

Are the different layers of a social network conveying the same information?

Ajaykumar Manivannan, W. Quin Yow, Roland Bouffanais, Alain Barrat

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

1 Comparison between term-aggregated networks




Table S1: Pearson correlation coefficients between term-aggregated networks

(a) Communication vs. co-presence.

	Duration-T1	Duration-T2	Duration-T3	Number-T1	Number-T2	Number-T3
Duration-T1	-0.02 (p=0.863)	-0.14 (p=0.262)	0.06 (p=0.76)	-0.02 (p=0.865)	-0.09 (p=0.483)	0.21 (p=0.285)
Duration-T2	0.06 (p=0.58)	0.16 (p=0.181)	0.07 (p=0.737)	0.02 (p=0.866)	0.17 (p=0.165)	0.12 (p=0.558)
Duration-T3	0.04 (p=0.722)	0.14 (p=0.29)	-0.07 (p=0.735)	0.01 (p=0.936)	0.13 (p=0.324)	-0.07 (p=0.744)
Number-T1	0.02 (p=0.879)	-0.17 (p=0.174)	0.03 (p=0.864)	0.01 (p=0.903)	-0.16 (p=0.216)	0.27 (p=0.159)
Number-T2	0.1 (p=0.384)	0.27 (p=0.027)	0.05 (p=0.793)	0.06 (p=0.621)	0.27 (p=0.027)	0.08 (p=0.672)
Number-T3	0.12 (p=0.293)	0.24 (p=0.066)	-0.07 (p=0.734)	0.08 (p=0.5)	0.21 (p=0.109)	-0.08 (p=0.694)


(b) Communication vs. Questionnaire


	Q1-T0	Q1-T1	Q1-T2	Q1-T3	Q2-T0	Q2-T1	Q2-T2	Q2-T3
Duration-T1	0.28 (p=0.0)	0.31 (p=0.0)	0.24 (p=0.002)	0.23 (p=0.003)	0.38 (p=0.0)	0.25 (p=0.002)	0.31 (p=0.0)	0.21 (p=0.007)
Duration-T2	0.27 (p=0.001)	0.29 (p=0.0)	0.3 (p=0.0)	0.35 (p=0.0)	0.27 (p=0.001)	0.34 (p=0.0)	0.37 (p=0.0)	0.3 (p=0.0)
Duration-T3	0.22 (p=0.013)	0.28 (p=0.001)	0.25 (p=0.005)	0.22 (p=0.013)	0.31 (p=0.0)	0.3 (p=0.001)	0.33 (p=0.0)	0.24 (p=0.007)
Number-T1	0.25 (p=0.001)	0.25 (p=0.001)	0.22 (p=0.005)	0.15 (p=0.054)	0.3 (p=0.0)	0.17 (p=0.031)	0.27 (p=0.001)	0.13 (p=0.09)
Number-T2	0.24 (p=0.003)	0.24 (p=0.004)	0.26 (p=0.001)	0.31 (p=0.0)	0.24 (p=0.003)	0.25 (p=0.002)	0.32 (p=0.0)	0.26 (p=0.001)
Number-T3	0.23 (p=0.009)	0.26 (p=0.003)	0.26 (p=0.003)	0.19 (p=0.029)	0.34 (p=0.0)	0.25 (p=0.004)	0.34 (p=0.0)	0.22 (p=0.011)


(c) Co-presence vs. questionnaire.

	Q1-T0	Q1-T1	Q1-T2	Q1-T3	Q2-T0	Q2-T1	Q2-T2	Q2-T3
Duration-T1	0.27 (p=0.0)	0.32 (p=0.0)	0.35 (p=0.0)	0.3 (p=0.0)	0.14 (p=0.008)	0.2 (p=0.0)	0.26 (p=0.0)	0.22 (p=0.0)
Duration-T2	0.15 (p=0.011)	0.31 (p=0.0)	0.26 (p=0.0)	0.3 (p=0.0)	0.09 (p=0.106)	0.2 (p=0.001)	0.17 (p=0.004)	0.26 (p=0.0)
Duration-T3	0.12 (p=0.152)	0.2 (p=0.016)	0.18 (p=0.027)	0.18 (p=0.032)	0.18 (p=0.03)	0.1 (p=0.24)	0.18 (p=0.028)	0.2 (p=0.017)
Number-T1	0.2 (p=0.0)	0.21 (p=0.0)	0.24 (p=0.0)	0.19 (p=0.001)	0.15 (p=0.005)	0.13 (p=0.014)	0.19 (p=0.001)	0.12 (p=0.034)
Number-T2	0.13 (p=0.028)	0.21 (p=0.0)	0.16 (p=0.007)	0.2 (p=0.001)	0.07 (p=0.202)	0.14 (p=0.017)	0.08 (p=0.171)	0.18 (p=0.002)
Number-T3	0.04 (p=0.669)	0.06 (p=0.496)	0.01 (p=0.886)	-0.02 (p=0.788)	0.14 (p=0.105)	0.02 (p=0.767)	0.05 (p=0.586)	0.06 (p=0.454)


2 Homophily patterns in the yearly aggregated co-presence network










3 Evolution of homophily patterns in triads and social preference in the communication network









4 Summary tables of homophily patterns for triads and social preferences

Table S2: Summary of the homophily patterns found in triads in the different networks, with respect to the various attributes considered.

Attribute	Weight	Communication			Co-presence			Weight	Questionnaires			
		T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3		T0	T1	T2	T3
Gender	Volume	W	S	S	W	No	VS	Q1	VS	VS	VS	W
	Number	W	S	S	No	No	VS	Q2	VS	No	VS	VS
Nationality	Volume	VS	VS	W	VS	No	No	Q1	No	No	No	No
	Number	VS	VS	W	VS	No	No	Q2	S	No	No	No
GPA	Volume	S	No	W	S	VS	S	Q1	No	S	W	No
	Number	S	No	W	No	VS	W	Q2	No	VS	No	W
First Language	Volume	No	W _{het}	VS _{het}	No	No	No	Q1	No	W _{het}	W _{het}	No
	Number	W _{het}	W _{het}	VS _{het}	No	No	No	Q2	No	No	W _{het}	No
Loneliness	Volume	No	No	S	VS _{het}	No	No	Q1	VS	No	No	No
	Number	No	No	S	VS _{het}	No	No	Q2	No	No	No	No
Student adaptation to college	Volume	No	No	W	W	VS _{het}	VS _{het}	Q1	S	No	No	No
	Number	No	No	W	W	No	S _{het}	Q2	W	No	No	No
Classroom Community	Volume	No	No	No	No	No	No	Q1	No	No	No	No
	Number	No	W	W _{het}	W	No	No	Q2	No	No	No	No

Table S3: **Summary of the homophily patterns found in Social preferences in the different networks, with respect to the various attributes considered.** Ma: Male, Fe: Female, Si: Singaporean, Fo: Foreigner, AM: Above Median, BM: Below Median, Ch: Chinese, NC: Non-Chinese

Attribute	Weight	Group	Communication			Co-presence			Weight	Questionnaires			
			T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3		T0	T1	T2	T3
Gender	Volume	Ma	No	W	VS	No	No	W	Q1	No	No	No	No
		Fe	VS	VS	W	VS	No	No		VS	W	W	S
	Number	Ma	No	No	VS	No	No	No	Q2	No	No	W	VS
		Fe	VS	VS	VS	S	No	No		No	VS	No	W
Nationality	Volume	Si	VS	VS	No	S	No	W _{het}	Q1	VS	W	VS	W
		Fo	VS	VS	VS	S	No	W		VS	S	W	S
	Number	Si	VS	VS	W	S	No	W _{het}	Q2	VS	S	VS	W
		Fo	VS	VS	VS	W	W	No		VS	VS	S	W
GPA	Volume	AM	W	No	No	S	W	S	Q1	W	W	No	No
		BM	W	W _{het}	No	No	S _{het}	No		W	No	No	No
	Number	AM	W	No	No	W	W	VS	Q2	No	No	W	No
		BM	S	No	No	No	VS _{het}	W _{het}		No	No	No	VS
First Language	Volume	Ch	W _{het}	W _{het}	No	W	No	W _{het}	Q1	S _{het}	W _{het}	No	S _{het}
		NC	No	W	W _{het}	No	W _{het}	No		W	No	No	No
	Number	Ch	W _{het}	W _{het}	No	No	W	W _{het}	Q2	W _{het}	S _{het}	S _{het}	W _{het}
		NC	No	W	W _{het}	No	No	No		VS	W	S	VS
Loneliness	Volume	AM	W _{het}	No	No	No	No	No	Q1	No	No	No	S _{het}
		BM	VS	W _{het}	No	W _{het}	No	S _{het}		W	VS _{het}	No	No
	Number	AM	No	No	No	No	No	No	Q2	W _{het}	No	W _{het}	VS _{het}
		BM	VS _{het}	S _{het}	No	W _{het}	No	W _{het}		VS	W _{het}	No	No
Student adaptation to college	Volume	AM	No	W _{het}	No	VS	No	No	Q1	W _{het}	No	No	S
		BM	No	No	No	W _{het}	No	No		S	No	S	No
	Number	AM	W	No	No	VS	No	No	Q2	S _{het}	VS _{het}	No	No
		BM	No	No	VS	W _{het}	No	W _{het}		W _{het}	VS _{het}	No	No
Classroom Community	Volume	AM	W _{het}	No	No	VS	VS	No	Q1	W _{het}	No	No	No
		BM	W _{het}	W _{het}	No	W _{het}	VS _{het}	W		S _{het}	W	No	VS _{het}
	Number	AM	No	W	No	VS	S	No	Q2	W _{het}	No	No	No
		BM	W _{het}	No	No	W _{het}	W _{het}	W		No	VS	No	W _{het}

5 Detailed tables of the numbers of concordant and discordant cases for each network pair

Table S4: Comparison of homophily in networks – A

(a) Communication vs. Co-presence

		Co-presence						
		VS	S	W	No	W_{het}	S_{het}	VS_{het}
Communication	VS	7	5	5	16	2	0	0
	S	2	2	1	6	0	0	0
	W	3	3	3	8	4	2	0
	No	8	2	8	32	9	2	3
	W_{het}	1	0	5	17	3	3	1
	S_{het}	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
	VS_{het}	0	0	0	2	1	0	0

(b) Communication vs. Q1

		Q1						
		VS	S	W	No	W_{het}	S_{het}	VS_{het}
Communication	VS	10	8	9	7	0	0	1
	S	2	3	3	3	0	0	0
	W	3	1	4	15	0	0	0
	No	1	4	6	45	2	4	2
	W_{het}	0	0	2	22	6	0	0
	S_{het}	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
	VS_{het}	0	0	0	2	0	0	1

(c) Communication vs. Q2

		Q2						
		VS	S	W	No	W_{het}	S_{het}	VS_{het}
Communication	VS	13	6	8	7	1	0	0
	S	7	0	1	3	0	0	0
	W	1	2	5	14	0	0	1
	No	3	0	6	44	6	0	5
	W_{het}	4	0	2	16	4	4	0
	S_{het}	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
	VS_{het}	0	0	0	2	1	0	0

Table S5: Comparison of homophily in networks - B

(a) Co-presence vs. Q1

		Co-presence						
		VS	S	W	No	W _{het}	S _{het}	VS _{het}
Coproence	VS	5	0	8	8	0	0	0
	S	1	3	4	3	1	0	0
	W	1	3	3	11	2	0	2
	No	9	10	5	52	5	2	0
	W _{het}	0	0	4	11	0	2	2
	S _{het}	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
	VS _{het}	0	0	0	4	0	0	0

(b) Copresence vs. Q2

		Q1						
		VS	S	W	No	W _{het}	S _{het}	VS _{het}
Coproence	VS	6	0	3	10	0	0	2
	S	5	2	1	4	0	0	0
	W	3	1	7	7	2	2	0
	No	11	4	9	49	6	2	2
	W _{het}	3	1	2	7	4	0	2
	S _{het}	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
	VS _{het}	0	0	0	4	0	0	0

(c) Q1 vs. Q2

		Q2						
		VS	S	W	No	W _{het}	S _{het}	VS _{het}
Q1	VS	8	2	4	2	0	0	0
	S	8	0	4	4	0	0	0
	W	6	4	4	10	0	0	0
	No	6	2	10	68	4	2	4
	W _{het}	0	0	0	4	2	2	0
	S _{het}	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	VS _{het}	0	0	0	0	4	0	0