


This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

A. Who would you like in your ideal work group?

NN 8, NE 14, ND 25%, NC 38%, NT 57%, NR 29%



NN Nodes NE Edges ND Density NC Centralization NT Transitivity NR Reciprocity

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO

SNA RAW SCORES

A. Who would you like in your ideal work group?

ID	CHOICES	IC	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	F, H	0.71	0.30	0.17	0.73	0.07	
B	F, H	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.07	←
C	-	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
D	A, G	0.29	0.14	0.21	0.51	0.15	
E	A, D	0.14	0.06	0.02	0.29	0.19	
F	A, D	0.43	0.22	0.23	0.57	0.19	
G	A, E	0.14	0.08	0.12	0.37	0.15	
H	A, F	0.29	0.16	0.01	0.51	0.18	

IC In-Degree PR PageRank BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub ND No In-Degree (←) No Out-Degree (→) No In or Out-Degree (↔)

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO

SNA RANK SCORES

A. Who would you like in your ideal work group?

ID	CHOICES	IC	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	F, H	1	1	3	1	4	
B	F, H	5	7	7	6	4	←
C	-	5	7	7	6	5	↔
D	A, G	3	4	2	3	3	
E	A, D	4	6	5	5	1	
F	A, D	2	2	1	2	1	
G	A, E	4	5	4	4	3	
H	A, F	3	3	6	3	2	

IC In-Degree PR PageRank BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub ND No In-Degree (←) No Out-Degree (→) No In or Out-Degree (↔) Very low Low High Very high

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO

SNA NODES ORDERED BY RANKS

A. Who would you like in your ideal work group?

RANK	IC	RANK	PR	RANK	BT	RANK	CL	RANK	HU
1	A	1	A	1	F	1	A	1	E
2	F	2	F	2	D	2	F	1	F
3	D	3	H	3	A	3	D	2	H
3	H	4	D	4	G	3	H	3	D
4	E	5	G	5	E	4	G	3	G
4	G	6	E	6	H	5	E	4	A
5	B	7	B	7	B	6	B	4	B
5	C	7	C	7	C	6	C	5	C

IC In-Degree PR PageRank BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO

SNA EDGES GROUPED BY TYPE

A. Who would you like in your ideal work group?

Non reciprocal edges

$X \rightarrow Y$ in network A · not $Y \rightarrow X$ in network A

- B · F
- B · H
- D · A
- D · G
- E · A
- E · D
- F · D
- G · A
- G · E
- H · F

Reciprocal edges

$X \rightarrow Y$ in network A · $Y \rightarrow X$ in network A

- A · F
- A · H

Half symmetrical edges

$X \rightarrow Y$ in network A · $X \rightarrow Y$ in network B

No edge of this type

Reversed half symmetrical edges

$X \rightarrow Y$ in network A · $Y \rightarrow X$ in network B

- D · A

Full symmetrical edges

$X \rightarrow Y, Y \rightarrow X$ in network A · $X \rightarrow Y, Y \rightarrow X$ in network B

No edge of this type

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

A. Who would you like in your ideal work group?

Strongly Connected Subgraphs

Structures where each node directly reaches all other nodes

6A · D · E · F · G · H

Weakly Connected Subgraphs

Structures where each node reaches all other nodes directly or indirectly

7A · B · D · E · F · G · H

Cliques

Structures where each node directly reaches all other nodes, provided the direction of connections is ignored

4A · D · E · G

3B · F · H


A · F · H

A · D · F

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

B. Who would you not want in your ideal work group?

NN 8, NE 16, ND 29%, NC 38%, NT 44%, NR 50%



NN Nodes NE Edges ND Density NC Centralization NT Transitivity NR Reciprocity

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO

SNA RAW SCORES

B. Who would you not want in your ideal work group?

ID	CHOICES	IC	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	B, D	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.14	←
B	D, G	0.71	0.28	0.36	0.78	0.05	
C	B, E	0.57	0.17	0.19	0.64	0.13	
D	B, H	0.43	0.19	0.19	0.58	0.11	
E	B, C	0.29	0.10	0.05	0.44	0.17	
F	C, E	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.11	←
G	B, C	0.14	0.14	0.07	0.47	0.17	
H	C, D	0.14	0.10	0.07	0.39	0.12	

IC In-Degree PR PageRank BT Betweenness CL Closenness HU Hub ND No In-Degree (←) No Out-Degree (→) No In or Out-Degree (↔)

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO

SNA RANK SCORES

B. Who would you not want in your ideal work group?

ID	CHOICES	IC	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	B, D	6	7	5	7	2	←
B	D, G	1	1	1	1	7	
C	B, E	2	3	2	2	3	
D	B, H	3	2	2	3	5	
E	B, C	4	5	4	5	1	
F	C, E	6	7	5	7	6	←
G	B, C	5	4	3	4	1	
H	C, D	5	6	3	6	4	

IC In-Degree PR PageRank BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub ND No In-Degree (←) No Out-Degree (→) No In or Out-Degree (↔) Very low Low High Very high

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

B. Who would you not want in your ideal work group?

RANK	IC	RANK	PR	RANK	BT	RANK	CL	RANK	HU
1	B	1	B	1	B	1	B	1	E
2	C	2	D	2	C	2	C	1	G
3	D	3	C	2	D	3	D	2	A
4	E	4	G	3	G	4	G	3	C
5	G	5	E	3	H	5	E	4	H
5	H	6	H	4	E	6	H	5	D
6	A	7	A	5	A	7	A	6	F
6	F	7	F	5	F	7	F	7	B

IC In-Degree PR PageRank BT Betweenness CL Closenness HU Hub

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

B. Who would you not want in your ideal work group?

Non reciprocal edges

$X \rightarrow Y$ in network B · not $Y \rightarrow X$ in network B

- A · B
- A · D
- C · B
- E · B
- F · C
- F · E
- G · C
- H · C

Reciprocal edges

$X \rightarrow Y$ in network B · $Y \rightarrow X$ in network B

- B · D
- B · G
- C · E
- D · H

Half symmetrical edges

$X \rightarrow Y$ in network B · $X \rightarrow Y$ in network A

No edge of this type

Reversed half symmetrical edges

$X \rightarrow Y$ in network B · $Y \rightarrow X$ in network A

- A · D

Full symmetrical edges

$X \rightarrow Y, Y \rightarrow X$ in network B · $X \rightarrow Y, Y \rightarrow X$ in network A

No edge of this type

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

B. Who would you not want in your ideal work group?

Strongly Connected Subgraphs

Structures where each node directly reaches all other nodes

6

B · C · D · E · G · H

Weakly Connected Subgraphs

Structures where each node reaches all other nodes directly or indirectly

8

A · B · C · D · E · F · G · H

Cliques

Structures where each node directly reaches all other nodes, provided the direction of connections is ignored

3

C · E · F

B · C · E

B · C · G

A · B · D

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO


SOCIOGRAM

ID	RP	RR	GP	GR	MP	MR	BL	OR	IM	AC	IC	ST
A	5	0	2	2	2	0	5	0	5	5	7	popular
B	0	5	2	2	0	2	-5	0	5	-5	0	rejected
C	0	4	0	2	0	1	-4	-2	4	-6	0	disliked
D	2	3	2	2	0	2	-1	0	5	-1	2	controversial
E	1	2	2	2	0	1	-1	0	3	-1	1	ambivalent
F	3	0	2	2	1	0	3	0	3	3	4	-
G	1	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	marginal
H	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	3	1	3	ambivalent

RP Received preferences RR Received rejections GP Given preferences GR Given rejections MP Mutual preferences MR Mutual rejections BL Balance OR Orientation IM Impact AC Affiliation coefficient IC Influence coefficient ST Sociometric status Very low Low High Very high

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

Influence coefficient




This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO

SOCIOGRAM

Affiliation coefficient



This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO

SOCIOGRAM NODES ORDERED BY RANKS

RANK	RP	RANK	RR	RANK	GP	RANK	GR	RANK	BL	RANK	IM	RANK	AC	RANK	IC
1	A	1	B	1	A	1	A	1	A	1	A	1	A	1	A
2	F	2	C	1	B	1	B	2	F	1	B	2	F	2	F
3	D	3	D	1	D	1	C	3	H	1	D	3	H	3	H
3	H	4	E	1	E	1	D	4	G	2	C	4	G	4	D
4	E	5	G	1	F	1	E	5	D	3	E	5	D	5	E
4	G	5	H	1	G	1	F	5	E	3	F	5	E	5	G
5	B	6	A	1	H	1	G	6	C	3	H	6	B	6	B
5	C	6	F	2	C	1	H	7	B	4	G	7	C	6	C

RP Received preferences RR Received rejections GP Given preferences GR Given rejections BL Balance IM Impact AC Affiliation coefficient IC Influence coefficient

This report is designed as a support tool to facilitate decision-making and does not replace the professional judgment of industry experts. Interpretations drawn from the report should be integrated with other information related to the specific evaluation context.

GROUP 1 - DEMO

SOCIOGRAM STATISTICS

Type I cohesion index : 28.57% , , Type II cohesion index : 0.25
Type I conflitct index : 50.00% , Type II conflitct index : 0.50

ID	Count	Sum	Median	IQR	Mean	SD	Min	P25	P50	P75	Max
Received preferences	8	14	1	1	1.75	1.67	0	0	1	2	5
Received rejections	8	16	1	2	2.00	1.85	0	0	1	3	5
Given Preferences	8	14	2	0	1.75	0.71	0	2	2	2	2
Given rejections	8	16	2	0	2.00	0.00	2	2	2	2	2
Mutual preferences	8	4	0	1	0.50	0.76	0	0	0	1	2
Mutual rejections	8	8	1	0	1.00	0.76	0	0	1	1	2
Balance	8	-2	0	3	-0.25	3.33	-5	-1	0	1	5
Orientation	8	-2	0	0	-0.25	0.71	-2	0	0	0	0
Impact	8	30	3	2	3.75	1.16	2	3	3	5	5
Affiliation coefficient raw	8	-4	0	3	-0.50	3.70	-6	-2	0	1	5
Influence coefficient raw	8	18	1	2	2.25	2.38	0	0	1	3	7

IQR Interquartile range SD Standard Deviation Min Minimum value P25 25° percentile P50 50° percentile P75 75° percentile Max Maximum value