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These slides are from U Toronto course “CSC 2231: Online Social Networking Systems”
http://www.cs.toronto.edu/syslab/courses/csc2231/07au/
and discuss
Background

- Macro-level sociology
  - Class struggle and capital
  - Social mobility

- Micro-level sociology
  - Interpersonal relations
  - Social psychology

- Problem: No bridges between macro- and micro-level behaviour
Background (cont.)

- Sociometry
  - Ego-centric network studies
    - (very popular in classroom research)

- Milgram and the “small world” phenomenon

- Rogers and the “diffusion of innovation”
Goals of the paper

• Granovetter tries to achieve two goals:
  – First, show that “the analysis of processes in interpersonal networks provides the most fruitful micro-macro bridge”
  – Second, illustrate the cohesive power of “weak ties”, and the benefits of studying them along with the “strong ties” popular in most network studies

• Both are important for us, for different reasons
Basic argument

• Classify interpersonal relations as “strong”, “weak”, or “absent”
  – Strength is (vaguely) defined as “a (probably linear) combination of...
    • the amount of time,
    • the emotional intensity,
    • the intimacy (mutual confiding),
    • and the reciprocal services which characterize the tie

  – Negative and/or asymmetric ties (e.g. enemies or relations with power imbalance) are brushed aside for now
Basic argument (cont.)

• The stronger the tie between two individuals, the larger the proportion of people to which they are both tied (weakly or strongly)
  – In the extreme case, two people that are always together will be tied to the same individuals
Forbidden triad

• If person A has a **strong** tie to both B and C, then it is unlikely for B and C not to share a tie.
  - Granovetter (admittedly) exaggerates and supposes such a triad *never* occurs
• A bridge is “a line in a network which provides the *only* path between two points”

• Therefore, if the previous triad is in fact absent, *no strong tie is a bridge*
  - In other words, *all bridges are weak ties!*
  - (realistically, bridges can be *local* rather than *global*, but still weak)
Strength of weak ties

• “Intuitively speaking, this means that whatever is to be diffused can reach a larger number of people, and traverse greater social distance (i.e., path length), when passed through weak ties rather than strong.”

• Consequences
  – Diffusion of information (rumours, innovations, getting a job!)
    • Homophily
  – Group cohesion and trust
  – Traversal of networks and node coverage
Questions

• Problems with “strength”...
  – Is “strength” of ties properly defined?
  – Can it be measured?
  – Does it make sense to classify ties in the “strong”, “weak”, and “absent” categories?
  – Is the omission of negative and asymmetric ties a major problem?
Questions (cont.)

• The forbidden triad
  – Is the assumption that the “forbidden triad” almost never occurs valid?

• Getting a job, spreading a rumour, finding innovations…
  – Perhaps we get these from weak ties simply because we have more of them?

• Does Granovetter’s argument hold despite these questions?
Applications

• What is in it for **Online** Social Networks?

• “Weak ties are strong” is a valuable insight for...
  – Information diffusion
  – Threat edges
  – Network crawling
  – ...

• But the micro-macro level bridge has deeper consequences
  – We take it for granted now, but it’s a key assumption behind several of the papers we’ve read recently
Reactions to the paper

• Hailed as one of the most influential Social Networks papers
  - Generated abundant research in practically every field it discussed
    • Especially in social mobility (getting jobs)
  - Also generated the perverse kind of “networking” job searchers are encouraged to use these days

• Social capital and “structural holes”
  - Social capital – the kind of capital we have because of who we know
  - Structural holes – the person acting as a bridge can reap significant benefits from the network “holes” around her
Reactions (cont.)

- On measurements, see “Measuring Tie Strength”, Marsden & Campbell 1984.
  - A measure of ‘closeness’ or intensity is the best indicator of tie strength
  - Strength predictors (blood ties, neighbours) fare poorly, as do duration and frequency of contact
  - “Time spent” is not bad as a strength construct