

Agent-Based Social Networks

Federico Bergenti

Università degli Studi di Parma, Italy

Agostino Poggi

Università degli Studi di Parma, Italy

Michele Tomaiuolo

Università degli Studi di Parma, Italy

INTRODUCTION

Social networking sites have deeply changed the face of the web in the last decade. Social web sites have attracted users with very weak interest in technology, including people that before the social networking revolution were not even regular users of other popular Internet services and computers in general (Stroud, 2008). The phenomenon is so widespread that many people started using social networking systems to ask questions directly to people instead of querying search engines (Morris et al., 2010) and in place of regular email. Moreover, some of the largest social networking sites constitute a separate and closed network (Sabbag, 2011). After the huge success of the early social networking systems, many other players came in the social networking market and nowadays hundreds of different social networking systems exist. Even if the social networking systems are greatly dissimilar in their user base and functionality, they are almost always centralized systems. The centralized nature allows a simple browser-based user experience and, moreover, many algorithms, e.g., friend suggestion, are far easier and more efficient to implement in this setting. However, such a solution has many drawbacks, e.g., lack of privacy, lack of anonymity, risks of censorship and operating costs. Therefore, a decentralized architecture may offer several advantages, but it may involve some security and design issues that are not present in

traditional social networks. This chapter has the goal of introducing social networks and how they can take advantages of a decentralized architecture and how the use of multi agent technologies help to cope with its security and design issues and, in addition, to support the creation of innovative services for its users.

BACKGROUND

Social networks can be defined as structures consisting of a finite set of actors and the relation or relations defined on them, where an actor is simply a discrete individual or a social unit (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Social networking systems are implemented as web-sites allowing users to have a profile and managing their online social network, i.e., such systems allow them to: (i) construct a profile which represents them in the system; (ii) create a list of users with whom they share a connection and (iii) navigate their list of connections and that of their friends (Ellison, 2007).

Although we agree that self-presentation and social network management are extremely important and necessary components of a social networking system, we believe that the social networking revolution is far more related to the paradigm shift that transformed most people from mere consumers of information to full-fledged information producers. Most people create information which is essentially personal and, then, it

is mainly of interest for friends and acquaintances. Before the social web revolution such information used to be essentially lost in the web, while, nowadays social networking systems are able to deliver the information to the “right” people.

After the huge success of the early social networking systems, many other players came in the social networking market and nowadays hundreds of different social networking systems exist. Even if the social networking systems are greatly dissimilar in their user base and functionality, they are almost always centralized systems because of the access and implementation advantages.

A minor drawback is that scaling centralized systems to tens or hundreds of million of users is not an easy task. At any rate, we consider this drawback as a minor one, since the problem can be solved providing enough resources. However, the huge operative costs of supporting the infrastructure necessary to provide the service to millions of users can only be justified with robust business plans. While some social networking services have extremely differentiated business models (McGrath 2010), for most of them the primary source of income is advertisement and consequently they have a strong motive for: (i) using user provided data to increase performance for that purpose and (ii) even giving access to authorized commercial third parties to the raw data. This behavior poses serious threats to privacy and data protection issues, especially considering that there is no clear legislation on what uses of the user data are legitimate, and regarding the conditions for disclosing the data to third parties, especially when the subjects involved are from different countries.

Another problem is that social networking systems have terms of service that their users give to the system operators a non-exclusive, transferable, sub-licensable, royalty-free, worldwide license to the submitted content (Facebook, 2016; Twitter, 2016). Such terms are needed for legal reasons: in order to serve webpages containing the users’ data (e.g., their profile page) the service provider needs some rights over that data; it is nonetheless

true that users are essentially allowing the service providers to do with the data whatever they want for free. Moreover, most of the times, the users themselves have not easy and streamlined ways to obtain all the data they inserted in the system in a semantically meaningful or at least in a structured way; this (i) is a serious lock-in problem in its own right and (ii) hinders users’ trust in the platform. Most social networking platforms do not provide their users with easy and standard ways to export user submitted contents in a structured way. According to Fitzpatrick and Lueck (2010) this issue (i) is similar to a serious lock-in problem in its own right, and (ii) it hinders users’ trust in the platform.

The last problem with centralized social networking system is that service providers are in the position to effectively perform a-priori or a-posteriori censorship, or to disclose all the information they have, no matter how private, to other entities. They can perform such actions either motivated by selfish interests or forced under legal terms and other forms of pressure.

DECENTRALIZED SOCIAL NETWORKS

Peer-to-Peer (P2P) technologies are the most suitable mean to build decentralized social networks. In fact, P2P technologies allow the definition of open and decentralized overlay networks on top of the Internet that users can use for directly communicating to find and share resources, often music and movie files (Schollmeier, 2001). Such networks are one of the few largest distributed computing systems ever, and more surprisingly, they can run with great stability and resilient performance in face of possibly the most ferocious dynamics (Qiu & Srikant, 2004).

Thus, the use of P2P technologies for the development of social network is not only viable, but also highly desirable (Wang et al, 2006). First of all, P2P systems essentially achieve automatic resource scalability, in the sense that the avail-

9 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/agent-based-social-networks/184392

Related Content

Secure Mechanisms for Key Shares in Cloud Computing

Amar Buchadeand Rajesh Ingle (2018). *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis* (pp. 21-41).

www.irma-international.org/article/secure-mechanisms-for-key-shares-in-cloud-computing/206875

The Importance of Electronic Commerce in Modern Business

Kijpokin Kasemsap (2018). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Fourth Edition* (pp. 2791-2801).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-importance-of-electronic-commerce-in-modern-business/183990

Fault-Recovery and Coherence in Internet of Things Choreographies

Sylvain Cherrierand Yacine M. Ghamri-Doudane (2017). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach* (pp. 31-49).

www.irma-international.org/article/fault-recovery-and-coherence-in-internet-of-things-choreographies/178222

A Framework to Evaluate the Informatization Level

Soo Kyoung Lim (2001). *Information Technology Evaluation Methods and Management* (pp. 144-152).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/framework-evaluate-informatization-level/23673

Algebraic Properties of Rough Set on Two Universal Sets based on Multigranulation

Mary A. Geetha, D. P. Acharjyaand N. Ch. S. N. Iyengar (2014). *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis* (pp. 49-61).

www.irma-international.org/article/algebraic-properties-of-rough-set-on-two-universal-sets-based-on-multigranulation/116046