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Representing a Social Network as a Graph

• We have some undirected graph $G = (V, E)$.

• In the synthetic setting (i.e., not a real social network), we use generative graph models:
  • $G(n, p)$ random graph model  [Erdős and Rényi ’59]
  • “ Preferential attachment ” model   [Barabási and Albert ’99]
  • “ Small world ” model   [Newman, Watts, and Strogatz ’99]

• In the theoretical setting we often focus on standard E-R graphs, but others are useful to verify our model.
Opinions in the Graph

• Each node has an opinion, which is assigned using the F-J opinion dynamics model [Friedkin-Johnsen ’91]

• Each node has an innate opinion (fixed), and an expressed opinion (updated over time).

• We set innate opinions to be either discrete or continuous:
  
  \[
  \text{discrete} \in \{-1,1\}, \quad \text{continuous} \in [-1,1]
  \]

• This graph evolves over time. At each time step, we manipulate roughly 10% of the edges in the graph using our edge dynamics model.
Graph Evolution Over Time (Edge Dynamics)

• We approximate confirmation bias by stochastically removing disagreeable edges in the graph.

  • i.e. — if edge is more disagreeable, it is more likely to be removed

• For each removed edge, we add a friend-of-friend edge — approximates the design of some recommender systems.

• Intuition: from a sociological perspective, despite differences in opinion, many connections in the real-world remain strong. We set some percentage of fixed edges, which cannot be deleted.
Notation / Definitions

• Let \( \vec{s} \) denote the *innate opinion vector*, with length \( n \) (num. of nodes).

• \( I \) is the \( n \times n \) identity matrix.

• \( L \) is the graph Laplacian, defined as \( D - A \).

• F-J opinion update, where \( \vec{z} \) denotes *expressed opinion vector*:

\[
\vec{z}(i) = \frac{\vec{s}(i) + \sum_j w_{ij} \vec{z}(j)}{1 + \sum_j w_{ij}} \quad \rightarrow \quad \vec{z} = (I + L)^{-1} \vec{s}
\]
Notation / Definitions (cont.)

• **Polarization**, where \( \vec{z} \) denotes *expressed opinion vector*:

\[
P(L, \vec{s}) = \vec{z}^T \vec{z} = \vec{s}^T (I + L)^{-2} \vec{s}
\]

• Note: this works because innate opinions are mean-0 vectors

• **Disagreement**, where \( \vec{z} \) denotes *expressed opinion vector*:

\[
D(L, \vec{s}) = \sum_{i,j} w_{i,j} \cdot (\vec{z}(i) - \vec{z}(j))^2 = \vec{z}^T L \vec{z} = \vec{s}^T (I + L)^{-1} L (I + L)^{-1} \vec{s}
\]
“Standard” Experimental Setup

• Start by presenting the setup and results for a “benchmark” edge dynamics experiment:
  • Erdős–Rényi random graph with $n = 1000$
  • Fixed Edge percentage $p_f \in [0\%, 5\%, 10\%, 15\%, 25\%]$
  • 500 “time steps” (iterations) of edge dynamics
  • Connection probability $p = 25/n$
  • friend-of-friend recommendations
  • “Confirmation bias” disagreeable edge deletion
  • Continuous innate opinions assigned to each node on [-1,1]
  • 10% of edges removed/addition each time step.
Characteristic Results

\[ P(L, \vec{s}) = \vec{z}^T \vec{z} = \vec{s}^T (I + L)^{-2} \vec{s} \]

\[ D(L, \vec{s}) = \vec{z}^T L \vec{z} \]

Polarization over time for standard experiment

Disagreement over time for standard experiment
Visual / Intuitive Understanding

• We show the evolution of the standard experiment using NetworkX visualization tools.

• The color of each node is set according to its *expressed* opinion from the F-J equilibrium
  • $[-1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1]$ maps to [blue ... white ... red]

• Edges are thin black lines that connect nodes. Nodes are clustered near neighboring nodes.

• Show for both 0% fixed edges and 10% fixed edges.
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Theoretical Analysis through Stochastic Block Model

• We view the underlying network as a Stochastic Block Model graph with two blocks, where each block holds a different innate opinion.

• SBM allows us to specify two separate connection probabilities, $p$ and $q$.

• Ties in with the classic problems of community detection and spectral clustering.

Abbe, “Community Detection and Stochastic Block Models”, JMLR 2018
We analyze the Laplacian \( \bar{L}_G = \mathbb{E} [L_G] \) of an SBM graph in expectation.

Then \( \bar{L}_G \) takes the following form, where \( p \) is the in-group connection probability, and \( q \) is the out-group connection probability.

Next, consider the discrete innate opinion vector \( \vec{s} \), with length \( n \).

- \( \vec{s} \) is the second eigenvector of \( \bar{L}_G \):

\[
\vec{s} = [1, \ldots, 1, -1, \ldots, -1]
\]
Expected SBM Laplacian w/ Fixed Edges

• For uniform fixed edges, set $\gamma$, which is some small connection probability independent of $p$ and $q$.

• We analyze the expected Laplacian $\hat{L}_G = \mathbb{E} \left[ L_G + L_F \right]$ of an SBM graph with probabilities $(p + \gamma)$ and $(q + \gamma)$.

• Note that if $\gamma > 0$, neither of the above quantities can equal 0…

$$\hat{s} = [1, \ldots, 1, -1, \ldots, -1]$$
Deriving P(L) and D(L) using $\bar{L}_G$

\[
\lambda_{n-1}(\bar{L}_G) = \frac{n(p + q)}{2} - \frac{n(p - q)}{2} = qn
\]

\[
\lambda_2((\bar{L}_G + \mathbf{I})^{-1}) = \frac{1}{qn + 1} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \bar{v}_2 = \bar{s}
\]

\[
P(L, \bar{s}) = \frac{| | \bar{z} | |^2}{2} = \bar{s}^T(\mathbf{I} + L)^{-2}\bar{s}
\]

\[
D(L, s) = \bar{s}^T(\mathbf{I} + L)^{-1}L(\mathbf{I} + L)^{-1}\bar{s}
\]

\[
(\bar{L}_G + \mathbf{I})^{-1}\bar{s} = \frac{1}{qn + 1} \cdot \bar{s}
\]

\[
\bar{L}_G(\bar{L}_G + \mathbf{I})^{-1}\bar{s} = \frac{qn}{qn + 1} \cdot \bar{s}
\]

\[
P(\bar{L}_G, s) = \frac{1}{(qn + 1)^2} \cdot \bar{s}^T\bar{s} = \frac{n}{(qn + 1)^2}
\]

\[
D(\bar{L}_G, s) = \frac{qn}{(qn + 1)^2} \cdot \bar{s}^T\bar{s} = \frac{qn^2}{(qn + 1)^2}
\]
Checking these Derivations

- We generate SBM graphs with two blocks — discrete innate opinions $\in \{-1, 1\}$.
- We change $p$ and $q$ over time, and show that reducing $q$ appears similar to the behavior of our model.

\[
P(L_G, s) = \vec{s}^T(I + L)^{-2}\vec{s}
\]

\[
D(L_G, s) = \vec{s}^T(I + L)^{-1}L(I + L)^{-1}\vec{s}
\]

As $q$ gets smaller, polarization increases, peaking when the two groups are fully disconnected without fixed edges.

As $q$ gets smaller, disagreement spikes initially and then falls when the blocks fully disconnect without fixed edges.
Checking these Derivations

- We generate SBM graphs with two blocks — discrete innate opinions $\in \{-1,1\}$.
- We change $p$ and $q$ over time, and show that reducing $q$ appears similar to the behavior of our model.

\[
P(\hat{L}_G, \bar{s}) = \frac{n}{((q + \gamma)n + 1)^2}
\]

\[
D(\hat{L}_G, \bar{s}) = \frac{(q + \gamma)n^2}{((q + \gamma)n + 1)^2}
\]
Real-World Verification

• We have this model and understand it theoretically; we want to get some idea of how realistic it is — verify our model against real world data.

• Related works attempt to do this by quantifying graph structure, through measures such as the global clustering coefficient, degree distribution, and small world quotient.

• We explore two methods:
  • The first method leverages graph measures to show that our model creates realistic structures.
  • The second constructs a real-world graph based on temporal data, so we can analyze how it changes over time.

Twitter (Delhi 2013) Dataset
De et al., Learning Linear Influence Models in Social Networks from Transient Opinion Dynamics. 2019.
Verification through Graph Measures

• In this section, we study a real-world snapshot from Twitter, which captured interactions surrounding a 2013 Delhi election [De et al. ’19]

  • \( n = 531 \) nodes \( |E| = 3621 \) edges

• We generate a graph, which has 531 nodes, \( \sim3600 \) edges, and fixed edges in \( p_f = \{15\%, 25\%, 35\%\} \)

  • Both Erdős–Rényi and Barabási–Albert graphs

• On these generated graphs, we simulate edge dynamics with both friend-of-friend recommendations and confirmation bias edge deletion
Verification through Graph Measures — Clustering

\[
CC_{Glo} = \frac{3 \cdot \# \text{ of triangles } \in G}{\# \text{ of open & closed triads } \in G}
\]

• Different fixed edges yield different values for the global clustering coefficient — **use this value to tune** against real data.
  
  • 25% fixed edges is closest

• Next we’ll compare other measures between the steady-state snapshots and Twitter graph.

• **Twitter global clustering coefficient** $\sim 0.227$
Verification through Graph Measures — Visually

• Taking a look at the *initial generated graphs*, compared against the Twitter graph.
Verification through Graph Measures — Visually

• Looking at the *simulated steady-state graphs*, compared against the Twitter graph.

Barabási–Albert graph w/ 25% fixed edges, **AFTER** edge dynamics

Erdős–Rényi graph w/ 25% fixed edges, **AFTER** edge dynamics

Twitter (Delhi 2013) snapshot visualized
Verification through Graph Measures — Degree Distribution

• Degree distribution of the initial generated graphs, compared against the Twitter graph.

• Known that real-world networks exhibit this type of power law degree dist.  [Muchnik et al. ’13]
Verification through Graph Measures — Degree Distribution

- Degree distribution of the simulated steady-state graphs, compared against the Twitter graph.
- Interesting result — prior work [Sasahara et al. ’20] has not been able to alter the degree distribution of a network through a synthetic model.

Erdős–Rényi graph with 25% fixed edges, degree distribution after edge dynamics

Barabási–Albert graph with 25% fixed edges, degree distribution after edge dynamics
Real-World Verification through Temporal Data

- In this section, we study a data set containing U.S. Congress co-sponsorship records over time. [Benson et al. ’18, Fowler ‘06]
  - $n = 1,718$ nodes, $260,851$ temporal co-sponsorship records
- Each record represents a bill and a list of people (nodes) who co-sponsored it.
- We also recovered partisan IDs for each node, so we have “innate opinions”.
- **High-Level Intuition:** We iterate through the records, sampling from each record to *add timestamped edges*.
  - With each added edge, we delete the *oldest* edge in the graph to remove the influence of connections that have no recent activity.
  - Initially, edge deletion is disabled, so we can build up density in the graph.
Temporal Verification — Clustering & Triangles

- Both the global clustering coefficient and number of triangles rising over time.
- Vertical lines indicate the time step when edge deletion is turned on and experiment starts.

![Graph showing global clustering coefficient over time with red vertical line indicating density threshold](image1.png)

![Graph showing triangles over time with red vertical line indicating density threshold](image2.png)
Visualizing the temporal graph evolving over time

Temporal graph at $t = 0$
Temporal graph at $t = 2200$
Temporal graph at $t = 2800$
Temporal graph at $t = 3500$
Temporal Verification — Polarization & Disagreement

- Using the party IDs as innate opinions, we see polarization rising over time, and disagreement rises before falling — does looks similar to our model at surface level.
- Vertical line indicates the time step when edge deletion is turned on.
Temporal Verification — Polarization & Disagreement

• Using the party IDs as innate opinions, we see polarization rising over time, and disagreement rises before falling — does looks similar to our model at surface level.
• Vertical line indicates the time step when edge deletion is turned on.

• Quantities of polarization and disagreement mirror the size of the largest connected component.
• After edge deletion is turned on, the graph starts disconnecting around \( t = 3000 \).
• Inconclusive result, but there is evidence that nodes are being sorted into clusters.

Size of largest connected component for temporal data set. Vertical line indicates timestep where density threshold was met.
Conclusions / Future Steps

• We introduce a model of social networks that combines F-J opinion dynamics with edge dynamics; friend-of-friend recommendations and confirmation bias edge deletion.

• We think we have a fairly strong theoretical understanding of our model.
  
  • The techniques used in the theoretical study of our model could be extended further — leverage relationships to approximate different quantities, generalize to more diverse opinion settings, etc.

• Potential to extend past the simple F-J model shown here for more realistic opinion dynamics.
Conclusions / Future Steps

• Interesting preliminary results for real-world verification.

• For the snapshot method, generalization to other measures such as small world quotient, closeness centrality is something to explore further — also, fixed edges aren’t the only way that we could constrain edge dynamics.

• Initial temporal results are inconclusive, but worth further inquiry — having access to an evolving real-world network opens up a number of possibilities for further comparison.
Q & A / Discussion