

MIT Open Access Articles

Reply to Adams: Multi-Dimensional Edge Interference

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. *Please share* how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation: Eagle, Nathan et al. "Reply to adams: Multi-dimensional edge inference." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 107.9 (2010): E31. Copyright ©2010 by the National Academy of Sciences

As Published: http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0913678107

Publisher: National Academy of Sciences (U.S.)

Persistent URL: http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/61402

Version: Final published version: final published article, as it appeared in a journal, conference proceedings, or other formally published context

Terms of Use: Article is made available in accordance with the publisher's policy and may be subject to US copyright law. Please refer to the publisher's site for terms of use.



LETTER

Reply to adams: Multi-dimensional edge inference

We completely agree with adams that, in social network analysis, the particular research question should drive the definition of what constitutes a tie (1). However, we believe that even studies of inherently social phenomena, such as the spread of influence (2) or supposed "social contagions" (3), can benefit strongly from a focus on objective behavioral data (4). For instance, the conventional wisdom is that social influence only travels along self-perceived ties. However, in truth, it remains unknown how much is being hidden from us by recency and saliency cognitive filters (5), and significant social influence may, in fact, travel across unperceived ties. Behavioral data are not prone to such filters and thus, when used properly, may shed considerable light on such important questions.

We also agree that an appropriate combination of selfreported edges and behavioral data, as suggested by adams, has the potential to address previously unanswered questions about the underlying dynamics of a group of interacting individuals. However, we urge caution in combining these very different kinds of data: a network with multiple types of edges, such as self-reported ones with those inferred by a factor analysis of behavioral data, can obscure important nuances that should be leveraged through parallel analyses rather than flattened into a single monolithic network. Indeed, there are times when it may be more appropriate to use "raw" behavioral data instead of the nonparametric output of a factor analysis. For instance, Fig. 1 shows how the self-reported friendship network compares with networks corresponding to communication, proximity on Saturday night, and travel, showing some marked differences. Understanding how behavioral data may influence, conflict with, or derive from the construction of the self-reported network is an interesting future line of inquiry.

It should, however, be possible to develop significantly better edge inference techniques by combining information at the local level of the dyad (including edge and node attributes) with information about ties elsewhere in the network. For instance, it was recently shown that the nested or hierarchical structure of entire social networks can predict missing dyadic links with high accuracy (6). Mathematically, this general approach has the form:

$$P(xy_{friendship}|xy_{behavior}, \Delta T_{E_{/xy}})$$

where $P(xy_{friendship})$ is the probability of a friendship between x and y, $xy_{behavior}$ is the local behavioral variables associated with the dyad, and $\Delta T_{E_{/y}}$ represents how the global topological summary statistics associated with the network would change with the addition/removal of the edge between x and y.

To conclude, we point out that purely behavioral data, of course, are not a panacea, and their proper interpretation can

Saturday Night Proximity > 0 Number of Unique Locations > 10

Reported Friendship Network

Fig. 1. Networks representing reported triendship, phone communication, proximity on Saturday night, and travel (a dyad is connected if proximate while being associated with more than 30 unique cellular towers). Nodes reflect the two groups of colleagues—the first year business school students and the Media Laboratory students working together in the same building on campus.

be difficult without appropriate cognitive models. Instead, the use of behavioral data in social network analysis provides a highly complementary and very powerful tool for understanding social phenomena of all kinds (4). It also provides an objective way to identify, wrestle with, and mitigate the cognitive biases humans express, which often muddy the waters for scientific understanding of human phenomena. We strongly believe that the appropriate collection and analysis of such behavioral data have crucial roles to play in social network analysis.

Nathan Eagle^{a,b,1}, Aaron Clauset^a, Alex (Sandy) Pentland^b, and David Lazer^{c,d}

^aSanta Fe Institute, Santa Fe, NM 87501; ^bMassachusetts Institute of Technology Media Laboratory, Cambridge, MA 02139; ^cNortheastern University, Boston, MA 02115; and ^dHarvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138

- 1. adams j (2010) Distant friends, close strangers? Inferring friendships from behavior. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 107:E29–E30.
- Watts DJ, Dodds PS (2007) Influentuals, networks, and public opinion formation. J Consum Res 34:441–458.
- Cohen-Cole E, Fletcher JM (2008) Detecting implausible social network effects in acne, height, and headaches: longitudinal analysis. BMJ 337:a2533.
- Eagle N, Pentland AS, Lazer D (2009) Inferring friendship network structure by using mobile phone data. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 106:15274–15278.
- Freeman L, Romney A, Freeman S (1987) Cognitive structure and informant accuracy. Am Anthropol 89:310–325.
- Clauset A, Moore C, Newman MEJ (2008) Hierarchical structure and the prediction of missing links in networks. *Nature* 453:98–101.

Phone Communication > 0

Author contributions: N.E., A.S.P., and D.L. designed research; N.E. performed research; N.E. analyzed data; and N.E. and A.C. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: nathan@mit.edu.