

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.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING | GROUP 1

RELEVANT NODES

a. Who would you choose as your quest companion?

I

IC · KZ · PR · BT · CL · BL · IM · AI · II · POP

110

b. Who wouldn't you choose as your quest companion?

K

IC · KZ · PR · CL · BL · AI · II · REJ

90

M

BT · REJ

30

ISO A →

K

L

 ISO B →

L


In alphabetical order: AI Affiliation Index AMB Ambitendent APP Appreciated BT Betweenness CL Closeness CON Controversial DIS Disliked HU Hub Centrality IC In-Degree Centrality II Influence Index IM Impact ISO Isolated KZ Katz Centrality MAR Marginal POP Popular PR PageRank Centrality REJ Rejected

Authors: Dr. Pierpaolo CALANNA, PhD, Dr. Gaetano BUONAIUTO (2021-2025), **License of use:** the layout of this report, the customization of charts, as well as the selection of quantitative indices, are subject to copyright.

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 choose as your quest companion?

NN 13, NE 28, RE 8, ND 18%, NC 58%, NT 44%, NR 57%



In alphabetical order: NC Centralization NE Number of Edges NN Number of Nodes NR Reciprocity NT Transitivity NX Density RE Number of Mutual Edges

Authors: Dr. Pierpaolo CALANNA, PhD, Dr. Gaetano BUONAIUTO (2021-2025), **License of use:** the layout of this report, the customization of charts, as well as the selection of quantitative indices, are subject to copyright.

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 choose as your quest companion?

ID	CHOICES	IC	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	B, E, I	0.33	0.33	0.13	0.23	0.49	0.12	
B	A, C, D	0.08	0.24	0.05	0.12	0.32	0.06	
C	A, D, I	0.17	0.26	0.04	0.02	0.27	0.12	
D	C, I	0.17	0.26	0.04	0.01	0.27	0.09	
E	A, F, I	0.25	0.30	0.10	0.05	0.38	0.13	
F	E, I, J	0.17	0.27	0.07	0.00	0.33	0.12	
G	H, I	0.08	0.24	0.06	0.00	0.24	0.08	
H	G, I	0.17	0.26	0.10	0.13	0.32	0.08	
I	A, J, M	0.67	0.43	0.22	0.42	0.69	0.05	
J	E, F, I	0.17	0.28	0.09	0.06	0.42	0.13	
K	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
L	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
M	H	0.08	0.25	0.08	0.12	0.42	0.01	

In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub Centrality IC In-Degree Centrality KZ Katz Centrality ND No In-Degree (←) No Out-Degree (→) No In or Out-Degree (↔) PR PageRank Centrality

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 choose as your quest companion?

ID	CHOICES	IC	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	B, E, I	2	2	2	2	2	5	
B	A, C, D	5	9	9	4	6	9	
C	A, D, I	4	6	10	7	7	3	
D	C, I	4	6	11	8	7	6	
E	A, F, I	3	3	4	6	4	2	
F	E, I, J	4	5	7	9	5	4	
G	H, I	5	10	8	10	8	7	
H	G, I	4	7	3	3	6	8	
I	A, J, M	1	1	1	1	1	10	
J	E, F, I	4	4	5	5	3	1	
K	-	6	11	12	10	9	12	↔
L	-	6	11	12	10	9	12	↔
M	H	5	8	6	4	3	11	

In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub Centrality IC In-Degree Centrality KZ Katz Centrality ND No In-Degree (←) No Out-Degree (→) No In or Out-Degree (↔) PR PageRank Centrality

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 choose as your quest companion?

IC	RK	KZ	RK	PR	RK	BT	RK	CL	RK	HU	RK
I	1	I	1	I	1	I	1	I	1	J	1
A	2	A	2	A	2	A	2	A	2	E	2
E	3	E	3	H	3	H	3	J	3	C	3
C	4	J	4	E	4	B	4	M	3	F	4
D	4	F	5	J	5	M	4	E	4	A	5
F	4	C	6	M	6	J	5	F	5	D	6
H	4	D	6	F	7	E	6	B	6	G	7
J	4	H	7	G	8	C	7	H	6	H	8
B	5	M	8	B	9	D	8	C	7	B	9
G	5	B	9	C	10	F	9	D	7	I	10
M	5	G	10	D	11	G	10	G	8	M	11
K	6	K	11	K	12	K	10	K	9	K	12
L	6	L	11	L	12	L	10	L	9	L	12

In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub Centrality IC In-Degree Centrality KZ Katz Centrality RK Rank PR PageRank Centrality

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 choose as your quest companion?

Non reciprocal edges

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

- B · C
- B · D
- C · A
- C · I
- D · I
- E · I
- F · I
- G · I
- H · I
- I · M
- J · E
- M · H

Reciprocal edges

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

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

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 · I
- D · I
- I · M

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 choose as your quest companion?

Cliques

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

4

E · F · I · J

3

A · C · I

C · D · I

G · H · I

H · I · M

A · E · I

A · B · C

B · C · D

Strongly Connected Groups

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

11

A · B · C · D · E · F · G · H · I · J · M

Weakly Connected Groups


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

No components 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 wouldn't you choose as your quest companion?

NN 13, NE 24, RE 4, ND 15%, NC 48%, NT 12%, NR 33%



In alphabetical order: NC Centralization NE Number of Edges NN Number of Nodes NR Reciprocity NT Transitivity NX Density RE Number of Mutual Edges

Authors: Dr. Pierpaolo CALANNA, PhD, Dr. Gaetano BUONAIUTO (2021-2025), **License of use:** the layout of this report, the customization of charts, as well as the selection of quantitative indices, are subject to copyright.

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 wouldn't you choose as your quest companion?

ID	CHOICES	IC	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	K, M	0.25	0.32	0.18	0.11	0.50	0.14	
B	K, M	0.08	0.26	0.11	0.06	0.42	0.14	
C	K, M	0.08	0.25	0.05	0.02	0.27	0.14	
D	G, K	0.08	0.25	0.05	0.15	0.28	0.10	
E	K, M	0.08	0.24	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.14	
F	G, K	0.08	0.25	0.03	0.00	0.21	0.10	
G	F, K	0.17	0.27	0.05	0.08	0.27	0.09	
H	A, E	0.00	0.22	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	←
I	C, D	0.08	0.26	0.08	0.27	0.35	0.00	
J	K, M	0.00	0.22	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.14	←
K	A, B	0.67	0.43	0.22	0.20	0.72	0.00	
L	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
M	A, I	0.42	0.35	0.17	0.34	0.50	0.00	

In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub Centrality IC In-Degree Centrality KZ Katz Centrality ND No In-Degree (←) No Out-Degree (→) No In or Out-Degree (↔) PR PageRank Centrality

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 wouldn't you choose as your quest companion?

ID	CHOICES	IC	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	K, M	3	3	2	5	2	1	
B	K, M	5	5	4	7	3	1	
C	K, M	5	8	6	9	7	1	
D	G, K	5	8	6	4	5	2	
E	K, M	5	9	9	8	9	1	
F	G, K	5	7	8	10	8	2	
G	F, K	4	4	7	6	6	3	
H	A, E	6	10	10	10	10	4	←
I	C, D	5	6	5	2	4	6	
J	K, M	6	10	10	10	10	1	←
K	A, B	1	1	1	3	1	5	
L	-	6	11	11	10	10	6	↔
M	A, I	2	2	3	1	2	6	

In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub Centrality IC In-Degree Centrality KZ Katz Centrality ND No In-Degree (←) No Out-Degree (→) No In or Out-Degree (↔) PR PageRank Centrality

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 wouldn't you choose as your quest companion?

IC	RK	KZ	RK	PR	RK	BT	RK	CL	RK	HU	RK
K	1	K	1	K	1	M	1	K	1	A	1
M	2	M	2	A	2	I	2	A	2	B	1
A	3	A	3	M	3	K	3	M	2	C	1
G	4	G	4	B	4	D	4	B	3	E	1
B	5	B	5	I	5	A	5	I	4	J	1
C	5	I	6	C	6	G	6	D	5	D	2
D	5	F	7	D	6	B	7	G	6	F	2
E	5	C	8	G	7	E	8	C	7	G	3
F	5	D	8	F	8	C	9	F	8	H	4
I	5	E	9	E	9	F	10	E	9	K	5
H	6	H	10	H	10	H	10	H	10	I	6
J	6	J	10	J	10	J	10	J	10	L	6
L	6	L	11	L	11	L	10	L	10	M	6

In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub Centrality IC In-Degree Centrality KZ Katz Centrality RK Rank PR PageRank Centrality

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 wouldn't you choose as your quest companion?

Non reciprocal edges

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

- B · M
- C · K
- C · M
- D · G
- D · K
- E · K
- E · M
- F · K
- G · K
- H · A
- H · E
- I · C
- I · D
- J · K
- J · M
- M · I

Reciprocal edges

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

- A · K
- A · M
- B · K
- F · G

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

- I · C
- I · D
- M · I

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 wouldn't you choose as your quest companion?

Cliques

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

3

F · G · K

D · G · K

C · I · M

Strongly Connected Groups

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

9

A · B · C · D · F · G · I · K · M

Weakly Connected Groups

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

12

A · B · C · D · E · F · G · H · I · J · K · M

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 choose as your quest companion?

NN 13, NE 28, RE 8, ND 18%, NC 58%, NT 44%, NR 57%

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	GN	SK	KT	P25	P75
In-Degree Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.67	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.96	0.45	2.01	5.20	0.08	0.17
PageRank Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.22	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.77	0.39	1.18	2.50	0.04	0.10
Katz Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.43	0.26	0.24	0.12	0.49	0.23	-1.19	1.79	0.24	0.28
Betweenness Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.42	0.05	0.09	0.12	1.35	0.63	1.93	4.01	0.00	0.12
Closeness Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.69	0.32	0.32	0.18	0.58	0.30	-0.09	1.04	0.27	0.42
Hub Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.13	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.64	0.34	-0.56	-1.15	0.05	0.12

In alphabetical order: COUNT Frequency CV Coefficient of Variation GN Gini Coefficient KT Kurtosis MAX Maximum Value MEAN Mean MEDIAN Median MIN Minimum Value NC Centralization NE Number of Edges NN Number of Nodes NR Reciprocity NT Transitivity P25 25th Percentile P75 75th Percentile RE Number of Mutual Edges SD Standard Deviation SK Skewness

b. Who wouldn't you choose as your quest companion?

NN 13, NE 24, RE 4, ND 15%, NC 48%, NT 12%, NR 33%

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	GN	SK	KT	P25	P75
In-Degree Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.67	0.08	0.15	0.19	1.25	0.56	1.96	3.77	0.08	0.17
PageRank Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.22	0.05	0.08	0.07	0.97	0.50	1.00	-0.28	0.02	0.11
Katz Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.43	0.25	0.25	0.10	0.38	0.17	-1.15	4.46	0.24	0.27
Betweenness Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.34	0.06	0.10	0.11	1.16	0.59	1.12	0.22	0.00	0.15
Closeness Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.72	0.27	0.28	0.22	0.80	0.43	0.36	-0.40	0.08	0.42
Hub Centrality	13.00	0.00	0.14	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.86	0.44	-0.30	-1.98	0.00	0.14

In alphabetical order: COUNT Frequency CV Coefficient of Variation GN Gini Coefficient KT Kurtosis MAX Maximum Value MEAN Mean MEDIAN Median MIN Minimum Value NC Centralization NE Number of Edges NN Number of Nodes NR Reciprocity NT Transitivity P25 25th Percentile P75 75th Percentile RE Number of Mutual Edges SD Standard Deviation SK Skewness

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.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING | GROUP 1

SOCIOGRAM | RAW SCORES

ID	RP	RR	GP	GR	MP	MR	BL	OR	IM	AI	II	ST
A	4	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	7	2	7	appreciated
B	1	1	3	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	ambitendent
C	2	1	3	2	1	0	1	1	3	2	3	appreciated
D	2	1	2	2	1	0	1	0	3	1	3	appreciated
E	3	1	3	2	2	0	2	1	4	3	5	appreciated
F	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	3	2	4	appreciated
G	1	2	2	2	1	1	-1	0	3	-1	2	disliked
H	2	0	2	2	1	0	2	0	2	2	3	appreciated
I	8	1	3	2	2	0	7	1	9	8	10	popular
J	2	0	3	2	2	0	2	1	2	3	4	appreciated
K	0	8	0	2	0	2	-8	-2	8	-10	0	rejected
L	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	marginal
M	1	5	1	2	0	1	-4	-1	6	-5	1	rejected

In alphabetical order: AI Affiliation Index BL Balance GP Given Preferences GR Given Rejections II Influence Index IM Impact MP Mutual Preferences MR Mutual Rejections OR Orientation RP Received Preferences RR Received Rejections ST Sociometric Status

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.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING | GROUP 1


SOCIOGRAM | NODES ORDERED BY RANK

BL	RK	IM	RK	AI	RK	II	RK	ST	RK
I	1	I	1	I	1	I	1	I	1
E	2	K	2	E	2	A	2	A	2
H	2	A	3	J	2	E	3	C	2
J	2	M	4	A	3	F	4	D	2
A	3	E	5	C	3	J	4	E	2
C	3	C	6	F	3	C	5	F	2
D	3	D	6	H	3	D	5	H	2
F	3	F	6	B	4	H	5	J	2
B	4	G	6	D	4	B	6	L	3
L	4	B	7	L	5	G	6	B	6
G	5	H	7	G	6	M	7	G	8
M	6	J	7	M	7	K	8	K	9
K	7	L	8	K	8	L	8	M	9

In alphabetical order: AI Affiliation Index BL Balance II Influence Index IM Impact ST Sociometric Status


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 index



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 index



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.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING | GROUP 1

SOCIOGRAM | DESCRIPTIVES

Type I Cohesion Index : 57.14% Type II Cohesion Index : 0.62

Type I Conflict Index : 33.33% Type II Conflict Index : 0.31

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	GN	SK	KT	P25	P75
Received Preferences	13.00	0.00	8.00	2.00	2.15	2.08	0.96	0.45	2.01	5.20	1.00	2.00
Received Rejections	13.00	0.00	8.00	1.00	1.85	2.30	1.25	0.56	1.96	3.77	1.00	2.00
Given Preferences	13.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.15	1.14	0.53	0.26	-1.14	-0.02	2.00	3.00
Given Rejections	13.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	1.85	0.55	0.30	0.08	-3.61	13.00	2.00	2.00
Mutual Preferences	13.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	1.23	0.93	0.75	0.39	0.21	-0.55	1.00	2.00
Mutual Rejections	13.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.62	0.77	1.25	0.62	0.85	-0.58	0.00	1.00
Balance	13.00	-8.00	7.00	1.00	0.31	3.47	11.29	0.20	-0.80	2.84	0.00	2.00
Orientation	13.00	-2.00	1.00	1.00	0.31	0.95	3.08	0.19	-1.43	1.71	0.00	1.00
Impact	13.00	0.00	9.00	3.00	4.00	2.68	0.67	0.35	0.68	-0.48	2.00	6.00
Affiliation Index	13.00	-10.00	8.00	2.00	0.62	4.29	6.97	0.19	-1.17	2.88	0.00	2.00
Influence Index	13.00	0.00	10.00	3.00	3.38	2.79	0.82	0.42	1.12	1.56	2.00	4.00

In alphabetical order: COUNT Frequency CV Coefficient of Variation GN Gini Coefficient KT Kurtosis MAX Maximum Value MEAN Mean MEDIAN Median MIN Minimum Value P25 25th Percentile P75 75th Percentile SD Standard Deviation SK Skewness