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Because I thought {X = Connection to themes of our class this semester. Do I understand the issues and questions at play?}, I did {Y = What I did. What domain? Is it a good approach? Will it actually get at the theme X?}, using method {Z = How well did I deploy the method? Do I understand what it can and can’t do? Did I implement it correctly? Do I consider alternate explanations, confounds, and how it might not have captured the full story?}. We found {A = What did I find? Am I at the right level of detail that that I the reader can follow my results without getting lost in irrelevant pieces?}. It means {B = What does A tell you about X? How does it deepen our understanding of the way the world works?}.
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**Theme**

In this paper, I will be exploring the applications of “page-rank” (or social rank/hierarchy) and social power/prestige in small-scale distributed groups over time. I will be building off research I conducted almost exactly two years ago about distributed groups, and I will be looking at the following five dimensions:

* familiarity (how well one knows/is known by others in the group)
* favor (how much someone likes/is liked by others in the group)
* communication (how often communication happens [in both directions] between members of the group)
* trust (how much someone trusts/is trusted by others in the group)
* support (likelihood of asking/being asked by others in the group for advice or emotional support)

Just as hens abide by a defined “pecking-order”, humans abide by learned rules of social behavior. Social rank and hierarchy are aspects of every human community. Rarely written down or documented, these social guidelines are passed along through communities as tacit knowledge or as unspoken rules.

My goal is to define an explicit “pecking-order” for a small, distributed, former high school friend group comprised of 7 males and 7 females, all among the ages of 21-22 and to analyze possible interactions, connections, and explanations between each of the five dimensions I listed.

**Issues & Questions**

The issues and questions in play are primarily related to social dynamics and subjective, tacit knowledge. (The challenge is to draw out this knowledge without introducing biases.) Three characteristics of social prestige that I will account for and take into consideration are:

* That it is *distributed*: one has power/prestige if others think they have power/prestige; the power is in the perception.
* That it is *subjective*: a person does not have inherent social power; societies determine the distribution of social power. (This distribution can and likely will change and will never be “wrong.”)
* That it is *objectively knowable*: this is the crux/backbone of my research; that it is possible to determine popularity/power/prestige.

Due to the distributive and subjective nature of social power, it is important to recognize that social power is also recursive (as the more power you have, the more power you can bestow upon others, but you must be given power first to give power). This is why I will be using PageRank to determine social status and hierarchy, to account for its recursive nature.
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