The Geography of Social Networks

- With the goal of better understanding how forced migrants’ social networks are implicated in livelihoods in order to improve provision of services and outcomes:
  - What role do geography and space play in the ways that forced migrants develop and use social networks?
  - What is the spatial structure of the social networks of forced migrants?
  - What is the impact of the spatial structure of social networks on livelihoods of forced migrants?
  - In what ways do men and women construct and use social networks differently and what is the impact?
Data and Methodology

- Two social network surveys
  - IDPs from Abkhazia living in Tbilisi, Kutaisi, & Zugdidi
    - Both collective centers and private accommodations
  - A panel study of IDPs from South Ossetia
    - R1 – 23/5-26/6/09; R2 – 17/12 – 20;/12/09; R3 – 21/6 – 28/7/11
    - Half living in new settlements & half started in collective center

- Multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) for IDPs from Abkhazia
  - Visualizes & describes the social relationships

- Social network mapping

- Simple summary statistics
Conceptualization of Role of Geography & Space in the Development of Networks

- Merging of:
  - How people use space where they are located
  - Where & how people spend time influence development of new ties
  - What is the function of the social interaction

- The merger conceptualizes how spaces of interaction influence livelihoods & development of bridging and bonding ties – likelihood of managing livelihoods
  - Bonding within group, often strong ties, less integration
  - Bridging across groups, often weaker ties, more integration
  - Analysis of how space/place is formative of productive new ties that assist with livelihood
**Bonding Ties & Strong Ties**

Home spaces and shared spaces in CC and new settlements dominated by access to other IDPs

+ Household, emotional, & social support

**Bridging Ties & Weak Ties**

Shared public & organizational spaces generally more integrated

+ Economic support

Non-local network members?
Key Findings: Time, Space & Gender

+ **Time:**
  + Importance of national and international context around displacement
  + Bonding ties important early in displacement relative to bridging ties

+ **Space:**
  + Networks of IDPs from Abkhazia spatially dispersed not so for those from South Ossetia
  + Critical for bonding ties and developing importance for bridging ties
  + Slow development of use of shared and organizational spaces

+ **Gender:**
  + Men and women have different geographies and use networks differently – men more local, women more dispersed (IDPs Abkhazia)
  + Generally men’s networks economic, female networks social, emotional
IDPs from Abkhazia: key characteristics of social networks of survival

- Often indistinguishable from local population in size, density and composition – evidence of protracted displacement
  - EXCEPT the spatial distribution of those in the network
    - More abroad: 11% living abroad v 7% of local population networks
    - More in same neighborhood
- Gender
  - Male networks
    - focused on economic support
    - Local and shared home (men in CC), public spaces (men in PA)
  - Female networks
    - more dispersed and focused on emotional support
    - Home spaces
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alter's Residence</th>
<th>Respondent's Status</th>
<th>IDP</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Respondent's Housing Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDP in PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same apartment</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same neighborhood</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same city/town/village</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere else in Georgia</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abkhazia</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other foreign country</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown country</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 37.63***  
Chi-Square = 17.27*  

*** p<0.001, * p<0.05
Geographic Diversity of Networks
Matter: Livelihood & Access to Finances
Focus on Role of Geography: spaces of interaction for IDPs from Abkhazia
### Geography of Social Network of IDPs from South Ossetia, in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alter's Residence</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent's Location</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent's Location</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent's Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same apt/cottage</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 25%</td>
<td>Other Sites 29%</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 21%</td>
<td>Other Sites 20%</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 21%</td>
<td>Other Sites 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same building/neighborhood</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 25%</td>
<td>Other Sites 35%</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 30%</td>
<td>Other Sites 36%</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 22%</td>
<td>Other Sites 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same city/town/village</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 24%</td>
<td>Other Sites 7%</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 19%</td>
<td>Other Sites 7%</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 24%</td>
<td>Other Sites 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere else in Georgia</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 24%</td>
<td>Other Sites 21%</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 30%</td>
<td>Other Sites 32%</td>
<td>Verkhvebi 33%</td>
<td>Other Sites 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another country</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer zone</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi2(5) = 29.5073 Pr = 0.000  Pearson chi2(5) = 21.0932 Pr = 0.001  Pearson chi2(4) = 29.5496 Pr = 0.000

Other Sites are Tserovani, Mtekhi, Tsmindatskali
Geography of Social Network of IDP from Abkhazia

Employed Female
Tbilisi Collective Center
22 years old
Network Size: 10 alters
Network Density: 0.27
Spatial Structure of Networks for IDPs from South Ossetia R1: Verkhvebi

Round 1 - Female IDP from South Ossetia
Location: Verkhvebi
Does not engage in regular or irregular income generating activity

Network Size: 5 alters
Network Density: 1 (fully connected)

Node Color: gray = respondent; blue = immediate family; red = relative; black = neighbor; green = friend
Node Shape: square = female, circle = male
Node Size = Year known (relative to age of respondent)

Line Color: IDP status of alter - purple = alter is an IDP; orange = alter is not an IDP
Network Spatial Structure IDPs from South Ossetia R2

Round 2 - Female IDP from South Ossetia
Location: Verkhwebi
Does not engage in regular or irregular income generating activity

Network Size: 6 alters
Network Density: 1 (fully connected)

Node Color: gray = respondent; blue = immediate family; red = relative; black = neighbor; green = friend
Node Shape: square = female, circle = male
Node Size: Year known (relative to age of respondent)

Line Color: IDP status of alter; purple = alter is an IDP; orange = alter is not an IDP
Spatial Structure of Networks for IDPs from South Ossetia R3

Round 3: Female IDP from South Ossetia
Location: Verkhoveli
Engages in income generating activity

Network Size: 6 alters
Network Density: 0.133 (fully connected)

Node Color: gray = respondent; blue = immediate family; red = relative;
black = neighbor; green = friend
Node Shape: square = female, circle = male
Node Size = Year known (relative to age of respondent)

Line Color: IDP status of alter- purple = alter is an IDP; orange = alter is not an IDP
How do IDPs from South Ossetia develop new network ties? Dominance of Bonding Ties; Emerging Bridging Ties

- Over time, home spaces remain fairly dominant in terms of generating new social ties; new bonding ties
  - Round 1 – 100% of new ties for CC residents
    - Nearly ¾ of new ties for the other sites
  - Round 3 – dropped significantly to 10% in Verkhvebi and 44% in Tserovani
  - All rounds family/kin most important generators for new ties

- Organizational spaces and bridging ties – work and study gain importance
  - Slowly through rounds
  - Round 2 all but Mtekhi report new ties from work
  - Round 3 all but Mtekhi report new ties from school
Where does social interaction take place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verkh</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Verkh</td>
<td>Other Sites</td>
<td>Verkh</td>
<td>Other Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of Others</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Home Spaces</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Public Spaces</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Space</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Space</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does this all mean for IDP livelihoods?

- Evidence shows that being in an urban environment creates the space for new social ties creation – bridging ties
- Transition from bonding to bridging ties – most evident in urban spaces
- Geography of the network matters
  - IDPs from Abkhazia – time and space dispersed network good for livelihoods in the sense of access to economic support
  - IDPs from South Ossetia – translocal – meaning more than one space in a locality creates opportunities for bridging ties