

Claudia Caffo, Davide Bello, Ririko Hirase,
Emma Bergman Karlsson, Téo Thevenin

- Our group, Group 13, began our project with an **initial meeting on Zoom with the TAs, Mariyana Angelova and Bence Hamrak, on Friday, 25 October**. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the expectations for the capstone project, and we were tasked with drafting a 1-page document to present at the second Kick-off meeting. To facilitate communication, we set up a WhatsApp group, initially with Claudia Caffo and Davide Bello, and later added Ririko Hirase and Téo Thevenin. Emma Bergman Karlsson joined soon after, bringing the group to five members, completing the team.
- After the first meeting, we scheduled another **brainstorming session on Monday, 5 November**, using Teams. During this session, we discussed the **problem** we wanted to explore, focusing on the role of polarizing political content on social media. We identified how such content creates echo chambers, reinforcing users' existing beliefs and making them more extreme. This became the core problem of our research, and we began to brainstorm potential **solutions**. Some ideas that emerged included adding links to reliable sources (like Wikipedia) to political content, changing algorithms to show more balanced content, and even regulating official political pages, though we noted the latter might be controversial and difficult to implement.
- At this stage, we also started **dividing up the work for the 1-page draft**. Claudia was tasked with identifying the causes of affective polarization, while Téo and Emma worked on dividing the literature review and defining the research question. Davide and Ririko focused on including potential solutions in the document. We planned to meet again after completing our sections to review the work and ensure everything aligned.
- The **second meeting with the TAs took place on Friday, 15 November**, and this session was pivotal in **narrowing our focus**. The TAs suggested that we concentrate on **regulating political elites** through platform enforcement, as they considered this the most promising solution. They also recommended two key papers for our reading: one on affective polarization and another on how women MPs might help reduce polarization. We agreed to focus on writing a policy brief for the next stage of the project. Additionally, we were tasked with finalizing the other two documents and uploading them by the day before our next meeting.
- As we worked on the **policy paper**, **our group met two other times** to review the content. We debated the **best solution** among those proposed by Ririko, Claudia, and Téo, taking into account the feedback from the TAs and our own reflections on feasibility and effectiveness. After each revision, we sent the document to the TAs for additional feedback. The supervisor, Bence Hamrak, pointed out potential pitfalls and encouragement. Following this, we made the necessary adjustments, formatted the document on Canva for clarity and visual appeal, and began drafting the final policy report, policy brief and methodological appendix.
- Our **third meeting on Friday, 6 December**, was with the supervisors, who provided the final feedback. As a result, we planned and held another meeting with the group members to address it and submit the final official documents.