

Social Contagion

Last updated: 2025/12/02, 08:14:21 EST


Principles of Complex Systems, Vols. 1, 2, 3D, 4 Fourever, V for Vendetta

Prof. Peter Sheridan Dodds

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



Licensed under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)



These slides are brought to you by:

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
2 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version


Final size

Spreading success

Groups


References

Sealie & Lambie
Productions



These slides are also brought to you by:

Special Guest Executive Producer



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

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
3 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



Outline

The PoCSverse
Social Contagion
4 of 112

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






“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]



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

Feynman on the Social Sciences:



Background

Granovetter's model

Network version



Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References

Sheldon Cooper Feynman on the Social Sciences:



Things that spread well:

[buzzfeed.com](#) :



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

+ News ...

The PoCServe
Social Contagion
11 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



LOL + cute + fail + wtf:

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
12 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups


References

Oopsie!



BUZZFEED FELL DOWN AND WENT BOOM.

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



The whole lolcats thing:



:-p

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
13 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References




Some things really stick:

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
14 of 112


Social Contagion Models

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

References



wtf + geeky + omg:



The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
15 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



Why social contagion works so well:

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
17 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size


Spreading success

Groups

References



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



Social Contagion

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
18 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups


References



Ugg Boots



Blundstones



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 SIR_S type contagion possible

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



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

The PoCSverse
Social Contagion
21 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References


<https://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?

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
22 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success


Groups

References

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FEaCfIp9qR4?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 

Controversy:

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



Social Contagion

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
24 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References

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]



The hypodermic model of influence

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
25 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model



Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



The two step model of influence ^[19]

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
26 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model



Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



The general model of influence: the Social Wild

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
27 of 112

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

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
29 of 112

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]



“... Leogrande’s doping **sparked** a series of events ...”

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
30 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter’s model


Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



The completely unpredicted fall of Eastern Europe:



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

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
31 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size



Spreading success

Groups

References



The dismal predictive powers of editors...



The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
32 of 112

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 ***** 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

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
35 of 112

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?




Getting others to do things for you

An influential 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 proof:

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
37 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size


Spreading success

Groups

References



The Office, S7E07 



Social contagion

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
38 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References


🧱 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

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
40 of 112

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

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
41 of 112

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)**.



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, TikTok, operating systems
 -  An individual's utility increases with the adoption level among peers and the population in general



Threshold models—response functions

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
44 of 112

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.



Threshold models

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**



Threshold models

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
46 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version




Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References

Another example of critical mass model:



Threshold models

The PoCServe
Social Contagion
47 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version




Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References

Example of single stable state model:



Threshold models

The PoCServe
Social Contagion
48 of 112

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



Threshold models—Nutshell

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
49 of 112

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 .



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 $\rightarrow$ 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 models of Social Influence” [29]

Watts and Dodds, The Oxford Handbook of Analytical Sociology, 2009.



Threshold model on a network

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
52 of 112

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

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
53 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version


Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References

- 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).




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:

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



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

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



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.



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.



Cascade condition

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

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



Cascade condition


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.



Cascade condition

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
60 of 112

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:

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




Cascade condition

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

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

 β_k = probability a degree k node is vulnerable.

 P_k = probability a node has degree k .



Cascade condition


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: $\beta = 1$

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



Cascades on random networks

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
63 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References




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



System may be 'robust-yet-fragile'.



'Ignorance' facilitates spreading.



Cascade window for random networks

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
64 of 112


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

The PoCServe
Social Contagion
65 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model



Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



All-to-all versus random networks

The PoCServe
Social Contagion
66 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model






Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



Cascade window—summary

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
67 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size


Spreading success

Groups

References

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.**”



Threshold contagion on random networks

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
69 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version


Final size

Spreading success

Groups


References

-  **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]



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

● = active, $\phi = 1/3$

$t=0$



The PoCverse
Social Contagion
71 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References





Expected size of spread

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
72 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

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

References



Expected size of spread

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
73 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size


Spreading success

Groups

References

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 $\Pr(\text{node of degree } k \text{ switching on at time } t)$.
- Asynchronous updating can be handled too.



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.



Expected size of spread

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

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

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


 $\binom{k}{j} \phi_0^j (1 - \phi_0)^{k-j} = \mathbf{Pr}$ (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:

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



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 θ_t ...



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 $\theta_0 = \phi_0$.

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

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



Expected size of spread

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
79 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups


References

Iterative map for θ_t is key:

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

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

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



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

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




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.

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 .



Early adopters—degree distributions

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
84 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background
Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size


Spreading success

Groups

References



$P_{k,t}$ versus k






“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.



The multiplier effect:

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
86 of 112

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:

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
87 of 112

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

The PoCServe
Social Contagion
88 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model



Network version

Final size


Spreading success

Groups


References



 $\phi = 1/3$ for all nodes



The power of groups...



despair.com

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
90 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version


Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References

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





“Threshold Models of Social Influence”

Watts and Dodds,

The Oxford Handbook of Analytical Sociology, **34**,
475–497, 2009. ^[29]



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

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
92 of 112

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



Context distance

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
94 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model



Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



Generalized affiliation model

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
95 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model


Network version

Final size


Spreading success

Groups

References



(Blau & Schwartz, Simmel, Breiger)



Generalized affiliation model networks with triadic closure

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
96 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References



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



Cascade windows for group-based networks

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
97 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model



Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References




Multiplier effect for group-based networks:


The PoCServe
Social Contagion
98 of 112

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

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
99 of 112

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.



Social contagion

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
100 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success


Groups

References

“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

The PoCverse
Social Contagion
101 of 112

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 (fashion),
or **active** = harder to achieve (political messages; even so:
buttons and hats).
- Entities can be novel or designed to combine with others, e.g.
block another one.



What really works, for good or bad:

- ❏ Create spreadworthy/shareworthy entities (things, ideas, stories).
- ❏ True spreading happens in the social wild, away from the source (or sources).
- ❏ What spreads is always in competition with a galaxy of other entities “trying” to spread.



Shareworthiness: The best marketing is the thing itself, rewarding intrinsically and socially

The PoCVerse
Social Contagion
103 of 112

Social Contagion
Models

Background

Granovetter's model

Network version

Final size

Spreading success

Groups

References

Just Ask Anyone Who's Seen It.

THE PRINCESS BRIDE





© 1999 Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation. All Rights Reserved. PG-13: Parents Strongly Cautioned

NOW PLAYING

WESTWOOD • I.R. Express 208-4175 Daily 12:15 2:45 • 5:15 8:00 & 10:30 PM THEX	DEANSDALE FOUNTAIN VALLEY Edwards Forum Valley 714/969-1000 INWHE Edwards Woodbridge 714/521-0855 CENTURY CITY • AMC Century 14 583-6800 Daily 12:00 2:30 • 5:00 7:10 & 9:25 PM THEX	NORTHBIDGE Plaza 1 Northridge Cinema 818/993-7171 SHERMAN OAKS SDC Sherman Oak Cinema 818/561-6660 THEX THOUSAND OAKS LXA Theater 805/467-4708 UNIVERSAL CITY Cinema Square Universal City Cinema 818/256-0508 THEX
WEST HOLLYWOOD • Cineplex Sherry Center 683-7865 Daily 12:00 2:30 • 5:00 7:30 & 10:00 PM Friday Late Show 12:30 AM THEX	PASADENA Edwards Alhambra 916/261-0980 ALHAMBRA Edwards Forum Center 618/989-9632 PASADENA Pacific 1 Hoopla 618/251-7555 PASADENA LXA Northridge 618/700-1590 LONG BEACH • GERRITOS LXA 714/504-1214 LONG BEACH MARINA LXA Marina 564-6025	ST VAL SINCE BURBANK AMC Burbank 618/933-9800 CLAREMONT Pacific 1 918/243-6365 GRANDE Edwards El 714/581-9520 • Printed in DOLOBY STEREO

ACADEMY MEMBERS: Your card will
admit you and a guest to any performance



Background

Granovetter's model

Network version



Final size

Spreading success


Groups

References

How empires have fallen apart:




- [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 
- [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 




References II

- [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 ↗
- [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.




References III

- [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](#)
- [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](#)
- [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](#)




References IV

- [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](#) 



References V

- [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 ↗
- [19] E. Katz and P. F. Lazarsfeld.
[Personal Influence](#).
The Free Press, New York, 1955.



References VI

[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.

[23] T. C. Schelling.


Dynamic models of segregation.

J. Math. Sociol., 1:143–186, 1971. pdf ↗



References VII

- [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.
- [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 ↗

