Socioeconomic Networks with Long-Range Interactions

Rui Carvalho¹ Giulia Iori²

¹Centre for Advanced Spatial Analysis University College London

> ²Department of Economics City University

> > October 3, 2007

Carvalho, Iori (CASA (UCL) and City Univ.)

Socioeconomic Networks ...

October 3, 2007 1 / 22

- Individuals and firms interact to share information and resources, exchange goods and credit, make new friendships or partnerships etc;
- The structure of the network through which interactions take place may impact on the success of the individual or the productivity of the firm;
- The network of interactions among socioeconomic agents plays an important role for the stability and efficiency of socioeconomic systems;
- Theories about how such interaction networks form are thus essential for a deeper understanding of the development and organization of society as a whole.

Two cultures

• Physics:

- Characterization of the structure of real networks;
- Dynamic models (probabilistic), capable of reproducing the observed geometrical structures (Poisson, stretched exponential and scale-free);
- Shortcoming: network growth mechanisms (e.g. preferential attachment) rely on node degree, which may be only one of the factors determining attachment in social networks;

Economics:

- Equilibrium networks;
- Network formation mechanisms based on utility maximization and costs minimization;
- Aim at identifying, among the set of equilibrium networks, the geometry that optimizes efficiency in the sense of social benefit;
- Interested in the stability of equilibrium networks under link deletion, addition or rewiring;
- Shortcoming: symmetries in the payoff functions mean that equilibrium networks are often too simple in their geometry (stars, complete networks, interlinked starts, etc.);

Carvalho, Iori (CASA (UCL) and City Univ.)

Jackson and Wolinsky Model

- Agents derive benefit both from their nearest neighbours and from faraway nodes;
- Utility of node *i*:

$$u_i = w_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} \delta^{d_{ij}} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}(i)} c_{ij}$$
(1)

- Jackson and Wolinsky study pairwise stability when agents can only update one link at a time;
- Bala and Goyal allow agents to rearrange all their connections at once;
- A configuration is accepted if it increases the utility of the agent;
- In Bala and Goyal, the star network is both efficient and stable for a wide range of the parameters when $\delta = 1$. Multiplicity of network architectures for $0 < \delta < 1$ which could be Nash.

• Simplified version of Jackson and Wolinsky ($w_{ij} = 1$, $w_{ii} = 0$ and $c_{ij} = c$):

$$u_{i} = \sum_{l=1}^{l_{max}^{(i)}} \sum_{\{k \mid d_{ik} = l\}} \delta^{l} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}(i)} c = \sum_{l=1}^{l_{max}^{(i)}} \delta^{l} z_{l}^{(i)} - c z_{1}^{(i)}$$
(2)

- Our approach:
 - Accept a (real world?) network topology (Poisson, scale-free): how does average utility rank compared to other networks?
 - Network growing mechanisms: preferential attachment by node utility;

• Average utility in generic random networks

$$\bar{u}\left(\delta\right) = \sum_{l=1}^{\bar{l}} \delta^{l} z_{l} \tag{3}$$

• The generating function formalism leads to:

$$\mathsf{z}_l = \left[\frac{\mathsf{z}_2}{\mathsf{z}_1}\right]^{l-1} \mathsf{z}_1$$

• Replacing (4) in (3) yields:

$$\overline{u}\left(\delta\right) = \frac{\delta z_1\left(\left(\delta Z\right)^{\overline{I}} - 1\right)}{\delta Z - 1} \tag{5}$$

where $Z = z_2/z_1$ and

$$\bar{I} = \frac{\ln[(N-1)(Z-1)/z_1 + 1]}{\ln(Z)}$$
(6)

(4)

Star and Poisson random networks

• Average utility of a star network:

$$\overline{u}_{*}\left(\delta\right) = \delta z_{1}\left(1 + \delta \frac{N-2}{2}\right) \tag{7}$$

where $z_1=2\left(\mathit{N}-1
ight) /\mathit{N}.$ For N large, $z_1\simeq 2$ and $\overline{u}_{*}\left(\delta
ight) \sim \mathit{N}\delta^2$;

• Poisson random networks are characterized by $z_1 = pN$ and $z_2 = z_1^2$, thus:

$$\overline{u}_{P}(N,\delta,z_{1}) = \frac{z_{1}\delta\left(\left(\delta z_{1}\right)^{\ln\left(N+\frac{1-N}{z_{1}}\right)/\ln\left(z_{1}\right)}-1\right)}{\delta z_{1}-1}$$
(8)

Analytical results for random networks Scale-free Networks

$$p_{k}(\gamma, a) = \frac{1}{\zeta(\gamma, 1+a)} (a+k)^{-\gamma} , a \ge 0$$
(9)

$$\overline{u}_{SF}(N, \delta, \gamma, a) = \frac{\delta z_{1}(\gamma, a) \left((\delta Z(\gamma, a))^{\overline{l}_{SF}(N, \gamma, a)} - 1 \right)}{\delta Z(\gamma, a) - 1}$$
(10)

$$\overline{l}_{SF}(N, \gamma, a) = \frac{\ln \left(-\frac{(a+2)(N-1)}{z_{1}(\gamma, a)} + \frac{z_{1}(\gamma-1, a)\zeta(\gamma-1, a+1)(N-1)}{z_{1}(\gamma, a)^{2}\zeta(\gamma, a+1)} + 1 \right)}{\ln \left(-a + \frac{z_{1}(\gamma-1, a)\zeta(\gamma-1, a+1)}{z_{1}(\gamma, a)\zeta(\gamma, a+1)} - 1 \right)}$$

$$z_{1}(\gamma, a) = \frac{\Phi(1, \gamma - 1, a + 1) - a\Phi(1, \gamma, a + 1)}{\zeta(\gamma, a + 1)}$$
(11)

$$z_2(\gamma, \mathbf{a}) = \frac{\zeta(\gamma - 1, \mathbf{a} + 1)}{\zeta(\gamma, \mathbf{a} + 1)} z_1(\gamma - 1, \mathbf{a}) - (\mathbf{a} + 1) z_1(\gamma, \mathbf{a})$$
(12)

э

Scale-free Networks: z_1 and z_2



Figure: $z_1(\gamma, a)$ and $z_2(\gamma, a)$ in networks with scale-free degre distribution. We plot $z_1(\gamma, a)$ (full curves) and $z_2(\gamma, a)$ (dashed curves) for a = 0 (black), 1 (blue), 2 (green) and 3 (red).

Average utility in scale-free and Poisson networks



Figure: Scaled average utility in networks with power-law (full curves) and Poisson (dashed curves) degree distributions as a function of δ , z_1 and γ for $N = 10^5$. Curves have been shifted vertically for clarity $\gamma + \sigma \gamma + \varepsilon = \gamma = \varepsilon$

Carvalho, Iori (CASA (UCL) and City Univ.)

Socioeconomic Networks ...

October 3, 2007 10 / 21

- In the classic Barabási–Albert model, a network is grown by adding, at every time step, a new node that attaches to *m* existing nodes with a probability proportional to their degree, $\Pi(k_i) = k_i / \sum_{j=1}^N k_j$;
- Preferential attachment generates a scale-free probability density of incoming links that leads to the stationary result p(k) = 2m²/k^γ, with γ = 3 independently of m;
- The linear preferential attachment hypothesis is very sensitive, as the scale-free nature of the network is destroyed by a non-linear attachment rule Π(k_i) ~ k_i^α;
- There are now several extensions of the preferential attachment mechanism. Of particular relevance to our approach are fitness models:

$$\Pi(k_i) \sim \frac{f_i k_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N f_j k_j}.$$
(13)

An extension to the model of Jackson and Wolinksy

- Our contribution: preferential attachment by (time-dependent) node utility: $\Pi_i = \frac{u_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} u_k}$;
- All nodes have the same utility for $\delta = 0$ and $\delta = 1$:

$$\begin{cases} u_i = 0 \quad \forall i \text{ when } \delta = 0\\ u_i = N \quad \forall i \text{ when } \delta = 1 \end{cases}$$
(14)

so attachment happens randomly in these cases and we recover an exponential distribution of node degree;

• The preferential attachment rule is invariant up to multiplicative factors:

$$u'_{i} = \frac{u_{i}}{\delta} = k_{i} + \sum_{l=2}^{l_{max}^{(i)}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_{i}^{k}} \delta^{l}$$
(15)

where k_i is the degree of node *i*. Thus, as $\delta \to 0$ our model converges to the Barabási-Albert model and the network becomes scale-free.

Algorithm optimizations



• Nodes *i* at a higher distance than a certain I_{\max} from new node *j* receive a contribution $\Delta u_i = \delta^{d(j,i)} < 10^{-precison}$ which is less than the number of significant digits that the computer can store. This maximal distance I_{\max} is defined as

$$10^{-precision} > \delta^{l_{\max}} \Leftrightarrow l_{\max} > -\frac{precision}{\log_{10} \delta}$$
(16)

Average utility



Figure: \overline{u}/N for our model (solid curve and symbols) and the BA model (solid curve, open symbols) for m = 1 ($z_1 = 2$), 2 ($z_1 = 4$) and 5 ($z_1 = 10$). Analytical curves for average utility in Poisson (dotted curve) and scale-free (dashed curve) networks for $z_1 = 2$, 4 and 10 and $\gamma = 3.1$ (for scale-free networks).

- $\delta \rightarrow 0$ —*Rich-get-richer regime*. Preferential attachment by degree is indistinguishable from preferential attachment by utility (for $\delta = 0$ the degree distribution becomes exponential);
- $\delta \simeq 0.15 \ (N = 10^5)$ —Fit-get-rich regime.
 - Properties:
 - minimum of average path length and assortativity by degree;
 - stratification of utility values (distribution of utility shows a step-like behaviour);
 - The neighbours of the utility hubs have high utility, but low degree (degree assortativity is minimal), so the network grows from a relatively isolated core of high utility nodes linked to nodes which have low connectivity;
- $\delta = 1$ —*Exponential regime*. The degree distribution becomes exponential.



Carvalho, Iori (CASA (UCL) and City Univ.)

Evolving Networks Average path length and clustering coefficient



Figure: Average clustering coefficient, a), and path length, b), for the simulation results when m = 1, 2 and 5. Curves were scaled by, respectively, average path length and clustering coefficient for $\delta = 1$ (Poisson network). Coloured bands around the curves are 95% confidence intervals.

Network Layouts



Cumulative distributions



Carvalho, Iori (CASA (UCL) and City Univ.)

Socioeconomic Networks ...

October 3, 2007 19 / 2

Discussion

- We have studied models of socioeconomic networks with long-range interactions inspired by the work of Jackson and Wolinsky;
- Average utility in Poisson and scale-free networks:
 - Scale-free networks have higher u
 ū for the range of parameters that is of significance in real-world networks (*z*₁ ≥ 2);
 - When $z_1 = 2$, the star has the highest utility of the networks studied here... but the star is of little practical relevance;
- We have proposed a natural extension of the Barabási-Albert preferential attachment by degree to preferential attachment by utility;
- For small δ, preferential attachment by utility is stronger than by degree: the neighbours of the utility hubs have high utility, but low degree, so the network grows from a "core" of high utility around the utility hubs;
- We have identified three regimes as δ is varied: rich-get-richer $(\delta \rightarrow 0)$, fit-get-richer $(\delta$ small) and exponential $(\delta = 1)$;

Thank you for your attention.

To find more:

http://www.casa.ucl.ac.uk/rui

http://www.giuliaiori.com