

Modeling biases in binary decision-making within the generalized nonlinear q-voter model

Maciej Doniec,¹ Pratik Mullick,² Parongama Sen,³ and Katarzyna Sznajd-Weron¹

¹⁾*Department of Science, Technology and Society Studies, Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Poland*

²⁾*Department of Operations Research and Business Intelligence, Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Poland*

³⁾*Department of Physics, University of Calcutta, India*

(Dated: 17 February 2025)

Binary decision frameworks are widely used in the social sciences, including management and economics, to understand collective behavior. In group decision-making, opinions evolve through social influence, shaping outcomes that lead to either consensus or polarization. The q voter model, also known as the non-linear voter model, has been extensively studied in this context. However, the impact of an individual's current opinion on their future stance has been largely overlooked. To fill this gap, we introduce a generalized model in which an agent's opinion depends not only on its neighbors but also on its own state. As in the original q -voter model, a unanimous influence group of size q causes the agent to adopt the group's opinion. However, if the group is not unanimous, the agent will change its opinion with a probability influenced by its current state. This introduces a bias toward a choice that reflects external factors such as politics or advertising. Our model generalizes previous q -voter models, including the original one, while allowing for a wider range of scenarios. We analyze the model on a complete graph, deriving the phase diagram and the exit probability for finite systems. We support our analytical approach with Monte Carlo simulations and show that they overlap even for small systems of size $N = 64$. Our results show that the exit probability depends on q . For $q \geq 3$, the exit probability exhibits a shape that was not observed in previous models, which implies that increasing initial support for a decision does not necessarily change the final collective outcome.

I. INTRODUCTION

Binary decision-making is a fundamental method that simplifies choices into two clear alternatives, facilitating faster and more efficient decision processes. Psychologically, this approach helps mitigate decision fatigue, the phenomenon in which decision quality declines after making numerous choices¹. Cognitive load theory supports this approach, suggesting that memory has limited capacity. When overwhelmed with excessive information or complex tasks, cognitive efficiency decreases significantly². Research shows that the quality of decisions tends to decrease as the number of choices increases³. Thus, narrowing options to a binary format reduces extraneous cognitive load, allowing people to concentrate on fundamental aspects without distraction from irrelevant details. Recent studies emphasize this psychological benefit^{4,5}. Moreover, it was shown that the framing of decisions in binary terms influences the risk taking behavior in management, showing the practical impact of binary decision-making in organizational settings that require quick actions⁶.

In many cases, decision-making is a sequential process that involves a series of decisions made over time, particularly in the context of collective decision making. In these collective settings, as individuals observe the decisions of others, they can adjust their own choices accordingly, which can enhance the dynamics of the group and the quality of the decisions⁷. While sequential decision-making can improve outcomes, it also introduces complexities such as potential biases (e.g., sequential bias), which can affect how decisions are made over time⁸. Sequential bias refers to the tendency for past decisions to influence current choices, potentially leading to systematic errors in judgment⁹. This bias is particularly important in col-

lective decision-making processes because it can shape how group members perceive options and make decisions based on previous outcomes¹⁰.

Among several binary opinion models^{11,12}, the q -voter model¹³, also known as the nonlinear voter model^{14,15}, is one of the most universal, and several biases have already been considered within this framework, as will be reviewed in the next section. However, to our knowledge, the q -voter model¹³ has not been thoroughly studied under the influence of a sequential bias. This inspired us to generalize the model to incorporate such an effect, which not only breaks the symmetry between two alternative choices but also accounts for cases where the evaluation of a current choice is influenced by previous decisions.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we briefly review the literature on linear and non-linear voter models, particularly focusing on how various biases have been modeled, to place our research in a broader context. We then introduce the new generalized model, which, in special cases, reduces to the original q voter model¹³ and the recently proposed biased version with influence from the media¹⁶. Next, we derive non-linear differential equations that describe the aggregated behavior of the model, identify fixed points, and analyze their stability. This enables us to construct the phase diagram, which reveals asymmetrical phases not present in the original q -voter model. Finally, we derive the exit probability for finite systems and demonstrate that for $q \geq 3$, it takes on a unique form that is not observed in previous models. We conclude with a discussion of the theoretical and practical applications of our model.

II. RELATED LITERATURE

The foundational voter model^{17,18} involves binary opinions in which each agent randomly adopts the opinion of a neighboring agent. This model exhibits a linear behavior in exit probabilities, as the probability of consensus is directly proportional to the initial fraction of agents holding a particular opinion. The linear voter model has been extensively studied due to its simplicity and ability to capture fundamental aspects of opinion dynamics in social systems¹⁹. Variations include the introduction of “zealots” who never change their opinions, influencing the overall consensus time.²⁰ Another variant in literature is the biased voter model^{21–23}, where agents favor one opinion over another. For example, Czaplicka et al.²² divide agents into fixed biased and unbiased groups: unbiased agents follow the original voter dynamics, while biased agents flip their opinions with probabilities that depend on their current opinion and that of their neighbor.

Partisan voter models^{24,25} extend the original voter model by introducing agents with inherent biases or preferences towards specific opinions. The noisy voter model²⁶, allowing spontaneous opinion flips, represents yet another adaptation of the voter framework. Linear voter models have also been analyzed on diverse network structures, such as lattices, random graphs, and scale-free networks, revealing how topology influences convergence to consensus^{27,28}.

Castellano et al.¹³ proposed a nonlinear extension of the voter model, called the *q*-voter model, where an agent interacts with a selected group of *q* neighbors. If all *q* neighbors share the same opinion, the agent conforms by adopting that opinion; otherwise, the agent’s opinion flips with a set probability. This model is different from the majority rule model^{29,30}, where a *q*-panel adopts the majority opinion within the panel.

A large number of studies have examined variants of the nonlinear *q* voter model, adapting its original formulation to different contexts. For example, Nyczka et al.³¹ examined three different versions of the model that included two types of social responses that occur with complementary probabilities: conformity and one type of nonconformity (two types of anticonformity and independence). Timpanaro and Prado³² explored a conformist *q*-voter model on a one-dimensional lattice with periodic boundary conditions, randomly selecting a successive *q*-panel, where unanimous opinions influence neighboring agents or a single neighboring agent. Javarone et. al³³ studied a variation of the *q*-voter model in which agents are conformists with some probability and anticonformists with a complementary probability, without introducing independent agents. On the other hand, Mobilia³⁴ studied the *q* voter model on a complete graph with “zealots” representing independent agents who are not susceptible to social influence. Byrka et al.³⁵ proposed a modified model in which each agent is subject to social influence or to some external factor (ignoring its *q* neighbors) with complementary probabilities. Recently, another approach to nonconformism has been proposed by introducing a skepticism parameter that quantifies an agent’s propensity to be a nonconformist³⁶. This parameter influences how likely an agent is to resist social influence,

affecting both anticonformity (going against the majority) and independence (randomly choosing an opinion).

The *q*-voter model and its variants have also been studied in multiplex networks³⁷, duplex cliques³⁸, random graphs^{39,40}, Barabasi-Albert networks⁴¹ and scale-free networks^{36,39}. A notable variant, the threshold *q*-voter model, examined by Vieira et al.⁴², was tested on a complete graph; in this model, unanimity among a minimum threshold *q*₀ of *q* agents ($0 \leq q_0 \leq q$) is enough to sway the focal agent, while also allowing the agent to remain independent. This threshold model was later applied to random networks³⁹. Another extension by Nyczka et al.⁴³ presented a generalized threshold *q*-voter model that incorporated basic social responses such as conformity, anticonformity, independence, and uniformity/congruence. A recent work⁴⁴ introduced a model to explore how opinion dynamics is affected by complex contagion, where individuals adopt opinions based on reinforcement from neighboring contacts. This model extends the voter model framework by incorporating complex contagion processes that require a threshold level of social support for an opinion to spread.

Some recent studies on multistate voter models extend the classic binary voter model to scenarios where agents can adopt one of several discrete states or opinions⁴⁵. Models where agents can hold more than two opinions have been studied to explore how the number of available states impacts consensus, coexistence, or fragmentation. Ramirez et al.⁴⁶ investigated multistate voter models on complete graphs and networks, analyzing the dynamics of consensus formation and the coarsening process through a sequence of metastable states. In a related study, Ramirez et al.⁴⁷ examined how nonlinear extensions of multistate voter models impact consensus dynamics, highlighting differences in ordering behavior compared to linear models.

Of late, *q*-voter models^{16,41} were analyzed, where if the *q*-panel is not unanimous, the focal agent could adopt an opinion influenced by mass media with a certain probability. In another variant⁴⁸, in case of lack of unanimity in the *q*-panel, the focal agent chooses an opinion determined by the weighted influence of agents in the *q*-panel. A related model studied by Civitarese et al.⁴⁹ explores how an independent agent might question its own stance when affected by an unreliable external influence, similar to societal effects of mass media on decision-making.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL

We consider a population of *N* agents on a complete graph, where each agent is described by a dynamic binary variable $S_i = \pm 1 (\uparrow / \downarrow)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ representing a binary opinion (yes/no, agree/disagree), a decision such as adopting/not adopting a certain innovation (technology, practice, etc.), or just a state adopted/not adopted (unadopted). In this paper we will use the latter nomenclature. The state of an agent – referred to here as the target agent – can change when influenced by a *q*-panel, which consists of *q* < *N* other agents chosen at random. If the *q*-panel is unanimous, meaning every agent in the *q*-panel is in the same state, the target agent takes




FIG. 1. Schematic diagram of our model illustrating possible scenarios in which a target agent (inside the circle) may change its state. Examples are provided for $q = 4$. Black (white) agents represent adopted (unadopted) agents, while gray agents indicate agents in an arbitrary state. In scenarios (a) and (b), the target agent's state changes independently of its initial state because the q -panel is unanimous. Cases (c) and (d) represent situations where the q -panel is not unanimous, meaning that the probability of changing state depends on the target agent's initial state: (c) the target agent is adopted and switches to an unadopted state with probability ε_{\downarrow} ; otherwise, it retains its original state; (d) the target agent is unadopted and adopts with probability ε_{\uparrow} ; otherwise, it retains its original state.

their state, a scenario known as conformity.

In the absence of unanimity in the q -panel, the target agent will change its state with a constant probability, independent of the proportion of agents in adopted or unadopted states within the q -panel. If the target agent is currently unadopted, it will switch to an adopted state with probability ε_{\uparrow} , and with the complementary probability $1 - \varepsilon_{\uparrow}$, it will remain unadopted. Conversely, if the target agent is already adopted, it will switch to the unadopted state with probability ε_{\downarrow} , and with complementary probability $1 - \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$, it will stay adopted. Our model therefore includes two parameters ε_{\uparrow} and ε_{\downarrow} , that accounts for the bias of an agent, depending on its current state. This is different from the idea of bias in partisan voter models, where an agent has inherent and fixed bias towards a specific opinion, irrespective of its current state^{24,25}.

The dynamics of our model for $q = 4$ are illustrated in Figure 1. One time step in our model consists of N elementary updates, where, in each elementary update, a target agent is randomly selected from the population of N agents, and its state is updated. For $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$ it reduces to the original q -voter model, and for $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 0$ to the model with mass media¹⁶.

IV. RESULTS

A. Aggregated description of the system

Let us denote by N_{\uparrow} the number of adopted agents and by N_{\downarrow} the number of unadopted agents. Since the total number of agents N is fixed:

$$N_{\uparrow} + N_{\downarrow} = N. \quad (1)$$

Taking this into account, and considering the model on a complete graph, we can fully describe the state of the system by the aggregate variable N_{\uparrow} . As usual, it is more convenient to use intensive variables rather than extensive ones such as N_{\uparrow} . Therefore, following previous studies^{12,31}, we introduce the concentration c of adopted agents as:

$$c = \frac{N_{\uparrow}}{N} \rightarrow 1 - c = \frac{N_{\downarrow}}{N}. \quad (2)$$

As usual, we can write the rate equation as:

$$\frac{\Delta c}{\Delta t} = \gamma^+ - \gamma^-, \quad (3)$$

where γ^+ is the probability of an event in which, during a time step $\Delta t = 1/N$, the number of adopted agents, N_{\uparrow} , increases by 1 (and simultaneously, c increases by $\Delta c = 1/N$), and γ^- is the probability of an event in which, during the same time step $\Delta t = 1/N$, the number of adopted agents decreases by 1 (and simultaneously, c decreases by $\Delta c = 1/N$). For an infinite system size, $N \rightarrow \infty$, the time step $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, and we can rewrite Eq. (3) in a continuous form:

$$\frac{dc}{dt} = \gamma^+ - \gamma^-. \quad (4)$$

Since the state of the system can change due to either the unanimity or non-unanimity of the q -panel, we can decompose γ^+ and γ^- into the components corresponding to these two cases as

$$\gamma^+ = \gamma_u^+ + \gamma_{nu}^+, \quad \gamma^- = \gamma_u^- + \gamma_{nu}^-, \quad (5)$$

where the subscript u refers to unanimity, while nu denotes non-unanimity. With these notations, γ_u^+ represents the probability of an event in which, during an elementary update of duration $\Delta t = 1/N$, the number of adopted agents, N_{\uparrow} , increases by 1 (and simultaneously, c increases by $\Delta c = 1/N$) due to unanimity. Similarly, γ_{nu}^+ represents the probability of an event in which N_{\uparrow} increases by 1 (and c increases by Δc) due to non-unanimity. Likewise, γ_u^- and γ_{nu}^- represent the probabilities of events in which N_{\uparrow} decreases by 1 (and c decreases by Δc) as a result of unanimity and non-unanimity, respectively.

The probabilities of events in which we randomly select a non-adopted/adopted agent and that it changes to the opposite state after interacting with a unanimous q -panel can be expressed as:

$$\gamma_u^+ = \frac{N_{\downarrow}}{N} \prod_{i=0}^{q-1} \frac{N_{\uparrow} - i}{N - 1 - i}, \quad (6)$$

$$\gamma_u^- = \frac{N_{\uparrow}}{N} \prod_{i=0}^{q-1} \frac{N_{\downarrow} - i}{N - 1 - i}, \quad (7)$$

where the terms before the product symbol represents the probabilities of events in which a target agent is selected that is unadopted or adopted, respectively, from a population of N agents. Once this target agent is selected, the probability of

an event in which we choose an agent in the q -panel who is in the opposite state to the target, from the remaining population of $N - 1$ agents, is $N_{\uparrow}/(N - 1)$ or $N_{\downarrow}/(N - 1)$ depending on the target's state. Since q agents in the same state are needed, this selection process is repeated q times, as represented by the product term.

The probabilities of events in which we randomly select a non-adopted/adopted agent and that it changes to the opposite state after interacting with a non-unanimous q -panel can be expressed as:

$$\gamma_{nu}^+ = \varepsilon_{\uparrow} \frac{N_{\downarrow}}{N} \left(1 - \prod_{i=0}^{q-1} \frac{N_{\uparrow} - i}{N - 1 - i} - \prod_{i=0}^{q-1} \frac{N_{\downarrow} - 1 - i}{N - 1 - i} \right), \quad (8)$$

$$\gamma_{nu}^- = \varepsilon_{\downarrow} \frac{N_{\uparrow}}{N} \left(1 - \prod_{i=0}^{q-1} \frac{N_{\uparrow} - 1 - i}{N - 1 - i} - \prod_{i=0}^{q-1} \frac{N_{\downarrow} - i}{N - 1 - i} \right). \quad (9)$$

The terms within the parentheses denote the probability of an event in which a q -panel is selected that contains neither q positive agents nor q negative agents.

Now we substitute explicit expressions for γ_u^+ , γ_u^- , γ_{nu}^+ and γ_{nu}^- given by Eqs.(6)-(9) into Eq. (5), and take the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit to simplify the forms of γ^+ and γ^- , defined by Eq. (5). As a result we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^+ &= (1 - c)c^q + \varepsilon_{\uparrow}(1 - c)(1 - c^q - (1 - c)^q), \\ \gamma^- &= c(1 - c)^q + \varepsilon_{\downarrow}c(1 - c^q - (1 - c)^q). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Inserting the probabilities given by Eq. (10) to Eq. (4) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dc}{dt} &= (1 - c)c^q - c(1 - c)^q \\ &+ (\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow}) \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{\uparrow}}{\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow}} - c \right) (1 - c^q - (1 - c)^q). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The above equation allows us to numerically study the time evolution of the system for arbitrary values of ε_{\uparrow} and ε_{\downarrow} , as shown in Fig. 2. Note that the trajectories in Fig. 2 were plotted for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} \geq \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$, which corresponds to the situation where the adopted state is preferred. However, for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} \leq \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$, the trajectories would look exactly the same if we examined the concentration $1 - c$ of the unadopted agents instead of the adopted ones. Note also the solid green lines and the dashed red lines, which are fixed points (stationary states) of Eq. (11) obtained from:

$$\frac{dc}{dt} = 0. \quad (12)$$

From Eq. (11) the conditions for the fixed points are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\uparrow} &= \frac{(1 - c)c^q - c(1 - c)^q}{(c - 1)(1 - c^q - (1 - c)^q)} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow} \frac{c}{1 - c}, \\ \varepsilon_{\downarrow} &= \frac{(1 - c)c^q - c(1 - c)^q}{c \cdot (1 - c^q - (1 - c)^q)} + \varepsilon_{\uparrow} \frac{1 - c}{c}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$




FIG. 2. The temporal behavior of the concentration c of adopted agents for $q = 5$ and several values of ε_{\uparrow} and ε_{\downarrow} from different initial conditions. Trajectories (black solid line) are the numerical solutions of Eq. (11). The solid green lines indicate stable, whereas dashed red lines unstable fixed points of Eq. (11) obtained from Eq. (12).

From Eqs. (13), we can obtain several results that have been reported earlier in the literature: for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$ the model boils down into the original q -voter by Castellano et. al.¹³:

$$\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \frac{c(1 - c)^q - (1 - c)c^q}{(1 - 2c)(1 - c^q - (1 - c)^q)}, \quad (14)$$

and for $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 0$ the model with mass media¹⁶

$$\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \frac{c(1 - c)^q - (1 - c)c^q}{(1 - c)(1 - c^q - (1 - c)^q)}. \quad (15)$$

It is worthwhile to note whether the voter model type behavior will occur for any parameter range. Following¹³, one can obtain the equation obeyed by $P(c)$, the probability that the fraction of adopted agents is c as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial P(c, t | c', t')}{\partial t'} &= (\gamma^+ - \gamma^-) \frac{\partial P(c, t | c', t')}{\partial c'} \\ &+ \frac{(\gamma^+ + \gamma^-)}{2N} \frac{\partial^2 P(c, t | c', t')}{\partial c'^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The terms on the right correspond to a drift and diffusion respectively and are to be considered as functions of the primed variables. For the voter model, the drift term vanishes. For

$q = 1$, for any ε_{\uparrow} and ε_{\downarrow} , one gets voter model trivially. Checking for $q = 2$, we obtain the condition for voter model behavior to prevail for

$$c(1-c)(2c-1+2(\varepsilon_{\uparrow}(1-c)-\varepsilon_{\downarrow}c))=0, \quad (17)$$

which can be only satisfied for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow} = \frac{1}{2}$. For larger values of q , the analysis becomes less simple to handle unless $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$ (for which the linear voter model ceases to exist for $q > 2$). However, this approach is useful to study the exit probability as well, shown later in this paper.

B. Linear stability analysis

A better understanding of the model involves not only finding the fixed points, but also analyzing their stability. Finding the analytical form for all solutions of Eq. (11) for any ε_{\uparrow} , ε_{\downarrow} , and q is very difficult, if not impossible. Therefore, in the next section, we will study the system numerically. However, several solutions are straightforward.

Note that the target agent needs at least one adopted agent in its neighborhood to adopt. Therefore, a state where all agents are unadopted ($c = 0$) is a steady state. A similar argument could be used to explain that a state where all agents are adopted ($c = 1$) is also a steady state. It is also easy to see that $c = 0$ and $c = 1$ are indeed solutions of Eq. (11) for any value of ε_{\uparrow} , ε_{\downarrow} , and q , because $(1-c)c^q - c(1-c)^q = 0$ and $1 - c^q - (1-c)^q = 0$ for both $c = 0$ and $c = 1$.

To check when these solutions would be stable, we need to determine the criteria for which:

$$\frac{d}{dc} \left(\frac{dc}{dt} \right) < 0. \quad (18)$$

First we calculate the derivative from Eq. (11) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dc} \left(\frac{dc}{dt} \right) = & q \cdot ((1-c)c^{q-1} + c(1-c)^{q-1}) - c^q - (1-c)^q \\ & + (\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow}) \left[q \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{\uparrow}}{\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow}} - c \right) \right. \\ & \times ((1-c)^{q-1} - c^{q-1}) \\ & \left. - (1 - c^q - (1-c)^q) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

From the above equation, we see that the fixed point $c = 0$ is stable for

$$\varepsilon_{\uparrow} < \frac{1}{q}, \quad (20)$$

whereas the fixed point $c = 1$ is stable for

$$\varepsilon_{\downarrow} < \frac{1}{q}. \quad (21)$$

The above conditions hold for our generalized model. However, if we reduce the model to the original q -voter model by

assuming that $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$, we obtain another stationary state for $c = 1/2$. The criteria for this state to be stable could be obtained from Eq. (19) as

$$\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > \frac{q-1}{2^q-2}, \quad (22)$$

which agrees with the result shown in¹³.

C. Phase diagram

As seen in Fig. 2 there are three types of the fixed points:

- $c = 1$: adopted state
- $c = 0$: unadopted state
- $0 < c < 1$: partially adopted state

Each of the above states can be a stable solution of Eq. (12), indicated by the solid green line in Fig. 2, or unstable, indicated by the dashed red line in Fig. 2. Based on the information of how many solutions of Eq. (12) exist, and which of these states are stable and which are not, we determine the phase of the system and construct the phase diagrams as shown in Fig. 3. For our model, we can distinguish five phases, labeled **A**, **B**, **C**, **D**, and **E**, see also Figs. 2 – 4:

A : there are two stable states: unadopted ($c = 0$) and adopted ($c = 1$), and an unstable partially adopted state. For $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$, this unstable state lies below $c = 1/2$, meaning that the adopted state ($c = 1$) is preferred. Specifically, the range of initial conditions leading to the adopted state is larger than that leading to the unadopted state. As ε_{\uparrow} increases, this unstable state moves toward $c = 0$. When ε_{\uparrow} exceeds $1/q$, the stable state $c = 0$ disappears, and the system enters phase **C**, as shown in Fig. 2(c).

B : there are three stable states (unadopted, adopted, and partially adopted), as well as two partially adopted unstable states.

C : there is only one stable and one unstable state. For $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$ the adopted state is stable and unadopted unstable and for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} < \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$ vice versa. This phase occurs for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > 1/q$, as shown in Fig. 3.

D : there are two stable states and two unstable states. For $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$ adopted and partially adopted states are stable, while unadopted and another partially adopted states are unstable. Obviously, for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} < \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$ we have a complementary situation. This phase occurs when $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > 1/q$, as shown in Fig. 3.

E : there is only one stable solution, which is actually a partially adopted state. Both, adopted and unadopted states are unstable. In Figs. 2(e) and (f) we have presented two different variants of phase **E** with $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow} > 1/q$ (symmetric case) and $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > \varepsilon_{\downarrow} > 1/q$ (asymmetric case) respectively.

We summarize the above results in Fig. 3, which presents the phase diagrams in the $(\varepsilon_{\uparrow}, \varepsilon_{\downarrow})$ plane. The left panel of Fig. 3 shows the phase diagram for $q = 5$, corresponding to Figs. 2 and 4, with labeled phases. In the right panel the phase diagram for $q = 3$ is shown, illustrating how the size of the influence group affects the system's behavior. Additionally, in this panel, we include two dashed white lines representing the parameter values of ε_{\uparrow} and ε_{\downarrow} from earlier models^{13,16}. We chose not to place these lines in the left panel, as doing so would make the diagram unreadable. However, by examining Fig. 3, we observe that phase **D** was not present in the previous models.

The phase diagrams in Fig. 3 are clearly symmetric with respect to the line $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$, which represents the original q -voter model¹³. This symmetry arises because ε_{\uparrow} and ε_{\downarrow} contribute equally to the dynamics.

Let us first focus on Fig. 3(a), which shows the phase diagram for $q = 5$. When $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 0$, the system is in phase **A**. If we increase ε_{\uparrow} to $(q - 1)/(2^q - 2)$ while maintaining $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$, we reach phase **B**, where a partially adopted steady state becomes possible. Beyond the lines $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = 1/q$ and $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 1/q$, the system loses one of the stable fully adopted states. Specifically, phase **A**, upon losing one fully adopted state, transitions to phase **C**, while phase **B**, upon losing one fully adopted state, transitions to phase **D**. Each of these transitions can occur in two distinct ways, as shown in Fig. 2(a), depending on whether $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > 1/q > \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$ or $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} > 1/q > \varepsilon_{\uparrow}$. However, when $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > 1/q$ and $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} > 1/q$, the system reaches phase **E**, where neither a fully adopted nor a fully unadopted state is possible as a steady state, and the only stable solution is a partially adopted state. These transitions between the phases are easier understand if we plot the stationary valued of adopted c as a function of only one model's parameter, for example ε_{\uparrow} , as shown in Fig. 4.

The phase diagrams shown in Fig. 3 (a) follows the same pattern for all values of $q > 3$, with the width of phase **C** decreasing as q increases. However, for $q = 2$ and $q = 3$, phases **B** and **D** are absent, as shown in Fig. 3(b). This is because the inequality $(q - 1)/(2^q - 2) < 1/q$ does not hold for $q = 2$ and $q = 3$, meaning that the coexistence of adopted/unadopted and partially adopted steady states is not possible.

D. Exit probability

In models of opinion dynamics, an important quantity of interest is the exit probability $E(c_0)$, which is defined as the probability that the system will reach an adopted state ($c = 1$) from an initial fraction of adopted agents equal to c_0 . In our model, an adopted state is stable only for some values of the model parameters, while it is unstable for others. In the latter case the adopted state will never be reached if the system size N is large. However, if the system size is small, the unstable state can be reached due to finite size fluctuations. Once the adopted state is entered, it will never be left, since $c = 1$ is an absorbing state by the definition of the model. This motivated us to determine the exit probability $E(c_0)$ for small systems within Monte Carlo simulations and additionally calculate it

analytically.

We focus on the case $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 1$ and start with Monte Carlo simulations to determine the exit probability for several values of ε_{\uparrow} and q for the system of size $N = 64$; the results are shown in Fig. 5.

In Fig. 5(a), which presents the results for $q = 2$, we observe that for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = 1/2$, the exit probability follows the line $E(c_0) = c_0$. Additionally, we see that the probability of reaching the adopted state increases as ε_{\uparrow} increases for any c_0 , though the manner in which it increases depends strongly on ε_{\uparrow} . For instance, for small values of ε_{\uparrow} (e.g., $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = 0.1$), only high values of c_0 ensure that the adopted state is reached, while most initial conditions lead to the unadopted state, which is an expected result. However, what is unexpected is the influence of q on the exit probability, as evidenced by the significant difference between the exit probabilities for $q = 2$ and $q = 3$.

In Fig. 5(b), which presents the results for $q = 3$, we observe a plateau region resulting from the existence of a stable partially adopted state, covering the range from $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = 0.4$ to $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = 0.6$. The emergence of this plateau can be understood from Fig. 3(b), where we highlight the line $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 1$. Once ε_{\uparrow} exceeds $1/q$, the system enters phase **E**, where the only stable state is a partially unadopted state. This situation does not occur for $q = 2$, as the $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 1$ line never intersects phase **E**. For $q > 3$, the exit probability results remain qualitatively similar to those for $q = 3$.

The exit probability can be obtained not only from simulation but also analytically. From Eq. (16), at the steady state, one can write for exit probability,

$$\frac{\partial^2 E(c_0)}{\partial c_0^2} + 2N \left(\frac{\gamma^+ - \gamma_-}{\gamma^+ + \gamma_-} \right) \frac{\partial E(c_0)}{\partial c_0} = 0. \quad (23)$$

The solution, satisfying $E(0) = 0$ and $E(1) = 1$ can be written as

$$E(c_0) = \frac{\int_0^{c_0} \exp(-\int g(c_0) dc_0) dc_0}{\int_0^1 \exp(-\int g(c_0) dc_0) dc_0}, \quad (24)$$

where

$$g(c_0) = 2N \left(\frac{\gamma^+ - \gamma_-}{\gamma^+ + \gamma_-} \right).$$

The $q = 2$ case can be handled easily. For the voter model behavior for $q = 2$, as noted earlier, $g(c_0) = 0$ leads to $E(c_0) = c_0$ which is obtained for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow} = \frac{1}{2}$. In general,

$$g(c_0) = \frac{2c_0(1 - (\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow})) + 2\varepsilon_{\uparrow} - 1}{2c_0(\varepsilon_{\downarrow} - \varepsilon_{\uparrow}) + 2\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + 1}.$$

For $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 1$, we have further simplification and the solution is (for $c_0 \neq 0.5$)

$$E(c_0) = \frac{(c_0(1 - 2\varepsilon_{\uparrow}) + (\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \frac{1}{2}))^{N+1} - (\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \frac{1}{2})^{N+1}}{(\frac{3}{2} - \varepsilon_{\uparrow})^{N+1} - (\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \frac{1}{2})^{N+1}}. \quad (25)$$

Eq. (25) provides an analytical solution for the exit probability in the case of $q = 2$. Cases for higher values $q > 2$ can




FIG. 3. Phase diagrams for (a) $q = 5$ and (b) $q = 3$. The values $\varepsilon_\downarrow = 1/q$ and $\varepsilon_\uparrow = 1/q$, which define the boundaries between the phases, separate the stability from the instability of the stationary states $c = 1$ and $c = 0$. The black dot marks the point $\varepsilon_\uparrow = \varepsilon_\downarrow = (q-1)/(2^q - 2)$, above which the state $c = 1/2$ becomes stable. In the left panel the capital letters denote phases, while in the right panel the white dashed lines denote special cases of our generalized model: $\varepsilon_\downarrow = \varepsilon_\uparrow$ corresponds to the original q -voter model¹³ and $\varepsilon_\downarrow = 0$ to the new model with mass media¹⁶.

be obtained numerically using the Markov Chain approach, presented below.

Since our system is fully homogeneous, the possible number of states of the system is $N+1$ ($N_\uparrow = 0, 1, \dots, N$, or equivalently $c = 0, \frac{1}{N}, \dots, 1$). This allows us to represent our system as an $(N+1)$ -state Markov chain⁵⁰. The transition probabilities between states can be derived from Eq. (10). We treat these probabilities as a function of c , where the concentration in state k is $c = \frac{k}{N}$.

The probabilities of events are as follows: for the transition from state k to $k+1$, it is denoted by $\gamma^+(k)$; for the transition from state k to $k-1$, it is denoted by $\gamma^-(k)$; and remaining in state k is denoted by $\gamma^0(k) = 1 - \gamma^+(k) - \gamma^-(k)$. Thus, the transition matrix for our Markov chain is the following:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \gamma^-(\frac{1}{n}) & \gamma^0(\frac{1}{n}) & \gamma^+(\frac{1}{n}) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma^-(\frac{1}{n}) & \gamma^0(\frac{1}{n}) & \gamma^+(\frac{1}{n}) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \gamma^-(\frac{n-2}{n}) & \gamma^0(\frac{n-2}{n}) & \gamma^+(\frac{n-2}{n}) & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \gamma^-(\frac{n-1}{n}) & \gamma^0(\frac{n-1}{n}) & \gamma^+(\frac{n-1}{n}) \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

For the exit probabilities, we need the fundamental matrix. However, we cannot construct it if there are absorbing states

in the system. Therefore, we construct the transition matrix for a new Markov chain, excluding the absorbing states $k = 0$ and $k = N$:

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma^0(\frac{1}{n}) & \gamma^+(\frac{1}{n}) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \gamma^-(\frac{2}{n}) & \gamma^0(\frac{2}{n}) & \gamma^+(\frac{2}{n}) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma^-(\frac{3}{n}) & \gamma^0(\frac{3}{n}) & \gamma^+(\frac{3}{n}) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \gamma^-(\frac{n-3}{n}) & \gamma^0(\frac{n-3}{n}) & \gamma^+(\frac{n-3}{n}) & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \gamma^-(\frac{n-2}{n}) & \gamma^0(\frac{n-2}{n}) & \gamma^+(\frac{n-2}{n}) \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \gamma^-(\frac{n-1}{n}) & \gamma^0(\frac{n-1}{n}) \end{bmatrix}$$

Now we can obtain the fundamental matrix by solving the following equation numerically:

$$F = (\mathbf{1} - Q)^{-1}. \quad (26)$$

Where $\mathbf{1}$ is the identity matrix. The elements of the fundamental matrix can be interpreted as the expected number of visits to a transient state. Absorbing states do not appear in the matrix Q , but instead, we take state $k = N-1$ instead of the absorbing state $k = N$ and include information about the transition probability from state $k = N-1$ to state $k = N$,




FIG. 4. Concentration of adopted agents in stationary states for $q = 5$ as a function of ε_{\uparrow} for (a) $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} = \varepsilon_{\uparrow}$, (b) $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 0.195 < 1/q$, (c) $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 0$ and (d) $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} + \varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 1$. The solid green lines indicate stable states. The dashed red lines indicate unstable states. The dashed gray vertical line marks the transition between phases, and the capital letters indicate the phases that occur in the system.

$\gamma^{+(\frac{n-1}{n})}$. Therefore, we construct the following matrix:

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \gamma^{+(\frac{n-1}{n})} \end{bmatrix}$$

By solving the following equation:

$$F \cdot R = \left[E\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \dots, E\left(\frac{N-1}{N}\right) \right] \quad (27)$$

we obtain a vector containing the exit probabilities for all initial conditions that are not absorbing states. Due to the fact that the exit probability defines reaching state $c = 1$, i.e., $k = N$, the exit probability for absorbing states is $E(0) = 0$ and $E(N/N) = 1$, regardless of the parameters $q, \varepsilon_{\uparrow}, \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$. The results from Eq. (27) are shown in Fig. 5, where they are compared with the results from the simulations. We can see that the equations match well with the results from simulations for $q = 2$ and $q = 3$. In both cases, the quantitative divergence increases as the system becomes more asymmetric, i.e., the further we move from $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = 0.50$.

V. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have introduced a generalized q -voter model. Social influence is modeled in the same way as in the original¹³: in the case of a unanimous q -panel, an agent adopts the state of the q -panel. The difference between the generalized and the original model occurs when the q -panel is not unanimous. In such a case, we assume that the probability ε_{\uparrow} of going from an unadopted state to an adopted state is not equal to the probability ε_{\downarrow} of going from an adopted state back to an unadopted state. For $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} = \varepsilon_{\uparrow}$ the model reduces to the original q voter model¹³ and for $\varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 0$ to the recently introduced mass media model¹⁶.

The motivation for this generalization comes from two sources. First, it can be understood as a form of sequential bias, as an agent's current opinion influences its updated opinion. Second, it can be seen as a situation where adopted and unadopted states offer additional benefits or are somehow promoted, though they are not equivalent. Such situations frequently occur in real markets, for example, during the diffusion of innovation or in duopoly markets, where both products are actively promoted.

The generalized asymmetric model exhibits rich behavior, but two results are particularly interesting and have not been observed in previous works. First, a new phase **D** appears for $q > 3$, in which two stable and two unstable steady states exist: for $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} > \varepsilon_{\downarrow}$ adopted and partially adopted states are stable. It means that for any initial conditions c_0 the system reaches a partially adopted state, however to reach an adopted state, the initial condition of adopted must exceed a certain critical value.

The second result is a very unique form of exit probability that appears for $q \geq 3$ in the case of small systems, and such systems are realistic when we consider social groups, for example organizations. In this case, we observe a broad plateau region, indicating that a larger fraction of initially adopted (or convinced) people does not lead to a higher probability of adoption of the entire system. In the language of opinion dynamics, we could also say that the larger number of people with positive opinions does not affect the probability of reaching a final positive consensus. On the other hand, for $q < 3$ the exit probability has an expected form, e.g. for the symmetric case $\varepsilon_{\uparrow} = \varepsilon_{\downarrow} = 1/2$ it increases linearly with c_0 .

These results show how even small asymmetries can lead to surprising collective behavior. The emergence of a stable partially adopted state for $q > 3$ and the non-trivial exit probability plateau in small systems suggest that collective adaptation is not solely determined by initial support, but depends on multiple factors such as the size q of the influence group and the size of the total social group making the collective decision. This is an interesting result from a social perspective, as the role of group size in collective action is one of the most important topics in social science⁵¹. Although the model is highly simplified, it provides useful insights into opinion dynamics and collective decision making. Future research could examine how these effects change under more realistic conditions, such as external influences, network structures, or strategic interventions, to better understand the mechanisms




FIG. 5. Exit probability $E(c_0)$ as a function of initial concentration of adopted agents c_0 for several values of ϵ_{\uparrow} , where $\epsilon_{\uparrow} + \epsilon_{\downarrow} = 1$, for (a) $q = 2$ and (b) $q = 3$. The dots represent outcome of the Monte Carlo simulations for a complete graph of size $N = 64$, averaged over 10^4 realizations. Lines represent analytical results: for $q = 2$ they can be obtained from the closed-form expression (25) or from the numerical solution of Eq. (27), while for $q \geq 3$ only the numerical solution of Eq. (27) are possible.

that drive collective adaptation, which is needed now more than ever⁵².

- ¹R. F. Baumeister, K. D. Vohs, and D. M. Tice, “The strength model of self-control,” *Current Directions in Psychological Science* **16**, 351–355 (2007).
- ²J. Sweller, “Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning,” *Cognitive Science* **12**, 257–285 (1988).
- ³K. D. Vohs, R. F. Baumeister, and N. J. Ciarocco, “Ego depletion and self-control failure: An energy model of self-control,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **88**, 632–657 (2005).
- ⁴A. Krajcsei and Z. Szabo, “The role of cognitive load in decision-making: A review,” *Frontiers in Psychology* **12** (2021).
- ⁵P. M. Gollwitzer and P. Sheeran, “Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis,” *Personality and Social Psychology Review* **25**, 469–488 (2021).
- ⁶M. Hossain and J. A. List, “The effect of decision framing on risky choices in management,” *Management Science* **66**, 2704–2720 (2020).
- ⁷R. Frey and A. Van de Rijt, “Social influence undermines the wisdom of crowds in sequential decision making,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**, e202143118 (2021).
- ⁸G. Zayas-Caban *et al.*, “Unveiling bias in sequential decision making: A causal inference approach for stochastic service systems,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07879 (2023).
- ⁹F. Chen and I. Krajbich, “Biased sequential sampling underlies the effects of time pressure and delay in social decision making,” *Nature Communications* **9**, 1–10 (2018).
- ¹⁰K. Tsetsos, N. Chater, and M. Usher, “Sequential sampling models of decision-making: A review of the evidence and a new model for group decisions,” *Cognitive Science* **36**, 711–731 (2012).
- ¹¹J. P. Gleeson, “Binary-state dynamics on complex networks: Pair approximation and beyond,” *Physical Review X* **3**, 021004 (2013).
- ¹²A. Jędrzejewski and K. Sznajd-Weron, “Statistical physics of opinion formation: Is it a spoof?” *Comptes Rendus Physique* **20**, 244–261 (2019).
- ¹³C. Castellano, M. A. Muñoz, and R. Pastor-Satorras, “Nonlinear q -voter model,” *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 041129 (2009).
- ¹⁴A. Peralta, A. Carro, M. San Miguel, and R. Toral, “Analytical and numerical study of the non-linear noisy voter model on complex networks,” *Chaos* **28** (2018), 10.1063/1.5030112.
- ¹⁵L. S. Ramirez, F. Vazquez, M. San Miguel, and T. Galla, “Ordering

dynamics of nonlinear voter models,” *Physical Review E* **109** (2024), 10.1103/PhysRevE.109.034307.

- ¹⁶R. Muslim, R. A. NQZ, and M. A. Khalif, “Mass media and its impact on opinion dynamics of the nonlinear q -voter model,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **633**, 129358 (2024).
- ¹⁷R. A. Holley and T. M. Liggett, “Ergodic theorems for weakly interacting infinite systems and the voter model,” *The annals of probability* , 643–663 (1975).
- ¹⁸T. M. Liggett and T. M. Liggett, *Interacting particle systems*, Vol. 2 (Springer, 1985).
- ¹⁹S. Redner, “Reality-inspired voter models: A mini-review; [modèles d’électeurs inspirés de la réalité: une mini-revue],” *Comptes Rendus Physique* **20**, 275 – 292 (2019).
- ²⁰M. Mobilia, “Does a single zealot affect an infinite group of voters?” *Physical review letters* **91**, 028701 (2003).
- ²¹I. Ferreira, “The probability of survival for the biased voter model in a random environment,” *Stochastic processes and their applications* **34**, 25–38 (1990).
- ²²A. Czaplicka, C. Charalambous, R. Toral, and M. San Miguel, “Biased-voter model: How persuasive a small group can be?” *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **161**, 112363 (2022).
- ²³L. Durocher, P. Karras, A. Pavlogiannis, and J. Tkadlec, “Invasion dynamics in the biased voter process,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08207 (2022).
- ²⁴N. Masuda, N. Gilbert, and S. Redner, “Heterogeneous voter models,” *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* **82**, 010103 (2010).
- ²⁵J. Llabrés, M. San Miguel, and R. Toral, “Partisan voter model: Stochastic description and noise-induced transitions,” *Physical Review E* **108**, 054106 (2023).
- ²⁶B. L. Granovsky and N. Madras, “The noisy voter model,” *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **55**, 23–43 (1995).
- ²⁷V. Sood and S. Redner, “Voter model on heterogeneous graphs,” *Physical Review Letters* **94**, 178701 (2005).
- ²⁸V. Sood, T. Antal, and S. Redner, “Voter models on heterogeneous networks,” *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* **77**, 041121 (2008).
- ²⁹S. Galam, “Sociophysics: A review of galam models,” *International Journal of Modern Physics C* **19**, 409–440 (2008).
- ³⁰P. Krapivsky and S. Redner, “Divergence and consensus in majority rule,”

- Physical Review E **103**, L060301 (2021).
- ³¹P. Nyczka, K. Sznajd-Weron, and J. Cisło, “Phase transitions in the q-voter model with two types of stochastic driving,” Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics **86**, 011105 (2012).
- ³²A. M. Timpanaro and C. P. Prado, “Exit probability of the one-dimensional q-voter model: Analytical results and simulations for large networks,” Physical Review E **89**, 052808 (2014).
- ³³M. A. Javarone and T. Squartini, “Conformism-driven phases of opinion formation on heterogeneous networks: the q-voter model case,” Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2015**, P10002 (2015).
- ³⁴M. Mobilia, “Nonlinear q-voter model with inflexible zealots,” Physical Review E **92**, 012803 (2015).
- ³⁵K. Byrka, A. Jedrzejewski, K. Sznajd-Weron, and R. Weron, “Difficulty is critical: The importance of social factors in modeling diffusion of green products and practices,” Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews **62**, 723–735 (2016).
- ³⁶N. Rinto Anugraha, R. Muslim, H. Henokh Lugo, F. Nugroho, I. S. Alam, and M. A. Khalif, “Nonlinear q-voter model involving nonconformity on networks,” Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena **472** (2025), 10.1016/j.physd.2024.134508.
- ³⁷T. Gradowski and A. Krawiecki, “Pair approximation for the q-voter model with independence on multiplex networks,” Physical Review E **102**, 022314 (2020).
- ³⁸A. Chmiel and K. Sznajd-Weron, “Phase transitions in the q-voter model with noise on a duplex clique,” Physical Review E **92**, 052812 (2015).
- ³⁹A. R. Vieira, A. F. Peralta, R. Toral, M. S. Miguel, and C. Anteneodo, “Pair approximation for the noisy threshold q-voter model,” Physical Review E **101**, 052131 (2020).
- ⁴⁰A. Krawiecki and T. Gradowski, “Q-voter model with independence on signed random graphs: Homogeneous approximations,” Physical Review E **109** (2024), 10.1103/PhysRevE.109.014302.
- ⁴¹R. Fardela, Z. Abdullah, and R. Muslim, “Opinion evolution under mass media influence on the barabasi-albert network based on the q-voter model,” International Journal of Modern Physics C (2024), 10.1142/S0129183124502115.
- ⁴²A. R. Vieira and C. Anteneodo, “Threshold q-voter model,” Physical Review E **97**, 052106 (2018).
- ⁴³P. Nyczka, K. Byrka, P. R. Nail, and K. Sznajd-Weron, “Conformity in numbers—does criticality in social responses exist?” PLoS One **13**, e0209620 (2018).
- ⁴⁴V. V. Vasconcelos, S. A. Levin, and F. L. Pinheiro, “Consensus and polarization in competing complex contagion processes,” Journal of the Royal Society Interface **16**, 20190196 (2019).
- ⁴⁵B. Nowak and K. Sznajd-Weron, “Switching from a continuous to a discontinuous phase transition under quenched disorder,” Physical Review E **106**, 014125 (2022).
- ⁴⁶L. Ramirez, M. San Miguel, and T. Galla, “Local and global ordering dynamics in multistate voter models,” Physical Review E **106**, 054307 (2022).
- ⁴⁷L. S. Ramirez, F. Vazquez, M. San Miguel, and T. Galla, “Ordering dynamics of nonlinear voter models,” Physical Review E **109**, 034307 (2024).
- ⁴⁸P. Mullick and P. Sen, “Social influence and consensus building: Introducing a q-voter model with weighted influence,” PloS one **20**, e0316889 (2025).
- ⁴⁹J. Civitarese, “External fields, independence, and disorder in q-voter models,” Physical Review E **103**, 012303 (2021).
- ⁵⁰S. Banisch, *Markov chain aggregation for agent-based models* (Springer, 2015).
- ⁵¹J. Esteban and D. Ray, “Collective action and the group size paradox,” American Political Science Review **95**, 663 – 672 (2001).
- ⁵²M. Galesic, D. Barkoczi, A. M. Berdahl, D. Biro, G. Carbone, I. Giannoccaro, R. L. Goldstone, C. Gonzalez, A. Kandler, A. B. Kao, R. Kendal, M. Kline, E. Lee, G. F. Massari, A. Mesoudi, H. Olsson, N. Pescetelli, S. J. Sloman, P. E. Smaldino, and D. L. Stein, “Beyond collective intelligence: Collective adaptation,” Journal of the Royal Society Interface **20** (2023), 10.1098/rsif.2022.0736.