

Social Contagion

Last updated: 2022/08/28, 03:24:52 EDT

Principles of Complex Systems, Vols. 1, 2, & 3D
CSYS/MATH 300, 303, & 394, 2022-2023 | @pocsvox

Prof. Peter Sheridan Dodds | @peterdodds

Computational Story Lab | Vermont Complex Systems Center
Santa Fe Institute | University of Vermont




PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion

Social Contagion
Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Licensed under the *Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License*.

These slides are brought to you by:

PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion


Sealie & Lambie
Productions



Social Contagion
Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups


References



These slides are also brought to you by:

PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion


Special Guest Executive Producer





Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



 On Instagram at [pratchett_the_cat](https://www.instagram.com/pratchett_the_cat) 



Outline

PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion

Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References

References



'The rumor spread through the city like wildfire which had quite often spread through Ankh-Morpork since its citizens had learned the words "fire insurance").'





"The Truth"  
by Terry Pratchett (2000). [22]

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References







Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References

From the Atlantic ↗






Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



From the Atlantic 



Things that spread well:

buzzfeed.com 




 Dangerously self aware: [11 Elements that make a perfect viral video.](#) 

+ News ...

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



LOL + cute + fail + wtf:

PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion

Oopsie!




BUZZFEED FELL DOWN AND WENT BOOM.

Please try reloading this page. If the problem persists [let us know](#).

Social Contagion
Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



The whole lolcats thing:


PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion



Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Some things really stick:


PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion



Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



wtf + geeky + omg:


PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion



Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Why social contagion works so well:

PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion




<http://xkcd.com/610/>

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Social Contagion


PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion



Social Contagion Models


Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




Social Contagion

Examples are claimed to abound:

-  Fashion
-  Striking
-  smoking  [7]
-  Residential segregation [23]
-  iPhones and iThings
-  obesity  [6]
-  Stupidity
-  Harry Potter
-  voting
-  gossip
-  Rubik's cube 
-  religious beliefs
-  school shootings
-  yawning 
-  **leaving lectures**


SIR and SIRS type contagion possible

-  Classes of behavior versus specific behavior :
dieting, horror movies, getting married, invading countries, ...

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Mixed messages: Please copy, but also, don't copy ...

PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion


Social Contagion Models


Background


- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TgDxWNV4wWY?rel=0>

 [Cindy Harrell appeared](#) in the (terrifying) music video for Ray Parker Jr.'s [Ghostbusters](#).

 In [Stranger Things 2](#), Steve Harrington [reveals his Fabergé secret](#).



Market much?

PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion


Social Contagion Models


Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FEaCflp9qR4?rel=0>







Advertisement enjoyed during "Herstory of Dance" , Community S4E08, April 2013.



Framingham heart study:

Evolving network stories (Christakis and Fowler):



- ☰ The spread of quitting smoking  [7]
- ☰ The spread of spreading  [6]
- ☰ Also: happiness  [11], loneliness, ...
- ☰ The book: Connected: The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives 


Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References

Controversy:

- ☰ Are your friends making you fat?  (Clive Thomson, NY Times, September 10, 2009).
- ☰ Everything is contagious —Doubts about the social plague stir in the human superorganism (Dave Johns, Slate, April 8, 2010).



Two focuses for us

- Widespread media influence
- Word-of-mouth influence


We need to understand influence

- Who influences whom? Very hard to measure...
- What kinds of influence response functions are there?
- Are some individuals super influencers?
Highly popularized by Gladwell^[12] as 'connectors'
- The infectious idea of opinion leaders (Katz and Lazarsfeld)^[19]


Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




The hypodermic model of influence




Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References




The two step model of influence [19]



Social Contagion Models


Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



The general model of influence: the Social Wild


PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion



Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Talking about the social wild:

Social Contagion Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size


Spreading success


Groups

References




Why do things spread socially?

- Because of properties of special individuals?
- Or system level properties?
- Is the match that lights the fire important?
- Yes. But only because we are storytellers:
homo narrativus 
- We like to think things happened for reasons ...
- Reasons for success are usually ascribed to intrinsic properties (examples next).
- Teleological stories of fame are often easy to generate and believe.
- System/group dynamics harder to understand because most of our stories are built around individuals.
- Always good to examine what is said before and after the fact ...



The Mona Lisa




Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References

- 🧱 “Becoming Mona Lisa: The Making of a Global Icon”—David Sassoon
- 🧱 Not the world's greatest painting from the start...
- 🧱 Escalation through theft, vandalism, **parody**, ...



'Tattooed Guy' Was Pivotal in Armstrong Case [nytimes]

PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion




Social Contagion
Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References

 "... Leogrande's doping sparked a series of events
..."



The completely unpredicted fall of Eastern Europe:


PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion



Social Contagion
Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References





Timunr Kuran: ^[20, 21] "Now Out of Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution of 1989"



The dismal predictive powers of editors...


PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion



Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups


References




From a 2013 Believer Magazine [↗](#) interview with Maurice Sendak [↗](#):

BLVR: Did the success of Where the Wild Things Are ever feel like an albatross?

MS: It's a nice book. It's perfectly nice. I can't complain about it. I remember Herman Melville said, "When I die no one is going to mention Moby-Dick. They're all going to talk about my first book, about ****ing maidens in Tahiti." He was right. No mention of Moby-Dick then. Everyone wanted another Tahitian book, a beach book. But then he kept writing deeper and deeper and then came Moby-Dick and people hated it. The only ones who liked it were Mr. and Mrs. Nathaniel Hawthorne. Moby-Dick didn't get famous until 1930.

 Sendak named his dog Herman.

 The essential Colbert interview: [Pt. 1](#) [↗](#) and [Pt. 2](#) [↗](#).



Drafting success in the NFL:

Top Players by Round, 1995-2012



1ST ROUND
Peyton Manning
 1ST OVER ALL, 1998



2ND ROUND
Drew Brees
 32ND PICK, 2001



3RD ROUND
Terrell Owens
 89TH PICK, 1996



4TH ROUND
Jared Allen
 126TH PICK, 2004




5TH ROUND
Zach Thomas
 154TH PICK, 1996



6TH ROUND
Tom Brady
 199TH PICK, 2000



7TH ROUND
Donald Driver
 213TH PICK, 1999






Social Contagion Models

- Background**
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References




Messing with social connections

- 🧱 Ads based on message content (e.g., Google and email)
- 🧱 BzzAgent 
 - 🧱 Harnessing of BzzAgents to directly market through social ties.
 - 🧱 Generally: BzzAgents did not reveal their BzzAgent status and did not want to be paid.
 - 🧱 NYT, 2004-12-05: "The Hidden (in Plain Sight) Persuaders" 
- 🧱 One of Facebook's early advertising attempts: Beacon 
- 🧱 All of Facebook's advertising attempts.
- 🧱 Seriously, Facebook. What could go wrong?

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Getting others to do things for you

A very good book: 'Influence'^[8] by Robert Cialdini ↗


Six modes of influence:

1. **Reciprocation**: *The Old Give and Take... and Take*; e.g., Free samples, Hare Krishnas.
2. **Commitment and Consistency**: *Hobgoblins of the Mind*; e.g., Hazing.
3. **Social Proof**: *Truths Are Us*; e.g., Jonestown ↗, Kitty Genovese ↗ (contested).
4. **Liking**: *The Friendly Thief*; e.g., Separation into groups is enough to cause problems.
5. **Authority**: *Directed Deference*; e.g., Milgram's obedience to authority experiment. ↗
6. **Scarcity**: *The Rule of the Few*; e.g., Prohibition.


Social Contagion Models


Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References





Social contagion

 Cialdini's modes are heuristics that help up us get through life.

 Useful but can be leveraged...

Other acts of influence:


 Conspicuous Consumption (Veblen, 1912)


 Conspicuous Destruction (Potlatch)

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References






Some important models:

- 🧱 Tipping models—Schelling (1971) [23, 24, 25]
 - 🧱 Simulation on checker boards
 - 🧱 Idea of thresholds
 - 🧱 Polygon-themed online visualization. (Includes optional diversity-seeking proclivity.)
- 🧱 Threshold models—Granovetter (1978) [15]
- 🧱 Herding models—Bikhchandani, Hirschleifer, Welch (1992) [2, 3]
 - 🧱 Social learning theory, Informational cascades,...

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




Thresholds

- Basic idea: individuals adopt a behavior when a **certain fraction of others** have adopted
- 'Others' may be everyone in a population, an individual's close friends, any reference group.
- Response can be probabilistic or deterministic.
- Individual thresholds can vary
- Assumption: order of others' adoption does not matter... **(unrealistic)**.
- Assumption: level of influence per person is uniform **(unrealistic)**.







Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




Some possible origins of thresholds:

-  Inherent, evolution-devised inclination to coordinate, to conform, to imitate. [1]
-  **Lack of information:** impute the worth of a good or behavior based on degree of adoption (social proof)
-  Economics: **Network effects** or **network externalities**
 -  Externalities = Effects on others not directly involved in a transaction
 -  Examples: telephones, fax machine, Facebook, operating systems
 -  An individual's utility increases with the adoption level among peers and the population in general



Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




Threshold models—response functions





Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References


 Example threshold influence response functions:
deterministic and **stochastic**

 ϕ = fraction of contacts 'on' (e.g., rioting)

 Two states: S and I.



Action based on perceived behavior of others:




- Two states: S and I.
- ϕ = fraction of contacts 'on' (e.g., rioting)
- Discrete time update (strong assumption!)
- This is a **Critical mass model**



Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Another example of critical mass model:



Social Contagion Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size

Spreading success


Groups

References



Threshold models


Example of single stable state model:





Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups


References



Chaotic behavior possible [17, 16, 9, 18]




 Period doubling arises as map amplitude r is increased.

 Synchronous update assumption is crucial

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Implications for collective action theory:

1. Collective uniformity \nRightarrow individual uniformity
2. Small individual changes \Rightarrow large global changes
3. The stories/dynamics of complex systems are conceptually inaccessible for individual-centric narratives.
4. System stories live in left null space of our stories—we can't even see them.
5. But we happily impose simplistic, individual-centric stories—we can't help ourselves ↗.

Social Contagion Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



Many years after Granovetter and Soong's work:



"A simple model of global cascades on random networks"

D. J. Watts. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 2002 [27]



Mean field model → network model



Individuals now have a limited view of the world

We'll also explore:



"Seed size strongly affects cascades on random networks" [14]

Gleeson and Cahalane, Phys. Rev. E, 2007.




"Direct, physically motivated derivation of the contagion condition for spreading processes on generalized random networks" [10] Dodds, Harris, and Payne, Phys. Rev. E, 2011



"Influentials, Networks, and Public Opinion Formation" [28]

Watts and Dodds, J. Cons. Res., 2007.





Threshold model on a network


Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



 All nodes have threshold $\phi = 0.2$.




Threshold model on a network

- Interactions between individuals now represented by a network.
- Network is **sparse**.
- Individual i has k_i contacts.
- Influence on each link is **reciprocal** and of **unit weight**.
- Each individual i has a fixed threshold ϕ_i .
- Individuals repeatedly poll contacts on network.
- Synchronous, discrete time updating.
- Individual i becomes active when fraction of active contacts $\frac{a_i}{k_i} \geq \phi_i$.
- Individuals remain active when switched (no recovery = SI model).

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



First study random networks:

- Start with N nodes with a degree distribution P_k
- Nodes are randomly connected (carefully so)
- Aim: Figure out when activation will propagate
- Determine a **cascade condition**


The Cascade Condition:

- If one individual is initially activated, what is the probability that an activation will spread over a network?
- What features of a network determine whether a cascade will occur or not?


Social Contagion Models


Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups


References





Example random network structure:



 $\Omega_{crit} = \Omega_{vuln} =$
critical mass =
global
vulnerable
component

 $\Omega_{trig} =$
triggering
component


 $\Omega_{final} =$
potential
extent of
spread

 $\Omega =$ entire
network

Social Contagion
Models




Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



$$\Omega_{crit} \subset \Omega_{trig}; \Omega_{crit} \subset \Omega_{final}; \text{ and } \Omega_{trig}, \Omega_{final} \subset \Omega.$$


Follow active links

-  An active link is a link connected to an activated node.
-  If an infected link leads to **at least 1 more infected link**, then **activation spreads**.
-  We need to understand which nodes can be activated when only one of their neighbors becomes active.

Social Contagion Models


Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups


References




The most gullible


Vulnerables:


 We call individuals who can be activated by just one contact being active **vulnerables**


 The vulnerability condition for node i :

$$1/k_i \geq \phi_i$$

 Which means # contacts $k_i \leq \lfloor 1/\phi_i \rfloor$

 For global cascades on random networks, must have a *global cluster of vulnerables* ^[27]


 **Cluster of vulnerables = critical mass**

 Network story: 1 node \rightarrow critical mass \rightarrow everyone.




Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Back to following a link:

-  A randomly chosen link, traversed in a random direction, leads to a degree k node with probability $\propto kP_k$.
-  Follows from there being k ways to connect to a node with degree k .
-  Normalization:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} kP_k = \langle k \rangle$$


-  So

$$P(\text{linked node has degree } k) = \frac{kP_k}{\langle k \rangle}$$

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups


References




Next: Vulnerability of linked node

 Linked node is **vulnerable** with probability

$$\beta_k = \int_{\phi'_*=0}^{1/k} f(\phi'_*) d\phi'_*$$


 If linked node is **vulnerable**, it produces $k - 1$ new outgoing active links

 If linked node is **not vulnerable**, it produces **no** active links.


Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Putting things together:


 Expected number of active edges produced by an active edge:

$$R = \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{(k-1) \cdot \beta_k \cdot \frac{kP_k}{\langle k \rangle}}_{\text{success}} + \underbrace{0 \cdot (1 - \beta_k) \cdot \frac{kP_k}{\langle k \rangle}}_{\text{failure}} \right]$$
$$= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k-1) \cdot \beta_k \cdot \frac{kP_k}{\langle k \rangle}$$

Social Contagion Models


Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups


References



So... for random networks with fixed degree distributions, cascades take off when:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k-1) \cdot \beta_k \cdot \frac{kP_k}{\langle k \rangle} > 1.$$


 β_k = probability a degree k node is vulnerable.

 P_k = probability a node has degree k .

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Two special cases:

🧱 (1) Simple disease-like spreading succeeds: $\beta_k = \beta$

$$\beta \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k-1) \cdot \frac{kP_k}{\langle k \rangle} > 1.$$


🧱 (2) Giant component exists: $\beta = 1$

$$1 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k-1) \cdot \frac{kP_k}{\langle k \rangle} > 1.$$



Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Cascades on random networks



Cascades occur only if size of max vulnerable cluster > 0 .



System may be 'robust-yet-fragile'.




'Ignorance' facilitates spreading.


Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




Cascade window for random networks





Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References


 'Cascade window' widens as threshold ϕ decreases.

 Lower thresholds enable spreading.



Cascade window for random networks


PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion



Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References






All-to-all versus random networks

all-to-all networks




random networks



Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Cascade window—summary


For our simple model of a uniform threshold:

1. **Low $\langle k \rangle$:** No cascades in poorly connected networks.
No global clusters of any kind.
2. **High $\langle k \rangle$:** Giant component exists but not enough vulnerables.
3. **Intermediate $\langle k \rangle$:** Global cluster of vulnerables exists.
Cascades are possible in **"Cascade window."**

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




Threshold contagion on random networks

- Next: Find expected fractional size of spread.
- Not obvious even for uniform threshold problem.
- Difficulty is in figuring out if and when nodes that need ≥ 2 hits switch on.
- Problem **beautifully solved** for infinite seed case by Gleeson and Cahalane:
"Seed size strongly affects cascades on random networks," Phys. Rev. E, 2007. ^[14]
- Developed further by Gleeson in "Cascades on correlated and modular random networks," Phys. Rev. E, 2008. ^[13]

Social Contagion Models


Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




Determining expected size of spread:

- ☰ Randomly turn on a fraction ϕ_0 of nodes at time $t = 0$
- ☰ Capitalize on local branching network structure of random networks (again)
- ☰ Now think about what must happen for a specific node i to become active at time t :
 - $t = 0$: i is one of the seeds (prob = ϕ_0)
 - $t = 1$: i was not a seed but enough of i 's friends switched on at time $t = 0$ so that i 's threshold is now exceeded.
 - $t = 2$: enough of i 's friends and friends-of-friends switched on at time $t = 0$ so that i 's threshold is now exceeded.
 - $t = n$: enough nodes within n hops of i switched on at $t = 0$ and their effects have propagated to reach i .




Expected size of spread




Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size**
- Spreading success
- Groups

References




Expected size of spread



Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Expected size of spread


Notes:

- Calculations are possible if nodes do not become inactive (strong restriction).
- Not just for threshold model—works for a wide range of contagion processes.
- We can analytically determine the entire time evolution, not just the final size.
- We can in fact determine **Pr**(node of degree k switching on at time t).
- Asynchronous updating can be handled too.

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups



References



Expected size of spread

Pleasantness:


- ✦ Taking off from a single seed story is about **expansion** away from a node.
- ✦ Extent of spreading story is about **contraction** at a node.



Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Expected size of spread



Notation:

$\phi_{k,t} = \Pr$ (a degree k node is active at time t).



Notation: $B_{kj} = \Pr$ (a degree k node becomes active if j neighbors are active).



Our starting point: $\phi_{k,0} = \phi_0$.



$\binom{k}{j} \phi_0^j (1 - \phi_0)^{k-j} = \Pr$ (j of a degree k node's neighbors were seeded at time $t = 0$).



Probability a degree k node was a seed at $t = 0$ is ϕ_0 (as above).




Probability a degree k node was not a seed at $t = 0$ is $(1 - \phi_0)$.



Combining everything, we have:

$$\phi_{k,1} = \phi_0 + (1 - \phi_0) \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \phi_0^j (1 - \phi_0)^{k-j} B_{kj}.$$



For general t , we need to know the probability an edge coming into a degree k node at time t is active.

Notation: call this probability θ_t .

We already know $\theta_0 = \phi_0$.

Story analogous to $t = 1$ case. For node i :

$$\phi_{i,t+1} = \phi_0 + (1 - \phi_0) \sum_{j=0}^{k_i} \binom{k_i}{j} \theta_t^j (1 - \theta_t)^{k_i - j} B_{k_i j}.$$

Average over all nodes to obtain expression for ϕ_{t+1} :


$$\phi_{t+1} = \phi_0 + (1 - \phi_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_k \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \theta_t^j (1 - \theta_t)^{k-j} B_{kj}.$$

So we need to compute θ_t ... massive excitement...

Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size**
- Spreading success
- Groups

References





Expected size of spread


First connect θ_0 to θ_1 :


 $\theta_1 = \phi_0 +$

$$(1 - \phi_0) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k P_k}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{j} \theta_0^j (1 - \theta_0)^{k-1-j} B_{kj}$$

 $\frac{k P_k}{\langle k \rangle} = R_k = \mathbf{Pr}$ (edge connects to a degree k node).

 $\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}$ piece gives \mathbf{Pr} (degree node k activates) of its neighbors $k - 1$ incoming neighbors are active.


 ϕ_0 and $(1 - \phi_0)$ terms account for state of node at time $t = 0$.

 See this all generalizes to give θ_{t+1} in terms of $\theta_t \dots$

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size**
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Expected size of spread

Two pieces: edges first, and then nodes

$$1. \theta_{t+1} = \underbrace{\phi_0}_{\text{exogenous}}$$

$$+(1 - \phi_0) \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k P_k}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{j} \theta_t^j (1 - \theta_t)^{k-1-j} B_{kj}}_{\text{social effects}}$$

with $\theta_0 = \phi_0$.


$$2. \phi_{t+1} =$$

$$\underbrace{\phi_0}_{\text{exogenous}} + (1 - \phi_0) \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_k \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \theta_t^j (1 - \theta_t)^{k-j} B_{kj}}_{\text{social effects}}$$

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Expected size of spread

Iterative map for θ_t is key:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \underbrace{\phi_0}_{\text{exogenous}}$$


$$+(1 - \phi_0) \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k P_k}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{j} \theta_t^j (1 - \theta_t)^{k-1-j} B_{kj}}_{\text{social effects}}$$

$$= G(\theta_t; \phi_0)$$

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size**
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Expected size of spread:

- Retrieve cascade condition for spreading from a single seed in limit $\phi_0 \rightarrow 0$.
- Depends on map $\theta_{t+1} = G(\theta_t; \phi_0)$.
- First: if self-starters are present, some activation is assured:

$$G(0; \phi_0) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{kP_k}{\langle k \rangle} \bullet B_{k0} > 0.$$

meaning $B_{k0} > 0$ for at least one value of $k \geq 1$.


- If $\theta = 0$ is a fixed point of G (i.e., $G(0; \phi_0) = 0$) then spreading occurs if

$$G'(0; \phi_0) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{kP_k}{\langle k \rangle} \bullet (k-1) \bullet B_{k1} > 1.$$

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



Expected size of spread:

In words:

- 🧱 If $G(0; \phi_0) > 0$, spreading must occur because some nodes turn on for free.
- 🧱 If G has an **unstable fixed point** at $\theta = 0$, then cascades are also always possible.


Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups


References


Non-vanishing seed case:


- 🧱 Cascade condition is more complicated for $\phi_0 > 0$.
- 🧱 If G has a **stable fixed point** at $\theta = 0$, and an **unstable fixed point** for some $0 < \theta_* < 1$, then for $\theta_0 > \theta_*$, spreading takes off.
- 🧱 Tricky point: G depends on ϕ_0 , so as we change ϕ_0 , we also change G .
- 🧱 A version of a critical mass model again.





General fixed point story:



 Given $\theta_0 (= \phi_0)$, θ_∞ will be the nearest stable fixed point, either above or below.

 n.b., adjacent fixed points must have opposite stability types.


 **Important:** Actual form of G depends on ϕ_0 .

 So choice of ϕ_0 dictates both G and starting point—can't start anywhere for a given G .

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size**
- Spreading success
- Groups

References




Early adopters—degree distributions

Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



$P_{k,t}$ versus k





Unpublished?





"Influentials, Networks, and Public Opinion Formation"


Watts and Dodds,
J. Consum. Res., **34**, 441–458, 2007. [28]

-  Exploration of threshold model of social contagion on various networks.
-  "Influentials" are limited in power.
-  Connected groups of weakly influential-vulnerable" individuals are key.
-  Average individuals can have more power than well connected ones.


Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



The multiplier effect:




Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References

- Fairly uniform levels of individual influence.
- Multiplier effect is mostly below 1.



The multiplier effect:




Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups



References




Skewed influence distribution example.



Special subnetworks can act as triggers




 $\phi = 1/3$ for all nodes

Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References



The power of groups...

PoCS
@pocsvox
Social Contagion



TEAMWORK

A FEW HARMLESS FLAKES WORKING TOGETHER CAN
UNLEASH AN AVALANCHE OF DESTRUCTION.


www.despair.com

“A few harmless flakes working together can unleash an avalanche of destruction.”

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References






“Threshold Models of Social Influence” ↗
Watts and Dodds,
The Oxford Handbook of Analytical
Sociology, **34**, 475–497, 2009. [29]

Social Contagion
Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References

- Assumption of sparse interactions is good
- Degree distribution is (generally) key to a network's function
- Still, random networks don't represent all networks
- Major element missing: **group structure**




Group structure—Ramified random networks


Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups



References



p = intergroup connection probability
 q = intragroup connection probability.




Bipartite networks




Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References




Context distance




Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References




Generalized affiliation model



(Blau & Schwartz, Simmel, Breiger)

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups
- References



Generalized affiliation model networks with triadic closure



Connect nodes with probability $\propto e^{-\alpha d}$

where

α = homophily parameter

and

d = distance between nodes (height of lowest common ancestor)



τ_1 = intergroup probability of friend-of-friend connection




τ_2 = intragroup probability of friend-of-friend connection

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References





Cascade windows for group-based networks


Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




Multiplier effect for group-based networks:




Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References

 Multiplier almost always below 1.




Assortativity in group-based networks





Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References

 The most connected nodes aren't always the most 'influential.'

 **Degree assortativity** is the reason.



“Without followers, evil cannot spread.” –Leonard Nimoy


Summary

- 🧱 **'Influential vulnerables'** are key to spread.
- 🧱 Early adopters are mostly vulnerables.
- 🧱 Vulnerable nodes important but not necessary.
- 🧱 Groups may greatly facilitate spread.
- 🧱 Seems that cascade condition is a global one.
- 🧱 Most extreme/unexpected cascades occur in highly connected networks
- 🧱 'Influentials' are posterior constructs.
- 🧱 Many potential influentials exist.

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References



Implications


- Focus on **the influential vulnerables**.
- Create entities that can be transmitted successfully through many individuals rather than broadcast from one 'influential.'
- Only **simple ideas** can spread by word-of-mouth.
(Idea of opinion leaders spreads well...)
- Want enough individuals who will adopt and display.
- Displaying can be **passive** = free (yo-yo's, fashion), or **active** = harder to achieve (political messages).
- Entities can be novel or designed to combine with others, e.g. block another one.


Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success

Groups

References







- [1] A. Bentley, M. Earls, and M. J. O'Brien.
I'll Have What She's Having: Mapping Social Behavior.
MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2011.
- [2] S. Bikhchandani, D. Hirshleifer, and I. Welch.
A theory of fads, fashion, custom, and cultural change as informational cascades.
J. Polit. Econ., 100:992–1026, 1992.
- [3] S. Bikhchandani, D. Hirshleifer, and I. Welch.
Learning from the behavior of others:
Conformity, fads, and informational cascades.
J. Econ. Perspect., 12(3):151–170, 1998. pdf 

Social Contagion
Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References






- [4] J. M. Carlson and J. Doyle.
Highly optimized tolerance: A mechanism for power laws in designed systems.
[Phys. Rev. E, 60\(2\):1412–1427, 1999. pdf](#) 
- [5] J. M. Carlson and J. Doyle.
Highly optimized tolerance: Robustness and design in complex systems.
[Phys. Rev. Lett., 84\(11\):2529–2532, 2000. pdf](#) 
- [6] N. A. Christakis and J. H. Fowler.
The spread of obesity in a large social network over 32 years.
[New England Journal of Medicine, 357:370–379, 2007. pdf](#) 

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




- [7] N. A. Christakis and J. H. Fowler.
The collective dynamics of smoking in a large
social network.
[New England Journal of Medicine, 358:2249–2258,
2008. pdf](#) 
- [8] R. B. Cialdini.
[Influence: Science and Practice.](#)
Allyn and Bacon, Boston, MA, 4th edition, 2000.
- [9] P. S. Dodds, K. D. Harris, and C. M. Danforth.
Limited Imitation Contagion on random networks:
Chaos, universality, and unpredictability.
[Phys. Rev. Lett., 110:158701, 2013. pdf](#) 

Social Contagion
Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

[References](#)



References IV

[10] P. S. Dodds, K. D. Harris, and J. L. Payne.
Direct, physically motivated derivation of the
contagion condition for spreading processes on
generalized random networks.
[Phys. Rev. E, 83:056122, 2011. pdf](#)


Social Contagion
Models




Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References

[11] J. H. Fowler and N. A. Christakis.
Dynamic spread of happiness in a large social
network: longitudinal analysis over 20 years in
the Framingham Heart Study.
[BMJ, 337:article #2338, 2008. pdf](#)

[12] M. Gladwell.
The Tipping Point.
Little, Brown and Company, New York, 2000.




- [13] J. P. Gleeson.
Cascades on correlated and modular random networks.
[Phys. Rev. E, 77:046117, 2008. pdf](#) 
- [14] J. P. Gleeson and D. J. Cahalane.
Seed size strongly affects cascades on random networks.
[Phys. Rev. E, 75:056103, 2007. pdf](#) 
- [15] M. Granovetter.
Threshold models of collective behavior.
[Am. J. Sociol., 83\(6\):1420–1443, 1978. pdf](#) 

Social Contagion Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

References




- [16] M. Granovetter and R. Soong.
Threshold models of diversity: Chinese restaurants, residential segregation, and the spiral of silence.
[Sociological Methodology, 18:69–104, 1988. pdf](#)
- [17] M. S. Granovetter and R. Soong.
Threshold models of interpersonal effects in consumer demand.
[J. Econ. Behav. Organ., 7:83–99, 1986. pdf](#)
- [18] K. D. Harris, C. M. Danforth, and P. S. Dodds.
Dynamical influence processes on networks: General theory and applications to social contagion.
[Phys. Rev. E, 88:022816, 2013. pdf](#)

Social Contagion Models


- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References





References VII

- [19] E. Katz and P. F. Lazarsfeld.
Personal Influence.
The Free Press, New York, 1955.
- [20] T. Kuran.
Now out of never: The element of surprise in the
east european revolution of 1989.
World Politics, 44:7-48, 1991. pdf ↗
- [21] T. Kuran.
Private Truths, Public Lies: The Social
Consequences of Preference Falsification.
Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, Reprint
edition, 1997.
- [22] T. Pratchett.
The Truth.
HarperCollins, 2000.




References VIII

- [23] T. C. Schelling.
Dynamic models of segregation.
[J. Math. Sociol.](#), 1:143–186, 1971. [pdf](#) 
- [24] T. C. Schelling.
Hockey helmets, concealed weapons, and
daylight saving: A study of binary choices with
externalities.
[J. Conflict Resolut.](#), 17:381–428, 1973. [pdf](#) 
- [25] T. C. Schelling.
[Micromotives and Macrobehavior.](#)
Norton, New York, 1978.
- [26] D. Sornette.
[Critical Phenomena in Natural Sciences.](#)
Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1st edition, 2003.

Social Contagion
Models

Background
Granovetter's model
Network version
Final size
Spreading success
Groups

[References](#)



References IX

[27] D. J. Watts.

A simple model of global cascades on random networks.

[Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 99\(9\):5766–5771, 2002.](#)

[pdf](#) 

[28] D. J. Watts and P. S. Dodds.


Influentials, networks, and public opinion formation.

[Journal of Consumer Research, 34:441–458, 2007.](#)

[pdf](#) 

[29] D. J. Watts and P. S. Dodds.


Threshold models of social influence.

In P. Hedström and P. Bearman, editors, [The Oxford Handbook of Analytical Sociology](#), chapter 20, pages 475–497. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2009. [pdf](#) 

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

[References](#)



References X

PoCS
@pocsvox

Social Contagion

Social Contagion Models

- Background
- Granovetter's model
- Network version
- Final size
- Spreading success
- Groups

References

