# Modeling how social network algorithms can influence opinion polarization.

Information Sciences 588 (2022)





Colóquio Interinstitucional

Modelos Estocásticos e Aplicações

UFF, 25 de Outubro de 2023



#### Motivation: Democracy on the Digital Era

#### **Delegation process**

#### RESEARCH ARTICLE

Analyzing a networked social algorithm for collective selection of representative committees

#### Alexis R. Hernández<sup>1\*</sup>, Carlos Gracia-Lázaro<sup>2</sup>, Edgardo Brigatti<sup>1</sup>, Yamir Moreno<sup>2,3,4</sup>

1 Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2 Institute for Biocomputation and Physics of Complex Systems (BIFI), Universidad de Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain, 3 Department of Theoretical Physics, Faculty of Sciences, Universidad de Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain, 4 ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy

#### A networked voting rule for democratic representation

Alexis R. Hernández<sup>1,2</sup>, Carlos Gracia-Lázaro<sup>2</sup>,

Edgardo Brigatti<sup>1</sup> and Yamir Moreno<sup>2,3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil <sup>2</sup>Institute for Biocomputation and Physics of Complex Systems (BIFI), and <sup>3</sup>Department of Theoretical Physics, Faculty of Sciences, Universidad de Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain <sup>4</sup>ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy

#### Sense making process

#### Polarization inhibits the phase transition of Axelrod's model

Carlos Gracia-Lázaro <sup>0</sup>, <sup>1</sup> Edgardo Brigatti <sup>0</sup>, <sup>2,\*</sup> Alexis R. Hernández <sup>0</sup>, <sup>2</sup> and Yamir Moreno <sup>0,1,3,4</sup> <sup>1</sup>Instituto de Biocomputación y Física de Sistemas Complejos (BIFI), Universidad de Zaragoza, 50018 Zaragoza, Spain <sup>2</sup>Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 22452-970 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil <sup>3</sup>Departamento de Física Teórica. Universidad de Zaragoza, Zaragoza, E-50009, Spain <sup>4</sup>ISI Foundation, via Chisola 5, 10126 Torino, Italy

#### Robustness of cultural communities in an open-ended Axelrod's model

Alexis R. Hernández<sup>a,b</sup>, Carlos Gracia-Lázaro<sup>b,\*</sup>, Edgardo Brigatti<sup>a</sup>, Yamir Moreno<sup>b,c,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 22452-970 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil <sup>0</sup> Instituto de Biocomputación y Física de Sistemas Complejos (BIFI), Universidad de Zaragoza, 50018 Zaragoza, Spain <sup>6</sup> Departamento de Física Teórica. University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza E-50009, Spain <sup>6</sup> ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy

#### Modelling how social network algorithms can influence opinion polarization

Henrique Ferraz de Arruda <sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Felipe Maciel Cardoso <sup>a</sup>, Guilherme Ferraz de Arruda <sup>c</sup>, Alexis R. Hernández <sup>d</sup>, Luciano da Fontoura Costa <sup>b</sup>, Yamir Moreno <sup>a,c,e</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Biocomputation and Physics of Complex Systems (BHT), University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain <sup>5</sup>São Carlos Institute of Physics, University of São Paulo, São Carlos, SP, Brazil <sup>1</sup>Si Foundation, Turín, Italy <sup>2</sup>Institute of Physics, Rio de Janeiro Federal University, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil <sup>2</sup>Department of Theoretical Physics, Cauly of Sciences, University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain

### **Delegation process**



### Sense making process

- Polarization: an obstacle for the emergence of collective intelligence.
- Social networks takes advantage of outrage to capture users' attention.





Center for Humane Technology

# Modelling how social network algorithms can influence opinion polarization



Modelling how social network algorithms can influence opinion polarization



Henrique Ferraz de Arruda <sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Felipe Maciel Cardoso <sup>a</sup>, Guilherme Ferraz de Arruda <sup>c</sup>, Alexis R. Hernández <sup>d</sup>, Luciano da Fontoura Costa <sup>b</sup>, Yamir Moreno <sup>a,c,e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Institute for Biocomputation and Physics of Complex Systems (BIFI), University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain <sup>b</sup> São Carlos Institute of Physics, University of São Paulo, São Carlos, SP, Brazil

<sup>c</sup> ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy

<sup>d</sup> Institute of Physics, Rio de Janeiro Federal University, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

<sup>e</sup> Department of Theoretical Physics, Faculty of Sciences, University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain

## Model

Agents are distributed in a Network of friendship relations and their opinions are represented by a real number " $b_i$ " in [-1,1]. The dynamics is comprehended by four processes:

- Transmission (related to individual's behavior)
- Distribution (related to the social network's algorithm)
- Attraction (or repulsion)
- Rewiring (change in friendship relationship)



#### Transmission

Describe Agent's behavior:

A post will be shared depending on the relative distance between the agent's opinion  $b_i$  and the post position  $\theta$ .

We consider tree different kind of users.





#### Distribution

Describe the Algorithm behavior:

The social network's algorithm decide to which friends to distribute the post, based on the relative distance between the agent's opinions ( $|b_i-b_i|$ ).

We consider two different algorithms.





### Attraction

Describe the effect of the received post on the agent's opinion:

The agent's opinion approach to the post value  $\theta$  by a small amount  $\Delta$  with a probability:

$$\xi(\theta, b_j) = 1 - |\theta - b_j|/2$$

otherwise, the agent's opinion departures from  $\theta$  by the same amount  $\Delta$ .



## Rewiring

Describe the situation when the receiving agent decide to unfriend the transmitting agent.

When a receiving agent experience a repulsive interaction, it considers to unfriend the transmitting agent. In this case a new friendship relation is created as a substitution.

The rewiring probability depends on the relative distance between the agent's opinions  $(|b_i-b_i|)$ .





## Transmission vs Distribution

Transmission prob.	Distribution prob.	Opinions' distribution
	1.00 -	Bi-modal
	0.75 - 0.50 - 0.25 -	Uni-modal
		Uniform
	$0 \leqslant \phi < \pi/2$	Uni-modal
		Bi-modal
	$\pi/4 \leq \phi < 3\pi/4$	Uni-modal
		Bi-modal

# Analysis of opinions' distribution and social structure

Density map of the individuals' opinion "b" against the average opinion of its neighbors,  $b_{NN}$ 

\* Social structure 0.50.50.5 N 0.0 · N 0.0 NNq0.0 -0.5-0.5-0.5-1.0 --1.0-1.0 $^{-1}$ 0 -1(c) Diverse (b) Echo chamber, (a) Consensus

Opinions' distribution

To quantify opinion's polarization, we use the bimodality coefficient:



where n is the number of samples, and g and k are the skewness and kurtosis of the analyzed distribution, respectively.

Initial configuration

\* Bipartite mutualistic network not shown



Empirically BC<sub>critic</sub> = 5/9 Higher values -> bi-modal Lower values -> uni-modal



we considered that the dynamic reached the steady state when there were no significant variations of BC along time.

### Echo-chambers bistability

#### Stochastic Block Model (without rewiring)



**Fig. 8.** Example of two samples (i and ii) of the resulting dynamic executed on a SBM, with  $P_t^{\text{uni}}$ ,  $P_d^{ll}$ , and  $\phi = 1.47$ . Items (a) and (c) display the SBM networks. The colors vary from blue to red, which represent left and right wings, respectively. In (b) and (d), we display the density maps of opinions (b) against the average opinion of the neighbors ( $b_{NN}$ ), where lighter colors represent large numbers.

# ER network with rewiring



## Comparison with real data: Twitter (US)



**Fig. 9.** Real data visualizations. The three first panels display the Twitter network visualizations, in which the colors vary from blue to red. More specifically, blue and red represent left and right wings, respectively. The second line shows the respective density maps of opinions (*b*) against the average opinion of the neighbors ( $b_{NN}$ ), in which lighter colors represent large numbers.

Table 1   Measures of bimodality coefficient, BC, and balance, $\beta$ , obtained from real Twitter networks.			
Subject	BC	β	
Obamacare	0.60	0.80	
Gun control	0.67	0.70	
Abortion	0.60	0.91	

#### Conclusions

 The model reproduce a wide range of social phenomena, such as, polarization, echo-chambers, diverse and focalized consensus...

 The distribution's probability (the algorithm) appears to have stronger effects on the final opinions' distribution.

 Real data from Twitter (US) shows a polarized distribution of opinions with echo-chambers formation, this configuration is very similar to one of the scenarios observed in our model.

# Thanks