

# gwdegree: Improving interpretation of geometrically-weighted degree estimates in exponential random graph models

Michael A Levy<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of California, Davis; Department of Environmental Science and Policy

DOI: [10.21105/joss.00036](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00036)

## Software

- [Review](#) ↗
- [Repository](#) ↗
- [Archive](#) ↗

## Licence

Authors of JOSS papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY).

## Summary

Exponential random graph models (ERGMs) are maximum entropy statistical models that provide estimates on network tie formation of variables both exogenous (covariate) and endogenous (structural) to a network. Network centralization – the tendency for edges to accrue among a small number of popular nodes – is a key network variable in many fields, and in ERGMs it is primarily modeled via the geometrically-weighted degree (GWD) statistic (Snijders et al. 2006; Hunter 2007). However, the published literature is ambiguous about how to interpret GWD estimates, and there is little guidance on how to interpret or fix values of the GWD shape-parameter,  $\theta_S$ . This Shiny application seeks to improve the use of GWD in ERGMs by demonstrating:

1. how the GWD statistic responds to adding edges to nodes of various degrees, contingent on the value of the shape parameter,  $\theta_S$ ;
2. how the degree distribution of networks of various size and density are shaped by GWD parameter and  $\theta_S$  values;
3. how GWD and GWESP – an ERGM term used to model triadic closure – interact to affect network centralization and clustering.

## References

- Hunter, David R. 2007. “Curved Exponential Family Models for Social Networks.” *Social Networks*, Special section: Advances in exponential random graph ( $p^*$ ) models, 29 (2): 216–30. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2006.08.005.
- Snijders, Tom A. B., Philippa E. Pattison, Garry L. Robins, and Mark S. Handcock. 2006. “New Specifications for Exponential Random Graph Models.” *Sociological Methodology* 36 (1): 99–153. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9531.2006.00176.x.