CHAPTER – 2
REVIEW OF SELECT LITERATURE

2.1. MEANING AND DEFINITIONS OF SOCIAL NETWORK

The term network has been added only to the vocabulary of Sociology. It refers to the set of relationships or links; a person has with others. By the fact of birth, one automatically becomes a member of family network. Then there is social network, which are created out of individual efforts e.g.- membership of a club, a circle of friends and so on. This means, that network have a series of social relationship, ordered in certain way, and secondly they are built by conscious efforts of individuals for certain goals. As such social factors influence the formation of networks; individuals also play an active role in their formation and continuity.

J.A. Barnes (1954: 43) has defined network, “Each person is, as it were, in touch with a number of people, some of whom are directly in touch with each other and some of whom are not.... I find it convenient to talk of a social field of this kind as network. The image, I have, is a set of points, some of which are joined by lines. The points of image are people, or some times groups and the lines indicate which people interact with each other. The social field has no units or boundaries, no coordinating organisations, it is made up friendship and acquaintance, inherited and largely achieved.”

E. Bott (1957: 16) has defined network: “A network is a social configuration in which some but not all the components are external units which do not make up a large whole and are not surrounded by a common boundary”. According to Bott, conceptually network stands between the family and the total social environment.
The contributors of the book 'Social Network in the Urban Situations' (1969) edited by J.C. Mitchell accept the finite nature of the network and pay special attention to the multiplicity of links. For them social network is a net in which arcs may be given values. In other words, the network is being thought as finite but may be several link in either direction between the persons in the network, and there links may be accorded different qualities and values.

F.E. Katz (1996: 203) defines network as ‘the set of persons who can get in touch with each other’ and contact as ‘the individuals to comprise a network’ they are members of the network set. It seems more in keeping with the common use of the word 'network' to refer to a network as the set of 'linkage' among persons and as the set of persons connected by these linkages.

Satish Saberwal (1969: 129) defines, ‘a network is a series of interlocking relationships, each characterized by reciprocal expectations. The totality of individual’s dyadic relations constitutes his personal network. If he nurtures these relationships of specific (and not diffuse) objectives, it may be called focused network: it has a dual focus, the objectives and on him, the focal person. Adrian C. Mayer's action-set (1966) and Eric Wolfs (1966) patron-client relationship are examples.

These definition show that the concept of ‘Social Network’ has several substantive and methodological dimensions. The major issues undertaken in the studies include family studies, studies of political processes, studies of urban situations and above all changing scenes of developing societies like India. On the basis of our definitions and connotations, the following characteristics of social networks may be stated, instead of giving a precise definition: -

1. Direct and indirect relationship between persons, as a system of relations;

2. Formal and informal relationships;
3. Possibility and actualization of using the linkages as instrument for achieving the goals of a person whose network is being identified;

4. It is infinite;

5. Bases of linkages may be primordial or secular;

6. Networks are dynamic not static i.e. may change over a period of time;

7. Network may vary according to cultural context i.e. networks have spatial dimensions.

2.2. EXPLANATION OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR BY THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL NETWORK

Anton Blok (1973:151-153) has stated the total network of social relationships and formation and operation of networks. He said, 'the network is still fraught with the conventional conceptual polarity of 'individual' and 'society', which hampers the development of a dynamic model. Two main approaches can be distinguished. On one hand, networks are understood as egocentric structures, which are defined with regard to a single individual. These networks are, as it were, personal creations of an ego and dissolve when ego dies (cf. Befu, 1963a, b; Boissevain. 1968, 1971; Mayer, 1966; Srinivas and Beteille, 1964). On the other hand, networks are conceived as ramifying chains of dyadic relationship, involving specific fields of activity. Bames' partial networks, which define particular social fields (e.g. kinsip, economic, religious and political relationship), belong to this realm. Defining networks in this way shows us how significant this concept can be for explaining social behaviour in any organisational setting.
2.3. THE TOTAL NETWORK OF SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

Society itself is visualized as a chain of social relations. This chain includes various kinds of relations, e.g. acquaintance, friendship, kinship, classmateship, etc. Some of the individuals in the chain are in direct contact with each other, while others are linked only indirectly. A chain of social relationship, among individuals, has no boundary except that of the society concerned. The total chain of social relationships may, thus, be viewed as coinciding with society itself. (Sharma, 1969; 12-27)

The basic unit, of such a chain, is the relationship between individuals. The dyadic relations, i.e., between two individuals, from the chain interconnected through the coupling links of individuals. We may, therefore, conclude that the concept of total network is oriented to the individual, and we can delimit and extract personal networks out of the total network. However, before discussing the type of social network, let us first look briefly at the process of where formation and operation. Thus social network means a mesh of social relations which may be taken as threads, tied together, forming a knot and these knot, of social relationships tied together to form a net.

In sociological literature the use of the social network may be traced even as early as-the writings of McIver and Page (1962:5) in defining society as a web (network) of social relations. It implies that social network is equivalent to a whole society. This use seems to be only figurative and shows only some thing like abstract social relationships. McIver and Page do not use network as a conceptual tool. Radcliff-Brown (1940,1952:190) made use of the term in defining social structure , as, “a network of actually existing relations”. He used kinship network to identify characteristics of different social structures. The use of different in ‘network’ was just to indicate the links of ‘person to person’ relationship like son and father, mother's brother, his sister's son e.g.: "In an Australian tribe the
whole social structure is based on a network of such relationships of person to person established through genealogical connections”. For Radcliffe-Brown structure was a theory, method and reality. The structure was basic for him, not the concepts of network.

Somewhat differently from Radcliffe-Brown, Nadel (1957) used network as connection between the role and social structure. The social structure, which is his main starting point, stipulated the ordered arrangement system or network of social relationships obtaining between individuals in their capacity of playing roles relative to one another. Thus for him, the concept of the role was basic in the theory' of social structure and not the concept of the network as such. In this sense the network means interlocking of the relationships by playing respective roles on part of the individual persons.

Maclever and Page, Radcliffe-Brown, Nadel and other sociologists and social anthropologist used the term ‘network’ both literally and figuratively or metaphorically to classify their basic theories of social structure, roles, kinship system etc. within the boundaries or framework of structural functional approach. But 'network' was not ever a basic concept for these authors.

The study of social network has arisen out of the classification of a number of anthropologists with conventional form of structural functional analysis; which looks at institutions/items in terms of the contribution they make to the maintenance of the ‘whole’ or ‘social structure’. Conflict is regarded as dysfunctional, although some authors view conflicts as salutary as they foster the formation of groups and demarcation of structural boundaries. Thus conflict is regarded as 'dysfunctional' when it brings about change and functional when it preserve statue quo (Boissevain, 1973: VIII; Noble, 1973; 4 and others). The concept of change contradicts the basic structural functional assumptions of balance, equilibrium, complementary opposition and continuity of existing order.
Structural functional analysis is in fact an adequate instrument for the study of primitive societies (Mitchell, 1969: 8; Srinivas and Beteille, 1964: 165). Thus the concept of social network has been introduced as a potential tool of analysis for more complex societies than simple, primitive societies.

2.4. FORMATION AND OPERATION OF SOCIAL NETWORKS

Right from one's birth, each person becomes a part of a network. The immediate networks of newly born human being, are their families and kin groups. They are introduced to the social network of their parent's network. As children grow, they developed social links with other children in the neighborhood and school. They began to look up to their peer groups. By the time they are adults, they are tied with wider networks, formed on the basis of their profession and groups, social clubs, political parties affinal relatives etc. The basic parameters of social status, such as caste, class, sex, education, occupation etc, determine how many and what type of networks would be formed. People with more resources and information usually have wider networks. Such persons are able to easily achieve their goals in their life.

The operational nature of social network is diversified on the basis of social values believes norms, traditions and custom. Access to information, status and powers are achieved through one’s social network. Recent studies on the use of social relationship in finding jobs so that knowing people in right basis, (also known as ‘source’) helps young people in finding better jobs. The occupation of the status of the source in such cases in often linked with the status of the parents of those seeking jobs. (Pundir: 1988,59)

2.5 TYPES OF SOCIAL NETWORKS

We have mentioned how the total network of chains of social relationship covers the society itself. To learn about the type of social
network, we need to focus on the basic unit of social relationships between persons. Such personal networks can be extracted out of the total network. In contrast to personal network, we can also mention in personal networks, which are based on group relationships:

2.5.1 Personal and Group Based Networks

A personal network is a set of linkages, which an individual establishes around him. This linkage may be structurally diverse. Some may be based on kin or caste, while others may be based on classmateship, friendship, workmateship and so on. They possess the morphological characteristic of density, ratability and range. They possess also interaction characteristic of content, directness, durability, intensity and frequency. If a personal network has the additional morphological characteristic of anchorage, or an ego being anchor of a personal network, then it becomes an egocentric personal matter. (Degenne and Forse, 1999: 29)

In contrast to the personal network, the group or in personal matter is viewed in term of the nature of interaction among its members, and in terms of incorporation of its members in the groups in terms of interaction, we can characterize a group as an aggregate of persons who interact more with each other. Through these interactions they form a unit, and identify the group and thus the members develop the consciousness of being together. In terms of incorporation, the group assumes more formal characteristics such as common interest, rights and obligation of members, organisations and structure. (Mitchell, 1969:1-50).

2.5.2 Characteristics of Personal Networks

Personal network have morphological and interactional characteristics, morphological characteristic help in the identification of the form of network,
while interactional characteristic of personal network are mentioned in terms of their constituents.

(i) **Morphological Characteristics**: J.C. Mitchell (1969: 12) has identified anchorage, density, reach ability and range as the morphological characteristic of personal networks;

a) **Anchorage**: The word anchorages indicate that the ego is the center of his network. He is its coordinator. Without him the network will become amorphous. This emerges an egocentric personal network. However, an ego may form a personal network without becoming its coordinator. In fact, in a non-ego-centric personal network nobody may act as a coordinator.

b) **Density**: The density in personal network signifies the density of social relations. The proportion of persons in a network, who know one another, can gauge it. For example, members of a club have higher density than people in a crowd.

c) **Ratability**: The individual who can be relied upon to act as on the request of another individual is reachable or mobilisable. For example, a friend of a friend can be reached or mobilized by a person.

d) **Range**: The term 'range' denotes the limit of direct and regular contacts, which an individual has. Thus, the total number of person ego can contact over telephone, letter or personally, is that person's range contacts. He or she must also be in touch with these 'contacts' regularly.

(ii) **Interactional Characteristics**: There are five international characteristics. They are content, directedness, durability, intensity and frequency.

a) **Content**: It refers to the normative context in which an interaction takes place, such as friendship, caste, membership, kinship etc. For example,
family interaction has a kinship content and family members behave towards each other on the basis of their kin relationship.

b) **Directedness**: Directedness means whether the relationship between ego and a member of his network's reciprocal or only one-sided. One can, put it differently: whether the relationship flows from one direction or both the directions. For example, in friendship, the directedness is reciprocal.

c) **Durability**: It signifies the continuity and stability of relationship over a period of time. A relationship is durable if interaction between two individuals continues over a period of time and vice versa.

d) **Intensity**: Intensity refers to the degree to which individuals are prepared to honour obligations. If a member of an egocentric personal network feels free to dishonour his obligation, (flowing from a favor done to him by the ego) the intensity of the relationship is low.

e) **Frequency**: Frequency signifies the number of time the interaction occurs between two individuals. For example, if the individuals meet daily the frequency of their contacts, is high in contrast to a situation in which they meet only occasionally. The higher the frequency the contacts, the greater are the chances the intensity and durability of relationships.

2.6. **EGOCENTRIC PERSONAL NETWORK**

A personal network may become an egocentric network, when somebody emerges as the coordinator of a network. Here, we have an example of the kind of problem sociologist face, while applying theory to empirical research. It is easy to define egocentric personal network, and identifies their characteristic. But when one is conducting research, one encounters a number of problems, in describing the egocentric personal network of an individual actor. Here, we first give a definition of the egocentric personal network and then discuss the problem
in applying this idea to research situation.

**a) Ego-centric and Non-ego centric Personal Networks**

An egocentric personal network is anchored on an individual. It includes all those persons with whom he is in actual contact. Looked at from the point of view of the member of the network, the ego or the individual on whom it is anchored, is the common connection of all of them. It does not mean that it is the only personal network of all the members. Each one of the members may have his own personal network, and this entire personal network may or may not overlap. The following diagram explains the distinction between the two situations.
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In fig. 1 of the above diagram, we have seen the personal network of the ego. It includes ego’s direct relationship with ACDEF and H and indirect relationship with B mediated through A and G mediated through F. Fig. 2 also includes the non egocentric personal network of A. The network included BQP and R besides the ego fig. 1. Similarly there can be personal network of other members of the members of the network of ego. As we can see there is an overlap between the two personal networks. A and B are common to both the egocentric and non-egocentric personal networks.
Both the diagram, fig. and fig. 2., show the egocentric personal networks. Fig. shows the personal network of ego alone. It shows he has ABCDEF of these; G and B are indirect contacts. In fig. 2 A is shown to have links with ego and these are reciprocal. Thus, two egocentric networks can be connected and separate outward as social networks.

b) Problems In the Delineation of Ego centric Personal Network

In applying these ideas of ego-centric personal network to empirical research, the most significant problems faced are six in numbers:

I. Nature of Contacts,

II. Centricity of Ego

III. Nature of Transaction

IV. Types of Social Relations

V. Mobilisability of the members

VI. Identification of the boundary

(i) Nature of Contacts

The social contact between any two individuals, may vary from a nodding acquaintance and exchange of greetings and pleasantries, (say, in morning walks) to a continual exchange of 'obligations, with built in expectations of reciprocity. One may have a greeting relationship with many people in one's neighbourhood or work place. But can one expect 'help' from all such persons, in all kinds of requirements? Will all such individuals be always prepared to help the ego that is in contact? Obviously not.

The social contact can create only a 'catchment' for an ego. From this ego has to form his social network on the basis of trial and error, or by way of
introduction. Unless stable undirected or reciprocal relationship emerges, the social contact will not turn in to links of a network.

(ii) Centricity of Ego

The centricity of ego is crucial in an egocentric personal network. An individual may have meaningful contact with several individuals, on the basis of which a social network may emerge. But he may or may not be the center of this network. In fact there need not be a center at all. There could be a situation of a kind of chain relationships, with a few large or small meshes hanging around the chain, as is depicted below.

CHAIN OF RELATIONSHIP WITH HANGING MESHES

Thus, the center may shift from one action-set to another action-set. Such chains of links are called non-ego-centric personal network.

The above problem necessitates a distinction between egocentric and non-ego-centric personal networks. The recruitment of members by an ego, and his functioning as the center of all relationships within the network, make the difference between egocentric and non-egocentric networks. The latter may not be formed on the initiative of any single person, and no body act as center or coordinating agency. In this context an action-set would mean, a temporary set of
people recruited through various channels to serve some short-term goal.

For example in the diagram, we may visualize a situation in which C is the son of D. D approaches E (a doctor) to request F (another doctor) to examine his son C in the hospital of F, and C is examined. This is one action-set in which D has initiated an action of which he may be deemed as center. Similarly on another occasion E may initiate an action for achieving some other goal.

(iii) Nature of Transactions

Interactions between the members of a personal network are viewed as transactions. Sometimes even a transaction of marketplace may involve a series of interactions. Therefore, transactions signify those sequence of interactions, which are systematically governed by reciprocity. It may be added that reciprocity assumes that both the parties involved in an interaction are satisfied; both consider it beneficial or profitable. However, two things must be borne in mind. First, it is difficult, if not impossible, to calculate profitability in all transactions. Secondly when one does oblige another person normally he does not specify his expectations of the return. He may make demands later as result of several interactions.

(iv) Types of Social Relations

In this context, the distinction between expressive and instrumental relationship is relevant. In expressive relationship, one derives satisfaction from the relationship itself for example, the relationship between a mother and her child. In contrast an instrumental relationship is that in which the relationship is mean to certain ends, rather than an end itself. As individuals in the pursuit of their self-interests form personal networks, then relationships are basically instrumental. They may sometimes be couched in an expressive form. For example an employee of an organisation may address the wife of his employer as “Mataji” (mother), but in doing so his basic intention is to secure access to the employer through his
wife for instrumental purpose. For this he is using the mode of an expressive relationship.

(v) Mobilisability of the Members

One of the crucial problems in identifying a personal network, is the mobilisability of members of the personal network by an ego. It is not easy to predict whether a member of one's network will act definitely in according with the request of an ego. However, there are four major factors, which have a bearing on the mobilisability of a member:

(a) Relative resources of the ego and the member (let us call him alter in accordance with sociological usage)

(b) Degree of dependence of the alter on the ego

(c) Number of intermediaries between the ego and the alter

(d) The bearing of the demand action on the interest of the alter on the basis of these four factors one can make the following generalization:

(a) The less the material resources of the alter in comparison with those of ego, the greater are the chances of his acting in accordance with the desire of ego.

(b) The more an alter is dependent on ego and his network, the greater are the chances of his acting in accordance with the desire of ego.

(c) The more the number of intermediates between the ego, and the terminal alter the less are the chances of his acting in accordance with the desire of ego.

(d) The less the adverse effect of the demand action on the interests of the
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alter the greater are the chances of his acting in accordance with the desire of ego.

(vi) Identification of the Boundary

In an empirical research on personal networks, the most difficult problem is the determination the boundary of a personal network. For this purpose, two criteria are suggested. It is held by some people that all those persons with whom ego is in contact, are member of his personal network other object to this criterion on the ground, that all the persons with whom a person is in contact may not be mobilisable. They assert that the criterion should b actual mobilization in an action situation. The main difficult\(j\)' in the second criterion should be actual mobilization in an action situation, then the distinction between a personal and an action-set is blurred, (if not lost), because an action-set is delineated in terms of a specific action that brings it in to being. A personal network, on the other hand, denotes a set of linkage, which exist beyond the duration of any particular action or transaction. Therefore, the boundary of an action-set will vary, while that of the personal network, (i f it is conceived as more durable than an action-set), has to be more or less stable. However, its boundary remains indistinct.

2.7. PERSONAL NETWORK AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

It may be emphasized that a personal network may become an egocentric network, when somebody emerges as a coordinator of a network, and an egocentric personal network may develop into a group. It all depends on the acquisition of additional characteristic, through interaction and change in the nature of social relations. The changes can proceed in the opposite direction as well. The structure of a group may weaken, and it may turn into a personal network or an egocentric network. This depends upon the non-emergence or emergence, of an individual as its coordinator. Thus personal networks are intimately related to the social structure both in its integrational and disintegration
aspects. They provide a window to look at the social structure and changes going on it. As personal network play an important role in the functioning of formal organisations, the relationship between personal network and social structure can be illustrated, by showing how personal network operate in formal organisations. (Nadel, 1957: 98)

(i) **Personal Network and Formal Organisations:**

   We can illustrate the relationship between the social structure and personal network, through the study of an interface between personal networks and formal organisations. Before doing so, it is in order to explain what we mean by formal organisations.

(a) **Nature of Formal Organisations:**

   Vincent Lemieux (1982) sought in purposing to bring by distinguishing network from 'apparatuses'. He offered six principal criteria: high role specialization, low multiplexing, low link redundancy, established frontiers, formal action coordination and strong hierarchy. Catherine Flamenl (1991) applied this approach to a set of civic organisation on the French Riviera. She investigated both their local internal organisation and their relations to respective national head offices.

   (i) She used link redundancy to oppose bodies as a function of internal organisation. Either they were setup much like formal bodies with a board of officers who carries out most duties with little input from members, or they operated with committees where members organized events together and reinforced mutual links.

   (ii) Multiplexing served to compare the roles of employees and activists in each organisation. She notes that individual play more
roles when a project aims for a broad goal rather than a specific target.

(iii) Frontiers transpired through a body's relation to other bodies. Relations were either competitive if an organisation defended its activist niche and government grants or cooperative if it sought outside partners.

Flament supplements Lemieux with an additional criterion. Her study includes links between the local office of a civic organisation and its national head office. She takes account of hierarchy (connectivity) and link strength or weakness. She notes that older national bodies with a tradition of being tightly organized tend to have strong hierarchies and strict membership rules. In another category of bodies, however, local autonomy is the rule and hierarchy is absent. Flament classifies formal institutionalized links as strong and others as weak. This set of criteria segments the population of civic organisation into three classes that operate in district and coherent ways:

- **Grouped institutions**, which have an apparatus-type structure with ‘strong formal links’
- **Groups**, which are exclusive introspective bodies and where organisational criteria do not apply
- **Network groups**, which are apparatuses that have developed what Lemieux, would call network features (e.g. individual autonomy and multiplexing of crosscutting links).

This classification is relevant to explain the historical development of civic organisation and their efficacy. Without going in to the technical details, we can say that a formal organisation is a social collectivity, the goals of which are formally defined. It has authorities vested with power. The authorities are
expected to mobilize the power vested in them for achieving the goals of the formal organisations. Formal organisations operate through impersonal, universalistic rules and procedures, which are expected to be mobilized across the board impersonally.

(b) Illustration of Formal Organisation

Alain Degenne and Michel Forse (1999:153) explain that a university may be taken as an example of a formal organisation. Its goals of education are formally defined. It has various authorities such as the Chancellor, the Vice-chancellor, Deans, Heads of departments and so on. Each one of the authorities is vested with some defined power to carry out the functions of the university, which may include recruitment of staff, admission of students, administration of educational functions, and conduct of the examination.

(c) Formal Organisation in a Traditional Society

In India, a traditional society, the collectivities such as the family, kin, caste, religion and language, help an individual to achieve his ends through personal and informal relationships. The introduction of formal organisation has created a serious problem. Indians are used to personal and in formal relations. Armed with such relations they feel safe. However, formal organisations function on the basis of universalistic rules and procedures, which operate impersonally; and formally. Thus the juxtaposition of formal organisations with traditional collectivities, such as caste, has created anomaly (Crozier and Friedberg,1980: 9).

(ii) The Concept of ‘Source’

The people who are used to operating on a personal basis do not feel secure with an impersonal system. One must have heard people using the word 'source' and trying to find 'sources', for getting things done through informal organisations. A source may be conceived of a person through whom the power
vested in an authority of a formal organisation may be utilized for personal ends. These may or may not be in conflict with the goal of formal organisation.

(iii) Resource Networks and Resource Groups

K.N. Sharma (1975: 191-197) said that these networks and groups are called ‘resource networks’ and groups. Resource networks are extracts from the total network. They are based on the criterion of shared interest, in the mobilization of power of formal organisations for personal ends. Therefore, they may be called partial networks. They may be either egocentric personal networks or non-egocentric personal networks.

The linkage between the members of personal resource network may be diverse. They may be based on kin, caste, family, classmateship, etc. An ego may have different degrees of understanding with the members of his renouncement network, regarding the mobilisability of each other. The transactions on which resource networks develop lead to the development of instrumental relationship. Finally, the uncertainty inherent in the mobilisability of resources makes the boundary of a resource network district.

a) Resource Groups

When the exchange of obligations between the members of a resource group stabilizes the unity, then identity and consciousness of kind emerge. Thus a resource network would turn into a resource network. Its boundary is identifiable an interactions between the members become pattern.

b) Functions of Resource Networks and Groups

The functions of resource networks and groups may be seen from the view point of individuals, formal organisations and the Indian societies for individual they are functional or beneficial because they serve their interest, whether it is in
context of formal organisations or conflicts. They guarantee the requisite support. But for formal organisations they are highly dysfunctional. In other words, they contribute negatively to the achievement of goals of formal organisations, by putting a premium on individual ends vice versa the goals of formal organisation.

Resource networks affect the social structure in very fundamental manners. The social relations inherent in resource networks and groups, as particular and personal, and, therefore, may be treated as extensions from the traditional social structure. The traditional social structure, however, is based on greater normative and juridical support for the corporate groups. Besides these, allows respect and loyalty play significant role in the which resource networks develop lead to the development of instrumental relationship. Finally, the uncertainty inherent in the mobilisability of renumbers makes the boundary of a resource network district.

a) Resource Groups

When the exchange of obligations between the members of a resource group stabilizes the unity, then identity and consciousness of kind emerge. Thus a resource network would turn into a resource network. Its boundary is identifiable an interactions between the members become pattern.

b) Functions of Resource Networks and Groups

The functions of resource networks and groups may be seen from the view point of individuals, formal organisations and the Indian societies for individual they are functional or beneficial because they serve their interest, whether it is in context of formal organisations or conflicts. They guarantee the requisite support. But for formal organisations they are highly dysfunctional. In other words, they contribute negatively to the achievement of goals of formal organisations, by putting a premium on individual ends vice versa the goals of formal organisation.
Resource networks affect the social structure in very fundamental manners. The social relations inherent in resource networks and groups, as particular and personal, and, therefore, may be treated as extensions from the traditional social structure. The traditional social structure, however, is based on greater normative and juridical support for the corporate groups. Besides these, allows respect and loyalty play significant role in the which resource networks develop lead to the development of instrumental relationship. Finally, the uncertainty inherent in the mobilisability of renumbers makes the boundary of a resource network district.

a) Resource Groups

When the exchange of obligations between the members of a resource group stabilizes the unity, then identity and consciousness of kind emerge. Thus a resource network would turn into a resource network. Its boundary is identifiable an interactions between the members become pattern.
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At present, it appears 'that there are some different ways in which the contents of links of social network may be appreciated.

2.8.1. Communication Content and Social Network

One of these relates the passage of information of some kind from one person to another. The use of this networks in this way probably lies more in the field of social psychology then in sociology but the study from Coleman, Katz and Menzel (1957) in the way in which a new drug is taken up by the physician in an American town is an example of study. Here the network is seen primarily as set of communication links relating physician to one another in a particular manner. This is one of the interesting points that emerge from Epstein's analysis of gossip in an American town (1969). Epstein examines the flow of information along a personal network among a set of relatively high status African residence of suburb in Ndola. The people, in the network, are all connected by friendship, having been schoolfellows, and pursued membership of an 'elite' category. Epstein point is that the norms in term of which the information passing through the network is evaluated influences and modifies the information accordingly. Thus the fact that co-members of an elite group are passing on information about the peccadilloes of one of their number with a person of lower social status enables them to discuss the matter in terms which reinforce their on self identity as an elite. The distinctiveness of the social network established on the basis of the flow of information from that established on the basis of the normative content of the links is well illustrated by study of the process by which women find out in America about how to contact an abortionist. (Lee, 1969: 123-146). Lee finds that 'communication concerning abortion trends to occur within the frame work'of the acquaintance network rather
than to formal channels', the 'acquaintance network' here being similar to what we have distinguish below as network based on normative contents. But the important thing is that there are certain parts of social network of the women, which were effectively excluded from the information network. Examples of the categories of such persons are mothers and parents, friends who disapproved (e.g., Catholics) and neighbours (Lee, 1969 Table 50:142). Lee generalizes this to argue that' barriers to free flow of information are located (1) with in the kinship area of the acquaintance universe, particularly across generational lands; (2) across authority lines, exemplified where women mentioned employers, teachers, school authorities, and subordinates such as pupils and employees; and (3) at some social distance varying publication with pupils with whom the woman does not have an intimate relationship, such as neighbours or 'someone whom with one work' (Lee, 1969:141-2).

James Coleman, Elihu Katz, Herbart Menzel (1957: 253-270) analyse the individual but the context is an entire community. The network study consists of the ties that connect the town physician. They rise: how do ideas or attributes spread through a population? More specifically, in their particular research setting, they address the question how the structural characteristics of the network of physician influence the rate at which the physician adopts a new drug. This is a study of “contagion”, a process that sweeps across a population and alters the character of some or all of its members. In this case the contagion process is the diffusion of behaviour: use of a drug. Once a physician engages in the action of prescribing a new drug other physician's character becomes permanently altered. The physician becomes a doctor. They wanted to determine whether any quality of a physician in the social setting could be associated with time of adoption. With data gathered from permanency in a mid western American town, they were able to determine the month in which each of the community's physician commenced prescribing a new drug. Then, from inter use of a sample of physician, they
gathered sociometric and personated data. They decided that those physician who were named frequently by other physician in the sociometric test, the sociometric charts, were more tightly integrated into the physician network and they hypothesized that these physicians would be early adopters. They also distinguished several kinds of networks that they felt were relevant to the diffusion process: the network of advisors; the network of discussionants; and the network of friends. They found that, in this order the different network had separate effects on the rate of diffusion of the innovation among the physician and position in each network had different implications for adoption behavior.

Using location in a network rather than the individual personality factors as variables, Coleman Katz and Menzel show that sociometric status and integration, summary qualities characterizing an individual in social network, are important.

William Erbe (1962; 502-16) raises a similar issue but in a different context. He defines gregariousness as the range of individual's social contacts and integration as the range of an individual's membership in informal groups. He finds that the influence of gregariousness (the range of social contacts) and integration in an informal group (indexed by self-defined membership) on the diffusion of information are compared with data from a national sample of graduate students. The information advantage of highly gregarious individuals is found to be explained primarily by the fact that they are more likely to be group members. Information is found to be more diffused in highly cohesive departments (characterized by the presence of many groups), especially among nonintegrated students, thus indicating the importance of the relative density of group interaction in the flow of information. The importance of group interactions is attributed to (1) the number and heterogeneity of sources of information available in a group and (2) the continuity of group relations.
Diana Carnes made an empirical study of a large network in which the research issue is the diffusion of information across interpersonal contacts. She studied an invisible college, an informal social network that is though to tie scientists in to closed, exclusive groups. Those individuals involved in such networks experience the advantage of increased interaction and easy communication. This result could increase the efficiency with which the information is transferred from one group member to another, and in science, on presumes, the diffusion of new information to interest parties is crucial. There are also, however, several disadvantages: invisible colleges might be considered antiequalitarian because they are closed; they seem to create barriers to the entrance of other scientists who may not be members, but who are interested in the field; and they probably cut down on a potentially useful information flow in to the group from the outside. Thus, invisible colleges may lead to a form of institutionalized science, a situation in which innovative ideas may be less rather than more likely to surface. While a highly interconnected network may increase the rate at which knowledge diffused within the group, barriers to membership may reduce the diffusion of knowledge into and out of the group.

2.8.2. Exchange Content and Social Network

A somewhat different but equally important way of conceptualizing the links between the individuals in personal network by means of the exchange the contents of these links. In this approach individual are related to each other by sets of transactions, which have implications for the actors wider than the simple act of exchange itself. This seems to be the basis of Adrian Mayer's notion of the action-set (1964) here a number of actors are involved in a number of transactions which bind them to one another in a series of expectations and obligations. Mayer uses the act are the candidate in a municipal action on the one hand and a set of his potential elector supporters on the others. He them traces a series of offers of services in exchange for support during the election. The
electors are connected by links of the candidate of their expectations of his patronage such as, for example, the improvement of road near the elector's house or the employment of the elector (or his kinsman) in an office over which the candidate has control, or his brokerage that is by introductioning the elector to business contacts or government officials in order to further private ends. Mayer is at pains to point out that the action-set may be recruited on the basis of number of different criterion. He gives a diagram of the links connecting the candidate to various electors, in which 38 links are shown. Of these, ten are in terms of kinship, kin factions or ritual kinship; seven in term of economic links; five in terms of party membership; four in term of caste and the rest in term of wide range of characteristics: the State, a wrestling club, trade union membership, occupational links, village links and so on. Here, then we have three networks: Exchange network. Communication network and Social network. As with communication networks some of the prepositions that could have been developed from Mayer’s material could have been related to the interrelationship among the exchange network, to the communication network and social network. (Leinhardt, 1977: 293-318)

Nancy R. Bechan, Rachel T. A.Croson and Robyn M. Dawes (2002: 168-206) analysed in four countries, level of thrust and reciprocity in direct-reciprocal exchange are compared with those network-analyzed exchanges among experimentally manipulated group' members (neighbours) or random experimental participants (strangers). They show that corporation decreases as social distance increases; and, that identical network-generalized exchanges generate different amount of thrusting behaviour due solely to manipulated some identity between actors. This study demonstrates the interaction of culture and social identity on the propensity to trust and reciprocate and also reveals different relationship between trust and reciprocation in each of the four countries, bringing in to questions the theoretical relationship between those cooperative
behaviours.

Linda D. Molm, Gretchen Peterson and Nobuiuki Takahashi (2003: 128-52) develop and test alternative predictions about how the form of social exchange, negotiated or reciprocal, affects perceptions of fairness, independent of structures and outcomes of exchange. Theories of procedural justice predict that fair exchange produces should enhance perceptions of the exchange partner's fairness. Negotiated exchange which encoperates, collective decision making, advance knowledge of terms, mutual assent, and binding agreements clearly appears more fair than does reciprocal exchange on most procedural dimensions. Thus, these theories implies that the perception of other's fairness should be greater in negotiated than in reciprocal exchange. They, from three experiments, however, found the opposite: actors perceive negotiated exchange partners as less fair, and they are less willing to engage in unequal exchanges with them; these effects are robust across multiple levels of inequality and variations with in two forms of exchange. These finding support their alternative arguments: rather than increasing perception of fairness, features of negotiated exchange instead serve to heighten the silence of conflict between actors, trigger self-saving attributions that lead factors to perceive others' motives and traits unfavorably, and increase perceptions that the other is unfair. They discuss implications for theory and for negotiations and reciprocity in social life.

Pei-Chia Lan (2002: 165-185) has drawn on a qualitative study of direct selling in Taiwan. He examined the procedure of network construction and its control effect or distributors. He found that weak ties rather than strong ties constitute major network for distributors to expand their business. In order to consolidate trust with in weak ties, distributors developed strategies: personalizing sales and familiarizing sponsorship. They are engaged in a multilevel performance of emotional labor in facing the audience of customers and fellow distributors. Social network not only function as a facilitator of economic
exchange but also become a mean of labor control that permits both public and private lives of distributors.

James Moody (2002: 25-56) said that relationship timing can have dramatic effect of diffusion through a network, relationship order determines transmission roots. Though past research have modeled diffusion through static network or developed method for modeling change in network pattern, none has combined these factors to show how relationship change channels diffusion. He formalized the diffusion problem in network with changes relations, identifies minimal bounds need to major diffusion potential in such networks, and provides a methods for identifying who is at risk for diffusion. The effect of timing for diffusion potential is demonstrated with potential flow of sexually transmitted decease (STDs) in an adolescent romantic network.

2.8.3 Normative Content and Social Network

This refers to that aspect of the relationship between two individuals, which can be referred to the expectations each may have of the other because of some social characteristic of other, may possess. Thus when Barnes referred to the social network he was concerned with a limited content i.e. with kinship neighbour liens or friendship.

J.A. Barnes (1954) research is the earliest empirical field stands with an explicit network perspective. For him, social status is not simply a category such as "middle income" or "lower class." Instead, it is a quality of location, a position in a complex system of relations in which interaction, behavioural options, information etc., are a function of that location and the structural properties of the system. In this context, social stratification becomes a concrete dimension of the social structure, and class differences in behaviour are not simply happenstance. Instead they drive from constraints imposed by structural features of social fields, the concatenation of multiple social relations, which provide individuals with
expectations for their own behaviour and the behaviour of others. He includes those persons in one's network with whom he is in touch directly or indirectly. The words 'in touch' are ambiguous and if persons on the basis of touch were identified perhaps the number would be limitless. Secondly the words 'in touch' do not indicate clearly the purpose for which a person is in touch with others. Thirdly it seems that when he uses the words 'a kind of social field' as defines for defined word network again becomes a sort of circular definition. The word 'social' again has been used in an ambiguous manner, since several dimensions like economic, political also have been identified as functional elements of a social system. It is also not clear from the definition of network as what is the purpose or in other words what Barnes has in mind to be explained. This is just similar to the definition of social structure, as person to person relationship, as given Radcliffe-Brown. Barnes furthers delimits the meaning of 'in touch' to two categories of persons-friends and acquaintance, which may be inherited/achieved. This is definitely an improvement. Now a question arises if friendship has been used then its meaning again has not been identified. As the proverb goes: 'friends are rare to seek, then the network becomes too limited and if another proverb: 'a friend in need is a friend indeed' is true then it should also have been mentioned. More than that, the word acquaintance is also very vague. There are relationships, which neither partakes of the nature of friendship nor acquaintanceship; and if a friend's friend were also related would not he be included in the network of a person? Barnes belongs to a western society where perhaps the 'friend' has superseded the family and kinship in respect of relationship, hence there is so much of emphasis on friendship and acquaintance. If this definition is extended to the Indian context we can not ignore to include family and kinship in the definition of network. (Leinhardt, 1977:233-292).

F.E. Katz (1966:203) defines network as 'the set of persons who can get it in touch with each other' and contacts as 'the individuals who comprise a network'
they are members of the network set. It seems more in keeping with the common use of the word 'network' to refer to a network as the set of 'linkages' among persons and as the set of persons connected by these linkages, Katz, pointing out the unity of social networks in sociological analysis, writes: 'there are conceptual gaps between 'micro-sociologists' and 'macro-sociologists' and between 'normative-structuralism' and 'behaviour interactionists'. He proposes 'a way of looking' at social network in the hope that this may close some of the conceptual gaps (1966:199). F.E. Katz includes the set of persons who can get in touch with each other and contacts as the individuals, who comprise a network, they are members of the network set. The word 'in contact with each other' can't be operationalized and if at all an exercise is done it will perhaps not distinguish between family, association, friendship club, political party, caste, class and other group like categories.

J. C. Mitchell (1969: 2-3) considers social networks as a specific set of linkages among a defined set of persons with the additional property that the characteristic of these linkages as a whole may be used to interpret the social behaviour of the person involved. A network in a graph theory is a relation in which the lines connecting the points have values ascribed to them, which may or may not be numerical. Mathematical graph theory is not restricted to finite nets but in sociology it is usually necessary for pragmatic reasons to work with in identifiable set of relationships that exist among them. He accepts the finite nature of network and pay special attention to the multiplicity of links.

P.D. Wheeldon (1969: 128-180) states, “each individual in a society has relationships with a large number of friends and acquaintance. All these relationships together constitute what has been called a personal network.”

Tessa Cubitt (1973: 67-82) examines some of Bott's (1957) suggestions in the light of a recent general characteristic of social networks. He finds that the whole network density is not as significant as this, since most networks have low
density, but that what is significant are which sectors provide the high-density areas. It is therefore the high density sector in which ego interacts most or which is most important to ego, rather than the whole extended network, that is responsible for norm enforcement. These are in fact, the actors’ perceptions which he observer uses in order to abstract from the behaviour of the individual those aspects, which are relevant for his analysis. These perceptual categories exist as frameworks for evaluating the behaviour of people in appropriate situations and it is for this reason that the study has referred to the content here as 'normative'.

2.8.4. Egocentric Context and Social Network

The social contact between any two individuals may vary from a nodding acquaintance and exchange of greetings and pleasantries, (say, in morning walks to a continual exchange of 'obligations', with built-in expectation of reciprocity. One may have a greeting relationship with many persons in one's neighbourhood or work place. The centrality of the ego is crucial in an egocentric personal network. An individual may have meaningful contacts with several individuals, on the basis of which a social network may emerge.

A.Trouwborst (1973: 111-123) has analyzed ego-centered partial networks in Burundi. He finds that Burundi has two institutions forming the basis of two types of networks. By partial network he understand that part of an individual's network which consists of social relationship with a link content. On the basis of a comparative analysis of both types of networks, he arrives at a few conclusions about the structural importance of the difference between them. He makes this comparison in terms of the quality, the aims and the resources involved, the criterion of directness, density and multiplicity, the numbers and composition of the people involved, and the ways in which the networks can be interpreted from the viewpoint of the concept of action-sets. An important difference between both networks appear to be one of them in distinction to the
other is based on a local group of relatives and neighbours, constituting what might be called the local core of the network.

Peter V. Marsden (2003:1-16) finds that name generators used to measure egocentric networks are complex survey questions that make substantial demands on respondents and interviewers alike. They are, therefore, vulnerable to interviewer effects, which arise when interviewers administer questions differently in ways that affect responses—in this case, the number of names elicited. He examines a simpler single-generator elicitation instrument administered in the 1998 General Social Survey (GSS). Interviewer effects on network size as measured by this instrument are smaller than those found by Van Tilburg (1998:300), but only modestly so. Variations in the network size of respondents within interviewer caseloads (estimated using a single-item “global” measure of network size and an independent sample of respondents) reduce but do not explain interviewer effects on the name generator measure. Interviewer differences remain significant after further controls for between-interviewer differences in the socio demographic composition of respondent pools. Further insight into the sources of interviewer effects may be obtained via monitoring respondent interviewer interactions for differences in how name generators are administered.

M.E.J. Newman (2003:83-95) has demonstrated that many networks have broad distributions of vertex degree. He shows that this has a substantial impact on the shape of ego-centered networks and on concepts and methods based on ego-centered networks, such as snowball sampling and the “ripple effect”. In particular, he argues that one's acquaintances, one's immediate neighbours in the acquaintance network, are far from being a random sample of the population, and that this biases the numbers of neighbours two and more steps away. He demonstrates this concept using data on academic collaboration networks.
Jimy Sanders, Victor Nee and Scott Sernau study how the social capital and closure properties of family and ethnic-based social networks influence the incorporation of immigrants into their host society. In so doing, they examine the relationship between immigrants' reliance on social ties and their employment. Data collected through ethnographic depth interviews of Asian immigrants in Los Angeles indicate that reliance on social ties -usually operates informally, as when job seekers consult their more experienced and better-connected friends, relatives, and acquaintances and ask them to serve as intermediaries. These networks provide group-based resources that assist immigrants in making headway in their new society. Yet reliance on social ties is most common for moves into jobs of low occupational prestige that have low human capital requirements. Because of linguistic and cultural competence, immigrants who seek Jobs from coethnic employers are often more self-reliant in the job search than those who seek work more broadly. In this way, ethnolinguistic closure encourages ethnic segmentation in the labor market. By contrast, reliance on social ties, another form of closure, facilitates job hunting in the wider domain of the labor market, where prospective employers may be of nay ethnicity. Reliance on social ties thereby provides a mechanism by which immigrants gain employment throughout the multiethnic metropolitan labor market.

Here, we have an example of the kind of problems sociologists face, while applying theory to empirical research. It is easy to define egocentric personal networks, and identify their characteristics. But when one is conducting research, one encounters a number of problems, in describing the egocentric personal networks of any individual actor.

2.8.5. Power and Centrality Context and Social Network

Numerous studies agree that centrality is bound up with power, both in organisations and in more informal networks, but they also report the link is
neither straightforward nor unequivocal. In 1948, Bavelas was already testing the hypothesis that central positions confer influence. With fellow social psychologists from MIT he ran a series of studies on small groups, concluding that centrality impacts a wide range of issues from leadership to personal satisfaction in-group members. Shortly thereafter, sociologists applied the concept to more complex social systems. B.S. Cohn and M. Mariott (1958) found it helpful to explain integration policy in India. M.N. Beauchamp (1965) used it to understand organisational efficiency, and J.A. Czepiel (1974) to study diffusion of innovations.

Centrality in networks operates somewhat like inequality in social stratification. Several perspectives are possible, each relevant in its own way. In both domains, there are absolute and relative viewpoints that intersect with a local or a global one. In a classic article, Linton Freeman (1979) deduces three forms of centrality.

1) **Degree Centrality**

Degree centrality is the simplest and the most intuitive. It measures an individual's centrality according to the number of connections to others, i.e. degree in undirected graphs and indegree/outdegree in directed graphs. Central individuals have strong connections to other network members; peripherals individual do not. A measurement scale can readily be designed to consider indirect links through a given number of intermediaries.

2) **Closeness Centrality**

The first way of evaluating the centrality of an individual, according to this criterion, is to make a judgment about her closeness to others. This is a more global measurement that brings in to play the closeness to all network members, not just connections to immediate neighbours.
Bavelas, Leavitt" and Beauchamp developed this concept but Sabidussi(1966) quantified it by defining the centrality of a point as the sum of its geodesic distances to all points on the graph. What this actually yields, is a measure of remoteness or inverse proximity, which can be, read as inverse centrality: the point furthest from other points is the least central and vice-versa.

3) Betweenness Centrality

Betweenness offers a more precise way of measuring an individual's centrality. Linton Freeman suggests that some weakly connects individuals (i.e. persons of low degree centrality) may still be indispensable to certain transactions. The greater an individual's actual or potential intermediary value to all members of network, the greater his control over communication flow and independence of others to communicate. Such an individual can easily influence the group by withholding and/or distorting information that passes through her hands. She is also in better position to coordinate information for the entire group. From all the above, she plainly occupies a central position.

4) Flow Betweenness

Freeman et al. (1991) set out to learn how flow betweenness affects centrality. They advance a new yardstick for betweenness that applies to valued graphs based on the unvalued betweenness model. Flow depends not only the flow capacity of the direct links between two individuals but also on the entire capacity of all (independent) direct and indirect paths that connect them.

2.8.6. From Centrality to Power and Social Network

Bonacich asserts the indices measure of an actor's power. Indeed, a central actor connected to other central actors can certainly be considered powerful. After all she holds a dominant position, as shown by the index just obtained, whenever an exchange or negotiation arises.
According to Knoke *land* Burt (1983), this index measures centrality or power satisfactory in an undirected network but simply measures actor prestige or fame in a directed context because it only includes received choices (i.e. indegree) for each actor. Indeed, an actor's fame or prestige rises with the number of individuals who cite him and the amount of fame or prestige they enjoy themselves.

Cook et al. (1983) has opposed the idea that power and centrality (in the sense of a monetary middleman) were necessarily synonymous. Relations with relatively uninfluential actors can prove invaluable in certain negotiations. And relations with actors with too much power can some-times prove a handicap because they have too many relational options. Lickwise, Caplow's coalition theory suggests that the power of other actors reduces rather than enhances the ego's power. Thus power is more subtle than a mechanical sum of powers held by others. The same applies to prestige, which quickly eclipse in an immediate environment of higher prestige. It is readily arguable that an actor's prestige falls in such an environment but rises as soon as clearly stands apart from the crowd.

North American Sociology has attempted to refine the concept of power by distinguishing direct exercise or domination from influence or effort to recruit support for a given cause. Knoke (1990) conjugates power and influence to yield four different type of power behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Power</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent Power</td>
<td>Broking</td>
<td>Persuasion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network analysts have obviously pondered how to construct and observe domination and influence. And because this evokes concepts inseparable from that of a relation, these concept should stand at the heart of network analysis. (Degenne and Forse, 1999: 133-142)

2.8.7. Local Elites Context and Social Network

The application of these yardsticks to local elites or actors in an organisation is rate owing to an unfortunate shortage of data. Nonetheless, P.V. Marsden and E.O. Lumann (1977) applied a similar model to five local events in a small US town. They estimated power by considering 10 different resources controlled by actors in the study population. They found 90% correlation with a direct measure of subjective influence (number of times an individual is cited as 'local leader' regardless of any relations to respondents). Actor scores for power also correlated well with centrality scores. Power and respite ratings for each actor enabled the team to predict which local events would actually occur with 60% accuracy because they knew actors had a decisive impact on making things happen.

Historically, the local elites based on structural analysis dates back to political sociology the 1950s and 1960s. Although Chicago sociology and other paradigms have upstaged political sociology, it has Atlanta and Robert Dahl's (1957; 1958; 1961) work on New Haven. However they offer scant detail about the political network of actors or how collective decision making process actually operate. It was only in the 1970s and 1980s that studies of local power systems really applied network analysis to inter organisational communication structures and exchange networks in a bid to grasp the differing degrees of actor involvement in the collective decision-making process.

E.O. Laumann and F.U. Pappi (Leibert and Imershein, 1977:199-250) showed that the coalition whose sum total of reputations carries the most prestige
would always win out. Thus there is a link between prestige and influence. However this link requires careful assessment because effective influence is the product of a complex process that is sensitive to the structural position of actors belonging to multiple networks, each of whom has specific resources that can sway decision-making toward own vested interests.

2.8.7. Local Elites Context and Social Network

The application of these yardsticks to local elites or actors in an organisation is rate owing to an unfortunate shortage of data. Nonetheless, P.V. Marsden and E.O. Lumann (1977) applied a similar model to five local events in a small US town. They estimated power by considering 10 different resources controlled by actors in the study population. They found 90% correlation with a direct measure of subjective influence (number of times an individual is cited as 'local leader' regardless of any relations to respondents). Actor scores for power also correlated well with centrality scores. Power and respite ratings for each actor enabled the team to predict which local events would actually occur with 60% accuracy because they knew actors had a decisive impact on making things happen.

Historically, the local elites based on structural analysis dates back to political sociology the 1950s and 1960s. Although Chicago sociology and other paradigms have upstaged political sociology, it has Atlanta and Robert Dahl's (1957; 1958; 1961) work on New Haven. However they offer scant detail about the political network of actors or how collective decision making process actually operate. It was only in the 1970s and 1980s that studies of local power systems really applied network analysis to inter organisational communication structures and exchange networks in a bid to grasp the differing degrees of actor involvement in the collective decision-making process.

showed that the coalition whose sum total of reputations carries the most prestige would always win out. Thus there is a link between prestige and influence. However, this link requires careful assessment because effective influence is the product of a complex process that is sensitive to the structural position of actors belonging to multiple networks, each of whom has specific resources that can sway decision-making toward own vested interests.

2.9. Select Studies of Social Networks in Indian Context

The major issues undertaken in the studies include family studies, studies of political processes, studies of urban situations, rural-urban articulations and above changing scene of developing societies like India. Studies of the increasing interaction of rural-urban institutions are limited.

M.N. Srinivas and A. Betiellie (1964: 165-168) observe that 'the model of social structure which based on itself on enduring groups and categories and their interrelations has been developed largely by social anthropologists engaged in the study of primitive societies. The typical examples of this type of approach are Evans-Pritchard's study of the Nuer. But in more complex social systems or in social systems undergoing social changes ' Boundaries between groups tend to be blurred or broken down, there is greater circulation of personal and an increasing degree of interpretation between different systems of groups, classes and categories' (1964: 165). They describe a social network as a 'set of concrete individuals who are members of diverse systems of enduring groups and categories. Here we represent the network from the point of view of the actor and there are as many networks as there are actors in the social system.' (1964: 166)

K. N. Sharma (n.d.: 165) suggests that the nearing of thrums and expressions like contact, common connections boundary and centricity need further exploration. He characterizes contacts, states that unless exchange between ego and alter takes place, network cannot emerge. Clarifying the term
common connection he says, "Only those Beohairs would become members of his network who have entered in to a kind of transaction which can support exchanges in the context of formal organisation." The term of ego has been examine by Sharma (p: 177) when he makes a distinction between network and action-set. He argues that it would be appropriate to treat them (links) as centers of specific action-set rather than networks. He states that in securing jobs in the city social network has played a significant role in addition to merit. He calls such networks as 'resource network'.

Satish Sabarwal (1976: 225) has shown distinctive social styles to be associated with the mobility efforts of each of the three castes namely A.D. Dhamis, Balmiks and Ramarhia in Modelpur. Taking caste solidarity and opportunistic links with social networks as analytically separable mobility strategies, he finds that the group is the intended unit of mobility in the first and the individual in the second strategy. The ambitious man resorts to one or the other (or a mix), depending on his estimate of likely situational pay-off, but as he ascends the lower rungs of Modelpur's caste solidarity declines and that of social network increases. He finds that compared with Balmiks. It has been easier for the Ad Dharmis to cross both the physical and the social fences and their vertical, multicast links are becoming stronger. Though most of them line in caste neighbourhoods, they are fragmented politically and their mutual aid mechanism is weaker than the Balmikis. Ramgarhia's caste solidarity is high: witness the development of their community organisations including the remarkable educational complex located in Modelpur. His enquiry has revealed individuals and organisations devoted to this task in all three groups: the Balmiki Sabah and the Municipal Sweeper's Union, the Ad Dharmis' Republican Party, and various Ramgharia associations. Their efforts and exhortations at any one time, however, have to interact with their changing milieu, and he proceed now to explore the dynamics of the growth, persistence, or decline of solidarity in any group or
Sacchidananda (1976: 10-30) finds that a new educated elite is emerging in the Scheduled Caste society and they are taking up leadership roles according to their own capabilities. Education among them is an inevitable avenue to elite status. His study is based upon interviews, case studies and observations of 200 respondents, which have the advantage of giving depth to the findings. His study is confined to educated Harizan elites only. The growth of education has led to the raise of a new middle class which through its power and influence is providing the leadership to the scheduled caste masses. The educated elites are taken both from the urban as well as rural areas in different part of Bihar.

He finds that Harizan elites have become politically conscious and realistic in the value of their vote for election, they activate focused networks and action sets for a number of things such as securing jobs or contract, setting daughter's marriage or getting support in election. He found “focused network” or "action set" in his analysis as activating contacts to achieve certain goals on the part of Harizan elite.

Brij Raj Chauhan (1979: 97-110) considered a network as a tool of analysis for understanding the rural urban articulations in India. He sees a field of linkage along economic, political and cultural dimensions between the village and the town in India.

J.K. Pundir (1998: 165) states that the social network is a social configuration in which there are component units, individuals, which are knit together forming a net, some units are not linked together. Some network extends beyond the defined social structure. It has the following characteristics-

(1) Direct and indirect relationship between a person and other persons, as a system of relationship; (2) personal and informal relationship; (3) possibility and actualization of using the linkages as instrumental for achieving goals of
persons whose network is being identified; (4) it is infinite; (5) basis of linkages
may be primordial and or secular; (6) the networks are dynamic not static; i.e.
may change over a period of time, and (7) networks vary according to cultural
context, i.e., networks have spatial dimension. His study of social network has
been done in two villages Kotana and Baoli. He finds that at first phase the
village elite is the important knots in his social network whereas at second phase
the manufacturer, officials and other recipients become the knots of the network.
The evidence, apply, prove that social network is not static.

Thus, his findings indicate that the concept of Bott is more revealing than
of Branes.

S.S. Sharma (1977: 15-23) has studied how Pradhans elected in election
and once again they are elected and in between how they lost election and defeated
by other persons, in western U.P. and specified how a person elected continuously
and lost election in between and elected once again. A specific type of network
can help in understanding this process. How this social network is build and what
are the major factors that influenced these networks. He has given the name of
this process “action set”, as A.C. Mayer used the term “Quasi group” and
focussed network, Sharma used the term "Action Set" in the same manner.

Vimal Shah stated that ‘Amul Dairy’ enhanced interaction between rural and
urban relations. Urban institutions like Bank, Amul Dairy etc. emerged in rural
society that changed and created new types of cultural, political and economic
networks. B.R. Chauhan has also studied in Meerut district of Western U.P. the
impact of these institutions. By the production of financial crops, now farmer reach
at national and international market. Development processes created new links in
economic and administrative fields.

Above studies indicate that in Indian society, social conditions and their
relations can be understood by social network. In Indian context sociologists used
this term for understanding of election process, relation between rural and urban people and in the process of development etc.

In India democratic and development approach made by Central Government and States also decide and make policies for different programs. To execute these state level policies and programs, elites of state play an important role and participate effectively. These elites are those people who are elected in state legislature. In election process, how these elites contest election with the cooperation of other persons, how relations are built between these persons and how these elites influence masses to become a part of these new relations. This subject of research is important for sociologists, and attracts attention towards it.