


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 16, ND 29%, NC 43%, NT 69%, NR 62%



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?

ID	CHOICES	IC	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	D, H	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.18	←
B	E, F	0.43	0.23	0.04	0.50	0.07	
C	B, D	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.15	←
D	F, H	0.57	0.10	0.27	0.57	0.12	
E	B, F	0.29	0.22	0.00	0.47	0.10	
F	B, E	0.43	0.25	0.19	0.64	0.08	
G	D, H	0.14	0.06	0.00	0.29	0.18	
H	D, G	0.43	0.09	0.07	0.46	0.12	

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.

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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

Reciprocal edges

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

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

- C · D
- D · F

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?

Cliques

Each node can reach every other node: a) without intermediaries; b) ignoring the direction of connections

3

B · E · F

D · G · H

A · D · H

Strongly Connected Groups

Each node can reach every other node: a) with or without intermediaries; b) following the direction of connections

3

B · E · F

D · G · H

Weakly Connected Groups

Each node can reach every other node: a) with or without intermediaries; b) ignoring the direction of connections


8

A · B · C · D · E · F · G · H

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 10%, NT 0%, NR 25%



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?

ID	CHOICES	IC	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	B, E	0.14	0.05	0.07	0.32	0.28	
B	D, H	0.29	0.11	0.22	0.50	0.00	
C	A, H	0.14	0.06	0.18	0.39	0.00	
D	C, E	0.29	0.11	0.31	0.50	0.22	
E	G, H	0.57	0.23	0.20	0.70	0.00	
F	D, G	0.14	0.10	0.16	0.44	0.00	
G	B, E	0.29	0.16	0.14	0.50	0.28	
H	E, F	0.43	0.19	0.25	0.58	0.22	

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.

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

ID	CHOICES	IC	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	B, E	4	8	8	6	1	
B	D, H	3	5	3	3	4	
C	A, H	4	7	5	5	3	
D	C, E	3	4	1	3	2	
E	G, H	1	1	4	1	5	
F	D, G	4	6	6	4	6	
G	B, E	3	3	7	3	1	
H	E, F	2	2	2	2	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.

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

RANK	IC	RANK	PR	RANK	BT	RANK	CL	RANK	HU
1	E	1	E	1	D	1	E	1	A
2	H	2	H	2	H	2	H	1	G
3	B	3	G	3	B	3	B	2	D
3	D	4	D	4	E	3	D	2	H
3	G	5	B	5	C	3	G	3	C
4	A	6	F	6	F	4	F	4	B
4	C	7	C	7	G	5	C	5	E
4	F	8	A	8	A	6	A	6	F

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.

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

Reciprocal edges

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

- E · G
- E · 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

- D · C
- F · 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?

Cliques

Each node can reach every other node: a) without intermediaries; b) ignoring the direction of connections

No components of this type

Strongly Connected Groups

Each node can reach every other node: a) with or without intermediaries; b) following the direction of connections

8

A · B · C · D · E · F · G · H

Weakly Connected Groups

Each node can reach every other node: a) with or without intermediaries; b) ignoring the direction of connections

8

A · B · C · D · E · F · G · H

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.

DEMO | GROUP 2


SOCIOGRAM

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

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.

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.

DEMO | GROUP 2

SOCIOGRAM NODES ORDERED BY RANKS

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

DEMO | GROUP 2

SOCIOGRAM STATISTICS

Type I cohesion index : 62.50%    Type II cohesion index : 0.62  
Type I conflict index : 25.00%    Type II conflict index : 0.25

ID	Count	Sum	Median	IQR	Mean	SD	Min	P25	P50	P75	Max
Received preferences	8	16	2	2	2.00	1.51	0	0	2	3	4
Received rejections	8	16	2	1	2.00	1.07	1	1	2	2	4
Given Preferences	8	16	2	0	2.00	0.00	2	2	2	2	2
Given rejections	8	16	2	0	2.00	0.00	2	2	2	2	2
Mutual preferences	8	10	1	1	1.25	0.89	0	0	1	2	2
Mutual rejections	8	4	0	1	0.50	0.76	0	0	0	1	2
Balance	8	0	0	2	0.00	1.51	-2	-1	0	1	2
Orientation	8	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
Impact	8	32	4	3	4.00	2.14	1	2	4	6	6
Affiliation coefficient	8	0	0	2	0.00	1.51	-2	-1	0	1	2
Influence coefficient	8	26	4	3	3.25	2.25	0	1	4	5	5

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