



Granular DeGroot dynamics -- a model for robust naive learning in social networks

LSE Research Online URL for this paper: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/123428/>

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:

Amir, Gideon, Arieli, Itai, Ashkenazi-Golan, Galit and Peretz, Ron (2022) Granular DeGroot dynamics -- a model for robust naive learning in social networks. In: Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation. ACM Press, pp. 323-324. ISBN 9781450391504

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3490486.3538291>

Reuse

Items deposited in LSE Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the LSE Research Online record for the item.

Granular DeGroot Dynamics – a Model for Robust Naive Learning in Social Networks

GIDEON AMIR*, Bar Ilan University, Israel

ITAI ARIELI, The Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Israel

GALIT ASHKENAZI-GOLAN, London School of Economics and Political Science, United Kingdom

RON PERETZ, Bar Ilan University, Israel

We study a model of opinion exchange in social networks where a state of the world is realized and every agent receives a zero-mean noisy signal of the realized state. It is known from Golub and Jackson [6] that under DeGroot [3] dynamics agents reach a consensus that is close to the state of the world when the network is large. The DeGroot dynamics, however, is highly non-robust and the presence of a single “stubborn agent” that does not adhere to the updating rule can sway the public consensus to any other value. We introduce a variant of DeGroot dynamics that we call $\frac{1}{m}$ -DeGroot. $\frac{1}{m}$ -DeGroot dynamics approximates standard DeGroot dynamics to the nearest rational number with m as its denominator and like the DeGroot dynamics it is Markovian and stationary. We show that in contrast to standard DeGroot dynamics, $\frac{1}{m}$ -DeGroot dynamics is highly robust both to the presence of stubborn agents and to certain types of misspecifications.

CCS Concepts: • **Theory of computation** → **Algorithmic game theory and mechanism design**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: DeGroot dynamics, robust naive learning, social networks

ACM Reference Format:

Gideon Amir, Itai Arieli, Galit Ashkenazi-Golan, and Ron Peretz. 2022. Granular DeGroot Dynamics – a Model for Robust Naive Learning in Social Networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC '22)*, July 11–15, 2022, Boulder, CO, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3490486.3538291>

Social networks play a very important role as a conduit of information. Individuals repeatedly interact with their peers and adjust the choices they make by responding to their observed behavior. One explanation for such adaptive behavior is informational effects; i.e., individuals infer the underlying information that gives rise to the observed behavior and based on this *social learning* change their own behavior (e.g., [2], [5], [1]). Making fully rational inferences about the private information of *all* agents given the observed behavior, however, is known to be conceptually and computationally complex.¹ In practice, agents are often unaware of the structure of the network. This unawareness prevents the agents from tracing the information path in an environment of repeated interaction.

In order to overcome the complexity of rational decision making, an alternative approach has been developed. The most prominent such approach is the one proposed by DeGroot [3] and brought into the economics literature by DeMarzo et al. [4]. The DeGroot framework comprises a social network that is represented by a (finite) graph. The vertices of the graph represent agents who are in

*The full version of this extended abstract can be found at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3791413>.

¹See, e.g., [7].

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

EC '22, July 11–15, 2022, Boulder, CO, USA

© 2022 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9150-4/22/07.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3490486.3538291>

direct relations with their neighbors in the graph. The true state of the world is represented by a real number μ . At each time period $t \geq 0$ each agent i obtains a subjective opinion $A_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}$ regarding the state of the world. A common assumption is that the initial opinions satisfy $A_{i,0} = \mu + \varepsilon_i$, where $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i \in V}$ are i.i.d. with expectation zero. As time progresses, the agents simultaneously revise their opinions while relying only on the opinions of their neighbors. An important property of the DeGroot updating procedure, as established by DeGroot [3] is that in the long run agents reach consensus.

When the graph is large, one can infer μ from the initial opinions $\{A_{i,0}\}_{i \in V}$, but no single agent can make such an inference by herself, since she observes her own opinion and the opinions of her neighbors only. However, Golub and Jackson [6] demonstrated the following striking property of the DeGroot dynamics, which they termed *naive learning*. Despite the simplicity of the DeGroot rule, when the graph is large and no agent is too central, the agents' opinions converge to a consensual opinion that is close to the true state of the world with high probability.

A weakness of the standard DeGroot dynamics as a tool to aggregate private information is its sensitivity to minor deviations. The source of such deviations may be either malicious agents, who have an incentive to change public opinion, or agents who suffer from behavioral biases. For example, suppose one of the agents does not follow the updating rule, while all the others do. Specifically, say that one of the agents is “stubborn”; that is, she starts with a certain opinion and never changes it. Applying DeGroot dynamics in the presence of such a stubborn agent results in everyone adopting the opinion of the stubborn agent in any finite connected graph. Another possible modification of the model is distorted monitoring: the agents do not observe the exact opinion of each of their neighbors, but rather a slight modification of it. Say, for example, that everyone sees $x + \beta$ when the true opinion is x . Then, even if β is very small (yet positive), the resulting limiting opinions of all of the agents will be ∞ regardless of the state of the world.

The core research question we address in this paper is the following: does there exist a simple boundedly rational heuristics that enable naive learning that is immune to the above-mentioned deviations? We provide a positive answer to this question in a setting with either a large or a countably infinite graph of bounded degree.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

G. Amir gratefully acknowledges the support of the Israeli Science Foundation grant #957/20. I. Arieli and R. Peretz gratefully acknowledges the support of Israel Science Foundation grant # 2566-20. G. Ashkenazi-Golan gratefully acknowledges the support of the Israel Science Foundation, grants 217/17 and 722/18, and NSFC-ISF, China Grant 2510/17.

REFERENCES

- [1] D Acemoglu, M A Dahleh, I Lobel, and A Ozdaglar. 2010. Bayesian learning in social networks. *Review of Economic Studies* 78 (2010), 1–34.
- [2] Robert J Aumann. 1976. Agreeing to disagree. *The annals of statistics* (1976), 1236–1239.
- [3] Morris H DeGroot. 1974. Reaching a consensus. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 69, 345 (1974), 118–121.
- [4] Peter M DeMarzo, Dimitri Vayanos, and Jeffrey Zwiebel. 2003. Persuasion bias, social influence, and unidimensional opinions. *The Quarterly journal of economics* 118, 3 (2003), 909–968.
- [5] John D Geanakoplos and Heraklis M Polemarchakis. 1982. We can't disagree forever. *Journal of Economic theory* 28, 1 (1982), 192–200.
- [6] Benjamin Golub and Matthew O Jackson. 2010. Naive learning in social networks and the wisdom of crowds. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 2, 1 (2010), 112–49.
- [7] Jan Hkzla, Ali Jadbabaie, Elchanan Mossel, and M Amin Rahimian. 2019. Reasoning in Bayesian opinion exchange networks is PSPACE-hard. In *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR, 1614–1648.