

Human group formation in online guilds and offline gangs driven by common team dynamic

Neil F. Johnson^{1*}, Chen Xu^{2,3}, Zhenyuan Zhao¹,

Nicolas Ducheneaut⁴, Nicholas Yee⁴, George Tita⁵, Pak Ming Hui³

¹Physics Department, University of Miami, FL 33126, U.S.A.

²Department of Physics, Suzhou University, Suzhou 215006, People's Republic of China

³Department of Physics, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong, Kong, China

⁴Palo Alto Research Center, Palo Alto, CA 94304, U.S.A.

⁵Department of Criminology, Law and Society,
University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, U.S.A.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed; E-mail: njohnson@physics.miami.edu

Quantifying human group dynamics represents a unique challenge. Unlike animals and other biological systems, humans form groups in both real (offline) and virtual (online) spaces – from potentially dangerous street gangs populated mostly by disaffected male youths, through to the massive global guilds in online role-playing games for which membership currently exceeds tens of millions of people from all possible backgrounds, age-groups and genders. We have compiled and analyzed data for these two seemingly unrelated offline and online human activities, and have uncovered an unexpected quantitative link between them. Although their overall dynamics differ visibly, we find that a common team-based model can accurately reproduce the quantitative features of each simply by adjusting the average tolerance level and attribute range for each population. By contrast, we find no evidence to support a homophilic version of the model, nor does conventional time-aggregated network analysis help unravel the dynamics.

In this paper, we uncover a quantitative link between two high profile, yet seemingly unrelated, human activities: street gangs in the offline, real world [1, 2, 3] and Internet guilds in virtual online worlds within massively multiplayer online games [4, 5, 6]. In particular,




FIG. 1: Internet guilds and street gangs. A: Empirical data from World of Warcraft on all servers. B: Cumulative distribution differs significantly from a power-law. Inset shows the averaged churn of the guilds. C: Cumulative distribution for Long Beach (i.e. ‘LA’) gangs. Inset shows the underlying discrete distribution. D: Time-aggregated social networks obtained using the team mechanism of Fig. 2. Left-hand panel corresponds to the network obtained around a given individual i , with colors denoting the network link weight and parentheses denoting $(p_i, \Delta p_i)$. The link weights vary in a complex way which is practically impossible to interpret using standard network analysis. Right-hand panel is the global network for all agents. No clear community structure emerges, despite the known robustness of several large groups.

we find that the evolution of gang-like groups in the real and virtual world can be explained using the same team-based group formation mechanism. The datasets that we analyze, and for which we provide a common microscopic group dynamic model, have been compiled by us




FIG. 2: Our generic model of group dynamics. A: The basic model setup, without yet specifying the criterion that an agent uses when seeking to join or leave a group. Two possible extremes are the team-formation model shown in Fig. 2B, where an agent seeks a group with a suitable niche in p -space, and the kinship model (not shown) where an agent seeks a group having members with a similar p -value.

over many years, and are believed to be state-of-the-art for each respective system. In contrast to the quantitative success of our team-based model, we find that a homophilic version of the model fails – moreover, conventional time-aggregated network analysis is unable to disentangle the dynamics. Interestingly, each server’s Internet Protocol (IP) address seems to play an equivalent role to a gang ethnicity. Given the current public concern regarding the social consequences of intensive Internet game-playing, and separately the current rise in street gangs [1, 2, 3], we hope that the present findings help contribute to the debate by setting these systems on a common footing.

I. BACKGROUND

Quantifying human group dynamics is a fundamental challenge [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. In particular, humans form a plethora of important group types in both real and virtual spaces. Massively multiplayer online games typically allow individuals to spontaneously form, join or leave a formal group called a guild [4, 5]. The design of the game encourages players to form such groups by making the most rewarding quests (i.e. missions) too difficult to accomplish alone. Millions of people worldwide log on to the world’s largest online game (World of Warcraft (WoW)) for the equivalent of several days every week. Indeed, online games are one of the largest collective human activities on the planet and hence of interest from the perspectives of global commerce [6], security [18] and even epidemiology [19]. A seemingly unrelated social phenomenon which is also of great concern, is urban gangs. Urban gangs have been gaining in popularity among young people both nationally and internationally [1, 2, 3]. There are obvious differences in the settings and history of online guilds and offline gangs, however the empirical datasets that we have compiled enable us to perform a unique comparative study of their respective grouping dynamics [3, 4, 5].

Studies of the formation and evolution of groups have long occupied a central position within the sociological and organizational theory literatures, particularly in terms of understanding how individual level characteristics (e.g., demographics, skill sets) shape group dynamics [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. Proponents of homophily tend to argue that individuals choose to participate in groups that minimize within-group heterogeneity, since sameness facilitates communication and reduces potential




FIG. 3: Empirical data and model comparison. A: World of Warcraft. B: LA gangs. Empirical data are dark blue, and the team-formation model from Fig. 2B is in red. The kinship model (light blue) produces a poor fit in both cases.

conflict [10, 25, 26, 27, 28]. With respect to stability, previous research has suggested that members of groups that are most unlike the other members of the group are also more likely to exit the group [29]. By contrast, some researchers suggested that rather than minimize diversity among members, members might instead join groups that maximize the diversity of skills in the group [30, 31] since a wider skill set might be more efficient in meeting particular goals [16, 30, 31]. Our findings provide quantitative evidence of such a team-based philosophy in the novel areas of online guilds and offline gangs. These findings are based on a combination of a simple, yet realistic, group formation model, and extensive empirical datasets for online WoW guilds [4, 5] and urban street gangs in Long Beach, California [3] which members of our team have separately compiled over the past few years through a combination of field-work and data collection (see Supporting Information (SI) for details and dataset documentation).

II. RESULTS

Figure 1A shows the online guild size distribution, extracted from our WoW dataset. There are 76686 agents involved in a total of 3992 guilds spread across three servers: S1, S2, and S3. All three servers are based in the US and were selected at random, with the servers' identities anonymized to preserve players' privacy. The vertical axis $N(s)$ is the number of guilds of size s . Data is shown using October 2005 as a representative month, however other months show similar behavior as demonstrated in the SI. Interestingly, the distribution is neither a Gaussian nor a power-law. Figure 1B confirms that if we were to insist on power-law behavior, the supposedly constant slope in $N(s' > s)$ would vary unacceptably. The inset in Fig. 1B shows the averaged churn $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$ versus the guild size s , where $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$ describes the monthly guild dynamics as follows: The membership of a guild is recorded at the beginning and end of each month, with the churn being the number of players who were members at the beginning of the month but who then left during that month. For guilds which have the same size at the beginning of the month, we then average over the churn values and call this averaged quantity $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$. We have checked across different months, and have also looked at different measures, in order to convince ourselves that the data in Fig. 1 are typical of the WoW data. Figure 1C shows our empirical data for the 5214 members of street gangs in Long Beach, California just outside of Los Angeles. The data

are shown for June 2005, but again other months show similar behavior. For convenience, we label these as ‘LA gangs’. All gangs are included irrespective of their ethnicity (e.g. Latino). The number of real gangs is much smaller than the number of guilds in WoW. $N(s' > s)$ for gangs is not smooth – nor is it a power-law with a well-defined slope, as shown explicitly in Fig. 1C.

Many previous small-group investigations have been based around networks with time-aggregated links, where the weight of each link reflects the fraction of time that two agents find themselves in the same group. Figure 1D shows the corresponding theoretical networks generated by time-aggregating the intra-group links experienced by a given individual (left-hand panel, individual networks) and between all individuals (right-hand panel, global network). This conventional time-aggregated network analysis completely masks the underlying grouping mechanisms by yielding (i) individual networks which are highly heterogeneous (see left-hand panel), and (ii) a global network which has high interconnectivity but fails to yield clear community structure (see right-hand panel) even when colors are used to represent link weights and even though our model shows that certain groups are quite robust. Details are given in the SI.

Figure 2A shows our generic model of self-organized group formation which acts as the starting point for implementing specific rule-sets for joining and leaving a group – for example, team-formation (see Fig. 2B) or homophilic kinship. Our generic model (Fig. 2A) creates a heterogeneous population by assigning an attribute p_i to each person (i.e. agent) i . Since people may have a range of attributes, we assign each agent a spread Δp_i around p_i . With the goal of building a minimal model, we choose each p_i to be a single number chosen randomly from a uniform distribution between zero and one, and the Δp_i ’s to be random numbers drawn from a single-peaked distribution with mean $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle$ and spread (i.e. standard deviation) $\sigma_{\Delta p}$. The Δp_i values are shown in Fig. 2 as horizontal bars around the corresponding color-coded p_i value. We then assign a tolerance to every agent – for simplicity, we choose the same value τ for each agent. The tree on the right-hand side of Fig. 2A applies to both team-formation and kinship versions. In the team-formation version, the group contains agents with complementary attributes (i.e. a team) while in the kinship version a group contains agents with similar attributes (i.e. like with like). Figure 2B describes what happens in one timestep in the team-formation implementation of Fig. 2A.

The top left panel of Fig. 3A shows that excellent agreement is obtained across the

entire range of observed group sizes, between the empirical WoW guild data from Fig. 1B (dark blue) and the team-formation model of Fig. 2 (red). Throughout this paper, the model(s) is implemented with the observed number of agents. Here $\tau = 0.69$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.16$ and $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.022$, but we stress that good agreement can be obtained across a reasonably wide range of parameter choices. The remaining panels in Fig. 3A show the data separated by server. To calculate $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$ in the model, we record the membership for each guild in a run during 0.7 Monte Carlo timesteps (after a transient of 1000 Monte Carlo steps). A Monte Carlo time step is the duration over which each agent has, on average, been chosen once for carrying out the dynamics in the model, i.e. each agent has been given a chance to join or leave a group. The parameter values used are within 10% of those quoted above. A similar process is followed for the LA gangs in Fig. 3B. The SI presents the LA gang data by ethnicity. In an analogous way to the breakdown by computer server in Fig. 3A, the fit by gang ethnicity is good even though the numbers are much smaller than WoW and hence more prone to noise. This surprising connection between ethnicity and server is consistent with the fact that it is essentially impossible to change one's real-world ethnicity or virtual-world server (unless a large fee is paid to WoW in the latter case, and even then it is an irreversible process). It is also intriguing that the best-fit model parameter values are so similar across WoW servers, and across gang ethnicities. This suggests a quasi-universal behavior in terms of the *way* in which people form gang-like groups online and offline. The small observed server-dependences (and ethnicity-dependences) can be explained by players on different servers (and gang members of different ethnicities) perceiving their environments differently, and hence adopting slightly different tolerances.

Our minimal team-formation model of Fig. 2B manages to capture all the features of the empirical gang and guild dynamics, including the approximately linear increase of the averaged churn with guild size in WoW. By contrast, the kinship (i.e. homophilic) version of the model does *not* reproduce the empirical results of either WoW or the gangs, even qualitatively, as demonstrated by the light blue curves in Fig. 3.

III. DISCUSSION

Our results show that irrespective of their respective settings and origins, the observed dynamics in two very distinct forms of human activity – one offline activity which is widely

considered as a public threat, and one online activity which is by contrast considered as relatively harmless – can be reproduced using the same, simple model of individuals seeking groups with complementary attributes (i.e. they want to form a team) as opposed to seeking groups with similar attributes (i.e. homophilic kinship). Just as different ethnicities may have different types of gangs in the same city in terms of their number, size, and stability, the same holds for the different computer servers on which online players play a given game. Our quantitative results provide a novel addition to the group formation debate by being (i) able to reproduce the quantitative features of both the dynamical and time-averaged behavior observed in the empirical datasets, (ii) plausible in terms of the individual-based rules that are used to describe group membership, (iii) robust in terms of its insensitivity to small perturbations in the model’s specification and parameter values, (iv) minimal in terms of the number of free parameters in the model, and (v) able to provide a deeper understanding of what mechanistic rules drive people to join and leave such groups in offline and online situations.

This close relationship between gangs and guilds might be less surprising if it were true that both are populated by a similar sector of society. However this is not the case. Online games are played equally by men and women across all age groups, locations and backgrounds [4, 5, 6] while gangs are mostly populated by teenage urban males from particular backgrounds [1]. Instead, we believe that our results demonstrate a commonality in the *way* in which humans form such offline and online groups. Interestingly this echoes recent claims by international law enforcement agencies concerning the hybrid nature of transnational gangs (‘maras’), crime organizations, insurgencies and terrorist groups, whose interactions and activities are now beginning to blur the boundaries between real and virtual spaces [1].

-
- [1] US Justice Department Report: *Hybrid and Other Modern Gangs*, Juvenile Justice Bulletin, December 2001.
 - [2] <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/7328967.stm>
 - [3] Tita, G. in *The Atlas of Crime*, eds. Hendrix, E.H., Dent, B. and Turnbull, L.S. (Oryx Press, Phoenix, 2000).
 - [4] Ducheneaut, N., Yee, N., Nickell, E., and Moore, R.J. (2006) Building an MMO with mass

- appeal: a look at gameplay in World of Warcraft *Games and Culture* **1**, 281-317
- [5] Williams, D., Ducheneaut, N., Li, X., Zhang, Y., Yee, N. and Nickell, E. (2006) From tree house to barracks: The social life of guilds in World of Warcraft *Games and Culture* **1**, 338-361
- [6] International Business Machines study: *Gaming as a Metaphor For 21st Century Leadership*, available at www.ibm.com/gio (2007)
- [7] Mesterton-Gibbons, M. and Adams, E.S. (2002) The Economics of Animal Cooperation. *Science* **298**, 2146-2147 (2002)
- [8] Couzin, I.D., Krause, J., Franks, N.R. and Levin, S.A. (2005) Effective leadership and decision-making in animal groups on the move *Nature* **433**, 513-516
- [9] Gueron, S. and Levin, S. (1995) The dynamics of group formation *Mathematical Biosciences* **128**, 245-264
- [10] Durrett, R. and Levin, S. (2005) Can stable social groups be maintained by homophilous imitation alone? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* **57**, 267-286
- [11] Epstein, J.M. and Axtell, R. *Growing artificial societies: social science from the bottom up* (The Brookings Institute, Washington, 1996)
- [12] Cederman, L.E. (2003) Modeling the size of wars: from billiard balls to sandpiles. *American Political Science Review* **97**, 135-150
- [13] Gonzalez, M.C., Hidalgo, C.A. and Barabasi, A.L. (2008) Understanding individual human mobility patterns *Nature* **453**, 779-782
- [14] Guimera, R., Uzzi, B., Jarrett, S. and Nunes Amaral, L.A. (2005) Team Assembly Mechanisms Determine Collaboration Network Structure and Team Performance *Science* **308**, 697-702
- [15] Barabasi, A.L. (2005) The origin of bursts and heavy tails in humans dynamics *Nature* **435**, 207-210
- [16] Wuchty, S., Jones, B. and Uzzi, B. (2007) The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge *Science* **316**, 1036-1039
- [17] Palla, G., Barabasi, A.L. and Vicsek, T. (2007) Quantifying social group evolution *Nature* **446**, 664-667
- [18] Their, D. (2008) World of Warcraft shines light on terror tactics *Wired Magazine*, 20 March
- [19] Balicer, R.D. (2007) Modeling Infectious Diseases Dissemination Through Online Role-Playing Games *Epidemiology* **18**, 260-261
- [20] Katz, N. and Lazer, D. (2004) Network Theory and Small Groups *Small Group Research* **35**,

307-332

- [21] Gongla, P. and Rizzuto, C.R. (2001) Evolving communities of practice *IBM Systems Journal* **40**, 842-862
- [22] Kreps, D. and Wilson, R. (1982) Reputation and imperfect information. *Journal of Economic Theory* **27**, 253-279
- [23] Mayhew, B., McPherson, J. and Rotolo, T. (1995) Sex and race homogeneity in naturally occurring groups. *Social Forces* **74**, 15-52
- [24] Ruef, M., Aldrich, H.E. and Carter, N.M. (2003) The structure of founding teams. *American Sociological Review*, **68**, 195-222
- [25] Lazarsfeld, P. and Merton, R.K. *Friendship as a Social Process: A Substantive and Methodological Analysis*, in *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, eds. Berger, M., Abel, T. and Page, C.H. (New York, Van Nostrand, 1954) p. 18.
- [26] Blau, P.M. (1977) A macrosociological theory of social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, **83** 26-54
- [27] McPherson, J.M. and Smith-Lovin. L. (1987) Homophily in voluntary organizations. *American Sociological Review*, **52**, 370-385
- [28] McPherson, J.M., Smith-Lovin, L. and Cook, J. (2001) Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, **27**, 415-444
- [29] Popielarz, P. and McPherson, J.M. (1995) On the Edge or In Between. *American Journal of Sociology*, **101**, 698-720
- [30] Thibaut, J.W. and Kelley, H.H. *The Social Psychology of Groups*, (New York, Wiley, 1959)
- [31] Hinds, P.J., Carley, K.M., Krackhardt, D. and Wholey, D. (2000) Choosing work group members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **81**, 226-251

Supporting Information (SI)

IV. DATA ON WOW GUILDS AND LA GANGS

Dataset documentation will be made available from Supporting Information (SI) website. The data on WoW guilds was extracted and compiled by co-authors N. Ducheneaut and N. Yee, interacting in part with Blizzard Entertainment who were the developers of WoW. The data on gangs comes from extensive field-work by co-author G. Tita, interacting in part with Long Beach Police Department. In addition to these datasets being unique, it is to our knowledge the first time that any comparative work has been carried out on these two specific human systems.

A. Monthly WoW guild size distributions and churn

Figures 1A and 1B in the main text give the guild size distribution $N(s)$ and cumulative guild size distribution $N(s' > s)$, using October 2005 as a representative month. Overall, data were collected from three different servers, each representing a different game environment, between June 2005 and December 2005 (i.e. 7 months). The cumulative distributions for the separate servers S1, S2 and S3 are also shown in Figure 3A in the main text. To demonstrate that the form of the distribution in October is typical of the WoW data, we also analyzed the data for all the remaining months. For each month, we repeat the same exercise of counting the guilds and their sizes for each server. In this SI, we show the data for several additional months (i.e. June, August and December 2005) as well as October 2005. The empirical data shows that the number of players in each month was 80183 (June), 93127 (August), 76686 (October), and 93322 (December). Figure S4 shows $N(s)$ and $N(s' > s)$ for these four months. The distributions for different months behave in a similar way. The results indicate that the guild size distribution measured at any time during the data collection process, represents a general property of the game during the entire data collection window.

In the inset of Figure 1B, we showed the values of $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$ for all the guilds in the three servers (S1, S2, S3) for October 2005. Here, we supplement the data with the analysis of $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$ for June, August, and December 2005, as shown in Figure S5. The data indicate




Figure S 4: (A) WoW guild size distributions $N(s)$ for the months June, August, October, and December 2005. The total numbers of players in these months are 80183, 93127, 76686, and 93322, respectively. (B) The cumulative guild size distributions $N(s' > s)$ for each of the four months.




Figure S 5: The average churn $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$ (as defined in main text) as a function of guild size in the WoW dataset, treating the data in all three servers collectively. Data for the months June, August, October, and December 2005 are shown.

that the behavior of $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$ versus guild size is almost the same for every month. Thus, the behavior that we observe whereby $\langle \text{churn} \rangle \sim s$ is a general feature of the WoW data. We have also analyzed the data for separate servers, and the behavior is again nearly the same. Note that there are necessarily fewer datapoints for a single server, hence it is more convenient to show the results corresponding to all servers bundled together. Later in this




Figure S 6: The cumulative gang size distribution $N(s' > s)$ for LA gangs of three main ethnic groups. (A) Cumulative gang size distribution for gangs with ethnicity E1. The total membership is $N = 608$. (B) Ethnicity E2 with total membership $N = 1504$. (C) Ethnicity E3 with total membership $N = 2552$.

SI, we will compare results of $N(s)$ as obtained by our team formation model with data of separate servers.

B. Data on LA gangs: Different ethnic groups

Our dataset consists of sizes of LA gangs and the ethnicity of the gangs. The data were collected in June 2005. (Data available from SI website/author). Putting all the data together, there are a total of 5214 members altogether. The cumulative distribution $N(s' > s)$ is shown in Figure 1C in the main text. The distribution shows a similar shape as for the WoW cumulative guild size distribution.

The data also contain information on the ethnicity of the gangs. There are three main ethnic groups that one can identify. For privacy reasons, we label these groups as E1, E2, and E3, with membership 608, 1504, 2552, respectively. Figure S6 shows the cumulative gang size distributions $N(s' > s)$ for the three major ethnic groups. For each of these ethnic groups, the number of gangs is very small (around 10). For this reason, $N(s' > s)$ shows step-like behavior. Comparing with WoW data, the total number of gangs and the number of members in the LA gang data are both much smaller than the corresponding numbers in WoW. In a later section in this SI, we will compare the results for our team formation model with these data of different ethnicity groups (see Figure S8).

V. A SELF-ORGANIZED TEAM FORMATION MODEL: DETAILED DESCRIPTION

Figure 2A of the main paper presents our generic group formation setup, which is the core setup for both the team *and* kinship models. The model can be constructed without considering a particular context. It could represent players in WoW, members in gangs, employees in companies, etc. Figure 2B of the main paper shows the rules which, when added on to the framework in Fig. 2A, constitute the team-formation model. The kinship model, described later, essentially corresponds to an opposite set of add-on rules to Fig. 2B. Since we are focusing in this section on the team model, we will use the words ‘team’ and ‘group’ interchangeably in the following discussion. However we emphasize that for the portions of the following discussion concerning Fig. 2A, the word ‘team’ can be replaced by ‘group’ since the statements apply equally to the team model and the kinship model.

Parameters – Consider a population of N agents or players. The attributes of an agent i are described by a set of numbers $(p_i, \Delta p_i, \tau_i)$, where p_i describes the i th-agent’s mean attribute. Δp_i describes the i -th player’s range of attributes around p_i (or equivalently a breadth of skills around the mean skill). τ_i describes the tolerance of an agent in deciding whether to leave a group, after he compares how close his attributes are to the members of the group. In the present model, we have not included the possible evolution of attributes, although this is an interesting problem for future studies.

Initialization – Initially, each agent is randomly assigned his attribute parameter p_i , the value of which is chosen randomly from a uniform distribution between 0 and 1. The agents’ Δp_i ’s are assumed to follow a Gaussian distribution characterized by a mean $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle$ and standard deviation $\sigma_{\Delta p}$. Each agent is then assigned a value of Δp_i from this Gaussian distribution. With p_i and Δp_i , the agent i covers the attributes $p_i \pm \Delta p_i$, for attributes characterized by the range between 0 and 1. The coverage of attributes is not allowed to go below 0 or above 1. For simplicity, the values of τ_i are taken to be the same for all agents, i.e., $\tau_i = \tau$ for all agents. The total number of agents in the system N can be easily taken from the real data. Thus the model is completely characterized by four physically meaningful parameters: N , $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle$, $\sigma_{\Delta p}$ and τ .

Key Ideas and Model Implementation – In each timestep, an agent i is randomly picked. The attachment of the agent i to a group then follows the rules below.

- (a) **For a single agent joining a team** – This step is imposed when the agent i being picked is an isolated agent. In this case, another agent j is randomly picked. The agent j belongs to a team labelled J with n_J members. Note that $n_J = 1$ if j is an isolated agent. **The key idea** is that it is a two-way consideration when an agent i wants to join a team J : the agent must find a team to which his attributes could contribute, and that team must in turn find the agent’s attributes acceptable. Moreover, the agent can only see the average attributes of the team to which he is applying. In other words, when joining a team, an agent will be guided by general information about the team (i.e. the average attribute of the team) rather than detailed information about all its members. This mimics the fact that an outsider cannot be expected to be aware of all the details of a team’s members before joining, since such knowledge can generally only be gained after being a member of that team. Once inside the team, this information can then be gained either through direct access to insider knowledge, or simply through osmosis.

An agent i therefore assesses a team J of which he wants to be a member, by looking at the average attribute P_J of that team:

$$P_J = \frac{1}{n_J} \sum_{k \in J} p_k, \quad (1)$$

where the sum is over all members of team J . The agent i will find the team suitable if his attributes complement those of the existing members. Therefore, if his attributes are too close to that of the existing members of the team, he feels that he could not contribute much and he will not join the team. The condition that the agent i finds the team J acceptable can thus be modelled by $|p_i - P_J| > \Delta p_i$.

For the team J , it will consider whether to enroll agent i as a new member. As an applicant to the team J , the team will know the range of attributes that agent i could cover and then assess the potential contribution of agent i to the team. This can be measured by counting the number of existing members with attributes in the range of agent i , normalized by the team size n_J . Thus, we define $f_{i,J}$ as

$$f_{i,J} = \frac{1}{n_J} \sum_{j \in J} \theta(\Delta p_i - |p_j - p_i|), \quad (2)$$

where the sum is over all members in team J and $\theta(x)$ is the Heaviside function, i.e., $\theta(x) = 1$ for $x > 0$ and $\theta(x) = 0$ otherwise. In deciding whether to accept a

new member, we define a team's tolerance by averaging the individual tolerance of its members, i.e.,

$$\tau_J = \frac{1}{n_J} \sum_{j \in J} \tau_j. \quad (3)$$

For $\tau_j = \tau$ for all agents, $\tau_J = \tau$. Note that $f_{i,J}$ is a quantity less than unity. If $f_{i,J}$ is large, many existing members in team J have attributes that are close to that of agent i and thus the team tends not to accept agent i as a new member due to redundancy in attributes. Thus, the condition that the team J will accept agent i as a new member is $f_{i,J} < \tau_J$.

In summary, the criteria for an agent i joining a team J are: $|p_i - P_J| > \Delta p_i$ and $f_{i,J} < \tau_J$.

- (b) **For an agent leaving a group, finding a better group, or for groups merging** – This step is imposed when the agent i being picked belongs to a group labelled I with n_I ($n_I > 1$) members. The following attempts are implemented **in sequence**.
- (i) **Agent i decides whether he can tolerate the team** – After being a member of team I for a while, the agent i has the chance to explore the microscopic details (individual attributes) of the team members. **The key idea** is that if he finds that there are many members with similar attributes to his, he will leave. To decide whether he can tolerate the team, he looks at the fraction f_i of members in the team with attributes within his range of coverage, i.e.,

$$f_i = \frac{1}{n_I - 1} \sum_{k \in I(k \neq i)} \theta(\Delta p_i - |p_k - p_i|), \quad (4)$$

where the sum is over all the agents in the team I except the agent i himself. Note that $0 \leq f_i \leq 1$. If f_i is close to 1, then there are too many members with similar attributes and the agent i will have a higher tendency to leave. If $f_i > \tau_i$, the i -th agent cannot tolerate the team any more and he *leaves* the group to become an isolated agent. If this happens, the timestep ends.

- (ii) **The next key idea** is team switching. If the agent i finds that he can tolerate the team, it does not necessarily mean that he is very happy with the team. He will try to find a better (more suitable) team to join. An agent j , who belongs to a group J ,

is randomly picked. The agent i will then compare whether the current team I or the team J is more suitable for him. He intends to join team J if $|p_i - P_J| > |p_i - P_I|$. This criterion implies that the agent i finds that he can contribute more in team J than in team I . Whether team J would accept agent i as a new member is again determined by the criterion $f_{i,J} < \tau_J$, as in step (a). Thus, the criteria for agent i to switch from team I to team J successfully are $|p_i - P_J| > |p_i - P_I|$ and $f_{i,J} < \tau_J$. If there is group switching, the timestep ends. We remark that the steps (b)(i) and (ii) are similar to job hunting. If the job is too bad, then one will simply quit without finding a new job. This is reflected in (b)(i). However, even if the job is acceptable, one tries to look for a better job. In job hunting, it is a two-way process: The employer is looking for someone who can cover the weaker aspects or services in a company, and the employee is looking for a better place. This is reflected in (b)(ii).

- (iii) **The next key idea** is to allow for team mergers. If nothing actually happened in (i) and (ii), i.e., the i -th agent does not leave the team I , either because he is happy or because team switching does not work, we consider the possibility of allowing two teams to merge. Team I to which agent i belongs, merges with another team J under the criterion $|P_I - P_J| > \Delta P_I$, where $\Delta P_I = (1/n_I) \sum_{i \in I} \Delta p_i$. Similarly, team J considers merging with team I under the criterion $|P_J - P_I| > \Delta P_J$. That is to say, if $|P_I - P_J| > \max(\Delta P_I, \Delta P_J)$, then teams I and J merge to form a bigger team. Note that there are two ways to implement mergers. The team J could be the same team that the j -th agent belonged to in procedure (ii) above, or a new agent j can be picked randomly when mergers are considered. Results are nearly identical for the two ways.

To summarize, the following are the key ingredients in our team formation model. Each of them seems reasonable based on our common knowledge of how people behave in team situations:

- Teams tend to recruit members to cover a spectrum of attributes
- Agent joins a team by assessing his potential contribution to the team
- Agent joining a team only sees an average of the attributes of a team
- Team accepts new member by assessing his potential contribution

- Agent leaves a team when there are many members with similar attributes
- Agent always looks for better teams where he could contribute more
- Team tends to expand by mergers when its membership becomes stable

VI. RESULTS ON WOW GUILD SIZE DISTRIBUTION $N(s)$

In Figure 3A in the main text, we presented the results of the cumulative guild size distribution $N(s' > s)$ for the WoW data in October 2005 by treating all three servers collectively, and then for individual servers. Here we supplement these results by presenting the underlying (i.e. non-cumulative) distribution for the guild size distribution $N(s)$. Since $N(s)$ is less smooth (i.e. more noisy) than the cumulative distribution $N(s' > s)$, we are actually executing a more stringent test of the model by carrying out the team model comparison based on $N(s)$ instead of $N(s' > s)$.

From the WoW data set, we count the number of players in all the guilds in each server, and also the total number of players in all servers. In each case, we take the number of players as input for N and run our team formation model. By adjusting the parameters $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle$, $\sigma_{\Delta p}$ and τ in the model, we obtained the guild size distributions for each of the three separate servers and for the three servers collectively. Figure S7 shows the $N(s)$ for our model obtained from one run in each of these cases, together with the distribution obtained from the data. The parameters are given in the figure caption. The results from the team formation model capture the essential features in the WoW guild size distributions.

From the parameters for each of the servers, it can be seen that they are very similar but not identical. This implies that (i) the behavior of the players in different servers are not too different, but that (ii) there are slight differences indicating some kind of special characteristic of a server (game environment). We will see that similar features also appear in the LA gang data. To the extent to which the server identity mimics an ethnicity, this seems to open up some deeper sociological questions which can be explored in future research on guilds and gangs.

We now make a few comments on the model as related to the key features in real data: Step (a) that sets the criteria for an agent to join a team and a team to accept a new member is the essence of the team formation model. This is essential in getting the *shape*




Figure S 7: The WoW guild size distribution $N(s)$ in October 2005. (A) Guild size distribution treating all servers collectively. The parameters used for team formation are $N = 76686$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.160$, $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.022$, and $\tau = 0.69$. (B) Guild size distribution of server S1. The parameters used for team formation simulation are $N = 24033$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.160$, $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.020$, and $\tau = 0.67$. (C) Guild size distribution of server S2. The parameters used for team formation simulation are $N = 24477$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.160$, $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.025$, and $\tau = 0.75$. (D) Guild size distribution of server S3. The parameters used for team formation simulation are $N = 28176$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.161$, $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.020$, and $\tau = 0.70$. Each simulation result is obtained from one particular run of the team formation model. Note that the parameters for different servers are very similar.

of $N(s' > s)$. The shape of $N(s' > s)$ (and $N(s)$) is more sensitive to the parameter τ . In WoW, there is a quantity called $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$. In order to get reasonable values for $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$, a mechanism is required for agents to leave a team or to switch teams readily. Steps (b)(i) and (b)(ii) serve to provide such a mechanism. In order to get at the largest size of the guilds in real data, we need a mechanism for guilds to merge. Step (b)(iii) serves this purpose.

Comparing the WoW data and the LA gangs data, there are more data points for WoW and thus the features in the distributions are easier to extract from the data. It is therefore interesting to observe that the team formation model can also give gang size distributions that resemble the real data, even when the data set is small (see below).

We note that if we were to focus *only* on fitting the guild-size or gang-size distributions, and hence decided not to care about simultaneously fitting the churn $\langle \text{churn} \rangle$, we could construct even simpler versions of our model and yet still obtain group-size distributions similar to the real data. For example, a model with slower team switching and more static groups can be used. However, with our present team-formation model we have managed to fit these size distributions *and* account for the churn. One implication of our work is therefore that previous grouping models which have been proposed to explain time-averaged group sizes in real data *without* churn, should be re-examined once such churn data becomes available. Fitting churn as well as the group-size distribution presents a very stringent challenge which relatively few candidate models will survive. Performing studies analogous to our present one, would therefore be a very useful way of reducing the number of competing models. Likewise our own extensive experimentation leaves us in no doubt that it would be very hard to identify an alternative model to our team-formation one, in which equally high quantitative accuracy was obtained and yet the structure and/or set of microscopic rules were fundamentally different. This gives us confidence that our analysis has indeed identified a realistic group formation mechanism.

VII. LA GANGS: $N(s' > s)$ FOR DIFFERENT ETHNIC GROUPS

In Figure 3B in the main text, we showed the cumulative gang size distribution $N(s' > s)$ obtained by our team formation model, treating all the gangs collectively. In Fig. SI6, we show the empirical data for $N(s' > s)$ for gangs of a given ethnicity. There are three major ethnic groups which we show explicitly. As in WoW, we counted the number of members in each of the ethnic groups. For the three major ethnic groups E1, E2, and E3, there are 608, 1504, and 2552 members, respectively. We use these numbers as inputs to our model. We then adjust the parameter values in the model to give a distribution $N(s' > s)$ that resembles the empirical data, for each of the three cases. Figure S8 shows the results for the ethnic groups E1, E2, E3. It is very encouraging that our model manages to capture the




Figure S 8: The cumulative guild size distribution $N(s' > s)$ for LA gangs of different ethnicity. (A) $N(s' > s)$ of membership of LA gangs of ethnicity E1. The parameters used for the team formation model are $N = 608$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.150$, $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.016$, and $\tau = 0.73$. (B) $N(s' > s)$ of membership of LA gangs of ethnicity E2. The parameters used for the team formation model are $N = 1504$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.142$, $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.014$, and $\tau = 0.72$. (C) $N(s' > s)$ of membership of LA gangs of ethnicity E3. The parameters used for the team formation model are $N = 2552$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.141$, $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.016$, and $\tau = 0.72$. Each model result corresponds to one run of the team formation model simulation. Note that the parameters for different ethnic groups are very similar, as was the case for different servers in WoW.

main features of the empirical data for the LA gangs, even though the individual gang sizes and number of gangs in each ethnic group are much smaller than for the case of WoW.

Interestingly, for a given value of N for each of the ethnic groups, the resulting number of groups in our team formation model is similar to that for the empirical data. We also note that from the results of WoW and street gangs, we can see that the role of server in WoW has a direct analogy with the role of ethnicity in street gangs. Finally, we restate our main result that our team formation model reproduces the main quantitative features of the group dynamics resulting from real-world interactions (street gangs) and cyber-world interactions (guilds).

VIII. INADEQUACY OF THE ALTERNATIVE MODEL BASED ON KINSHIP

In Figure 3 in the main text (i.e. for server S1 in Figure 3A, and in Figure 3B) there are lines (in light blue) showing the results for a kinship model. The kinship model is in many ways the ‘opposite’ of the team-formation model, and was introduced by us to explore

homophily as a possible alternative group-formation mechanism. Here, we briefly discuss the mechanisms in this kinship model.

In the team formation model, the teams tend to recruit members with attributes that spread over the whole spectrum of attributes, i.e. the attributes of the agents complement each other. By contrast in the kinship model, groups form around agents with similar attributes. In short, agents tend to dislike being in a group with agents having very different attributes.

We can readily modify our team formation model in order to create a kinship formation model, as follows. Figure 2A remains the same, and so does Figure 2B in terms of its structure – however we flip the inequalities in Fig. 2B for the criteria for an agent joining a group and for a group accepting a member. A kinship model can hence be defined which is diametrically opposite to our team formation model, and yet can be discussed on the same footing. In step (a), the criteria for an agent i joining a group J are: $|p_i - P_J| \leq \Delta p_i$ and $f_{i,J} \geq \tau_J$. These imply that an agent wants to join a group with an average attribute close to his own, and a group wants to accept new members having attributes close to its existing members. In step (b)(i), an agent i cannot tolerate a group I when he finds the members are too different from him. Thus the agent leaves if $f_i < \tau_i$. In step (b)(ii), each agent is continually looking for a better group which has a more similar average attribute to him. So group switching happens if $|p_i - P_J| < |p_i - P_I|$ and $f_{i,J} \geq \tau_J$. Finally, when membership becomes stable, a group tends to expand by merging with groups having similar average attributes. Thus two groups I and J merge if $|P_I - P_J| \leq \min(\Delta P_I, \Delta P_J)$.

In fact, for every team formation model that incorporates the idea of agents with different attributes tending to form a team, a corresponding kinship model can be identified, built around the opposite idea of agents with similar attributes forming groups. However the cumulative distribution function obtained from the kinship model cannot capture even the basic qualitative shape of the empirical data. The detailed reason is that the kinship model tends to produce too many groups of small sizes.

IX. WEIGHTED NETWORKS FROM TEAM FORMATION MODEL

In Figure 1D in the main text, we showed several networks constructed according to the following rule: The link between agents reflects the extent to which these agents are

connected during a particular time interval, as determined by the team formation model. The details underlying this analysis and figure, are as follows.

Self-centered networks – The self-centered networks represent how one particular agent is connected to the other agents in the system, based on the dynamics of the team formation model after a long time has passed in the simulation. We stress that this is the exact same version of the team formation model as used throughout the main paper and SI, and hence accurately reproduces the empirical data. The information for constructing the networks is given as follows.

- (i) At the very beginning of the simulation, there are no links connecting the agents.
- (ii) Let the team formation dynamics run for 1 Monte Carlo step (MCS). The dynamics is paused. For a particular agent labelled i , the agents that are connected to agent i at that time are recorded, i.e. the agents belonging to the same group as agent i at that time. The weight of the links between agent i and the co-members of his group at 1 MCS, are increased from zero to one unit.
- (iii) Continue the dynamics until the end of the second MCS. Repeat the recording of the agents to which agent i is connected, and add one unit to the weight of each of the corresponding links.
- (iv) Continue the process up to 1000 MCS, and stop.
- (v) There is now an accumulated weight for each link originating from agent i . This weight carries information concerning how agent i has been connected to other agents during these 1000 MCS.
- (vi) To display the results, a weighted network can then be drawn for each agent i . We use different colors to represent the different weights of the links. Thus the color of a link between i and j , shows the fraction of MCSs in 1000 MCSs during which agent i has been connected to agent j . Each weighted network can be labelled by the parameters $(p_i, \Delta p_i)$ for agent i , since the tolerance τ is identical for all agents.
- (vii) One can record the weights of the links originating from any agent i in the system, and construct a weighted network in a similar way.

(viii) In displaying the weighted network, the agents are represented by dots. The locations of the dots carry no physical meaning. The color of a link represents the weight.

To supplement the self-centered networks shown in Figure 1D of the main text, Fig. SI9 shows some additional networks resulting from the same run. It is a system with $N = 1000$, $\tau = 0.69$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.16$, and $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.02$. The 7 panels are selected to cover the whole range of p : $p \sim 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9, 1$. From our investigations, and as illustrated by the color display, we can see that the weights of the connections depend on the p -value of the agent concerned. For example, we see that agents with $p \sim 0.5$ tend to spend less time with other agents. *Collective networks* – In addition to focusing on how one agent connects to the rest of the population, we can also construct a collective network showing how the entire set of nodes are interconnected during a suitable time window of the team formation model. These networks are generally very messy and hard to interpret. The collective network shown in Figure 1D in the main text, is an aggregated network of the team formation model with $N = 1000$, $\tau = 0.4$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.11$, and $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.02$. The connections between agents are recorded over 1000 time steps, and the link appearing between any two nodes represents the internode connectivity during that time window. At the end of 1000 time steps, we record the members of the teams. To show the teams at 1000 time steps, members (dots) of the same team are shown in the same color.




Figure S 9: Each panel shows the self-centered weighted network of particular agent labelled by the values $(p_i, \Delta p_i)$ in a run of 1000 MCSs in a system of $N = 1000$ agents. Other parameters are: $\tau = 0.69$, $\langle \Delta p_i \rangle = 0.16$, and $\sigma_{\Delta p} = 0.02$. The links originate from the agent with $(p_i, \Delta p_i)$ and connect to the other agents represented by the dots. The color of each link gives the fraction of MCSs in 1000 MCSs for which agent $(p_i, \Delta p_i)$ is connected to this other agent. These results are obtained during the same run as those shown in Figure 1D of the main text.