the role of users as strategic agents who may try to maximize their personal exposure (Tennenholtz and Kurland 2019) (e.g., by conforming to the mainstream or jumping on popular trends (Goga, Venkatadri, and Gummadi 2015; Chakraborty et al. 2018)).

We also assume user’s interest distributions are the same for created and consumed content, and each user creates content and queries recommendations with the same constant probabilities. In the future, inserting personalized models for these probabilities could lead to varied results.

Future research should also validate our results across different network configurations. Although the homophilic networks considered in this study are closer approximations of real-world social networks compared to complete and random graphs, other graph models like small-world models (Watts and Strogatz 1998) and preferential attachment models (Jeong, Néda, and Barabási 2003) may more accurately reflect certain aspects of social networks.

5.5 Counteracting epistemic exclusion and homogenization

How might the harms of exclusion and homogeneity discussed above be counteracted? In discussing the phenomenon in the context of traditional organizations, Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard (2018) note that “color blindness is not an effective strategy for dealing with racial differences in the workplace. Rather, our research suggests that acknowledging and highlighting them, along with the related challenges, can go a long way toward kindling relationships” (Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard 2018, p. 6). This also holds true for our context, insofar as the differential intergroup engagement on non-work related topics serves as a proxy for identity.

Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard (2018) suggest a number of strategies that can be effective for combating homophily-based exclusion for in-person workplace settings. While some of these suggestions (e.g., mentorship networks) cannot be tested in our simulation settings, other, individual-based suggestions can. For example, as Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard (2018) suggest, “minorities might consider beginning their self-disclosure by sharing status-disconfirming interests that help them connect with others” (Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard 2018, p. 6). In terms of our simulations, this is similar to the finding that minority individuals who are more similar to the majority gain more visibility. Of course, as noted by Phillips, Dumas, and Rothbard (2018), their suggestion is not meant to be a case for assimilation and lack of authenticity. Rather, it is meant as a recommendation for “sharing information that serves to bridge boundaries”. Nonetheless, it is true that often the effort to bridge such boundaries fall on individuals with minority and marginalized identities. It is possible that algorithms can play a positive role in this context by relieving this burden from minorities.

5.6 The potential of fairness intervention

Literature on bias and fairness in recommender systems offers various intervention proposals aimed at achieving more equitable outcomes. The majority of these methods intervene at the level of individual recommendation lists, e.g. by requiring equal exposure across groups (Singh and Joachims 2018; Zehlike et al. 2017; Zehlike and Castillo 2020). However, enforcing fairness of exposure (Singh and Joachims 2018; Zehlike and Castillo 2020) or equity of attention (Biega, Gummadi, and Weikum 2018) can be misleading, as increased user exposure does not necessarily lead to higher user utility. In this paper’s context, imagine an algorithmic intervention that ensures minority and majority created content has the same chance of being recommended at every step. If majority users are generally less likely to be interested in and engage with some of the minority content, this does not necessarily lead to a tangible advantage for the minority group. Measurement-construct gaps of this sort become particularly visible when, like in this study, the impact of policy changes is monitored over a long period of time (Akpınar et al. 2022a). Recent research underscores the importance of adopting more holistic, long-term perspec-

tives on recommendation fairness (Patro et al. 2022). The researchers assert that context-specific explorations are essential for yielding meaningful insights. Our work takes an initial step in this direction, emphasizing the role of authenticity.

Ethical considerations statement

The technical portion of this work is based on agent-based simulation which alleviates the potential for ethical problems related to data collection and system interference. While we acknowledge that one of the authors is affiliated with a private corporation, we believe that this does not present a conflict of interest because (1) the corporation in question does not operate in or directly compete with social media companies, (2) the beginnings of this research project precede the affiliation in question, (3) no internal knowledge or information has been used to complete this research project and paper.

Researcher positionality statement

Both of the authors are from different parts of the world but currently reside and work in the United States. This study was inspired by the authors' own experience of tensions between authenticity and exclusion in the professional social media and wider professional context. Yet the authors also recognize their relative societal advantage as affiliates of large US-based institutions. Therefore, significant attention was devoted to the question: Does this work benefit the community at large? We believe that this question can be answered in the affirmative. Raising awareness for the role social media algorithms play in the amplification of biases is an important avenue towards developing equitable technology.

Adverse impact statement

We draw attention to the role of social media algorithms in replicating and amplifying tensions between authenticity and exclusion. Similar tension has been described in the organizational science literature previously. Our work does not focus on potential algorithmic interventions and thus we hypothesize the risk for adverse impacts of this work to be negligible. We tried our best to select culturally respectful and sensitive examples throughout this work and discuss philosophical implications and technical limitations in the main text of the paper.

References

Adomavicius, G.; Jannach, D.; Leitner, S.; and Zhang, J. 2021. Understanding Longitudinal Dynamics of Recommender Systems with Agent-Based Modeling and Simulation. arXiv:2108.11068.

Akpinar, N.-J.; DiCiccio, C.; Nandy, P.; and Basu, K. 2022a. Long-term Dynamics of Fairness Intervention in Connection Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2022 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society, AIES '22*, 22–35. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450392471.

Akpinar, N.-J.; Liu, L.; Dylan, H.-M.; and Lipton, Z. 2022b. Counterfactual Metrics for Auditing Black-Box Recommender Systems for Ethical Concerns. In *ICML 2022 Workshop on Responsible Decision Making in Dynamic Environments*.

Alsobayel, H.; et al. 2016. Use of social media for professional development by health care professionals: a cross-sectional web-based survey. *JMIR medical education*, 2(2): e6232.

Amigó, E.; Deldjoo, Y.; Mizzaro, S.; and Bellogín, A. 2023. A unifying and general account of fairness measurement in recommender systems. *Information Processing and Management*, 60(1): 103115.

Aridor, G.; Goncalves, D.; and Sikdar, S. 2020. Deconstructing the Filter Bubble: User Decision-Making and Recommender Systems. In *Fourteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys '20*. ACM.

Atzmueller, M.; and Lemmerich, F. 2018. Homophily at academic conferences. In *Companion Proceedings of the The Web Conference 2018*, 109–110.

Avin, C.; Keller, B.; Lotker, Z.; Mathieu, C.; Peleg, D.; and Pignolet, Y.-A. 2015. Homophily and the Glass Ceiling Effect in Social Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS'15*. ACM.

Baeza-Yates, R. 2018. Bias on the web. *Communications of the ACM*, 61(6): 54–61.

Baron, R. S.; Hoppe, S. I.; Kao, C. F.; Brunzman, B.; Linneweh, B.; and Rogers, D. 1996. Social corroboration and opinion extremity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 32(6): 537–560.

Biega, A. J.; Gummadi, K. P.; and Weikum, G. 2018. Equity of Attention: Amortizing Individual Fairness in Rankings. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '18*. ACM.

Boyd, D. 2010. Social network sites as networked publics: Affordances, dynamics, and implications. In *A networked self*, 47–66. Routledge.

Britton, B.; Jackson, C.; and Wade, J. 2019. The reward and risk of social media for academics. *Nature Reviews Chemistry*, 3(8): 459–461.

Brock, A. 2009. "Who do you think you are?": Race, Representation, and Cultural Rhetorics in Online Spaces. *Poroi*, 6(1).

Burke, R. 2017. Multisided Fairness for Recommendation. arXiv:1707.00093.

Celis, L. E.; Straszak, D.; and Vishnoi, N. K. 2018. Ranking with Fairness Constraints. In Chatzigiannakis, I.; Kaklamani, C.; Marx, D.; and Sannella, D., eds., *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2018)*, volume 107 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, 28:1–28:15. Dagstuhl, Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. ISBN 978-3-95977-076-7.

- Chakraborty, A.; Patro, G. K.; Ganguly, N.; Gummadi, K. P.; and Loiseau, P. 2018. Equality of Voice: Towards Fair Representation in Crowdsourced Top-K Recommendations. arXiv:1811.08690.
- Chaney, A. J. B.; Stewart, B. M.; and Engelhardt, B. E. 2018. How algorithmic confounding in recommendation systems increases homogeneity and decreases utility. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, RecSys '18, 224–232. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450359016.
- Chen, J.; Dong, H.; Wang, X.; Feng, F.; Wang, M.; and He, X. 2023. Bias and Debias in Recommender System: A Survey and Future Directions. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 41(3).
- Davis, J. L.; and Jurgenson, N. 2014. Context collapse: Theorizing context collusions and collisions. *Information, communication & society*, 17(4): 476–485.
- DeVito, M. A.; Birnholtz, J.; Hancock, J. T.; French, M.; and Liu, S. 2018. How people form folk theories of social media feeds and what it means for how we study self-presentation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, 1–12.
- Dhoest, A.; and Szulc, L. 2016. Navigating online selves: Social, cultural, and material contexts of social media use by diasporic gay men. *Social Media+ Society*, 2(4): 2056305116672485.
- Donelan, H. 2016. Social media for professional development and networking opportunities in academia. *Journal of further and higher education*, 40(5): 706–729.
- Dotson, K. 2014. Conceptualizing epistemic oppression. *Social Epistemology*, 28(2): 115–138.
- Ekstrand, M. D.; Tian, M.; Azpiazu, I. M.; Ekstrand, J. D.; Anuyah, O.; McNeill, D.; and Pera, M. S. 2018. All The Cool Kids, How Do They Fit In?: Popularity and Demographic Biases in Recommender Evaluation and Effectiveness. In Friedler, S. A.; and Wilson, C., eds., *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, volume 81 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 172–186. PMLR.
- Ellison, N. B.; Gibbs, J. L.; and Weber, M. S. 2015. The use of enterprise social network sites for knowledge sharing in distributed organizations: The role of organizational affordances. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(1): 103–123.
- Ertug, G.; Brennecke, J.; Kovács, B.; and Zou, T. 2022. What does homophily do? A review of the consequences of homophily. *Academy of Management Annals*, 16(1): 38–69.
- Fabbri, F.; Bonchi, F.; Boratto, L.; and Castillo, C. 2020. The Effect of Homophily on Disparate Visibility of Minorities in People Recommender Systems. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 14: 165–175.
- Fazelpour, S.; and Rubin, H. 2022. Diversity and homophily in social networks. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, volume 44.
- Fortunato, S.; Flammini, A.; Menczer, F.; and Vespignani, A. 2006. Topical interests and the mitigation of search engine bias. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(34): 12684–12689.
- Fricker, M. 2007. *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. OUP Oxford.
- Friedler, S. A.; Scheidegger, C.; and Venkatasubramanian, S. 2021. The (Im)possibility of fairness: different value systems require different mechanisms for fair decision making. *Commun. ACM*, 64(4): 136–143.
- Gallotti, R.; and De Domenico, M. 2019. Effects of homophily and academic reputation in the nomination and selection of Nobel laureates. *Scientific reports*, 9(1): 17304.
- Geyik, S. C.; Ambler, S.; and Kenthapadi, K. 2019. Fairness-Aware Ranking in Search & Recommendation Systems with Application to LinkedIn Talent Search. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, KDD '19, 2221–2231. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450362016.
- Goga, O.; Venkatadri, G.; and Gummadi, K. P. 2015. The Doppelgänger Bot Attack: Exploring Identity Impersonation in Online Social Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Internet Measurement Conference*, IMC '15. ACM.
- Golub, B.; and Jackson, M. O. 2012. How homophily affects the speed of learning and best-response dynamics. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(3): 1287–1338.
- Hofstra, B.; Corten, R.; van Tubergen, F.; and Ellison, N. B. 2017. Sources of Segregation in Social Networks: A Novel Approach Using Facebook. *American Sociological Review*, 82(3): 625–656.
- Hollenbaugh, E. E. H. E. E. 2021. Self-presentation in social media: Review and research opportunities. *Review of communication research*, 9.
- Hu, Y.; Da, Q.; Zeng, A.; Yu, Y.; and Xu, Y. 2018. Reinforcement Learning to Rank in E-Commerce Search Engine: Formalization, Analysis, and Application. arXiv:1803.00710.
- Hurrle, D.; and Postatny, J. 2015. Introduction. In *Social Media for Scientific Institutions*, 1–4. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.
- Jackson, S. J.; Bailey, M.; and Welles, B. F. 2020. *#HashtagActivism: Networks of race and gender justice*. The MIT Press.
- Jeong, H.; Néda, Z.; and Barabási, A. L. 2003. Measuring preferential attachment in evolving networks. *Europhysics Letters (EPL)*, 61(4): 567–572.
- Kamath, K.; Sharma, A.; Wang, D.; and Yin, Z. 2014. Real-Graph: User Interaction Prediction at Twitter. In *KDD 2014 Workshop on User Engagement Optimization*.
- Karizat, N.; Delmonaco, D.; Eslami, M.; and Andalibi, N. 2021. Algorithmic folk theories and identity: How TikTok users co-produce Knowledge of identity and engage in algorithmic resistance. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction*, 5(CSCW2): 1–44.
- Khazraee, E.; and Novak, A. N. 2018. Digitally mediated protest: Social media affordances for collective identity construction. *Social Media+ Society*, 4(1): 2056305118765740.
- Klar, S.; Krupnikov, Y.; Ryan, J. B.; Searles, K.; and Shmargad, Y. 2020. Using social media to promote academic research: Identifying the benefits of twitter for sharing academic work. *PloS one*, 15(4): e0229446.

- Knight, C. G.; and Kaye, L. K. 2016. 'To tweet or not to tweet?' A comparison of academics' and students' usage of Twitter in academic contexts. *Innovations in education and teaching international*, 53(2): 145–155.
- Kossinets, G.; and Watts, D. J. 2006. Empirical Analysis of an Evolving Social Network. *Science*, 311(5757): 88–90.
- Krauth, K.; Dean, S.; Zhao, A.; Guo, W.; Curmei, M.; Recht, B.; and Jordan, M. I. 2020. Do Offline Metrics Predict Online Performance in Recommender Systems? arXiv:2011.07931.
- Lawrence, B. S.; and Shah, N. P. 2020. Homophily: Measures and meaning. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(2): 513–597.
- Levin, S.; Van Laar, C.; and Sidanius, J. 2003. The effects of ingroup and outgroup friendships on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(1): 76–92.
- Louch, H. 2000. Personal network integration: transitivity and homophily in strong-tie relations. *Social Networks*, 22(1): 45–64.
- Luo, T.; Freeman, C.; and Stefaniak, J. 2020. "Like, comment, and share"—professional development through social media in higher education: A systematic review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(4): 1659–1683.
- Masrour, F.; Wilson, T.; Yan, H.; Tan, P.-N.; and Esfahanian, A. 2020. Bursting the Filter Bubble: Fairness-Aware Network Link Prediction. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(01): 841–848.
- Mayworm, S.; DeVito, M. A.; Delmonaco, D.; Thach, H.; and Haimson, O. L. 2024. Content moderation folk theories and perceptions of platform spirit among marginalized social media users. *ACM Transactions on Social Computing*, 7(1): 1–27.
- McKinnon, R. 2016. Epistemic injustice. *Philosophy Compass*, 11(8): 437–446.
- McPherson, M.; Smith-Lovin, L.; and Cook, J. M. 2001. Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27(1): 415–444.
- Neal, D. R. 2012. *Social media for academics: a practical guide*. Elsevier.
- Nguyen, T. T.; Hui, P.-M.; Harper, F. M.; Terveen, L.; and Konstan, J. A. 2014. Exploring the filter bubble: the effect of using recommender systems on content diversity. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on World Wide Web*, WWW '14, 677–686. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450327442.
- O'Connor, C. 2019. *The origins of unfairness: Social categories and cultural evolution*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Page, S. E. 2019. *The diversity bonus: How great teams pay off in the knowledge economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Patro, G. K.; Porcaro, L.; Mitchell, L.; Zhang, Q.; Zehlike, M.; and Garg, N. 2022. Fair ranking: a critical review, challenges, and future directions. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '22, 1929–1942. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450393522.
- Phillips, K. W.; Dumas, T. L.; and Rothbard, N. P. 2018. Diversity and authenticity. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(2): 132–136.
- Phillips, K. W.; Rothbard, N. P.; and Dumas, T. L. 2009. To Disclose or Not to Disclose? Status Distance and Self-Disclosure in Diverse Environments. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(4): 710–732.
- Rolin, K. 2019. The epistemic significance of diversity. *The Routledge handbook of social epistemology*, 158–166.
- Settles, I. H.; Jones, M. K.; Buchanan, N. T.; and Dotson, K. 2021. Epistemic exclusion: Scholar (ly) devaluation that marginalizes faculty of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 14(4): 493.
- Singh, A.; and Joachims, T. 2018. Fairness of Exposure in Rankings. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '18. ACM.
- Stoica, A.-A.; Riederer, C.; and Chaintreau, A. 2018. Algorithmic Glass Ceiling in Social Networks: The effects of social recommendations on network diversity. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference*, WWW '18, 923–932. Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE: International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee. ISBN 9781450356398.
- Sugimoto, C. R.; Work, S.; Larivière, V.; and Haustein, S. 2017. Scholarly use of social media and altmetrics: A review of the literature. *Journal of the association for information science and technology*, 68(9): 2037–2062.
- Tennenholtz, M.; and Kurland, O. 2019. Rethinking search engines and recommendation systems: a game theoretic perspective. *Communications of the ACM*, 62(12): 66–75.
- Twitter. 2023. Twitter Recommendation Algorithm: Real Graph (accessed 5/13/2024). https://github.com/twitter/the-algorithm/blob/main/src/scalar/com/twitter/interaction_graph/README.md.
- Veletsianos, G. 2016. *Social media in academia: Networked scholars*. Routledge.
- Vitak, J. 2012. The impact of context collapse and privacy on social network site disclosures. *Journal of broadcasting & electronic media*, 56(4): 451–470.
- Watts, D. J.; and Strogatz, S. H. 1998. Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature*, 393(6684): 440–442.
- Zehlike, M.; Bonchi, F.; Castillo, C.; Hajian, S.; Megahed, M.; and Baeza-Yates, R. 2017. FA*IR: A Fair Top-k Ranking Algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, CIKM '17. ACM.
- Zehlike, M.; and Castillo, C. 2020. Reducing Disparate Exposure in Ranking: A Learning To Rank Approach. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*, WWW '20. ACM.
- Zehlike, M.; Sühr, T.; Baeza-Yates, R.; Bonchi, F.; Castillo, C.; and Hajian, S. 2022. Fair Top-k Ranking with multiple

protected groups. *Information Processing and Management*, 59(1): 102707.

Zhang, J.; Adomavicius, G.; Gupta, A.; and Ketter, W. 2020. Consumption and Performance: Understanding Longitudinal Dynamics of Recommender Systems via an Agent-Based Simulation Framework. *Info. Sys. Research*, 31(1): 76–101.

Zhou, S.; Chai, S.; and Freeman, R. B. 2024. Gender homophily: In-group citation preferences and the gender disadvantage. *Research Policy*, 53(1): 104895.

Zhu, Q.; and Skoric, M. M. 2021. From context collapse to “safe spaces”: Selective avoidance through tie dissolution on social media. *Mass Communication and Society*, 24(6): 892–917.

A Supplementary figures




Figure 4: Histogram of scaled topic preferences over 10 simulation runs. While both groups are equally interested in the work-related topic, the majority group prefers the mainstream topic and the minority group prefers the marginal topic.




Figure 5: Histogram of the number of outgoing edges (i.e. 'follow' relationships) to majority and minority group users over 10 simulation runs. On average, both groups have more in-group connections than connections across groups.




Figure 6: Moving average (window size = 1,000) of ratio of average professional content recommendations for content created by minority and majority groups. Data obtained from 10 simulation runs for each minority group share value, using **real graph recommendation policy and homophilic network structure**.




Figure 8: Moving average (window size = 1,000) of ratio of the average number of recommendations for professional topic content created by minority and majority group users over time, using **topic match recommendation policy**. Results are averaged over 10 simulation runs.




Figure 7: Moving average (window size = 1,000) of ratio of the average number of recommendations for professional topic content created by minority and majority group users over time, using **random recommendation policy**. Results are averaged over 10 simulation runs.




Figure 9: Average number of recommendations and incoming edges by content topic and creator group with linear approximations. Each point corresponds to one user in one of 20 simulation runs with **homophilic network and real graph recommendation policy**.