

# How networks shape diversity for better or worse

Andrea Musso\* and Dirk Helbing†

Computational Social Science, ETH Zürich, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland

Correlations between characteristics of interacting individuals are found in various phenomena such as obesity, smoking, cooperation, and opinions. This article provides tools to understand this phenomenon in the context of structured populations, which engage in a process of opinion formation: What can the connectivity structure of a population reveal about correlations in opinions of its individuals? By studying the voter model, a classical model of opinion formation, we derive analytical results clarifying how local (individual) and global (population-wide) opinion correlations are expected to depend on the population structure. This dependency is revealed by replacing the conventional distance on structured populations (the shortest path) by an effective distance based on diffusion processes. We show that global properties of real-world population structures, such as degree-heterogeneity and small-worldness, have important ramifications for global opinion correlations and, in particular, for opinion diversity. Our results open new perspectives for understanding how to change interaction patterns such that they sustain opinion diversity and, thereby, the innovation, productivity, resilience, and collective intelligence of a society.

## INTRODUCTION

The behavior of individuals is not independent from that of their friends, the friends of their friends, and, in general, their social circle: obesity [1], smoking [2], the propensity towards cooperation [3–5], support for scientific information or fake news [6], adoption of innovation [7], political ideology [8], song preferences [9], and various other forms of human behavior [10] tend to manifest in clusters. Although the mechanisms underlying correlations in the behavior of individuals are complex and may vary between different kinds of behaviors [11, 12], it is plausible that some generic features can be explained by the social structure through which the behaviors of individuals spread [13–15].

This article aims at clarifying the interplay between behaviors and connectivity structure in the context of a population engaging in opinion formation. By studying the voter model [16–21], a classical model of opinion formation, we develop analytical tools which shed new light on how correlations in the opinions of individuals depend on the population’s connectivity structure. Our approach is based on replacing the canonical distance in structured populations, i.e., the shortest path distance, by a more elaborate notion of effective distance [22], which is based on diffusion processes (random walks): the *random social exploration (RSE) distance* [23]. Although this new distance uniquely depends on the structure of the population, it clearly captures opinion correlations: individuals who are close with respect to the distance show remarkable opinion correlations, while individuals who are located far from each other do not.

We employ this effective distance to study the impact of the connectivity structure on opinion diversity. The

key idea here is that, by averaging the value of the RSE distance over all pairs of individuals in the population, we can construct an index, which reveals how opinion diversity depends on the connectivity structure. In turn, this index allows us (i) to understand how certain defining features of population structures, e.g. degree-heterogeneity [24] and “small-worldness” [25, 26], affect opinion diversity, and (ii) to classify population structures into *amplifiers* and *suppressors* of (opinion) diversity (see Ref. [27]).

We hope that our results will shift some of the debate on network-based opinion formation from the investigation of consensus to the study of diversity. The former has received a lot of attention in the literature [17–20], the latter so far rather little [28]. However, in various real-world situations, diversity is preferable to consensus. As Voltaire once famously said: “If there were only one religion in England, there would be danger of tyranny; if there were two, they would cut each other’s throats; but there are thirty, and they live happily together in peace.” More generally, diversity has numerous beneficial effects: it fosters innovation [29], improves cooperation [30, 31] and socio-economic development [32], sharpens collective intelligence [33–35], increases productivity [36, 37] and improves societal resilience [38]. Therefore, it is imperative to understand its determinants and to discover new ways of promoting it.

## RANDOM SOCIAL EXPLORATION DISTANCE

To define the RSE distance, consider a structured population, as depicted in Figure 1A, where vertices represent individuals and edges represent friendships, acquaintances, interactions, or other ties. For illustration, assume that two individuals  $i$  and  $j$  decide to play the following random social exploration game (see Figure 1A-C): Player  $i$  (resp. player  $j$ ) chooses one friend, at random, and sends him/her a letter. The message on the letter reads: “Please choose a friend at random and for-

\* andrea.musso@gess.ethz.ch

† Also at Complexity Science Hub Vienna, Josefstädter Strasse 39, 1080 Vienna, Austria




FIG. 1. Illustrations of RSE distance (A-C) and voter model (D-F). (A-C) In each figure the red (resp. blue) vertex illustrates the current position of the letter sent by  $i$  (resp.  $j$ ) in the random social exploration game; the red (resp. blue) edges highlight the path traveled by  $i$ 's (resp.  $j$ 's) letter. (A)  $i$  randomly selects friend  $n$  and sends her a letter. In the mean time,  $j$  randomly selects friend  $k$  and sends her a letter. (B)  $k$  receives the letter from  $j$  and forwards it to  $l$ , meanwhile,  $n$  receives the letter from  $i$  and forwards it to  $l$ . (C)  $l$  receives both letters. Hence, the letter of  $i$  and the letter of  $j$  meet in  $l$ 's hands. Note that, for this specific run of the random social exploration game, the letters have been forwarded twice before meeting in  $l$ 's hands, so  $d_{ij} = 2$ . The value of  $\langle d_{ij} \rangle$  is obtained by averaging  $d_{ij}$  over many runs of the random social exploration game. (D-F) Three time steps  $t = 0, 1, 2$  of the voter model on a population comprised of six individuals  $i, j, k, l, m$  and  $n$  with a population structure represented by the hexagonal network above. Each figure illustrates the population's opinions at one time step (marked by different colors), with time increasing from top to bottom. (D) Initially, every individual has a distinct opinion. (E) In the first time step,  $i$  and  $m$  imitate  $l$ . By doing so, they adopt  $l$ 's previous opinion, i.e., the red opinion. Similarly,  $k$  and  $n$  imitate  $j$ , and  $j$  imitates  $i$ .  $l$  invents a new opinion, previously held by nobody: the black opinion. (F) In the second time step, the black opinion spreads to  $m, n, i$  and  $k$ , who all imitate  $l$ . Meanwhile,  $j$  imitates  $i$ , and  $l$  imitates  $m$ .

ward this letter to him/her". Individuals receiving the letter follow the message. So, the letter of  $i$  (resp.  $j$ ), forwarded again and again, "randomly explores" her social circle. The *RSE distance* between  $i$  and  $j$  is then defined as the average number of forwards  $\langle d_{ij} \rangle$  required for the letter of  $i$  to meet the letter of  $j$ , i.e., for the two letters to end up in the hands of the same individual at the same time. The average is determined over many repetitions of the random social exploration game.

In the mathematics literature, the RSE distance between  $i$  and  $j$  is commonly referred to as the *expected meeting time* [23] of the random walks [39] started at  $i$  and  $j$ . Here, however, we prefer the name RSE distance because it shifts the focus from the random walks to the population structure.

## VOTER MODEL

To illustrate how the RSE distance captures opinion correlations, we study the *voter model with new opinions* [40], which is probably the simplest model encompassing the driving mechanisms of opinion dynamics and cultural evolution [41], namely imitation and innovation [42–44]. The model is defined on a connected network ("graph")  $G$ , where vertices represent individuals and edges represent friendships, acquaintances, interactions, or other ties. At time  $t$ , each individual  $i$ 's opinion is characterized by a state variable  $o_i(t)$ . The dynamical evolution of the model follows very few, simple rules: Initially, each individual has a distinct opinion (color). Then, during each discrete time step, individuals synchronously update their opinions by: (i) imitating the *current* opinion of a randomly selected neighbor with probability  $1 - r$ ; (ii) "inventing" a new opinion, previously held by nobody, with probability  $r$  (see Figures 1D-F). The parameter  $r$ , with  $0 \leq r \leq 1$ , is dubbed *innovation rate* and quantifies the balance between imitation and innovation. Larger values of  $r$  favor innovation, while smaller ones accentuate imitation.

## RESULTS

**RSE distance and opinion correlation.** The correlation between the opinions of two individuals  $i$  and  $j$  can be captured by the frequency  $F_{ij}$  with which  $i$  and  $j$  have the same opinion:  $F_{ij} = \langle \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{1}_{ij}(s) \rangle$ , where  $\mathbb{1}_{ij}(s)$  equals 1, if  $i$  and  $j$  have the same opinion at time  $s$ , otherwise it is set to zero. Being a frequency,  $F_{ij}$  varies between 0 and 1. The closer  $F_{ij}$  is to one, the more often  $i$  and  $j$  have the same opinion, i.e. the more their opinions are (positively) correlated.

As analytically derived in the Supplementary Information (SI), the RSE distance  $\langle d_{ij} \rangle$  between two individuals  $i$  and  $j$  captures (positive) correlations in their opinions:

$$F_{ij} \approx (1 - 2r)^{\langle d_{ij} \rangle} \quad (1)$$

(see Fig. 2A). Here,  $r \ll 1$  is the parameter of the voter model and  $F_{ij}$  is the frequency with which two individuals  $i$  and  $j$  hold the same opinion. Eq. 1 illustrates that individuals who are closer with respect to the RSE distance tend to have the same opinion more often, i.e., their opinions are more (positively) correlated.

Why? The core idea is that the correlation in the opinions (or more generally behavior) of  $i$  and  $j$  depends on the similarity and size of their social environments. Consider, for instance, the extreme case where  $i$  and  $j$  have only one and the same friend. Their social environment is then identical and small. Hence,  $i$  and  $j$  experience a very similar influence, such that their opinions should be quite correlated. Conversely, if  $i$  and  $j$  both have many different friends, their social environments are dissimilar and large. Hence, the social influence they experience should be more dissimilar. Consequently, their opinions should be less correlated. The connection with the RSE distance comes by observing that, if  $i$  and  $j$  have similar and small social environments, randomly forwarding letters—as in the random social exploration game—will quickly lead to the letters meeting. On the contrary, if  $i$  and  $j$  have different and large social environments, it will take long until random forwarding will bring the letters together.

Eq. 1 shows that the RSE distance is a structural measure, which captures *local* opinion correlations, namely, correlations between the opinions of specific individuals. Aggregating the values of the RSE distance over the whole population, we can construct an index reflecting how global opinion correlations depend on the population structure and, consequently, on opinion diversity as well. This consideration leads us to study opinion diversity and its relationship with the RSE distance in the following.

**RSE distance and diversity.** Let us now discuss, what the RSE distance can reveal about the diversity of a population’s opinions. In other words, what can a population’s connectivity structure tell us about its expected opinion diversity?

To address this question, it is necessary to specify in quantitative terms what we mean by “opinion diversity”. To do so, we adopt *Simpson’s diversity index*  $D$  [45]. This index is defined as the probability that two randomly chosen individuals from the population hold different opinions. Being a probability, the quantity varies between 0 and 1. When only one opinion is present, the opinion of two randomly chosen individuals cannot differ. Hence, Simpson’s diversity index takes the value of 0. Conversely, when every individual has a different opinion, the probability that two randomly selected individuals hold different opinions is large. Thus, Simpson’s diversity index is close to 1 (precisely, its maximum value is  $1 - 1/N$ , where  $N$  denotes the number of individuals in the population). For illustration, the diversity  $D$  of the (highly diverse) population portrayed in Figure 1D is  $D = 0.833$ , whereas that of the (more homogeneous)




FIG. 2. Comparison of the results of Eq. 1 and Eq. 2 with numerical simulations of the voter model run on the network  $G$  of Facebook friendships in a large software company (see Appendix for details). (A–B) The frequency  $F_{ij}$  with which  $i$  and  $j$  have the same opinion (blue dots) as a function of (A) their RSE distance  $\langle d_{ij} \rangle$  and (B) their shortest path distance  $spd_{ij}$ , for various pairs  $i, j$  of individuals. In (A) we find a good correspondence between our analytical estimate (red line) and the value of  $F_{ij}$  computed by numerical simulations (blue dots). Comparing (A) and (B), we observe that the RSE distance explains variations in  $F_{ij}$  much better than the conventional shortest path distance. (C) Analytical estimate for the long-term average diversity  $\langle D(\infty) \rangle$  according to Eq. 2 (dashed lines) in comparison with the average value  $\langle D(t) \rangle$  of the population’s opinion diversity obtained by numerical simulation after  $t$  time steps of the voter model with parameter  $r$  (the shaded regions around solid lines indicate 95% confidence intervals). After a convergence time period, we observe an excellent correspondence between analytical estimates and simulation results. See Appendix for details and parameter values.

population in Figure 1F is  $D = 0.45$ .

Our main result is the following equation (derived in the Supplementary Information), which describes the opinion diversity of a population with structure  $G$  in the voter model with parameter  $r \ll 1$ :

$$\langle D(\infty) \rangle = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle D(t) \rangle \approx 1 - (1 - 2r)^{N\Delta(G)}. \quad (2)$$

Herein,  $D(t)$  is the (Simpson) diversity of the population’s opinions after running the voter model with parameter  $r$  for  $t$  time steps.  $\langle D(t) \rangle$  is the average value of  $D(t)$  over many runs of the model, and  $\langle D(\infty) \rangle$  is the value approached by  $\langle D(t) \rangle$  as time goes by (i.e. as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ). It can be interpreted as the long-term average diversity of the population’s opinions. Finally,  $\Delta(G)$  is

the population's average RSE distance  $d = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j} \langle d_{ij} \rangle$ , rescaled by its size  $N$  (number of individuals):

$$\Delta(G) = \frac{d}{N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\langle d_{ij} \rangle}{N^2}. \quad (3)$$

Figure 2C reports numerical simulations confirming the analytical result of Eq. 2. Furthermore, Figure 3 illustrates the interplay between the parameters appearing on the left hand side of Eq. 2, namely, the innovation rate  $r$  and the population's average RSE distance  $N\Delta(G) = d$ .

Eq. 2 shows that, for a fixed population size  $N$ , the larger the value of  $\Delta(G)$  the better the population structure sustains diversity. In other words, large values of  $\Delta(G)$  indicate population structures that are beneficial for diversity, whereas, small value of  $\Delta(G)$  signal population structures that are detrimental.

However, the question remains what should be considered “large” and “small” values of  $\Delta(G)$ ? We suggest to take the complete network  $K$  as a natural benchmark. It corresponds to a population structure where ties occur between all individuals. On the complete network, we have  $\Delta(K) = 1$ , as is shown in the SI. Accordingly, population structures  $G$  with  $\Delta(G) > 1$  can be said to *amplify diversity* (as compared to the above benchmark), while those with  $\Delta(G) < 1$  *suppress* it. For diversity suppressors to fight off homogeneity, innovation must be stronger than for all-to-all interactions, while for amplifiers, less innovation is required to sustain diversity (compared to all-to-all interactions).

The classification of population structures as suppressors or amplifiers of diversity is a fascinating research question, which is still largely open. We address this classification by computing  $\Delta(G)$  on a case-by-case basis and by extrapolating trends in population structures that cause variations in  $\Delta(G)$ .

**Heterogeneous degree distributions suppress diversity.** In typical networks with a heterogeneous degree distribution, most vertices have small degrees, while there is still a significant probability of finding vertices with large degrees. In other words, heterogeneous degree distributions tend to be characterized by large, sometimes unbounded, variations in the degree of a vertex. Degree heterogeneity turns out to be ubiquitous in real-world population structures [24]: from the World Wide Web [46] to sexual relationship networks [47], a “hub-and-spoke structure” is characteristic for human social systems. It is, therefore, imperative to ask: how does this feature of social networks affect the opinion diversity of a population?

To answer this question, let us consider the probably most studied model of degree-heterogeneous graphs: scale-free networks [48, 49]. These networks are characterized by a power-law degree distribution  $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ , where the exponent  $\gamma > 0$  marks the weight of the distribution's tail. The smaller the value of  $\gamma$ , the heavier the distribution's tail. That is, the higher the probability of




FIG. 3. Evolution of opinions in the voter model on a scale-free network  $G$ . In (A), the innovation rate  $r$  is considerably smaller than the reciprocal of the population's average RSE distance  $1/d = 1/N\Delta(G)$ , while in (B), the innovation rate  $r$  is significantly larger than  $1/d$ . The colored trajectories illustrate the percentage of the population  $a$  holding a specific opinion (corresponding to one color) at a given time  $t$ . We observe two very different regimes. When  $r \ll 1/d$  (see (A)), a strong majority of the population holds the same opinion. Sporadically, stochastic effects lead to a replacement of the dominant opinion, but low diversity in the population's opinions is the rule. In contrast, when  $r \gg 1/d$  (see (B)), no opinion is able to acquire a majority in the population. Some opinions become relatively popular, with  $a \approx 50\%$ , but are soon replaced by others. The chaotic rise and fall of opinions displayed in (B) reveals a persistently high level of diversity in the population's opinions. This shows that, if the population's average RSE distance  $d$  is small, a high innovation rate is required to sustain long-term diversity. However, if  $d$  is large, modest innovation rates can prevent homogeneity. See Appendix for the parameter values.

finding vertices with large degree values. For a scale-free network  $G_\gamma$  with exponent  $\gamma$ , we fit data from numerical simulations and find (see also the SI):

$$\Delta(G_\gamma) \approx c \left( \frac{\langle k \rangle^2}{\langle k^2 \rangle} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (4)$$

Herein,  $\langle k \rangle$  and  $\langle k^2 \rangle$  denote the first and second moments of the degree distribution of  $G_\gamma$ .  $c$  is a fitting constant. In a finite network with  $N$  vertices, the values of the first and second moments of the degree distribution can be computed explicitly in terms of  $N$  and  $\gamma$ . According to Chap. 6.4 of Ref. [24], one finds:

$$\Delta(G_\gamma) \propto \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \gamma \geq 3 \\ 1/N^{\frac{3-\gamma}{3(\gamma-1)}} & \text{if } 2 < \gamma < 3 \\ 1/N^{\frac{1}{3}} & \text{if } \gamma \leq 2 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Eq. 5 implies that, for scale-free networks,  $\Delta(G_\gamma)$  is al-

ways smaller than one. Moreover, the distance to the benchmark grows as  $\gamma$  decreases, i.e., as the distribution's tail becomes heavier (see Figure 4). This phenomenon has an intuitive explanation: large-degree vertices (“hyperinfluentials” [50]) play an important role, either as initiators or early adopters, in triggering large imitation cascades [50]. The opinion of a hyperinfluential can be imitated by all her neighbors. Therefore, the larger the degree of a hyperinfluential, the more likely she is to trigger an imitation cascade that will end up reducing opinion diversity.




FIG. 4. Estimates (lines) and numerical simulation results (symbols) illustrating values of  $\Delta(G)$  for scale-free, Watts-Strogatz, and complete networks. Both analytical estimates and numerical simulations underline that scale-free networks are suppressors of diversity ( $\Delta(G) < 1$ ). Specifically, greater heterogeneity in the degree-distribution (i.e., a smaller exponent  $\gamma$ ) induces greater suppression of diversity (i.e., smaller values of  $\Delta(G)$ ). Conversely, Watts-Strogatz networks amplify diversity ( $\Delta(G) > 1$ ). However, the amplification of diversity is reduced as more long-range connections are established (i.e., as the rewiring probability  $s$  increases). See Appendix for the parameter values underlying the Figure.

**Diversity in a small world.** A network has the “small-world” property, if it is possible to go from one vertex to other vertices by passing through a very small number of intermediate vertices. More precisely, the small-world property refers to networks in which the average distance between vertices scales logarithmically (or more slowly) with the number of vertices. First popularized by the celebrated Milgram experiment [51], the small-world property has been identified as a common feature in a wide array of population structures [52]. Therefore, understanding its implications for diversity is crucial.

The Watts-Strogatz network [25] is one of the most prominent models to study the effects of the small-world

property on trajectories of dynamical phenomena [24]. The model reflects that most real-world networks are neither completely regular nor completely random, but located somewhere in between these two extremes. To construct networks lying between regularity and randomness, it is convenient to start with a ring of  $N$  vertices, with each vertex symmetrically connected to its  $2m$  nearest neighbors. Then, for every vertex, each edge is rewired with probability  $s$ , i.e., the edge’s endpoint is reconnected to a vertex chosen randomly according to a uniform distribution. Duplicate edges are forbidden. The resulting network  $G_s$  lies between an ordered lattice ( $s = 0$ ) and a purely random network ( $s = 1$ ).

Fitting numerical simulations, we obtain the following estimate for the Watts-Strogatz network  $G_s$  (see the SI):

$$\Delta(G_s) \approx \frac{1 + s\langle k \rangle^2}{\langle k \rangle^2/N + s\langle k \rangle^2}. \quad (6)$$

Here,  $\langle k \rangle$  denotes the average degree in  $G_s$  and  $N$  is the number of vertices of  $G_s$ . It is apparent from Eq. 6 that an increase in the rewiring probability  $s$  entails a decrease in  $\Delta(G_s)$ , which, however, remains above the benchmark of the complete network (i.e.,  $\Delta(G_s) \geq 1$ ), as illustrated in Figure 4.

From the investigation of  $\Delta(G_s)$  of the Watts-Strogatz model, we conclude that lattice-like regularity tends to be favorable for diversity. The absence of long-range connections and large clustering coefficients create small, local, opinion-homogeneous clusters. These are obstacles to consensus formation, as the opinions of individuals within such clusters are hard to change and individuals within such clusters are less exposed to new opinions. Long-range connections expose opinion-homogeneous clusters to other opinions and reduce the persistence of individuals within such clusters, thereby promoting faster global consensus, hence, less diversity. Several real-world examples of such phenomena exist. For instance, the diversity of languages spoken in Italy has suffered [53], partly as a consequence of the establishment of long-range connections among regions by industrialization, increased mobility, television, Internet and social media use.

**Real-world populations.** In Table I, we report values of the rescaled average RSE distance  $\Delta(G)$  for various real-world networks together with their degree-heterogeneity [24] and clustering coefficients [25]. As expected, low values of  $\Delta(G)$  are correlated with high heterogeneity and low clustering. More generally,  $\Delta(G)$  tends to decrease as (i) the degree heterogeneity increases (ii) the clustering decreases. Details concerning the underlying network data can be found in the Appendix (see also the SI).

## DISCUSSION

Understanding the interplay between population structure and diversity is a crucial questions for human devel-

TABLE I. Rescaled average RSE distance  $\Delta(G)$ , degree heterogeneity and clustering coefficient of various real-world networks.

Network	$\Delta(G)$	Heterogeneity	Clustering
power	2.48	4	0.103
netscience	1.5	7	0.431
macaque neural	0.8	27	0.558
lesmis	0.63	12	0.499
astro-ph	0.39	45	0.425
cond-mat-2005	0.36	27	0.243
foursquare	0.23	52	0.132
celegans metabolic	0.14	155	0.351
douban	0.14	37	0.01
livemocha	0.13	328	0.014
brightkite	0.12	127	0.11
email-Enron	0.08	140	0.085
marker cafe	0.07	706	0.046
gowalla	0.03	613	0.023
topology	0.02	723	0.106
as-22july06	0.02	261	0.011
hyves	0.01	522	0.002

opment, because diversity provides various benefits to society. In this article, we have made some steps towards this understanding. By studying the voter model of opinion formation, we have found: (i) The RSE distance, a structural measure based on random walks, is a good predictor of individual opinion correlations. (ii) A population’s opinion diversity depends on its connectivity structure. This dependence is captured by the rescaled average RSE distance  $\Delta(G)$ , which one may call “structural diversity index”. (iii) Population structures can amplify and suppress diversity: degree heterogeneity and long-range connections cause suppression, while clustering and grid-like regularities promote amplification.

Our results open up several future research directions (see also the SI). First, understanding the consequences that certain characteristics of the population structure imply for the diversity of its opinions offers opportunities to change these structures such that they will sustain diversity. For instance, if an increase in degree-heterogeneity causes a reduction in diversity, then a simple, decentralized strategy such as “stop following the  $h$  most connected VIPs in your social network channel” can help sustain it, as shown in Figure 5.

Future research may explore: First, what other *decentralized* strategies can help one change population structures such that the diversity will increase? How can the fact that long-range connections hinder diversity be used? Second, as opinion dynamics is just one of the many possible applications of the RSE distance, what can the RSE distance tell us about other dynamical processes on population networks, such as the evolution of cooperation? Third, what about robustness? Does the close relationship between the RSE distance and opinion diversity also exist in real-world settings, for example, in lab or web experiments?




FIG. 5. Relative change in  $\Delta(G)$  of four real-world social networks (marker-cafe [54], gowalla [55], brightkite [55] and foursquare [56]) as connections to highly connected individuals are removed. The relative change in  $\Delta(G)$  is given by  $(\Delta(G_h) - \Delta(G))/\Delta(G)$ , where  $G_h$  is the network obtained, when each individual in  $G$  has removed the connections to her/his  $h$  most connected neighbors. We note that the simple, decentralized strategy of having individuals remove connections to highly connected neighbors leads to remarkable increases in the value of  $\Delta(G)$ , even when the number of removed connections per individual is small. For instance, removing connections to the two most connected individuals ( $h = 2$ ) induces a relative (percentage) increase in  $\Delta(G)$  ranging from 20% (foursquare) to 120% (gowalla).

Bio-diversity has long been considered a cornerstone of healthy natural ecosystems. In view of all the benefits for innovation, productivity, resilience, and collective intelligence, it is now time to recognize the importance of sociodiversity.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project received partial financial support from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No 833168). A.M. is grateful to Thomas Asikis for support in running simulations.

## APPENDIX

**Parameter values and further details regarding figures and tables.** All networks are generated and manipulated using graph-tool [57]. For python scripts enabling the fast numerical computation of the RSE distance see the SI. **Figure 2:** Simulations were performed on the network Large Technology Corporation (L2) in

Ref. [58]. For (A) and (B) the voter model was run with parameter  $r = 1/(3 \cdot 10^4)$ . **Figure 3:** Simulations where conducted on a scale-free network with  $N = 100$  vertices, minimal degree  $m = 3$  and  $1/d = 0.02$ . The values of the innovation rate  $r$  were set to (A)  $r = 0.002$  and (B)  $r = 0.2$ . **Figure 4:** Simulations where performed on scale-free networks with  $N = 10^4, 10^3, 10^2$  vertices and minimum degree  $m = 5, 4, 3$ , respectively, and on Watts-Strogatz networks with  $N = 10^4, 10^3$  ver-

tices and average degree  $\langle k \rangle = 8, 6$ , respectively. The plotted estimates are obtained by using Eq. 5 and Eq. 6. **Table I:** The degree heterogeneity and the clustering coefficient are defined in the SI. Confidence intervals for the values of  $\Delta(G)$  are small, so we omit them. The network data is described below. **Network data:** All network data used in this paper is openly accessible at <https://networks.skewed.de>. For more information see the SI.

- 
- [1] N. A. Christakis and J. H. Fowler, The spread of obesity in a large social network over 32 years, *New England Journal of Medicine* **357**, 370 (2007).
- [2] N. A. Christakis and J. H. Fowler, The collective dynamics of smoking in a large social network, *New England Journal of Medicine* **358**, 2249 (2008).
- [3] C. Hauert and M. Doebeli, Spatial structure often inhibits the evolution of cooperation in the snowdrift game, *Nature* **428**, 643 (2004).
- [4] M. A. Nowak, *Evolutionary Dynamics: Exploring the Equations of Life* (Harvard University Press, 2006).
- [5] M. A. Nowak, Five rules for the evolution of cooperation, *Science* **314**, 1560 (2006).
- [6] M. Del Vicario, A. Bessi, F. Zollo, F. Petroni, A. Scala, G. Caldarelli, H. E. Stanley, and W. Quattrociocchi, The spreading of misinformation online, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**, 554 (2016).
- [7] M. Granovetter, Threshold models of collective behavior, *American Journal of Sociology* **83**, 1420 (1978).
- [8] S. A. Levin, H. V. Milner, and C. Perrings, The dynamics of political polarization, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- [9] M. J. Salganik, P. S. Dodds, and D. J. Watts, Experimental study of inequality and unpredictability in an artificial cultural market, *Science* **311**, 854 (2006).
- [10] N. A. Christakis and J. H. Fowler, *Connected: The Surprising Power of our Social Networks and how they Shape our Lives* (Little, Brown Spark, 2009).
- [11] M. McPherson, L. Smith-Lovin, and J. M. Cook, Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks, *Annual Review of Sociology* **27**, 415 (2001).
- [12] F. P. Santos, Y. Lelkes, and S. A. Levin, Link recommendation algorithms and dynamics of polarization in online social networks, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- [13] M. Granovetter, Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness, *American Journal of Sociology* **91**, 481 (1985).
- [14] D. J. Watts, A simple model of global cascades on random networks, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **99**, 5766 (2002).
- [15] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks, *Physical Review Letters* **86**, 3200 (2001).
- [16] T. M. Liggett, *Interacting Particle Systems*, Vol. 276 (Springer Science, 2012).
- [17] C. Castellano, D. Vilone, and A. Vespignani, Incomplete ordering of the voter model on small-world networks, *Europhysics Letters* **63**, 153 (2003).
- [18] V. Sood and S. Redner, Voter model on heterogeneous graphs, *Physical Review Letters* **94**, 178701 (2005).
- [19] K. Suchecki, V. M. Eguíluz, and M. San Miguel, Voter model dynamics in complex networks: Role of dimensionality, disorder, and degree distribution, *Physical Review E* **72**, 036132 (2005).
- [20] V. Sood, T. Antal, and S. Redner, Voter models on heterogeneous networks, *Physical Review E* **77**, 041121 (2008).
- [21] R. Axelrod, The dissemination of culture: A model with local convergence and global polarization, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* **41**, 203 (1997).
- [22] D. Brockmann and D. Helbing, The hidden geometry of complex, network-driven contagion phenomena, *Science* **342**, 1337 (2013).
- [23] D. J. Aldous, Meeting times for independent markov chains, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **38**, 185 (1991).
- [24] A. Barrat, M. Barthélemy, and A. Vespignani, *Dynamical Processes on Complex Networks* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- [25] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks, *Nature* **393**, 440 (1998).
- [26] L. A. N. Amaral, A. Scala, M. Barthélemy, and H. E. Stanley, Classes of small-world networks, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **97**, 11149 (2000).
- [27] E. Lieberman, C. Hauert, and M. A. Nowak, Evolutionary dynamics on graphs, *Nature* **433**, 312 (2005).
- [28] C. Hauert and M. Doebeli, Spatial social dilemmas promote diversity, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- [29] M. P. Feldman and D. B. Audretsch, Innovation in cities: Science-based diversity, specialization and localized competition, *European Economic Review* **43**, 409 (1999).
- [30] F. C. Santos, M. D. Santos, and J. M. Pacheco, Social diversity promotes the emergence of cooperation in public goods games, *Nature* **454**, 213 (2008).
- [31] V. V. Vasconcelos, S. M. Constantino, A. Dannenberg, M. Lumkowsky, E. Weber, and S. Levin, Segregation and clustering of preferences erode socially beneficial coordination, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- [32] N. Eagle, M. Macy, and R. Claxton, Network diversity and economic development, *Science* **328**, 1029 (2010).
- [33] J. Lorenz, H. Rauhut, F. Schweitzer, and D. Helbing, How social influence can undermine the wisdom of crowd effect, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**, 9020 (2011).

- [34] L. Hong and S. E. Page, Groups of diverse problem solvers can outperform groups of high-ability problem solvers, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **101**, 16385 (2004).
- [35] A. W. Woolley, C. F. Chabris, A. Pentland, N. Hashmi, and T. W. Malone, Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups, *Science* **330**, 686 (2010).
- [36] L. M. Bettencourt, H. Samaniego, and H. Youn, Professional diversity and the productivity of cities, *Scientific Reports* **4**, 1 (2014).
- [37] C. A. Hidalgo, B. Klinger, A.-L. Barabási, and R. Hausmann, The product space conditions the development of nations, *Science* **317**, 482 (2007).
- [38] S. E. Page, *The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies*. (Princeton University Press, 2007).
- [39] D. A. Levin and Y. Peres, *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*, Vol. 107 (American Mathematical Soc., 2017).
- [40] D. J. Aldous and J. Fill, Reversible markov chains and random walks on graphs (2002).
- [41] L. L. Cavalli-Sforza and M. W. Feldman, *Cultural Transmission and Evolution: A Quantitative Approach* (Princeton University Press, 1981).
- [42] R. Boyd and P. J. Richerson, *Culture and the Evolutionary Process* (University of Chicago Press, 1988).
- [43] M. Tomasello, *The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition* (Harvard University Press, 2009).
- [44] M. Mäs, A. Flache, and D. Helbing, Individualization as driving force of clustering phenomena in humans, *PLoS Computational Biology* **6**, e1000959 (2010).
- [45] E. H. Simpson, Measurement of diversity, *Nature* **163**, 688 (1949).
- [46] R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A.-L. Barabási, Diameter of the world-wide web, *Nature* **401**, 130 (1999).
- [47] F. Liljeros, C. R. Edling, L. A. N. Amaral, H. E. Stanley, and Y. Åberg, The web of human sexual contacts, *Nature* **411**, 907 (2001).
- [48] A.-L. Barabási and R. Albert, Emergence of scaling in random networks, *Science* **286**, 509 (1999).
- [49] G. Caldarelli, *Scale-free Networks: Complex Webs in Nature and Technology* (Oxford University Press, 2007).
- [50] D. J. Watts and P. S. Dodds, Influentials, networks, and public opinion formation, *Journal of Consumer Research* **34**, 441 (2007).
- [51] S. Milgram, The small world problem, *Psychology Today* **2**, 60 (1967).
- [52] D. J. Watts, *Six Degrees: The Science of a Connected Age* (WW Norton & Company, 2004).
- [53] C. Moseley, *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* (Unesco, 2010).
- [54] M. Fire, L. Tenenboim-Chekina, R. Puzis, O. Lesser, L. Rokach, and Y. Elovici, Computationally efficient link prediction in a variety of social networks, *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* **5**, 1 (2014).
- [55] E. Cho, S. A. Myers, and J. Leskovec, Friendship and mobility: user movement in location-based social networks, in *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD* (2011) pp. 1082–1090.
- [56] D. Yang, D. Zhang, L. Chen, and B. Qu, Nationtelescope: Monitoring and visualizing large-scale collective behavior in lbsns, *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* **55**, 170 (2015).
- [57] T. Peixoto, The graph-tool python library, figshare . (2014).
- [58] M. Fire and R. Puzis, Organization mining using online social networks, *Networks and Spatial Economics* **16**, 545 (2016).