

Interdependent Diffusion: The social contagion of interacting beliefs

Draft October 4, 2020

James P. Houghton

houghton@mit.edu

jameshou@seas.upenn.edu

Abstract:

Social contagion is a well-studied phenomenon in which people adopt beliefs that they are exposed to by their neighbors, and then pass those beliefs along to others. Research (and daily life) shows that people prefer to adopt beliefs that are consistent with those they already hold. However, scholars do not often account for interactions between beliefs in their models of social contagion. Instead, they assume that beliefs spread independently of one another. Is this a harmless simplification? Or does omitting interdependence between beliefs suppress important dynamics, and change the outcome of social contagion? This paper performs a head-to-head comparison between independent and interdependent diffusion. Simulations identify two social processes that emerge when diffusants interact, and predict that as a result of interdependent diffusion, worldviews will emerge that are unconstrained by external truth, and polarization will develop in homogenous populations. A controlled laboratory experiment confirms these predictions with 2400 participants in 120 artificial social networks. I conclude that the assumption of independence between diffusants is not as universally appropriate as its ubiquity would suggest. Instead, interdependence between diffusants is likely to be both common and consequential.

Keywords:

Social Contagion, Social Learning, Social Networks, Polarization, Worldviews, Interdependent Diffusion, Experiment, Agent-Based Simulation

Introduction:

On June 18th, 2015, the U.S. Treasury announced that a portrait of a woman would appear on the ten-dollar bill. The same day, news emerged of a mass shooting at a historically black church in Charleston, South Carolina. Within twenty-four hours both stories had spread through the U.S. population, driven by broadcast news and social media. In working to understand the spread of news about the shooting, researchers would be justified in ignoring the news about the \$10 bill, and vice versa. We can assume independence between these diffusants because the probability that an individual will choose to share one piece of news is not likely to be causally influenced by whether they have understood and shared the other.

In the days that followed the shooting, two other news items emerged on social media. The first was a report that the Charleston shooter had been motivated by racial hatred, which he found symbolized in the Confederate flag. The second was a call to remove the Confederate flag from the South Carolina state capitol grounds (1). Even though these are distinct ideas, each spreading through a process of social contagion, we cannot ignore one in trying to understand the diffusion of the other. If an individual has previously adopted the belief that the flag should be removed from the capitol grounds, they will be more likely to believe that the shooter's identification with the flag is politically relevant, and vice versa. Rather than being independent diffusants, these beliefs are *interdependent*.

With good reason, the overwhelming majority of social contagion research over the last 50 years has assumed that diffusants spread independently of one another.

Independence is an extremely useful and generative simplification. By assuming that diffusants do not interact, we can study the effects of social network structure, homophily, social reinforcement, or demographics on each contagion process in isolation. We then linearly superimpose any additional contagion processes upon the first.

The independence assumption makes it easier to develop and communicate theories of social contagion, and the most influential authors on social contagion use it to great effect. For example, when Granovetter showed that one's distant acquaintances may provide more novel information than one's close friends, he ignored how the receiver acquires the contextual knowledge needed to understand foreign information (2). Similarly, when he showed how individuals' heterogeneous responses to peer pressure can shape cascades of collective action, he set aside the social contagion of tactics and political attitudes that accompany protest (3). When Schelling showed that even weak preferences for similar neighbors could lead to segregation, he measured "similarity" along a single dimension (4). When Watts highlighted the importance of local network structure for the initial germination of adoption cascades, he limited his model to one diffusant at a time (5). When Burt showed that individuals who bridge a gap between strangers can benefit from brokering information between them, he assumed that all parties share enough common understanding to make the information transferable in the first place (6). When Kempe, Kleinberg, and Tardos worked out how to promote a belief to maximize its spread, they ignored the simultaneous spread of other beliefs in the network (7). As a final example, when

Centola and Macy developed the theory of complex contagion, they specified that social reinforcement of the *same* behavior was required for individuals to adopt a behavior, omitting the possibility that related behaviors may also support adoption (8).

As with theoretical treatments, most empirical studies of social contagion have considered diffusants to be independent of one another. For example, Travers and Milgram's use of chain letters to study social network structure may have reached different conclusions if individuals' willingness to forward the letter had been influenced by other pieces of mail (9). Lorenz *et al.* (10) and Muchnik, Aral, and Taylor (11) showed that social influence undermined the "wisdom of crowds" effect when the crowd assessed one item at a time. Rand, Arbesman, and Christakis (12) and Suri and Watts (13) showed that social network structure influenced the spread of cooperation, a single social behavior, and the list goes on.

The independence assumption makes for parsimonious theory, and it reduces the complexity and expense of experiments. However, scholars of social contagion assume independence between diffusants so frequently and to such productive ends that we do not always make this assumption explicit. This is dangerous, in that readers – and occasionally authors – may not recognize that an assumption is being made.

"Interdependent diffusion" describes any social contagion process in which individuals' likelihood of adopting diffusant A is a function of their current state of adoption of B (C, D, ...) *and* in which their likelihood of adopting B (C, D, ...) is a function of their state of adoption of A. In the social contagion literature, only a few studies explicitly allow for this type of interaction between diffusants. Baldassari and

Bearman (14) and DellaPosta, Shi, and Macy (15) both explore interdependence that arises when individuals' opinions and preferences serve to signal membership in a particular group. In their models, various preferences tend to become popular in different parts of the social network, and positions on political issues become associated with lifestyle choices. Friedkin et al. (16) and Goldberg and Stein (17) simulate interdependence that arises from logical interactions between diffusants to explore the emergence of polarization or consensus. While they do not explicitly compare independent and interdependent diffusion and have not tested their theories empirically, writers of this nascent literature (see also 18-20) suggest that scholars of social contagion should reassess the common assumption of independence between diffusants.

This paper begins such a reassessment. How much does interdependence *matter*? In addressing this question, I argue that interdependence matters to scholars and practitioners if it 1) generates new sociological processes, 2) suggests new observable outcomes, and 3) has practical consequences for communication and social policy. If these results are not observed then the assumption of independence is sufficient. If they are observed, much work remains to understand how interdependence changes our understanding of social contagion.

This paper uncovers two new sociological processes that are unique to interdependent diffusion and which cannot be reduced to the familiar influences of network structure, homophily, social reinforcement, or demographics. First, when

beliefs² support one another's adoption, they can "snowball" through a population to reach a broader audience than any could have reached on its own. Secondly, when individuals have similar belief sets, they are more likely to respond in the same way to new beliefs to which they are exposed, and so become yet more similar.

Simulations in this paper predict that shared "worldviews" will emerge spontaneously from the process of interdependent diffusion. Specifically, subsets of a population will come to share a set of interconnected beliefs (and reject others that are equally available) without reference to any ground truth. Interdependent diffusion is also predicted to foment polarization by increasing similarity within ideological camps and difference between camps, and aligning the population along a "left-right" political axis.

Finally, this paper reports an experimental test of the above predictions that involved 2400 participants in 120 artificial social networks. Each individual was given clues to a mystery and was asked to share any promising leads with their social network neighbors. After exchanging clues for eight minutes, they were asked to judge who performed the crime and how. The presented information was manipulated to create a world with strong interdependence between clues, and a comparison world in which the same clues were independent of each other. Unbeknownst to the participants, the mystery had no solution and the clues were perfectly symmetric and pretested to eliminate outside bias. Regardless, participants confidently surmised an answer, and in so doing confirmed the predicted emergence of worldviews and polarization.

² Throughout this paper, I use the term "beliefs" to refer to ideas or statements of fact, rather than values or ideals.

While this paper cannot explore all of the implications of interdependent diffusion, it does highlight a few mechanisms that are of sufficient impact and relevance to make interdependence an unignorable aspect of social contagion. This paper reminds us that the assumption of independence between diffusants is just that – an assumption. Despite its ubiquity, the assumption should be made explicit when employed and challenged when necessary.

Results:

A Minimal Model of Interdependent Diffusion

A very simple model can illustrate the effect of belief interaction on social contagion. In this model, individuals' beliefs are represented using the “semantic network” abstraction borrowed from the cognitive science literature (21-24). As shown in Fig. 1, nodes in a semantic network represent concepts such as people, places, or activities. A semantic network edge represents the belief that two concepts are connected in some way (*e.g.* the *person* visited the *place*). Beliefs interact when they both reference a particular node in the semantic network³.

When an individual is exposed to a new belief by her neighbor in the social network, she decides whether to adopt it by seeing how it relates to beliefs in her existing semantic network. She is likely to adopt a belief connecting two concepts that are already close together in her semantic network, as it seems consistent with the beliefs she already holds (24, 25). Conversely, she is unlikely to adopt a belief that two

³Other models assume relationships such as “belief *i* is compatible with *j*, but not *k*”. Avoiding the need to pre-specify compatibility gives confidence that any systematic variation in adoption can be attributed to the diffusion process rather than to the assumed relationships. The importance of this is outlined in the supplement.

distant concepts are connected, as doing so would dramatically reshape her belief structure. The simplest representation of this tendency is that a simulated individual will adopt any belief that her neighbors possess, as long as the existing distance in her semantic network is below some threshold. To make the simulation easy to follow, I use a threshold of 2 links distance, such that a belief will be permanently adopted if it closes a triangle in the adopter's semantic network⁴.




Fig. 1. A minimal model of interdependent diffusion

⁴ The results of the simulation are qualitatively similar with other thresholds or decision rules.

The Reciprocal Facilitation Mechanism

To observe the first effect of interdependence on diffusion, we can follow a single focal belief as it spreads through the social network. The focal belief spreads when the prior beliefs of an exposed individual make her susceptible to the focal belief (i.e. in this simplified model the focal belief would “close a triangle” in her semantic network). Continuing to spread to other neighbors in the social network, the focal belief may then reciprocate that facilitation by creating conditions of susceptibility to the beliefs which had previously supported its diffusion, and repeat the cycle.

Fig. 2 illustrates this mechanism of “reciprocal facilitation”, in which simultaneously-diffusing beliefs alternately create susceptibility to one another, and together are adopted by more individuals than any single belief could have reached by diffusing on its own. In this illustration, Juliet, Ken, and Lisa each begin with a different set of beliefs denoted as connections (AB, AC, ...) between concepts: (A, B, C, ...). At first, these individuals are not susceptible to adopting beliefs from one another, and so no diffusion can occur. Ken’s acquisition of belief BD in step 1 kicks off a cycle of reciprocal facilitation between BD and AD in steps 2-4. Without the introduction of belief BD, Lisa could never adopt AD, despite her prior susceptibility. Similarly, without AD she could not adopt BD, despite her prior exposure.




Fig. 2. The reciprocal facilitation mechanism. Beliefs (AB, AD, etc.) represent connections made between concepts (A, B, C, D, E) and spread when an exposed individual can close a triangle in their existing semantic network by adopting a belief.

Returning to the earlier example, we can see reciprocal facilitation at work between beliefs about the confederate flag. The existing political conflict facilitated the spread of information about the shooter's identification with the flag, and as it spread, news of the shooter's identification brought more attention to the political conflict over the flag's display at the state capitol.

What are the effects of reciprocal facilitation at the macro level? Figure 3 shows the result of applying the "triangle closing" decision rule to a population of 60 agents in a

random social network⁵. The first effect of reciprocal facilitation is to allow the average number of susceptible and adopting individuals to grow simultaneously, as shown by the red logistic growth curves in Fig. 3A. As a comparison, in black, I show how the same beliefs would diffuse if they did not interact. In the independent case, beliefs may only be adopted by individuals who are susceptible at the start, and so beliefs spread less widely in the population. Put another way: to explain the same level of final adoption, models of independent diffusion need to assume significantly more initial susceptibility to each belief.

It would be reasonable for us to ignore interdependence and instead assume more widespread initial susceptibility, were it not for the second effect of reciprocal facilitation. When diffusants do not interact, the population initially susceptible to a belief is an excellent predictor of the number who will eventually adopt it. However, Fig 3B shows that as susceptibility evolves alongside adoption in interdependent diffusion, the population that is initially susceptible to a belief becomes a poor predictor of who will eventually adopt it.

To use a concrete example, imagine that a “focus group” is selected from our artificial population before the simulation starts, and imagine that amongst this group AB is adopted by 25% more people than CD. Unsurprisingly, when we simulate independent diffusion in the full population, AB turns out to be more popular than CD in over 99% of cases. On the other hand, when we simulate interdependent diffusion, AB


⁵ For details of the simulation, see the Methods section.

is adopted by more people than CD only 57% of the time – just slightly better than chance.


The Effect of Reciprocal Facilitation on Emergent Belief Structures

Independent diffusion | **Interdependent diffusion**


A. Susceptibility and adoption coevolve



B. Adoption becomes unpredictable



C. Adjacent beliefs have correlated adoption



D. Popular beliefs cluster together




Fig. 3: The effect of reciprocal facilitation on emergent belief structures.

The popularity of interdependent beliefs is hard to predict because reciprocal facilitation does not support the diffusion of all beliefs to the same degree. Instead, it preferentially amplifies those that are connected to other widely adopted beliefs. Figure

3C shows that a belief's popularity becomes correlated with the popularity of the most popular belief adjacent to it. This is because a belief that is supported by many popular beliefs will have many opportunities to diffuse, and then to facilitate the adoption of other closely related beliefs. Conversely, a belief that is connected only to unpopular supporting beliefs will have trouble reaching even the few individuals who are susceptible to adopting it.

As a result, patterns emerge when individual semantic networks are aggregated to the level of the population. After interdependent diffusion, the most popular beliefs are closely related to one another and form densely connected islands in the semantic space. Fig. 3D shows one of many possible measures of this structure, the clustering coefficient (see the methods section for others). In everyday language, we might call these clusters of interacting beliefs "worldviews". Shared by large segments of the population, these self-reinforcing sets of beliefs have a strong influence on which new beliefs can be adopted. While clustering is a consistent outcome of interdependent diffusion, the process itself is strongly path-dependent, and so the precise locations of the clusters (the worldviews that emerge) are unpredictable.

This simulation suggests that clustering does not occur because some beliefs are inherently more compatible with one another, but because the most popular beliefs bring popularity to their neighbors. In contrast, independently diffusing beliefs can only exhibit this kind of macro-level structure if it is assumed to be present in individuals' initial susceptibility to beliefs. Doing so merely defers explanation to another exogenous phenomenon.

The Agreement Cascade Mechanism

To explain a second mechanism of interdependent diffusion, we can observe a pair of neighbors in the social network. When these two individuals exchange beliefs, they become more similar to one another. Because their existing belief sets influence the way they respond to new beliefs, shared beliefs make the two individuals more likely to adopt (or reject) the same new beliefs in the future, regardless of any preference to align or distinguish themselves from one another. As a result, they become more similar still. Additionally, similar neighbors expand one another's access to beliefs that the two may adopt in common, and filter each other's exposure to beliefs that would set them apart from one another. In contrast, individuals who adopt differing beliefs are likely to diverge further as their dissimilar semantic networks make them susceptible to different beliefs.

Fig. 4 illustrates this “agreement cascade” mechanism, in which exchanging beliefs creates further opportunities for similarity to develop between individuals. In this example, Mike, Nina, and Otis share two out of their three beliefs with their neighbors (AD and DE), and so their belief sets are positively correlated at 0.42. When Nina and Otis exchange beliefs in step 1, they not only make themselves more similar in the act, but they also set themselves up for congruent behavior in the future. Their response to externally supplied beliefs in step 2 further reinforces their similarity with one another and amplifies their emerging dissimilarity with Mike.




Fig. 4. The agreement cascade mechanism. Similarity between neighbors is measured as the correlation (ρ coefficient) between the set of beliefs they hold.

Returning to our 60-agent simulation, we can ask how patterns of similarity evolve at the macro level. In this simulation, we assume that adoption is permanent, and so diffusion raises the average similarity of the population purely by chance. This is especially true in the first round of simulation when neighbors have had a chance to exchange beliefs, but those beliefs have not yet spread through the population. Fig. 5A shows that agreement cascades drive individuals who already share some beliefs to form increasingly self-similar “camps”, and amplify the differences between camps.


A simple and reproducible way to assess the similarity of individuals within an ideological camp – absent exogenous labels such as demographic or party – is to measure the similarity between all pairs of individuals and define a certain percentile as belonging to the same ideological camp. The more exclusive we are (i.e. the higher the percentile), the more conservative the claim that these represent “within-camp” relationships. Similarly, to define across-camp similarity, we can define a percentile that (conservatively) represents relationships between individuals in different ideological

camps. In this simulation, I use the 95th and 5th percentiles respectively. See the Methods section for more details⁶.

The Effect of Agreement Cascades on Emergent Polarization

Independent diffusion | Interdependent diffusion

A: "Camps" become more distinct



B: Beliefs align along an axis




Figure 5: The effect of agreement cascades on emergent polarization

As individuals become more similar to people within their own camp and more differentiated from people in other camps, correlation begins to emerge between belief sets. For example, AB may co-occur with CD 70% of the time, but co-occur with DE only 10% of the time. This sorting is a form of dimensionality reduction, in which the complex landscape of beliefs becomes condensed into a few axes (e.g. liberal-conservative, or libertarian-populist) (26). The upper inset diagram in Fig. 5B illustrates

⁶ There are many complex measures of polarization in the literature (14, 15, 17, 26-32 for a sample), which generally attempt to represent three basic intuitions. First, that individuals within the same ideological camp come to be more similar to one another. Secondly, that individuals in different ideological camps become more dissimilar to one another. Lastly, that an individual's position on one dimension of belief becomes informative of their position on other dimensions. As my purpose is not to identify camps and their members, but to suggest that one set of conditions is more generative of polarization than another, these measures add more complexity than value. Instead I report heuristic measures characterizing the above three intuitions.

individuals who exchange interdependent beliefs and begin to take positions along a left-right axis. Differences between these individuals are mostly due to their relative positions along the left-right axis, and individuals at any point on the axis are relatively similar to one another. The lower inset diagram illustrates individuals who have exchanged independent beliefs with one another. In this diagram, there is less alignment along the left-right axis and more variation between individuals at any given point.

Fig. 5B measures belief alignment as the amount of variation between individuals that can be explained by the best fitting axis in the space of possible beliefs (see the Methods section for details). While some difference from the homogeneous initial state is an inevitable result of diffusion, the effect of agreement cascades is to increase the ease with which individuals' beliefs can be summarized by their position on a "political spectrum". As a result, it becomes easier to predict an individual's position on one belief from their position on other beliefs.

A Laboratory Experiment

The above simulation describes mechanisms that emerge when beliefs interact, and makes specific, testable predictions about the effect of interdependence on diffusion. However, all such simulations deliberately simplify human behavior to explain the sociological mechanisms in play, and may mischaracterize behavior in important ways. To test whether these mechanisms and predictions hold with real human actors and realistic beliefs, I conducted a randomized controlled experiment with 2400 participants in 120 artificial social networks. I systematically varied the level of

interaction between beliefs in otherwise identical populations, and measured emergent polarization in individuals' behavior and self-reported beliefs.

Over the course of 8 days, I recruited 2768 U.S. and Canadian Mechanical Turk workers, of whom 2400 completed training and were randomized into 20-person social networks⁷. Each network was assigned to one of four (matched) experimental conditions, each with n=30 samples. The participant population was 45% female; mean 37.1 years old; 27% high-school, 49% bachelors, 16% masters+ graduates. 96.8% of players who completed training went on to complete all steps of the experiment, with less than 0.4% difference in dropout between conditions. The preregistration for this experiment⁸ included all code necessary to generate test conditions, implement the game using Empirica (33), conduct the experiment, and process the resulting data. Anonymized timestamped data for every player action is available for further analysis⁹.

In this experiment, participants were asked to find a solution to a mystery by identifying a burglar's name, description, clothing, burglary tool, and getaway vehicle. Participants were seeded with four clues to the mystery, and incentivized to sort those clues into "Promising Leads" and "Dead Ends", as shown in Fig. 6. When a participant categorized a clue as a promising lead, it was immediately shared with their three neighbors in the 20-person social network.

The measures of polarization described in the above simulation were operationalized to reflect participants' behavior, and also their self-reported opinions.

⁷ This sample size was chosen primarily to satisfy budget constraints.

⁸ The preregistration can be found at <https://osf.io/239ns>

⁹ Experiment data can be found at <https://github.com/JamesPHoughton/detective-game-interdependent-diffusion>

“Behavioral” measures were constructed from each player’s final categorization of 22 clues, reflecting the cumulative choices that they had made throughout the game. Following the game, participants estimated the likelihood that each suspect, vehicle, etc. was involved in the crime. “Self-report” measures were constructed from these 11-item assessments, reflecting how participants internalized the information they encountered to create opinions. Finally, participants were asked to rate their confidence in their overall solution, and the level of consensus they perceived in their team. The “Gameplay” section of the supplement recounts the participants’ full experience.




Fig. 6. The primary user interface of the “Detective Game”. Clue cards can be dragged into categories in the player’s “Notebook”. Promising Leads are immediately shared with three neighbors, who can drag them into their own notebooks.

In the theory-building simulations above, agents can be programmed to pay attention to interactions between beliefs in an “interdependent” world, and ignore those

interactions in an identical “independent” world. Human beings, on the other hand, are wired to see connections and relationships between ideas, and so it is impossible to conduct a perfect test in which *all* clues interact in one experimental condition, while *none* of those clues interact in another. Instead, I partitioned the clues such that some were common to both independent and interdependent conditions and used for analysis (i.e. “analysis clues”), while others varied across conditions to manipulate the level of interaction between analysis clues. In each game, 22 analysis clues linked the crime scene and stolen object to each of the suspects, descriptions, clothes, tools, and vehicles, as illustrated in Fig. 7a. In the interdependent condition, 55 additional “cross-linking clues” connected all of these elements of the mystery (i.e. suspects, vehicles, etc.) to one another (Fig. 7b). In the independent condition, 55 “filler clues” took the place of cross-linking clues to break the relationships between elements (Fig. 7c). These filler clues ensured that the two conditions had the same total number of clues, and that the structure of clues was as similar as possible between conditions.

Clues were extensively pre-tested to minimize bias from the outside world, such that each element was perceived to be equally likely to be involved in a burglary absent other information. Sets of clues were then randomly generated from the pool of pretested concepts, representing over 225 billion possible mysteries. At the start of the game, each clue was present in exactly one player’s notebook. As a result, beliefs spread on a level playing field, such that *a priori* none should be expected to diffuse more than any other. Further information can be found in the “Clue Generation” section of the supplement.


Introducing Cross-links to Manipulate Interaction Between Clues

A: Analysis Clues
(All conditions)



- Hayes **was seen at** the Daly Auction House.
- A person wearing a hardhat **was seen at** the Daly Auction House.
- A red-haired man **was seen at** the Daly Auction House.
- ...

B: Cross-linking Clues
(Interdependent condition)



- Hayes **hangs out with** Snyder.
- Hayes **was known to wear** a hardhat.
- Hayes **was known to wear** a blue blazer.
- Hayes **was described as** a red-haired man.
- ...

C: Filler Clues
(Independent condition)



- Hayes **installs security systems.**
- Hayes **is 37 years old.**
- Hayes **has a prior conviction for shoplifting.**
- Hayes **has a tattoo of a star.**
- ...


Fig. 7: Clues are designed such that in the interdependent condition, “analysis” clues are connected to one another by cross-linking clues; while in the independent condition, analysis clues remain disconnected from one another.

In addition to the two types of clue structures, the experiment also included two types of social networks, in both of which 20 players were connected to exactly three neighbors each. The first network was a “dodecahedral” network (Fig. 8a), in which none of a player’s neighbors were directly connected to any other, and the average network distance between individuals was short. We should expect to find very little polarization in this network, as information can diffuse across the network readily, and coordination among subgroups is impeded by the lack of mutual connections. The second social network was a “regular connected caveman” structure (Fig. 8b), which exhibits high levels of clustering and large average distances between individuals. We

should expect to find high levels of polarization in this network regardless of the level of interaction between clues, as strong clustering makes it easy for subgroups to converge on a shared set of clues, and long average path lengths make it harder for information to spread between camps. Further information can be found in the “Social Network Structure” section of the supplement.


Varying Network Structure to Create a Comparison Effect

A: Dodecahedral Network



Mean path length: 2.63
Mean clustering: 0

B: Regular Connected Caveman



Mean path length: 3.95
Mean clustering: 1/2

Fig 8. Participants inhabit 20-node regular degree-3 networks chosen to (A) minimize characteristic path length and clustering, and (B) maximize these attributes.

Together these manipulations create four separate conditions. The dodecahedral network and independent clue set formed a baseline condition. Contrasted with the baseline, experimental conditions measured the effect of interdependence, the effect of social network structure, and the effect of both manipulations combined. Blocks of four simultaneous games were constructed with one game in each condition. To guard against latent external biases, each block used a different randomly-generated set of

clues. Clue assignments varied as little as possible within each block, such that the clues assigned to a particular network position in one game corresponded to those assigned to the same network position in the other three games. Upon completing training, participants were randomly assigned to positions within a block, blind to their treatment condition. I treated games within each block as matched samples, using one-sided pairwise t-tests to assess the differences between each experimental condition and the baseline.

Experimental Results

Over eight minutes of gameplay, participants on average made 28.4 classifications and adopted 16.2 clues as promising leads. Even though there were no solutions to the given mysteries, and clues were perfectly symmetric and seeded equally in the population, participants came to strongly-held beliefs about which suspect was guilty and how they performed the crime. For example, the average difference in confidence between the most and least likely suspect, vehicle, tool, etc. was over 30% in each category, and over half of participants reported confidence in at least one aspect of the mystery of 95% or greater.

The baseline condition included independent clues diffusing through the non-polarizing dodecahedral social network. This condition approximates the conditions of independent diffusion assumed broadly in the social contagion literature. However, despite the level of control afforded by a laboratory experiment, this condition does not perfectly eliminate all interactions between clues. For example, even though the independent clue set contains no explicit links between suspects, participants may draw

an implicit connection between the guilt of one suspect and the presumed innocence of another. This imperfect control means that measured differences between independent and interdependent conditions will underestimate the true effect of belief interaction.

Finding 1: Interdependent diffusion has a measurable polarizing influence

The first finding of this experiment confirms the theoretical prediction that interdependence between diffusants has a previously unobserved polarizing influence on the population's adoption behavior. Increasing the level of interdependence between clues above the baseline condition (all else held constant) measurably increased the population's alignment along a left-right axis among both behavioral (+2.16% $p=.013$) and self-reported (+2.77% $p=.022$) measures of belief (Table 1 and Fig. 9). Although not all similarity measures were significant, experimental results support the prediction that camps became more self-similar (behavioral measures $+0.0249$, $p=.014$) and more distinct from one another (self-report measures $p=.058$) as a result of interdependence.

The above theory does not predict how individuals will feel about their team's performance. Interdependence did not change the perceived consensus among the team by any measurable amount, despite the increase in polarization. However, participants in the interdependent condition did report feeling more confident in their solution (+2.17% $p=.045$).

Finding 2: The effect of interdependence is of meaningful size

The second finding is that the measured effect of interdependence is large enough to be worth attention when compared to other drivers of polarization. While we should be wary of generalizing macro-scale effect sizes from lab experiments to large-scale social networks, we can meaningfully compare the effect of interdependent diffusion with the more familiar effect of social network structure. An *a fortiori* test is to compare the measured effect of interdependence with the maximal effect that can be induced by changing the social network structure alone. If the effect of interdependence is relevant compared to that of drastic changes to the network structure, then it should also be relevant when compared with more moderate effects of network structure in the real world.

Table 1. Effect and interaction summary

		Effect over baseline condition			Interaction of Interdependence and Network Effects
		Interdependent Clues Alone	Polarizing Network Alone	Interdependent Clues and Polarizing Network	
Within-Camp Similarity (95 th percentile correlation)	Behavioral ¹	+0.0249**	+0.155***	+0.158***	-0.0227
	Self-Report ¹	-0.00389	+0.0231	+0.0357***	+0.0183
Across-Camp Similarity (5 th percentile correlation)	Behavioral ¹	+0.0112	-0.0307***	-0.0310***	-0.00827
	Self-Report ¹	-0.0345*	-0.0904***	-0.0844***	+0.0402
Alignment with Political Axis (% Variance in 1 st Component)	Behavioral ¹	+2.16%**	+13.8%***	+14.2%***	-1.79%
	Self-Report ¹	+2.77%**	+7.16%***	+5.34%***	-4.57%**
Confidence	Self-Report	+2.17%**	+0.682%	+3.74%**	+0.887%
Consensus	Self-Report	-0.624%	+1.75%*	+1.03%	-0.0925%

¹ Preregistered; *P value <.1, **P value <.05, ***P value <.01; one-sided pairwise T-tests; n=30 pairs; Baseline: Independent clues and non-polarizing social network.

The two networks included in this experiment exhibit dramatically different levels of network clustering and average path length. However, regardless of the strength of the social network manipulation, the effect of interdependent diffusion was only significantly different from the effect of social network structure in two of the six outcome measures: the behavioral measures of alignment along a left-right axis and within-camp similarity. At the same time, the estimated effect of interdependence reached approximately 40% of the *a fortiori* social network effect for the behavioral measures of across-camp similarity and alignment along a left-right axis. Other measures reported smaller but still meaningful fractions (Table 1 and Fig. 9).

Again, these should not be taken as estimates of the effect size we would expect to see outside of the lab. However, the fact that the effects of interdependence and social network structure were even comparable in this experiment suggests that scholars' almost exclusive focus on network structure over belief interaction is out of proportion to the relative importance of the two effects.

Finding 3: A negative interaction effect may exist between interdependent diffusion and social network structure

A practical question is whether and how polarization can be reduced. Based upon the prior literature, a reasonable strategy would be to shorten the average distance between individuals and break up clusters, to help information travel across the network before camps consolidate. If there is no interaction (or a positive interaction) between the effects of interdependence and network structure, these changes to social network structure would be at least as powerful when beliefs interdepend as they are

when beliefs spread on their own. However, if there is a negative interaction between interdependence and network structure, then these interventions will not be as effective as we might expect.

The final condition of this experiment measured the effect of interdependent diffusion in the polarizing social network. While statistical power was poor, this condition revealed a significant negative interaction effect for alignment with a political axis based on self-reported beliefs (-4.57% $p=.033$). It is unclear whether the interaction arises because the two factors operate through similar pathways, or because the outcome variable begins to saturate. However, it is clear that even if we had perfect control of social network structure, we could not fully address polarization without attending to belief interaction.

Effect of Interdependence and Network Structure




Fig. 9. Interdependent diffusion has a measurable polarizing effect over a baseline condition of independent clues in a non-polarizing social network. The effect size is an unignorable fraction of that of the a fortiori social network manipulation. A negative interaction effect may exist between interdependence and social network structure. (Error bars show 95% CI).

Discussion:

When multiple interrelated beliefs are regularly found together (1, 15, 26, 30), it is easy to suppose that they constitute internally-consistent worldviews that represent some underlying truth about the world. Through both simulation and experiment, this paper demonstrates that external “truth” need not be present for these worldviews to emerge. Individuals may observe internal consistency between their beliefs and social confirmation of their choices entirely as a product of interdependent diffusion. It is perhaps alarming that this can be observed in an experiment premised on a *designed* lack of evidence for any conclusion, in which participants interacted with the presented information for only eight minutes.

Implicit in the above supposition is the idea that observed worldviews represent natural groupings of beliefs (right or wrong), and that different groupings could not have become popular. Instead, this paper shows that worldviews can emerge in a path-dependent way that could have led different worldviews to emerge in the same environment.

It is not surprising to see polarization develop when a social network is formed from relatively isolated communities (8, 15), or to see polarization grow when individuals choose to associate with people like themselves (27). What is surprising is that when beliefs interact, polarization emerges even in a static, symmetric, and well-connected social network whose members are anonymous, have no desire to form groups, have no predefined issues to disagree over, have no incentive to ‘perform’ for their neighbors, and indeed have very little emotional connection with the beliefs they are sharing. It

turns out that none of our habitual explanations for polarization are strictly necessary; interdependent diffusion is sufficient.

Of the many difficulties in creating this experiment, the most complex was to design a nontrivial set of “independent” beliefs for participants to exchange. Despite many rounds of structured pretesting with hundreds of participants, in the end, the “control” condition of this experiment can only approximate conditions of independence for a subset of the diffusants. The real-world relevance of interdependent diffusion could not be better emphasized than by the difficulty of recreating the almost-ubiquitous assumption of independence between diffusants *even in ideal laboratory conditions*. It may well be that rather than assuming independence between diffusants, we ought to consider simultaneously spreading beliefs to be interdependent until proven otherwise. It is certainly the case that when scholars assume independence between diffusants, that assumption should be noted and challenged.

While this paper demonstrates the relevance of belief interaction for polarization and worldview emergence, it is by no means an exhaustive study of the consequences of interdependent diffusion. As the literature expands to include more studies of belief interaction, further effects will certainly be discovered and their practical implications recognized. Rather than closing the book, I hope that this paper opens a new chapter in the study of interdependent diffusion.

Several weeks after the Charleston Shooting, the South Carolina state legislature finally approved a bill to remove the Confederate flag from the State House grounds. Why was the Charleston shooting the incident that spurred this change, while other

instances of racial violence throughout history had not had the same effect? The removal of the flag was not a new issue, nor an inevitable outcome (1, 34). The legislators did not adopt the belief that the flag should be removed because they were newly exposed to it, but because they first adopted a series of facilitating beliefs regarding the flag, racial violence, symbols of oppression, and the preferences of their constituency. These influences cannot be reduced to simple contagion of independent diffusants; they depend entirely upon the interaction of interdependent, simultaneously diffusing beliefs.

Methods:

In the simulation presented in Figs. 3 and 5, the social network is a connected Erdős–Rényi (G_{nm}) random graph with 60 agents total, each with an average of 3 neighbors. Each agent is initialized with 25 beliefs (edges) selected randomly from the 300 edges available in a complete semantic network with 25 concepts (nodes). These values ensure good coverage of beliefs in the population, while individual semantic networks are initially sparse. Random seeding ensures that the simulation starts without polarization or systematic variation in belief popularity, and also that the social network structure itself does not contribute to polarization. Because beliefs are drawn from a complete semantic network, there is no natural belief structure around which polarization may nucleate.

In each step, individuals are selected in random order, and update their beliefs by incorporating into their semantic networks all beliefs (edges) that their neighbors

possess and they are susceptible to adopting. In the interdependent case, individuals are susceptible to any belief that closes a triangle in their semantic networks at the current time. In the comparison (independent) case for Fig 3A, a random selection of the population is defined to be susceptible to each belief in the same proportion as are initially susceptible to the belief in the interdependent diffusion case. In Figs 3B-D and Fig 5, a random selection of susceptible individuals is made in proportion to the *final* number of susceptible individuals in the interdependent diffusion case. As a result, a histogram of the extent of diffusion of each belief is approximately the same under both independent and interdependent treatments. This ensures that the subsequent presentation of results reflects purely the effect of interdependence between diffusants, and not the effect of different levels of adoption in the compared populations. Results are similar when calculated based upon the initial susceptibility.

The measures presented Figs. 3A-C are averaged over all beliefs in the simulation, and over 20,000 simulations. The measures in Figs. 3D and 5 are population-level measures averaged over 20,000 simulations. This volume of simulations is an order of magnitude beyond the point at which noise affects the result. The measure of the susceptible population in Fig. 3A (and all discussion of the susceptible population) represents all individuals who would adopt the belief if exposed to it, along with all of the individuals who have already adopted the belief. I break from the traditional compartmental model description of susceptibility and adoption/infection as mutually exclusive categories to more effectively demonstrate the coevolution of susceptibility and adoption. Using traditional definitions does not change the outcome of

the simulation. Fig. 3B measures the correlation between new adoption and those who are initially susceptible to the belief but do not start with it. As this has no meaningful value at t_0 , the curve is drawn from t_1 - t_9 . Figure 3D uses the clustering coefficient of a semantic network constructed from the most popular 10% of beliefs as a demonstration that the most popular beliefs are mutually interrelated, and not merely all related to a single leading belief (e.g. a star or barbell pattern). Clustering only makes sense when beliefs are conceptualized as a semantic network. Other conceptualizations of belief interaction might prefer to plot the number of top decile beliefs that each top decile belief interacts with. This measure gives essentially the same result (i.e. large fractional growth over time in the interdependent case, with no change from randomness in the independent case) but lacks the depth of meaning captured by the clustering metric. The measure is generally insensitive to the specific threshold used to define a 'popular' belief for any thresholds between about 5% and 40%. Fig. 5B shows the percentage of variation explained by the first principal component of the data. The original feature space has one dimension for each belief in the simulation (300), and points representing each individual's position in that feature space (60) according to the beliefs they have adopted. The inset graphs are exaggerated and show a larger population to illustrate how a component can explain more or less variation. For all remaining parameters in the simulation, other (meaningful) values and measures yield qualitatively similar results. For a full sensitivity analysis and code, see <https://github.com/JamesPHoughton/interdependent-diffusion>.

There are many ways to measure the similarity between individuals. The “self-reported” beliefs of experiment participants fall on a continuous scale from 0 to 100, and so it is natural to use Pearson’s correlation on the vectors of individuals’ beliefs. This measure has the advantage of being easily interpretable and having a well-defined range that is independent of the number of features in the vector of attributes being compared, and the negative region of which can be interpreted as expressing dissimilarity. To assess the similarity of the binary “behavioral” data I use the Phi coefficient, an analogous measure to Pearson’s correlation with the same interpretable range. The behavioral measures in the experiment are sensitive not only to interdependence and network structure but also to the average level of diffusion of beliefs. To minimize noise due to differences in the level of activity between games, each of the behavioral measures is assessed compared to what would be expected due to chance, keeping the number of adopters of each clue and the number of clues adopted by each participant fixed. All code for conducting the experiment and analyzing results, along with the results of the experiment, are available at <https://github.com/JamesPHoughton/detective-game-interdependent-diffusion>.

References:

1. J. P. Houghton *et al.*, Beyond Keywords: Tracking the Evolution of Conversational Clusters in Social Media. *Sociol. Methods Res.* **48**, 588-607 (2019).
2. M. Granovetter, The Strength of Weak Ties. *Am. J Sociol.* **78**, 1360-1380 (1973).
3. M. Granovetter, Threshold Models of Collective Behavior. *Am. J Sociol.* **83**, 1420-1443 (1978).
4. T. Schelling, "Sorting and Mixing" in *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. (Norton, Toronto, 1978) chap. 4.
5. D. J. Watts, A simple model of global cascades on random networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **99** 5766-5771 (2002).
6. R. Burt. Structural Holes: the social structure of competition. *Harvard University Press* (1992).
7. D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and E. Tardos. Maximizing the Spread of Influence through a Social Network. *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. ACM, 2003.
8. D. Centola, M. Macy, Complex Contagions and the Weakness of Long Ties. *Am. J Sociol.* **113** 702-734 (2007).
9. J. Travers and S. Milgram. An Experimental Study of the Small World Problem. *Sociometry.* **32** 425-443 (1969).
10. J. Lorenz *et al.* How social influence can undermine the wisdom of crowd effect. *PNAS* **108** 9020-9025 (2011).
11. L. Muchnik, S. Aral, and S. Taylor. Social Influence Bias: A Randomized Experiment. *Science* **341** 647-651 (2013).
12. D. Rand, S. Arbesman, and N. Christakis. Dynamic Social Networks Promote Cooperation in Experiments with Humans. *PNAS* **108** 19193-19198 (2011)
13. S. Suri and D. Watts. Cooperation and Contagion in Web-Based, Networked Public Goods Experiments. *PLoS ONE* **6** e16836 (2011)
14. D. Baldassarri, P. Bearman, Dynamics of political polarization. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **72** 784-811 (2007).
15. D. DellaPosta *et al.*, Why do liberals drink lattes? *AM. J. Sociol.* **120** 1473-1511 (2015).
16. N. E. Friedkin *et al.*, Network science on belief system dynamics under logic constraints. *Science.* **345**, 321-326 (2016).
17. A. Goldberg, S. Stein, Beyond Social Contagion: Associative Diffusion and the Emergence of Cultural Variation. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **83** 897-932 (2018).
18. C. T. Butts, Why I know but don't believe. *Science.* **354** 286-287 (2016).

19. S. E. Parsegov *et al.*, Novel Multidimensional Models of Opinion Dynamics in Social Networks. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.* **62** 2270-2285 (2017).
20. F. Xiong *et al.* Analysis and application of opinion model with multiple topic interactions. *Chaos.* **27** 083113 (2017).
21. A. M. Collins, E. F. Loftus, A Spreading-Activation Theory of Semantic Processing. *Psychol. Rev.* **82** 407-438 (1975).
22. M. Steyvers, J. B. Tenenbaum, The large-scale structure of semantic networks: Statistical analyses and a model of semantic growth. *Cogn. Sci.* **29** 41-78 (2005).
23. R. J. Brachman, "On the epistemological status of semantic networks" in *Associative Networks.* 3-50 (1979).
24. M. Schilling, A 'small-world' network model of cognitive insight. *Creat. Res. J.* **17** 131-154 (2005).
25. Nickerson, Raymond S. Confirmation Bias: A Ubiquitous Phenomenon in Many Guises. *Review of General Psychology* **2** 175–220 (1998).
26. P. DiMaggio, J. Evans, B. Bryson. Have Americans Social Attitudes Become More Polarized? *Am. J Sociol.* **102** 690-755 (1996).
27. P. Dandekar, A. Goel, and D. Lee. Biased assimilation, homophily, and the dynamics of polarization. *PNAS* **110** 5791-5796.
28. J. Becker, E. Porter, and D. Centola. The wisdom of partisan crowds. *Proc National Acad Sci.* **116**, 10717–10722 (2019).
29. I. Permyner. The conceptualization and measurement of social polarization. *J Econ Inequal* **10**, 45–74 (2012).
30. D. Baldassarri and A. Gelman. Partisans Without Constraint: Political Polarization and Trends in American Public Opinion. *Ssrn Electron J* **114**, 408–446 (2008).
31. K. T. Poole and H. Rosenthal. The Polarization of American Politics. *J Politics* **46**, 1061–1079 (1984).
32. J.M. Esteban and D. Ray. On the Measurement of Polarization. *Econometrica* **62**, 819 (1994).
33. A. Almaatouq, J. Becker, J.P. Houghton, N. Paton, D.J. Watts, and M.E. Whiting. Empirica: a virtual lab for high-throughput macro-level experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11398.* (2020).
34. J. Hawes. Grace will lead us home: The Charleston Church Massacre and the Hard, Inspiring Journey to Forgiveness. *St. Martin's Press, New York.* (2019).

Acknowledgments: Special thanks to Abdullah Almaatouq, Sinan Aral, Carolyn Fu Hazhir Rahmandad, David Rand, Ray Reagans, Hagay Volvovsky, Duncan Watts, and the System Dynamics and Economic Sociology groups at MIT Sloan for their guidance.