

Determining the Size of Centrality in Social Networks

Mochamad Suyudi, Sukono

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences
Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia
moch.suyudi@gmail.com; sukono@unpad.ac.id;

Abdul Talib Bon

Department of Production and Operations, University Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia
talibon@gmail.com

Abstract

Social network theory is becoming more and more significant in social science, and the centrality measure is underlying this burgeoning theory. In perspective of social network, individuals, organizations, companies etc. are like nodes in the network, and centrality is used to measure these nodes' power, activity, communication convenience and so on. Meanwhile, degree centrality, betweenness centrality and closeness centrality are the popular detailed measurements. This paper presents these 3 centrality in-depth, from principle to algorithm, and prospect good in the future use.

Keywords

Social network, centrality, degree centrality, betweenness centrality, closeness centrality.

1. Introduction

Among the individuals and individuals, organizations and organizations, individuals organizations there are a common set of connections, and the social scientists call these connections 'network' (Giddens, 2009). And one social network is a structure constituted by a set of 'nodes' connected with different 'ties' (Granovetter, 1973). In 70's of 20th century, *The Strength of Weak Ties* from Granovetter was published on *American Journal of Sociology* (Brass, et al., 2004), henceforth the theory of social

network has been growing more and more mature. On the perspective of social network, 'nodes' can be many kinds of social actors, such as individuals, groups, companies, organizations. Meanwhile 'ties' can also represent different connections and relations. Under this paradigm, more and more social actors and relations are analyzed (Contractor and Faust., 2006). And according to a hundred years' big data analytics, social network gets fast-growing attentions in recent 20 years in social science (Chen, 2015). The research contents of social network include "strong/weak ties", "social capital", "egocentric/whole network" and "centrality" etc. We use "social network" as searching keywords on Web of Science, to analyze the numbers of related publications in last 30 years from 5 top journals in management, including *Academy of Management Journal*(AMJ), *Academy of Management Review*(AMR), *Administrative Science Quarterly*(ASQ), *Journal of Management*(JM), *Strategic Management Journal*(SMJ). From this statistical result, we can see that the publications are increasing obviously (Figure 1.). Social network is becoming increasingly popular in analysis (Borgatti and Halgin., 2011).

Data in social science basically has three types – ideational data, attribute data and relational data (Sensitivity analysis, 2000). Ideational Data usually makes motivations, meanings and definitions into conceptions, and typological analysis from Max Weber is a good example (Kalberg, 1980). Attribute data is about the index like attitude, characteristics, choices and preferences from the units of social actors (individuals or groups or organizations) (David, James, and Kuklinski, 1982). The well-known correlation analysis and regression analysis use attribute data. And unlike attribute data, relational data doesn't describe single unit, furthermore it describe relations among several or numerous social actors, from static to dynamic condition (Liu, 2014), also what kind of

relational data depend on the what researchers focus on(Knoke and Yang, 2008). After getting social network data, we could use it to calculation, explanation and simulation. Centrality, the data on nodes' structural dimension, is one of most used and important (Li, 2013).




Figure 1. Publications About Social Network In 30 Years

2. Research Methods.

Degree, betweenness and closeness these 3 centrality measures are derived from the adjacency matrix and so constitute some different algorithm on the same underlying data. Thus the questions like how to distinguish these 3 measures or how to use exactly are easily generated. Although the conceptual differences exist among these 3 main centrality measures, from calculations we can see these measures do not differ that dramatically. Some scholars have tried different centrality measures to seize network centrality, and found betweenness centrality and degree centrality have positive effect on investment(Freeman, 1977). Meanwhile, some studies examined correlations among degree, betweenness and closeness, also examined these relations in circumstances of systematic error, random error, and incomplete statistics(Freeman, 1978). Overall, Freeman recommend that we could use degree centrality to measure activity of transferring and communication, betweenness centrality to calculate mediation or control of interest, and closeness centrality to estimate level of efficiency and convenience(Freeman, Roeder, and Mulholland,1979; Bolland., 1988). Relatively, degree centrality and betweenness centrality have been used more frequently. Some cross-over studies suggest that in some condition, 3 centrality measures have an interesting associated correlation (Table 1.).

Table 1. Degree, Betweenness and Closeness

	High Degree	High Betweenness	High Closeness
Low Degree		Individual's few ties are crucial for network flow	Individual ties to some active/important actors
Low Betweenness	Individual's connections are redundant communication bypassed him/her		Maybe network exist many paths , individual are near to many actors but so are many others
Low Closeness	Embedded in cluster that is away from the rest of network	Individual monopolizes the ties from a bit of people to many other. Relatively rare.	

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Centrality

Centrality is such an important index because it indicates which node takes up critical position in one whole network. Central positions always get equated with remarkable leadership, good popularity or excellent reputation in the network (Jar-Der, 2010; Krackhardt and Brass, 1944). As soon as the social actor gets a higher centrality, it means he/she gets closer to the center of network, that higher power, influence, convenience from the network he/she may acquire (Sparrowe., Liden, and Wayne, 2001; Hochberg, Ljungqvist, and Lu, 2007). Perhaps most typically chosen degree centrality measures are degree centrality, betweenness centrality and closeness centrality. Freeman first probed into these 3 centralities in the 1970's (Freeman, 1977; Freeman, 1978; Freeman et al., 1979). For a better understanding and visualization, we take an undirected singleline network graph as an example to interpret (Figure 2.).



Figure 2. Example of a network graph

3.2. Degree Centrality

In a network graph, degree centrality is measured by the total amount of direct links with the other nodes, the fundamental formula C_d is equation (1) (Bolland, 1988; Marvin, 1954).

$$C_d(N_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n X_{ij} \quad (i \neq j) \quad (1)$$

Since as time goes by, the size of the network may vary, to decrease this possible size effect to degree centrality measurement, Wasserman etc. make equation (1) standardized and put forward to equation (2) C'_d (Nieminen, J., 1974).

$$C'_d(N_i) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n X_{ij}}{(n-1)(n-2)} \quad (i \neq j) \quad (2)$$

$\sum_{j=1}^n X_{ij}$ means the number of links directly connected with node N , and n means the total number of the nodes in focal network. We take a network graph like Figure 2. as an example, the number of direct links connected with point A obviously is 2, in other words A point's C_d is 2, after standardization C'_d is approximately equal to 0.167. In the same way we can calculate C_d and C'_d of point B , point C , point D , point E . See the results on Figure 3.



C_d	1	2	2	2	1
C'_d	0.083	0.167	0.167	0.167	0.083

Figure 3. Calculations on Degree Centrality

3.3. Betweenness Centrality

Betweenness centrality is to measure one node undertaking 'mediation' role in a network. If one node locates in the only way which other nodes have to go through, such as communication, connection, transportation or transaction, then this node should be important and very likely have a high betweenness centrality (Freeman, Linton C., 1977). Fundamental formula C_b is equation (3), Wasserman etc.

$$C_b(N_i) = \sum_{j < k} \frac{g_{jk}(N_i)}{g_{jk}} \quad (3)$$

standardize C_b by dividing $\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}$, and standardized formula C'_b see equation (4).

$$C'_b(N_i) = \frac{2 \sum_{j < k} \frac{g_{jk}(N_i)}{g_{jk}}}{(n-1)(n-2)} \quad (4)$$

In these two equations, $\sum_{j < k} \frac{g_{jk}(N_i)}{g_{jk}}$ means the number of node N locate between any other two nodes in the network (Wasserman and Faust, 1994). On shortest paths of all connections in a network, the higher the betweenness centrality the more frequent node N falls between any pairs of other nodes. Back to the network graph Figure 2, A stands in the middle of E and C , E and D , B and D , B and C , so according to equation (3) for point A $C_b = 4$, $C'_b = 0.67$. The whole results are on Figure 4.




Figure 4. Calculations on Betweenness Centrality

3.4. Closeness Centrality

Closeness centrality, is meant to measure one node to the others nodes' sum distances, if the length of node N 's shortest paths with other nodes in the network is small, then node N has a high closeness centrality (Wasserman and Faust, 1994; Beauchamp and Murray, 1965). It stands for the convenience and ease of connections between the focused node and the other nodes. The fundamental formula C_c is equation (5),

$$C_c(N_i) = \frac{1}{\left[\sum_{j=a}^n d(N_i, N_j) \right]} \quad (i \neq j) \quad (5)$$

$\sum_{j=a}^n d(N_i, N_j)$ means the total number of "steps" from node N to the other nodes in the network (Freeman, 1977; Freeman, 1978). After putting closeness centrality on social actors in practice, Beauchamp suggests multiply C_c by $(n-1)$, so that we could get standardized equation C'_c (Sabidussi, Gert, 1966).

$$C'_c(N_i) = \frac{n-1}{\left[\sum_{j=a}^n d(N_i, N_j) \right]} \quad (i \neq j) \quad (6)$$

Still in the sample graph Figure 2., A stand both next to B and C , so the distance to B and C is the same- 1 "step". On the other hand, we can see that A stands 2 "step" away from E and D . So to node A ,

$$C_c(N_i) = \frac{1}{1 + 1 + 2 + 2} = \frac{1}{6} = 0.167, \quad C'_c(N_i) = \frac{4}{6} = 0.67$$

Other nodes' results we can get on Figure 5.




Figure 5. Calculations on Closeness Centrality.

4. Conclusion

The analyses from attribute data for social actors (individuals, organizations etc.) have been well-known and widely used, such as regression analysis and correlation analysis. Social network, on the contrary, focus more on the social actors' relation data in the network. These relations construct various network structures, positions, clusters and transfer, from which we can better research on phenomena and circumstances, from a general election to transnational financial corporations. Originally, there are three things to form social network at once: phenomena, contexts for theory building and testing and analytical tools(Li and Mingxiang, 2013). So it's not hard to speculate there is a great researching possibility in it. Top journals like Nature, Science reckon social network a promising future(Palla et al., 2005; Borgatti et al., 2009; Barabási, 2009). Indeed there are an optimistic growing amount of research productions in recent years, and we can see its research trends is more and more interdisciplinary.

References

- Anthony Giddens, *Sociology(6th)[M]*. Polity Press, Cambridge, 2009.
- Barabási, A. L. "Scale-free networks: a decade and beyond." *Science* 325.5939(2009):412-3.
- Beauchamp, Murray A. "An improved index of centrality." *Behavioral Science* 10.2(1965):161-3.
- Bolland, John M. "Sorting out centrality: An analysis of the performance of four centrality models in real and simulated networks." *Social Networks* 10.3(1988):233-253.
- Borgatti, S. P., et al. "Network analysis in the social sciences." *Science* 323.5916(2009):892-5.
- Borgatti, Stephen P., and D. S. Halgin. "On Network Theory." *Organization Science* 22.5(2011):1168-1181.
- Brass, Daniel J., et al. "TAKING STOCK OF NETWORKS AND ORGANIZATIONS: A MULTILEVEL PERSPECTIVE." *Academy of Management Journal* 47.6(2004):795-817.
- CHEN Y S. The trajectory of sociology over two centuries: a cultural study using millions of books[J]. *Sociological Studies*, 2015, 1: 23-48.
- Contractor, Noshir S., and K. Faust. "Testing Multitheoretical, Multilevel Hypotheses about Organizational Networks: An Analytic Framework and Empirical Example." *Academy of Management Review* 31.3(2006):681-703.
- Freeman, Linton C. "A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness." *Sociometry* 40.1(1977):35-41.
- Freeman, Linton C. "Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification." *Social Networks* 1.3(1978):215-239.
- Freeman, Linton C., D. Roeder, and R. R. Mulholland. "Centrality in Social Networks: ii. Experimental Results." *Social Networks* 2.2(1979):119-141.
- Granovetter, Mark S. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78.Volume 78, Number 6(1973):347-367.
- Hochberg, Yael V, A. Ljungqvist, and Y. Lu. "Whom You Know Matters: Venture Capital Networks and Investment Performance." *The Journal of Finance*. 2007(52):251-301.
- Jar-Der Luo, *Social Network Analysis(2nd)[M]*. Beijing: Social Science Academic Press(China), 2010.
- Kalberg, Stephen. "Max Weber's Types of Rationality: Cornerstones for the Analysis of Rationalization Processes in History." *American Journal of Sociology* 85.Volume 85, Number 5(1980):1145-1179.
- Knoke David, H. James, Kuklinski, *Network Analysis[M]*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication, 1982.
- Knoke D, Yang S. *Social network analysis[M]*. Sage, 2008.
- Krackhardt D. Brass D. *Interorganizational Networks: The Micro Side*. Ins. Wasserman and Galaskiewicz, *Advances in Social Network Analysis[M]*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 1994.
- Li, Mingxiang. "Social network and social capital in leadership and management research: A review of causal methods." *Leadership Quarterly* 24.5(2013):638-665.
- Liu Jun, *Lectures on Whole Network Approach-Appractical Guide to UCINET(2nd)[M]*. Shanghai: Truth & Wisdom Press, 2014.
- Marvin E. Shaw. "Group Structure and the Behavior of Individuals in Small Groups." *The Journal of Psychology* 38.1(1954):139-149.
- Nieminen, J. "On the centrality in a graph." *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 15.1(1974):332-336.
- Palla, Gergely, et al. "Uncovering the overlapping community structure of complex networks in nature and society." *Nature* 435.7043(2005):814-8.
- Sabidussi, Gert. "The centrality index of a graph." *Psychometrika* 31.4(1966):581-603.
- Sensitivity analysis[M]*. New York: Wiley, 2000.
- Sparrowe, Raymond T., R. C. Liden, and S. J. Wayne. "Social Networks And The Performance Of Individuals And Groups." *Academy of Management Journal* 44.2(2001):316-325.

Wasserman S., Faust K., Social network analysis: Methods and applications[M]. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Biographies

Mochamad Suyudi, is a lecturer at the Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran. Bachelor in Mathematics at the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran, and Master in Mathematics at the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Universitas Gajah Mada.

Sukono is a lecturer in the Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran. Currently serves as Head of Master's Program in Mathematics, the field of applied mathematics, with a field of concentration of financial mathematics and actuarial sciences.

Abdul Talib Bon is a professor of Production and Operations Management in the Faculty of Technology Management and Business at the Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia since 1999. He has a PhD in Computer Science, which he obtained from the Universite de La Rochelle, France in the year 2008. His doctoral thesis was on topic Process Quality Improvement on Beltline Moulding Manufacturing. He studied Business Administration in the Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia for which he was awarded the MBA in the year 1998. He's bachelor degree and diploma in Mechanical Engineering which his obtained from the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. He received his postgraduate certificate in Mechatronics and Robotics from Carlisle, United Kingdom in 1997. He had published more 150 International Proceedings and International Journals and 8 books. He is a member of MSORSM, IIF, IEOM, IIE, INFORMS, TAM and MIM.