

Exponential-Family Random Graph Models for Valued Networks

Pavel N. Krivitsky

July 21, 2022

Abstract

Exponential-family random graph models (ERGMs) provide a principled and flexible way to model and simulate features common in social networks, such as propensities for homophily, mutuality, and friend-of-a-friend triad closure, through choice of model terms (sufficient statistics). However, those ERGMs modeling the more complex features have, to date, been limited to binary data: presence or absence of ties. Thus, analysis of valued networks, such as those where counts, measurements, or ranks are observed, has necessitated dichotomizing them, losing information.

In this work, we generalize ERGMs to valued networks. Using the concept of reference measures, we describe a rigorous yet intuitive framework that retains many of the inferential and interpretability properties of the binary case, and discuss additional issues and caveats that emerge. Focusing on modeling counts, we introduce terms that generalize and model common social network features for count data, while avoiding degeneracy. We apply these methods on a commonly analyzed dataset whose values are counts of interactions.

Keywords: p-star model; transitivity; weighted network; count data; maximum likelihood estimation

1 Introduction

Networks are used to represent phenomena ranging from sexual partnerships, of interest in epidemiology, to similarity between products in an online store,

of interest in marketing, to advice giving in an office, of interest in organization management. More often than not, the relations of interest are not strictly dichotomous in the sense that all present relations are effectively equal to each other. For example, in sexual partnership networks, some ties are short-term while others are long-term or marital; and while a particular individual seeking advice might seek it from some office-mates but not others, he or she will likely do it in some specific order.

Exponential-family random graph models (ERGMs) are generative models for networks which postulate an exponential family over the space of networks of interest (Holland and Leinhardt, 1981; Frank and Strauss, 1986), specified by their sufficient statistics. These sufficient statistics typically embody the features of the network of interest that are believed to be significant to the social process which had produced it, such as degree distribution (e.g. propensity towards monogamy in sexual partnership networks), homophily (i.e. “birds of a feather flock together”), and triad-closure bias (i.e. “a friend of a friend is a friend”) (Morris, Handcock, and Hunter, 2008).

However, a major limitation of ERGMs to date has been that they had been primarily applied to binary relations: a relationship between a given actor i and a given actor j is either present or absent. This is a serious limitation: valued network data have to be dichotomized for ERGM analysis, which typically leads to loss of information.

Some extensions of ERGMs to specific forms of valued ties have been formulated: to networks with polytomous tie values, represented as a constrained three-way binary array by Robins, Pattison, and Wasserman (1999) and more directly by Wyatt, Choudhury, and Bilmes (2009, 2010); to multiple binary networks by Pattison and Wasserman (1999); and the authors are also aware of some preliminary work by Handcock (2006) on ERGMs for signed network data. Rinaldo, Fienberg, and Zhou (2009) discussed binary ERGMs as a special case and a motivating application of their developments in geometry of discrete exponential families.

A broad exception to this limitation has been a subfamily of ERGMs that have the property that the ties and their values are stochastically independent given the model parameters. The likelihoods for these models have can often be expressed as generalized linear models (GLMs) or generalized non-linear models (GNLMs). To represent common properties of social networks, such as triad-closure bias and clustering, latent class and position models have been used and extended to valued networks. (Hoff, 2005; Krivitsky, Handcock, Raftery, and Hoff, 2009; Mariadassou, Robin, and Vacher, 2010)

In this paper, we generalize the ERGM framework to directly model valued networks, while retaining much of the flexibility and interpretability of binary ERGMs, including the above-described property in the case when tie values are independent under the model, particularly focusing on count data. In Section 2 we review conventional ERGMs and describe their traits that valued ERGMs should inherit. In Section 3, we describe a framework that extends the model class to valued networks that permits a natural generalization to univariate exponential families and discuss additional considerations that emerge when the dyad sample space is no longer binary. In Section 4 we give some details and caveats of our implementation of these models. In Section 5, we further elaborate on ERGM modeling of count data, describing an approach to interpreting model terms and parameters, and proposing terms to represent features commonly found in social networks, and Section 6 we analyze a dataset with count tie values that has previously been studied primarily by dichotomizing its ties.

2 ERGMs for binary data

In this section, we define notation, review the (potentially curved) exponential-family random graph model and identify those of its properties that we wish to retain when generalizing.

2.1 Notation and binary ERGM definition

Let N be the set of actors in the network of interest, assumed known and fixed for the purposes of this paper, and let $n \equiv |N|$ be its cardinality, or the number of actors in the network. For the purposes of this paper, let a *dyad* be defined as a (usually distinct) pair of actors, ordered if the network of interest is directed, unordered if not, between whom a relation of interest may exist, and let \mathbb{Y} be the set of all dyads. More concretely, if the network of interest is directed, $\mathbb{Y} \subseteq N \times N$, and if it is not, $\mathbb{Y} \subseteq \{\{i, j\} : (i, j) \in N \times N\}$. In many problems, a relation of interest cannot exist between an actor and itself (e.g. a friendship network), or actors are partitioned into classes with relations only existing between classes (e.g. bipartite networks of actors attending events), in which case \mathbb{Y} is a proper subset of $N \times N$, excluding those pairs (i, j) between which there can be no relation of interest.

Further, let the set of possible networks of interest (the sample space

of the model) $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{Y}}$, the power set of the dyads in the network. Then a network $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$, can be considered a set of ties (i, j) . Again, in some problems, there may be additional constraints on \mathcal{Y} . For example, in the high-school networks analyzed using ERGMs by Goodreau, Kitts, and Morris (2008b), each student was limited to nominating at most five male and five female friends, so \mathcal{Y} could be defined as a proper subset of $2^{\mathbb{Y}}$, excluding those networks where any student has outdegree toward male students or outdegree toward female students that exceeds five.

Using notation similar to that of Hunter and Handcock (2006) and Krivitsky, Handcock, and Morris (2010), define an exponential family random graph model to have the form

$$\Pr_{\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}))}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x})}, \quad \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (1)$$

for random network variable \mathbf{Y} and its realization \mathbf{y} ; model parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}$, $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = \mathbb{R}^q$ and its mapping to canonical parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta} : \boldsymbol{\Theta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$; a vector of sufficient statistics $\mathbf{g} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, which may also depend on data \mathbf{x} , assumed fixed and known; and a normalizing constant (in \mathbf{y}) $\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}} : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which ensures that (1) sum to 1, and thus has the value

$$\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}'; \mathbf{x})).$$

Here, we have given the most general case defined by Hunter and Handcock (2006): a frequently used special case is $q = p$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \boldsymbol{\theta}$, so the exponential family is linear. For notational simplicity, we will omit \mathbf{x} for the remainder of this paper, as \mathbf{g} incorporates it implicitly.

2.2 Properties of binary ERGM

2.2.1 Conditional distributions and change statistics

Hunter, Handcock, Butts, Goodreau, and Morris (2008b) and others define *change statistics*, which emerge when considering the probability of a single dyad having a tie given the rest of the network and provide a convenient local interpretation of ERGMs. To summarize, define the p -vector of change statistics

$$\Delta_{i,j} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y} + (i, j)) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y} - (i, j)),$$

where $\mathbf{y} + (i, j)$ is the network \mathbf{y} with edge or arc (i, j) added if absent (and unchanged if present) and $\mathbf{y} - (i, j)$ is the network \mathbf{y} with edge or arc (i, j) removed if present (and unchanged if absent). Then, through cancellations,

$$\Pr_{\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} = 1 | \mathbf{Y} - (i, j) = \mathbf{y} - (i, j)) = \text{logit}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y})).$$

Hunter et al. (2008b) and Krivitsky et al. (2010) offer a further discussion of change statistics and their uses, and it is desirable for a generalization of ERGM to valued networks to facilitate similar local interpretation.

Furthermore, the conditional distribution serves as the basis for maximum pseudo-likelihood estimation (MPLE) for these models. (Strauss and Ikeda, 1990)

2.2.2 Relationship to logistic regression

If the model has the property of *dyadic independence* discussed in the Introduction, or, equivalently, the change statistic $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y})$ is constant in \mathbf{y} (but may vary for different (i, j)), the model trivially reduces to logistic regression. In that case, the MLE and the MPLE are equivalent. (Strauss and Ikeda, 1990) Similarly, it may be a desirable trait for valued generalizations of ERGMs to also reduce to GLM for dyad-independent choices of sufficient statistics.

3 Valued ERGMs

We now define ERGMs for valued network data, and discuss some general properties and special cases of particular interest.

3.1 Measure-theoretic model formulation

Define N , n , and \mathbb{Y} as above. Let S be the set of possible values any dyad may have. Since S may have more states than presence and absence, instead of defining the sample space \mathcal{Y} as a subset of a power set, define it as $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq S^{\mathbb{Y}}$, a subset of the function space of mappings that assign to each dyad $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Y}$ a value in S . Let $\mathbf{y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}(i, j) \in S$ be the value associated with dyad (i, j) .

Given a σ -finite measure space $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbf{Y}, P_h)$ with *reference measure* P_h , the probability measure $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}$, dominated by P_h , is a (potentially curved) ERGM

if the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta};\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{g}}$ with respect to P_h ,

$$\frac{dP_{\boldsymbol{\theta};\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{g}}(\boldsymbol{y})}{dP_h} = \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{y}))}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}, \quad (2)$$

where the normalizing constant

$$\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{y})) dP_h(\boldsymbol{y}),$$

with $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, \boldsymbol{g} , and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as defined above, and

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta} \subseteq \{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^q : \kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}') < \infty\} \quad (3)$$

(Barndorff-Nielsen, 1978, pp. 115–116; Brown, 1986, pp. 1–2).

Constraint (3) is trivial for binary networks, since their sample space is finite.

3.2 Reference measures

In addition to the specification of the sufficient statistics \boldsymbol{g} and, for curved families, mapping $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ of model parameters to canonical parameters, $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta};\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{g}}$ depends on the specification of the reference measure P_h . In this section, we describe some univariate reference measures and their effects.

3.2.1 Binary data

As Rinaldo et al. (2009) discuss, the binary ERGM (1) is a special case of (2), with $S = \{0, 1\}$, $\mathcal{Y} = 2^{\mathcal{V}}$, and $P_h = \mu$, a counting measure. There is little motivation to explicitly use reference measures other than this for binary networks, but ERGMs that use offset terms (Krivitsky et al., 2010) and profile likelihood calculations of Hunter et al. (2008b) use non-counting measures implicitly: a model of the form

$$\Pr_{\boldsymbol{\theta};\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{g}}(\boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{y}) = \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) \cdot \boldsymbol{g}_o(\boldsymbol{y}) + \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{y}))}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_o, \boldsymbol{g}_o, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o, \boldsymbol{\theta})},$$

for some offset terms $\boldsymbol{\eta}_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) \cdot \boldsymbol{g}_o(\boldsymbol{y})$ with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o$ assumed fixed and known could be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP_{\boldsymbol{\theta};\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{g}}(\boldsymbol{y})}{dP_h} &= \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{y}))}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_o, \boldsymbol{g}_o, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \\ \frac{dP_h}{d\mu}(\boldsymbol{y}) &= \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) \cdot \boldsymbol{g}_o(\boldsymbol{y})). \end{aligned}$$

3.2.2 Count data

The domain of count data, such as when $\mathbf{Y}_{i,j}$ is defined as the number of observed interactions of interest between actor i and actor j , is $S = \mathbb{N}_0$ (natural numbers, including 0), and the reference measure gains importance. For the remainder of this section, define $h = \frac{dP_h}{d\mu}$, the derivative of the reference measure with respect to the counting measure μ on a measure space $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbf{Y}, \mu)$, with $\mathbf{Y} = 2^{\mathcal{Y}}$.

Consider a $p = q = 1$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \boldsymbol{\theta}$ (linear ERG) model with $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}$. If $h(\mathbf{y}) = 1$ (i.e. P_h is the counting measure), the resulting family has the pmf (or $\frac{dP_{\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}}{d\mu}(\mathbf{y})$)

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) &= \frac{\exp\left(\boldsymbol{\theta} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}\right)}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}), \end{aligned}$$

giving the dyadwise distribution $\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Geometric}(p = 1 - \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$, with $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ constrained by (3) to $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \subseteq \{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R} : \boldsymbol{\theta}' < 0\}$.

On the other hand, suppose that, instead, $h(\mathbf{y}) = \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} (\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!)^{-1}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) &= \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} (\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!)^{-1} \frac{\exp\left(\boldsymbol{\theta} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}\right)}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mathbf{y}_{i,j})}{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!}, \end{aligned}$$

giving $\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Poisson}(\mu = \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$, with $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

The reference measure P_h thus determines the support and the basic shape of the ERGM distribution. For this reason, we define a *geometric-reference ERGM* to have the form (2) with dyadwise support $S = \mathbb{N}_0$ and reference measure having $\frac{dP_h}{d\mu}(\mathbf{y}) = 1$ and a *Poisson-reference ERGM* to have $\frac{dP_h}{d\mu}(\mathbf{y}) = \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} (\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!)^{-1}$.

Note that this does not mean that any Poisson-reference ERGM will, even under dyadic independence, be dyadwise Poisson. We discuss the sufficient conditions for this in Section 5.1.3.

3.2.3 Rank data

A sample space of complete rankings of every actor in a network by every other actor can be represented by a directed network with no self-loops and $S = \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$, with a complex constraint structure for \mathcal{Y} :

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{\mathbf{y}' \in S^{\mathbb{Y}} : \forall_{i \in N} \forall_{r \in S} \exists!_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} \mathbf{y}'_{i,j} = r\}.$$

With a finite reference measure space $(\mathcal{Y}, 2^{\mathcal{Y}}, \mu)$, the sufficient statistics in the kernel of the model can be used to represent associations, such as popularity, mutuality, and triadic effects. If ranks are coded so that the lowest rank is 1 and the highest is $n - 1$, many of the statistics for count data, described in Section 5.2, could be used to model these properties, although their interpretations are likely to be very different. A looser definition of \mathcal{Y} could be used to model data where orderings were not complete.

3.2.4 Continuous data

If $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and is an open set, some care must be taken in defining the reference measure. In particular, the σ -algebra generated as a power set of possible networks, $\mathbb{Y} = 2^{\mathcal{Y}}$ may not be Lebesgue-measurable. Thus, \mathbb{Y} may instead be defined as $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{Y})$, the Borel algebra on the set of possible networks. Starting from the σ -finite measure space $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{Y}), \lambda)$, where λ is the Lebesgue measure, reference measure can then be specified with respect to this space for univariate continuous dyad values.

Many reference measures are possible, and can be tailored to the specific application and structure of the data. In the remainder of this paper, we focus on count data.

4 Inference and implementation

As exponential families, valued ERGMs inherit the inferential properties of exponential families in general and binary ERGMs in particular, and with similar caveats, including calculation of standard errors and analysis of deviance. At the same time, the constraint (3) means that some valued ERGMs do not fulfill regularity conditions, and we give an example of this in Sections 5 and 6.

The greatest practical difficulty associated with inference on these models is usually that the normalizing constant $\kappa_{\eta, \mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is intractable, its exact evaluation requiring integration over the sample space \mathcal{Y} . However, the exponential-family nature of model also means that, provided a method exists to simulate realizations of networks from the model of interest given a particular $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the methods of Geyer and Thompson (1992) for fitting exponential families with intractable normalizing constants and, more specifically, their application to ERGMs by Hunter and Handcock (2006), apply. These methods rely on network sufficient statistics rather than networks themselves, and can thus be used with little modification.

Furthermore, because the normalizing constant (if it is finite) is thus accommodated by the fitting algorithm, we may focus on the unnormalized density for the purposes of model specification and interpretation. Therefore, for the remainder of this paper, we specify our models up to proportionality, as Geyer (1999) suggests.

We base our implementation on the R package `ergm` for fitting binary ERGMs. (Handcock, Hunter, Butts, Goodreau, Krivitsky, and Morris, 2010) The design of this package separates the specification of model sufficient statistics from the specification of the sample space of networks (Hunter et al., 2008b), and so we implement our models by substituting in a Metropolis-Hastings sampler that implements our reference measure of interest. (A simple sampling algorithm for realizations from a Poisson-reference ERGM is described in Appendix A.) This implementation will be incorporated into a future public release.

5 Statistics and interpretation for count data

In this section, we develop sufficient statistics for count data to represent network features that may be of interest, and discuss their interpretation. In particular, we focus on the Poisson-reference ERGM without complex constraints: $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{Y}}$.

At the same time, because the normalizing constant is incorporated into the fitting algorithm, this discussion is equally valid for some over- and under-dispersed generalizations of the Poisson distribution, such as the Conway–Maxwell–Poisson (CMP) distribution, which would have the reference measure $\frac{dP_h}{d\mu} = 1$ (same as a Geometric-reference ERGM), but also a sufficient

statistic

$$\mathbf{g}_k(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \log(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!) \quad (4)$$

with $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 0$ constrained by (3). (Shmueli, Minka, Kadane, Borle, and Boatwright, 2005) If this statistic is instead used in a Poisson-reference ERGM, it also becomes a CMP distribution, but one where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 1$, with $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$ inducing a Poisson distribution (in the presence of a dyad sum term), $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < 0$ indicating underdispersion relative to Poisson and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}) > 0$ indicating overdispersion.

5.1 Interpretation of model parameters

Just as sufficient statistics of the binary ERGM embody the structural properties of the network that are of interest, those of a valued ERGM embody properties of interest. Similarly, as binary ERGM statistics have a “local” interpretation in the form of *change statistics* summarized in Section 2.2.1, the conditional dyadwise distribution provides a local interpretation. We elaborate on these interpretations here.

5.1.1 Expectations of sufficient statistics

If Θ is an open set, then, for some k for which $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_k$ and holding $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k'}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $k' \neq k$ fixed, it is a general exponential family property that $E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{g}_k(\mathbf{Y}))$ is strictly increasing in $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$. (Barndorff-Nielsen, 1978, pp. 120–121) Thus, if the statistic \mathbf{g}_k is a count or measure of some feature of interest of the network (e.g. edges, ties between/within a group, isolates, triadic structures), a greater value of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ results in a distribution of networks with more of the feature counted by \mathbf{g}_k .

5.1.2 Discrete change statistic

Define the set of networks

$$\mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y}) = \{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y} : \forall_{i',j' \in \mathbb{Y} \setminus \{(i,j)\}} \mathbf{y}'_{i',j'} = \mathbf{y}_{i',j'}\}.$$

That is, $\mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})$ is the set of networks such that all dyads but the focus dyad (i,j) are fixed to their values in \mathbf{y} while (i,j) itself may vary over its possible values; and define $\mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=k} \in \{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{y}'_{i,j} = k\}$ (a singleton set) to

be the network with non-focus dyads fixed and focus dyad set to k . Then, define the *discrete change statistic*

$$\Delta_{i,j}^{k_1 \rightarrow k_2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=k_2}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=k_1}).$$

This statistic emerges when taking the ratio of probabilities of two networks that are identical except for a single dyad value:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Pr_{\theta;\eta,\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=k_2} | \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y}))}{\Pr_{\theta;\eta,\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=k_1} | \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y}))} &= \frac{\frac{h(\mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=k_2}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=k_2}))}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta},\mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}}{\frac{h(\mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=k_1}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=k_1}))}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta},\mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}} \\ &= \frac{h_{i,j}(k_2)}{h_{i,j}(k_1)} \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \Delta_{i,j}^{k_1 \rightarrow k_2}(\mathbf{y})), \end{aligned}$$

where $h_{i,j} : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the component of $h = \frac{dP_h}{d\mu}$ associated with dyad (i, j) , if the reference measure can be thus factored. For a Poisson-reference ERGM, $h_{i,j}(k) = (k!)^{-1}$. This may be used to assess the effect of a particular ERGM term on the *decay rate* of the ratios of probabilities of successive values of dyads (Shmueli et al., 2005) and on the shape of the dyadwise conditional distribution.

5.1.3 Conditional distribution

The conditional distribution of a dyad $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Y}$, given all other dyads $(i', j') \in \mathbb{Y} \setminus \{(i, j)\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\theta;\eta,\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{i,j} | \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})) &= \frac{\Pr_{\theta;\eta,\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})} \Pr_{\theta;\eta,\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}')} \\ &= \frac{\frac{h(\mathbf{y}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}))}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta},\mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})} \frac{h(\mathbf{y}') \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}'))}{\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\eta},\mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}} \\ &= \frac{h_{i,j}(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}))}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})} h(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}') \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}'))}. \end{aligned}$$

For a Poisson-reference ERGM, the sum in the denominator has a closed form if $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}')$ is linear in $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}'$ and $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}'$ is not constrained. That is, if both of

$$\forall \mathbf{y}_{i,j}' \in S \Delta_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow \mathbf{y}_{i,j}'} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y}_{i,j}' \Delta_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) \quad (5a)$$

$$\forall \mathbf{y}_{i,j}' \in S \exists \mathbf{y}'' \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y}) \mathbf{y}_{i,j}'' = \mathbf{y}_{i,j}', \quad (5b)$$

hold, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr_{\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{i,j} | \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})) \\
&= \frac{(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!)^{-1} \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=0}) + \mathbf{y}_{i,j} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y})))}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})} (\mathbf{y}'_{i,j}!)^{-1} \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}'))} \\
&= \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=0})) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{y}_{i,j} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}))}{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}! \sum_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})} (\mathbf{y}'_{i,j}!)^{-1} \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}'))} \\
&\propto \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{y}_{i,j} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}))}{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!},
\end{aligned}$$

with the terms that do not depend on $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ itself omitted, giving

$$\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{i,j} | \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y}) \sim \text{Poisson}(\mu = \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}))).$$

That is, the conditional distribution the focus dyad's value given the rest of the network is Poisson. If (5a) holds, but not (5b), a censored Poisson distribution may result.

5.2 Model specification statistics

5.2.1 Poisson regression model

As a binary ERGM reduces to a logistic regression model under dyadic independence, a Poisson-reference ERGM may reduce to a Poisson regression model. Unlike a binary ERGM, however, dyadic independence is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for this: only if (5) hold, giving a conditional Poisson distribution; dyadic independence holds, so marginal distribution is same as the conditional distribution; and $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \boldsymbol{\theta}$, to give a linear ERGM, does a Poisson regression model result. Then, with $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g}$ (i.e. constant in \mathbf{y}),

$$\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} \stackrel{\text{ind.}}{\sim} \text{Poisson}(\mu = \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g})),$$

and the discrete change statistic $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g}$ may be viewed as the covariate vector for dyad (i, j) . This facilitates modeling of such structural properties as assortative and disassortative mixing (e.g. homophily) and degree/intensity heterogeneity. Rather than enumerate them here, we borrow from the binary

ERGM literature and show how the sufficient statistics developed there may be directly adapted to count data and the interpretation that results.

Morris et al. (2008) describe many dyad-independent sufficient statistics for binary ERGMs, that could be used to model a variety of patterns for degree heterogeneity and mixing among actors over (assumed) exogenous attributes. By virtue of being dyad-independent, each statistic can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j} \mathbf{x}_{i,j}, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_{i,j} \equiv \Delta_{i,j} \mathbf{g}$. For example, for a uniform homophily model, $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}$ may be an indicator of whether i and j belong to the same group. If $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ are counts, these statistics induce a Poisson regression type model (for a Poisson-reference ERGM), where the effect of a unit increase in some $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ on dyad (i,j) is to increase its expectation by a factor of $\exp(\mathbf{x}_{i,j,k})$.

Nonlinear models Nonlinear (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}$) ERGMs with similar constraint on \mathbf{g} may produce nonlinear Poisson regression. An example of this is the likelihood component of some latent space network models: for example, the likelihood of the Poisson model of Hoff (2005) is a special case of such an ERGM, with $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}}$ and $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{y}_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}}$ (i.e. the sufficient statistic is the network), and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ mapping latent space positions and other parameters contained in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to the logarithms of dyad means (i.e. the dyadwise canonical parameters).

5.2.2 Threshold counts

Consider a Poisson-reference ERGM with $p = q = 2$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \boldsymbol{\theta}$, and

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} 1_{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} > 0} \right)^{\top}.$$

Its dyadwise distribution is

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr_{\theta;\eta,g}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) &= \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} (\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!)^{-1} \frac{\exp\left(\theta_1 \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j} + \theta_2 \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} 1_{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} > 0}\right)}{\kappa_{\eta,g}(\theta)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa_{\eta,g}(\theta)} \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \frac{\exp\left(\theta_1 \mathbf{y}_{i,j} + \theta_2 1_{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} > 0}\right)}{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!}.\end{aligned}$$

This is a variant of a zero-modified Poisson distribution and may be useful for modeling count data known to be sparser than Poisson. (Dietz and Böhning, 2000) More generally, any statistic developed for features of binary graphs can be used directly to model features of sparsity of the count graph.

5.2.3 Mutuality

Many directed networks, such as friendship nominations, exhibit *mutuality* — that, other things being equal, if a tie (i, j) exists, a tie (j, i) is more likely to exist as well — and binary ERGMs can model this phenomenon using a sufficient statistic $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}, i < j} \mathbf{y}_{i,j} \mathbf{y}_{j,i} = \min(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \mathbf{y}_{j,i})$, counting the number of reciprocated ties. Other sufficient statistics that can model it include $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}, i < j} 1_{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} \neq \mathbf{y}_{j,i}}$ and $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}, i < j} 1_{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{j,i}}$, the counts of asymmetric and symmetric dyads, respectively. (Morris et al., 2008)

In the presence of an edge count term $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}$, these three are simply different parametrizations of the same distribution family:

$$\mathbf{y}_{i,j} \mathbf{y}_{j,i} \equiv \frac{(\mathbf{y}_{i,j} + \mathbf{y}_{j,i}) - 1_{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} \neq \mathbf{y}_{j,i}}}{2} \equiv \frac{(\mathbf{y}_{i,j} + \mathbf{y}_{j,i}) - 1 + 1_{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{j,i}}}{2}.$$

Nevertheless, these three different statistics suggest two major ways to generalize the terms to count data: by evaluating a product or a minimum of the values, or by evaluating their similarity or difference. We compare the effects of these terms in Figure 1.

Product It is tempting to model mutuality for count data in the same manner as for binary data, with $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$ being values rather than indicators. For example, a simple model with overall dyad mean and reciprocity

terms, with $p = q = 2$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \boldsymbol{\theta}$, and

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}, i < j} \mathbf{y}_{i,j} \mathbf{y}_{j,i} \right)^{\top}$$

would have a conditional Poisson distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{i,j} | \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y}) &\sim \text{Poisson}(\mu = \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{0 \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}))) \\ &\sim \text{Poisson}(\mu = \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 1 + \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \mathbf{y}_{j,i})) , \end{aligned}$$

a desirable property. However, because for any $c > 0$, $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \exp(cy^2)/(y!)^2 = +\infty$, for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 > 0$, representing positive mutuality, (3) is not fulfilled. (Note that the expected value of $\mathbf{Y}_{i,j}$ is *exponential* in the value of $\mathbf{Y}_{j,i}$ and vice versa.) A Strauss point process exhibits a similar problem. (Kelly and Ripley, 1976)

Geometric mean This problem can be alleviated by using the geometric mean of $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$ instead of their product, although this changes the shape of the distribution in ways that are difficult to interpret: if

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}, i < j} \sqrt{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} \mathbf{y}_{j,i}} \right)^{\top} ,$$

then

$$\Pr_{\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{Y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{i,j} | \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})) \propto \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \mathbf{y}_{i,j} + (\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \sqrt{\mathbf{y}_{j,i}}) \sqrt{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}})}{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!} ,$$

and, with nonzero $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$, the probabilities of greater values of $\mathbf{Y}_{i,j}$ are inflated by more.

Minimum An alternative generalization is to take the minimum of the two values. For example, if

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}, i < j} \min(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \mathbf{y}_{j,i}) \right)^{\top} ,$$

Effect of the mutuality term on
 $\Pr_{\theta; \eta, g}(Y_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{i,j} | Y_{j,i} = \mathbf{y}_{j,i})$




Figure 1: Effect of proposed mutuality statistics with parameter $\theta_{\leftrightarrow} > 0$ on $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ with respect to the reference measure and other terms. Note how whereas the $\min(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \mathbf{y}_{j,i})$ statistic deflates the probabilities of those values of $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ that are less than $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$, thus inflating all of those of $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ above it, the $-|\mathbf{y}_{i,j} - \mathbf{y}_{j,i}|$ statistic deflates the probabilities in both directions away from $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$, thus inflating those that are the closest. $\sqrt{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} \mathbf{y}_{j,i}}$ inflates greater values of $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ in general, inflating by more if $\sqrt{\mathbf{y}_{j,i}}$ is greater.

then

$$\Pr_{\theta;\eta,g}(Y_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{i,j} | \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})) \propto \frac{\exp\left(\theta_1 \mathbf{y}_{i,j} + \theta_2 1_{\mathbf{y}_{i,j} < \mathbf{y}_{j,i}}(\mathbf{y}_{i,j} - \mathbf{y}_{j,i})\right)}{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!}. \quad (7)$$

Thus, a possible interpretation for this term is that the conditional probability for a particular value of $\mathbf{Y}_{i,j}$, $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ is deflated by $\exp(\theta_2)$ for every unit difference between $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$, but only when $\mathbf{y}_{i,j} < \mathbf{y}_{j,i}$. In a sense, $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$ “pulls up” $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ to its level and vice versa.

Negative difference Generalizing the concept of similarity between $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$ leads to a statistic of difference between their values. We negate it so that a positive coefficient value leads to greater mutuality. Then,

$$g(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}, i < j} -|\mathbf{y}_{i,j} - \mathbf{y}_{j,i}| \right)^\top, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\Pr_{\theta;\eta,g}(Y_{i,j} = \mathbf{y}_{i,j} | \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{i,j}(\mathbf{y})) \propto \frac{\exp(\theta_1 \mathbf{y}_{i,j} - \theta_2 |\mathbf{y}_{i,j} - \mathbf{y}_{j,i}|)}{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!},$$

so the conditional probability of a particular $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ is deflated by $\exp(\theta_2)$ for every unit difference from $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$, in either direction. Thus, $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$ “pulls in” $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ and vice versa. Of course, other differences (e.g. squared difference) are also possible.

While the conditional distributions, and hence the parameter interpretations for the minimum and the negative difference statistic are different, models induced by (7) and (8) are also reparametrizations of each other: $\min(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \mathbf{y}_{j,i}) \equiv \frac{1}{2}((\mathbf{y}_{i,j} + \mathbf{y}_{j,i}) - |\mathbf{y}_{i,j} - \mathbf{y}_{j,i}|)$.

5.2.4 Triad-closure bias

We now turn to the question of how to represent triad-closure bias — friend-of-a-friend effects — in count data. The same concerns apply as with mutuality: merely multiplying values of the dyads in a triad leads to a model which cannot have positive triad closure bias. In addition, ERGM sufficient statistics that take counts over triads often exhibit degeneracy (Handcock,

2003; Rinaldo et al., 2009; Wyatt et al., 2010), which must be addressed in the valued case as well. For these reasons, we describe a family of statistics that sum over dyads instead. Wyatt et al. (2010) use a generalization of the curved geometrically-weighted edgewise shared partners (GWESP) statistic (Hunter and Handcock, 2006) and we describe a similar but different statistic here.

Minimum of the greatest two-path value One term used to model triad closure in binary dynamic networks by Snijders, van de Bunt, and Steglich (2010) is the *transitive ties* effect, a simple special case of the GWESP statistic (having fixed $\alpha = 0$). Here, we adapt it to cross-sectional count data. Let

$$g(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \min \left(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \max_{k \in N} (\min(\mathbf{y}_{i,k}, \mathbf{y}_{k,j})) \right). \quad (9)$$

Intuitively, define the value of a path of length 2 (*two-path*) from i to j to be the minimum of the values along the path. The statistic is then the sum over the dyads (i, j) of the minimum of the value of (i, j) and the value of the two-path between them with the greatest value. The interpretation is thus somewhat analogous to that of the minimum mutuality statistic, with $\mathbf{y}_{j,i}$ replaced by $\max_{k \in N} (\min(\mathbf{y}_{i,k}, \mathbf{y}_{k,j}))$. The motivation for using minimum, as opposed to negative absolute difference to combine the two-path value with the focus dyad value is that the intuitive notion of friend-of-a-friend effect that this statistic embodies suggests that while the presence of a mutual friend may increase the probability or expected value of a particular friendship (i.e. “pull it up”), it should not limit it (i.e. “pull it in”) as an absolute difference would. These interpretations are somewhat oversimplified: it is just as true that a positive coefficient on this statistic results in $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ “pulling up” the potential two-paths between i and j .

In a directed network, (9) would model transitive (hierarchical) triads, while

$$g(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Y}} \min \left(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}, \max_{k \in N} (\min(\mathbf{y}_{j,k}, \mathbf{y}_{k,i})) \right)$$

would model cyclical triads.

6 Application to a network of social relations in a karate club

As an application, we use a Poisson-reference ERGM to compare impacts of social forces — transitivity and homophily — on the structure of a valued network of interactions between members of a university karate club. Zachary (1977) reported observations of social relations in a university karate club with membership that varied between 50 and 100. The actors — 32 ordinary club members and officers, the club president (“John A.”), and the part-time instructor (“Mr. Hi”) — were the ones who consistently interacted outside of the club. Over the course of the study, the club divided into two factions, and, ultimately, split into two clubs, one led by Hi and the other by John and the original club’s officers. The split was driven by a disagreement over whether Hi could unilaterally change the level of compensation for his services. We pose a similar question to Goodreau et al. (2008b): is the structure at the time of observation driven by faction allegiance or by transitivity (“friend-of-a-friend” effects)?

Zachary identifies the faction with which each of the 34 actors was aligned and how strongly and reports, for each pair of actors, the count of social contexts in which they interacted. The 8 contexts considered were academic classes at the university; Hi’s private karate studio in his night classes; Hi’s private karate studio where he taught on weekends; student-teaching at Hi’s studio; the university rathskeller (bar) located near the karate club; a bar located near the university campus; open karate tournaments in the area; intercollegiate karate tournaments. The highest number of contexts of interaction for a pair of individuals that was observed was 7.

We begin with a Poisson-reference ERGM. Empirically, this network is sparser than Poisson, and because the interaction for a given pair of individuals is likely to be dependent across the social contexts counted, the counts are likely to be over- or under-dispersed. Thus, as a baseline, the values are modeled as a zero-modified Conway-Maxwell-Poisson (Shmueli et al., 2005) distribution using the following sufficient statistics:

baseline propensity to have ties: number of dyads with value greater than 0;

baseline intensity of interactions: sum of dyad values; and

CMP dispersion: a statistic of the form (4).

In modeling the structure of the interactions, we represent differential

Table 1: Results from fitting the models to Karate Club data

Term	Estimates (Std. Errors)		
	Faction	Transitivity	Full
Dispersion	-2.55 (0.57)	-1.87 (0.61)	-2.33 (0.60)
Ties	-7.76 (0.99)	-7.29 (1.04)	-7.54 (1.01)
Baseline intensities	3.97 (0.68)	2.88 (0.75)	3.64 (0.74)
Hi’s intensities	0.80 (0.15)	0.50 (0.12)	0.71 (0.15)
John’s intensities	0.80 (0.14)	0.54 (0.12)	0.72 (0.16)
Faction similarity	0.27 (0.04)		0.25 (0.04)
Transitivity		0.21 (0.09)	0.11 (0.09)

Coefficients statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ are bolded.

Standard errors include uncertainty due to MCMCMLE approximation (Hunter and Handcock, 2006).

propensity of the faction leaders to interact, the effect of differences in faction membership, and triad-closure bias using the following sufficient statistics:

intensity of Hi’s interaction: sum of dyad values incident on Hi;

intensity of John’s interaction: sum of dyad values incident on John;

similarity (negative difference) in faction membership: a statistic of the form (6) with $\mathbf{x}_{i,j} = -|m_i - m_j|$, where m_i is the faction membership code of actor i ; and

transitivity of intensities: the statistic (9).

Faction memberships m_i are coded as follows: strongly Hi’s as -2 , weakly Hi’s as -1 , neutral as 0 , weakly John’s as $+1$, and strongly John’s as $+2$. We fit three models: the full model, with all of the above-described terms, the model excluding transitivity (“Faction”), and the model excluding faction membership (“Transitivity”).

Table 1 gives the results for the three fits. MCMC diagnostics, described by Goodreau, Handcock, Hunter, Butts, and Morris (2008a), show adequate mixing and networks simulated from these fits have, on average, statistics equal to the observed sufficient statistics. The CMP family is neither regular nor steep, but the dispersion estimates for all three models are negative and highly significant, very far from the non-open boundary of the parameter space at $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 1$, so this lack of steepness is unlikely to be problematic. The estimated value of the dispersion parameter for the full model (-2.33)

suggests strong underdispersion relative to zero-modified Poisson and the rest of the model: it implies that the estimated “denominator” is $(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!)^{1-(-2.33)} = (\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!)^{3.33}$, rather than Poisson’s $(\mathbf{y}_{i,j}!)^1$. Highly negative CMP coefficients may also be interpreted as the model being an overfit.

There is a highly significant negative coefficient on the baseline propensity for ties. An interpretation for this is that, from the point of view of a single dyad, the probability of a given pair of actors having a tie is deflated, but if they do have a tie, it is likely to be across multiple social contexts. Both faction leaders appear to have greater overall propensities to interact than the other club members, and, interestingly, they appear to have similar effect sizes to each other.

Taken separately, both the transitivity effect and the faction similarity effect are statistically significant and positive, the former indicating transitivity in social contexts of interaction and the latter indicating a positive faction cohesion. However, put together, the transitivity loses its significance. (Notably, the estimated correlation between their parameter estimates is -0.34 .) This suggests that they are explaining the same aspect of the network structure, but that faction allegiance is the stronger explanation. Though factions may themselves be endogenous due to influence through social relations or, as Zachary concludes, the two processes reinforced each other over time, at observation time, faction allegiance explains network structure better than transitivity.

7 Discussion

We have generalized the exponential-family random graph models to networks whose relationships are not restricted to binary data. We have proposed ways to model several common network features for count data and interpret these models, and we have applied it to compare the effects of transitivity and faction cohesion to a valued social network of counts of social contexts within which actors interacted, while controlling for such factors as sparsity, dispersion, and heterogeneity in activity level over observed attributes.

This work focuses on models for cross-sectional networks, where a single snapshot of relationship states or relationships aggregated over a time period are observed. For longitudinal data, comprising multiple snapshots of networks over the same actors over time, binary ERGMs have been used as a ba-

sis for discrete-time models for network tie evolution by Robins and Pattison (2001), Wyatt et al. (2009, 2010), Hanneke, Fu, and Xing (2010), and Krivitsky and Handcock (2010). The longitudinal model of Wyatt et al. (2009) combined a model for cross-sectional structural properties with a model for transition between the dyad states. Valued ERGMs can be directly applied to the discrete temporal ERGMs of Hanneke et al. (2010) although their adaptation to the work of Krivitsky and Handcock (2010) may be less straightforward.

In practice, networks are not always observed completely. Handcock and Gile (2010) develop an approach to ERGM inference for partially observed or sampled binary networks. It would be natural to extend this approach to valued networks and valued ERGMs.

Some methods for assessing a network model’s fit, particularly MCMC diagnostics Goodreau et al. (2008a) can be used with little or no modification. Others, like the goodness-of-fit methods of Hunter, Goodreau, and Handcock (2008a) may require development of characteristics meaningful for valued networks.

One notable property of the network analyzed in Section 6 is that both the network and the dyad values on it are small. This suffices for a demonstration, but inference on larger networks with greater interaction counts would, at the very least, require more efficient schemes for drawing samples of networks from the model than that described in Appendix A.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Mark S. Handcock for helpful discussions and comments on early drafts and Stephen E. Fienberg for his feedback on this manuscript. This research was supported by Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology Ciência 2009 Program.

References

- Ole E. Barndorff-Nielsen. *Information and Exponential Families in Statistical Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1978. ISBN 0471995452. 6, 10
- Lawrence D. Brown. *Fundamentals of Statistical Exponential Families with*

Applications in Statistical Decision Theory, volume 9 of *Lecture Notes — Monograph Series*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Hayward, California, 1986. ISBN 0-940600-10-2. URL <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.lnms/1215466757>. 6

Ekkehart Dietz and Dankmar Böhning. On estimation of the Poisson parameter in zero-modified Poisson models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 34(4):441–459, 2000. ISSN 0167-9473. doi:10.1016/S0167-9473(99)00111-5. 14

Ove Frank and David Strauss. Markov graphs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(395):832–842, 1986. ISSN 0162-1459. 2

Charles J. Geyer. Likelihood inference for spatial point processes. In Ole E. Barndorff-Nielsen, Wilfrid S. Kendall, and Marie-Colette N. M. van Lieshout, editors, *Stochastic Geometry: Likelihood and Computation*, volume 80 of *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*, pages 79–141. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 1999. ISBN 0-8493-0396-6. 9

Charles J. Geyer and Elizabeth A. Thompson. Constrained Monte Carlo maximum likelihood for dependent data (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 54(3):657–699, 1992. ISSN 0035-9246. 9

Steven M. Goodreau, Mark S. Handcock, David R. Hunter, Carter T. Butts, and Martina Morris. A **statnet** tutorial. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 24(9):1–26, May 2008a. ISSN 1548-7660. URL <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v24/i09>. 20, 22

Steven M. Goodreau, James Kitts, and Martina Morris. Birds of a feather, or friend of a friend? Using exponential random graph models to investigate adolescent social networks. *Demography*, 45(1):103–125, February 2008b. ISSN 0070-3370. 4, 19

Mark S. Handcock. Assessing degeneracy in statistical models of social networks. Working Paper 39, Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, December 2003. URL <http://www.csss.washington.edu/Papers/>. 17

- Mark S. Handcock. Statistical exponential-family models for signed networks. Unpublished manuscript, 2006. 2
- Mark S. Handcock and Krista J. Gile. Modeling social networks from sampled data. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(1):5–25, 2010. ISSN 1932-6157. doi:10.1214/08-AOAS221. 22
- Mark S. Handcock, David R. Hunter, Carter T. Butts, Steven M. Goodreau, Pavel N. Krivitsky, and Martina Morris. *ergm: A Package to Fit, Simulate and Diagnose Exponential-Family Models for Networks*. Seattle, WA, 2010. URL <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ergm>. Version 2.2-6. Project home page at <http://statnetproject.org>. 9
- Steve Hanneke, Wenjie Fu, and Eric P. Xing. Discrete temporal models of social networks. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 4:585–605, 2010. ISSN 1935-7524. doi:10.1214/09-EJS548. 22
- Peter D. Hoff. Bilinear mixed effects models for dyadic data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(469):286–295, 2005. ISSN 0162-1459. 2, 13
- Paul W. Holland and Samuel Leinhardt. An exponential family of probability distributions for directed graphs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 76(373):33–65, 1981. ISSN 0162-1459. 2
- David R. Hunter and Mark S. Handcock. Inference in curved exponential family models for networks. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 15(3):565–583, 2006. ISSN 1061-8600. 4, 9, 18, 20
- David R. Hunter, Steven M. Goodreau, and Mark S. Handcock. Goodness of fit for social network models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(481):248–258, March 2008a. ISSN 0162-1459. doi:10.1198/016214507000000446. 22
- David R. Hunter, Mark S. Handcock, Carter T. Butts, Steven M. Goodreau, and Martina Morris. *ergm*: A package to fit, simulate and diagnose exponential-family models for networks. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 24(3):1–29, May 2008b. ISSN 1548-7660. URL <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v24/i03>. 4, 5, 6, 9

- Frank P. Kelly and Brian D. Ripley. A note on Strauss’s model for clustering. *Biometrika*, 63(2):357–360, 1976. ISSN 0006-3444. 15
- Pavel N. Krivitsky and Mark S. Handcock. A separable model for dynamic networks. *Under review*, November 2010. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1011.1937v1>. 22
- Pavel N. Krivitsky, Mark S. Handcock, Adrian E. Raftery, and Peter D. Hoff. Representing degree distributions, clustering, and homophily in social networks with latent cluster random effects models. *Social Networks*, 31(3):204–213, July 2009. ISSN 0378-8733. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2009.04.001. 2
- Pavel N. Krivitsky, Mark S. Handcock, and Martina Morris. Adjusting for network size and composition effects in exponential-family random graph models. *Under review*, 2010. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1004.5328>. 4, 5, 6
- Mahendra Mariadassou, Stéphane Robin, and Corinne Vacher. Uncovering latent structure in valued graphs: A variational approach. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(2):715–742, 2010. ISSN 1932-6157. doi:10.1214/10-AOAS361. 2
- Martina Morris, Mark S. Handcock, and David R. Hunter. Specification of exponential-family random graph models: Terms and computational aspects. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 24(4):1–24, May 2008. ISSN 1548-7660. URL <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v24/i04>. 2, 13, 14, 27
- Philippa Pattison and Stanley Wasserman. Logit models and logistic regressions for social networks: II. Multivariate relations. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 52(2):169–193, November 1999. ISSN 0007-1102. 2
- Alessandro Rinaldo, Stephen E. Fienberg, and Yi Zhou. On the geometry of discrete exponential families with application to exponential random graph models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 3:446–484, 2009. ISSN 1935-7524. doi:10.1214/08-EJS350. 2, 6, 18
- Garry Robins and Philippa Pattison. Random graph models for temporal processes in social networks. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 25(1):5–41, 2001. 22

- Garry Robins, Philippa Pattison, and Stanley S. Wasserman. Logit models and logistic regressions for social networks: III. Valued relations. *Psychometrika*, 64(3):371–394, 1999. ISSN 0033-3123. 2
- Galit Shmueli, Thomas P. Minka, Joseph B. Kadane, Sharad Borle, and Peter Boatwright. A useful distribution for fitting discrete data: Revival of the Conway–Maxwell–Poisson distribution. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C*, 54(1):127–142, January 2005. ISSN 1467-9876. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9876.2005.00474.x. 10, 11, 19
- Tom A. B. Snijders, Gerhard G. van de Bunt, and Christian E. G. Steglich. Introduction to stochastic actor-based models for network dynamics. *Social Networks*, 32(1):44–60, 2010. ISSN 0378-8733. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2009.02.004. 18
- David Strauss and Michael Ikeda. Pseudolikelihood estimation for social networks. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 85(409):204–212, 1990. ISSN 0162-1459. 5
- Danny Wyatt, Tanzeem Choudhury, and Jeff Bilmes. Dynamic multi-valued network models for predicting face-to-face conversations. In *NIPS-09 workshop on Analyzing Networks and Learning with Graphs*, Whistler, British Columbia, Canada, December 2009. Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS). 2, 22
- Danny Wyatt, Tanzeem Choudhury, and Jeff Blimes. Discovering long range properties of social networks with multi-valued time-inhomogeneous models. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-10)*, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, July 2010. Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence. 2, 18, 22
- Wayne W. Zachary. An information flow model for conflict and fission in small groups. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 33(4):452–473, 1977. ISSN 0091-7710. 19, 21

A A simple sampling algorithm for a Poisson-reference ERGM

We use a Metropolis-Hastings sampling algorithm (Algorithm 1) to sample from a Poisson-reference ERGM. Because a dyad at 0 can only be incremented, the proposals between 0 and 1 are not symmetric (i.e. Figure 2).

A possible improvement to this algorithm would be to adapt to it the tie-no-tie (TNT) proposal (Morris et al., 2008), which optimizes sampling in sparse networks by focusing on proposing jumps for dyads which have ties, rather than at random.

Algorithm 1 Sampling from a Poisson-reference ERGM with no constraints

Require: Arbitrary $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{Y}$ and S sufficiently large

```

1: for  $s \leftarrow 1..S$  do
2:    $(i, j) \leftarrow \text{RandomChoose}(\mathbb{Y})$  {Select a dyad at random.}
3:   if  $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}^{(s-1)} = 0$  then
4:      $d \leftarrow +1$  {Starting with 0, only increasing is possible.}
5:      $q \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}$  {Adjust the Hastings ratio.}
6:   else
7:      $d \leftarrow \text{RandomChoose}(\{-1, +1\})$  {Propose a jump.}
8:     if  $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}^{(s-1)} = 1 \wedge d = -1$  then
9:        $q \leftarrow 2$  {Adjust the Hastings ratio. (This is the reverse of the
        "forced"  $0 \rightarrow 1$  jump.)}
10:    else
11:       $q \leftarrow 1$ 
12:     $r \leftarrow \left( (\mathbf{y}_{i,j}^{(s-1)} + 1_{d=+1})^{-d} q \right) \exp \left( \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i,j}^{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}^{(s-1)} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}_{i,j}^{(s-1)} + d}(\mathbf{y}^{(s-1)}) \right)$ 
13:     $u \leftarrow \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ 
14:    if  $u < r$  then
15:       $\mathbf{y}^{(s)} \leftarrow \mathbf{y}_{(i,j)=\mathbf{y}_{i,j}^{(s-1)}+d}^{(s-1)}$  {Accept the proposal.}
16:    else
17:       $\mathbf{y}^{(s)} \leftarrow \mathbf{y}^{(s-1)}$  {Reject the proposal.}
18: return  $\mathbf{y}^{(S)}$ 

```

Then, $\mathbf{y}^{(S)}$ is a draw from a Poisson-reference ERGM.




Figure 2: Proposal probabilities for Algorithm 1. Note that proposals between 0 and 1 are not symmetric.