

Who Says Networks, Says Oligarchy? Oligarchies as “Rich Club” Networks

Christopher Ansell
*University of California
Berkeley, CA, USA*

Renata Bichir
*University of São Paulo
São Paulo, Brazil*

Shi Zhou
*University College London
London (UCL), UK*

Abstract

Departing from Roberto Michels’s classic analysis of oligarchy, we provide a structural analysis of the concept based on social network analysis. We define oligarchy as a social network that exhibits three structural properties: tight interconnections among a small group of prominent actors who form an “inner circle”; the organization of other actors in the network through the intermediation of this inner circle; and weak direct connections among the actors outside the inner circle. We treat oligarchy as a global property of social networks and offer an approach for measuring the oligarchical tendencies of any social network. Our main contribution is to operationalize this idea using a “rich club” approach. We demonstrate the efficacy of this approach by analyzing and comparing several urban networks: Sao Paulo urban infrastructure networks and Los Angeles and Chicago transportation policy networks.

Keywords: oligarchy, rich clubs, policy networks, urban networks

Authors

Christopher Ansell, *Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA.*

Renata Bichir, *Center for Metropolitan Studies, Center of Arts, Sciences and Humanities, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil.*

Shi Zhou, *Department of Computer Science, University of College London (UCL), London, UK.*

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Margaret Weir and Eduardo Marques for allowing us to use relational data they collected on, respectively, Chicago and Los Angeles transportation networks and Sao Paulo urban infrastructure networks.

Correspondence concerning this work should be addressed to Christopher Ansell by email: cansell@berkeley.edu

EHWZHHQ FRUSRUDWH ERDUGV literature has some nodes are or in a central
DQG UHVRXUFHV EHWZHHQ WKH other] and that these central nodes may play an
studies usefully widened the discussion of the role important brokerage role, often by spanning “structural
corporate interlocks, but also gradually shifted attention nodes” in the network. We also know that subgroups form
away from the regime-like characteristics of interlocking within networks, often among well-connected actors, and
directorates.

We have no interest in resurrecting the old elite network on “small world” networks has also found that
pluralist debate. Our relational approach to oligarchy small group of “hubs” can link a sparsely connected
suggests that the structure of social networks is like a small group of “hubs” can link a sparsely connected
WR DIIHFV WKH ÀRZ RI LQIRUPDWLRQ WKHQ GLVWUXJH XWLRK RHR I S F
UHVRXUFHV SDWWHUQV RI GHSHQLHG UHODUHQWV DQGLDWHG
But to be clear, a structural analysis of networks alone of the network as a whole. It is more useful, however,
GRHV QRW SURYLGH VXI¿FLHQW UHODUHQWV DQGLDWHG
UXOLQJ HOLWH PRQRSROLJHV SRZHO DFCVGLYGLX HLCQVH UHWHGD WRHQG \V
demonstrate that the relational basis for such control whether or not a network has a ruling elite.
LQÀXHQFH H[LVWV ,Q DGGLWLRQ In the following section, we develop a strategy for
we depart from the more dichotomous inclinations of the measuring the oligarchical tendencies of a network using
elite-pluralist debate, focusing instead on how to measure a distribution of degree” approach. In later sections of
oligarchical tendencies in networks. the paper, we demonstrate the value of this approach by

Why is a relational concept of oligarchy useful? analyzing several social networks.

One way to approach this question is through the idea of brokerage. Brokerage is a form of intermediation where a
focal actor, the broker, mediates the relationship between

VRPH RWKHU VHW RI DFWRUV 6RFLDQ WKHQGLWLRQV DQGLDWHG
ZHOO HVWDEOLVKHG WUDGLWLRQV WKHQGLWLRQV DQGLDWHG
6LPPHO *RXOG DQG)HUQDQGHV offers several possibilities. In this paper, we
2EVWIHOG 6WRYHO DQG 6WRYHO DQG 6WRYHO DQG
tradition has been to understand the position and power of
individual brokers, and the advantages that accrue to them
RU WKR VH WKH\ FRQQHFV +RZH\KRX DQG DQGLDWHG
interesting or valuable to understand the collective pattern
of mediation in a network. The concept of oligarchy, oligarchical tendencies of a network, and supplement
suggest points to the collective mediation of a network
by a small but cohesive subgroup
recall the three aspects of oligarchy that we drew from
0LFKHVV WKH HOLWH DUH W KH VWHV QWHUFRQQHFV W KH DQGLDWHG
themselves, forming an “inner circle”; the “masses
are organized through the intermediation of this inner
circle; and the masses are poorly interconnected among
themselves. An oligarchy describes a network where a
cohesive subgroup monopolizes the intermediation of
relationships in the network as a whole. As in the work on
individual brokerage, Michels suggests that advantages
accrue to the inner circle. But the concept of oligarchy
about the collective, rather than individual intermediation
of the network.

3XUH ROLJDUFKLHV PD\ UDUHO\; X[LVWQJ H[LVWQJ H[LVWQJ
many kinds of social networks may have oligarchical
tendencies. It is well established in the social network
as the number of links a node has (Barabási and Albert,
called ‘scale-free’ because it is not the average degree,
tendencies. It is well established in the social network

characterizes the network's connectivity.

In a power-law network, most nodes have only a few links, and the network is guaranteed to have a small number of links among a group of rich nodes (Zhou and

7 KH ULFK FOXE FRHI; FLHQW ' L
RI WKH DFWXDO QXPEHU RI OLQNV
G R Q G H U D V R R U G H I S J a q u a n t i t a t i v e m e a s u r e o f G H
K L J K H U W K D Q W K H D Y H U D J H G H e u d e n s i t y o f c o n n e c t i v i t y a m o n g a g r o u p o f r i c h
Q R G H V : K H Q ' W K H U L F K Q R G H V D
L P S R U W D Q W W R H [D P L Q H W K H U I R O O P I R Q J W K F O K L T J X H G H K J W Q H Q R G H V U L F K
link among themselves (although each of them may have
D O D U J H Q X P E H U R I O L Q N V Z L W K Q R

2.2 Network Mixing Patterns

1 H Z P D Q L G H Q W L ; H G G L I I H U H Q W P K L J K H U W K D Q W K H U L F K I
networks. A network is assortative if nodes of similar degrees tend to be connected to one another and disassortative if nodes tend to be connected to nodes of different degrees. The assortativity coefficient is usually calculated for all groups of rich nodes so that this network hierarchy can be found to be critically relevant to the network's global structure and perfect disassortative network, i.e., every link connects nodes of different degrees.

For simplicity, a network is said to contain a rich club if the richest nodes (e.g. the top 5% best-connected nodes) are themselves highly interconnected. For a network to be rich-club assortative, the rich club must be more interconnected than expected for a disassortative network. The rich-club degree distribution can have a vastly different rich-club degree distribution than the overall network. The rich-club degree distribution can have a vastly different rich-club degree distribution than the overall network. The rich-club degree distribution can have a vastly different rich-club degree distribution than the overall network.

5 L F K & O X E & R H I ; F L H Q W

The "rich club" concept proposed by Zhou and Mondragón (2009) is a network property that is not necessarily more interconnected than expected for a disassortative network. The rich-club degree distribution can have a vastly different rich-club degree distribution than the overall network. The rich-club degree distribution can have a vastly different rich-club degree distribution than the overall network. The rich-club degree distribution can have a vastly different rich-club degree distribution than the overall network.

FRHI; FLHQW DQG KLJK GHJUHH Q R G H V R Q D Y H U D J H W K H U L F K Q R G H V D
D Q G F R P S O H P H Q W K H U L F K Q R G H V D
Q H W Z R U N P L [L Q J S D W W H U Q V) R U H [D P S O H L I D Q H W Z R U N G L V S O D \ V
I R O O R Z L Q J D P E L J X L W L H V) R U H [D P S O H L I D Q H W Z R U N G L V S O D \ V
D V V R U W D W L Y H P L [L Q J Z K H U H K L J K H U W K D Q W K H U L F K Q R G H V D
with other high-degree nodes, does this mean the high-degree nodes do not link with themselves at all?

3 5 L F K ' Q R G H V D U H G H ; Q H G H U W K D Q W K H U L F K I
Z L W K W K H K L J K H V W G H J U H H V I R O O R Z L Q J D P E L J X L W L H V) R U H [D P S O H L I D Q H W Z R U N G L V S O D \ V
as the top best-connected nodes or as the nodes with degrees larger than or equal to a given degree. For a given group of rich nodes, any member of the group has a degree higher than or equal to any node outside the group. More nodes with lower degrees are included when the size of the group increases.

There has been a debate on the rich club phenomenon with respect to how to determine whether the rich nodes in a network show a tendency to form a tightly interconnected rich club. The logic here is analogous to the logic of the rich club phenomenon, which is to determine whether the rich nodes in a network show a tendency to form a tightly interconnected rich club. The logic here is analogous to the logic of the rich club phenomenon, which is to determine whether the rich nodes in a network show a tendency to form a tightly interconnected rich club.

7 K L V S U R S H U W \ G H U L Y H V I U R P W Z R P D L Q P H F K D Q L V P V R I W K H S R Z H U O D Z Q H W Z H [S D Q G F R Q W L Q X R X V O \ E \ W K H D G G L W L R Q R I Q H Z Y H U W L F H V D Q G L L Q H Z Y H U W L
words, the authors showed that large networks self-organize into a scale-free state, a feature unpredicted by previous random network models.
7 KH P D [L P X P S R V V L E O H Q X P E H U R I O L Q N V D P R Q J Q Q R G H V L V Q Q
: K H Q W K H J U R X S R I U L F K Q R G H V L V J L Y H Q E \ W K H Q R G H U D Q N Q W K H P R V W H [F C
W K H O D U J H V W J U R X S L V W K H Z K R O H Q H W Z R U N Q 1 : K H Q W K H J U R X S L V J L Y H Q E \ W K H O D U J H V W G H J U H H L Q W K H Q H W Z R U N D Q G W K H O D U J H V W J U R X S F R Q W D L Q V D O

FRHI; FLHQW ZKHQ WKH QHWZRUN & KUUDWGRPO \ UHZLURHG ³ ZKJDDJLD
SUHVHUYLQJ WKH RULJLQDO GHUICH GQGWHLFLPWORQO \ + R0BVMUF
this method cannot be used to compare between different detecting cohesive subgroups (Wasserman and Faust
real networks – because a “short” person on a basketball VXFK DV FOLTXH DQDO\VLV DQ
team may be taller than a “tall” person in a primary school methods of “community detection,” such as the Girvan-
class. 1HZPDQ PHWKRQ 1HZPDQ PD\ E

\$PDUDO DQG *XLPHUD identifying the “hubs” of a network
phenomenon to a monotonic increase of the rich-club The rich-club approach has a different focus
FRHI; FLHQW DV D IXQFWLRQ RIDGHU SHUSRKWH FRKDNH FWKXIVHI WKDFK
the monotonic increase may be “a natural consequence of analytical focus beyond identifying well-connected
a stochastic process” and comment that “... an oligarchy leaders or important subgroups. “Rich” nodes form
will always appear to be present, even if the network a cohesive group among themselves, but they also
LV UDQGRP ´ +RZHYHU LW LV ZHGHUHQHQRZ QMPVSRWH” Wodes – e.g. Ftheir
FOXE FRHI; FLHQW LV QRW D P RGRWRISQHESEIWSFWLORQCHLQDES RHWKES D O
QHWZRUNV OF\$XOH\ HW DO UZSKDQGHW ³ DDFK ´ 6HFKRIQG WKHU
ULFK FOXE FRHI; FLHQW FDQ H YHGHUHQHQRZ QMPVSRWH” Wodes – e.g. Ftheir
LQ VRPH QHWZRUNV =KRX DQG as proposed to identify the oligarchs themselves.

ORQGUDJRQ DQG =KRX DUJZKHW KDFK WFOH ELDIS SURDFK XV
FOXE FRHI; FLHQW LV DQ DEVROXWIES” BHDV Network Role Evaluate the rich-
of interconnectivity among a group of rich nodes. It is Q RGHV PHUHO\ DI; OLDWH DPRQJ W
calculated without any assumption and judgment about WKH\ DOVR DI; OLDWH ZLWK QRQ UL
the rich-club phenomenon. In other words, it is measuring DVVRUWDWLYH ´ ULFK QRGHV DI; C
a person’s height without judging whether a person is ULFK QRGHV ZKLOH QRQ ULFK QRG
WDOO RU QRW , Q WKLW SDSHU of rich nodes (in a network) as a network metric and avoid referring to the rich-club
phenomenon. L PLODU GHJUHH DVVRFLDWH ZLWK

3. Oligarchy as a Global Property of Networks

\$VVRUWDWLYH PL[LQJ LV FRPP RQ THE REST OF THE NETWORK HWZRUNV EXW LV
not associated with “oligarchical” networks. An oligarchy In addition to knowing that there is a group of
LV D ULFK FOXE ZLWK GLVDVVRUWDWLYH RICH NODES WHO ARE TIED TOGETHER BUT ALSO LINKED TO A G V
the “rich” nodes are interconnected, but they are also wider network of clients, the concept of oligarchy also
connected to the “poor” nodes who are not strongly presumed that the “rich club” at the core of the network
interconnected among themselves. is small relative to the network as a whole. One way to

The idea that the power of well-connected HYDOXDWH ZKHWKHU WKH ³ ULFK FO
people is derived from their connections to other with the degree distribution of the network. If the rich-club
connected people is well established in social network V VPDOO ZH VKRXOG H[SHFW WK
analysis, and typically measured using eigenvectors to resemble a power law.
FHQWUDOLW\ %RQDFLFK RU LQ SUMRATZE, AN OLIGARCHY NETWORK CAN BE
to vary the relative importance of indirect ties, “power characterized as having a “rich club” (a group of well-
FHQWUDOLW\ ´ %RQDFLFK FRQGHFWHJEXQWGHZLVKRWUHH FRQQ
later measure, however, is that it requires an arbitrary EXW WKH RYHUDOO QHWZRUN H[KL
decision on the part of the analyst about whether people are disassortative (where each rich node is strongly
gain more power by being tied to other “rich” nodes or by FRQQHFWHG WR WKH SRRU QRGHV
being tied to more “impoverished” nodes. Following this distribution (few well-connected nodes and many poorly-
tradition of measuring centrality and power in networks, FRQQHFWHG QRGHV 7DNHQ WRJHW
some authors have recently developed new measures to measure the degree to which a small group dominates the
for identifying “leadership insularity” (Abersman collective intermediation of the network as a whole. In

/RRNLQJ IRU WKH PRVW LQÀXHQWLDO LQGLYLGXDOV LQ VFKRRO QHWZRUNV & RO
GHJUHH VFRUH ;[HG SHUFHQWDJH RI SRSXODWLRQ LV GH; QHG DV LQÀXHQWLDO

Michels' terms, the rich club is a cohesive "inner circle" that organizes the weakly organized "masses."

One alternative way to identify an oligarchical network regime is to develop a core-periphery analysis. Much like the concept of an oligarchy, a core-periphery structure is a "core" of people who are tied together and a "periphery" of less well connected actors (Laumann & Hanson, 2000). These networks allow us to compare urban networks in São Paulo and Los Angeles. The data set includes information on almost 5500 urban public works project contracts (road and public works) in São Paulo, Brazil, from 1995 to 2005.

Figure 1 shows the network structure of the São Paulo Urban Infrastructure Networks. The network is highly clustered and contains several small, tightly interconnected communities. The core-periphery structure that assigns those who are most central in the network to the core and those who are most peripheral to the periphery. The core consists of 100 nodes and the periphery consists of 5400 nodes. The core is highly interconnected and the periphery is weakly interconnected; it says less about the link between the core and the periphery. There are several limitations of using a core-periphery analysis to evaluate how closely the derived assignment corresponds to municipal inhabitants and 20 million in the metropolitan area. The core-periphery analysis is at the core of municipal infrastructure policy and receives a large share of the political attention.

The core-periphery algorithm partitions a network into a core that is tightly interconnected and an important policy domain.

1. The core-periphery measure says that the core is tightly interconnected and the periphery is weakly interconnected; it says less about the link between the core and the periphery.
2. The core-periphery measure says that the core is tightly interconnected and the periphery is weakly interconnected; it says less about the link between the core and the periphery. The core-periphery measure directly measures how rich nodes are tied to non-rich nodes (assortative and disassortative mixing).
3. The "core" of a core-periphery structure might be very large, while we are assuming that the "rich club" is a small group (as measured by the rich club coefficient).

Thus, while core-periphery measures may also provide an alternative club approach offers a more direct and discriminating

8. The core-periphery measure directly measures how rich nodes are tied to non-rich nodes (assortative and disassortative mixing). The core-periphery measure directly measures how rich nodes are tied to non-rich nodes (assortative and disassortative mixing).

9. The core-periphery measure directly measures how rich nodes are tied to non-rich nodes (assortative and disassortative mixing). The core-periphery measure directly measures how rich nodes are tied to non-rich nodes (assortative and disassortative mixing).

felt that they were still not fully included in a planning process now dominated by the Metropolitan Planning Commission. In the analysis that follows, we attempt to normalize our measures where possible.

2 UJDQL]DWLRQV 032V DOVR FUHDWHG E\ ,67(\$ 21 WKH WZR cities, Chicago groups were more successful in getting 7 KH 5 LFK & OXE & RHI FLHQW their MPO to be responsive to their input.

5. Comparison of the Networks

\$ V LQGLFDWHG LQ 7DEOH WKH WZR DOVR FUHDWHG E\ ,67(\$ 21 WKH WZR cities, Chicago groups were more successful in getting 7 KH 5 LFK & OXE & RHI FLHQW their MPO to be responsive to their input.

When we look at the distribution of the rich-club FRHI FLHQW DV D IXQFWLRQ RI GH we can see that all the policy networks show a rich-club WKH WZR DOVR FUHDWHG E\ ,67(\$ 21 WKH WZR cities, Chicago groups were more successful in getting 7 KH 5 LFK & OXE & RHI FLHQW their MPO to be responsive to their input.

As the comparison of the “strong” and “weak” tie networks UHDWHU WKH ULFK FOXE FRHI FLHQW LQ & KLFDJR DQG / \$ VXJJHVWV GHQVLW\ LV DOVR D UHÀHFWLRQ of the kinds of social relations elicited by interviews and surveys. If you ask people to specify only the people they ZRUN ZLWK FORVHO\ 3 VWURQJ WLHV WKHQ \RX ZLOO JHQHUDWH a sparser network than if you ask them whom they have ZRUNHG ZLWK 3 ZHDN WLHV 7 KH GLIIHUHQFHV EHWZHHQ WKH QHWZRUNV LQGLFDWH WKDW LW LV LPSRUWDQW WR H[HUFLVH FDXV when making comparisons, since many network measures are sensitive to the size and density of the network. In

Table 1 'HJUHH & OXVWHULQJ DQG 0L[LQJ 3URSHUWLHV

Dataset	Density	Number of Nodes	Number of Ties	Average Degree	Maximal Degree	Shortest Path Length Between Nodes	Clustering & RHI FLHQW	Assortative L&RHW FLHQW
São Paulo								
Reynaldo	0.030			5.3	42			-0.23
Covas	0.028					3.23		
Janio	0.024					3.32		
Erundina			584					
Maluf	0.028					3.24		
Pitta	0.028	204				3.25	0.305	
Chicago								
Chicago – Weak	0.403	35	240					
& KLFDJR ± 6 WURQJ		33		3.82				
Los Angeles								
LA – Weak								
/ \$ ± 6 WURQJ		38		5.42				

0,66,1*)227127(

Figure 1 5 LFK & OXE & RHI¿ FLHQW DV D) XQFWLRQ RI 'HJU Figure 6 m 5 R&ORXE & RHI¿ FLHQW DV D) XQFWLRQ RI 'HJU

Figure 3 'HJUHH GLVWULEXWLRQ 6 m R 3DROR QHWZRUNV Figure 4 'HJUHH GLVWULEXWLRQ & KLFDJR DQG /\$ QHWZRUR

and a less well-connected periphery.

2XU DQDO\VLV FRQFOXGH Vather the precise meaning of the concept is often suggestive
networks come much closer to being oligarchies than analysis of the concept based on social network analysis.
the American networks. While the American networks Building on the classic treatment of oligarchy by
have some oligarchical tendencies, they ultimately Michels, we begin with a conception of oligarchy as a
appear more pluralistic. Well-connected organizations social structure organized and dominated by a small
in the American networks are clubbish, but the analysis inner circle of prominent actors tightly interconnected
does not suggest that this elite is very well differentiated among themselves. These "oligarchs" are linked to less

:LWKRXW VWXG\LQJ RWKHU % Upon the network, who are only weakly
WR FRQ;GHQWO\ FRQFOXGH W know connected among themselves. The power of
national differences in urban policy networks. But the oligarchy lies in the cohesion of the oligarchs, their ability
contrast suggests that this is a distinct possibility. One to organize less prominent actors, and the weakness of
thing that is clear from the data, however, is that these less prominent actors to organize themselves.
Brazilian oligarchy appears to be stable across municipal main contribution is to operationalize this idea using
administrations, a point that reinforces the argument a "rich club" approach. The social network concept of a
PDGH E\ 0DUTXHV DERXW With club captures the idea that well-connected actors
political parties were in charge during these different KLJK GHJUHH DUH DOVR FRQQHFV
DGPLQLVWUDWLRQV VR LW LV VWKWL NLLQL QVRS;JRS HWKW VHWV DRE LD LVL F
is a sharp disjuncture in the distribution of the rich-club whether well-connected actors are only connected to
FRHI;FLHQW DW KLJKHU GHJUHHDFIG XULIQH UW DW V;RUWWD OHYW ZRQ JW
DGPLQLVWUDWLRQ &RYDV WKD VLS DR E B O A D W H A H F W Y L D Q O O W W E R S
to destabilize the oligarchy. But the distribution returns to Q HWZRUN ;WV D SRZHU ODZ GLVWU
WKH SULRU SDWWHUQ XQGHU WKH JQH HW DDHQW ZEVOR UDVG RIL QQRV GDHWU
(UXQGLQD whether the inner-circle is a small or large group relative

The contrast between Chicago and Los Angeles to the size of the network.
was less striking than we anticipated, though in the :H GHPRQVWUDWH WKH HI;FDFV
H[SHFWHG GLUHFWRQ \$V PHQWALPZQ had comparing several urban networks. OUR G
to be a civically fragmented city, while Chicago has DQDO\VLV RI 6mR 3DXOR &KLFDJR D
reputation for more civic cohesion. The distribution that policy networks have oligarchical tendencies, in the
WKH ULFK FOXE FRHI;FLHQW Essence that well-connected actors in all three cities tend
VLPLODU LQ ERWK FLWLHV W KVR ZHO DRQHQ FWHVGH W RD RM KHWU BQQC
linked to one another. The Los Angeles networks are less Sao Paulo networks, the weak tie networks in Chicago and
disassociative than the Chicago networks, suggesting Los Angeles, and the Chicago strong tie network are
that that the well-connected organizations in Los Angeles also disassortative, meaning that the well-connected
are less well-connected to the wider network. This could do actors are connected to less well-connected actors.
be one indicator of greater fragmentation in the Los RZHYHU RQO\ WKH 6mR 3DXOR QH
Angeles networks. For the strong tie networks, Chicago clear power law distribution, indicating a small coterie
also appears somewhat closer to a power law distribution. ZHOO FRQQHFVHG DFWRUV :H FR
(many organizations with few ties; a few organizations networks come closest to being oligarchical regimes,
ZLWK PDQ\ WLHV WKDQ WKH / While the Chicago and Los Angeles networks are more
Angeles, many organizations have a medium range of pluralist. Remarkably, the oligarchical structure of the
ties. Our conclusion is that there is a less distinctive elite in R 3DXOR QHWZRUNV LV VWDEOH
in Los Angeles. For the weak tie networks, however, that administrations, suggesting that oligarchy, once formed,
contrast is less clear. may be a robust form of political organization.

7. Conclusion

The concept of oligarchy has an illustrious history in the social sciences, but is only weakly developed as an analytical concept. Though it is not uncommon to hear the word used to describe political and economic regimes in organizations, social movements, and nations,

References

SUEHVDPQ 6 DQG &KULVWDNLV 1
,QVXODULW\ D 1HZ 0HDVXUH
EHWZHHQ &HQWUDORRNV 1HW

3URPLQHGFH DQG &RQWURO 7KH :HLJKWHG
Rich-Club Effect.Physical Review Letters

3ROVE\ 1 : +RZ WR 6WXG\ &RPPXQLW\ 3RZHU
The Pluralist AlternativeThe Journal of Politics

6LPPHO *The Sociology of Georg Simmel6LPRQ
DQG 6FKXVWHU

6WRYHO . 6KDZ / Annual Review
of Sociology,

9RVV . DQG 6KHUPDQ 5 %UHDNLQJ WKH ,URQ
/DZ RI 2OLJDUFK\ 8QLRQ 5HYLWDOLJDWLRQ LQ WKH
American Labor Movement.The American
Journal of Sociology

:DVVHUPDQ 6 DQG)Social Network
Analysis: Methods and Application & DPEULGJH
&DPEULGJH 8QLYHUVLVW\ 3UHVV

:DWWV 'XQ Small Worlds: The Dynamics of
Networks Between Order and Randomness.
3ULQFHWRQ 3ULQFHWRQ 8QLYHUVLVW\ 3UHVV

:HLU 0 5RQJHUXGH - DQG \$QVHOO &
&ROODERUDWLRQ LV QRW HQRXJK 9LUWXRXV &\FOHV RI
Reform in Transportation PolicyUrban Affairs
Review

=KRX 6 DQG 0RQGUDJyQ 5 7KH 5LFK &OXE
Phenomenon in the Internet TopologyIEEE
Communications Letters

=KRX 6 DQG 0RQGUDJyQ 5 E 5HGXQGDF\ DQG
UREXVWQHVV RI WKH \$6 OHYHO ,QWHUQHWW RSRORJ\ DQG
its models.IEE Electronic Letters

=KRX 6 DQG 0RQGUDJyQ 5 6WUXFWXUDO FRQVWUDLQWV
LQ FRPSOH[New Journal of Physics

=KRX 6 :K\ WKH ,QMICSTQHW LV VR μ VPDOO!"