# Opinion and consensus formation in the presence of polyadic interactions

Jan Mölter, *Technical University of Munich* <sub>jointly with</sub> Anastasia Golovin, Pia Steinmeyer & Christian Kuehn 13<sup>th</sup> May 2025

SIAM Conference on Applications of Dynamical Systems - Minisymposium: Dynamical Systems on Networks and Fractals

Slides



Opinions are seldomly formed in isolation, but rather through **interactions** with others in society.

Besides pairwise interactions between individuals, **group dynamics** may play an integral part in opinion formation due to each individual's striving for conformity (bandwagon effect, peer-pressure ...).



Source: cottonbro studio

#### **GROUP DYNAMICS IN OPINION FORMATION**



"The tendency to conformity in our society is so strong that reasonably intelligent and well-meaning young people are willing to call white black." (Solomon Asch, 1955)



Source: cottonbro studio

We generalise the (classical) adaptive voter model and use a **hypergraph** to encode polyadic interactions.



Adaptation: rewire-to-same or rewire-to-random. **Propagation**: proportional voting or majority voting.

**Proportional voting** 



**Majority voting** 



$$\begin{split} \left[ \dot{A} \right] &= (1 - \rho) \left[ \sum_{\substack{(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2} \\ \hat{a} + \hat{b} \leq K}} [A^{\hat{a}} B^{\hat{b}}] (\hat{b} \eta_{A}(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) - \hat{a} \eta_{B}(\hat{a}, \hat{b})] \right] \\ &= (1 - \rho) \left[ \sum_{\substack{(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2} \\ \hat{a} + \hat{b} \leq K}} [A^{\hat{a}} B^{\hat{b}}] (\hat{a} \eta_{B}(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) - \hat{b} \eta_{A}(\hat{a}, \hat{b})) \right] \\ &= \rho \left[ \frac{a + 1}{a + b + 1} [A^{a + 1} B^{\hat{b}}] \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{N}^{2} \cap B_{K}^{1}(0)} (a + 1, b) + \frac{b + 1}{a + b + 1} [A^{\hat{a}} B^{\hat{b}+1}] \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{N}^{2} \cap B_{K}^{1}(0)} (a, b + 1) - [A^{\hat{a}} B^{\hat{b}}] \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{N}^{2} \cap B_{K}^{1}(0)} (a, b) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2} \\ \hat{a} + \hat{b} \leq K}} [A^{\hat{a}} B^{\hat{b}}] \left( \frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{a} + \hat{b}} (\pi_{A}(a - 1, b) - \pi_{A}(a, b)) + \frac{\hat{b}}{\hat{a} + \hat{b}} (\pi_{B}(a, b - 1) - \pi_{B}(a, b)) \right) \right] \\ &+ (1 - \rho) \left[ \sum_{\substack{(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2} \\ \hat{a} + \hat{b} \leq K}} \eta_{A}(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \left( \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha \leq \hat{a} \\ 1 \leq \beta \leq \hat{b}}} (1 + \delta_{\hat{a}, \hat{a} - \beta} \delta_{\hat{b}, b + \beta}) [A^{\hat{a} - \alpha} B^{\hat{b} - \beta} (A^{\alpha} B^{\beta}) A^{\hat{a} - \alpha - \beta} B^{\hat{b}}] - \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha \leq \hat{a} \\ 1 \leq \beta \leq \hat{b}}} (1 + \delta_{\hat{a}, a} \delta_{\hat{b}, b}) [A^{\hat{a} - \alpha} B^{\hat{b} - \beta} (A^{\alpha} B^{\beta}) A^{\hat{a} - \alpha - \beta} B^{\hat{b}}] - \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha \leq \hat{a} \\ 1 \leq \beta \leq \hat{b}}} (1 + \delta_{\hat{a}, a} \delta_{\hat{b}, b}) [A^{\hat{a} - \alpha} B^{\hat{b} - \beta} (A^{\alpha} B^{\beta}) A^{\hat{a} - \alpha - \beta} B^{\hat{b}}] - \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha \leq \hat{a} \\ 1 \leq \beta \leq \hat{b}}} (1 + \delta_{\hat{a}, a} \delta_{\hat{b}, b}) [A^{\hat{a} - \alpha} B^{\hat{b} - \beta} (A^{\alpha} B^{\beta}) A^{\hat{a} - \alpha - \beta} B^{\hat{b}}] - \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha \leq \hat{a} \\ 1 \leq \beta \leq \hat{b}}} (1 + \delta_{\hat{a}, a} \delta_{\hat{b}, b}) [A^{\hat{a} - \alpha} B^{\hat{b} - \beta} (A^{\alpha} B^{\beta}) A^{\hat{a} - \alpha - \beta} B^{\hat{b}}] - \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha \leq \hat{a} \\ 1 \leq \beta \leq \hat{b}}} (1 + \delta_{\hat{a}, a} \delta_{\hat{b}, b}) [A^{\hat{a} - \alpha} B^{\hat{b} - \beta} (A^{\alpha} B^{\beta}) A^{\hat{a} - \alpha - \beta} B^{\hat{b} - \alpha - \beta} B^{\hat{b}$$

#### HYPERGRAPH ADAPTIVE VOTER MODEL: MEAN-FIELD TRAJECTORIES



### **Majority voting**



$$\dot{\mu} = \frac{2(1-p)}{N} \sum_{\substack{(\hat{a},\hat{b}) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \\ \hat{a}+\hat{b} < \kappa}} [A^{\hat{a}} B^{\hat{b}}] \left(\hat{a} \eta_{\mathsf{B}}(\hat{a},\hat{b}) - \hat{b} \eta_{\mathsf{A}}(\hat{a},\hat{b})\right)$$

### **Proportional voting**

Since 
$$\eta_{\mathsf{A}}(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) = \frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{a}+\hat{b}}$$
 and  $\eta_{\mathsf{B}}(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) = \frac{\hat{b}}{\hat{a}+\hat{b}}$ ,

 $\dot{\mu} = 0.$ 

In equilibrium, there may be only **local consensus** (through fragmentation) or **no consensus** at all.

## Majority voting

Since 
$$\eta_A(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) = \Theta(\hat{a} - \hat{b})$$
 and  $\eta_B(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) = \Theta(\hat{b} - \hat{a})$ ,

$$\dot{\mu} = \frac{2(1-p)}{N} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \mathbb{N}^2, |\sigma| \leq K \\ \sigma_1 > \sigma_2}} \sigma_2 \left( [\mathsf{A}^{\sigma_2} \mathsf{B}^{\sigma_1}] - [\mathsf{A}^{\sigma_1} \mathsf{B}^{\sigma_2}] \right).$$

If 
$$\mu \stackrel{(>)}{<} 0$$
,  $[A^{\sigma_2}B^{\sigma_1}] - [A^{\sigma_1}B^{\sigma_2}] \stackrel{(>)}{<} 0$  and hence  
 $\dot{\mu} \stackrel{(>)}{<} 0$ .

In equilibrium, there is always global consensus.



We use a **hypergraph** to encode polyadic interactions in the sense that we consider an underlying network covered by  $M_g$  hyperegdes of size g. A measure for the influence of the additional hypergraph structure is the probability that a randomly chosen edge is not contained in any of the hyperedges,

$$\mathfrak{q}_{g,M_g} = \left(1 - \frac{\binom{N-2}{g-2}}{\binom{N}{g}}\right)^{M_g} \approx \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{M_g}{N^2}g(g-1)}.$$



**Assumption**: Rewiring only succeeds if the active egde is not contained in any of the groups given by the hyperedges.

$$\frac{1}{p_*} = 1 + \frac{1+\mu^2}{2(\langle k\rangle - 1)}\mathfrak{q}_{g,M_g}$$

Hence,  $p_* \rightarrow 1$  exponentially fast as the hyperedges become larger and/or more.



The inclusion in (social) groups prevents the topology from fragmentation, emphasising the importance of family or friendship groups for the functioning of a society.

**Assumption**: When contained in any of the groups given by the hyperedges, propagation occurs with a bias towards promoting majority or minority opinion.

$$\dot{\mu} = (1 - p) \frac{2(1 - \mathfrak{q}_{g,M_g})\beta}{N} \mu \, [\mathsf{AB}]$$

Hence, in any non-trivial equilibrium, necessarily  $\mu = 0$  and  $\beta \leq 0$ .



Even the slightest institutional (majority) mistrust manifesting itself in a minority bias promoted by (social) groups leads to a functioning yet deeply divided society with no (stable) majority.

#### CONCLUSIONS

- $\rightarrow\,$  We have argued that it may be crucial to take group dynamics into account when studying opinion formation.
- → We have shown how to define a proper generalisation of the classical adaptive voter model for polyadic interactions, presented a mean-field description, and discussed how different dynamics may affect consensus formation.
- → We have discussed two **low-dimensional ad-hoc models** where polyadic interactions lead to interesting societal effects.

- A. Golovin, J. Mölter, and C. Kuehn (2024). "Polyadic Opinion Formation: The Adaptive Voter Model on a Hypergraph". Ann. Phys. (Berlin) 536:2300342. DOI: 10.1002/andp.202300342. arXiv: 2308.03640 [physics.socph]
- P. Steinmeyer, J. Mölter, and C. Kuehn (2025). "Phase transitions for polyadic epidemic and voter models with multiscale groups". arXiv: 2410.12682 [nlin.A0]



Thank you!







# Opinion and consensus formation in the presence of polyadic interactions

Jan Mölter, *Technical University of Munich* <sub>jointly with</sub> Anastasia Golovin, Pia Steinmeyer & Christian Kuehn 13<sup>th</sup> May 2025

SIAM Conference on Applications of Dynamical Systems - Minisymposium: Dynamical Systems on Networks and Fractals

Slides



#### **BISTABILITY IN THE ADAPTIVE VOTER MODEL**



In the phase space given by the simplicial cylinder

$$[-1,+1] \times \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \ge 0 \land \|x\|_1 \le M\},\$$

the trivial equilibria form the manifold

$$[-1,+1] \times \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \ge 0 \land \|x\|_1 = M \}.$$

A trivial equilibrium ( $\mu$ , (1 –  $\theta$ )M,  $\theta$ M) is (linearly) stable if

$$-\frac{(1-\hat{\beta})\mu(\mu-(2\theta-1))}{1-\mu^2} > 1 - \frac{1-\frac{1}{2}\rho}{1-\rho}\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle}.$$