

Political Networks Conference / June 22, 2021




A Multi-Modal Graph Learning Framework to Capture the Evolution of Global Terrorism

Gian Maria Campedelli

University of Trento

gianmaria.campedelli@unitn.it

@CampedelliGian



Terrorist attacks are the most concrete consequence of terrorists' decision making processes \Rightarrow the combination of weapons and targets and timing constitutes a group's *operating profile* (McCormick 2003)

Groups' operating profiles are constrained by a number of factors:

- *Material resources* (Dolnik 2007; Koehler-Derrick and Milton 2019)
- *Support* (Polo and Gleditsch 2016)
- *Goals* (Polo 2020)
- *Ideology* (Drake 1998; Asal et al. 2009)

+ research on terrorists' life cycle reveal temporal variations in goals, resources, strategies, and therefore **attacks** (Clauset and Gleditsch 2012; Yang, Pah, and Uzzi 2019)

Lack of fundamental knowledge about operational and behavioral similarity patterns across different organizations. (Some) Unanswered questions:

- *How wide is the behavioral complexity spectrum of terrorist behaviors at the global level?*
- *What overall trends can be observed about global terrorism from a comparative perspective?*
- *Are there behavioral connections between groups that operate in very different geographical contexts and for very different motives?*




Lack of fundamental knowledge about operational and behavioral similarity patterns across different organizations. (Some) Unanswered questions:


- *How wide is the behavioral complexity spectrum of terrorist behaviors at the global level?*
- *What overall trends can be observed about global terrorism from a comparative perspective?*
- *Are there behavioral connections between groups that operate in very different geographical contexts and for very different motives?*

To answer these questions, we leverage multi-modal networks to represent terrorist behaviors at the yearly level:

- Multi-modality as an approach to capture different (non necessarily correlated) dimensions of terrorist attacks
- Dynamic component to observe behavioral variations over the years

- **Main Source:** Global Terrorism Database (+ BAAD, TRAC, EDTG)
- **Sample:** terrorist actors responsible for at least 50 attacks from 1997 to 2018: *105 groups (42,000+ events)*
- **Focus:** each group's yearly deployed *tactics*, attacked *targets*, utilized *weapons*








Group \times Tactic Group \times Target Group \times Weapon


$$\mathcal{G}_t^M = \left\{ G_{1_t}, G_{2_t}, G_{3_t} \right\}$$



Why Iterative Refining?

- Terrorist actors display extremely skewed activity
- Outliers being very active (10 groups account for $\sim 60\%$ of total attacks)
- Parallely, critical mass of groups characterized by low frequency but distinct distributions of feature weights

⇒ Refined procedure allows to disentangle more nuanced patterns in the "critical mass" yearly subsamples




RBG Multi-modal Unipartite Nets


- Transformation from bipartite to unipartite nets to compute mode-weighted resolution-corrected *modularity*
- *Radius Ball Graph*: variant of the nearest neighbor problem in computational geometry
- Radius optimization using Euclidean distance

⇒ **Result:** modal weighted networks connecting groups which are operationally similar with respect to a particular mode


RBG Graph 1997. -, Tactic. Mode




RBG Graph 1997. -, Target. Mode




RBG Graph 1997. -, Weapon. Mode




RBG Graph 2005. -, Tactic. Mode




RBG Graph 2005. -, Target. Mode




RBG Graph 2005. -, Weapon. Mode




RBG Graph 2012. -, Tactic. Mode




RBG Graph 2012. -, Target. Mode




RBG Graph 2012. -, Weapon. Mode




RBG Graph 2018. -, Tactic. Mode







RBG Graph 2018. -, Target. Mode



RBG Graph 2018. -, Weapon. Mode




Results: Dynamics of RBG Networks




- RBG networks anticipate cluster trends: all modes document increasing density and clustering coefficient. Stable N of components → *reduction in heterogeneity of behaviors?*
- Asynchronous trends in degree assortativity → different network structures in each mode highlight importance of evaluating behaviors in a multi-modal framework

Results: Detected Clusters



- The number of clusters oscillates from 3 to 10, no clear pattern
- In line with RBG network dynamics: ratio clusters/groups shows a downward trend → increase of homogeneity at the global level

Results: Co-clustering Stability



- High stability from 2009 to 2018 and from 2002 to 2006
- Co-clustering similarity not always higher for closer years: some groups change their behaviors temporarily and then switch back to previous operating profiles, e.g. $\text{sim}[C(2013; 2018)] > \text{sim}[C(2017; 2018)]$
- Before 2002: high variability




What are the drivers/correlates of co-clustering, aka operational similarity?

Results: Drivers of Similarity/1

What are the drivers/correlates of co-clustering, aka operational similarity?


Analytical Strategy: *Exponential Random Graph Models (ERGM)* on the *group* \times *cluster* bipartite yearly networks



- **Sum of Feature Weights:** *is overall activity a driver of co-clustering?*
- **Diff in N of non-zero features:** *is similarity in repertoire diversity a driver of co-clustering?*
- **Diff in "N of non-zero features to weights" ratio:** *is diversity in relation to overall activity a driver of co-clustering?*
- **Most Common Target:** *are groups with the same target preference more similar?*
- **Most Common Tactic:** *are groups with the same tactical preference more similar?*
- **Most Common Weapon:** *are groups with the same weapon preference more similar?*
- **Region:** *are groups operating in the same region more similar?*
- **Ideology:** *are groups sharing the same ideology more similar?*

Results: What Drives Co-clustering?/3

- **Sum of Feature Weights:** *Is the amount of resources/activity a driver of co-clustering?* **YES!**
- **N of non-zero features:** *is repertoire diversity a driver of co-clustering?* **YES!**
- **Diff in "N of non-zero features to weights" ratio:** *is diversity in relation to overall activity a driver of co-clustering?* **YES!**
- **Most Common Target:** *are groups with the same target preference more similar?* **Not Really**
- **Most Common Tactic:** *are groups with the same tactical preference more similar?* **Not Really**
- **Most Common Weapon:** *are groups with the same weapon preference more similar?* **Really**
- **Region:** *are groups operating in the same region more similar?* **Not Really**
- **Ideology:** *are groups sharing the same ideology more similar?* **NO!**



- **ERGM Diagnostics:** convergence has been assessed and confirmed for all the estimated models ✓
- **Results Robustness:** tested on enlarged sample including organizations that have plotted at least 30 attacks from 1997 to 2018 (164 groups, ~57% increase) → all outcomes have been confirmed ✓

- Yearly focus may obscure **micro-temporal patterns** → *future work should experiment with more restricted time windows*
- This framework does not consider **exogenous components** (e.g., military campaigns, regime change) → *very limited power in causal explanations*

- Increasing homogeneity of behaviors over the years
- Higher stability of co-clustering after 2002, corroborating diminished heterogeneity patterns
- We report organizations' ability to switch back to previously adopted operating profiles, highlighting relevance of dynamic behavioral monitoring
- Operational similarity between pairs of groups is driven by:
 - 1 groups' overall amount of activity;
 - 2 similarity in repertoire diversity
 - 3 similarity in both activity and repertoire diversity combined




Dr. Iain J Cruickshank
Carnegie Mellon University
&
US Army AI Task Force



Prof. Kathleen M. Carley
Carnegie Mellon University

Thanks for your attention!



email: gianmaria.campedelli@unitn.it
Twitter: @CampedelliGian



Title Slide: *Flow*, Siyon Jin (2011)

Closing Slide: *The Persistence of Memory*, Salvador Dalí (1931)

- Victor H. Asal et al. (July 2009). “The Softest of Targets: A Study on Terrorist Target Selection”. In: *Journal of Applied Security Research* 4.3. Publisher: Routledge _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361610902929990>, pp. 258–278. ISSN: 1936-1610. DOI: 10.1080/19361610902929990. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361610902929990> (visited on 05/10/2021).
- Aaron Clauset and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch (Nov. 2012). “The Developmental Dynamics of Terrorist Organizations”. en. In: *PLOS ONE* 7.11. Publisher: Public Library of Science, e48633. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0048633. URL: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0048633> (visited on 04/29/2021).
- Adam Dolnik (Apr. 2007). *Understanding Terrorist Innovation: Technology, Tactics and Global Trends*. en. Routledge. ISBN: 978-1-134-09825-5.
- C. J. M. Drake (1998). “Ideology”. en. In: *Terrorists’ Target Selection*. Ed. by C. J. M. Drake. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 16–34. ISBN: 978-0-230-37467-6. DOI: 10.1057/9780230374676_3. URL: https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230374676_3 (visited on 04/29/2021).

- Gabriel Koehler-Derrick and Daniel James Milton (Sept. 2019). "Choose Your Weapon: The Impact of Strategic Considerations and Resource Constraints on Terrorist Group Weapon Selection". en. In: *Terrorism and Political Violence* 31.5, pp. 909–928. ISSN: 0954-6553, 1556-1836. DOI: 10.1080/09546553.2017.1293533. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09546553.2017.1293533> (visited on 05/10/2021).
- Gordon H. McCormick (2003). "Terrorist Decision Making". In: *Annual Review of Political Science* 6.1. _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.6.121901.085601>, pp. 473–507. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.6.121901.085601. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.6.121901.085601> (visited on 05/01/2021).
- Sara MT Polo (Mar. 2020). "The quality of terrorist violence: Explaining the logic of terrorist target choice". en. In: *Journal of Peace Research* 57.2, pp. 235–250. ISSN: 0022-3433, 1460-3578. DOI: 10.1177/0022343319829799. URL: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022343319829799> (visited on 05/10/2021).

- Sara MT Polo and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch (Nov. 2016). "Twisting arms and sending messages: Terrorist tactics in civil war". en. In: *Journal of Peace Research* 53.6, pp. 815–829. ISSN: 0022-3433, 1460-3578. DOI: 10.1177/0022343316667999. URL: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022343316667999> (visited on 05/10/2021).
- Yang Yang, Adam R. Pah, and Brian Uzzi (Oct. 2019). "Quantifying the future lethality of terror organizations". en. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116.43. Publisher: National Academy of Sciences Section: Social Sciences, pp. 21463–21468. ISSN: 0027-8424, 1091-6490. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1901975116. URL: <https://www.pnas.org/content/116/43/21463> (visited on 04/29/2021).