

Polarization and Quid Pro Quo: The Role of Party Cohesiveness

Ratul Das Chaudhury^{1*}, C. Matthew Leister¹, Birendra Rai¹

ABSTRACT

When can an interest group exploit ideological and affective polarization between political parties to its advantage? We study a model where an interest group credibly promises payments to legislators conditional on voting for its favored policy. Legislators value voting as their friends within their party, and suffer an ideological-disutility upon voting against their party's ideologically preferred policy. Affective polarization, owing to its inter-personal nature, is modeled by assuming a legislator values distinguishing her voting decision from legislators in the opposite party. Our main finding is that an aggregate measure of relative cohesiveness of social networks in the two parties determines whether the interest group can profitably exploit increasing polarization. However, the significance of relative cohesiveness vanishes if there is no ideological polarization between the two parties.

JEL Classification: C70, D72, D85

Keywords: Ideological polarization, affective polarization, quid pro quo, social networks

¹ Department of Economics, Monash University, Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia

* Corresponding Author: ratul.daschaudhury@monash.edu

Acknowledgments. This paper is based on the the first author's Ph.D. thesis titled *Essays on Lobbying and Crime*. We thank conference participants at the American Economic Association Meeting (2021), Econometric Society European Meeting (2021), and European Economic Association Meeting (2021). We are particularly grateful to Marco Faravelli, Jun Xiao, and Yves Zenou for detailed comments. The usual disclaimer applies.

1. Introduction

The influence of special interest money on elected officials tops the list when people – regardless of their political leaning – are asked to specify the biggest problem with elected officials in Washington (Pew Research Center, 2015). At the same time, political polarization in the United States has increased dramatically over the last few decades. Ideological polarization in the general public is reflected in more than 70% of Americans believing that voters in both parties “not only disagree over plans and policies, but also cannot agree on the basic facts” (Pew research Survey, 2019). Affective polarization – ill will, animus, or antipathy towards those that lean towards the other party – is reflected in nearly 55% of Republicans saying that Democrats are “more immoral” when compared with other Americans; 47% of Democrats say the same about Republicans (Pew Research Center, 2019). Despite deep ideological and affective polarization across party lines, voters across the political spectrum remain concerned about the role of money in politics.

Whether material or informational exchange between special interest groups and legislators has an impact on legislative outcomes remains a matter of intense scholarly scrutiny (Battaglini and Pattachini, 2018; Bombardini and Trebbi, 2020). Recent studies have documented increasing ideological, as well as, increasing affective polarization political elites (Enders, 2021). However, the impact of rising polarization between political parties on the ability of an interest group to influence legislation in its favor has not been explored. The present paper aims to fill this gap.

We draw upon the framework offered in Battaglini and Pattachini (2018) and suitably modify it to account for ideological and affective polarization in order to investigate when can an interest group exploit polarization between political parties to its advantage. Our baseline model involves two ideologically polarized parties that hold opposite positions on an issue (e.g., relaxed versus tighter controls on carbon emissions). The interest group strictly favors one policy over the other, and credibly promises resources to legislators if they vote for its favored policy. We refer to the party ideologically inclined towards the interest group’s favored policy as the party in “favor” of the interest group; and, the other

as the party “against” the interest group. We assume each legislator derives resource-utility from the investment she receives from the interest group. Legislators suffer an ideological-disutility if they vote against their party’s ideologically preferred policy. The magnitude of this disutility serves as a measure of ideological polarization between the parties.

A key feature of our baseline model is that legislators within a party are connected via a network of friendships. We assume each legislator in a party derives network utility if her friends within her party vote as she does, regardless of the policy they vote for. In particular, voting against the ideologically preferred policy of one’s party may be costly due to a variety of factors, but such costs may be attenuated if one’s friends also vote similarly. The final ingredient of the baseline model is that each legislator obtains a private preference shock prior to voting which provides all additional relevant information. We assume the interest group maximizes the sum of the probabilities of legislators voting for the policy it favors.

While the two major political parties in the United States currently seem to be as *ideologically* polarized as ever, political scientists view increasing *affective* polarization as one of the most striking developments in U.S. politics (Mason, 2015; Rogowski and Sutherland, 2016; Iyengar and Krupenkin, 2018; Iyengar et al., 2019; Enders, 2021). Affective polarization differs from ideological polarization due to its inter-personal nature as ideological polarization simply refers to opposite policy preferences.

The bulk of existing literature in economics and political science has focused on documenting affective polarization in the general public. Using survey data from delegates to presidential nominating conventions, Enders (2021) finds that even the political elites “exhibit extreme emotional reactions toward political groups just like their mass counterparts”. Further, recent studies suggest that affective polarization can be conceptualized *as if* legislators value distinguishing their voting decisions from legislators in the ideologically opposite party (Druckman et al., 2021). Drawing upon these studies, we formalize affective polarization by assuming a legislator suffers an affective-disutility when legislators in the opposite party vote as she does. The magnitude of this affective-disutility

serves as the measure of affective polarization between the parties.

The analysis of both models involves two technical assumptions. The first ensures the probabilities of legislators voting in favor of the interest group are strictly in the interior of the unit interval such that the interest group is sufficiently uncertain about the voting decisions of legislators. The second ensures that investments towards legislators never serve as a “bad” from the perspective of the interest group (i.e., the interest group has an incentive to invest towards legislators).

We show that the relative structure of party networks determines whether growing polarization between parties aids the interest group. Specifically, the marginal impact of increasing polarization (ideological or affective) between the parties on the interest group depends on the relative *Bonacich-cohesiveness* of the two parties, where Bonacich-cohesiveness of a party refers to the sum of Bonacich centralities of all its legislators¹. For instance, an increase in ideological polarization between parties benefits the interest group if and only if the party in favor of the interest group is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive. Similarly, an increase in affective polarization increases the marginal returns from increasing ideological polarization if and only if the party in favor of the interest group is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive. However, the significance of relative cohesiveness of party networks vanishes if there is no *ideological* polarization.

Related literature. Our work contributes to the literature on influence activities by interest groups (Snyder, 1991; Austen-Smith and Wright, 1992; Grossman and Helpman, 1994; Ansolabehere et al., 2003; Stratmann, 2002; Baumgartner et al., 2009; Dekel et al., 2009; Lessig, 2011; Vidal et al., 2012; Bertrand et al., 2014; Schnackenberg, 2017; McKay, 2018). It also contributes to the literature on how networks among legislators impact legislative decisions (Rice, 1927; Routh, 1938; Truman, 1951; Arnold et al., 2000; Fowler, 2006; Cohen and Malloy, 2014; Harmon et al., 2019). In particular, our work complements recent studies that seek to bridge these two historically distinct literatures.

Our paper is most closely related to Battaglini and Pattachini (2018), henceforth BP2018, that examines competition between multiple interest groups in influencing vot-

¹Bonacich centrality of an agent is related to the centralities of those with whom she is connected (Bonacich, 1987; Ballester et al., 2006).

ing decisions of socially connected legislators while allowing cross-party linkages. The politically salient notions of “party”, “ideology”, and “polarization” are not central to the theoretical analysis in BP2018². It shows that equilibrium investments by the interest groups are proportional to the Bonacich centralities of legislators in the overall network that allows for cross-party linkages.

In our baseline model, we assume there are no cross-party linkages. Our extended model that accounts for affective polarization in addition to ideological polarization permits (negative) cross-party linkages. These modeling choices provide a plausible and tractable way to make the notions of party, ideology, and polarization salient. In both of our models, relative cohesiveness of party networks determines whether the interest group can profitably exploit polarization. This highlights that the significance of relative cohesiveness is robust as it exists with or without cross-party links³.

BP2018 supplements equilibrium existence and uniqueness results with empirical analysis. Our focus is on the comparative statics. In particular, we show that a simple aggregate level feature of the network – relative cohesiveness of party networks – determines whether the interest group can exploit increasing polarization to its advantage. BP2018 shows that two competing interest groups with symmetric budgets nullify each other’s impact in so far as legislators’ voting decisions are concerned. This is not the case with asymmetric budgets. To the extent that some asymmetry between interest groups is a plausible assumption, our choice to focus on one interest group can be viewed as an extreme form of asymmetry that helps obtain the sharpest analytical results.

Finally, our work contributes to the growing literature on affective polarization within economics. This nascent literature has focused on documenting trends in affective polarization in the general public and understanding the reasons behind it (Boxell et al., 2021). To the best of our knowledge, our paper is the first to formally model the notion of affective polarization and theoretically analyze its impact in a politically and economically relevant context.

²BP2018, however, controls for party affiliation of legislators in the empirical analysis.

³Allowing “positive” cross-party linkages in the baseline model will impact the precise form but will not overturn the conceptual significance of relative cohesiveness.

2. Baseline model

Suppose $n \geq 2$ legislators have to vote for one of two policies: policy- f or policy- a . Each legislator belongs to a party $P \in \{F, A\}$. Let $n_F \geq 1$ and $n_A \geq 1$ denote the number of legislators in party F and party A , respectively. There exists an interest group that strictly favors policy- f over policy- a , and credibly promises investments towards legislators if they vote for its favored policy, i.e., policy- f . Party F is ideologically inclined towards policy- f and thus favors the interest group, whereas party A is ideologically inclined towards policy- a and thus against the interest group.

Legislators within a party are assumed to be connected via an exogenously given social network. The strength of the mutual friendship between legislators i and j in a party is denoted by $g_{ij} \in [0, 1]$, with $g_{ii} = 0$. We assume that no two legislators belonging to different parties are friends such that $g_{ij} = 0$ if legislator i belongs to party $P \in \{A, F\}$ and legislators j belong to party $P' \neq P$. This assumption is not essential for the analysis but helps focus on how differences in the networks across parties impact the interest group.

The $n_P \times n_P$ symmetric matrix G_P shall represent the social network in party $P \in \{F, A\}$. We denote the ‘‘overall network’’ by G , which is a $n \times n$ square matrix that can be viewed as a 2×2 *block* matrix as shown below

$$G = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} G_F & 0_{n_F \times n_A} \\ \hline 0_{n_A \times n_F} & G_A \end{array} \right] \quad (1)$$

The $n_F \times n_F$ matrix G_F and the $n_A \times n_A$ matrix G_A are the two blocks on the main diagonal of G , and the two off diagonal blocks are matrices of zeroes.

2.1. Objective of legislators

The total utility of legislator i belonging to party $P \in \{F, A\}$ upon voting for policy- a , i.e., against the interest group, is assumed to be

$$U_i(a; P) = \begin{cases} -\sigma + \delta \sum_{j \in F} g_{ij} v_j(a) + \epsilon_{ia} & \text{if } P = F \\ 0 + \delta \sum_{j \in A} g_{ij} v_j(a) + \epsilon_{ia} & \text{if } P = A \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

A legislator in party F suffers an ideological-disutility of magnitude $\sigma \geq 0$ from voting against the interest group given the ideological inclination of party F towards the policy favored by the interest group. A legislator in party A does not suffer such a disutility as party A is ideologically inclined against the interest group. The magnitude of σ can be interpreted as the intensity of ideological polarization between the two parties regarding the underlying issue.

The second term captures the network effect due to friendships. The indicator variable $v_j(a)$ takes the value 1 when legislator $j \neq i$ votes against the interest group, and zero otherwise. A legislator in *any* party who votes against the interest group derives a utility $\delta \geq 0$ *per* unit strength of friendship with a legislator in her party that also votes against the interest group.

The final term $-\epsilon_{ia}$ indicates a private exogenous preference shock that is realized after the interest group announces the vector of investments toward legislators but before the legislators vote. It may be interpreted as a private signal that provides a legislator all additional relevant information to assess the utility she will derive if she votes against the interest group. The preference shocks are independently and identically distributed across legislators, and common knowledge. Specifically, they are uniformly distributed over the interval $[-\frac{1}{2\theta}, \frac{1}{2\theta}]$ with density $\theta > 0$ and mean zero.

In specifying the utility derived by legislators upon voting in favor of the interest group, we assume, without loss of generality, that the preference shock can be normalized to zero. The utility of legislator i belonging to party P upon voting in favor of the interest

group, i.e, voting for policy- f , is

$$U_i(f; P) = \begin{cases} 0 + u(m_i) + \delta \sum_{j \in F} g_{ij} v_j(f) & \text{if } P = F \\ -\sigma + u(m_i) + \delta \sum_{j \in A} g_{ij} v_j(f) & \text{if } P = A \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The first term here captures the idea that legislators in the party against the interest group suffer an ideological-disutility of σ upon voting in favor of the interest group. The second term indicates the resource-utility to a legislator from the investment she would receive from the interest group conditional on voting in favor of the interest group. We assume resource-utility function is continuous, strictly increasing, twice continuously differentiable, and strictly concave in m_i , with $u(0) = 0$ and marginal utility $u'_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $m_i \rightarrow 0$. The third term captures the network utility as described earlier.

The network effect in our model thus captures the benefit derived by a legislator when her friends in her party vote as she does, regardless of which policy they vote for. Further, the above formulation amounts to implicitly assuming that legislators care about their actions rather than the outcome of voting process.

2.2. Objective of the interest group

The *ex-ante* probability that legislator i votes in favor of the interest group – after the investments are announced by the interest group but before the private preference shocks are observed – is the expected value of $v_i(f)$ given the distribution of preference shocks. We henceforth denote this expectation $\mathbb{E}(v_i(f))$ by q_i . We restrict attention to pure investment strategies by the interest group and assume it allocates its resource of size $M > 0$ among the legislators to maximize the sum of ex-ante probabilities of the legislators voting for its favored policy.

Let \mathbf{M} denote the set of all feasible investment vectors $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$ such that each $m_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n m_i \leq M$. Formally, the interest group announces a feasible

payment vector $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}$ that maximizes

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{m}) = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i(\mathbf{m}). \quad (4)$$

3. Equilibrium and comparative statics

An equilibrium $(\mathbf{m}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$ is a pair of an investment vector \mathbf{m}^* announced by the interest group and a vector \mathbf{q}^* of ex-ante probabilities of legislators voting in favor of the interest group where (i) \mathbf{q}^* constitutes an equilibrium conditional on \mathbf{m}^* , and (ii) \mathbf{m}^* maximizes the sum of probabilities of the legislators voting in favor of the interest group. We first analyze the voting behavior of legislators conditional on an arbitrary vector of payments $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_i, \dots, m_n)$ announced by the interest group. *Conditional* on her private preference shock ϵ_{ia} , the expected utility of legislator i in any party P if she votes in favor of the interest group will be

$$\mathbb{E}(U_i(f, P|\epsilon_{ia})) = \begin{cases} 0 + u(m_i) + \delta \sum_{j \in F} g_{ij} q_j & \text{if } P = F \\ -\sigma + u(m_i) + \delta \sum_{j \in A} g_{ij} q_j & \text{if } P = A \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

As described earlier, the expected value of $v_j(f)$ from the perspective of legislator $i \neq j$ is q_j – the probability that legislator j votes in favor of the interest group – since preference shocks are observed privately. Consequently, the probability that legislator j votes against the interest group will be $(1 - q_j)$. Further, the expected value of the preference shock conditional on observing the preference shock will simply be the observed preference shock. Hence, *conditional* on her preference shock, the expected utility of legislator i in any party P if she votes against the interest group is

$$\mathbb{E}(U_i(a, P|\epsilon_{ia})) = \begin{cases} -\sigma + \delta \sum_{j \in F} g_{ij} (1 - q_j) + \epsilon_{ia} & \text{if } P = F \\ 0 + \delta \sum_{j \in A} g_{ij} (1 - q_j) + \epsilon_{ia} & \text{if } P = A \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Conditional on the private shock, we assume a legislator will vote for the interest group if her expected utility from voting for the interest group is at least as high as her expected utility from voting against the interest group. Consequently, the *ex-ante probability* that a legislator votes for the interest group – i.e., before she observes her private preference shock – will be the probability that her private preference shock does not exceed a certain threshold. The probability that legislator i in party $P \in \{F, A\}$ votes in favor of the interest group turns out to be

$$q_i(\mathbf{m}; P) = \frac{1}{2} + \theta \left(\left(u(m_i) + \delta \sum_{j \in P} g_{ij} (2q_j - 1) \right) + \sigma_P \right), \quad (7)$$

where $\sigma_P = \sigma$ if $P = F$ and $-\sigma$ if $P = A$. Let $\bar{q}(P)$ and $\underline{q}(P)$ denote the highest and lowest probabilities of any legislator in party P voting for policy- f . The highest probability of any legislator in party P , say, legislator i , voting in favor of the interest group is

$$q_i^{max}(P) = \min\{1, \bar{q}(P)\}, \quad (8)$$

where, if $\bar{q}(P) \in [0, 1]$, then it would be given by

$$\bar{q}(P) = \frac{1}{2} + \theta \left(u(M) + \delta (n_P - 1) + \sigma_P \right). \quad (9)$$

This is because $\bar{q}(P)$ would correspond to the scenario where (i) the interest group invests all its resource on legislator i , (ii) $g_{ij} = 1$ for all $j \neq i$ in party P , and (iii) $q_j = 1$ for all $j \neq i$ in party P . Analogously, the lowest probability of a legislator in party P , say, legislator i , voting in favor of the interest group is

$$q_i^{min}(P) = \max\{0, \underline{q}(P)\}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\underline{q}(P) = \frac{1}{2} + \theta \left(0 - \delta (n_P - 1) + \sigma_P \right) \quad (11)$$

This is because $\bar{q}(P)$ would correspond to the scenario where (i) the interest group invests nothing towards legislator i , (ii) $g_{ij} = 1$ for all $j \neq i$ in party P , and (iii) $q_j = 0$ for all $j \neq i$ in party P . Following Battaglini and Pattachini (2018), we assume the following to ensure voting probabilities always lie in the *interior* of the unit interval.

[A1] $\bar{q}(P) \in (0, 1)$ and $\underline{q}(P) \in (0, 1)$ for $P \in \{F, A\}$.

Assumption A1 effectively says that any parameter in the model, given the values of the other parameters, cannot be too large. It will hold, for instance, if the density of preference shocks, θ , is small enough to ensure the interest group is sufficiently uncertain about preferences of legislators.

Given the interdependence in voting probabilities of legislators, a vector of equilibrium voting probabilities of legislators conditional on a vector of investments by the interest group will be a solution of the system of *linear* equations generated by (7). This system of linear equations induces a continuous mapping of probability vectors from $[0, 1]^n$ to $(0, 1)^n$. The domain of this mapping is a compact and convex set, the co-domain is a subset of the domain, and the mapping is continuous since it is linear. Hence, Brouwer's fixed-point theorem ensures a solution exists. Our next assumption ensures the solution is unique.

A2. The matrix $(\mathbb{I} - 2\delta\theta G)$ is invertible.

When both A1 and A2 hold, the unique equilibrium vector of voting probabilities that solves the system of linear equations generated by (7) conditional on investment vector

\mathbf{m} is

$$\mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{1} + \theta \cdot (\mathbb{I} - 2\delta\theta G)^{-1} \cdot (\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}), \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the $n \times 1$ vector of ones, \mathbb{I} is the $n \times n$ identity matrix, G is the overall network specified in (1), $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}) = (u(m_1), u(m_2), \dots, u(m_n))$ is the vector of resource-utilities derived by legislators, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma, \sigma, \dots, -\sigma, -\sigma)$ is the vector that accounts for ideological inclinations of legislators (with the positive entries corresponding to legislators in the party in favor of the interest group).

Assumption A2 holds when the matrices $(\mathbb{I} - 2\delta\theta G_F)$ and $(\mathbb{I} - 2\delta\theta G_A)$ are invertible.⁴ An additional, and crucial, implication of A2 is that every component of the associated vector $\mathbf{b}(\delta, \theta, G) = (\mathbb{I} - 2\delta\theta G)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}$ is strictly positive (Ballester et al., 2006). As we shall shortly describe, this ensures investments towards every legislator serve as a “good” from the perspective of the interest group.

The vector \mathbf{b} specifies the Bonacich centralities of the legislators, whereby one’s centrality depends on the centralities of those with whom one is connected. In general, given a network $G = [g_{ij}]_{n \times n}$ involving n agents, the Bonacich centrality of agent i is

$$b_i = 1 + \beta \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n g_{ij} \cdot b_j, \quad (13)$$

which, in turn, implies the vector of Bonacich centralities is

$$\mathbf{b}(\beta, G) = (\mathbb{I} - \beta G)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \beta^k G^k \cdot \mathbf{1}, \quad (14)$$

where the non-negative decay factor $\beta \in [0, 1)$ scales down the relative weight of longer paths between agents, $\mathbf{1}$ is a $n \times 1$ vector of one’s, and \mathbb{I} is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. In the context of our model, the decay factor is given by $\beta = 2\delta\theta$.

⁴If the largest eigenvalue of G_P is $\bar{\lambda}(G_P) > 0$, then the matrix $(\mathbb{I} - 2\delta\theta \cdot G_P)$ is invertible if and only if $1 > 2\delta\theta \cdot \bar{\lambda}(G_P)$.

Assumption A1 implies $\beta < 1$ and assumption A2 implies the Bonacich centrality of each legislator is well-defined and strictly positive. Under these assumptions, we obtain the following proposition⁵.

Proposition 1. *There exists a unique equilibrium, $(\mathbf{m}^*, \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{m}^*))$.*

\mathbf{q}^* denotes the equilibrium vector of voting probabilities conditional on the investment vector \mathbf{m}^* , and \mathbf{m}^* maximizes the sum of probabilities of the legislators voting in favor of the interest group. Note that (12) implies the objective function of the interest group as a function of the investment vector is

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{m}) = \sum_{i \in F, A} q_i^*(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{n}{2} + \theta \left(\sum_{i \in F, A} b_i \cdot u(m_i) \right) + \theta \sigma (B_F - B_A), \quad (15)$$

where B_P is the sum of Bonacich centralities of all legislators in party $P \in \{F, A\}$, which we henceforth refer to as the *Bonacich-cohesiveness* of party P . The interest group effectively chooses the investment vector that maximizes a weighted-sum of legislators' resource-utilities, where the weights are the Bonacich centralities. $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{m}^*)$ is continuous and strictly concave in the investment vector \mathbf{m} due to the continuity and strict concavity of the resource-utility functions of legislators. Weierstrass theorem ensures the existence of a maximizer due to the compactness of the set of feasible investment vectors and continuity of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{m})$, and strict concavity of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{m})$ ensures uniqueness.

3.1. Ideological polarization

An increase in ideological polarization implies legislators in the party against the interest group would suffer greater disutility if they vote in favor of the interest group. On the one hand, this would require the interest group to increase investments toward these legislators to induce them to vote in its favor. On the other hand, given the limited

⁵The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 1 in BP2018.

budget of the interest group, such tailoring of investments cannot compensate for the greater ideological-disutility once ideological polarization becomes sufficiently large. The following corollary highlights that the relative cohesiveness the two parties determines the impact of an increase in ideological polarization on the interest group.

Corollary 1. *An increase in ideological polarization benefits the interest group if and only if the party in favour of the interest group is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive.*

Using (15), the equilibrium value of the interest group's objective is

$$\mathcal{Q}^*(\mathbf{m}^*) = \frac{n}{2} + \theta \left(\sum_{i \in F, A} b_i \cdot u(m_i^*) \right) + \theta \sigma (B_F - B_A). \quad (16)$$

Corollary 1 follows directly from the observation that $\frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}^*}{\partial \sigma} \geq 0$ if and only if $B_F > B_A$. It highlights the crucial role of relative cohesiveness of networks in the two parties in determining whether increasing ideological polarization between parties aids the interest group. To further see the import of this proposition, it is helpful to contrast it with a model that ignores the network among legislators. Such a model is a special case of our model, and corresponds to both G_F and G_A being the empty network. The Bonacich centrality of every legislator will then be unity. The Bonacich-cohesiveness of a party – the sum of Bonacich centralities of all legislators in the party – will thus be the number of legislators in the party. Consequently, if the party against the interest group has relatively fewer legislators, then an increase in ideological polarization can never hurt the interest group. In this sense, Corollary 1 highlights that greater Bonacich-cohesiveness of the party against the interest group can compensate for its potential numerical disadvantage in limiting the influence of the interest group.

3.2. Impact of changes in network structure

We shall say a network G benefits the interest group relative to some other network G'

if $\mathcal{Q}^*(G') > \mathcal{Q}^*(G)$. We suppress the dependence on other primitives for notational convenience. For any party $P \in \{F, A\}$, we say network $G_P^s = [g_{ij}^s]$ is a *stronger* network among legislators in party P than network $G_P = [g_{ij}]$ if every $g_{ij}^s \geq g_{ij}$ and at least one inequality is strict.

Proposition 2(a). *Given any network in the party against the interest group, an increase in the strength of the network in the party in favor of the interest group benefits the interest group.*

Proposition 2(b). *Fix any network G_F in the party in favor of the interest group. Consider a pair of overall networks G and G^s such that the network in party A is relatively stronger under the overall network G^s . There exists a critical level of ideological polarization, $\hat{\sigma}(G, G^s) > 0$, such that $\mathcal{Q}^*(G^s) \geq \mathcal{Q}^*(G)$ if and only if $\sigma \leq \hat{\sigma}(G, G^s)$.*

The formal proof is provided in the Appendix. Intuitively, part (a) follows because a stronger network in the party in favor of the interest group allows the interest group to better exploit the increased network effect under the relatively stronger network. Part (b) highlights that the interest group may be able also to profitably exploit an increase in the strength of the network in the party against it.

Given any voting pattern of legislators in the party against the interest group, a stronger network in this party would increase the utility derived by some legislators due to the increased network effect under the stronger network. Legislators in the party against the interest group suffer an ideological-disutility from voting in favor of the interest group. However, if the ideological-disutility is sufficiently low, then the interest group can tailor higher investments towards at least some legislators that have sufficiently high Bonacich centralities, and thereby increase their probability of voting in favor of the interest group. This, in turn, may increase the probability of their "close" friends voting in favor of the interest group as well. However, no such tailoring of investments can compensate for the greater ideological-disutility suffered by these legislators once ideological polarization between the parties becomes sufficiently high. Our next proposition notes

two additional implications of the baseline model.

Proposition 3(a). *Equilibrium investments by the interest group are independent of ideological polarization between parties.*

Proposition 3(b). *An increase in strength of the network in a party increases total investment towards it.*

Part (a) follows from the fact that the optimization problem of the interest group is independent of the level ideological polarization between parties. With respect to part (b), note that a stronger network in party P will weakly or strictly increase the Bonacich centrality of every legislator in party P , and will not alter the Bonacich centrality of any legislator in party $P' \neq P$. Consequently, the interest group will attach weakly greater weights on legislators in party P in its optimization problem when the network in party P gets stronger; but, the weights on legislators in party P' will remain unchanged. Given the fixed budget of the interest group, the equilibrium investment on every legislator in party P' will be relatively lower under the relatively stronger network in party P . Hence, total investment towards party P' will decrease. Consequently, total investment towards party P will increase.

4. Affective polarization

We model “pure” affective polarization as an affective-disutility that a legislator suffers when a legislator in the opposite party votes as she does, regardless of the policy they vote for. This is equivalent to assuming each legislator in one party values distinguishing her vote from legislators in the other party. The size of the affective-disutility serves as a measure of affective polarization between the parties. Building up on the baseline model, we assume that utility of legislator i belonging to party $P \in \{F, A\}$ upon voting against

the interest group (i.e., voting for policy- a) is

$$U_i(a; P) = \begin{cases} -\sigma + \delta \sum_{j \in F} g_{ij} v_j(a) - \alpha \sum_{j \in A} v_j(a) + \epsilon_{ia} & \text{if } P = F \\ 0 + \delta \sum_{j \in A} g_{ij} v_j(a) - \alpha \sum_{j \in F} v_j(a) + \epsilon_{ia} & \text{if } P = A \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where the indicator variable $v_j(a)$ takes the value 1 when legislator $j \neq i$ votes against the interest group, and zero otherwise. The second term captures the network effect and its interpretation is as in the baseline model. The third term captures the idea that a legislator in any party who votes for policy- a suffers an affective-disutility $\alpha > 0$ per legislator of the other party that also votes for policy- a . Finally, as in the baseline model, the preference shock ϵ_{ia} is assumed to be uniformly distributed over the interval $[-\frac{1}{2\theta}, \frac{1}{2\theta}]$ with density $\theta > 0$ and mean zero. Turning to the utility of legislator i in party P upon voting in favor of the interest group, we assume

$$U_i(f; P) = \begin{cases} 0 + u(m_i) + \delta \sum_{j \in F} g_{ij} v_j(f) - \alpha \sum_{j \in A} v_j(f) & \text{if } P = F \\ -\sigma + u(m_i) + \delta \sum_{j \in A} g_{ij} v_j(f) - \alpha \sum_{j \in F} v_j(f) & \text{if } P = A \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

where the indicator variable $v_j(f)$ is 1 when legislator j votes in favor of the interest group, and zero otherwise. The third term captures the idea that a legislator in any party who votes for policy- f suffers an affective-disutility $\alpha > 0$ per legislator of the other party that also votes for policy- f .

Conditional on the private shock, we assume a legislator will vote for the interest group if her expected utility from voting for the interest group is at least as high as her expected utility from voting against the interest group. Consequently, as in the baseline model, the *ex-ante probability* that a legislator votes for the interest group – i.e., before she observes her private preference shock – will be the probability that her private preference shock does not exceed a certain threshold. The probability that legislator i in party $P \in \{F, A\}$ votes in favor of the interest group turns out to be Conditional on an investment vector \mathbf{m} , the probability that any legislator i in party $P \in F, A$ votes in favor of the interest

group is

$$q_i(\mathbf{m}; P) = \frac{1}{2} + \theta \left(\left(u(m_i) + \delta \sum_{j \in P} g_{ij} (2q_j - 1) - \alpha \sum_{j \notin P} (2q_j - 1) \right) + \sigma_P \right), \quad (19)$$

where $\sigma_P = \sigma$ if $P = F$ and $-\sigma$ if $P = A$. As in the baseline model, let $\bar{q}(P)$ and $\underline{q}(P)$ denote the highest and lowest probabilities of any legislator in party P voting for policy- f . As in the baseline model, the following assumption ensures the voting probabilities lie in the interior of the unit interval.

[A3] $\bar{q}(P) \in (0, 1)$ and $\underline{q}(P) \in (0, 1)$ for $P \in \{F, A\}$.

A vector of equilibrium voting probabilities of legislators conditional on a vector of investments by the interest group is a solution to the system of *linear* equations generated by (19). As in the baseline model, Brouwer's fixed-point theorem ensures a solution exists. In order to ensure uniqueness, we need an assumption analogous to assumption A2 in the baseline model. It is helpful to first define the matrix

$$\tilde{G} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \delta \cdot G_F & -\alpha \cdot \mathbf{1} \\ \hline -\alpha \cdot \mathbf{1} & \delta \cdot G_A \end{array} \right] \quad (20)$$

where the blocks on the main diagonal correspond to the networks in the two parties, and the matrices $\mathbf{1}$ in the off diagonal blocks are matrices of ones having the appropriate order such that \tilde{G} is a symmetric $n \times n$ square matrix.

[A4] The matrix $(\mathbb{I} - 2\theta\tilde{G})$ is invertible, and every component of the associated vector of *modified* Bonacich centralities, $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\delta, \theta, \alpha, \tilde{G}) = (\mathbb{I} - 2\theta\tilde{G})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}$, is non-negative.

Appendix B provides further details about the conditions under which Assumption A4 holds. The more pertinent observation is that it ensures investments towards legislators do not serve as a "bad" from the perspective of the interest group. Under A3 and A4, the unique vector of equilibrium probabilities of the legislators voting in favor of the interest

group conditional on investment vector \mathbf{m} is

$$\mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{1} + \theta \cdot (\mathbb{I} - 2\theta\tilde{G})^{-1} \cdot (\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}), \quad (21)$$

where the vector $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}) = (u(m_1), u(m_2), \dots, u(m_n))$ specifies the resource-utility of legislators, the vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma, \sigma, \dots, -\sigma, -\sigma)$ corresponds to the ideological inclinations of legislators, and the associated vector

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\delta, \theta, \alpha, \tilde{G}) = (\mathbb{I} - 2\theta\tilde{G})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}, \quad (22)$$

provides the *modified* Bonacich centralities of legislators. Algebraic manipulation of the above equation reveals that, in the presence of affective polarization, the modified Bonacich centrality of legislator i in party $P \in \{F, A\}$ is related to the modified Bonacich centralities of all other legislators as follows:

$$\tilde{b}_i(P) = 1 + \beta \cdot \sum_{j \in P} g_{ij} \cdot \tilde{b}_j - \tilde{\alpha} \cdot \sum_{k \notin P} 1 \cdot \tilde{b}_k, \quad (23)$$

where $\beta = 2\delta\theta$ and $\tilde{\alpha} = 2\theta\alpha$. The modified Bonacich centrality of a legislator is thus positively related to the modified Bonacich centralities of legislators in ones own party, and negatively related to the modified Bonacich centralities of legislators in the opposite party. As we detail in the Appendix, (22) implies the modified Bonacich centrality of legislator i in party P is

$$\tilde{b}_i(P) = \omega_P \cdot b_i(P) = \left(\frac{1 - \tilde{\alpha}B_{P'}}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_P B_{P'}} \right) \cdot b_i(P), \quad (24)$$

where ω_P is a factor that modifies the “standard” Bonacich centrality $b_i(P)$ of each legislator i in party P in the presence of affective polarization. B_P and $B_{P'}$ are the “standard” Bonacich-cohesiveness of party P and party P' as in the baseline model. The modified Bonacich-centralities are non-negative if $\tilde{\alpha} \in [0, \tilde{\alpha}_{max}]$, where $\tilde{\alpha}_{max} = \min\{\frac{1}{B_F}, \frac{1}{B_A}\}$. We shall henceforth assume $\alpha \in [0, \hat{\alpha}]$, where $\hat{\alpha}\theta = \tilde{\alpha}_{max}$.

Affective polarization modifies the standard Bonacich centralities of legislators in two ways. The denominator of ω_P highlights that the mutuality inherent in affective polarization *amplifies* the standard Bonacich of every legislator in both parties. Higher affective-disutility and greater cohesiveness of either party increase this amplification factor. The term in the numerator of ω_P *dampens* the standard Bonacich centrality, where the dampening factor increases with increasing affective polarization and the cohesiveness of the opposite party. Further, the amplifying factor is identical for every legislator in both parties and decreases non-linearly with an increase in affective polarization. In contrast, the dampening factor is relatively stronger for the party that is relatively less cohesive and declines linearly with an increase in affective polarization.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $B_P \geq B_{P'}$ such that party P is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive.*

(a) $\omega_{P'}(0) = 1$, $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \hat{\alpha}} \omega_{P'}(\alpha) = 0$, and $\frac{\partial \omega_{P'}}{\partial \alpha} < 0$ for $\alpha \in [0, \hat{\alpha}]$.

(b) $\omega_P(0) = 1$, $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \hat{\alpha}} \omega_P(\alpha) = 1$, and

- $\frac{\partial \omega_P}{\partial \alpha} < 0$ if $\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{1}{\theta B_{P'}} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{B_{P'}}{B_P}}\right)\right)$.
- $\frac{\partial \omega_P}{\partial \alpha} \geq 0$ if $\alpha \in \left[\frac{1}{\theta B_{P'}} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{B_{P'}}{B_P}}\right), \hat{\alpha}\right]$.

Under our assumptions, the dampening effect outweighs the amplifying effect such that the Bonacich centralities of legislators in the presence of affective polarization are lower than in the absence of affective polarization. However, as lemma highlights, the impact of increasing affective polarization on Bonacich centralities can be monotonic or non-monotonic depending on whether a legislator belongs to the party that is relatively less or relatively more cohesive.

Proposition 4. *There exists a unique equilibrium, $(\mathbf{m}^*, \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{m}^*))$.*

Using (21), the value of the objective of the interest group as a function of its invest-

ments is

$$Q(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{n}{2} + \theta \left(\sum_{i \in F} \tilde{b}_{iF} \cdot u(m_i) + \sum_{j \in A} \tilde{b}_{jA} \cdot u(m_j) \right) + \theta \sigma \left(\frac{B_F - B_A}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F B_A} \right), \quad (25)$$

Equation (25) highlights that the interest group effectively chooses the investment vector that maximizes a weighted-sum of legislators' resource-utilities, where the weights are the modified Bonacich centralities. Weierstrass theorem ensures the existence of a maximizer and strict concavity of $Q(\mathbf{m})$ in \mathbf{m} ensures uniqueness.

The above equation highlights that affective polarization alters the objective function of the interest group in two distinct ways relative to the baseline model. It has a direct effect on the marginal calculations of the interest group as it modifies the Bonacich centralities of legislators. The last term in equation (25) highlights that affective polarization also impacts the equilibrium level of the interest group's objective by effectively amplifying the difference in the cohesiveness of the parties⁶.

Proposition 5. *For any given network,*

- (a) $\frac{\partial Q^*}{\partial \sigma} \geq 0$ if and only if $B_F \geq B_A$.
- (b) $\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left[\frac{\partial Q^*}{\partial \sigma} \right] \geq 0$ if and only if $B_F \geq B_A$.
- (c) Suppose $B_F \geq B_A$. There exists a critical $\alpha_c \in (0, \hat{\alpha})$ such that
 - $\frac{\partial Q^*}{\partial \alpha} < 0$ if $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_c)$.
 - $\frac{\partial Q^*}{\partial \alpha} \geq 0$ if $\alpha \in [\alpha_c, \hat{\alpha}]$.

Part (a) highlights that, as in the baseline model, the interest group benefits from an increase in ideological polarization between parties if and only if the party in favor of the interest group is more Bonacich-cohesive than the party against the interest group. Further, this result does not depend on the level of affective polarization. Part (b) highlights the interaction between ideological and affective polarization. Affective

⁶Equation (25) highlights that the significance of relative cohesiveness of within-party networks vanishes if $\sigma = 0$, i.e., in the absence of ideological polarization between the parties.

polarization effectively amplifies the difference in the (standard) Bonacich-cohesiveness of the two parties. Consequently, an increase in affective polarization amplifies the returns to the interest group from increasing ideological polarization, and its qualitative sign depends on which party is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive.

Part (c) highlights that, when the party in favor of the interest group is relatively more cohesive, the marginal impact of an increase in affective polarization on the interest group is non-monotonic. It is only when affective polarization is sufficiently large that further increase in affective polarization benefits the interest group.⁷ The detailed proof of part (c) is provided in Appendix B. It relies on (i) continuous differentiability of the interest group's objective function with respect to α , (ii) using lemma 1 to show that $\frac{dQ^*}{d\alpha}$ is strictly negative in a neighborhood of $\alpha = 0$, and (iii) using Lemma 1 to show that $\frac{dQ^*}{d\alpha}$ is strictly positive in some feasible neighborhood of $\hat{\alpha}$.

Part (c) does not settle whether the interest group benefits from affective polarization relative to the absence of affective polarization. To answer this question, define

$$\Delta Q^*(\hat{\alpha}, 0) \equiv Q^*(\alpha = \hat{\alpha}) - Q^*(\alpha = 0), \quad (26)$$

which is the difference in the equilibrium values of the interest group's objective at the highest and lowest feasible level of affective polarization. Using Lemma 1 and equation (25), if party P is more Bonacich-cohesive than party P' , then

$$\Delta Q^*(\hat{\alpha}, 0) = \sum_{i \in P} b_i \left(u(m_i^*) \Big|_{\alpha=\hat{\alpha}} - u(m_i^*) \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right) - \sum_{j \in P'} b_j \left(u(m_j^*) \Big|_{\alpha=0} - \sigma_P \right), \quad (27)$$

where $\sigma_P = \sigma$ if $P = F$ and $-\sigma$ if $P = A$. Suppose the party in favor of the interest group is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive. Since investments by the interest group are independent of the level of ideological polarization, equation (27) suggests that higher ideological polarization makes it more likely that the interest group benefits from suf-

⁷When the party against the interest group is relatively more cohesive, then it is possible that the interest group does not benefit from the presence of affective polarization (see Appendix B for details).

ficiently high affective polarization relative to the absence of affective polarization. In contrast, if the party against the interest group is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive, then this implication is more likely when ideological polarization is relatively lower.

In general, the impact of affective polarization on investments by the interest group towards legislators is difficult to pin down without further assumptions. Assuming logarithmic resource-utility, increasing affective polarization increases total investment towards the party in favor of the interest group if and only if it is more Bonacich-cohesive than the party against the interest group (see Proposition 6 in Appendix B).

5. Conclusion

The influence of special interest money on elected officials and growing political polarization have been salient themes in public discourse and academic inquiry. We investigate when can an interest group exploit increasing polarization between political parties to its advantage by accounting for both ideological and affective polarization between parties, and the social connections within parties.

Our analysis underscores that the impact of rising ideological or affective polarization between political parties on the interest group depends on the relative cohesiveness of party networks. Higher ideological polarization benefits the interest group if and only if the party in favor of the interest group is relatively more cohesive. An increase in affective polarization increases the returns to the interest group from increasing ideological polarization if and only if the party in favor of the interest group is relatively more cohesive. If the party in favor of the interest group is relatively more cohesive, then the higher the ideological polarization between the parties, the more likely it is that the interest group benefits from affective polarization relative to the absence of affective polarization. However, the crucial role of relative cohesiveness cannot arise unless there exists ideological polarization between the parties.

Our analysis can be extended to account for other relevant considerations (e.g., within-party ideological heterogeneity). Exploring the co-evolution of political polarization and

influence activities may be particularly insightful. Our model may also be modified to investigate other questions related to polarization. For instance, there is growing suspicion that social media platforms facilitate ideological and affective polarization among the general public. Our model can serve as the starting point to investigate these issues by replacing the interest group with a firm, and appropriately modeling its action space and objective function.

References

- Ansolabehere, S., J. M. de Figueiredo, and J. Snyder, James M. (2003). Why is there so little money in U.S. politics? *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17(1), 105–130.
- Arnold, L., R. Deen, and S. Patterson (2000). Friendship and votes: The impact of interpersonal ties on legislative decision making. *State and Local Government Review* 32(2), 142–47.
- Austen-Smith, D. and J. R. Wright (1992). Competitive lobbying for a legislator’s vote. *Social Choice and Welfare* 9(3), 229–57.
- Ballester, C., A. Calvo-Armengol, and Y. Zenou (2006). Who’s who in networks. Wanted: The key player. *Econometrica* 74(5), 1403–1417.
- Battaglini, M. and E. Patacchini (2018). Influencing connected legislators. *Journal of Political Economy* 126(6), 2277–2322.
- Battaglini, M., E. Patacchini, and E. Rainone (2021). Endogenous social interactions with unobserved networks. *Review of Economic Studies* (forthcoming), 1–8.
- Baumgartner, F., J. Berry, M. Hojnacki, B. L. Leech, and D. Kimball (2009). *Lobbying and Policy Change: Who Wins, Who Loses, and Why*.
- Bertrand, M., M. Bombardini, and F. Trebbi (2014). Is it whom you know or what you know? An empirical assessment of the lobbying process. *American Economic Review* 104(12), 3885–3920.
- Bombardini, M. and F. Trebbi (2020). Empirical models of lobbying. *Annual Review of Economics* 12, 391–413.
- Bonacich, P. (1987). Power and centrality: A family of measures. *American Journal of Sociology* 92(5), 1170–1182.
- Boxell, L., M. G. and J. M. Shapiro (2021). Cross-country trends in affective polarization. *Review of Economics and Statistics* forthcoming.

- Cohen, L. and C. Malloy (2014). Friends in high places. *American Economic Journal: Economics Policy* 6(3), 63–91.
- Dekel, E., M. Jackson, and A. Wolinsky (2009). Vote buying: Legislatures and lobbying. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 4(2), 103–128.
- Druckman, J., S. Klar, Y. Krupnikov, M. Levendusky, and J. B. Ryan (2021). Affective polarization, local contexts and public opinion in america. *Nature Human Behaviour* 5, 28–38.
- Enders, A. M. (2021). Issues versus affect: How do elite and mass polarization compare. *Journal of Politics* 83(4), 1872–1877.
- Fowler, J. (2006). Connecting the congress: A study of cosponsorship networks. *Political Analysis* 14(4), 456–87.
- Grossman, G. M. and E. Helpman (1994). Protection for sale. *The American Economic Review* 84(4), 833–850.
- Harmon, N., R. Fisman, and E. Kamenica (2019). Peer effects in legislative voting. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 11(4), 156–80.
- Iyengar, S. and M. Krupenkin (2018). The strengthening of partisan affect. *Political Psychology* 39, 201–218.
- Iyengar, S., Y. Lelkes, M. Levendusky, N. Malhotra, and S. J. Westwood (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the united states. *Annual Review of Political Science* 22(1), 129–146.
- Lessig, L. (2011). *Republic, lost: How money corrupts Congress—and a plan to stop it* (1st ed. ed.).
- Mason, L. (2015). “I disrespectfully agree”: The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization. *American Journal of Political Science* 59(1), 128–145.

- McKay, A. M. (2018). Fundraising for favors? Linking lobbyist-hosted fundraisers to legislative benefits. *Political Research Quarterly* 71(4), 869–880.
- Pew Research Center (2015, November). Beyond distrust: How Americans view their government. Report, Washington, D.C.
- Pew Research Center (2019, October). Partisan antipathy: More intense, more personal. Report, Washington, D.C.
- Rice, S. (1927). The identification of blocks in small political parties. *American Political Science Review* 21(3), 619–27.
- Rogowski, J. C. and J. L. Sutherland (2016). How ideology fuels affective polarization. *Political Behavior* 38, 485–508.
- Rouff, G. C. (1938). Interpersonal relationships and the legislative process. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 195(1), 129–136.
- Schnakenberg, K. E. (2017). Informational lobbying and legislative voting. *American Journal of Political Science* 61(1), 129–145.
- Snyder Jr., J. M. (1991). On buying legislatures. *Economics and Politics* 3(2), 93–109.
- Stratmann, T. (2002). Can special interests buy congressional votes? evidence from financial services legislation. *The Journal of Law & Economics* 45(2), 345–373.
- Truman, D. (1951). *The Governmental Process: Political interests and Public Opinion*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Vidal, J. B., M. Draca, and C. Fons-Rosen (2012). Revolving door lobbyists. *The American Economic Review* 102(7), 3731–3748.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Proofs for the baseline model

The arguments behind the proofs of Proposition 1, Corollary 1, and Proposition 3 appear in the main text. In the following we provide the proof of Proposition 2.

Proposition 2. (a) *Given any network in the party against the interest group, an increase in the strength of the network in the party in favor of the interest group benefits the interest group.* (b) *Fix any network G_F in the party in favor of the interest group. Consider a pair of overall networks G and G^s such that the network in party A is relatively stronger under the overall network G^s . There exists a critical level of ideological polarization, $\hat{\sigma}(G, G^s)$, such that $\mathcal{Q}^*(G^s) \geq \mathcal{Q}^*(G)$ if and only if $\sigma \leq \hat{\sigma}(G, G^s)$.*

Consider a pair of overall networks G and G^s such that the network in party P is relatively stronger under the overall network G^s , while the network in party $P' \neq P$ is identical under G and G^s . Let the Bonacich centrality vectors of the legislators under G and G^s be \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{b}^s . Since G^s is stronger than G , it follows that $\mathbf{b}^s \geq \mathbf{b}$, where $b_{iP}^s \geq b_{iP}$ for all $i \in P$ with the inequality being strict for at least two legislators in party P , and $b_{jP'}^s = b_{jP'}$ for all $j \in P'$. Consequently, the Bonacich-cohesiveness of the parties under the overall networks G and G^s will be such that

$$B_P(G^s) > B_P(G) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{P'}(G^s) = B_{P'}(G). \quad (28)$$

Let \mathbf{m}^* and \mathbf{m}^{*s} denote the equilibrium investment vectors under G and G^s . Fix any network G_A and consider a pair of overall network G and G^s such that the network in party F is stronger in G^s . The value of the interest group's objective under G and G^s

will be as follows.

$$\mathcal{Q}^*(\mathbf{m}^*, G) = \frac{n}{2} + \theta \left[\sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^*) b_i + \sigma(B_F - B_A) \right] \quad (29)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}^*(\mathbf{m}^{*s}, G^s) = \frac{n}{2} + \theta \left[\sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^{*s}) b_i^s + \sigma(B_F^s - B_A) \right] \quad (30)$$

We first note that

$$\mathcal{Q}^*(\mathbf{m}^{*s}, G^s) \equiv \max_{\mathbf{m}} \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{m}, G^s) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{m}^*, G^s) \quad (31)$$

$$\implies \sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^{*s}) b_i^s \geq \sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^*) b_i \quad (32)$$

$$\implies \sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^{*s}) b_i^s \geq \sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^*) b_i. \quad (33)$$

where inequality (33) follows from $b_i^s \geq b_i$ for every $i \in F, A$.

For the proof of part (a), fix any G_A and consider a pair of overall network G and G^s such that the network in party F is stronger in G^s than in G . The interest group benefits from the stronger network in party F if

$$\mathcal{Q}^*(\mathbf{m}^*, G) \leq \mathcal{Q}^*(\mathbf{m}^{*s}, G^s) \quad (34)$$

$$\equiv -\sigma \leq \frac{\sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^{*s}) b_i^s - \sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^*) b_i}{B_F(G^s) - B_F(G)} = \hat{\sigma}(G, G^s) \quad (35)$$

It follows from (28) and (33) that $\hat{\sigma}(G, G^s) > 0$. Hence, (35) holds for every $\sigma \geq 0$, thereby implying that a stronger network in party F always benefits the interest group regardless of the level of ideological polarization between the parties.

For part (b), fix any network G_F in party F and consider a pair of overall network G and G^s such that the network in party A is stronger under G^s than under G . The

interest group benefits from the stronger network in party A if

$$\mathcal{Q}^*(\mathbf{m}^*, G) \leq \mathcal{Q}^*(\mathbf{m}^{*s}, G^s) \quad (36)$$

$$\equiv \sigma \leq \frac{\sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^{*s}) b_i^s - \sum_{i \in F, A} u(m_i^*) b_i}{(B_A^s - B_A)} = \hat{\sigma}(G, G^s) \quad (37)$$

Thus, there exists a critical $\hat{\sigma}(G, G^s) > 0$ such that a stronger network in party A benefits the interest group if and only if $\sigma \leq \hat{\sigma}(G, G^s)$.

Appendix B: Proofs for the extension

We begin with some further remarks about assumption A4. The matrix $(\mathbb{I} - 2\theta\tilde{G})$ must be invertible for $\mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{m})$ – the equilibrium voting probabilities conditional on investment vector \mathbf{m} – to be well defined. In general, the inverse of a 2×2 block matrix is given by

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{W} & \mathbf{X} \\ \hline \mathbf{Y} & \mathbf{Z} \end{array} \right]^{-1} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} (\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{XZ}^{-1}\mathbf{Y})^{-1} & -(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{XZ}^{-1}\mathbf{Y})^{-1}\mathbf{XZ}^{-1} \\ \hline -(\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{YW}^{-1}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{YW}^{-1} & (\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{YW}^{-1}\mathbf{X})^{-1} \end{array} \right] \quad (38)$$

where \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} are square matrices and \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are conformable for partition (see Bernstein, 2018). For the inverse to exist, the matrices \mathbf{W} , \mathbf{Z} , $(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{XZ}^{-1}\mathbf{Y})$ and $(\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{YW}^{-1}\mathbf{X})$ must themselves be invertible.

In the context of our model,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{I} - 2\theta\tilde{G})^{-1} &= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} (\mathbb{I} - \beta G_F) & \tilde{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\ \hline \tilde{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{1} & (\mathbb{I} - \beta G_A) \end{array} \right]^{-1} \\ &= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} (\mathbb{I} - \beta G_F - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} & -\tilde{\alpha}(\mathbb{I} - \beta G_F - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{I} - \beta G_A)^{-1} \\ \hline -\tilde{\alpha}(\mathbb{I} - \beta G_A - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{I} - \beta G_F)^{-1} & (\mathbb{I} - \beta G_A - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \end{array} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Hence, the matrix $(\mathbb{I} - 2\theta\tilde{G})$ is invertible if and only if the matrices $(\mathbb{I} - 2\beta G_P)$ and $(\mathbb{I} - \beta G_P - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_{P'} \cdot \mathbf{1})$ are invertible for $P, P' \in \{F, A\}$ and $P \neq P'$. Further, when $(\mathbb{I} - 2\theta\tilde{G})$ is invertible, then the vector of modified Bonacich centralities is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbf{b}} &= (\mathbb{I} - 2\theta\widehat{\mathbf{G}})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\
&= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} (\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_F) & \tilde{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\ \hline \tilde{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{1} & (\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_A) \end{array} \right]^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\
&= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} (\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_F - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} & -\tilde{\alpha}(\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_F - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_A)^{-1} \\ \hline -\tilde{\alpha}(\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_A - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_F)^{-1} & (\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_A - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \end{array} \right] \cdot \mathbf{1} \\
&= \left[\begin{array}{l} (\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_F - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(n_F \times 1)} - \tilde{\alpha}(\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_F - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_A)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(n_A \times 1)} \\ -\tilde{\alpha}(\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_A - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_F)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(n_F \times 1)} + (\mathbb{I} - \beta\mathbf{G}_A - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F \cdot \mathbf{1})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(n_A \times 1)} \end{array} \right] \\
&= \left[\begin{array}{l} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A B_F} \right) \mathbf{b}_F - \left(\frac{\tilde{\alpha} B_A}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A B_F} \right) \mathbf{b}_F \\ - \left(\frac{\tilde{\alpha} B_F}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A B_F} \right) \mathbf{b}_A + \left(\frac{1}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_A B_F} \right) \mathbf{b}_A \end{array} \right] \\
&= \left[\begin{array}{l} \omega_F \cdot \mathbf{b}_F \\ \omega_A \cdot \mathbf{b}_A \end{array} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where \mathbf{b}_P is the $n_P \times 1$ vector of the "standard" Bonacich centralities of legislators in party $P \in \{F, A\}$. Also, $\tilde{\alpha} \in [0, \tilde{\alpha}_{\max})$, where $\tilde{\alpha}_{\max} = \min\{\frac{1}{B_F}, \frac{1}{B_A}\}$, ensures the modified Bonacich centralities of all legislators are non-negative.

The technical arguments behind the proof of Proposition 4 appear in the main text. The proofs of Lemma 1, Proposition 5 (a), and Proposition 5 (b) are straightforward. In the following, we provide proofs of Proposition 5 (c) and Proposition (6).

Proposition 5 (c). *Suppose $B_F \geq B_A$. There exists a critical $\tilde{\alpha}_c$ such that*

- $\frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}^*}{\partial \alpha} < 0$ if $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_c]$.
- $\frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}^*}{\partial \alpha} \geq 0$ if $\alpha \in [\alpha_c, \hat{\alpha}]$.

The equilibrium value of the interest group's objective can be re-written as

$$\mathcal{Q}^*(\mathbf{m}^*) = \frac{n}{2} + \omega_P \sum_{i \in P} u(m_i^*) b_i + \omega_{P'} \sum_{j \in P'} u(m_j^*) b_j + \frac{\theta \sigma (B_F - B_A)}{(1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F B_A)} \quad (41)$$

\mathcal{Q}^* is continuously differentiable in α , with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{Q}^*}{d\alpha} = & \theta \left[\frac{\partial \omega_P}{\partial \alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in P} u(m_i^*) b_i + \omega_P \cdot \sum_{i \in P} b_i u'(m_i^*) \frac{\partial m_i}{\partial \alpha} \right] \\ & + \theta \left[\frac{\partial \omega_{P'}}{\partial \alpha} \cdot \sum_{j \in P'} u(m_j^*) b_j + \omega_{P'} \cdot \sum_{j \in P'} b_j u'(m_j^*) \frac{\partial m_j}{\partial \alpha} \right] \\ & + \frac{4\sigma\theta^2 \cdot \tilde{\alpha} B_A B_F (B_F - B_A)}{(1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F B_A)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The equilibrium Lagrange multiplier associated with the interest group's constraint optimization problem is $\lambda^* = \theta \cdot u'(m_i) \omega_P \cdot b_{iP}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{Q}^*}{d\alpha} = & \theta \left[\frac{\partial \omega_P}{\partial \alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in P} u(m_i^*) b_i + \frac{\partial \omega_{P'}}{\partial \alpha} \cdot \sum_{j \in P'} u(m_j^*) b_j + \lambda^* \left(\sum_{i \in P} \frac{\partial m_i}{\partial \alpha} + \sum_{j \in P'} \frac{\partial m_j}{\partial \alpha} \right) \right] \\ & + \frac{4\sigma\theta^2 \cdot \tilde{\alpha} B_A B_F (B_F - B_A)}{(1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F B_A)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

As the interest group will invest all its funds, $\sum_{i \in P} \frac{\partial m_i}{\partial \alpha} + \sum_{j \in P'} \frac{\partial m_j}{\partial \alpha} = 0$. Hence,

$$\frac{d\mathcal{Q}^*}{d\alpha} = \theta \left[\frac{\partial \omega_P}{\partial \alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in P} u(m_i^*) b_i + \frac{\partial \omega_{P'}}{\partial \alpha} \cdot \sum_{j \in P'} u(m_j^*) b_j \right] + \frac{4\sigma\theta^2 \cdot \tilde{\alpha} B_A B_F (B_F - B_A)}{(1 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 B_F B_A)^2} \quad (44)$$

Using (44) and Lemma 1, $\frac{dQ^*}{d\alpha} < 0$ at $\alpha = 0$. If $B_P > B_{P'}$, then $\omega_{P'}(\hat{\alpha}) = 0$. This, in turn, implies $m_j^* = 0$ for all $j \in P'$ when $\alpha = \hat{\alpha}$. Hence,

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \hat{\alpha}} \left[\frac{dQ^*}{d\alpha} \right] = \frac{2\theta^2 B_P B_{P'}}{(B_P - B_{P'})} \cdot \sum_{i \in P} b_i u(m_i^*) + \frac{4\theta^2 \sigma \cdot B_A B_F^2}{(B_F - B_A)}. \quad (45)$$

Proposition 5 (c) follows from the observation that when $P = F$, both terms on the RHS in (45) are positive. Also note that when $P = A$, the first term is positive but the second term is negative. Hence, the marginal impact of increasing polarization on the interest group is ambiguous when the party against the interest group is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive.

Proposition 6. *Suppose $u_i(m_i) = \ln(m_i)$ for every $i \in F, A$. Increase in affective polarization increases total investment by the interest group towards the party in favor of the interest group if and only if it is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive.*

The equilibrium investments by the interest group turn out to be

$$m_i^*(F) = \frac{(1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_A) b_i \cdot M}{(1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_F) B_A + (1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_A) B_F} = \left(\frac{\omega_F}{\omega_A B_A + \omega_F B_F} \right) b_i \cdot M \quad (46)$$

$$m_i^*(A) = \frac{(1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_F) b_i \cdot M}{(1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_F) B_A + (1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_A) B_F} = \left(\frac{\omega_A}{\omega_A B_A + \omega_F B_F} \right) b_i \cdot M \quad (47)$$

which, in turn, imply

$$\frac{\partial m_i^*(F)}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{2\theta b_j \cdot M [B_A (B_F - B_A)]}{[(1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_F) B_A + (1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_A) B_F]^2} \quad (48)$$

$$\frac{\partial m_i^*(A)}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{2\theta b_i \cdot M [B_F (B_A - B_F)]}{[(1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_F) B_A + (1 - \tilde{\alpha} B_A) B_F]^2} \quad (49)$$

When $B_F > B_A$, then $\frac{\partial m_i^*(F)}{\partial \alpha} > 0$ for every $i \in F$ and $\frac{\partial m_j^*(A)}{\partial \alpha} < 0$ for every $i \in A$. In contrast, when $B_A > B_F$, then $\frac{\partial m_i^*(F)}{\partial \alpha} < 0$ for every $i \in F$ and $\frac{\partial m_j^*(A)}{\partial \alpha} > 0$ for every $i \in A$. In general, with logarithmic resource-utility, increase in affective polarization

increases total investment by the interest group towards the party that is relatively more Bonacich-cohesive.