arXiv:2002.00849v2 [cs.SI] 4 Feb 2020

Using Sampled Network Data With The Autologistic Actor Attribute Model

Alex D. Stivala * H. Colin Gallagher † David A. Rolls ‡ Peng Wang †

Garry L. Robins † ‡

December 25, 2021

Abstract

Social science research increasingly benefits from statistical methods for understanding the structured nature of social life, including for social network data. However, the application of statistical network models within large-scale community research is hindered by too little understanding of the validity of their inferences under realistic data collection conditions, including sampled or missing network data. The autologistic actor attribute model (ALAAM) is a statistical model based on the well-established exponential random graph model (ERGM) for social networks. ALAAMs can be regarded as a social influence model, predicting an individual-level outcome based on the actor's network ties, concurrent outcomes of his/her network partners, and attributes of the actor and his/her network partners. In particular, an ALAAM can be used to measure contagion effects, that is, the propensity of two actors connected by a social network tie to both have the same value of an attribute. We investigate the effect of using simple random samples and snowball samples of network data on ALAAM parameter inference, and find that parameter inference can still work well even with a nontrivial fraction of missing nodes. However it is safer to take a snowball sample of the network and estimate conditional on the snowball sampling structure.

***Keywords*—** Autologistic actor attribute model, ALAAM, Social influence model, Missing data, Network sampling, Snowball sampling

1 Introduction

An autologistic actor attribute model (ALAAM) (Robins et al., 2001b; Daraganova and Robins, 2013) is a statistical model based on the widely used exponential random graph model (ERGM) for social networks (Frank and Strauss, 1986; Robins et al., 2001a, 2007; Lusher et al., 2013). An ERGM can be used to model social networks, predicting the presence of a tie between two actors based on other ties (structural properties of the network) and attributes of the actors (nodes) themselves. By contrast, an ALAAM can be used to predict an attribute of an actor, based on the actor's ties to other nodes in the network, as well as attributes of the actor and its network partners. In this way it is similar to logistic regression, but, unlike logistic regression or similar statistical techniques, specifically does *not* assume independence of the predicted attributes across actors — an actor's outcome attribute may depend also on those of its neighbors in the network. Hence an ALAAM may be used as a model of social influence, examining how some attribute of an actor in a network is affected by his or her position in the network and the attributes of other actors in the network.

Although ALAAMs are not widely cited (they are not included in Silk et al. (2017), for example) they have been used to model the acquisition of descriptive norms as social category learning in social networks (Kashima et al., 2013), spatial and network influence processes on unemployment (Daraganova and Pattison, 2013), and the performance of researchers (Letina, 2016; Letina et al., 2016).

As a result, ALAAMs have not been as widely studied as the better-known multiple regression quadratic assignment procedure (MRQAP) (Krackhardt, 1988; Dekker et al., 2007) or network autocorrelation model (Ord, 1975; Cliff and Ord, 1981; Doreian, 1981; Anselin, 1990; Friedkin, 1990; Leenders, 2002). It is known that the network autocorrelation model has a systematic negative bias in the estimation of the network effect under almost all conditions (Mizruchi and Neuman, 2008; Neuman and Mizruchi, 2010), and Wang et al. (2014) present a detailed analysis of the statistical power and type I error rate

*Corresponding author at: Institute of Computational Science, Università della Svizzera italiana, Lugano, Switzerland. Email: alexander.stivala@usi.ch

†Centre for Transformative Innovation, Faculty of Business and Law, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia

‡Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Australia

of the network autocorrelation model. More recently, Sewell (2017) proposes a method to use network autocorrelation with egocentric network samples, where only ties directly involving randomly sampled actors are considered, and Dittrich et al. (2017, 2019) propose a Bayesian approach to the network autocorrelation model.

ALAAMs, being the social influence counterpart of the social selection ERGM model, share the latter's flexibility in that a wide variety of effects can be included in the model (subject to dependence assumptions). This makes them potentially much larger in scope (but more complex) than models such as network autocorrelation, which only estimate a single network effect. In this paper we investigate the effect of missing data and network sampled data on the inference of ALAAM parameters. We examine two forms of sampling: first, data missing at random, as would occur when taking a simple random sample from the network, and, second, network samples obtained via snowball sampling.

A practical motivation for this study is the manner in which social influence models may be applied to epidemiological studies of health outcomes in large-scale community samples (e.g. Gibbs et al. 2013). Conventionally, these studies often use cross-sectional data to examine the prevalence of health conditions (e.g. Dirkzwager et al. 2006) or probable mental health conditions across a given population (e.g. Kessler et al. 2002; Bryant et al. 2014). In such settings, a methodological priority is placed on obtaining some form of random sample: given the impracticality of interviewing an entire general population, random sampling allows one to make valid inferences based on a representative sample of individuals drawn from that population. However, the individualistic assumptions upon which such research designs are usually based are increasingly at odds with conceptual frameworks of human behavior which appeal to the structured nature of social life. For instance, health researchers and other social scientists increasingly seek to understand health and other individual outcomes as embedded within larger social systems of interconnected actors, employing an array of socio-structural concepts, including social capital (De Silva et al., 2005; Kawachi et al., 2013), community resilience (Norris et al., 2008), and community wellbeing (Gibbs et al., 2015).

Social network research methods offer a resolution to this tension, particularly statistical models for social networks, illuminating the multifaceted role that network ties play in the prevalence of health issues, including processes of social support, social selection, and social influence and diffusion (Valente, 2010). However, in many instances, a complete census of a network may be prohibitively expensive and difficult: it may be the case that not every member of the population can be identified, much less recruited into a study. Complicating matters is that network researchers cannot rely on random sampling techniques, which have been designed to mitigate the very thing which is of primary interest: social interdependence among actors (Robins, 2015). We are thus left with an important dilemma: sociocentric research methods are often difficult to execute properly, depending on the research setting, yet the questions that these methods can address become no less important, such as the prevalence and spread of mental health issues across a disaster-affected area. A central issue is therefore the degree to which network data may be missing, either randomly, or by some design (i.e. sampled), and still yield valid inferences.

As a result, a considerable amount of research has been directed at identifying the impact of different forms of missing data, or the sampling of network data, and adequately accounting for it within statistical models. Work examining the effect of missing data on social network parameter estimation goes back at least to Holland and Leinhardt (1973). More recently, Kossinets (2006) examines the effect of missing data on estimating network statistics of a bipartite graph. Smith and Moody (2013) investigates the effects of nodes missing at random, and Smith et al. (2017) the effects of non-random missing data, on network centrality, degree homophily, and topology measures. Robins et al. (2004) investigate the effect of missing data on ERGM parameter estimation. Koskinen et al. (2013) propose a Bayesian technique to handle missing data in ERGM parameter estimation. Previous work that has examined the effect of snowball sampling on the estimation of social network properties includes Handcock and Gile (2010); Thompson and Frank (2000); Illenberger and Flötteröd (2012); Pattison et al. (2013). Handcock and Gile (2010), Pattison et al. (2013), and Stivala et al. (2016) describe methods to estimate ERGM parameters from snowball samples, while Thompson and Frank (2000) describe a maximum likelihood estimator of population network parameters given a snowball sample, and Illenberger and Flötteröd (2012) describe estimators of topological network parameters using snowball samples. Nonetheless, efforts to describe the appropriate sampling techniques for network research are still at an early stage, and the application of sociocentric (whole-network) methods to questions of health remain limited to relatively small, well-delineated systems in which the collection of near-complete whole-network data is feasible, such as networks of students within a high school (e.g. Kiuru et al. (2012)).

However, research has still only partially addressed this question of missing and sampled network data. Previous work on missing network data and the sampling of network data pertains mostly to network statistics (e.g. Borgatti et al. 2006; Smith and Moody 2013; Smith et al. 2017), or social selection models, namely ERGM, in which one aims to predict tie formation based on an exogenous set of actor attributes, and endogenous processes of network tie formation. By contrast, no existing work examining the effect of missing or sampled data on its social influence counterpart, ALAAM, in which the aim is to predict an individual outcome based on an exogenous set of network ties, an exogenous set of personal attributes, and endogenous processes of social influence or diffusion. Thus, social influence models are advantageous in addressing the same questions as the conventional regression models used within epidemiological studies (e.g. logistic regression), while at the same time taking account of network interdependencies among these outcomes in a principled manner. This article therefore aims to commence research on whether ALAAM represents a valid socio-structural approach with missing and sampled network data, which represent a more realistic set of circumstances in many empirical settings.




Figure 1: The structural ALAAM configurations used.

2 Autologistic Actor Attribute Models (ALAAMs)

ALAAMs were first described in Robins et al. (2001a), modeling the probability of attribute Y (a vector of binary attributes) given the network X (a matrix of 0-1 tie variables). The model can be expressed in the form (Daraganova and Robins, 2013):

$$\Pr(Y = y|X = x) = \frac{1}{\kappa(\theta_I)} \exp\left(\sum_I \theta_I z_I(y,x,w)\right) \tag{1}$$

where θ_I is the parameter corresponding to the network-attribute statistic z_I, in which the "configuration" I is defined by a combination of dependent attribute variables y, network variables x, and actor covariates w, and $\kappa(\theta_I)$ is a normalizing quantity which ensures a proper probability distribution.

The ALAAM predicts the outcome variable Y, taking into account network dependencies in a principled manner which is not possible with standard logistic regression. Assumptions about which attributes Y are independent, and therefore which configurations I are allowed in the model, determine the class of the model. In the simplest case, in which any two attribute variables Y_i and Y_j are assumed to be independent, the only possible configuration is a single node. Then there are no network effects, and the model reverts to standard logistic regression (Daraganova and Robins, 2013, p. 105).

The simplest network dependence assumption is that an attribute variable Y_i is conditionally dependent on network tie X_{jk} if and only if $\{i\} \cap \{k, j\} \neq \emptyset$, that is, if and only if the actor i is one end of the tie X_{jk}. Hence the configurations I allowed in this class of model include stars (Daraganova and Robins, 2013, p. 107), as well as the *contagion* effect, that is, the propensity of two nodes with a tie between them to both have the attribute Y.

We will use this dependence assumption, and also include covariate effects, in which other attributes of an actor influence its outcome attribute Y, just as they would in standard logistic regression if we did not have the network effects.

The ALAAM configurations we will use are:

Attribute density The number of nodes with attribute Y;

Activity Presence of a tie at a node with attribute Y. That is, whether having attribute Y is associated with having a tie to others;

Contagion The propensity for two nodes with a tie between them to both have attribute Y;

Binary The propensity for a node to have attribute Y based on another binary attribute U;

Continuous The propensity for a node to have attribute Y based on its continuous attribute V.

The structural configurations are shown in Figure 1.

By estimating the parameters θ_I, we can make inferences as to whether or not the corresponding effects are significant, given the other effects included in the model. For example, if the Contagion parameter is positive and significant, it means that, in the network in question, the number of directly connected actors that both have the outcome attribute is more than would be expected to occur by chance, given the other effects in the model. The Binary and Continuous parameters therefore have exactly the same meaning as they would in standard logistic regression, with the exception that, in our model which includes network effects, their value is estimated while controlling for the structural effects.

In this paper we examine the effect of missing data and snowball samples on the validity of these inferences.

3 Snowball Sampling

Snowball sampling (Coleman, 1958; Goodman, 1961) is a method to generate a sample of nodes in a network by "link tracing", that is, when a node is in the sample, obtaining further nodes by "following" links (ties) from the node in question. There are many variations and other techniques related to snowball sampling, and a useful set of papers (Goodman, 2011; Heckathorn, 2011; Handcock and Gile, 2011) clarifies the distinctions between them.

To obtain a snowball sample from a network, the first step is to take a random sample of some number of nodes, called the *seed nodes* or *wave 0* of the sample. Then wave 1 of the sample consists of all nodes that have a tie to a node in wave 0, but

are not themselves in wave 0. Wave l of the snowball sample consists of all nodes that have a tie to a node in wave $l-1$ of the sample, but are not themselves in waves $0,\ldots,l-1$. The l-wave snowball sample is then the set of all nodes thus obtained, and the ties between them — that is, the subgraph induced by the nodes in the sample. This is illustrated in Figure 2.

We use two forms of snowball sampling in this paper. In the first form, at most a fixed number m of ties is followed from a node to obtain more nodes in the sample. This is the "traditional" form described in Goodman (1961), and is the situation in a survey design where respondents are asked to name up to m friends, for example. This is also known as a *fixed choice* design, and has also been described as *degree censoring* (Kossinets, 2006) at m.

In the second form, there is no such limit m and all ties from a sampled node are followed. This is equivalent to l steps of breadth-first search (BFS) in the network, and is therefore also known as *BFS sampling*, and is used for example in Newman (2003); Lee et al. (2006); Kurant et al. (2011); Pattison et al. (2013); Stivala et al. (2016). In the graphs shown in the results in the following sections, we denote this form with "$m = \text{Inf}$" since it is equivalent to sampling with an infinite value of the fixed maximum number of ties m.

The snowball sampling parameters that govern the structure and size of a snowball sample are then: the number of waves, the number of seed nodes, and m, the maximum number of ties to follow (when $m = \text{Inf}$ it is BFS sampling, otherwise it is a fixed choice snowball sampling design).

The advantage of snowball sampling in obtaining a sample retaining network structural information is illustrated by Figures 2 and 3. Figure 2 is a two-wave (and ten seed nodes) snowball sample from the network science collaboration network (Figure 4) (Newman, 2006). This sample includes 146 nodes (of the original 1589), i.e. approximately 9% of the nodes in the original network. Figure 3 is the network resulting from sampling exactly the same number of nodes at random from the original network. It is clear that this retains very little of the original network structure (most nodes are isolates, and the largest structures are cliques of size three, i.e. triangles) compared to the snowball sample.

3.1 Conditional Estimation

ALAAM parameters are usually (when a full network is available) estimated by maximum likelihood estimations (MLE) using a stochastic approximation algorithm (Snijders, 2002; Lusher et al., 2013). In short, this involves a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) procedure, whereby, at each iteration, the outcome variable for a randomly chosen actor is toggled, and the resulting changes in the sufficient statistics of the model are used to compute the acceptance probability in a Metropolis–Hastings algorithm to simulate a sequence of simulated outcome vectors. These are then used in an iterative algorithm to estimate ALAAM parameters by stochastic approximation.

When parameters are to be estimated from a snowball sample, however, a conditional estimation algorithm, as proposed in the similar situation for ERGM estimation (Pattison et al., 2013) is used. Conditional estimation for snowball sampled data in the context of ALAAM parameter estimation is described in Daraganova (2009); Daraganova and Pattison (2013); Kashima et al. (2013). The essential idea is that the estimates are conditional on the fixed network and on the outcome attributes fixed in the outermost wave (wave 2 in the two-wave snowball sample illustrated in Figure 2), as in this last wave of the snowball sample, there is no data about their network nominations (other than those already in earlier waves), and so the outcome variable of these nodes is made exogenous to the model. In concrete terms, this means that in the MCMC procedure, only nodes in the innermost waves have their outcome variable toggled.

4 Implementation

ALAAM estimation is done using IPNet (Wang et al., 2009), with the estimations, one for each of the $N_A = 100$ simulated ALAAMs, run in parallel on a Linux compute cluster using `GNU parallel` (Tange, 2011). Only converged parameter estimates, defined as those with a reported t-ratio with a magnitude less than 0.1, are included. A parameter estimate is considered significant if its magnitude is more than twice its standard error.

Scripts for sampling in networks, visualization, and bootstrap error estimation are written in R (R Core Team, 2013) using the `igraph` package (Csárdi and Nepusz, 2006). Graphs are generated with the R `ggplot2` package (Wickham, 2009); locally weighted polynomial regression curves are generated using the `loess` function with default parameters.

In graphs and inference, 95% confidence interval are used. Confidence intervals on RMSE plots are computed by the non-parametric bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) method (Efron, 1987; Davison and Hinkley, 1997). This method adjusts for bias and skewness in the bootstrap distribution. The bootstrap replicates are constructed by taking random resamples of size N_A with replacement from the N_A estimates (one for each simulated ALAAM). Bootstrap confidence intervals are estimated with 20000 replicates using the R `boot` package (Davison and Hinkley, 1997).

The confidence interval shown for estimated type I and type II error rates is the 95% confidence interval for the binomial proportion computed using the Wilson score interval (Wilson, 1927).




Figure 2: A two wave snowball sample, obtaining 146 nodes from a 1589 node network.




Figure 3: A network sample obtained as the subgraph induced by a random sample of 146 nodes from a 1589 node network.




Figure 4: The network science collaboration network, $N = 1589$.

Network	N	Components	Mean degree	Max. degree	Density	Clustering coefficient	Positive outcome % mean	s.d.
ERGM	500	5	4.90	11	0.00983	0.10347	15	2.19
Project 90	4430	1	8.31	159	0.00188	0.34332	15	0.34
Add Health	2539	1	8.24	27	0.00324	0.14189	15	0.54

Table 1: Network statistics of the simulated (ERGM) and empirical networks.

Network	N	Density	Activity	Contagion	Binary	Continuous
ERGM	500	-7.20	0.55	1.00	1.20	1.15
Project 90	4430	-15.0	0.55	1.00	1.20	1.15
Add Health	2539	-12.5	0.55	1.00	1.20	1.15

Table 2: Parameters of the simulated ALAAMs.

5 Simulation Studies

To evaluate the behavior of ALAAM estimation with missing data, we require ALAAMs with known parameters. This is done by simulating an ALAAM (that is, generating the outcome variable from specified ALAAM parameters) on a fixed network. Hence we first need a network to use. We use an undirected network with 500 nodes. This network was taken as a single sample from a sequence of simulated networks generated by PNet (Wang et al., 2009) with the ERGM edge, alternating k-star, alternating k-triangle, and alternating 2-path parameters equal to -4.0, 0.2, 1.0, and -0.2, respectively. These parameters are chosen to generate "reasonable" network statistics, in line with parameters estimated from empirical networks, and are the same as those used in Pattison et al. (2013). The networks are sampled from a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulation, with sufficient burn-in (of the order of 10^7 iterations) to ensure initialization effects are minimized.

As well as the simulated network, we use two empirical networks, as used in a study of respondent-driven sampling (Goel and Salganik, 2010). The first is the "Project 90" network, a sexual contact network of high-risk heterosexuals in Colorado Springs (Potterat et al., 2004; Woodhouse et al., 1994; Klovdahl et al., 1994; Rothenberg et al., 1995). The second is a friendship network from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health ("Add Health") (Harris and Udry, 2015; Moody, 2001). As in Goel and Salganik (2010), we use only the giant components of these networks. Descriptive statistics of the networks are shown in Table 1.

Each node in each network has a binary and a continuous attribute. The binary attribute is assigned the positive value for 50% of the nodes, chosen at random. For the continuous attribute, the attribute value v_i at each node i is $v_i \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0,1)$.

The simulated ALAAMs are generated with the parameters shown in Table 2. These parameters were chosen so that approximately 15% of nodes have a positive outcome variable. For each set of parameters in this table, a set of 100 outcomes is sampled from the distribution with those parameters using IPNet (Wang et al., 2009). The outcomes are sampled from a MCMC distribution with sufficient burn-in (10^6 iterations for the 500 node simulated network, 10^7 iterations for the Add Health network, and 10^8 iterations for the Project 90 network) to ensure initialization effects are minimized, and the samples are taken far enough apart (10^5 iterations for the simulated network and 10^7 iterations for the larger empirical networks) to ensure that they are essentially independent. The proportion of nodes with a positive outcome variable is shown in Table 1 — it is close to 15% on average. This proportion was selected to correspond roughly to rates of mental health conditions within a disaster-affected population (e.g. Bryant et al. 2014).

Figure 5 shows the simulated 500 node network with nodes colored according to the outcome variable for one sample from the ALAAM simulations.

5.1 Simulation Study 1: Random Sampling of Nodes

In the first study we investigate the effect of sampling nodes independently at random from the network, which we refer to as random node sampling, or "simple random sampling". The network then used for estimation is the subgraph of the original graph induced by the selected (not omitted) set of nodes. In other words, when a node is not included, all edges connected to that node are also not in the resulting network. We estimate the ALAAM parameters from this sampled subnetwork, comparing the results to the estimation of the full network.

Figure 6 shows the effect of random node sampling on the root mean square error (RMSE) in ALAAM parameter estimation. The RMSE is the square root of the mean squared difference between the estimate and the true value. (Note that in this figure the RMSE values are on different scales for each parameter). The RMSE decreases steadily as more the sample size increases, although for the Contagion parameter there appears to be a larger jump from 100 to 200 nodes.

Figure 7 shows the effect of random node sampling on the type II error rate, that is, the false negative rate, in ALAAM




Figure 5: The simulated network $N = 500$ with nodes shaped according to the binary attribute and node size proportional to the continuous attribute. Nodes with the positive outcome variable are colored light blue/green (16.2% of the nodes) and the others dark blue.




Figure 6: Effect on root mean square error of random node sampling. Simulated ERGM network $N = 500$.




Figure 7: Effect on type II error of network random node sampling. Simulated ERGM network $N = 500$.




Figure 8: Effect on type II error rate of random node sampling. Project 90 network $N = 4430$.

parameter inference. This is the percentage of experiments (over the 100 simulated ALAAMs) in which the estimate has the wrong sign or the confidence interval covers zero (so we cannot reject the null hypothesis that the parameter for the effect is zero). With the exception of the Activity parameter, the type II error rate does not increase greatly even when only 300 nodes (60% of the total) are sampled. Hence even if we can only sample (at random) 60% of the network, ALAAM inference still has good power on effects other than Activity. Even this low power relative to the other effects could be because the Activity parameter in our simulations has a small magnitude compared to the other effects.

Figure 8 for the Project 90 network and Figure 9 for the Add Health network, show the effect of increasingly larger random node sampling sizes on the type II error rate. In both networks, Density and Contagion have very low type II error rates over the whole range of sample sizes, while the rates for Binary and Continuous decrease slowly. The behavior of the Activity parameter, however, is quite different. For the Project 90 network (Figure 8) the type II error rate is very low for the entire range of sample sizes, while for the Add Health network (Figure 9) the error rate is very high for less than 1000 nodes, and rather abruptly becomes very low for larger sample sizes. This in turn is different from the behavior on the simulated network where the type II error rate on the Activity parameter declines more smoothly with increased sample size (Figure 7).

In order to measure the type I error rate in inference (false positive rate), for an effect, we require simulated ALAAMs which do not have that effect present (its parameter is zero). So for each of our ALAAM effects (except Density, which if zero results in almost all nodes having a positive outcome variable), we simulate another set of 100 ALAAM outcomes in which the corresponding parameter is set to zero. This allows us to test for false positives with respect to this zero effect, that is, the percentage of experiments in which, for an estimate of a zero effect parameter, the confidence interval does not include zero. The other parameters are retained at their values shown in Table 2, except in the case of the Activity effect, which when it is zero, results in less than 1% of the nodes having a positive outcome variable, and so the Density parameter was increased to -4.0 for the simulated ERGM network, -7.0 for the Project 90 network, and -6.0 for the Add Heath network, to obtain a reasonable number of nodes with a positive outcome variable.

The type I error rates obtained in this way are shown in Figure 10 for the simulated network, which shows that even when the sample size is only 100 nodes (20% of the nodes), the type I error rate does not increase significantly on any of the ALAAM effects tested. It is notable that the type I error rates for contagion and the other attribute predictors hardly change as the sample becomes a smaller proportion of the network, illustrating that, at least for this example, the inference of a "significant" effect is robust for a sample that is only 20% of the entire network.

Only 1.7% of ALAAM estimations just described do not converge, consisting almost entirely of those with very small sample sizes.




Figure 9: Effect on type II error rate of random node sampling. Add Health network $N = 2539$.

When using the empirical networks, however, the situation is not as encouraging. Figure 11 shows the results for the Project 90 network, and Figure 12 for the Add Health network. For effects other than Activity, the type I error rates are, sometimes, higher than desirable (particularly for Contagion in the Project 90 network), but never much more than 25%. However for the Activity parameter, the type I error rate can be over 50% (for the Add Health network), and the relationship between sample size and type I error rate is noticeably not monotonic, particularly for the Add Health network.

For both the Project 90 and Add Health networks, less than 1% of the ALAAM estimations just described do not converge.

Hence it seems that selecting nodes at random from an empirical network (which may have, for example, a highly skewed degree distribution), rather than following a network sampling scheme (such as snowball sampling) can risk an unacceptably high (and particularly difficult to estimate or predict, given the non-monotonicity in sample size) type I error rate in some parameters.

5.2 Simulation Study 2: Snowball Sampling

The second study investigates the effect on ALAAM estimation of network samples obtained via snowball sampling. Snowball samples are obtained using 1, 2, or 3 waves. For the 2- and 3-wave snowball sample, the number of seed nodes is varied from 1 to 20. For the 1-wave snowball sample, the number of seed nodes is varied from 1 to 100, since when there is only a single wave, many fewer nodes are obtained in the sample, so a larger number of seed nodes may be required. For each of these conditions, we investigate the effect of a fixed-choice snowball sample, in which only up to m ties are followed (that is, degree censoring at m), with $m = 3$ or $m = 5$, as well as the case where there is no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$).

Figures 13, 14 and 15 show the size of the snowball samples obtained with different snowball sampling parameters for the simulated ERGM network, the Project 90 network, and the Add Health network, respectively. Clearly, the sample sizes grows faster in the number of seed nodes when more waves are used. Not using degree censoring also results in large sample sizes, and also larger variance in sample size.

Figure 16 shows the type II error rate, on network samples from the simulated ERGM network, obtained by snowball sampling with different numbers of waves and seeds, and with and without fixed choice (at two different values) limiting the maximum number of ties followed in the snowball sampling. This shows that using more waves in the snowball sampling gives higher power (lower type II error rate). This is particularly noticeable for the Activity parameter, which has extremely low power when using one or two waves, but can achieve the same power as using the full network with 13 seeds (when not using fixed choice) when using three waves.




Figure 10: Effect on type I error rate of random node sampling. Simulated ERGM network $N = 500$.




Figure 11: Effect on type I error rate of random node sampling. Project 90 network $N = 4430$.




Figure 12: Effect on type I error rate of random node sampling. Add Health network $N = 2539$.




Figure 13: Size of the snowball sample with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Simulated ERGM network $N = 500$.




Figure 14: Size of the snowball sample with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Project 90 network $N = 4430$.




Figure 15: Size of the snowball sample with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Add Health network $N = 2539$.




Figure 16: Effect on type II error rate of conditional estimation with snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Simulated ERGM network $N = 500$. The solid horizontal line is the baseline error rate, with the dashed lines showing its 95% confidence interval.




Figure 17: Effect on type II error rate of conditional estimation with snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Project 90 network ($N = 4430$). The solid horizontal line is the baseline error rate, with the dashed lines showing its 95% confidence interval.

It is clear that, for a given number of waves and seeds, there is higher power with a higher value of m (the number of links to follow) in the fixed choice design, and higher still when not using a fixed choice design (that is, following all links in the snowball sampling). For example, when using three waves, the Contagion parameter has the same power as the baseline (using the entire network) with 10 or more seeds when not using fixed choice ($m = \text{Inf}$), but never achieves this same power even with 20 seeds using fixed choice with $m = 3$.

The results are qualitatively similar, for the empirical networks, Project 90 (Figure 17) and Add Health (Figure 18). An exception is that the advantage of not using degree censoring is even greater for the empirical networks than in the simulated network (especially on the Activity, Binary, and Continuous parameters), and that for the Activity parameter on the Add Health network in particular, using a fixed choice design with $m = 3$ results in very low power even for 3 waves and 20 seeds.

To address the question of whether these results are simply due to the different sample sizes generated by the snowball sampling parameters (waves, seeds, fixed choice size m), or if the sample structure might be relevant, Figure 19 shows the type II error rate as a function of sample size, for both snowball sampling and simple random sampling (that is, the results from simulation study 1, described in the previous section). These graphs show that, for a given snowball sample size, there is (mostly) no significant difference in the type II error rate for the different snowball sampling parameters, except in some cases where fixed choice $m = 3$ has significantly different power from the others (e.g. on Activity on Binary with 3 waves). Snowball sampling has a lower type II error rate than random sampling for the Activity parameter, and a similar type II error rate for the Contagion parameter, when two or three waves are used. However for the Binary and Continuous parameters, snowball sampling has a significantly higher type II error rate than random sampling over almost the entire range of sample sizes.

Figures 20 and 21 show the corresponding results for the Project 90 and Add Health networks, respectively. In general, snowball sampling has a similar or lower type II error rate than random node sampling for the same sample size. Exceptions to this are for very small sample sizes, and for the Binary parameter in the Add Health network.

Figure 22 shows that, in the simulated ERGM network, when using three waves, except for very small numbers of seeds, the type I error rate is not significantly different from the baseline (using the entire network) on any of the parameters. However when using fewer than three waves, the type I error rate can be far higher.

Figures 23 and 24 show the corresponding results for the Project 90 and Add Health networks, respectively. Similarly for the results for the simulated ERGM network, using three waves results in an acceptable type I error rate, however using fewer waves frequently does not. A very noticeable exception is in the Contagion parameter in the Project 90 network (Figure 23)




Figure 18: Effect on type II error rate of conditional estimation with snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Add Health network ($N = 2539$). The solid horizontal line is the baseline error rate, with the dashed lines showing its 95% confidence interval.




Figure 19: Type II error rate of conditional estimation plotted against sample size for snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$), as well as for simple random sampling. For snowball sampling, the number of seeds is varied from 1 to 100 for 1 wave, and 1 to 20 for 2 and 3 waves, and only the locally weighted polynomial regression (`loess` in R) curve is shown, to make the figure clearer. Simulated ERGM network $N = 500$. The solid horizontal line is the baseline error rate, with the dashed lines showing its 95% confidence interval.




Figure 20: Type II error rate of conditional estimation plotted against sample size for snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$), as well as for simple random sampling. For snowball sampling, the number of seeds is varied from 1 to 100 for 1 wave, and 1 to 20 for 2 and 3 waves, and only the locally weighted polynomial regression (`loess` in R) curve is shown, to make the figure clearer. Project 90 network ($N = 4430$). The solid horizontal line is the baseline error rate, with the dashed lines showing its 95% confidence interval.




Figure 21: Type II error rate of conditional estimation plotted against sample size for snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$), as well as for simple random sampling. For snowball sampling, the number of seeds is varied from 1 to 100 for 1 wave, and 1 to 20 for 2 and 3 waves, and only the locally weighted polynomial regression (`loess` in R) curve is shown, to make the figure clearer. Add Health network ($N = 2539$). The solid horizontal line is the baseline error rate, with the dashed lines showing its 95% confidence interval.




Figure 22: Effect on type I error rate of conditional estimation of snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Simulated ERGM network $N = 500$. The solid horizontal line is the baseline error rate, with the dashed lines showing its 95% confidence interval.




Figure 23: Effect on type I error rate of conditional estimation of snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Project 90 network ($N = 4430$). The solid horizontal line is the baseline error rate, with the dashed lines showing its 95% confidence interval.

where the type I error rate actually increases very rapidly to very high values when degree censoring is used with three waves; however when degree censoring is *not* used, the type I error rate is not significantly different from the baseline (the rate when the full network is used).

Figures 25, 26, and 27 show the number of converged estimates for the simulated ERGM network, the Project 90 network, and the Add Health network, respectively. Note that, unlike simulation study 1, where nodes were included in the network sample at random, the network sample is now a snowball sample, and conditional estimation is used to estimate ALAAM parameters conditional on the snowball sampling structure. As a result of this, it can be more difficult to obtain a converged estimate, especially when a smaller number of waves are used. In fact, when using fewer than three waves, and particularly when using only one wave, the percentage of converged estimates can be very low, unless a very large number of seeds is used. When using three waves, however, most estimations converge even for a relatively small number of seeds.

With this in mind, the type I error rate results (Figures 22, 23, and 24) are perhaps not as bad as they first appear. Specifically, it would appear that in situations where the type I error rate is likely to be unacceptably high, it is quite likely that conditional estimation will not converge. Hence rather than risking false positive conclusions, it is likely that in fact no estimate could be obtained at all. (Whether this is actually a preferable situation is perhaps arguable).

6 Conclusion

ALAAM parameter inference can work well even with a relatively small sample taken from the original network, when the sample is obtained by a snowball sample and the estimation is conditional on this sampling structure.

Relatively small amounts of data missing at random from a network may not have an adverse effect on ALAAM parameter inference, however the amount of missing data, and the magnitude of its effect on error rates, may be difficult to estimate. The main recommendation from this study is that, rather than risk a possibly unknown amount of missing data, to use a snowball sampling scheme to obtain a structured network sample instead. Further, snowball sampling should use (at least) three waves, and degree censoring should not be used (i.e. all links should be followed, rather than capping at an arbitrary number).

The main limitation of this study are that only three networks (one simulated from an ERGM, and two empirical), were used, and that the ALAAM model is relatively simple (it includes "contagion", probably the most important and frequently




Figure 24: Effect on type I error rate of conditional estimation of snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Add Health network ($N = 2539$). The solid horizontal line is the baseline error rate, with the dashed lines showing its 95% confidence interval.




Figure 25: Number of converged estimates (out of 100) when using conditional estimation with snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Simulated ERGM network $N = 500$.




Figure 26: Number of converged estimates (out of 100) when using conditional estimation with snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Project 90 network ($N = 4430$).




Figure 27: Number of converged estimates (out of 100) when using conditional estimation with snowball sampling with 1, 2, or 3 waves and degree censoring at $m = 3$, $m = 5$, or no degree censoring ($m = \text{Inf}$). Add Health network ($N = 2539$).

used parameter for an ALAAM, but does not include any triangular configurations, for example). Hence we cannot generalize with any confidence about performance on other networks, or more complex models, although the fact that the results are similar on the simulated and empirical networks of different sizes might be an encouraging sign that the results will at least be applicable to networks "like" those tested. The methods described here could be used on the actual network collected in empirical studies as a sensitivity analysis of ALAAM parameter inference.

Another major limitation of this work is that, although two of the networks used are empirical, in all cases both the attributes (nodal covariates) were simulated, and the actual binary outcome variable was simulated from an ALAAM. Hence, in some sense this is the easiest case for estimation of an ALAAM, as it is known that the outcome was generated from an ALAAM. Further work could be to validate ALAAM estimation and conditional ALAAM estimation from snowball samples of networks with empirical nodal covariates and outcome variable. Such data is potentially available, for example, from the Project 90 network.

We have assumed, in the fixed choice snowball sampling design, that the (up to) m links followed from each node are chosen at random. However in practice when conducting network data collection and asking respondents to name up to m friends, for example, the named contacts are subject to cognitive biases (Freeman et al., 1987) and hence not random. This could potentially lead to biases in the sample that are not considered in this study.

This study is an early step in understanding how ALAAMs and sociocentric network designs may be conducted effectively within general community settings. In such settings, missing data, and/or the necessity to obtain data on only a sample, not the full network, are inevitable, but the research questions are often of paramount importance. An interesting possibility raised by these findings is whether long-established random sampling approaches could be complemented with snowball and referral techniques for estimating network-based determinants for individual outcomes. A wider program of research is merited to determine this conclusively.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by a Victorian Life Sciences Computation Initiative (VLSCI) grant number VR0261 on its Peak Computing Facility at the University of Melbourne, an initiative of the Victorian Government, Australia. We also used the University of Melbourne ITS High Performance Computing facilities.

This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (`http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth`). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

References

L. Anselin. Some robust approaches to testing and estimation in spatial econometrics. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 20(2):141–163, 1990.

S. P. Borgatti, K. M. Carley, and D. Krackhardt. On the robustness of centrality measures under conditions of imperfect data. *Social Networks*, 28(2):124–136, 2006.

R. A. Bryant, E. Waters, L. Gibbs, H. C. Gallagher, P. Pattison, D. Lusher, C. MacDougall, L. Harms, K. Block, E. Snowdon, V. Sinnott, G. Ireton, J. Richardson, and D. Forbes. Psychological outcomes following the Victorian Black Saturday bushfires. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 48(7):634–643, 2014.

A. D. Cliff and J. K. Ord. *Spatial processes: models & applications*. Taylor & Francis, 1981.

J. S. Coleman. Relational analysis: the study of social organizations with survey methods. *Human Organization*, 17(4):28–36, 1958.

G. Csárdi and T. Nepusz. The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal Complex Systems*, 1695, 2006. URL `http://igraph.sf.net`.

G. Daraganova. *Statistical models for social networks and network-mediated social influence processes: Theory and application*. PhD thesis, The University of Melbourne, 2009.

G. Daraganova and P. Pattison. Autologistic actor attribute model analysis of unemployment: dual importance of who you know and where you live. In D. Lusher, J. Koskinen, and G. Robins, editors, *Exponential Random Graph Models for Social Networks*, chapter 18, pages 237–247. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2013.

G. Daraganova and G. Robins. Autologistic actor attribute models. In D. Lusher, J. Koskinen, and G. Robins, editors, *Exponential Random Graph Models for Social Networks*, chapter 9, pages 102–114. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2013.

A. C. Davison and D. V. Hinkley. *Bootstrap Methods and Their Application*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

M. J. De Silva, K. McKenzie, T. Harpham, and S. R. Huttly. Social capital and mental illness: a systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 59(8):619–627, 2005.

D. Dekker, D. Krackhardt, and T. A. Snijders. Sensitivity of MRQAP tests to collinearity and autocorrelation conditions. *Psychometrika*, 72(4):563–581, 2007.

A. J. Dirkzwager, L. Grievink, P. G. Van der Velden, and C. J. Yzermans. Risk factors for psychological and physical health problems after a man-made disaster. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 189(2):144–149, 2006.

D. Dittrich, R. T. A. Leenders, and J. Mulder. Bayesian estimation of the network autocorrelation model. *Social Networks*, 48: 213–236, 2017.

D. Dittrich, R. T. A. Leenders, and J. Mulder. Network autocorrelation modeling: A Bayes factor approach for testing (multiple) precise and interval hypotheses. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 48(3):642–676, 2019.

P. Doreian. Estimating linear models with spatially distributed data. *Sociological Methodology*, 12:359–388, 1981.

B. Efron. Better bootstrap confidence intervals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82(397):171–185, 1987.

O. Frank and D. Strauss. Markov graphs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(395):832–842, 1986.

L. C. Freeman, A. K. Romney, and S. C. Freeman. Cognitive structure and informant accuracy. *American Anthropologist*, 89 (2):310–325, 1987.

N. E. Friedkin. Social networks in structural equation models. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, pages 316–328, 1990.

L. Gibbs, E. Waters, R. A. Bryant, P. Pattison, D. Lusher, L. Harms, J. Richardson, C. MacDougall, K. Block, E. Snowdon, et al. Beyond bushfires: Community, resilience and recovery — a longitudinal mixed method study of the medium to long term impacts of bushfires on mental health and social connectedness. *BMC Public Health*, 13(1):1036, 2013.

L. Gibbs, S. Howell-Meurs, K. Block, D. Lusher, J. Richardson, C. MacDougall, E. Waters, L. Harms, et al. Community wellbeing: applications for a disaster context. *Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 30:20–24, 2015.

S. Goel and M. J. Salganik. Assessing respondent-driven sampling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, 107(15):6743–6747, 2010.

L. A. Goodman. Snowball sampling. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 148–170, 1961.

L. A. Goodman. Comment: On respondent-driven sampling and snowball sampling in hard-to-reach populations and snowball sampling not in hard-to-reach populations. *Sociological Methodology*, 41(1):347–353, 2011.

M. S. Handcock and K. J. Gile. Modeling social networks from sampled data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(1):5–25, 2010.

M. S. Handcock and K. J. Gile. Comment: On the concept of snowball sampling. *Sociological Methodology*, 41(1):367–371, 2011.

K. M. Harris and R. J. Udry. National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) Wave I, 1994-1995, 2015. URL `https://doi.org/10.15139/S3/11900`.

D. D. Heckathorn. Comment: Snowball versus respondent-driven sampling. *Sociological Methodology*, 41(1):355–366, 2011.

P. W. Holland and S. Leinhardt. The structural implications of measurement error in sociometry. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 3(1):85–111, 1973.

J. Illenberger and G. Flötteröd. Estimating network properties from snowball sampled data. *Social Networks*, 34(4):701–711, 2012.

Y. Kashima, S. Wilson, D. Lusher, L. J. Pearson, and C. Pearson. The acquisition of perceived descriptive norms as social category learning in social networks. *Social Networks*, 35(4):711–719, 2013.

I. Kawachi, S. Takao, and S. V. Subramanian. *Global perspectives on social capital and health*. Springer, New York, 2013.

R. G. Kessler, G. Andrews, L. J. Colpe, D. K. Mroczek, S.-L. T. Normand, E. E. Walters, and A. M. Zaslavsky. Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychological Medicine*, 32: 959–976, 2002.

N. Kiuru, W. J. Burk, B. Laursen, J.-E. Nurmi, and K. Salmela-Aro. Is depression contagious? a test of alternative peer socialization mechanisms of depressive symptoms in adolescent peer networks. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 50(3):250–255, 2012.

A. S. Klovdahl, J. J. Potterat, D. E. Woodhouse, J. B. Muth, S. Q. Muth, and W. W. Darrow. Social networks and infectious disease: The Colorado Springs study. *Social Science & Medicine*, 38(1):79–88, 1994.

J. H. Koskinen, G. L. Robins, P. Wang, and P. E. Pattison. Bayesian analysis for partially observed network data, missing ties, attributes and actors. *Social Networks*, 35(4):514–527, 2013.

G. Kossinets. Effects of missing data in social networks. *Social Networks*, 28(3):247–268, 2006.

D. Krackhardt. Predicting with networks: Nonparametric multiple regression analysis of dyadic data. *Social Networks*, 10(4): 359–381, 1988.

M. Kurant, A. Markopoulou, and P. Thiran. Towards unbiased BFS sampling. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 29(9):1799–1809, 2011.

S. H. Lee, P.-J. Kim, and H. Jeong. Statistical properties of sampled networks. *Physical Review E*, 73:016102, 2006.

R. T. A. Leenders. Modeling social influence through network autocorrelation: constructing the weight matrix. *Social networks*, 24(1):21–47, 2002.

S. Letina. Network and actor attribute effects on the performance of researchers in two fields of social science in a small peripheral community. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(2):571–595, 2016.

S. Letina, G. Robins, and D. Maslić Seršić. Reaching out from a small scientific community: the social influence models of collaboration across national and disciplinary boundaries for scientists in three fields of social sciences. *Revija za sociologiju*, 46(2):103–139, 2016.

D. Lusher, J. Koskinen, and G. Robins, editors. *Exponential Random Graph Models for Social Networks*. Structural Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2013.

M. S. Mizruchi and E. J. Neuman. The effect of density on the level of bias in the network autocorrelation model. *Social Networks*, 30(3):190–200, 2008.

J. Moody. Peer influence groups: Identifying dense clusters in large networks. *Social Networks*, 23(4):261–283, 2001.

E. J. Neuman and M. S. Mizruchi. Structure and bias in the network autocorrelation model. *Social Networks*, 32(4):290–300, 2010.

M. E. J. Newman. Ego-centered netwoks and the ripple effect. *Social Networks*, 25(1):83–95, 2003.

M. E. J. Newman. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. *Physical Review E*, 74(3): 036104, 2006.

F. H. Norris, S. P. Stevens, B. Pfefferbaum, K. F. Wyche, and R. L. Pfefferbaum. Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(1-2):127–150, 2008.

K. Ord. Estimation methods for models of spatial interaction. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 70(349): 120–126, 1975.

P. E. Pattison, G. L. Robins, T. A. B. Snijders, and P. Wang. Conditional estimation of exponential random graph models from snowball sampling designs. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 57(6):284–296, 2013.

J. Potterat, D. E. Woodhouse, S. Q. Muth, R. B. Rothenburg, W. W. Darrow, A. S. Klovdahl, J. B. Muth, et al. Network dynamism: history and lessons of the Colorado Springs study. In *Network epidemiology: A handbook for survey design and data collection*. Oxford University Press, 2004.

R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2013. URL `http://www.R-project.org`.

G. Robins. *Doing Social Network Research: Network-based Research Design for Social Scientists*. Sage, London, 2015.

G. Robins, P. Elliott, and P. Pattison. Network models for social selection processes. *Social Networks*, 23(1):1–30, 2001a.

G. Robins, P. Pattison, and P. Elliott. Network models for social influence processes. *Psychometrika*, 66(2):161–189, 2001b.

G. Robins, P. Pattison, and J. Woolcock. Missing data in networks: exponential random graph (p^*) models for networks with non-respondents. *Social Networks*, 26(3):257–283, 2004.

G. Robins, T. Snijders, P. Wang, M. Handcock, and P. Pattison. Recent developments in exponential random graph (p^*) models for social networks. *Social Networks*, 29(2):192–215, 2007.

R. B. Rothenberg, D. E. Woodhouse, J. J. Potterat, S. Q. Muth, W. W. Darrow, and A. S. Klovdahl. Social networks in disease transmission: the Colorado Springs study. *NIDA research monograph*, 151:3–19, 1995.

D. K. Sewell. Network autocorrelation models with egocentric data. *Social Networks*, 49:113–123, 2017.

M. J. Silk, D. P. Croft, R. J. Delahay, D. J. Hodgson, N. Weber, M. Boots, and R. A. McDonald. The application of statistical network models in disease research. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 8(9):1026–1041, 2017.

J. A. Smith and J. Moody. Structural effects of network sampling coverage I: Nodes missing at random. *Social Networks*, 35 (4):652–668, 2013.

J. A. Smith, J. Moody, and J. H. Morgan. Network sampling coverage II: The effect of non-random missing data on network measurement. *Social Networks*, 48:78–99, 2017.

T. A. B. Snijders. Markov chain Monte Carlo estimation of exponential random graph models. *Journal of Social Structure*, 3 (2):1–40, 2002.

A. D. Stivala, J. H. Koskinen, D. A. Rolls, P. Wang, and G. L. Robins. Snowball sampling for estimating exponential random graph models for large networks. *Social Networks*, 47:167–188, 2016.

O. Tange. Gnu parallel - the command-line power tool. *;login: The USENIX Magazine*, 36(1):42–47, Feb 2011. URL `http://www.gnu.org/s/parallel`.

S. K. Thompson and O. Frank. Model-based estimation with link-tracing sampling designs. *Survey Methodology*, 26(1):87–98, 2000.

T. W. Valente. *Social networks and health: Models, methods, and applications*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2010.

P. Wang, G. Robins, and P. Pattison. *PNet: program for the simulation and estimation of exponential random graph (p^*) models*. Department of Psychology, The University of Melbourne, 2009.

W. Wang, E. J. Neuman, and D. A. Newman. Statistical power of the social network autocorrelation model. *Social Networks*, 38:88–99, 2014.

H. Wickham. *ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer, New York, 2009. ISBN 978-0-387-98140-6. URL `http://had.co.nz/ggplot2/book`.

E. B. Wilson. Probable inference, the law of succession, and statistical inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 22(158):209–212, 1927.

D. E. Woodhouse, R. B. Rothenberg, J. J. Potterat, W. W. Darrow, S. Q. Muth, A. S. Klovdahl, H. P. Zimmerman, H. L. Rogers, T. S. Maldonado, J. B. Muth, et al. Mapping a social network of heterosexuals at high risk for HIV infection. *AIDS*, 8(9): 1331–1336, 1994.