

SOCIAL PERCOLATION ON INHOMOGENEOUS SPANNING NETWORK

Abhijit Kar Gupta^{†1} and Dietrich Stauffer[‡]

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Cologne University,
50923 Köln, Germany*
E-mail: [†]abhi@rri.ernet.in, [‡]stauffer@thp.uni-koeln.de

Abstract

The *Social Percolation* model recently proposed by Solomon *et al.* [4] is studied on the Ising correlated inhomogeneous network. The dynamics in this is studied so as to understand the role of correlations in the social structure. Thus the possible role of the structural social connectivity is examined.

Keywords: dynamics of social systems, percolation, statistical mechanics of model systems, self-organization.

In recent times, there has been a great interest in applications of Statistical Physics in Social Science [1, 6]. These works are wide ranged; from the stock market data analysis to the ‘microscopic’ models to understand the social dynamics. The study in social dynamics is concerned with the concept of information propagation and thus the formation of opinion in a complex social network. Various approaches have been developed in this respect. A class of social impact models based on *social impact* theory has been dealt with in ref.[3]. One of the main premises in such models are the interactions among the social agents and groups; the agents are influenced by one another while taking decision. Another approach is the assumption that the agents take decisions of their own (not influenced by each other), only the spreading of information is necessary through some kind of contact

¹Postdoctoral fellow at: *Raman Research Institute, Bangalore-560 080, India*

process, the philosophy of epidemiology (see a brief review [2]). The primary interest is to study through simple models how a complex process of opinion formation (and regulation) takes place among the agents in a social space when the information is shared locally by ‘word of mouth’ (‘nearest neighbour’ connection may be). This is prior to a domination by powerful media (*e.g.*, TV, Newspapers, Internet) which may influence the agents (people) quite homogeneously. Every social system has a kind of feedback mechanism. Thus it is reasonable to expect that the quality of a product, initially released in the market, is also adjusted according to the ever upgraded opinions (preferences) of the agents and the economic constraints.

In this paper we examine a model which has been recently proposed by Solomon *et al.* [4] (also see ref.[5]) in a context of how an opinion is formed, when a commercial product is released in the market. The product is sometimes chosen by a spanning population of a region or sometimes fails to hit the target. Naturally, a concept of percolation [7] comes in and it has been termed as ‘*Social Percolation*’ in ref.[4]).

The above ‘social percolation’ model is based on a social network which, for example, may be a two dimensional regular network. The agents are assumed to be situated on the sites of the network which provides the frame of fixed connectivity. They decide to buy some product (or watch a movie) if that qualifies according to their personal preferences. There is no other external influence in decision making. Thus the ‘*quality*’ and the personal ‘*preference*’ are two variables in the model, the former is the global and the later being a local variable.

The steps are the following:

- To start with it is assumed that the agents along one boundary line are informed about the product. Each agent has a certain independent personal preference (p_i , for the i th agent) to begin with. A uniform random distribution is chosen for this purpose so that $1 > p_i > 0$, for all i . The quality q is assigned a certain value ($q < 1$) at the beginning.

- Now if the quality is greater than the preference of an agent, $p_i < q$, the agent i responds and the information is passed on to the nearest neighbour uninformed agents. Otherwise the agent remains inactive and the information is not propagated to any of its nearest neighbours. After it responds, the agent i enhances its personal preference from p_i to $p_i + \delta p$. Else the inactive agent reduces its preference

from p_i to $p_i - \delta p$ at the next time step. Those who remain uninformed in the process keep their preferences unchanged.

- At the end of one sweep (one time unit) of the whole system, it is checked if any of the agents on the other end has got the information and has responded. If so that means the information is propagated from one end to the other of the community. That is, in the language of percolation, it is checked if the responded agents span or percolate the system from one end to the other. This is a case of commercial success. So, in such a case, for financial constraints, the quality is reduced from q to $q - \delta q$ for the next time step. Otherwise (in case of failure) the quality is increased from q to $q + \delta q$.

The above three steps constitute the execution of the model of Solomon *et al.* which shows an interesting ‘self-organized’ social dynamics [6]. A Leath-type algorithm is implemented to upgrade the sites sequentially from a set of agents (sites) who are informed at the start.

In the above work [4] it is assumed that the population is distributed homogeneously on a social space and so the dynamics is tested on a regular square lattice. Here in the present work we ask the question of how the social structure plays a role in the social dynamics. It may happen that the population is not homogeneously widespread in a big locality. Because of geographical and other reasons, there may be certain clusterings of houses which may be connected by pathways. Thus there can be an entire inhomogeneous but correlated network of such population formed in a big region. Our interest is to examine how this correlated inhomogeneous structure plays role in the dynamics of the simple model system in contrast to the earlier studies [4] done on homogeneous random percolating network.

For the purpose of this work, in order to generate correlated inhomogeneous network, we create spanning clusters of up spins at the critical temperature $J/K_B T_c = 0.44$ of a 2D Ising model at zero field in the sense of Fortuin-Kasteleyn-Coniglio-Klein-Swendsen-Wang cluster definitions [7]. We removed bonds between two parallel (up) spins with a probability $P = \exp(-2J/K_B T)$. For a typical 101×101 and a 1001×1001 systems we iterate up to 10^4 Monte Carlo steps per spin.

Now, precisely, we check for a spanning cluster of neighbouring up spins connected by unremoved bonds. The agents are now situated on

a tenuous and inhomogeneously connected network. Thus instead of random site percolation as in Solomon *et al.* we use Ising-correlated site-bond percolation to take into account the herding of human beings. In the rest of the work we refer the homogeneous network of ref.[4] as 'random case'.

Below we present our observations on various aspects of the dynamics and we discuss the related scenario. For our entire work we chose $\delta p = 0.001$ and $\delta q = 0.001$ and all the quantities are calculated on typical networks of size 101×101 and 1001×1001 . The initial value of q was chosen to be 0.5. The late time dynamics does not depend on this choice.

We enumerate the time evolution of the quality q and the average preference $\langle p \rangle = (1/N) \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$, where N is number of agents on the spanning network. Both the quantities increase with time while q shows a plateau type behaviour (not shown here) for an intermediate regime and $\langle p \rangle$ increases initially in a power law. In Fig.1, we have plotted the difference of the above two, $q - \langle p \rangle$, with time t . To demonstrate a size effect we also plot the same for a network of size 500×500 (indicated in the figure). For a comparison we plot the above quantity for the case of homogeneous random case. The difference in the two cases is apparent: in the Ising correlated case the difference ($q - \langle p \rangle$) ever increases with time after a period of nonmonotonicity, while in the random case the same goes down or remains constant in the same time domain. This reason may be attributed to the more frequent failures (no spanning) in this case, the quality of the product had to be increased while at the same time because of less effective communication through the tenuous network, many of the agents remain uninformed and thus average preference, although it increases with time, remains low compared to q .

To check the time evolution of the distribution of the agents personal preferences, we plot the distribution of p_i 's for three different times, $t = 200$ (early time), $t = 1000$ (intermediate time) and at $t = 2500$ (a relatively late time) in Fig.2, Fig.3 and in Fig.4 respectively. The value of q is indicated in the figures in each case for a guideline. In all cases the average of p_i 's ($\langle p \rangle$) is always less than q . In the early time the distribution is more or less uniform and soon the preferences start clustering around a value, a sharp peak appears and that shifts to the right. This reflects the fact that the agents are

again and again exposed to the information of the product so that they thrive for the high quality product and thus enhance their personal taste. However, apart from the sharp peak in the intermediate and late times, there appears to be a number of agents whose preferences remain far below. These are counted in the average $\langle p \rangle$ which brings down the value significantly from the most probable value and thus keeps it far below the quality (q) of the product provided at that time. We have checked that this is even more prominent at very late times when the distribution is clearly divided into two parts, one around the sharp peak on the right and a number of agents' preferences cluster around 0. Thus this further demonstrates the drifting of average preference away from the quality value, as time passes in the Ising correlated case. For comparison with the random homogeneous case Fig.5 is plotted corresponding to that in Fig.4. The left side of the peak in Fig.5 decays roughly exponentially and thus the contribution of the agents having such preference values to the average is much less in this case as compared to the case of Fig.4 for Ising correlated network.

We enumerate some additional quantities in order to understand the additional influences of the correlated inhomogeneous network on the dynamics. We look at a magnetization-like quantity and compare our present case with that of the random percolation model. Let us define a quantity d_i , which we may call as decision of the agent i : $d_i = +1$, if the agent i chooses to buy the product or go for a movie ($p_i < q$) and $d_i = -1$ otherwise ($p_i > q$). The average decision, $\langle d \rangle = (1/N) \sum_{i=1}^N d_i$, in the model, interestingly, oscillates in time between two well separated branches. Again for a comparison we plot the above for Ising correlated and for the random case, shown in Fig.6 and Fig.7 respectively. Although the qualitative behaviour is similar in two cases, there is a noticeable quantitative difference which may be important in determining some other quantities of interest. The average decision $\langle d \rangle$ is always positive (high or low) as can be seen in Fig.6 whereas the same attains negative values in the lower branch in the random case (Fig.7). This presumably tells us that a comparatively larger fraction of agents (due to the many smaller non-spanning clusters) abstain from buying products at each time, while in the Ising correlated case the fraction of agents who abstain from buying the product at each time step is comparatively less.

However, as may be expected, there are a certain fraction of agents which are always difficult to reach due to ill connectivity (the structure of the tenuous network) in Ising correlated case. Therefore, their preferences remain low compared to the most probable preferences in the social network. Now we see that this fact is reflected further in other quantities we define below for brevity.

Within the framework of the social percolation model one may define a concept of ‘profit’ (or ‘loss’) and the accumulation of ‘wealth’. Money spent by the producer/ manufacturer is proportional to the quality q of the product. Therefore, the price of the product could be proportional to q/N , where N is the number of agents targeted. But the product is sold among the agents whose preferences p_i are less than the quality q at that time. So we can define a quantity which we may call ‘*profit*’ (the negative of this may be called ‘*loss*’): Profit = $(q/N) \sum_{p_i < q} p_i - q$. The cumulative sum of the so-called profit (or loss) with time may be thought of as ‘*wealth*’.

We numerically evaluate the above quantities in the random case (homogeneous structure) and later test those quantities for the inhomogeneous Ising correlated network. The distinct two branches shown in Fig.8 may be a company’s profit (and loss) with time. In Fig.9 we draw a distribution of these profit (or loss) values with time. This shows a bimodal distribution. The ‘wealth’ is plotted in Fig.10 where we see that the wealth is negative in the entire time domain shown but it tries to recover the total loss with time, the curves goes through a dip minimum and then a sharp rise.

In Fig.11, Fig.12 and in Fig.13 we demonstrate the above quantities (as indicated in the figure) for a Ising correlated network corresponding to Fig.8, Fig.9 and in Fig.10 respectively. Now the quantitative as well as a qualitative differences are apparent. In this type of social network (under the scope of the present simple model) a company does not probably suffer much loss. Of course in this type of analysis the ‘price’ is not fixed, neither the quality or the preference values are bounded. This, however, indicates that the social structure (this means the connectivity among agents here) seems to play a definite role in the process of dynamics of any financial interest.

In conclusion, we may say that the indication of self-organized like behaviour (as that found in the same model but for a random homogeneous lattice[4]) is probably absent here in the Ising correlated

network. However, this correlated, inhomogeneous and tenuous network brings into the possibilities of many other interesting differences as compared to the random case. The spread of information in all directions is what dictates the quantitative and in some cases qualitative change in some relevant quantities.

Acknowledgment:

This work is supported by SFB 341 at the *Institute for Theoretical Physics, Cologne University*. Discussions with A. Novak and Z-F Huang are thankfully acknowledged.

References

- [1] S. Moss de Oliveira, P.M.C. de Oliveira, and D. Stauffer, *Evolution, Money, War and Computers* (Teubner, Stuttgart-Leipzig, 1999)
- [2] Gérard Weisbuch and Dietrich Stauffer, *Hits and Flops dynamics*, preprint (2000)
- [3] J.A. Holyst, K. Kacperski, F. Schweizer, *Social impact models of opinion dynamics*, to be published in *Annual Reviews of Computational Physics*, **IX**, World Scientific, Singapore (2000); cond-mat/0004026
- [4] S. Solomon, G. Weisbuch, L. de Arcangelis, N. Jan, D. Stauffer, *Physica A*, **277**, 239 (2000)
- [5] Z. Huang, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. C*, **11**, 1 (2000)
- [6] F. Schweitzer, ed. *Self-Organization of Complex Structures. From Individual to Collective Dynamics*, Gordon and Breach, Amsterdam, 1997
- [7] D. Stauffer and A. Aharony, *Introduction to Percolation Theory* (Taylor and Francis, London, 2nd ed. 1994)




Figure 1: Time variations of the difference between the quality (q) of the product and the average preferences ($\langle p \rangle$) of the agents are shown for Ising correlated network and that for the homogeneous network of random percolation case for comparison. To demonstrate the dependence on system size one set of data is also plotted for a bigger system (indicated in the figure) for the Ising correlated network.




Figure 2: Plotted here is the early time ($t = 200$) distribution of personal preferences for a Ising correlated network on a 1001×1001 lattice. The position of the value of the quality q is indicated for comparison.




Figure 3: Plotted here is the distribution of the same as that in Fig.2 but at a later time $t = 1000$.




Figure 4: The distribution of personal preferences (on Ising correlated network) at a late time $t = 2500$. This is plotted here without the dominating sharp peak (right end). This shows the distribution profile for the preferences of numerous other agents than those clustered around the most probable value.




Figure 5: The distribution (without the sharp peak) of personal preferences at $t = 2500$ for a homogeneous network (random percolation case) for a 1001×1001 lattice. This is plotted here to have a comparison with the case in Fig.4.




Figure 6: Average decision ($\langle d \rangle$) with time (t) for the Ising correlated network of size 1001×1001 .




Figure 7: Average decision ($\langle d \rangle$) with time (t) is plotted here for the random homogeneous case for a 1001×1001 lattice to be compared with Fig.6.




Figure 8: Time variation of 'profit' / 'loss' in the random percolation case




Figure 9: Distribution of 'profit' / 'loss' in the random percolation case




Figure 10: Accumulation of 'wealth' in the random percolation case




Figure 11: Time variation of profit/ loss in the Ising correlated case




Figure 12: Distribution of profit/ Loss in the Ising correlated case




Figure 13: Accumulation of 'wealth' in the random percolation case