


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, NR 3, ND 29%, NC 52%, NT 50%, NR 38%



NN Nodes NE Edges NR Reciprocal 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.

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

ID	CHOICES	IC	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	F, H	0.29	0.22	0.10	0.58	0.17	
B	C, H	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.13	←
C	F, H	0.29	0.10	0.02	0.50	0.17	
D	F, H	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.17	←
E	F, G	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.08	←
F	C, H	0.57	0.17	0.13	0.70	0.13	
G	A, H	0.29	0.16	0.04	0.58	0.12	
H	A, G	0.86	0.31	0.21	0.88	0.03	

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	F, H	3	2	3	3	1	
B	C, H	4	6	6	5	2	←
C	F, H	3	5	5	4	1	
D	F, H	4	6	6	5	1	←
E	F, G	4	6	6	5	4	←
F	C, H	2	3	2	2	2	
G	A, H	3	4	4	3	3	
H	A, G	1	1	1	1	5	

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?

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

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

Reciprocal edges

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

- A · H
- C · 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

- B · H
- D · F
- D · H
- G · 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?

Cliques

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

3

B · C · H

D · F · H

A · F · H

C · F · H

A · G · H

Strongly Connected Groups

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

5

A · C · 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.

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

NN 8, NE 16, NR 3, ND 29%, NC 71%, NT 75%, NR 38%



NN Nodes NE Edges NR Reciprocal 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.

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

ID	CHOICES	IC	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	D, G	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.11	←
B	D, E	0.43	0.05	0.04	0.46	0.14	
C	D, E	0.29	0.27	0.00	0.58	0.14	
D	C, E	1.00	0.31	0.17	1.00	0.05	
E	C, D	0.43	0.29	0.01	0.64	0.12	
F	B, D	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.15	←
G	B, D	0.14	0.03	0.02	0.14	0.15	
H	B, D	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.15	←

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.

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

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

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.

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

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

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

Reciprocal edges

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

- C · D
- C · E
- D · E

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 · G
- F · D
- H · B
- H · 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

3

B · D · E

B · D · H

B · D · F

B · D · G

A · D · G

C · D · E

Strongly Connected Groups

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

3

C · D · E

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.

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

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	SK	KT	P25	P75
In degree Centrality	8.00	0.00	0.86	0.29	0.29	0.31	1.25	0.94	0.35	0.00	0.36
PageRank Centrality	8.00	0.02	0.31	0.13	0.12	0.11	1.44	0.51	-0.73	0.02	0.18
Betweenness Centrality	8.00	0.00	0.21	0.03	0.06	0.08	1.67	1.22	0.64	0.00	0.10
Closeness Centrality	8.00	0.00	0.88	0.54	0.41	0.35	1.51	-0.25	-1.83	0.00	0.61
Hub Centrality	8.00	0.03	0.17	0.13	0.12	0.05	1.35	-1.11	0.74	0.11	0.17

**Min** Minumum value **Max** Maximum value **SD** Standard deviation **CV** Coefficient of variation **SK** Skewness **KT** Kurtosis **P25** 25° percentile **P75** 75° percentile

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

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	SK	KT	P25	P75
In degree Centrality	8.00	0.00	1.00	0.21	0.29	0.34	1.50	1.42	2.20	0.00	0.43
PageRank Centrality	8.00	0.02	0.31	0.04	0.12	0.14	2.21	0.65	-2.14	0.02	0.28
Betweenness Centrality	8.00	0.00	0.17	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.90	2.54	6.68	0.00	0.03
Closeness Centrality	8.00	0.00	1.00	0.30	0.35	0.37	1.69	0.61	-0.82	0.00	0.60
Hub Centrality	8.00	0.05	0.15	0.14	0.12	0.03	1.19	-1.95	4.16	0.12	0.15

**Min** Minumum value **Max** Maximum value **SD** Standard deviation **CV** Coefficient of variation **SK** Skewness **KT** Kurtosis **P25** 25° percentile **P75** 75° percentile

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 3

SOCIOGRAM

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

RP Received preferences RR Received rejections GP Given preferences GR Given rejections MP Mutual preferences MR Mutual rejections BL Balance OR Orientation IM Impact AI Affiliation index II Influence index 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.

DEMO | GROUP 3


SOCIOGRAM | NODES ORDERED BY METRIC

RANK	BL	RANK	IM	RANK	AI	RANK	II	RANK	ST
1	H	1	D	1	H	1	H	popular	H
2	F	2	H	2	F	2	F	appreciated	F
3	A	3	C	3	A	3	A	ambitendent	C
4	G	3	F	4	G	3	C	ambitendent	G
5	C	4	B	5	C	3	G	marginal	A
6	B	4	E	6	B	4	B	disliked	B
6	E	4	G	6	E	4	D	disliked	E
7	D	5	A	7	D	4	E	rejected	D

RP Received preferences RR Received rejections GP Given preferences GR Given rejections BL Balance IM Impact AI Affiliation index II 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.


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.

Type I cohesion index : 37.50%    Type II cohesion index : 0.38  
Type I conflict index : 37.50%    Type II conflict index : 0.38

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	SK	KT	P25	P75
Received preferences	8.00	0.00	6.00	2.00	2.00	2.14	1.25	0.94	0.35	0.00	2.50
Received rejections	8.00	0.00	7.00	1.50	2.00	2.39	1.50	1.42	2.20	0.00	3.00
Given Preferences	8.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Given rejections	8.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Mutual preferences	8.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.75	0.71	1.33	0.40	-0.23	0.00	1.00
Mutual rejections	8.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.75	1.04	2.67	0.64	-2.24	0.00	2.00
Balance	8.00	-7.00	6.00	0.50	0.00	4.21	inf	-0.28	-0.39	-3.00	2.50
Orientation	8.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	nan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Impact	8.00	2.00	7.00	3.50	4.00	1.69	1.12	0.95	-0.03	3.00	4.50
Affiliation index	8.00	-7.00	6.00	0.50	0.00	4.21	inf	-0.28	-0.39	-3.00	2.50
Influence index	8.00	0.00	8.00	3.00	2.75	2.82	1.27	0.80	0.32	0.00	3.50

**Min** Minumum value **Max** Maximum value **SD** Standard deviation **CV** Coefficient of variation **SK** Skewness **KT** Kurtosis **P25** 25° percentile **P75** 75° percentile