
REGULAR ARTICLE - SUPPORTING INFORMATION

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

Figure S1: Boxplots of the cosine similarity distributions between the networks aggregated in different terms (T1, T2, T3), compared with the same distributions for networks with reshuffled weights (RW) or links (RL). (a) Communication vs. co-presence network – weights given by aggregated call durations; (b) Questionnaire network – Q1 vs. Q2; (c) Communication (aggregated call durations) vs. questionnaire network (Q1); (d) Communication (aggregated call durations) vs. questionnaire network (Q2); (e) Co-presence (aggregated durations) vs. questionnaire network (Q1); (f) Co-presence (aggregated durations) vs. questionnaire network (Q1); (f) Co-presence (aggregated durations) vs. questionnaire network (Q2). For the questionnaire cases the RL and RW procedures are equivalent as the networks are fully connected.

Table S1: Pearson correlation coefficients between term-aggregated networks

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


(a) Communication vs. co-presence.

(b) Communication vs. Questionnaire

	Q1-T0	Q1-T1	Q1-T2	Q1-T3	Q2-T0	Q2-T1	Q2-T2	Q2-T3
Duration-T1	0.28	0.31	0.24	0.23	0.38	0.25	0.31	0.21
	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.002)	(p=0.003)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.002)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.007)
Duration-T2	0.27	0.29	0.3	0.35	0.27	0.34	0.37	0.3
	(p=0.001)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)
Duration-T3	0.22	0.28	0.25	0.22	0.31	0.3	0.33	0.24
	(p=0.013)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.005)	(p=0.013)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.007)
Number-T1	0.25	0.25	0.22	0.15	0.3	0.17	0.27	0.13
	(p=0.001)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.005)	(p=0.054)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.031)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.09)
Number-T2	0.24	0.24	0.26	0.31	0.24	0.25	0.32	0.26
	(p=0.003)	(p=0.004)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.003)	(p=0.002)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.001)
Number-T3	0.23	0.26	0.26	0.19	0.34	0.25	0.34	0.22
	(p=0.009)	(p=0.003)	(p=0.003)	(p=0.029)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.004)	(p=0.0)	(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	0.32	0.35	0.3	0.14	0.2	0.26	0.22
	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.008)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)
Duration-T2	0.15	0.31	0.26	0.3	0.09	0.2	0.17	0.26
	(p=0.011)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.106)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.004)	(p=0.0)
Duration-T3	0.12	0.2	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.1	0.18	0.2
	(p=0.152)	(p=0.016)	(p=0.027)	(p=0.032)	(p=0.03)	(p=0.24)	(p=0.028)	(p=0.017)
Number-T1	0.2	0.21	0.24	0.19	0.15	0.13	0.19	0.12
	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.005)	(p=0.014)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.034)
Number-T2	0.13	0.21	0.16	0.2	0.07	0.14	0.08	0.18
	(p=0.028)	(p=0.0)	(p=0.007)	(p=0.001)	(p=0.202)	(p=0.017)	(p=0.171)	(p=0.002)
Number-T3	0.04	0.06	0.01	-0.02	0.14	0.02	0.05	0.06
	(p=0.669)	(p=0.496)	(p=0.886)	(p=0.788)	(p=0.105)	(p=0.767)	(p=0.586)	(p=0.454)



2 Homophily patterns in the yearly aggregated co-presence network

Figure S2: Dyadic homophily – Yearly aggregated co-presence network. Data (black dots) are compared with the distribution (boxplots) obtained for a null model in which attributes are reshuffled among nodes. N_D gives the number of dyads on which the measure is performed. Boxplot: Whiskers - 5th, 10th and 90th, 95th percentiles, Box – 25th and 75th percentiles.




Figure S3: Triadic homophily – Yearly aggregated co-presence network. Data (black dots) are compared with the distribution (boxplots) obtained for a null model in which attributes are reshuffled among nodes. N_{Δ} gives the number of triads on which the statistics is made. Boxplot: Whiskers - 5th, 10th and 90th, 95th percentiles, Box – 25th and 75th percentiles.





Figure S4: Homophily in Social Preference – Yearly aggregated copresence network Ma: Male, Fe: Female, Si: Singaporean, Fo: Foreigner, AM: Above Median, BM: Below Median, Ch: Chinese, NC: Non-Chinese; Data (black dots) are compared with the distribution (boxplots) obtained for a null model in which attributes are reshuffled among nodes. Boxplot: Whiskers - 5th, 10th and 90th, 95th percentiles, Box – 25th and 75th percentiles.



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

Figure S5: Homophily in Triads with respect to several attributes - Term aggregated communication networks. Data (black dots) are compared with the distribution (boxplots) obtained for a null model in which attributes are reshuffled among nodes. N_{Δ} gives the number of triads on which the statistics is made. Boxplot: Whiskers - 5th, 10th and 90th, 95th percentiles, Box - 25th and 75th percentiles.




Figure S6: Homophily in Triads with respect to psychological indices -Term aggregated communication networks. LS: loneliness scale; SACQ: student adaptation to college; CC: classroom community Data (black dots) are compared with the distribution (boxplots) obtained for a null model in which attributes are reshuffled among nodes. N_{Δ} gives the number of triads on which the statistics is made. Boxplot: Whiskers - 5th, 10th and 90th, 95th percentiles, Box - 25th and 75th percentiles.




Figure S7: Homophily in Social Preference with respect to several attributes - Term aggregated networks. Ma: Male, Fe: Female, Si: Singaporean, Fo: Foreigner, AM: Above Median, BM: Below Median, Ch: Chinese, NC: Non-Chinese; Data (black dots) are compared with the distribution (boxplots) obtained for a null model in which attributes are reshuffled among nodes. Boxplot: Whiskers - 5th, 10th and 90th, 95th percentiles, Box - 25th and 75th percentiles.




Figure S8: Homophily in Social Preference with respect to psychological indices – Term aggregated networks LS: loneliness scale; SACQ: student adaptation to college; CC: classroom community; Ma: Male, Fe: Female, Si: Singaporean, Fo: Foreigner, AM: Above Median, BM: Below Median, Ch: Chinese, NC: Non-Chinese ; Data (black dots) are compared with the distribution (boxplots) obtained for a null model in which attributes are reshuffled among nodes. Boxplot: Whiskers - 5th, 10th and 90th, 95th percentiles, Box – 25th and 75th percentiles.

4 Summary tables of homophily patterns for triads and social preferences

Attribute	Weight	Comm	unication	n	Co-pre	sence		Weight	Questi	onnaires		
Attribute	vveigitt	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3	vveigni	Т0	T1	T2	T3
Gender	Volume	W	S	S	W	No	VS	Q1	VS	VS	VS	W
Gender	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
Nationality	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
GPA	Number	S	No	W	No	VS	W	Q2	No	VS	No	W
First Lan-	Volume	No	$W_{\rm het}$	$VS_{\rm het}$	No	No	No	Q1	No	$W_{\rm het}$	$W_{\rm het}$	No
guage	Number	$W_{\rm het}$	$W_{\rm het}$	$VS_{\rm het}$	No	No	No	Q2	No	No	$W_{\rm het}$	No
Loneliness	Volume	No	No	S	VS_{het}	No	No	Q1	VS	No	No	No
Lonenness	Number	No	No	S	VS_{het}	No	No	Q2	No	No	No	No
Student	Volume	No	No	W	W	VS_{het}	VS_{het}	Q1	S	No	No	No
adaptation to college	Number	No	No	W	W	No	$S_{ ext{het}}$	Q2	W	No	No	No
Classroom	Volume	No	No	No	No	No	No	Q1	No	No	No	No
Community	Number	No	W	$W_{\rm het}$	W	No	No	Q2	No	No	No	No

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

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	Comm	unicatior		Co-pre	sence		Weight	Questi	onnaires		
Attribute	vveigitt	Group	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3	vveigni	Т0	T1	T2	T3
	Volume	Ma	No	W	VS	No	No	W	Q1	No	No	No	No
Gender	volume	Fe	VS	VS	W	VS	No	No	ΨI VI	VS	W	W	S
Gender	Number	Ma	No	No	VS	No	No	No	Q2	No	No	W	VS
	Number	Fe	VS	VS	VS	S	No	No	Q2	No	VS	No	W
	Volume	Si	VS	VS	No	S	No	$W_{\rm het}$	Q1	VS	W	VS	W
Nationality	volume	Fo	VS	VS	VS	S	No	W	Ψī	VS	S	W	S
Nationality	Number	Si	VS	VS	W	S	No	W_{het}	Q2	VS	S	VS	W
	Number	Fo	VS	VS	VS	W	W	No	Q2	VS	VS	S	W
	Volume	AM	W	No	No	S	W	S	Q1	W	W	No	No
GPA	Volume	BM	W	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No	S_{het}	No	Q1	W	No	No	No
-	Number	AM	W	No	No	W	W	VS	Q2	No	No	W	No
		BM	S	No	No	No	VS_{het}	$W_{\rm het}$	4-	No	No	No	VS
	Volume	Ch	$W_{\rm het}$	$W_{\rm het}$	No	W	No	$W_{\rm het}$	Q1	S_{het}	$W_{\rm het}$	No	S_{het}
First Lan-	volume	NC	No	W	$W_{\rm het}$	No	$W_{\rm het}$	No	Q1	W	No	No	No
guage	Number	Ch	$W_{\rm het}$	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No	W	$W_{\rm het}$	Q2	W_{het}	S_{het}	S_{het}	$W_{\rm het}$
		NC	No	W	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No	No	~	VS	W	S	VS
	Volume	AM	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No	No	No	No	Q1	No	No	No	$S_{\rm het}$
Loneliness	Volume	BM	VS	$W_{\rm het}$	No	$W_{\rm het}$	No	S_{het}	Q1	W	VS_{het}	No	No
Lonenness	Number	AM	No	No	No	No	No	No	Q2	W_{het}	No	$W_{\rm het}$	VS_{het}
		BM	VS_{het}	S_{het}	No	$W_{\rm het}$	No	$W_{\rm het}$	4-	VS	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No
Student	Volume	AM	No	$W_{\rm het}$	No	VS	No	No	Q1	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No	S
adaptation	Volume	BM	No	No	No	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No	4-	S	No	S	No
to college	Number	AM	W	No	No	VS	No	No	Q2	$S_{\rm het}$	VS_{het}	No	No
		BM	No	No	VS	$W_{\rm het}$	No	$W_{\rm het}$	~-	$W_{\rm het}$	VS_{het}	No	No
	Volume	AM	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No	VS	VS	No	Q1	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No	No
Classroom	. oranic	BM	$W_{\rm het}$	$W_{\rm het}$	No	$W_{\rm het}$	VS_{het}	W	×-	S_{het}	W	No	$VS_{\rm het}$
Community	Number	AM	No	W	No	VS	S	No	Q2	$W_{\rm het}$	No	No	No
		BM	W_{het}	No	No	W_{het}	$W_{\rm het}$	W	~-	No	VS	No	$W_{\rm het}$

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-pre	esence		
		VS	S	W	No	$W_{\rm het}$	$S_{\rm het}$	VS_{het}
n	VS	7	5	5	16	2	0	0
catio	S	2	2	1	6	0	0	0
Communication	W	3	3	3	8	4	2	0
Com	No	8	2	8	32	9	2	3
Ŭ	$W_{\rm het}$	1	0	5	17	3	3	1
	$S_{\rm het}$	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
	VS_{het}	0	0	0	2	1	0	0

(b) Communication vs. Q1

					Ç	21		
		VS	S	W	No	$W_{\rm het}$	S_{het}	VS_{het}
uo	VS	10	8	9	7	0	0	1
Communication	S	2	3	3	3	0	0	0
unu	W	3	1	4	15	0	0	0
Com	No	1	4	6	45	2	4	2
	$W_{\rm het}$	0	0	2	22	6	0	0
	S_{het}	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
	$VS_{\rm het}$	0	0	0	2	0	0	1

(c) Communication vs. Q2

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

			Co-presence									
		VS	S	W	No	$W_{\rm het}$	$S_{\rm het}$	VS_{het}				
	VS	5	0	8	8	0	0	0				
ence	S	1	3	4	3	1	0	0				
Copresence	W	1	3	3	11	2	0	2				
S	No	9	10	5	52	5	2	0				
	$W_{\rm het}$	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				

Table S5: Comparison of homophily in networks - B

(a) Co-presence vs. Q1

					Q	21		
		VS	S	W	No	$W_{\rm het}$	S_{het}	VS_{het}
	VS	6	0	3	10	0	0	2
ence	S	5	2	1	4	0	0	0
Copresence	W	3	1	7	7	2	2	0
ů	No	11	4	9	49	6	2	2
	$W_{\rm het}$	3	1	2	7	4	0	2
	$S_{\rm het}$	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
	VS_{het}	0	0	0	4	0	0	0

(b) Copresence vs. $\mathbf{Q2}$

(c) **Q1 vs. Q2**

					Q	2		
		VS	S	W	No	$W_{\rm het}$	$S_{\rm het}$	VS_{het}
	VS	8	2	4	2	0	0	0
	S	8	0	4	4	0	0	0
Q1	W	6	4	4	10	0	0	0
	No	6	2	10	68	4	2	4
	$W_{\rm het}$	0	0	0	4	2	2	0
	$S_{\rm het}$	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	VS_{het}	0	0	0	0	4	0	0