



Social Networks 00 (2015) 1-3

# Social Networks

# Hierarchical Structure in Social Networks

Cynthia  $Cook^{1c}$ , Matthew J. Denny $^d$ , Mitchell  $Goist^1$ , Timmy Huynh $^1$ 

<sup>a</sup>Department of Statistics cmc496@psu.edu

<sup>b</sup>Department of Political Science, mzd5530@psu.edu

<sup>c</sup>Department of Political Science mlg307@psu.edu

<sup>d</sup>Department of Sociology and Criminology, tnh133@psu.edu

#### **Abstract**

Keywords: Hierarchy, Network, Power

#### 1. Introduction

### 2. Measuring Hierarchy

- 2.1. Measuring Hierarchy in Groups
- 2.2. Measuring Hierarchy in Networks

#### 3. A Model of Network Hierarchy

#### 3.1. Measures of Hierarchy

1. Landau's  $h \in [0, 1]$  and Kendall's  $K \in [0, 1]$  are both used to compare a network to a perfect linear hierarchy in [1], where i = 1...N is the number of nodes and  $S_i$  is the row sum for each node also referred to as the dominance total:

$$h = \frac{12}{N^3 - N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} [S_i - \frac{N-1}{2}],$$

IF we let d be the number of cyclic triads defined as:  $d = \frac{N(N-1)(2N-1)}{12} - \frac{1}{2} \sum S_i^2$ . Then

$$K = 1 - \frac{d}{d_{max}}$$
, where

$$d_{max} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{24}(N^3 - N) & \text{if } N \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{1}{24}(N^3 - 4N) & \text{if } N \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

2. Triangle transitivity is shown to be higher in dominance relationships in [1], but not used as a measure here.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Authors are listed in alphabetical order but all contributed equally to this publication.

3. Treeness  $T \in [-1, 1]$  is the average of f(G) over the set in W(G), where W(G) is the subset  $G_C$  and all of its subsets obtained through a leaf removal algorithm. This measure is defined in [2].

$$f(G) = \frac{H_f(G_C) - H_b(G_C)}{\max\{H_f(G_C), H_b(G_C)\}},$$

where  $H_f$ ,  $H_b$  denote the forward and backward path entropies, respectively, where  $h_f(v_i) = -\sum P(\pi_k|v_i)logP(\pi_k|v_i)$ .

4. Feedforwardness  $F \in [0, 1]$  is the average of path weights  $F(\pi_k)$  where cyclic modules that are closer to the top get a higher penalty, and defined by [2]. Here the paths under consideration are all paths starting at from the top of  $G_C$  denoted  $\pi_k$ . Let k = 1, ...M be this number of paths then:

$$F(G) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{M} \frac{|v(\pi_k)|}{\sum a_i},$$

where  $a_i$  are the weights of each node along the path under consideration (i.e. the number of collapsed nodes from G in the corresponding node of  $G_C$ ), and  $v(\pi_k)$  is the number of nodes along the path  $\pi_k$ .

5. Orderability  $O \in [0, 1]$  is the fraction of nodes that do not belong to any cycle and defined by [2]:

$$O(G) = \frac{|v_i \in V_c \cap V|}{|V|}$$

6. Global Reaching Centrality where the graph is unweighted and directed is defined by [3] as:

$$GRC = \frac{\sum_{i \in V} \left[ C_R^{max} - C_R(i) \right]}{N-1},$$

where  $C_R(i)$  is the local reaching centrality defined as the proportion of all nodes in G that can be reached along outgoing edges from node i.

7. Global Reaching Centrality where the graph is weighted and directed is defined by [3] using the following version for the reaching centrality:

$$C_{R}^{'}(i) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{j:0 < d_{(i,j) < \infty}^{out}} (\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{d^{out}(i,j)} w_{i}^{(k)}(j)}{d^{out}(i,j)})$$

8. Global Reaching Centrality where the graph is unweighted and undirected is defined by [3] using the following version for the reaching centrality:

$$C_R''(i) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i:0 < d(i,i) < \infty} \frac{1}{d(i,j)}$$

9. Control Centrality in a weighted and directed graph, defined by [4], identifies the minimum number of nodes need to drive an entire network to a given final state. Consider a directed, weighted network:

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t)$$

which is the state of each node at time t, and also denoted as (A, B). The components of this controllability matrix are:  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ , where each element gives the strength that node i can affect node i; and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ , where each element is the strength between the input signal  $u_j(t)$  and node i, and M contains independent signals imposed by an outside controller. Defining C = (A, B), the control centrality of node i is:

$$C_c(i) \equiv rank_o(\mathbf{C}^i)$$

- 4. Data
- 5. Analysis
- 6. Conclusions

## References

[1] Y.-Y. Liu, J.-J. Slotine, A.-L. Barabási, Control centrality and hierarchical structure in complex networks.

#### References

- [1] Shizuka, D. and McDonald, D. B. (2012), A social network perspective on measurements of dominance hierarchies. Animal Behavior: 83,
- [2] Murtra, B., Goni, J., and Caso, C. (2013), On the origins of hierarchy in complex networks. PNAS: 110, 33, 13316-13321.
- [3] Mones, E., Vicsek, L., and Vicsek, T. (2012), Hierarchy Measure for Complex Networks. Plos ONE: 7, 3, 1-10.
  [4] Liu, Y. Slotine, J., and Barabási, A. Control centrality and hierarchical structure in complex networks. Plos ONE 7, 9.