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Balance Model

The balance model does not violate any of the following rules:

- The friend of my friend is my friend.
- The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
- The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
- The friend of my enemy is my enemy.
The balance model does not violate any of the following rules:

The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
The friend of my enemy is my enemy.

Consider the following structure, which contains instances of violations of one or more of the above rules:

Note: all missing arrows are negative arrows
The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
The friend of my enemy is my enemy.

An instance of the satisfaction of this rule:
The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
The friend of my enemy is my enemy.

An instance of the violation of this rule:
The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
The friend of my enemy is my enemy.

An instance of the satisfaction of this rule:
The friend of my friend is my friend. 
**The enemy of my friend is my enemy.**
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
The friend of my enemy is my enemy.

An instance of the violation of this rule:
The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
The friend of my enemy is my enemy.

An instance of the satisfaction of this rule:
The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
The friend of my enemy is my enemy.

An instance of the violation of this rule:
The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
**The friend of my enemy is my enemy.**

An instance of the satisfaction of this rule:
The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
**The friend of my enemy is my enemy.**

Instance of a violation of this rule:

![Diagram illustrating the friendship and enmity relationships](image-url)
The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
The friend of my enemy is my enemy.

What do balanced structures look like? The structure below is not balanced.
Triad Structures
Which of the above triads do not violate any of the following rules?

The friend of my friend is my friend.
The enemy of my enemy is my friend.
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.
The friend of my enemy is my enemy.
Example of a macro-structure consistent with the balance model
Example of a macro-structure consistent with the balance model
Example of a macro-structure consistent with the balance model
Generic representation of the macro-structure of the balance model

M completely interconnected by M
N* completely interconnected by N

\[ \begin{align*}
  &\begin{array}{c}
    \text{M} \\
    \text{N}^* \\
    \text{M}
  \end{array}
  \end{align*} \]
Clustering model permits the above triads
Generic representation of the macro-structure of the clustering model

M completely interconnected by M
N* completely interconnected by N
Transitivity model permits the above triads, i.e., none of the circled triads violates the following if-then assertion:

If \((i \rightarrow j)\) and \((j \rightarrow k)\), then \((i \rightarrow k)\)
Generic representation of the macro-structure of the transitivity model

M  Completely interconnected by M
N* Completely interconnected by N
A* Completely interconnected by A

Note. All interclique A* relations implied by transitivity are suppressed and all other missing interclique relations are N*.
Ridge Structures
Romeo and Juliet: prior to their romance

Balance Model
Romeo and Juliet: during their romance

Balance Model
Romeo and Juliet: the result of their romance

Balance Model
Romeo and Juliet: the result of their romance

Are there other scenarios that would resolve the unbalanced situation their romance created?
Of course, we have this boring, but **tragic**, possibility:
transforms to another form of tragedy
transforms to another form of tragedy
and, we also have this interesting possibility:

transforms to another form of tragedy
Romeo and Juliet:  *A Scenario of Transitional Changes*

transforms to
and then

transforms to

based on reciprocation
and then transforms to based within family social pressure and reciprocation
and then, given

one member of the other family caves in
resulting, via reciprocation and mounting social pressure, in the **happy** conclusion

but, then, and only in this circumstance, we would not have any of the previous forms of **tragedy**.
So, from a balance theory perspective, Romeo and Juliet clearly created a major problem of adjustment when they initiated their romance.
The friend of my friend is my friend.

The enemy of my enemy is my friend.

The enemy of my friend is my enemy.

The friend of my enemy is my enemy.
From a social influence network perspective, each person’s attitude toward another person is subject to **interpersonal influence**.
Homophily, i.e., the love of the same.

In decompositions of interpersonal contact networks into dyads, some of which are in contact and others not, homophily appears with

(1) a positive association, denoted as *status homophily*, between two individuals’ sociodemographic similarity and the occurrence of interpersonal contact, and

(2) a positive association, denoted as *value homophily*, between the occurrence of interpersonal contact and the similarity of individuals’ attitudes or behaviors toward an object
We also have the following:

In decompositions of interpersonal contact networks into dyads, we also frequently find

(3) a positive association, denoted as *status agreement*, between two individuals’ sociodemographic similarity and their similarity of attitudes or behaviors toward an object.
So we have three associations:

Status homophily (similar status and contact)

Value homophily  (similar attitudes and contact)

Status agreement  (similar status and attitudes)
i,j sociodemographic similarity

i,j similarity of attitude or behavior toward an object

i,j contact

i,j similarity of attitude or behavior toward an object
i,j sociodemographic similarity

i,j similarity of attitude or behavior toward an object

i,j contact

i,j similarity of attitude or behavior toward an object

Time
i,j sociodemographic similarity

i,j similarity of attitude or behavior toward an object

i,j contact

i,j similarity of attitude or behavior toward an object
### Romeo and Juliet

#### Graph Representation

![Graph of Romeo and Juliet relationships](image)

#### Table of Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RF</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>JM</th>
<th>JF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Romeo and Juliet: Equal Interpersonal Influences, Zero Self-Weights

All relations (positive and negative) are weakened.
But if Romeo is **intransigent** with respect to his love for Juliet, then

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RF</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>JM</th>
<th>JF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If Romeo’s and Juliet’s fathers (RF & JF) are intransigent, then

R & J’s relationship goes negative at the cost of their own self-regard and regard for their parents. Plus, the two mothers’ regard for their husbands is frayed.
But, suppose that we have an intransigent positive Romeo who embraces Juliet’s mother and father.