

## Contents

<i>Preface</i>	ix
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
<b>PART I. THEORY</b>	<b>11</b>
Chapter 2. Understanding Diffusion	13
Chapter 3. The Theory of Complex Contagions	34
Chapter 4. A Social Experiment on the Internet	63
<b>PART II. APPLICATIONS</b>	<b>85</b>
Introduction to Part II	87
Chapter 5. Complex Contagions in Other Contexts	89
Chapter 6. Diffusing Innovations That Face Opposition	96
Chapter 7. Diffusing Change in Organizations	109
<b>PART III. SOCIAL DESIGN</b>	<b>135</b>
Introduction to Part III	137
Chapter 8. Designing Social Networks for Diffusion	142
Chapter 9. Creating Social Contexts for Behavior Change	155
<b>PART IV. CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>171</b>
Chapter 10. Conclusion	173

Epilogue: Experimental Sociology	179
<i>Appendix A: The Ethics of Social Design</i>	191
<i>Appendix B: Methods of Computational Social Science</i>	199
<i>Appendix C: Technical Appendix for Models</i>	205
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	221
<i>Notes</i>	225
<i>References</i>	261
<i>Index</i>	291

## CHAPTER 1

# Introduction

The promise of viral diffusion is all around us. We all know that new ideas can spread with the remarkable ease of a virus. Yet we also know that social innovations that can benefit society often fail to diffuse. The topic of this book is a new approach to using the pathways of network diffusion to accelerate social change.

A good example of a situation where this approach was successful was in Korea at the start of the 1960s. At the time, population growth rates were skyrocketing. Korea was facing an imminent population explosion. To intervene, the Korean government instituted a nationwide contraceptive initiative. Similar policy initiatives were attempted during the 1960s and early 1970s by the governments of several developing nations. They faced a similar problem. Living conditions were improving, but childbearing norms in rural households, in which families typically had five or more children, were still guided by traditional concerns of early life mortality.<sup>1</sup>

Most interventions were based on psychological models of behavior change. In some countries, mass-media campaigns shamed families for having too many children and attempted to induce contraceptive use by emphasizing individual accountability. The modest success of many of these programs stood in stark contrast to the Korean initiative, which surpassed all of its stated policy goals in less than twenty years. The success of this program signaled that a new way of thinking about public health interventions was on the horizon—a sociological way of thinking about how peer networks could be used to change social norms.<sup>2</sup>

The Korean intervention presented villages throughout the country with a menu of contraceptive options. Although Korea's program was nationally focused, its effectiveness hinged on villagers getting local exposure to contraceptive choices through social contact with their neighbors. Peer-to-peer networks of social diffusion successfully reached large numbers of adopters in many of the villages. When diffusion

succeeded, women tended to adopt the same contraceptive methods as their contacts. This produced uniformity on contraceptive methods used within villages; however, there was a surprising amount of variation in the methods adopted across villages. Some were “IUD” villages, whereas others were “pill” villages, and still others were “vasectomy” villages. Interestingly, the particular method of contraception was not the determining factor for successful diffusion; rather, it was the network of social influence.<sup>3</sup> In the most successful villages, closely knit groups were linked together by overlapping social ties, which fostered the spread of contraceptive use throughout the community. The more studies that followed, the more findings supported the same basic conclusion—that social networks are the primary pathways for the spread of new social norms.<sup>4</sup>

An unexpected puzzle arose, however, from the fact the network pathways that were most successful for spreading behavior change were not the same networks that would be predicted by the theory of viral diffusion. While the viral model suggests that radiating networks of weak ties would lead to successful dissemination, it was instead overlapping patterns of spatial interaction that were the key to widespread adoption. In the decades since, scores of similar findings have surfaced in every field of diffusion research, from the spread of digital technologies to the mobilization of social movements. A growing catalog of studies has found that closely knit, densely overlapping networks are associated with the successful spread of innovative behaviors.

Today, the notion of virality animates the research agendas of hundreds of thousands of scientists worldwide, ranging from computer scientists and physicists, to sociologists and marketing scholars. Across many of these areas, lessons from the field of infectious-disease epidemiology provide a general orientation for studying behavioral contagions. The guiding assumption is that behaviors spread like viruses. The author of *The Tipping Point*, Malcolm Gladwell crystallized this idea: “I’m convinced that ideas and behaviors and new products move through a population very much like a disease does. This isn’t just a metaphor, in other words. I’m talking about a very literal analogy. . . . Ideas can be contagious in exactly the same way that a virus is.”<sup>5</sup>

This book offers a different perspective on diffusion. I show why the disease theory of diffusion does not work for understanding the spread of most behaviors and what this tells us about the kinds of social networks that are best suited for spreading innovations. This journey to

discover how behaviors spread reveals the specific features of network structure that control the diffusion of behavior and, ultimately, shows how these features can be used to influence the process of social change. While research on diffusion often focuses on how to improve the qualities of a product or idea to make it more contagious, I consider situations in which the innovation itself cannot easily be changed. Instead, I focus on how changes to the social network of a population can transform a failed technology into a successful innovation. To demonstrate the impact of these ideas, this book is dedicated to providing practical solutions to problems of diffusion. The results offer a way of thinking about the network dynamics of social change that gives new life to the promise of using online technologies to promote sustainable changes in population behavior.

The examples used in this book vary widely, ranging from the diffusion of social media technologies to the spread of prophylactic measures for HIV to the growth of rebellion in post-Revolutionary France. The majority of examples are drawn from the diffusion literatures that I have been immersed in the longest—namely, the spread of health technologies and the mobilization of social movements. While on the surface these two topics seem to have nothing in common with one another, beneath the surface they have a shared logic of social influence. From a networks perspective, the common structures that underpin diffusion in both of these settings reveal the basic network characteristics that may be useful for improving the spread of behavior in a variety of contexts.

The findings here help to identify the kinds of networks that may be effective for spreading smoking cessation, as well as the network structures that can accelerate organizational change. These results show how to create online networks that can improve the adoption of new exercise behaviors. And they also reveal the differences between using social media to diffuse contagious memes versus to mobilize political activism. Here the dynamics of both informational and behavioral diffusion are explained within a framework that allows each to be understood on its own terms. The findings suggest a way for theorists and practitioners who are interested in diffusion to gain insight into when social networks will be helpful for spreading changes in behavior and how to make practical use of them.


One point worth stressing at the outset is that the approach here differs from approaches to social change that are based on the assumption

that people's choices can be altered by exposure to the right kinds of messages. This is true in many circumstances. But the present approach is *collective* rather than *individual*. One surprisingly helpful way of thinking about this is by analogy with schooling among fish. Studying fish individually, it would be impossible to anticipate the complex schooling behaviors that they produce when they interact as a group. Similarly, studying people one at a time provides little insight into the collective dynamics by which new behaviors spread through a population. Diffusion, like schooling, is a collective social process that unfolds through the complex interactions of many interdependent actors. The approach adopted here is to study behavior change as we would study schooling—not as an individual phenomenon, but as a collective one. This perspective assumes that people are often in situations where the decisions they make are influenced less by the information they have access to, and more by the social norms that are common in their networks. The goal here is to show how these social networks may themselves be used to control the schooling process, and spread lasting changes in behavior.

### ISN'T IT OBVIOUS?

Science has often been described as the development of new intuitions about how the world works. Commentary on the science of sociology has noted that while much of contemporary sociology can seem obvious today, it was not always so. Ideas that may seem bromidic now were once revolutionary approaches to thinking about social problems. The seemingly inevitable fate of successful ideas is to be absorbed into the body of scientific knowledge, eventually entering the popular lexicon, where they are reduced from novel intuitions to tacit features of everyday life. However, there are also scientific ideas that are so counterintuitive that they defy integration into the body of popular knowledge. These intuitions present such a challenging contrast with the expectations forged by a long evolutionary, cultural, and personal history that they are hard to hold on to even once they have been learned.

A quick example here will illustrate what is meant by a counterintuitive idea and how it can happen that a scientific discovery can remain counterintuitive even once it has been explained. Figure 1.1 shows a picture of two coffee tables. The intuition that I want to elicit concerns which of the two tables is longer. Look at each table and consider the ratio of its length to its width. What would you say it is? When



*Figure 1.1* Adapted from Richard Thaler and Cass Sunstein, *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008).

I first saw this figure in the 2008 book by Richard Thaler and Cass Sunstein,<sup>6</sup> I guessed that the one on the left is perhaps 3:1 or 3.5:1, while the one on the right is closer to 1.5:1 or 1.25:1. Make your guess.

Now, take out your pen and lay it against the page. They are, in fact, the same table. Cognitive psychologists explain this illusion in terms of the way that the eye corrects (or fails to correct, depending on how you see it) for the orientation of the figures and the visual contrast created by the legs. Once you have measured the figures to your satisfaction and have internalized this new piece of knowledge, look away and then look back. Which table is longer?

The point is that despite having the right answer in mind, the objects nevertheless look the same as they did before. The bias in the perceptual system cannot be overcome by the knowledge that it is there. The value of scientific education is that once the bias is explained, a person can anticipate this kind of error and take precautions to avoid making mistakes in situations where it might matter. Whenever vigilance is surrendered, however, even if for a moment, a particularly persistent illusion can lead the mind to make unavoidable, and quite consequential errors in judgment.

This book is about just such an illusion, but not one in the perceptual science of psychology. Rather, it is about a similar kind of bias in our understanding of social networks. In particular, it is about a compellingly intuitive theory of diffusion that, like the apparent differences between the two tables in figure 1.1, is likely to be persistent. Nevertheless, the intuitive appeal of this idea notwithstanding, this book shows how this popular and intuitive theory of diffusion can go seriously wrong, leading to costly errors in our understanding of how behaviors spread through social networks. The intuitive theory I am talking about is called the *strength of weak ties*.

## OUTLINE OF THE CHAPTERS

The basic idea of the strength of weak ties is that while our *strong ties*—that is, our friends and close family—all tend to know each other, our *weak ties*—that is, our casual acquaintances—connect us to remote parts of the social network. As the sociologist Mark Granovetter famously put it, “Whatever is to be diffused can reach a larger number of people, and traverse a greater social distance, when passed through weak ties rather than strong.”<sup>7</sup> Our journey here starts in chapter 2 with the initial finding that launched my work into this topic—namely, that there is an unexpected problem with this remarkably influential theory of network diffusion.

The broad influence of this theory is due in part to the recent explosion of network science across disciplines such as physics, biology, and computer science, which ushered in a period of rapid discovery for understanding how the structure of social networks affects the dynamics of diffusion. What all of these fields have in common is a belief in the idea that a contagion, such as a virus, an idea, a meme, a method of contraception, a diet, a fashion, an emotion, an ideology, or a technology, can spread from one person to another. The guiding principle of all of this work is that the structure of social contacts can foretell how a contagion will diffuse through a population. The full impact of Granovetter’s original insight was not realized until the physicists Duncan Watts and Steven Strogatz developed the *small-world* model, which demonstrated that bridge ties—that is, social links connecting otherwise distant people—can dramatically increase the rate of diffusion across social networks.<sup>8</sup> The strength of weak ties hypothesis and the small-world principle resonate with one another to present a unified and powerful view of how network structure controls the dynamics of



social diffusion. The problem is that when we compare this view to a large body of empirical research on diffusion, a puzzle arises from the fact that while weak ties seem to improve diffusion in some cases, there are many other cases in which they do not.

The solution to this puzzle comes in chapter 3, with the finding that there is an important difference between “complex” behavioral contagions, for which transmission requires contact with multiple adopters, and “simple” informational and viral contagions, for which transmission only requires contact with a single source. Computational explorations show that when contagions are complex, because they are costly, risky, or involve some degree of complementarity, weak ties can slow down diffusion. This finding has implications for most of the contagions that social scientists care about, such as cooperation, social norms, marriage practices, health behaviors, voting behavior, technology adoption, and investment decisions, to name just a few.<sup>9</sup> It also means that social networks that accelerate the spread of an infectious disease can slow down the diffusion of its cure. This occurs because diseases, like information, are typically simple contagions that pass quickly along weak ties. Behavior change, however, typically is not.

With this finding, chapter 4 turns our attention from the mathematical world of computational experiments to the empirical world of behaviors spreading through human social networks. This is where we face a crucial challenge—devising a way to test this theory of diffusion empirically. For the vast majority of research on networks and diffusion, even the rudimentary task of identifying the existence of a diffusion process has been fraught with difficulties, to say nothing of being able to identify exactly how the structure of a social network may have altered it. Here the Internet is an invaluable ally for social research. Over the course of two years, an independent online community was constructed and populated with thousands of volunteers recruited at large from the World Wide Web. Techniques from small-group laboratory experiments were combined with tools from large-scale data science analytics to conduct an Internet-based social network experiment of how behaviors spread through online communities. The illuminating results from this study show that while weak ties were highly effective for spreading information, they slowed down the spread of behavior.

These results suggest that the rapid diffusion of information through weak ties may not tell much about the dynamics of behavior change. In fact, the more quickly that information goes viral, the less promising

the outlook may be for spreading behavior. Thus, the finding that emerges from the intuitive distinction between simple viral contagions and complex behavioral contagions is the counterintuitive insight that the more weak ties there are in a network, the slower that innovations may spread.

In part 2 of this book, I use this theory of social contagions to address practical problems of diffusion. Chapter 5 shows the range of empirical settings to which the theory of complex contagions has been applied—from the spread of political hashtags on Twitter to the diffusion of smoking among teens.

Chapter 6 shows how these findings can be used to address the specific challenges that arise when innovators face social opposition. One application shows how public health interventions may be designed in order to trigger network cascades of behavior change in at-risk populations. Another application considers how social networks can be used to incubate the spread of an innovative technology in a population where an alternative product is already entrenched. In each case, the lesson is the same: clustering the early adopters together can increase the spread of innovation.

Chapter 7 turns to the topic of organizational performance and shows how the findings in this book challenge conventional wisdom about the value of information brokers for diffusing innovations. This chapter identifies the importance of *wide bridges* for spreading new behaviors and ideas across organizational boundaries. The discussion here also explores the origins of network structure. This chapter shows how the identities that people have within an organization can influence the structure of the networks that emerge, and demonstrates how organizational identities can be used to design networks that are effective for diffusion.

Building on these practical applications, part 3 takes a hands-on approach to constructing new forms of social capital online. Chapter 8 offers experimental findings on how to design social networks among strangers to increase the flow of new behaviors. The results highlight the importance of both social relevance and empathy in network ties and show how these factors can be strengthened within existing online settings by incorporating *homophily*—that is, similarity between social contacts—into the architecture of a social network.

Chapter 9 then turns to the difficult problem of how to control the kinds of behaviors that spread online. Social influence comes in all shapes and sizes, and there are some circumstances in which

constructing influential networks may backfire by spreading undesirable behaviors. The relational context of social networks comes to the foreground here. The results show that sometimes the most intuitive network strategies for inducing behavior change can have the least desirable outcomes. To offer some guidance on how to avoid this, chapter 9 identifies how features of social comparison and social support in online network settings can determine the kinds of influences that people will have on each other's behavior. A policy experiment illustrates these ideas by showing how the design of relationships within an online community can catalyze, or inhibit, changes in physical activity.

By the end of this book, the discussion has developed from studying the effects of strong and weak ties on diffusion to demonstrating how the principle of social reinforcement gives new insight into the network dynamics of behavior change. The basic approach throughout is always the same: seeing how imperceptible changes in the structure of social relationships produce significant differences in collective outcomes. This method allows more than the understanding of individual behavior: it provides an appreciation of the unseen forces that guide the movements of collective behavior. The most promising finding is that the reasonable expectation that people will resist behavior change does not mean that people are incorrigible. Nor does it mean that diffusion will fail. Instead, this expectation reveals the pathways that behavioral contagions will need to follow if they are to flow through a population—and the strategies that can be used to make this process most effective.

## Index

Page references in italics refer to illustrations and their captions.

- academic disciplines, 119–20
- adaptive organizations, 133
- adoption, maintenance versus, 79–83
- altruists, 108, 246n9
- amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS; Lou Gehrig’s Disease), 145–48
- Ancona, Deborah, 112
- anonymity, 158, 253–54n4
- anti-vaccination movement, 95, 243–44n20
- ants, collective behavior among, 240n2
- Arendt, Hannah, 91–92
- Asch, Solomon, 187
  
- bacteria, quorum sensing among, 240n2
- balanced organizational identities, 129; critical mass in networks with, 132; making adaptive change in networks with, 133
- Barabási, Lázó, 49
- Bass, Frank M., 235n33
- behavior: collective, 4; as complex contagion, 37–38; disease model of contagion applied to, 87; health decisions as, 67–69; social worlds designed to induce change in, 158–65; spread across internet of, 75–78, 77; spread by social reinforcement of, 173; weak ties for spread of, 7–8
- behavioral economics, 177
- Berkman, Lisa, 33
- biases, in optical illusions, 5
- big data, 180–81, 203–4
- bird’s-eye view of social networks, 18, 23
  
- Blau, Peter M., 184, 185, 249n21
- bots, 187–89
- Brahe, Tycho, 181
- bridges, 43–45; technical appendix for, 207–13. *See also* wide bridges
- brokerage ties, 117–20
- brokers, in structural hole theory, 109–13, 111, 113; across academic disciplines, 119
- Brown, John Seely, 250n3
- Burt, Ronald, 109–10, 117, 120, 186
  
- Caldwell, David, 112
- Carroll, Lewis, 139
- change: organizational, structural holes theory of, 109–13; in social networks, 130–31
- China, spatial diffusion in, 46, 233–34n17
- circumcision, to prevent HIV transmission, 13–14, 227n3–4
- closed triads, 22
- clustered neighborhoods, 107
- clustered networks, 23–24; degrees of separation in, 26; diffusion in, 23; Emperor’s Dilemma in, 241–42n9; experiment with, 41; infectious diseases in, 95, 243–44n20; in internet experiment, 70–72, 71, 74; relational strength of strong ties in, 81; seeding, 107; spread of behavior in, 75–78, 77
- clustered seeding, 101–4, 102–4, 246n8
- cocktail hours, 124
- cognitive science, 120
- Colditz, Graham, 68
- Coleman, James, 38

- collective actions: as complex contagions, 38; legitimacy in acceptance of, 39; risk in, 90–91; strength and weakness of ties in, 60–62
- collective behavior: among social insects, 240–41n2; large populations needed to test, 63–64; sociological study of, 179–80
- communication technologies, 38
- competition, 139
- complementarily, 79
- complex contagions, 7, 35–37, 37; counterfactual experiments with, 40–45; expected decrease in, 137; experiments with, 40–45, 41, 42, 44, 45; in health behavior, 94–95; health forum experiment as, 78–79; mechanisms of, 37–40; in social movements, 90–92; technical appendix for, 206–7
- computational social science, 120
- condoms, 20, 227–28n7
- conflict resolution, 249–50n26
- conformity, 187
- consolidation, of organizational identities, 249n22–23
- contagions: complex and simple, 7, 35–37; network model of, 19–20; through weak ties, 6
- contraception, 1–2
- Correll, Shelley, 185
- counterfactual hypothesis, 34, 41
- Cox proportional hazards model, 239n15
- credibility: in adoption of behavior, 38–39; in health forum experiment, 78–79
- critical mass, 38, 131–32
- data science, 120
- degrees of separation, 25, 26, 230n26; technical appendix for, 213–14
- DeviantArt (online art-sharing community), 154
- Diet Diary, 151–52
- dieting, 157
- Dietler, Michael, 14–15
- diffusion: Bass model of, 235n33; in clustered networks, 23; as collective social process, 3; designing networks for, 149–54; distinguished from homophily, 235n2; human side of, 78–79; incubator neighborhoods for, 104–8; internet experiment in, 72–75; in large world, 27; limits to, 156–57; of media technologies, 92–94; network model of, 19–21, 20, 21; obstacles to testing, 63–65; over opposition, 96–97; resistance to behavior change in, 14; robustness of, 47–49; small-world hypothesis for, 6; spatial, 46–47; with weak ties, 28, 29, 29
- Digg (online news application), 93
- dining areas, 123–24
- disease model of contagion, 87
- Doximity (physician networking community), 154
- Duguid, Paul, 250n3
- Durkheim, Emile, 182, 250n1
- dyadic coordination, 107
- ego networks, 16, 16–18
- emergent networks, 128–33
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 138
- emotional contagion, 39–40
- empathy, 147, 154, 174
- Emperor's Dilemma, 241–42n9, 243–44n20
- epidemiology, 2; social epidemiology, 33
- ethical issues, 192–94; in practice of and uses of science, 191–92; in preventing harmful policies, 195–97; of unintended consequences, 197–98
- evolution: biological, 139; of networks, 150
- expansive organizational identities, 127–28, 249n21; critical mass in networks with, 131–32; making adaptive change in networks with, 133; networks for, 128–29
- experimental sociology, 179–89; methodological issues in, 199–204
- experiments: fitness program, 158–66; on heterogeneity and inequality, 184–85; in physics and social sciences, 182; in public-health interventions, 97–104, 98–104; spread of behavior across internet in, 75–78, 77; using internet, 66–75, 71, 74

- external validity, 201–3  
extinctions, of species, 139
- Facebook, 94  
fashion, status and, 56  
fax technology, 38  
fitness program, 157–58; results of, 165–66, 166; social world designed for, 158–65, 159, 161, 162, 164  
focused organizational identities, 126–27, 249n21; critical mass in networks with, 132; making adaptive change in networks with, 133; networks for, 129  
Framingham Heart Study, 94, 97, 245n3  
Freedom Summer, 30, 32–33, 35  
free rider effects, 161–62  
friendships, 252n9  
friends of friends networks, 17, 17–18
- gateway communities, 249–50n26  
Gladwell, Malcolm, 2, 11, 52  
Gould, Roger, 31–32, 34, 77–78  
Granovetter, Mark, 6, 17; on long ties, 30; on recruitment by social movements, 30; on relationally weak and strong ties, 61; on resistance to risky behavior, 32; on seeding strategies, 246n9; on testing models of collective behavior, 63; on weak ties, 21, 22, 24, 26–27, 45  
Guare, John, 230n26
- Hagerstrand, Torsten, 77  
handshakes, 26  
Hansen, Morten, 111–12  
Harvard University, 124  
hashtags, on Twitter, 89–90  
health behavior, 67–69; adoption versus maintenance in, 80; complex contagions in, 94–95; online discussion groups on, 142–43; strategies for intervention in, 97–104, 98; websites for, 145–48  
Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, 67  
Healthy Lifestyle Network, 68–72, 75  
Hedström, Peter, 32, 46, 77  
heterogeneity, 184–85; technical appendix for, 213–15
- HIV/AIDS: hubs in spread of, 52; male circumcision to prevent, 13–14, 227n3–4  
homophily, 8; distinguished from diffusion, 235n2; in network design, 151–54, 152; in online communities, 143  
honeybees, 240–41n2  
hubs, 47, 49, 51–53, 175
- identities, organizational, 123–26, 174, 249n21; expansive, 127–28; focused, 126–27; technical appendix for, 217–20  
incubator neighborhoods, 104–8  
inequality, 184–85  
infectious diseases: in clustered social networks, 95, 243–44n20; co-infections of, 244n21; as simple contagions, 7, 20, 35–36; spread through weak ties, 235n35  
influence, in social networks, 151–54  
information: as simple contagion, 36; transmitted across academic disciplines, 119; weak ties for spread of, 7, 60–61  
information brokers, 109–13, 111, 113, 174  
informed consent, 70  
innovation: competition and, 139; diffusion of, over opposition, 96–97; digital, diffusion of, 92–94; Emerson on, 138; incubator neighborhoods for, 104–8; in social networks, 133  
internet: health discussion groups on, 142–43; social communities on, 63, 140–41; social experiment using, 66–75, 183–84, 186–87; as source of social data, 181; spread of behavior across, 75–78, 77. *See also* online communities and discussions  
intervention strategies. *See* public health interventions, over opposition  
intuitions, 176
- Kawachi, Ichiro, 33  
Kenya: male circumcision in, 13; mud-brick houses in, 14–15  
Korea, 1–2

- Lazarsfeld, Paul, 148, 252n9  
legitimacy, 39  
long ties: in clustered networks, 26; for diffusion, 25; as dyadic structures, 107; strength of, 29–30; thresholds and, 54–55; tradeoff between wide bridges and, 87  
Lou Gehrig’s Disease (amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; ALS), 145–48  
lunchrooms, 123–24
- MacPherson, Elle, 56  
maintenance, adoption versus, 79–83  
Malawi, 227n4  
males, circumcision of, to prevent HIV transmission, 13–14, 227n3–4  
Mann-Whitney U test (Wilcoxon rank sum test), 237–38n12  
Marcus, M. Lynne, 39  
markets (economic), 138–39, 180  
Marx, Karl, 171, 182  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), 124  
McAdam, Doug, 32–33, 35, 37, 46; on recruitment to social action, 92; on risk in social actions, 90, 91; on thresholds, 50  
meals, 123–24  
measles, 35–36; anti-vaccine movement and, 243–44n20  
measuring social networks, 130  
media technologies, 92–94  
medications, to prevent HIV, 14  
Merton, Robert, 117, 148, 252n9  
methodological issues, 199–204  
Microsoft Research (firm), 124  
minimally complex innovations, 114  
Mississippi Freedom Summer (1964), 30, 32–33  
mud-brick houses, 14–15
- narrow bridges, 110  
National Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), 97, 244–45n2  
network model of diffusion, 19–21  
network science, 120  
Newton, Isaac, 181–82  
observational data, 203–4  
one-and-done interventions, 20  
O’Neill, Tip, 85  
online communities and discussions, 142–43; anonymity in, 253–54n4; in fitness program, 158–65, 159, 161, 162, 164; as institutions, 155; as social worlds, 156  
opinion leaders, 56–58; structural hole theory and, 109  
optical illusions, 5–6  
organizational change, structural holes theory of, 109–13  
organizational culture, 128  
organizational identities, 123–26, 174; adaptive organizations and, 133; critical mass in networks with, 131–32; expansive, 127–28, 249n21; focused, 126–27, 249n21  
organizational networks, 8; structuring, 120–22
- Paris Commune (1871), 31–32, 34, 77–78  
pathogenic bacteria, 240n2  
Patients Like Me (PLM; website), 145–48  
patient zero, 19–20, 20  
Paulsen, Ronnelle, 32–33, 35, 37; on thresholds, 50  
peer networks, 144; Patients Like Me website as, 145–48  
peer reinforcement, 39  
peer-to-peer networks, 1–2  
physical proximity, in diffusion, 46  
physics, 181–82  
Piketty, Thomas, 249n17  
polarization, political, 188–89  
populations: needed to test diffusion, 63–64; as unit of study, 65  
project management software, 114  
*Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (bacteria), 240n2  
public health interventions, over opposition, 96; strategies for, 97–104, 98–101; technical appendix for, 216–17  
Putnam, Robert, 30, 135, 142, 250n4
- QuitNet (social media), 95  
quorum sensing, 240–41n2

- randomized networks: in internet  
  experiment, 70–72, 71, 74; seeding, 106;  
  spread of behavior in, 75–78, 77
- random seeding, 99–101, 99–101
- rare diseases, websites for, 145–48
- Red Queen Effect, 139
- reinforcement: in health forum experi-  
  ment, 79, 239n15; peer reinforcement,  
  39; social reinforcement, 173, 175–76
- replication of experiments, using  
  networks, 65
- Ridgeway, Cecilia, 185
- risk, in social action, 90–91
- robots, 240–41n2
- Rogers, Everett, 22
- Ross, Philip, 243–44n20
- scale-free networks, 19, 49–53, 52
- Schwartz, Joseph E., 249n21
- science, practice and uses of, 191–92
- Second Life (online game), 93
- seeding strategies, 97–99; clustered, 101–4,  
  102–4, 246n8; in clustered networks,  
  107; in high-brokerage networks, 116,  
  116; in low-brokerage networks, 115,  
  115; random, 99–101, 99–101; in  
  randomized networks, 106–7; in  
  wide-bridge networks, 116–17, 117
- selection, 148–49, 252n9
- seminars, 124
- shortcuts, 48
- Simmel, Georg, 17, 117; on dyads, 107; on  
  group affiliations, 19; on social worlds  
  and relationships, 155
- simple contagions, 7, 20, 35–37, 36, 143–44;  
  bridges in, 45; increase in, 137; technical  
  appendix for, 206
- simulated social interactions, 187
- small-world network model, 6–7, 25,  
  25–27; real-world social networks and,  
  47–48; technical appendix for, 205–6
- small-world topologies, 19
- smoking, 94–95
- social actions, risk in, 90–91
- social capital, 142, 175, 250n4; architecture  
  of, 177; in peer networks, 147–48; social  
  comparison as, 166
- social change, 183
- social contexts, 121–25, 176–77; member-  
  ships in, 125–27
- social design, 148–49, 156; fitness  
  program experiment in, 158–66; pitfalls  
  of, 166–70
- social emergence, 183
- social epidemiology, 33
- social inertia, 53, 234n25; in clustered  
  seeding, 104; diffusion impeded by,  
  175; in fitness program, 167; in random  
  seeding, 101
- social insects, collective behavior among,  
  240–41n1
- social mechanisms, for complex  
  contagion, 38–40
- social media: incubator neighborhoods  
  for innovation in, 105; political hashtags  
  on, 89–90; visual presentation on,  
  242n13
- social movements, 30–31; Freedom  
  Summer as, 32–33; mobilizations of,  
  90–92; Paris Commune as, 31–32; social  
  capital and, 250n4; spatial diffusion  
  of, 46
- social networks, 16–19; Arendt on, 91–92;  
  assigning experimental participants to,  
  70–72, 71; bird's-eye view of, 18; degree  
  distributions in, 47; designing, for  
  diffusion, 149–54; diffusion through,  
  19–21, 20, 21; emergent, 128–33;  
  experiment using internet for, 67;  
  homophily in, 8; in Korea, 1–2; in  
  mobilization of social movements, 90;  
  organizational identities in, 123–26;  
  ratio of weak ties to strong ties in, 137;  
  self-knowledge of, 69; sharing on,  
  93–94; social contexts distinguished  
  from, 121–22; technical appendix for,  
  217–20; weak ties to, 6, 21–29
- social reinforcement, 173, 175–76; in  
  health forum experiment, 79, 239n15
- social relevance, 175–76
- social selection, 150
- social support, 168
- social worlds, 155–56; designed to induce  
  behavior change, 158–66



- sociology, 4; experimental, 179–89; of social life, 19
- Soule, Sarah, 77
- South Korea, 91
- spatial diffusion, 46–47
- spatial networks, 34, 46–47, 78
- status, 55–58, 57, 58; emergence of, 185–86; technical appendix for, 214–15
- stock market, 180, 181
- Strang, David, 77
- strategic complementarity, 38
- strength of weak ties theory, 6
- Strogatz, Steven, 6
- strong ties, 6, 22–23, 174; Arendt on, 92; for collective action, 61; ratio of strong ties to, 137; relational strength of, in clustered networks, 81; in spatial networks, 34; technical appendix for, 215–16
- structural holes, 110; bridges connecting, 111; experiment on, 186–87; people who benefit from, 117; theory of, 109–13, 120
- structural reach, 46–47
- structure folding, 248n12
- suicides, 182
- Sunstein, Cass, 5
- Sweden, 32
- teams: organizational, 123; team-based incentives, 161–62
- technology adaptation: as complex contagions, 38; diffusion of, over opposition, 96; incubator neighborhoods for, 104–8; in media technologies, 92–94; thresholds in, 58–60
- tertius gaudens* (people who benefit from structural holes), 117
- Thaler, Richard, 5
- thresholds, for complex contagions, 37, 48–53, 232n3; degree heterogeneity and, 50–51; long ties and, 54–55; technical appendix for, 215; in technology adoption, 58–60
- ties, in social networks, 48; brokerage ties, 117–20; in collective actions, 60–62; technical appendix for, 215–16 *See also* long ties; strong ties
- Tocqueville, Alexis de, 250n1
- totalitarianism, 92
- Total Quality Management (TQM), 111
- traffic behavior, 179
- Twitter, political hashtags on, 89–90
- unintended consequences, 197–98
- unionization, in Europe, 32
- urban legends, 39
- vaccines, 95, 156, 243–44n20
- validity, external, 201–3
- Van Valen, Leigh, 139
- Venkatesh, Viswanath, 39
- viral diffusion, 2
- Watts, Duncan, 6
- weak ties, 6, 21–29, 174; brokerage ties as, 117; for collective action, 61; in complex contagion experiment, 41–45, 42; for diffusion of ideas and behavior, 7–8; diffusion with, 28, 29; infectious diseases spread through, 235n35; in mobilization of social action, 90–91; patterns of behavior transmitted through, 138; ratio to strong ties, 137; in social networks, 17–18; strength of, 30–33; technical appendix for, 215–16
- Weber, Max, 182, 250n1
- Weight Watchers, 236–37n11
- Whyte, William, 46
- wide bridges, 8, 174; advantages over brokerage ties of, 117–19; seeding innovations in, 116–17, 117; in spatial networks, 46; stability of, 107; as strong ties, 61; tradeoff between long ties and, 87
- Wilcoxon rank sum test (Mann-Whitney U test), 237–38n12
- working groups, 123, 130
- Your Disease Risk (website), 68