Module 8 — Institutional Systems

Systems Thinking

hbar.university

Institutions as Constraint Systems

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node formalizes institutions as structured constraint systems imposed on agent behavior.

It builds on: - Information Constraints in Systems (7.5)

It prepares for: - Norms and Enforcement (8.2) - Constraint Architecture (9.1)

Institutions restrict feasible actions and shape collective dynamics.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let there be n agents.

Each agent i has:

- State $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$,
- Action space $\mathcal{A}_i$,
- Utility function $U_i : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$.

Let joint action space:

$$\mathcal{A} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{A}_i.$$

Definition (Institution)

An **institution** is a constraint mapping:

$$\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{A} \to \{0, 1\},$$

where:

$$\mathcal{I}(a) = 1$$

indicates action profile a is permitted.

Feasible action set:

$$\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a \in \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{I}(a) = 1\}.$$

Institutional Dynamics

Agent dynamics under institution:

$$\dot{x}_i = f_i(x, a), \quad a \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{I}}.$$

Institution modifies feasible trajectories by restricting admissible actions.

Assumptions and Conditions

1. Action space finite or measurable.
2. Constraint mapping well-defined.
3. Agents select actions from feasible set.
4. Institution is exogenous at this stage.

No assumption of optimality or enforcement mechanism yet.

Proof or Mathematical Development

Constraint-Induced Feasible Set Reduction

Without institution:

$$a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

With institution:

$$a \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}.$$

Thus feasible trajectory set:

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathcal{T}.$$

Institution alters reachable states.

Stability Under Constraints

Let x^* be equilibrium without institution.

If x^* requires action $a^* \notin \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{I}}$, then equilibrium infeasible.

Thus institutional constraints modify equilibrium structure.

Information Constraint Interaction

Let information flow between agents be bounded by capacity C.

Institution may enforce reporting rule:

$$a_i = g_i(\text{message}_i).$$

If message entropy:

$$H(\text{message}_i) \leq C,$$

then feasible coordination limited by communication constraint.

Thus institutions operate under information limits.

Structural Role

Institutions:

- Restrict action space.
- Modify reachable states.
- Shape equilibrium outcomes.
- Mediate coordination under information constraints.

They transform decentralized dynamics via rule imposition.

Structural Compression

Invariant

Institution = constraint:

$$\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}.$$

Mechanism

Restriction of feasible action profiles alters system trajectories.

Cross-System Echo

- Control Theory: admissible control sets.
- Economics: legal and regulatory constraints.
- Biology: regulatory gene networks.
- Networks: protocol rules limiting message exchange.

Norms and Enforcement

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node formalizes norms as equilibrium constraints sustained by enforcement mechanisms.

It builds on: - Institutions as Constraint Systems (8.1)

It prepares for: - Path Dependence (8.3) - Principal–Agent Theory (9.2)

Norms are endogenous behavioral regularities stabilized by incentives and sanctions.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let there be n agents with action spaces $\mathcal{A}_i$.

Let joint action:

$$a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Each agent has utility:

$$U_i(a) : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}.$$

Definition (Norm)

A **norm** is a strategy profile $a^* \in \mathcal{A}$ such that:

1. a^* is self-enforcing under institutional constraints,
2. Deviation triggers sanction reducing utility.

Formally, suppose deviation by agent i leads to punishment action P_i.

Norm condition:

$$U_i(a^*) \geq U_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*) - S_i(a_i'),$$

for all $a_i' \in \mathcal{A}_i$,

where:

$$S_i(a_i') \geq 0$$

is sanction imposed after deviation.

Enforcement Mechanism

Define enforcement mapping:

$$E : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $E_i(a) = S_i(a_i)$ if deviation detected.

Effective utility:

$$\tilde{U}_i(a) = U_i(a) - E_i(a).$$

Norm requires:

$$a^* \text{ is Nash equilibrium under } \tilde{U}.$$

Assumptions and Conditions

1. Agents are rational (maximize utility).
2. Sanctions are credible.
3. Deviations are observable.
4. Enforcement mapping well-defined.

No assumption of central authority; enforcement may be decentralized.

Proof or Mathematical Development

Self-Enforcement Condition

Without sanction:

$$U_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*) > U_i(a^*)$$

implies deviation profitable.

With sanction:

$$\tilde{U}_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*) = U_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*) - S_i(a_i').$$

Norm stable if:

$$S_i(a_i') \geq U_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*) - U_i(a^*).$$

Thus minimal sanction equals gain from deviation.

Repeated Interaction

In repeated setting with discount factor $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

present value of deviation:

$$U_i^{\text{dev}} = U_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*) + \delta V_i^{\text{punishment}}.$$

Norm sustainable if:

$$U_i(a^*) + \delta V_i^{\text{continuation}} \geq U_i^{\text{dev}}.$$

Higher δ increases enforceability.

Structural Role

Norms:

- Convert constraints into stable equilibria.
- Operate through incentive-compatible enforcement.
- Link institutional rules to behavioral regularities.
- Depend on observability and sanction credibility.

They are decentralized stabilization mechanisms.

Structural Compression

Invariant

Norm stable if:

$$U_i(a^*) \geq U_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*) - S_i(a_i').$$

Mechanism

Sanction offsets deviation gain.

Cross-System Echo

- Control Theory: penalty functions.
- Economics: repeated-game equilibria.
- Biology: social punishment in populations.
- Networks: protocol enforcement mechanisms.

Path Dependence

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node formalizes how historical trajectories constrain future states in institutional systems.

It builds on: - Bifurcations (2.4) - Norms and Enforcement (8.2)

It prepares for: - Collective Action (8.4) - Incentive Compatibility (9.3)

Path dependence captures history-sensitive equilibrium selection.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let state space $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

Consider a stochastic dynamical system:

$$x_{t+1} = F(x_t) + \varepsilon_t,$$

where ε_t is random perturbation.

Suppose system admits multiple stable equilibria:

$$x_1^*, \dots, x_k^*.$$

Definition (Path Dependence)

The system exhibits **path dependence** if long-run outcome depends on initial condition or realized history of shocks.

Formally, let:

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_0}\left(\lim_{t\to\infty} x_t = x_i^*\right)$$

depend nontrivially on x_0.

Equivalently:

$$\exists x_0 \neq x_0' \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathbb{P}_{x_0}(x_i^*) \neq \mathbb{P}_{x_0'}(x_i^*).$$

Assumptions and Conditions

1. Multiple attractors exist.
2. Basin of attraction boundaries nontrivial.
3. Noise term has bounded variance.
4. Transition probabilities well-defined.

If system has unique globally stable equilibrium, path dependence absent.

Proof or Mathematical Development

Deterministic Case

Consider:

$$\dot{x} = f(x),$$

with two stable equilibria x_1^*, x_2^*.

Let basin of attraction:

$$\mathcal{B}_i = \{x_0 : \lim_{t\to\infty} x(t) = x_i^*\}.$$

If:

$$\mathcal{B}_1 \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}_2 \neq \emptyset,$$

then final state depends on initial condition.

Stochastic Reinforcement Example

Let proportion $p_t \in [0,1]$ evolve as:

$$p_{t+1} = p_t + \frac{1}{t}(X_t - p_t),$$

where:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_t = 1) = p_t.$$

This is Polya urn process.

Limit:

$$p_t \to P,$$

where P is random variable distributed on [0,1].

Outcome depends on early realizations.

Thus system locks into path-specific equilibrium.

Lock-In Mechanism

Suppose payoff increases with adoption:

$$U(a) = \alpha a + \beta a^2.$$

Increasing returns ($\beta > 0$) amplify early differences.

Small historical advantage becomes permanent dominance.

Structural Role

Path dependence:

- Explains institutional lock-in.
- Links increasing returns to equilibrium multiplicity.
- Connects bifurcation theory to historical processes.
- Formalizes irreversibility in social systems.

History shapes feasible equilibrium selection.

Structural Compression

Invariant

Multiple basins of attraction:

$$\mathcal{B}_i \neq \emptyset.$$

Mechanism

Positive feedback amplifies early deviations.

Cross-System Echo

- Economics: technology lock-in.
- Biology: evolutionary contingency.
- Physics: symmetry breaking.
- Networks: adoption cascades.

Collective Action

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node formalizes coordination problems where individually rational behavior conflicts with group-optimal outcomes.

It builds on: - Norms and Enforcement (8.2) - Path Dependence (8.3)

It prepares for: - Institutional Stability (8.5) - Principal–Agent Theory (9.2)

Collective action problems arise when public goods or shared resources are involved.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let there be n agents.

Each agent chooses action:

$$a_i \in \{0, 1\},$$

where:

- $a_i = 1$: contribute,
- $a_i = 0$: do not contribute.

Let total contributions:

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i.$$

Each agent has utility:

$$U_i(a) = B(S) - ca_i,$$

where:

- $B(S)$ is benefit function, increasing in S,
- $c > 0$ is private contribution cost.

Assumptions and Conditions

1. Benefit function satisfies:
$$B'(S) > 0.$$
2. Benefits are non-excludable.
3. Each agent maximizes own utility.
4. Actions chosen simultaneously.

Proof or Mathematical Development

Individual Incentive

Agent i's marginal benefit of contributing:

$$\Delta U_i = B(S_{-i} + 1) - B(S_{-i}) - c.$$

If:

$$B(S_{-i} + 1) - B(S_{-i}) < c,$$

then contribution not individually rational.

Social Optimum

Social welfare:

$$W(a) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(a) = nB(S) - cS.$$

Marginal social benefit:

$$\Delta W = n[B(S+1) - B(S)] - c.$$

Thus social optimum may require:

$$n[B(S+1) - B(S)] > c,$$

even if:

$$B(S+1) - B(S) < c.$$

Hence:

$$\text{Individual incentive} \neq \text{Social optimum.}$$

Free-Rider Equilibrium

If for all S_{-i}:

$$B(S_{-i} + 1) - B(S_{-i}) < c,$$

then Nash equilibrium:

$$a_i = 0 \quad \forall i.$$

Public good underprovided.

Institutional Remedy

Introduce sanction s for non-contribution.

Effective utility:

$$\tilde{U}_i(a) = B(S) - ca_i - s(1 - a_i).$$

Contribution rational if:

$$B(S_{-i} + 1) - B(S_{-i}) \geq c - s.$$

Sufficiently large s induces cooperation.

Structural Role

Collective action:

- Formalizes tension between private incentives and public welfare.
- Explains need for norms and enforcement.
- Connects institutional constraints to equilibrium selection.
- Links individual rationality to systemic outcomes.

It provides formal basis for governance design.

Structural Compression

Invariant

Public good problem arises when:

$$B(S + 1) - B(S) < c \quad \text{but} \quad n[B(S + 1) - B(S)] > c.$$

Mechanism

Externalities create divergence between individual and collective marginal incentives.

Cross-System Echo

- Economics: public goods and free-riding.
- Biology: cooperative behavior in populations.
- Networks: shared infrastructure maintenance.
- Control Theory: distributed optimization under local incentives.

Institutional Stability

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node formalizes when an institution persists under strategic behavior and perturbation.

It builds on: - Norms and Enforcement (8.2) - Collective Action (8.4)

It prepares for: - Constraint Architecture (9.1)

Institutional stability characterizes whether rule systems are self-sustaining equilibria.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let:

- $\mathcal{A}$ be action space,
- $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ feasible actions under institution,
- $U_i(a)$ agent utilities.

Define effective utilities under enforcement:

$$\tilde{U}_i(a) = U_i(a) - E_i(a),$$

where $E_i(a) \geq 0$ is sanction.

Let $a^* \in \mathcal{I}$.

Definition (Institutional Stability)

Institution $\mathcal{I}$ is **stable** if:

1. a^* is Nash equilibrium under $\tilde{U}$,
2. Deviations from $\mathcal{I}$ are unprofitable,
3. Enforcement mechanism itself is incentive-compatible.

Assumptions and Conditions

1. Agents rational.
2. Sanctions credible and enforceable.
3. Enforcement agents have incentive to enforce.
4. No external authority assumed.

Stability analyzed in strategic equilibrium framework.

Proof or Mathematical Development

First-Level Stability (Compliance)

For all i and a_i':

$$\tilde{U}_i(a^*) \geq \tilde{U}_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*).$$

Expanding:

$$U_i(a^*) \geq U_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*) - S_i(a_i').$$

Second-Level Stability (Enforcement Incentives)

Let enforcement require action e_j by agent j.

If enforcing imposes cost c_e, and failure to enforce yields benefit b_j,

stability requires:

$$U_j^{\text{enforce}} \geq U_j^{\text{not enforce}}.$$

Thus:

$$-c_e + V_j^{\text{future}} \geq b_j.$$

Future continuation value must offset enforcement cost.

Dynamic Stability

Let institutional state variable $I_t \in \{0, 1\}$.

Transition probability:

$$\mathbb{P}(I_{t+1} = 1 \mid I_t = 1) = 1 - p_{\text{collapse}}.$$

Institution stable if:

$$p_{\text{collapse}} = 0 \quad \text{under equilibrium behavior.}$$

Structural Role

Institutional stability:

- Extends Nash equilibrium to rule systems.
- Requires enforcement incentive compatibility.
- Links micro-incentives to macro-rule persistence.
- Connects governance to dynamic equilibrium.

Institutions persist only if self-enforcing.

Structural Compression

Invariant

Institution stable if:

$$\tilde{U}_i(a^*) \geq \tilde{U}_i(a_i', a_{-i}^*) \quad \forall i.$$

Mechanism

Sanctions and continuation values offset deviation gains.

Cross-System Echo

- Economics: subgame perfect equilibrium.
- Biology: stable cooperative equilibria.
- Control Theory: feedback maintaining constraint set.
- Networks: protocol stability under strategic nodes.