

# When do Social Learners Affect Collective Performance Negatively? The Predictions of a Dynamical-System Model

Vicky Chuqiao Yang<sup>1</sup>, Mirta Galesic<sup>1</sup>, Harvey McGuinness<sup>2</sup>, and Ani Harutyunyan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Santa Fe institute, 1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe NM 87501, USA.

<sup>2</sup>Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA.

<sup>3</sup>Sunwater Institute, North Bethesda, MD 20852, USA.

## ABSTRACT

A key question concerning collective decisions is whether a collective decision-making system can settle on the best available option when some members learn socially instead of evaluating the options on their own. This question is challenging to study, and previous research has reached mixed conclusions, because collective decision outcomes depend on the insufficiently understood complex system of cognitive strategies, task properties, and social influence processes. This study integrates these complex interactions together in one general yet partially analytically tractable mathematical framework using a dynamical system model. In particular, it investigates how the interplay of the proportion of social learners, the relative merit of options, and the type of conformity response affect collective decision outcomes in a binary choice. The model predicts that when the proportion of social learners exceeds a critical threshold, a bi-stable state appears in which the majority can end up favoring either the higher- or lower-merit option, depending on fluctuations and initial conditions. Below this threshold, the high-merit option is chosen by the majority. The critical threshold is determined by the conformity response function and the relative merits of the two options. The study helps reconcile disagreements about the effect of social learners on collective performance and proposes a mathematical framework that can be readily adapted to extensions investigating a wider variety of dynamics.

## 1 Introduction

Collective decisions are central to human societies, from small-scale social systems such as families and board meetings to large-scale ones such as democratic governments and international agreements. Some of the most pressing challenges facing humanity, for instance, addressing climate change, global pandemics, and economic inequalities, are depending critically on collective decisions. A central concern regarding these systems is the effect of individuals who adopt other people's opinions and behaviors rather than explore the merit of available options on their own. This study investigates how collective performance is affected by the relative presence of individuals who learn socially by following the choices of others around them versus individuals who learn about the merit of different options on their own.

Previous research on the effect of social learning on collective decision outcomes has come to mixed conclusions. Some find social learners impair collective performance [1, 2], some find them beneficial [3, 4], and some argue they depend on the network structure and adaptability [5, 6]. The question is challenging to address because collective decision outcomes depend on the insufficiently understood

interactions of multiple cognitive and social factors, including cognitive strategies, task properties, and the social influence processes. Few attempts have been made at developing overarching mathematical frameworks capable of integrating these complex interactions into parsimonious theories.

One example of the lack of integration is in the nature of the task. Most previous research focuses tasks with a clear correct solution (e.g., [1, 3, 6–8]). These studies have found that social learning can impair collective performance [2], although adaptive learners who can switch from social to individual learning can help avoid this fate [9, 10], especially if more accurate individuals are less likely to copy others [6] and if more accurate individuals are preferentially copied [5]. Another research focus is on whether the group comes to a consensus. In such tasks, the option that receives the most support will depend on various contextual factors, including the initial proportion of individuals supporting each option, their position in the group, and the strength of their preference for that option [4, 11, 12]. Few theoretical frameworks are able to contain both scenarios.

Another example is that most studies of collective intelligence do not explicitly compare different ways in which social learners can be influenced by others. Different shapes of conformity functions have been observed in human groups, depending on whether the goal of social learning is informational or normative conformity [13]. Informational conformity is concerned with seeking the best option by gathering all available information, while normative conformity is concerned with fitting into a group. These two types of conformity respond to the frequency of observed behaviors or beliefs differently. In normative conformity, a belief or behavior is adopted with a likelihood that is higher than its observed frequency, exhibiting an s-shape relationship with the observed frequency (similar to the solid blue curve in Fig. 1(B), called hyper-conformity). In informational conformity, the likelihood of adopting a behavior or belief still increases with its observed frequency, but at a linear or slower pace, resulting in a linear or an inverse s-shape relationship with the observed frequency (similar to the dashed orange curve in Fig. 1(B), called weak conformity) [13]. Systematic comparison of the effects of these different kinds of conformity is rarely incorporated in studies of collective decisions.


In this paper, we explicitly compare these different assumptions within an overarching mathematical framework that enables exploration of the dynamic complex system underlying collective performance, composed of cognitive strategies (individual vs. social learning), task properties (options having same vs. different merits), and social influence processes (normative vs. informational conformity). We show how the framework helps to understand sometimes contradictory findings of the effect of social learners on the quality of collective decisions.

## 2 Summary of the Mathematical Model

We consider opinion  $X$  and  $Y$  to compete for followers in a well-mixed population consisted of social and individual learners, where the proportion of social learners is  $s$ . We denote the merit of  $X$  relative to  $Y$  to be  $m$ , where  $m$  is a number between 0 and 1. For each type of cognitive strategy, we use the conservation relationship described in the group competition framework [14]—the change in the proportion of population favoring an option equals those switching to the option minus those switching to the other option (see Fig. 1(A) for an illustration). Mathematically, this is expressed as

$$\frac{dx_j}{dt} = P_{YX}^{(j)}(1 - x_j) - P_{XY}^{(j)}x_j, \quad (1)$$

where  $j$  denotes the cognitive strategy under consideration,  $j = i$  denotes variables for individual learners, and  $j = s$  denotes those for social learners. The term  $x_j$  is the proportion of people holding opinion



**Figure 1.** (A) Sketch of the model setup showing the interpretation of parameters. (B) The conformity function for a few shape parameter  $\alpha$  values.  $\alpha > 1$  and  $\alpha < 1$  lead to different concavities of the function. The vertical axis,  $f(x)$ , is the transition rates from Y to X. The horizontal axis,  $x$ , is the observed frequency of option X in the population.


X among those using cognitive strategy  $j$ ,  $P_{YX}^{(j)}$  denotes the transition rate from Y to X, and  $P_{XY}^{(j)}$  is the transition rate vice-versa. In this model, we study the interplay of three main elements of the complex social system underlying collective decisions: cognitive strategy, the merit of different options, and conformity response. To achieve this goal, we formulate the transition rates of social and individual learners based on different mechanisms. For individual learners, the transition rates depend only on the merit of X relative to Y, denoted as  $m$ . The merit is the proportion of individuals who would choose an option after fully evaluating all available information individually, such as assessing factual evidence or one's own moral values.  $m$  is a number between 0 and 1, and  $m = 0.5$  denotes the two options having equal merit. For social learners, the transition rates depend on the proportion of people holding opinion X, and the conformity response function, whose shape is parameterized by one parameter,  $\alpha$ . Altering  $\alpha$  allows for both informational and normative conformity (see Fig. 1(B) for a few examples). After deriving the transition rates for the two types of learners, we analyze the fixed points of Eq. 1 and their stability. Please see the Methods for more detail on the model's derivation and solutions.

### 3 Results

We study the model's predictions by analyzing the fixed points of Eq. 1 for  $x$  (denoted as  $x^*$ ) and their stability. The fixed points signify where  $x$  stops changing over time. A fixed point is stable if the system, when perturbed, returns to that point, and is unstable if the system departs from this fixed point when perturbed.

The model predicts that the proportion of social learners,  $s$ , significantly affects the system's behavior. When social learners use hyperconformity response ( $\alpha > 1$ , typical when group members are motivated to fit in), our model predicts that the majority of the population will choose the option with higher merit, but only if the proportion of social learners is below a critical threshold. When the proportion of social learners exceeds the critical threshold, a bi-stable state appears in which the majority can favor either the higher- or lower-merit option, depending on fluctuations and initial conditions. Fig. 2(A) shows the dependency of  $x^*$  on  $s$  for  $m = 0.5$  (X and Y have equal merit). The bi-stable state occurs when  $s$  is above a threshold  $s_c$ . At  $s_c$ , the dynamical system undergoes a pitchfork bifurcation, where the stability of the fixed point  $x = 0.5$  changes. In Fig. 2(B), we show results for a case of unequal merits ( $m = 0.6$ , X has higher merit than Y), and a bi-stable state is also present, while the symmetry of the bifurcation is broken.

The critical threshold  $s_c$  is determined by parameters  $\alpha$  and  $m$ . In Fig. 2(C), we present numerical solutions for  $s_c$  for a number of  $m$  values as a function of  $\alpha$ . The region of  $s > s_c$  is where the bi-stable state occurs. The critical point  $s_c$  decreases with  $\alpha$ , and also decreases as  $m$  gets closer to 0.5. Note that in the bi-stable region, if  $m$  also evolves, the system is path dependent. As shown in Fig. 2(D), if the merit  $m$  increases from a small value, the stable fixed point  $x^*$  first increases along the lower branch, and after  $m$  grows past the critical point,  $x^*$  goes through a sudden jump to the upper branch. If  $m$  is again lowered,  $x^*$  does not go through the same jump to the lower branch. Instead,  $x^*$  stays on the upper branch until  $m$  drops below the other bifurcation point. The existence of path dependence suggests that when social learning is strong, beliefs and behaviors persist over time despite changes in the merit of options. It is also possible for the opinion composition to jump suddenly after sufficient change in merit.



**Figure 2.** The model’s predictions in relation to parameters  $s$ ,  $\alpha$ , and  $m$ . (A) The fixed points of the portion of people holding opinion  $X$ ,  $x^*$ , as a function of the proportion of social learners,  $s$ , when the two options have equal merit,  $m = 0.5$ . For  $s$  greater than a critical value, a bi-stable state appears. (B) The same analysis of (A) in the case of unequal merit,  $m = 0.6$ . (C) Critical transition point for  $s$ ,  $s_c$ , as a function of  $\alpha$  for a few  $m$  values. The area above the curves represents parameter regimes where bi-stable states appear. (D) The fixed points’ dependency on  $m$  when  $s = 0.8$  is greater than the critical threshold. They exhibit a bi-stable state for mid-range  $m$ , and the system can display path dependency if  $m$  changes. In (A), (B) and (D),  $\alpha = 1.5$ .

The occurrence of a bi-stable region is not a result of our assumption of specific functional form of  $f(x)$ . We generalize our model by considering general increasing  $f(x)$  symmetrical about the midpoint,  $(0.5, 0.5)$ . In the case of equal merit, we show analytically that the bi-stable region occurs for  $s \geq s_c = 1/f'(0.5)$ . For derivation, see SM Sec. 4. This result also predicts that bi-stable state exists only when  $f'(0.5) > 1$ , that is when the social learners have a superlinear response to the frequency of options near a 50-50 split. This also explains why the bi-stable state does not appear in the  $\alpha \leq 1$  case (see SM Sec. 1 for model behavior under this condition).

Besides the simple well-mixed model of two types of learners, we consider two additional generalizations. The first relaxes the assumption of a dichotomy between individual and social learners, allowing individuals to adopt learning strategies that are on a spectrum of social and individual learning (SM Sec. 2.1). The second is to consider individuals connected on a 2-D lattice, and social learners are only locally affected by their neighbors (SM Sec. 2.2). In both generalizations, we find that our major conclusions regarding the critical threshold of social learners remain unchanged.

	$s < s_c$ (fewer social learners)	$s > s_c$ (more social learners)
$\alpha > 1$ (Normative/hyperconformity)	high-merit	high- or low-merit, depends on initial conditions and fluctuations
$\alpha \leq 1$ (Informational/weak-conformity)	high-merit	

**Table 1.** Summary of the model’s prediction of collectively chosen options under majority rule.

## 4 Discussion


We study the joint effects of the proportion of social learners, the relative merit of different options, and social learners’ conformity response on the collective decision outcome. Our model suggests that under hyperconformity (for example, motivated by a desire to fit into one’s social environment), the social learners’ effect on the collective decisions depends critically on the proportion they constitute in the system. The model predicts a threshold for the proportion of social learners, below which the high-merit option would be preferred by the majority. When the proportion of social learners exceeds this threshold, it becomes possible for the low-merit option to be favored by the majority. The model also predicts that when the proportion of social learners is above the critical threshold, the system is path dependent if  $m$  changes over time—it can be hard to reverse the change in opinion composition if  $m$  reverses. However, if the social learners use conformity function of  $\alpha \leq 1$ , corresponding to a linear or weak-conformity (for example, when they are motivated by a desire to find the best solution), the critical threshold ceases to exist, and the majority always favors the high-merit option.

Our model is formulated in terms of the proportion of individuals in a system, which would work best when the group size is large. The same mechanism can also be adapted to study small groups. For example, both the spectrum extension and the spatial extension of our model, presented in SM Sec. 2.1 and 2.2, respectively, are formulated on the individual level and can apply to groups of finite size.

A previous model [4] considers an animal group consisted of informed and uninformed individuals using a different modeling framework (most notably, it considers individuals to have inherent preferences, and the degree of social learning depends on the strength of the preferences, while our model does not assume either), and finds seemingly contradictory results. It particularly considers the scenario of the low-merit opinion held at greater strength, meaning individuals holding this opinion are more “stubborn” and less likely to update their views. The authors find that in this scenario, when the uninformed individuals (social learners) are below a threshold, the minority preference (similar to the low-merit option in our model) is more likely to prevail. While the uninformed individuals are above the threshold, a bi-stable state occurs and the likelihood for the majority preference to prevail is increase. After extending our model to include a parameter for the strength of opinion (see SM Sec. 2.3 for details), we recovered the qualitative results in [4] (Fig. 3(B)), suggesting that this finding can be a special case predicted in our modeling framework. When the two opinions are held at equal strength, we recover our original result that the presence of uninformed voters can destabilize the collective-decision making system (Fig. 3(A)). This finding also suggests that the role of social learners may differ depending on the presence of committed opinion holders. This is in line with findings from previous research— both theoretical and experimental studies have found that the presence of inflexible opinion holders significantly alters the collective system outcome [15–18]. Ultimately, if an individual learner never changes their mind based on new evidence,

their chosen option could spread throughout the social network [17, 19].

Our model offers several novel contributions to the literature. First, the model characterizes collective decision-making problems using three parameters, the combination of which distinguishes a broad range of group-level behaviors (see Table 1 for a summary). These parameters describe cognitive strategies ( $s$ ), the problem at hand ( $m$ ), and the conformity response ( $\alpha$ ). The model predicts a threshold (that depends on  $m$  and  $\alpha$ ) above which social learners hurt the collective decision outcomes, and under which they do not, suggesting that the same model can explain seemingly conflicting findings about collective performance. Second, the model is analytically tractable, such as in drawing conclusions for the behavior of the system for general  $f(x)$  detailed in SM Sec. 4. This expands the simulation studies typical in studying collective decisions and enables us to draw conclusions for a broad class of behaviors. Third, our model offers a flexible mathematical framework that can be extended or adapted to study interactions of a wide range of social and psychological factors for future research, as demonstrated in the extensions outlined in SM Sec. 2.



**Figure 3.** Simulation results from the extended model to include opinion strength—the portion of people holding opinion  $X$  at steady state as a function of the portion of social learners. In both panels,  $m = 0.4$ , denoting  $X$  is of lower merit, and the desired outcome is  $x < 0.5$ . The black dotted line is  $x = 0.5$  to help guide the eye. (A) When the two options have equal strength, which recovers the original model. (B) When the low-merit opinion ( $X$ ) has higher strength, the model recovers the finding in [4]. In both panels, the parameter  $\alpha = 1.5$ .

The problem of how social learners influence collective performance is highly relevant to democratic elections. It has been noted that a sizable portion of the voting population is uninformed about options they are voting on, such as policies proposed by the candidates [20]. These uninformed voters might instead use social learning to make decisions [21]. While there is a long-standing consensus on the wide-spread phenomenon of such uninformed voters [22, 23], there is little agreement on how they affect the outcome of democratic elections [20]. On the one hand, some argue that the presence of uninformed voters does not affect election outcomes, because information shortcuts such as political parties and opinion leaders are sufficient to lead to good decisions, or the uninformed decisions can be taken as noise that cancels out [23, 24]. On the other hand, some argue that this optimistic view is at odds with the empirical evidence [23, 25] and that uninformed voters can lead to adoption of bad policies [26]. Our model suggests that both outcomes can occur depending on conditions, in particular, whether the portion of uninformed voters is above or below the critical threshold determined by the conformity response and the relative merit of the



two options. Further, our model predicts the possibility of sudden shifts in collective decision outcomes when the portion of uninformed voters is above the critical threshold.

This paper offers insights into the complex process of collective decision making through a parsimonious model. We have shown that our main conclusions are robust to several relaxations of the model assumptions, such as considering that individuals can fall on a spectrum between pure social and pure individual learning or that the social influence is only local (SM Sec. 2). Our work also suggests several directions for future work. For example, what happens if the information that individual learners receive is not independent, such as when several receive information about available options from the same news source? How does the structure of communication networks, such as the presence of echo chambers, affect the outcome? What happens when there are more than two options? Besides social learning, what happens to the system when uninformed decision-makers are more susceptible to stereotypes, such as gender, race, and physical attractiveness [27, 28]? How does the effect of social learners change in multi-stage decision making processes, such as primary and main elections? We hope our work offers an innovative mathematical framework to study the effect of social learning in these more complex scenarios.

## Methods

### Derivation of the mathematical model

We develop a dynamical-system model of collective decision making in a binary choice task to investigate the interplay of the proportion of individual vs. social learners, the relative merit of two options for individual learners, and the shape of conformity response for social learners.

First, as mentioned above, individuals can use different cognitive strategies when choosing an option. They may prefer to ground their decisions primarily in their own exploration of the merit of different options, such as evidence or personal values (individual learners), or they may prefer to follow choices of others around them (social learners) for informational or conformist reasons [13]. The cognitive strategies an individual will use can depend on contextual differences, including how easy it is to learn on one's own about the merit of different options, availability of suitable models, and cultural differences regarding the value of conformity [29, 30].

Second, tasks that involve a choice between options can differ regarding the amount of evidence in favor of one option or the other. Real-world contexts are often characterized by layers of uncertainty that make evidence for different options unclear [31, 32]. Examples are tasks in political, financial, health, and environmental domains, in particular in novel, uncertain, and evolving contexts [33–36]. In these situations, different options can be perceived as having quite similar merits, and the processes of social influence can be critical in determining the winning option [37–40].

Third, the likelihood of an individual adopting an option generally increases with the frequency of others adopting it in the overall population [41]. However, this relationship, which we refer to as the *conformity function*, can take many functional forms. It can be linear, whereby the likelihood of an option being chosen equals its frequency in the population; S-shaped (the likelihood of adoption is higher than option frequency (hyperconformity)); or inverse-S-shaped, whereby the frequency is lower than the frequency of that option in the population (weak conformity; [42]). The exact shape might depend on factors such as group size [43] and on whether individuals seek to adapt to their nonsocial environments (linear or weak conformity) or fit into their social environments (hyperconformity; [13]).

The formulation of the transition rates,  $P_{YX}$  and  $P_{XY}$  in Eq. 1 is as follows. First, the mixture of cognitive strategies is incorporated as a population variable—the population consists of portion  $s$  social learners,

and  $1 - s$  individual learners. We assume individuals do not change their cognitive strategies for a given issue. The other two key variables determine the transition rates between the two opinions between  $X$  and  $Y$  for the two groups of learners.

Second, we consider individual learners to change their opinion based on independent consideration of evidence and values. We express the merit of opinion  $X$  relative to  $Y$ , denoted as  $m$ , to be the transition rate of an individual switching from  $Y$  to  $X$ ,  $P_{YX}^{(i)} = m$ . By symmetry,  $P_{XY}^{(i)} = 1 - m$ . Note that among individual learners, the steady state proportion  $m$  favors option  $X$  while proportion  $1 - m$  favors  $Y$ .

Third, we consider social learners' behaviors that are affected by conformity only. The transition rate for social learners from  $Y$  to  $X$  is an increasing function of the observed frequency of opinion  $X$  in the whole population ( $x$ ). By construction,  $x = (1 - s)x_i + sx_s$ . We define  $P_{YX}^{(s)} = f(x)$ , where  $f(x)$  is the frequency-dependent conformity response function (or conformity function later in text). According to reviews of empirical evidence [42, 44, 45], a realistic function is an monotonic increasing function symmetric about  $(0.5, 0.5)$ , with alternating convexity in the upper and lower parts.

A particular functional form satisfying these conditions, which we will use for most of our following analysis is,

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} (2x)^\alpha / 2, & 0 \leq x \leq 0.5, \\ 1 - (2(1-x))^\alpha / 2, & 0.5 \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

This function is parameterized by one parameter,  $\alpha$ , varying which allows for all convexities of the conformity functions observed in the literature. A plot of this function with various  $\alpha$  values is shown in Fig. 1(B). Parameter  $\alpha > 1$  leads to hyperconformity,  $\alpha < 1$  leads to weak conformity, and  $\alpha = 1$  denotes a linear response.

After accounting for the transition rates, the governing equations for social and individual learners in Eq. 1 becomes,

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = m(1 - x_i) - (1 - m)x_i, \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dx_s}{dt} = f(x)(1 - x_s) - f(1 - x)x_s. \quad (4)$$

Simplifying Eqs. 3 and 4, we have

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = m - x_i, \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{dx_s}{dt} = f((1 - s)x_i + sx_s) - x_s. \quad (6)$$

We investigate in what conditions is the high-merit option preferred by the majority, in other words, if  $m > 0.5$ ,  $x > 0.5$  and if  $m < 0.5$ ,  $x < 0.5$ .

### Analyzing the fixed points

We analyze the dynamical system's fixed points and their stability according to methods outlines in [46]. We find the fixed points by solving for  $x_i$  and  $x_s$  such that  $dx_i/dt = dx_s/dt = 0$  in Eqs. 5 and 6. The solutions are denoted as  $x_i^*$  and  $x_s^*$  respectively. Note that in Eq. 5, it is obvious that  $x_i^* = m$ . We then solve



for  $x_s^*$ . In the results presented in Fig. 2, which uses the functional form of  $f(x)$  in Eq. 2, we solve for  $x_s^*$  computationally using the Python 3 programming language.

The fixed points of  $x$ , the proportion of the population holding opinion  $X$ ,  $x^*$ , is then computed using its definition,  $x^* = sx_s^* + (1 - s)x_i^*$ .

We then analyze the stability of the fixed points by computing the Jacobian matrices of the dynamical system (Eqs. 5 and 6) at these fixed points, and solving for the eigenvalues of these Jacobian matrices. Stable fixed points are characterized by both eigenvalues being negative, and unstable ones are characterized by at least one positive eigenvalue. The fixed points' stability shown in Fig. 2 is obtained by computing the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrices using the Python 3 programming language.

### Analytical derivation for general $f(x)$

Here we derive analytical predictions of our model without functional form assumptions of  $f(x)$ . We consider general increasing  $f(x)$  symmetrical about the point  $(0.5, 0.5)$ . The functional form given in Eq. 2, and subsequently in Fig. 1(B), are all special cases of this general consideration. Here we derive analytical predictions of the expression of the critical transition point,  $s_c$ , under the condition of  $X$  and  $Y$  having equal merit,  $m = 0.5$ .

The point  $x_i = x_s = 0.5$  is a fixed point of the dynamical system for all  $s$  values when  $m = 0.5$ . This can be verified by plugging these values in Eqs. 5 and 6 and show the right-hand-side of both equations are 0. Note that the symmetry condition for  $f(x)$  requires  $f(0.5) = 0.5$ . Because the critical transition in  $s$  occurs when this fixed point changes stability [46], we analyze its stability by computing the Jacobian matrix of the dynamical system and it is

$$J(x_i, x_s) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ f'((1-s)x_i + sx_s)(1-s) & f'((1-s)x_i + sx_s)s - 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

where  $f'(x_0)$  is the derivative of  $f(x)$  with respect to  $x$  evaluated at  $x_0$ . Plugging  $x_i = x_s = 0.5$  in Eq. 7, we solve for the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix. The two eigenvalues are  $\lambda_1 = -1$  and  $\lambda_2 = f'(0.5)s - 1$ . Since  $\lambda_1 < 0$ , the stability of the fixed point depends on the sign of  $\lambda_2$ . If  $\lambda_2 < 0$ , then  $(x_i, x_s) = (0.5, 0.5)$  is stable, and if  $\lambda_2 > 0$ , it is unstable. Solving for  $\lambda_2 = 0$ , we find the solution of this critical point is

$$s_c = \frac{1}{f'(0.5)}. \quad (8)$$

When  $s < s_c$ ,  $(0.5, 0.5)$  is stable, and the system has one fixed point. When  $s > s_c$ ,  $(0.5, 0.5)$  is unstable, and the system has bi-stable states. Equation 8 also shows that  $r_c$  has a solution between 0 and 1 only when  $f'(0.5) > 1$ . This predicts the bi-stable state exists only when  $f'(0.5) > 1$ . This also explains why the bi-stable state does not appear in the  $\alpha \leq 1$  case.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank Sidney Redner for helpful discussions and Albert Kao for constructive feedback on an earlier version of the manuscript.

**Funding.** VCY was supported by the Santa Fe Institute Omidyar Fellowship, Suzanne Hurst and Samuel Peters. MG was partially supported by NSF DRMS 1757211. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funders.

## References

1. Becker, J., Porter, E. & Centola, D. The wisdom of partisan crowds. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **116**, 10717–10722 (2019).
2. Rogers, A. R. Does biology constrain culture? *Am. Anthropol.* **90**, 819–831 (1988).
3. Jayles, B. *et al.* How social information can improve estimation accuracy in human groups. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 12620–12625 (2017).
4. Couzin, I. D. *et al.* Uninformed individuals promote democratic consensus in animal groups. *Science* **334**, 1578–1580 (2011).
5. Almaatouq, A. *et al.* Adaptive social networks promote the wisdom of crowds. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 11379–11386 (2020).
6. Becker, J., Brackbill, D. & Centola, D. Network dynamics of social influence in the wisdom of crowds. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, E5070–E5076 (2017).
7. Jayles, B. *et al.* The impact of incorrect social information on collective wisdom in human groups. *J. Royal Soc. Interface* **17**, 20200496 (2020).
8. Simoiu, C., Sumanth, C., Mysore, A. & Goel, S. Studying the “wisdom of crowds” at scale. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, vol. 7, 171–179 (2019).
9. Enquist, M., Eriksson, K. & Ghirlanda, S. Critical social learning: A solution to Rogers’s paradox of nonadaptive culture. *Am. Anthropol.* **109**, 727–734 (2007).
10. Rendell, L., Fogarty, L. & Laland, K. N. Rogers’ paradox recast and resolved: Population structure and the evolution of social learning strategies. *Evol. Int. J. Org. Evol.* **64**, 534–548 (2010).
11. Conradt, L., Krause, J., Couzin, I. D. & Roper, T. J. “Leading according to need” in self-organizing groups. *The Am. Nat.* **173**, 304–312 (2009).
12. Dyer, J. R., Johansson, A., Helbing, D., Couzin, I. D. & Krause, J. Leadership, consensus decision making and collective behaviour in humans. *Philos. Transactions Royal Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* **364**, 781–789 (2009).
13. Claidière, N. & Whiten, A. Integrating the study of conformity and culture in humans and nonhuman animals. *Psychol. Bull.* **138**, 126 (2012).
14. Abrams, D. M. & Strogatz, S. H. Linguistics: Modelling the dynamics of language death. *Nature* **424**, 900 (2003).
15. Xie, J. *et al.* Social consensus through the influence of committed minorities. *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 011130 (2011).
16. Centola, D., Becker, J., Brackbill, D. & Baronchelli, A. Experimental evidence for tipping points in social convention. *Science* **360**, 1116–1119 (2018).


17. Mobilia, M., Petersen, A. & Redner, S. On the role of zealotry in the voter model. *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.* **2007**, P08029 (2007).
18. Galam, S. & Jacobs, F. The role of inflexible minorities in the breaking of democratic opinion dynamics. *Phys. A: Stat. Mech. its Appl.* **381**, 366–376 (2007).
19. Mobilia, M. Does a single zealot affect an infinite group of voters? *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 028701 (2003).
20. Somini, I. *Democracy and Political Ignorance* (Stanford University Press, 2016).
21. Buchanan, J. M. & Tullock, G. *The Calculus of Consent*, vol. 3 (University of Michigan press Ann Arbor, 1962).
22. Converse, P. E. The nature of belief systems in mass publics (1964). *Critical Rev.* **18**, 1–74 (2006).
23. Bartels, L. M. Uninformed votes: Information effects in presidential elections. *Am. J. Polit. Sci.* 194–230 (1996).
24. Bhatti, Y. What would happen if we were better informed? Simulating increased knowledge in European Parliament elections. *Representation* **46**, 391–410 (2010).
25. Grosser, J. & Seebauer, M. The curse of uninformed voting: An experimental study. *Games Econ. Behav.* **97**, 205–226 (2016).
26. Caplan, B. *The Myth of the Rational Voter: Why Democracies Choose Bad Policies* (Princeton University Press, 2011).
27. Riggle, E. D., Ottati, V. C., Wyer, R. S., Kuklinski, J. & Schwarz, N. Bases of political judgments: The role of stereotypic and nonstereotypic information. *Polit. Behav.* **14**, 67–87 (1992).
28. McDermott, M. L. Race and gender cues in low-information elections. *Polit. Res. Q.* **51**, 895–918 (1998).
29. Asch, S. E. Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. *Organ. Influ. Process.* 295–303 (1951).
30. Hoppitt, W. & Laland, K. N. *Social Learning: An Introduction to Mechanisms, Methods, and Models* (Princeton University Press, 2013).
31. Meder, B., Le Lec, F. & Osman, M. Decision making in uncertain times: What can cognitive and decision sciences say about or learn from economic crises? *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **17**, 257–260 (2013).
32. Spiegelhalter, D. J. & Riesch, H. Don't know, can't know: Embracing deeper uncertainties when analysing risks. *Philos. Transactions Royal Soc. A: Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **369**, 4730–4750 (2011).
33. Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E. & Stokes, D. E. *The American Voter* (University of Chicago Press, 1980).
34. Lo, A. W. & Mueller, M. T. Warning: Physics envy may be hazardous to your wealth! *J. Invest. Manag. (JOIM)* **8** (2010).

35. Han, P. K., Klein, W. M. & Arora, N. K. Varieties of uncertainty in health care: A conceptual taxonomy. *Med. Decis. Mak.* **31**, 828–838 (2011).
36. Galesic, M., Kaure, A. & Gaissmaier, W. A sampling framework for uncertainty in individual environmental decisions. *Top. Cogn. Sci.* **8**, 242–258 (2016).
37. Boyd, R. & Richerson, P. J. *Culture and the Evolutionary Process* (University of Chicago press, 1988).
38. Young, H. P. The evolution of conventions. *Econom. J. Econom. Soc.* 57–84 (1993).
39. Salganik, M. J., Dodds, P. S. & Watts, D. J. Experimental study of inequality and unpredictability in an artificial cultural market. *Science* **311**, 854–856 (2006).
40. Centola, D. The spread of behavior in an online social network experiment. *Science* **329**, 1194–1197 (2010).
41. Morgan, T. J. H. & Laland, K. N. The biological bases of conformity. *Front. Neurosci.* **6**, 87 (2012).
42. Claidière, N., Bowler, M. & Whiten, A. Evidence for weak or linear conformity but not for hyper-conformity in an everyday social learning context. *PLoS ONE* **7** (2012).
43. Latané, B. The psychology of social impact. *Am. Psychol.* **36**, 343 (1981).
44. Claidière, N., Bowler, M., Brookes, S., Brown, R. & Whiten, A. Frequency of behavior witnessed and conformity in an everyday social context. *PloS ONE* **9** (2014).
45. Morgan, T., Rendell, L., Ehn, M., Hoppitt, W. & Laland, K. The evolutionary basis of human social learning. *Proc. Royal Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* **279**, 653–662 (2012).
46. Strogatz, S. H. *Nonlinear dynamics and chaos* (CRC press, 2018).

# Supplementary Materials for When do Social Learners Affect Collective Performance Negatively? The Predictions of a Dynamical-System Model

## 1 Results for $\alpha < 1$

We analyze the fixed point for the case of  $\alpha < 1$  when using the functional form of  $f(x)$  in Eq. 2. The system has one fixed point through all parameters, with some examples shown in Fig. S1.  $x^*$  increases smoothly with  $m$ . When  $s = 1$ ,  $x^* = 0.5$  and when  $s = 0$ ,  $x^* = m$ .



**Figure S1.** Fixed points for the proportion of people holding opinion  $X$ ,  $x^*$  when  $\alpha = 0.8$ . (A) as a function of  $s$ , with  $m = 0.7$  (dashed line) (B) as a function of  $m$ ,  $s = 0.8$ .

## 2 Model extensions

### 2.1 Individual-social learning spectrum extension

The model in the main text makes the parsimonious dichotomy of social vs. individual learners. In reality, one would expect each individual to be on a spectrum between pure individual and pure social learning. Here we present a model with this modification and show the major conclusions of the simpler model presented in the main text does not change. Consider for individual  $i$  holding opinion  $Y$ , the transition probability of them changing opinion to  $X$  is:


$$P_i(Y \rightarrow X) = (1 - s_i)m + s_i f(x), \quad (\text{S1})$$

where  $s_i$  is a parameter between 0 and 1. It characterizes the degree of social learning of the individual  $i$ , through weighting the merit of the idea and the conformity response,  $f(x)$ . The extreme value  $s_i = 1$  denotes fully social learner, and  $s_i = 0$  denotes fully individual learner. The other variables are defined as the same as the main text. Similarly, the transition probability from  $X$  to  $Y$  is:

$$P_i(X \rightarrow Y) = (1 - s_i)(1 - m) + s_i f(1 - x), \quad (\text{S2})$$

We computationally simulate a distribution of  $s_i$  and run the system to equilibrium. The results for uniform distribution and a right-skewed distribution  $s_i$  are shown in Fig. S2. For uniformly distributed  $s$ , there is a smooth increase of  $x$  with  $m$ , and only one fixed point appears for each set of parameters. This behavior is

similar to the original model with  $s < s_c$ . For a right-skewed distribution of  $s$  (more social learning), a bi-stable region of  $x$  occurs for mid-range  $m$ , which is similar to the behavior of the original system with  $s > s_c$  (Fig. 2(D) of main text).



**Figure S2.** Result of the simulations assuming each individual is on the gradient of individual to social learners. The distributions of  $s$ , which indicate the degree of social learning of each individual, are shown on the top panels. The corresponding results of  $x$  at convergence as a function of  $m$  are shown on the bottom panels. Left column: uniform distribution  $s$ . Right column: Beta distribution  $s$ , with shape parameters  $a = 5$ ,  $b = 1$ . Both simulations involve 10,000 individuals,  $\alpha = 1.5$ .


## 2.2 Spatial extension

We consider the spatial extension of the model presented in the main text, which assumes a well-mixed population. We consider individuals arranged on a 2-D lattice. A proportion  $s$  of those individuals are randomly assigned to be social learners, and  $1 - s$  individual learners. In each time step, the individual learners' transition probability from  $X$  to  $Y$  is  $P(X \rightarrow Y) = m$ , and that from  $Y$  to  $X$  is  $P(Y \rightarrow X) = 1 - m$ . Social learners' opinion transitions are affected by the opinion of their four neighbors.  $P(X \rightarrow Y) = f(x_n)$ , where  $x_n$  is the portion of neighbors holding  $X$  opinion. We run the model until a convergence criterion in  $x$ , the portion holding  $X$  in the whole population, is met. Examples of the simulation results, with periodic boundary conditions, are shown in Fig. S3. Bistable states appear for large  $s$ , similar to Fig. 2(D) of the main text.

## 2.3 Opinion strength extension

We formulate an extension of our model to account for the strength of opinions in order to compare with the model in ref. [4] of the main text. The model in ref. [4] assumes two types of individuals, informed and uninformed. Each informed person  $i$  has a preferred state between  $X$  and  $Y$ , and if one is in their preferred state, there is probability  $w_i$ , the strength of the opinion, that they stay in the original state. With probability  $1 - w_i$ , this person take a sample of the population and change their opinion to align with the majority of the sample. The uninformed have strength 0. To include a similar consideration in our model, we extend the transition rates of the individual learners from  $X$  to  $Y$  as,  $P_{XY}^{(i)} = (1 - w_x)(1 - m)$ , where  $w_x$ ,





**Figure S3.** Proportion of individuals holding opinion  $X$  at steady state for the 2D grid model. Left: small  $s$ ,  $s = 0.5$ . Right: large  $s$ ,  $s = 0.95$ . Both simulations involve 4000 individuals in a 200 by 200 grid, and  $\alpha = 1.8$ .

a parameter taking on values between 0 and 1, is the relative strength of opinion  $X$  compared to  $Y$ . This modification denotes that there is probability  $w_x$  that a person holding opinion  $X$  stays in this opinion. Similarly, the transition rates of individual learners from  $Y$  to  $X$  is  $P_{YX}^{(i)} = w_x m$ . The transition rates of the social learners and the other dynamics of the system remain the same. In this formulation, the individual learners in our model is similar to the informed individual in [4], and the social learners are similar to the uninformed individuals in [4].

In the results shown in main text Fig. 3, we are specifically comparing of the results of our extended model with Fig. 2(B) of ref. [4].